

the vacancies caused by the retirement of Shri Lokanath Misra, Shri M.S. Abdul Khader, Shri Yogendra Sharma, Shrimati Sumitra G. Kulkarni, Shri Maqsood Ali Khan and Shri Harsh Deo Malaviya from the membership of the Rajya Sabha."

The question its put and the motion was adopted.

REFERENCE TO ALLEGED FIRING BY THE PAC MEN IN A TRAIN

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
श्रीमन्, दिनांक 21. 4. 78 को गोरखपुर से छिन्नी घाट जाने वाली ट्रेन में जब यह गाड़ी सिसवा स्टेशन पर पहुंची तो ट्रेन के पैसेंजर्स ने देखा कि एक डिब्बे में जिस में पी०ए०सी० के सिपाही बैठे हुए थे उसमें तीन, चार महिलायें भी बैठी थीं और पी०ए०सी० के सिपाहियों ने उस डिब्बे की बत्ती गुल कर दी थी और उस डिब्बे में दूसरे मुसाफिर जो चढ़ने का प्रयास कर रहे थे उनको वे चढ़ने नहीं दे रहे थे और यह प्रक्रिया सिसवा स्टेशन पर पहुंचने के पहले दो, तीन स्टेशनों पर हो चुकी थी। जो मुसाफिर उस डिब्बे में चढ़ना चाहते थे उनको वह लोग चढ़ने नहीं देते थे। जब गाड़ी सिसवा स्टेशन पर पहुंची तो काफी मुसाफिरों ने इस बात पर एतराज किया कि आप ने डिब्बे की बत्ती गुल कर दी है और तीन, चार महिलायें उस डिब्बे में बैठी हुई हैं और दूसरे मुसाफिरों को उस डिब्बे में आप चढ़ने नहीं दे रहे हैं यह क्या बात है। मुसाफिरों के एतराज करने पर उन्होंने मुसाफिरों पर हमला किया, बाद में कहा जाता है कि मुसाफिरों की ओर से भी कुछ डेने डिब्बे के ऊपर फेंके गए। लेकिन पी० ए० सी० के सिपाहियों ने गोली चलाना शुरू कर दिया एक छोटे से कारण पर और तीन व्यक्ति स्टेशन पर मारे गए। इस तौर पर ऐसा लगता है कि पी०ए०सी० के लोगों के लिए साधारण लोगों की जान लेना बहुत आसान हो गया है। उनकी ट्रेनिंग पिछले स. तों में ऐसी हुई है, पी०ए०सी० और पुलिस के दोनों की ट्रेनिंग पिछले सालों में ऐसी हुई

है कि वह निहायत नृशंसतापूर्वक निर्दोष लोगों की जान ले लेते हैं। मैं सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि वह कृपया पी०ए०सी० और सी आर पी के लोगों के लिए इस तरह की ट्रेनिंग की व्यवस्था करे, उसके ढंग में ढांचे में कुछ इस प्रकार का परिवर्तन करे कि उनके नजरिए में परिवर्तन आए, उनके आउटलुक में तब्दीली आए और वह अपने को जनता का सेवक समझें और इस प्रकार की गुन्डागर्दी जैसी कि सिसवा स्टेशन पर हुई कि तीन चार महिलाओं को उस डिब्बे में पाकर उन्होंने उस डिब्बे की बत्ती गुल कर दी और दूसरे मुसाफिरों ने जब उसमें चढ़ने की कोशिश की तो उनको चढ़ने नहीं दिया गया और उसके बाद थोड़ी सी बात पर गोलियां चलाई, इस तरह का यह नजरिया और हरकतें बन्द हों। इसलिए इस तरफ मैं आप के माध्यम से सरकार का ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूँ।

DEMAND FOR DISCUSSION ON THE FIVE-YEAR, PLAN 1978-83

श्री भीष्म नारायण सिंह (बिहार) :
सभापति महोदय, दो शब्द में निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। अभी प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने फाइव इयर प्लान के बारे में कुछ कहा और 1978-83 का प्लान ले लिया। यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण विषय है और इस पर डिस्कशन होना चाहिए यह बात मैं आपके माध्यम से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ।

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY

MR. CHAIRMAN: "We shall now take up discussion on the working of the Ministry of Industry. Shri Bhupesh Gupta—not here. Shri Devendra Nath Dwivedi—and here. Shri Shyam Lai Yadav—not here. Shri Kalyan Roy, you have the opportunity.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): Sir, with your permission, I will just initiate the debate and Comrade Indradeep Sinha will intervene on behalf of the party. Sir, in the beginning, I must congratulate the Minister of Industry for showing the courage to take over the Jaipuria empire in spite of a split in the Cabinet; and we have been told that he is under severe pressure to hand over the Jaipuria empire back to Sitaram Jaipuria and his gang.

The working class regrets why it is that Mr. George Fernandes is not interested in taking over Swadeshi Polyester which actually yields the highest profit. This shows that Mr. Fernandes agrees with me that mixed economy has come to a dead end. It is becoming unproductive with 70 per cent of the total credit going to the private sector. In spite of that, there is a fall in production, rise in prices, mounting working class anger and the largest unemployment we ever had in this country.

The second point that I would like to take up is the question of the jute industry about which we have just seen the report of the Public Undertakings Committee. Sir, the Jute Corporation of India has not been able to deliver the goods, not because of some inherent weakness, but because of the big houses, the Birlas, the Mafatlals, the Jains, the Bajorias and others who control the jute industry. They have fleeced the growers and the public financial institutions and have prospered. They have diverted the money to the easy areas where they can make profits. Mr. George Fernandes is there for one year and the Cabinet is there for one year. Rs. 22 crores have been taken by the jutemill-owners from the Jute Corporation of India, but not a farthing has been paid back, and yet they are getting more and more jute from the Jute Corporation of India. Now they are creating a big crisis of raw jute and are threatening to close down the jute mills for once" a day or once a week. As a matter of fact,

during the emergency 80,000 workers in the jute mills were sacked. Not a single worker, in spite of Mr. George Fernandes having got the position in the Cabinet and all the facility, has been reinstated. If he is in such a situation, I do not know what will happen. Sacking is going on but the largest amount of sacking took place during the emergency. Not a single worker has been taken back in spite of so many representations. I do not know why Mr. Fernandes is so helpless to see that the dismissed workers are taken back.

The third point is about the textile mills. More and more textiles mills are becoming sick. What is the policy of the present Government towards the sick mills which have been made sick deliberately. It is not my statement or that of somebody-else from the left saying this. The Prime Minister said categorically in the Conference of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry that he will prove to the hilt that it is the management—now I see Mr. Modi is staring at me—who is responsible for the sickness in the industries. Mr. Fernandes should have taken note of it. The very-people who made the mills sick, who are guilty of misappropriation, guilty of misuse of money and guilty of all kinds of nepotism, have been put in charge of the various national textile mills in West Bengal and Tamil Nadu and other places. The same thing is happening to the jute industry. The Kharah Jute Mill, after it was taken over by the IRCI, has been put in charge of those who made it sick. So, the loot goes on. Previously it belonged to Bajoria and now it is in the State sector. We should have a deep probe into the matter.

My fourth point is about the question which is agitating very much. What is the policy of the Government to the monopoly sector and the multinational sector? Despite all the shouting and the proclamation, more licences have been issued to the multinational companies and mono-

poly houses since the Janata Government took over.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI (Maharashtra); Have you not read the guidelines?

SHRI KALYAN ROY; Each Minister has a guideline. The result is confusion, chaos and anarchy. So I have ceased to take any notice of the guidelines of the Janata Government. Its Cabinet is a crowd. But the question is: why is it that the monopoly concerns are flourishing in spite of Mr. Fernandes being the Industry Minister? He was shouting so much about the Birla Commission. What steps have Mr. Fernandes taken to expedite the work of the Sarkar Commission? What has he done with the file? The whole Sarkar Commission file is lying on the desk of Mr. Fernandes. May I ask, in all humility, with anguish, with sorrow, why is it that it is not moving? It did not move during the period of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi because she did not want it to move. It is obviously clear. Mr. K. K. Birla had a direct access to the former Prime Minister. But why is it not moving now? Why is it that more money is being placed at the disposal of Mr. G. D. Birla, Mr. K. K. Birla and Mr. B. M. Birla? Will the enquiry be expedited? Will Mr. Fernandes reply to this?

Lastly, before I sit down, I would like to point out about one public sector undertaking and that is MAMCO. This MAMCO was set up when the entire mining industry was under the clutches of the private sector. And MAMCO was set up in order to produce mining equipment so that we did not have to import mining equipment from abroad. The mine-owners tried to sabotage it. After the coal mines were nationalised, MAMCO, for the first time, got some orders. Mr. Fernandes stated in February this year that MAMCO placed orders to the tune of Rs. 242 crores from Coal India Limited and other public sector undertakings. You would have thought that there was

no shortage of orders, that there was no crisis and MAMCO would be flourishing. But how much did they actually get? Out of Rs. 242 crores, they got orders worth only Rs. 20 crores. And now a plant which is employing nearly 20,000 workers is on the verge of closure. A public sector concern, the only concern which produces mining equipment today, is not getting orders from public sector undertakings. And who is getting? Sir, for instance, Coal India Limited wanted to set up a washery in Ramgarh. There were two tenders—one from the Tatas and the other from MAMCO. And who is getting it? The Tatas, not MAMCO. *(Interruption)* Not only that, I have sent to Mr. Ramchandran photostat copies of the commission offered to certain officers by the Tatas if they could secure the contract for the Tatas. So if this position continues, it does not matter whether Mr. George Fernandes is there or his friend, the industrial tycoon, Mr. Shah is there; the rot which has set in will deteriorate in this mixed economy about which he is praising so much today. Mr. Fernandes said the other day that he has ceased to be a trade unionist, he has ceased to be a socialist and he now believes sincerely in the political philosophy of Mr. Mody. So there will be no end to unemployment or poverty or crisis. The crisis will only deepen. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Maurya.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES); Sir, I thought my friend was participating in the debate on the working of the Ministry of Industry. But, the way he was arguing, a number of insinuations have been made and a number of allegations also have been made, some of which will need to be refuted. I know that this is not perhaps the opportune moment. May be while replying to the debate, I will meet some of the points that my hon. friend has thought fit to raise.

श्री बुद्ध त्रिभुवन शर्मा (आंध्र प्रदेश) : मान्यवर, बहुत से आरोप लगते रहे निराधार जिनका न कोई आधार था, न जिनमें कोई सार था। जनता पार्टी के नेताओं ने और मंत्रियों ने तो यहाँ तक कह दिया कि पिछले 30 वर्षों में देश के विकास की जगह पर देश का विनाश हुआ और देश को आगे नहीं बढ़ाया गया। हालांकि इनमें भी कुछ ऐसे व्यक्ति निकले जनता पार्टी में, जो नेता भी कहे जाते हैं और मंत्री भी, जिन्होंने इस विचार को समर्थन नहीं दिया। आज की जनता पार्टी की सरकार की नीति, उनकी अपनी इकानामिक सर्वे जो पहले वर्ष की वर्ष गांठ पर इस देश को और सदन को उन्होंने पेश की है, उससे सत्य का पता लगता है। जिस समय सत्ता कांग्रेस ने जनता पार्टी के नेताओं को सौंपी थी उस वर्ष 1976-77 साल के उत्पादन में बढ़ोत्तरी लगभग साढ़े 10 फीसदी थी, 10.5 फीसदी के करीब थी। इस वर्ष उन्होंने देश को और समाज को जो पहली भेंट दी है वह यह है कि वह घट कर लगभग पांच फीसदी रह गई है यह श्रीमन्, उनके अपने डाकुमेंट्स में से हैं जो कि आज की जनता सरकार ने दिए हैं। उससे ही मैं पढ़ कर अपनी इस बात को समर्थन देते हुए आगे बढ़ूंगा :

"The current year began with stocks of food grains of 18 million tonnes which rose to 20 million tonnes by the end of June, 1977. Industrial production in the year 1976-77 had been to the tune of 10.4 per cent while in the year 1977-78 it has come down to .5.2 per cent."

आगे इसी के पन्ना दो पर उन्होंने कहा है :-

"Industrial production increased by 10.4 per cent in 1976-77. Industries in which production increased substantially were...." They have given the details. "In contrast to the trend in 1976-77, industrial production in 1977-78 is likely to register a growth of 5-6 per cent."

इसी के आगे विस्तार में दिया है। मैं इसको और ज्यादा कोट न करते हुए और मुद्दों पर

जाना चाहूंगा। ये डाकुमेंट्स काफी हैं आज की सरकार की योग्यता, क्षमता और उद्योग मंत्रालय को चलाने की बात काबिलीयत बात ने के लिए। जहाँ तक 30 वर्ष की उपलब्धियों का प्रश्न है मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि जिस समय अंग्रेज गये थे और कांग्रेस के हाथ में सरकार चलाने की जिम्मेदारी आई थी, उस समय साईकिल और वेटरिमेक्स जैसी मामूली चीजें विदेशों से आया करती थीं और जिस समय इनके हाथ में सत्ता कांग्रेस ने सौंपी है, उस समय इस देश में इंजीनियरिंग गुड्स करीब-करीब साढ़े चार सौ करोड़ कीमत का अमेरिका और यूरोप के बाजार में भेजा जाता था। जहाँ तक इंजीनियरिंग गुड्स का सम्बन्ध है इसका ग्राफ लगाया जाए तो 1971 से 1972 तक बढ़ता ही चला गया। यहाँ तक कि 1975-76 में इंजीनियरिंग गुड्स के एक्सपोर्ट की कीमत करीब चार सौ करोड़ रुपए दी गई थी। पिछले वर्ष 23 मार्च, तक जब इनको सत्ता सौंपी गई थी उस समय तक इसकी कीमत करीब साढ़े चार सौ करोड़ पहुंच गई थी। मेरा यह निश्चित मत है कि यदि हम सत्ता में रहते तो 1980 तक इंजीनियरिंग गुड्स के विदेशों में भेजने की क्षमता और उससे प्राप्त किया हुआ धन करीब एक हजार करोड़ रुपये तक पहुंच जाता। अब यह क्या करने वाले हैं यह तो ये लोग अपने आप ही बता सकते हैं। लेकिन जो ट्रेड चला है इससे निश्चितपूर्वक मुझे लगता है कि हम गीरों के बाजार में, अमेरिका के बाजार में अपने इंजीनियरिंग गुड्स को उस रफ्तार से नहीं बढ़ा सकेंगे जिस रफ्तार से हम बढ़ाना चाहते थे। निश्चितपूर्वक कुछ नेताओं ने जानबूझकर और कुछ ने अपने विचारों के आधार पर पब्लिक सेक्टर को कमजोर करने की बात कही है।

मुझे खुशी है कि कल जो जनता पार्टी की नेशनल एक्जीक्यूटिव की बैठक

हुई उसने एक मजबूत दिशा दी है। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह पार्टी कहाँ तक अपने ढंग से चलने वाले पंचरंगे मंत्रियों की सरकार को काबू कर पायेगी, इसका मुझे ज्यादा विश्वास नहीं है। लेकिन जनता पार्टी ने एक दिशा दी है। जनता पार्टी की कल की बैठक के बारे में जो कुछ अखबारों में छपा है और वहाँ पर दिये गये वक्तव्य जिस तरह से छपे हैं उनसे ऐसा लगता है कि कम से कम हमारे देश में जो फाइनेंशियल इंस्टीट्यूशन्स हैं जो मोनोपोली हाउसेज हैं, जिन कारखानों और कम्पनियों में फाइनेंशियल इंस्टीट्यूशन्स का अत्यधिक धन लगा हुआ है उनको बचाया जा सकेगा राष्ट्रीयकरण करके या उनको उनके ही कर्मों पर छोड़ दिया जायेगा। इसके विपरीत यह भी कहा गया है कि उनका स्पष्टीकरण किया जायेगा। आप जानते हैं कि इनमें दो रंग के लोग हैं। इनमें लाल रंग के लोग भी हैं और नीले रंग के लोग भी हैं। नीले रंग वालों का इरादा है कि राष्ट्रीयकरण विनाश को जन्म देता है, राष्ट्रीयकरण कम्पीटीशन को रोकता है और जब कम्पीटीशन नहीं रहता है तो क्वालिटी और क्वान्टिटी भी गिरती चली जाती है। इसके साथ-साथ इनकी पार्टी में इस विचारधारा के नेता और मंत्री भी हैं जो यह दिशा देते हैं कि जहाँ पर देश में फाइनेंशियल इंस्टीट्यूशन्स का अधिक धन लगा हुआ है, उन उद्योगों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाना चाहिये। दोनों एक दूसरे का कंट्रिब्यूशन करते हैं, दोनों विपरीत दिशाओं में जाते हैं। इन दोनों का कैसे मेल हो पाएगा, यह जाहूँ किस प्रकार होगा, यह इस सदन को और इस देश को समझना है। उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा है, मैं उन्हीं के शब्दों को यहाँ पर कोट करता हूँ। जनता पार्टी की नेशनल एक्जीक्यूटिव ने देश को जो जो अपना प्रोग्राम दिया है उसमें उन्होंने कहा है

Immediate steps to bring about decentralisation in the ownership of the means of production..."

इसका क्या अर्थ है, यह तो माननीय मंत्री जी ही समझा पायेंगे। लेकिन जहाँ तक मैं जान पाया हूँ कि यह बात उनकी इस नीति के खिलाफ है कि पिछले साल में जिन उद्योगों को लाइसेंस दिये गये उसके विपरीत यह बात जाती है। आप जानते हैं कि हमारे देश में एक एम० आर० टी० पी० एक्ट है। वह इसीलिए बनाया गया ताकि हमारे देश में जो मोनोपोली हाउसेज हैं उनके रास्ते में रुकावट पैदा हो सके। हमारे देश के संविधान में डायरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल्स हैं उनमें यह कहा गया है कि देश की सम्पत्ति का वितरण उत्पादन इस प्रकार से हो कि वह गिने-चुने लोगों के हाथों में सिकुड़ कर न रह जाये। इसी उद्देश्य से एम० आर० टी० पी० एक्ट बनाया गया था। लेकिन पिछले साल में एम० आर० टी० पी० एक्ट का उल्लंघन करके लायसेंस दिये गये हैं उनके बारे में शायद श्री पीलू मोदी जी ज्यादा जानते होंगे। इस सम्बन्ध में हमने जो जानकारी ली है, वह कहाँ तक सत्य है या असत्य है, मैं नहीं जानता, लेकिन उसमें सबसे पहले नम्बर पर टाटा आता है। एम० आर० टी० पी० एक्ट का उल्लंघन करके टाटा को सबसे ज्यादा लायसेंस दिए गए हैं। इसके अलावा दूसरे भी कुछ उद्योग हैं या इंडस्ट्रियल हाउसेज हैं जिन पर जनता पार्टी के मंत्रियों और सरकार की विशेष कृपा रही है। एक तरफ तो जनता पार्टी कहती है कि जिन उद्योगों में फाइनेंशियल इंस्टीट्यूशन्स का अधिक धन लगा हुआ है उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाये और दूसरी तरफ जिस प्रकार से लायसेंस देने की प्रथा चालू की गई है वह बिल्कुल विपरीत दिशा में जा रही है। इन लोगों के कथन पर इस वक्त मैं नहीं जाना चाहता क्योंकि

[श्री वृद्ध प्रिय मोयं]

ये लोग तो यहां तक भी कहते हैं कि पिछले 30 सालों में देश में कोई प्रगति नहीं हुई है। भारत की जनता के फैसेले के बाद और उसके आधार पर जब इन लोगों को सत्ता सौंपी गई थी उसने एक साल पहले वर्ल्ड बैंक के चेयरमैन श्री मैकनमारा ने स्वयं कहा था कि भारत की अर्थ व्यवस्था अब मजबूत खम्भों पर टिक गई है। उनके ये शब्द थे। लेकिन हम बात को मानने के लिए जनता पार्टी के मंत्री तैयार नहीं हैं। ये लोग तो केवल एक मात्र हम लोगों को दोष देते हैं। जिस समय इनको सत्ता सौंपी गयी थी, उस समय हजारों की तादाद में फारेन एक्सचेंज रिजर्व फ़ोड दिया गया था। मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि हमारी परेशानी तो यह थी कि फारेन एक्सचेंज किस तरह से कमाया जाये और इनकी परेशानी यह है कि जो फारेन एक्सचेंज जमा किया गया है उसको किस तरह से खर्च किया जाये।

श्रीमन्, जहां तक सीमेंट उद्योग का सम्बन्ध है, पिछले एक साल में उसके उत्पादन में कोई वृद्धोत्तरी नहीं हुई है। सीमेंट उद्योग का उत्पादन करीब 18.35 मिलियन टन का हो गया था और जिस वक्त इन लोगों को सत्ता सौंपी गई थी उस समय सीमेंट की इन्स्टॉलड कैपैसिटी 21.65 मिलियन टन की थी। 1976-77 के साल में सीमेंट का उत्पादन करीब 18.85 मिलियन टन का था। इससे देश की सीमेंट की जरूरत पूरी होती थी और देश की जरूरत को पूरा करके करीब 5-6 लाख टन सीमेंट हम एक्सपोर्ट भी कर रहे थे और अगर इस वर्ष हम सत्ता में लौटते तो हमारा इरादा इस वर्ष 10 लाख मिलियन टन सीमेंट का एक्सपोर्ट करने का था। लेकिन सीमेंट के मामले में आज हमारी क्या दशा है। यह अपने को तथाकथित

जनता पार्टी की सरकार कहने वाले मंत्रों क्या इस बात का उत्तर दे सकेंगे कि लाइम स्टोन से सीमेंट बनाने के लिये किसी विशेष टैकनालाजी की जरूरत नहीं है, लाइम स्टोन से सीमेंट तैयार हो जाता है। लेकिन आज इन्होंने इतनी तरक्की देश की की है कि सीमेंट का यह इम्पोर्ट कर रहे हैं, विदेशों से सीमेंट ले रहे हैं। यह मैंने एक रूप इनका बताया कि किस तरह से दिशा-विहीन ये चले जा रहे हैं और एक कन्ट्रोवर्सी उठा दी कि हैवी इंडस्ट्रीज की इस देश को इतनी आवश्यकता नहीं है। एग्रीकल्चर के ऊपर, स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्री के ऊपर, काटेज इंडस्ट्री के ऊपर ज्यादा से ज्यादा कन्सेन्ट्रेशन होना चाहिए। निश्चयपूर्वक, जहां तक काटेज इंडस्ट्री की बात है, जहां तक हैडीक्राफ्ट की बात है, जहां तक स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्री की बात है, हम इस विचारधारा के रहे हैं कि इन पर ज्यादा से ज्यादा जोर दिया जाना चाहिए। क्योंकि हैडीक्राफ्ट से बनी हुई चीजें हम दुनिया के बाजारों में भेजते हैं और उससे करीब 4 सौ करोड़ रुपये की मुद्रा कमाते हैं और अगर इसको और बढ़ावा दिया जाये तो करीब एक हजार करोड़ रुपये की मुद्रा हम हर साल कमा सकते हैं। निश्चयपूर्वक मैं इस विचारधारा का हूं कि इनको बढ़ावा मिलना चाहिए। लेकिन उद्योगों को खेती-बाड़ी से अलग नहीं किया जा सकता। हैवी इंडस्ट्रीज को खेती के उत्पादन से अलग नहीं किया जा सकता है। क्या कोई जादू इस सरकार ने सीख लिया है कि फर्टिलाइजर के कारखाने जो कि लार्ज स्केल में होते हैं बगैर उनके बनाये हुए यहां आधुनिक तरीके से खेती करके ज्यादा से ज्यादा एक एकड़ में पैदा कर सकें। क्या इन्होंने कोई जादू सीख लिया है कि बगैर सीमेंट के उत्पादन के ट्यूबवैल बना सकें या बगैर सीमेंट के डैम बना सकें या नहरों को निकाल सकें। क्या इन्होंने जादू सीख लिया है कि बगैर इस्पात के कारखाने के किसान को जो बोझा इस्तेमाल करता है, जो ट्रैक्टर इस्तेमाल करता है, उसको बना कर के दे सकें।

लेकिन निश्चयपूर्वक एक राजनीति को ला करके खड़ा किया गया है और खेती के नाम पर बड़े उद्योगों को समाप्त करने की साजिस की गई है। क्या यह देश जिसने एक जगह कायम की थी दुनिया के बाजार में, यह उसे समाप्त कर देना चाहते हैं। क्या ये यह चाहते हैं कि फिर से तृतीय युग आ जाये जो अंधेजों के जमाने में था। खेती को हेवी इंडस्ट्रीज से अलग नहीं किया जा सकता है। लेकिन एक लगातार कार्यक्रम पैदा किया जा रहा है। श्रीमन्, एनीमल हसबेन्ड्री को उठा कर देख लीजिए। एनीमल हसबेन्ड्री सीधा एक तरह से खेती से जुड़ा हुआ महकमा है। पशुपालन विभाग से दूध निकलता है, मक्खन निकलता है, चीज निकलती है, इसलिये यह उद्योग से जुड़ जाता है। श्रीमन्, आप स्वयं एक जाने माने किसान घराने से आते हैं और एक ऐसे अच्छे किसान घराने से, जिस पर अभिमान किया जा सकता है। क्या हम किसी भी तरह से गन्ने के उत्पादन को उद्योग से अलग कर सकते हैं? इन्होंने इसकी कोशिश की वह गन्ना जोकि पिछले साल 13 या 14 रुपये के भाव पर बिका करता था और जिसे इस साल कम से कम 15, 16 रुपये के भाव से बिकना चाहिए था, 5 रुपये 6 रुपये के भाव में बिक गया। हमने शूगर के लिये दुनिया में एक मार्केट कायम की थी। निश्चयपूर्वक वह घाटे का सौदा था। लेकिन इस घाटे के सौदे के साथ-साथ हमारी एक एस्टेब्लिश्ड मार्केट दुनिया के बाजार में हो गई थी और हम उससे करीब 4 सौ करोड़ रुपये की मुद्रा कमाते थे और इस साल हमें 3 सौ 4 सौ करोड़ रुपये की मुद्रा वहां से कमाना थी। इससे 1 हजार करोड़ रुपये तक की मुद्रा और कमाई जा सकती थी और दूसरी चीजों पर उसको खर्च किया जा सकता था। एक तरफ हमने एक बाजार और एक मंडी कायम की थी अपने यहां की बनी हुई चीनी के लिये, उधर मंडी को हमने खो दिया और दूसरी तरफ वहां के किसानों

का गन्ना जो कि 13, 14, 15 और 16 रुपये के भाव से बिकना चाहिए था वह 5 और 6 रुपये के भाव से बिक गया। यहां तक कि किसानों ने अपने गन्ने के खेतों को जला दिया। यह ऐसी चीजें हैं जिन में कहीं न कहीं हम जान बूझ कर भ्रम या चक्रव्यूह में फंसे जा रहे हैं जनता पार्टी के नेतृत्व में। क्या हम कपास के उत्पादन को उद्योग से अलग कर सकते हैं? टैक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री को हम कपास के उत्पादन से अलग कर सकते हैं? आज किसानों को कपास के वह दाम नहीं मिल रहे हैं जो कि उनको मिलने चाहिए थे। क्योंकि कहां से दाम लगते हैं? दाम लगते हैं किसान के घर से। किसान के घर से अगर दाम न लगाकर हम बाजार से दाम लगायें कि किस भाव पर कपड़ा बिका और उस भाव पर कपड़ा बिकने के बाद कितना रुपया उद्योग में लगा हुआ है, उसको लगा कर 10, 15 या 20 प्रतिशत का फायदा उसमें लगायें और उसके बाद जो बचता है वह किसान को मिले तो किसान को कभी भी घाटा नहीं हो सकता है। लेकिन उल्टे चलने की परम्परा हमारे यहां पड़ गई है और उस परम्परा के कारण ही आज किसान को उसके गन्ने के दाम नहीं मिल पाये, उसके जूट के दाम नहीं मिल पाये, उसकी कपास के दाम नहीं मिल पाये। श्रीमन्, मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि कृषि को किसी भी हालत में उद्योग से अलग नहीं किया जा सकता है।

मुझे मालूम नहीं कि मंत्री महोदय को एक साल में क्या तजुरबा हुआ है लेकिन तीन-सवा तीन साल में मेरा तजुरबा यह हुआ कि 75 फीसदी उद्योगों के लिए कच्चा माल खेती बाड़ी से आता है, एग्रीकल्चर से आता है। मुश्किल से 25 फीसदी है जो विदेशों से आता है जिसको हम कच्चे माल से पक्के माल में बदल देते हैं। क्या 75 फीसदी उत्पादन को हम कमजोर करके अपनी इंडस्ट्री को बढ़ा सकते हैं। क्या इंडस्ट्री खेती बाड़ी के बढ़ाए बिना बढ़ सकती है, नहीं बढ़ सकती।

[श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मौर्य]

जब हम खेती का उत्पादन बढ़ायेंगे तो इंडस्ट्री बढ़ेगी, जब इंडस्ट्री बढ़ेगी तो खेती का उत्पादन बढ़ेगा। इसलिए खेती और इंडस्ट्री का ऐसा ही सम्बन्ध है जैसे कि एक मुर्गी का अंडे से है। यह दोनों एक दूसरे से जुड़े हुए हैं। यह दोनों एक दूसरे से अलग नहीं किए जा सकते। लेकिन इन्होंने एक चीज पैदा कर दी जिससे एक भ्रम फैल गया और लोगों के बीच में वह भ्रम फैलता चला जा रहा है। आज वह शक्ति जहां लगनी चाहिए थी वहां पर नहीं लग रही है। यह बड़े अभिमान से कहते हैं, हमारे मंत्री भी कहते हैं, पब्लिक मीटिंग्स में बड़ा अच्छा भाषण देते हैं कि आजादी दिला दी, बहुत अच्छी बात की। मैं भी तीन सवा तीन साल तक मिनिस्टर रहा। मेरे पास पब्लिक सेक्टर था। मैं एक छोटा मन्त्री था श्रीमन् जार्ज साहब बड़े मन्त्री हैं। मैं आपके द्वारा एक प्रश्न करना चाहता हूँ। पब्लिक सेक्टर को हम देखते रहे, टैक्सटाइल की 102 मिलें दिखाते रहे, कानपुर की मिलें भी इसी में आती हैं? एक भी जगह पर फायरिंग की मिसाल आप नहीं दे सकते। श्रीमन्, यह तो काफी समय तक लेबर लीडर और जनप्रिय नेता रहे, क्या यह इस बात का जवाब दे सकते हैं कि कितनी बार आपके नेतृत्व में, आपके मंत्रालय में मंत्री पद पर हाते हुए कितनी बार गोली चली, कितने लोग मारे गये, कितने मजदूर मारे गये? आपने आजादी तो दी लेकिन आजादी दी गोली चलाने की, मजदूरों पर गोली चलाने की आजादी। आप हम पर आरोप लगा सकते हैं कि हमने कुछ हद तक मजदूरों की मांगों को दबाया, चाहे वह बोनस की मांग थी या किसी और चीज की मांग थी, इमरजेंसी के नाम पर आप हम पर आरोप लगा सकते हैं। मुझे उसकी सफाई देने की कोई जरूरत नहीं। मैं इन आरोपों की सफाई देना भी नहीं चाहता।

श्री कल्याण राय : आपको जानकारी होनी चाहिए कि बीजू पटनायक का नाम है

बूचर आफ बेलाडिला।

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA:
You have added to my knowledge.

श्रीमन्, मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा था कि झूठे नारों से काम नहीं चलेगा। आप यह बताये कि कितने मैन-डेज का लाम हुआ है, कितनी जगह पर तालाबन्दी हुई है, कितनी जगहों पर मजदूरों को मारा गया इनके एक वर्ष के राज्य में। हमारे ऊपर तो आप आरोप लगाते हैं कि यहां पर बोलने की आजादी नहीं थी। आपके यहां तो जीने की आजादी नहीं है। कौन सी लैस्सर इविल है? अब मैं आपका ध्यान एक दूसरी बात की तरफ आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। श्रीमन्, इन्होंने बड़े ही अभिमान के साथ कहा है कि हम 10 वर्षों में बेकारी दूर कर देंगे। 10 वर्ष बाद हमें एतराज होगा, अगर बेकारी दूर नहीं होगी तो प्रधान मंत्री जी का क्या पता होगा। हर चीज को आप इस तरह से करना चाहते हैं। अब प्रोहिबीशन की बात ले लीजिए। प्रोहिबीशन बाई इम्पोजीशन, क्या ऐसा कभी हुआ है? ऐसा कभी नहीं हो सकता। आप यह कहते हैं कि चार वर्ष में प्रोहिबीशन लागू करेंगे, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ अब एक साल तो हो गया है बाकी तीन सालों में आप नहीं कर पाएंगे। क्या इस तरह से प्रोहिबीशन कभी लागू हुई है? यह तो एक काटेज इंडस्ट्री बन जायेगी। लोग जहर पीने लग रहे हैं। प्रोहिबीशन बाई परशुएशन हो सकती है इससे एक तो इंडस्ट्री का उत्पादन गिरेगा। अब तो कुछ हद तक विदेशी मुद्रा भी हम बचाते हैं। हमारे यहां की रम और व्हिस्की कनाडा तक जाती हैं या दूसरी जगह जाती हैं। मैं भी प्रोहिबीशन के हक में हूँ लेकिन मैं यह चाहता हूँ प्रोहिबीशन बाई परशुएशन होनी चाहिए। प्रोहिबीशन बाई इम्पोजीशन आप नहीं कर सकते। मुझे लगता है कि आप 600 करोड़ रुपए की एक्सचेंज भी खोयेंगे और साथ ही

जगह-जगह पर काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज बनती चली जाएंगी। इनमें आपस में मतभेद हैं, इनकी दिशाएं अलग-अलग हैं। एक ने तो बड़ी शक्ति के साथ कहा। काश ! उनकी आज तबीयत ठीक होती तो मैं जोर से कहता। उन्होंने तो यहां तक कह दिया कि नेहरू ने पब्लिक सेक्टर को जन्म देकर इस देश को गलत दिशा दी। लेकिन मुझे खुशी हुई इनके एक मंत्री ने बम्बई में जाकर कहा कि जो लोग यह कहते हैं कि नेहरू ने गलत दिशा दी वे लोग स्वयं गलत रास्ते पर हैं। नेहरू ने पब्लिक सेक्टर को जन्म देकर इस देश की इकॉनॉमी का विकास किया, मिक्सड इकॉनॉमी का सहारा लेकर उसको बहुत अच्छी साइंड फूटिंग पर रखा। इन में किसी भी चीज को उठा कर देख लिया जाय, आपस में मतभेद होगा। इनके आपस में विचार नहीं मिलते हैं। आप एक ओर चमड़े के उत्पादन को लें इससे मेरे आवाओ अजदाद का संबंध रहा है। हमने भारत लेदर कारपोरेशन को जन्म दिया था। चूंकि इसका जन्म इंदिरा गांधी के प्रधान मंत्री पद पर होते हुए हुआ इसलिए इसको समाप्त किया जाना चाहिए। ऐसे-ऐसे एक्सपोर्ट काबिल लोग जो वहां रखे गये थे उनको पॉलिटिकल विक्टिमाइजेशन का शिकार बना कर निकाल दिया गया। मंत्री महोदय बता सकेंगे कि आज भारत लेदर कारपोरेशन का क्या भविष्य है ? हमने यह निश्चय किया था कि हम भारत लेदर कारपोरेशन का डेवलपमेंट करके इस देश के चमड़े को जो रेडी टु फिनिश के नाम से एक्सपोर्ट हो जाता है या जो फिनिश के नाम से एक्सपोर्ट हो जाता है उसको हम ज्यादा से ज्यादा फिनिश करके यहीं पर उसकी चीजें बना कर दुनिया के बाजार में भेजेंगे। क्योंकि निश्चयपूर्वक चमड़े का कोई बदल नहीं है। रबड़ चमड़े की जगह नहीं ले सकती है, प्लास्टिक नहीं ले सकती है चाहे जितना साइंस का विकास हो जाय लेकिन चमड़े की जगह कोई भी दूसरी चीज नहीं ले पायेगी। जहां तक चमड़े के रा मँटीरियल का सवाल है इसके लिए केवल इजरायल हिन्दुस्तान का मुकाबला कर सकता है और कोई दूसरा

मुल्क नहीं। आज यूरोप, अमेरिका, कनाडा आदि की मंडियों में चमड़े के उद्योग के जरिये हम ज्यादा से ज्यादा कमा सकते हैं। लेकिन इस ओर कोई कदम नहीं उठाया जा रहा है। शांत बैठे हुए मंत्री महोदय क्या यह बता सकेंगे कि कभी उन्होंने आंकेड़े जांच कर यह जानना चाहा कि चमड़ा उद्योग का क्या हो रहा है ? आज जूता बनाने वाले भूखे मरते हैं और मिडिल मैन उससे फायदा उठा रहा है। इन तमाम चीजों पर आपकी निगाह जानी चाहिए लेकिन आपकी निगाह उन पर न जाकर पॉलिटिकल विक्टिमाइजेशन पर टिकी हुई है। बहुत से पब्लिक सेक्टरों के चेयरमैन और बड़े-बड़े एक्सपर्ट जो विश्व में बड़ी-बड़ी तनख्वाहों पर जा सकते हैं, आज वे महसूस करते हैं कि उद्योग मंत्री में न समझने की ताकत है और न दूसरों को समझने का मौका देते हैं। यही वजह है कि आज हमारा पब्लिक सेक्टर डिटोरियोरेंट होता चला जा रहा है।

श्रीमन्, मैं आंकेड़े देना चाहूंगा कि किस तरह से हमारी हालत खराब होती चली आ रही है। 1976-77 में पब्लिक सेक्टर में लगभग 800 करोड़ का प्रोडक्शन हुआ जिसमें से फायदा 75 करोड़ रुपए का था। 1977-78 के लिए क्या मंत्री महोदय बताने की कृपा करेंगे—जब जवाब देंगे—कि फायदा कितना होने वाला है। मेरा निश्चयपूर्वक विश्वास है कि यह फायदा 75 करोड़ से घट कर 35 करोड़ पर आने वाला है। यह क्यों हो रहा है यह जानने की कोशिश की जाय लेकिन आप राजनीति ज्यादा कर रहे हैं और देश के विकास तथा उत्पादन की बात कम सोच रहे हैं।

मैं हूँ ही इंजीनियरिंग कारपोरेशन के प्रोडक्शन के बारे में मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहूंगा कि 1976-77 में अगर हमने सी करोड़ रुपए की पैदावार की थी और इससे हमें फायदा पांच करोड़ रुपए

[श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मौर्य]

का हुआ था तो 1977-78 में क्या हालत होगी ? क्या मंत्री महोदय इसको बता सकेंगे ? मेरे अपने विचार से, जहाँ तक मैं जानकारी रखता हूँ, मुझे ऐसी सूचना मिली है कि 1977-78 में प्रोडक्शन जो सौ करोड़ था वह घट कर 50 करोड़ का होने वाला है। खाली झण्डा उठाने से काम नहीं चलेगा, भाषणवाजी से काम नहीं चलेगा। आपकी कथनी और करनी में अन्तर नहीं होना चाहिये। हमारी कथनी और करनी में अन्तर हुआ था तो जनता ने हमें पाताल में गिरा दिया, इसलिए यदि आपकी भी कथनी और करनी में अन्तर होगा तो आप भी ऐसे उठ जायेंगे कि आपको कोई पछने वाला नहीं रह जायेगा। क्या आप इसका उत्तर दे सकेंगे ? क्या आप इसका उत्तर दे सकेंगे कि यह नुकसान में जाने वाला है और नुकसान भी 30 करोड़ रुपये का होने वाला है। कहां फायदे में चलने वाला हमारा एक क्षेत्र आज 30 करोड़ के घाटे के पहुँचने की नीबत में आ गया है।

एम० ए० एम० सी० की हालत 1976-77 में फायदे की थी परन्तु अब यह घाटे में जाने वाला है।

ये कुछ मुद्दे हैं जिनको मैंने उठाया है और भी बहुत से मुद्दे हैं जिनको मैं किसी और मौके पर उठाने की कोशिश करूँगा। मैं आपसे यह निवेदन करूँगा कि आप यह देखने की कोशिश करें कि हमारा मुकाबला किससे है, हमारा मुकाबला गोरों के उन बाजारों से है जहाँ पर हम साढ़े चार सौ करोड़ रुपये की इंजीनियरिंग गुड्स बेचा करते थे। एक वक्त हुआ करता था जब वहाँ से यहाँ सामान आया करता था। उसी के मुकाबले में हम मारे गये हैं। इस

सम्बन्ध में मुझे एक उर्दू का शेर याद आता है :—

“न पैमां शिकन है, न गद्दार है हम।
वतन परवरी के खतावार है हम ॥”

हमने मुकाबला किया था उन गोरों का, उनकी बाजारों में जाकर। इसी वजह से आपको वहाँ शह मिली। आज उसी शह पर आप हैवी इंडस्ट्री को खत्म करने की साजिश कर रहे हैं, आज उसी शह पर आप पब्लिक सेक्टर को न्यूट्रि-लाइज करके कम करने की साजिश कर रहे हैं, आज उसी शह पर आप देश को पीछे ले जाना चाहते हैं बैलगाड़ी के जमाने पर। मैं जानता हूँ, सबसे ज्यादा रुपया बैलगाड़ी पर लगा हुआ है। मैं साथ ही साथ सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि बैलगाड़ी को माडर्नाइज किया जाए, उसे भी उसी तरह का बनाया जाये। हमारे मेरठ के लोगों ने, हमारे मुजफ्फरनगर के किसानों ने उसमें रबर का टायर डाल दिया, फ्रीवील लगाया, उससे काफी तरक्की हुई। तो उसे और आगे बढ़ाया जा सकता है। लेकिन निश्चितपूर्वक आप ऐसे युग में इस देश को ले जा रहे हैं जहाँ से वापस ले आना मुश्किल हो जाएगा। हमारे यहाँ सीमेंट का ही प्रश्न मैं बार-बार इस वजह से उठा रहा हूँ कि यह भी महकमा मेरे पास था। हमारा इरादा था कि जिस तरह से जापान और रूस और ईरान भी एक मिलियन टन, डेढ़ मिलियन टन के सीमेंट प्लाण्ट लगा रहे हैं, यहाँ पर हम चाहते थे कि इसको 2 रूप में बांट दें एक तो ऐसा रूप कि ज्यादा से ज्यादा हम एक्सपोर्ट कर सकें, क्योंकि अब पाल्पूशन के नाम से उन लोगों के पास, जिनके पास प्लांटिंग डालर है, इस उद्योग में नहीं जाना चाहते, तो उस उद्योग में हम बड़े से बड़े कारखाने लगायें। सीमेंट के, वह भी समुद्र के किनारे दूसरे, हमारा इरादा था कि हम मिनी सिमेंट

प्लांट को बढ़ायें। आज आप इसका अनुमान कर सकते हैं कि आपन इसकी रिसर्च की थी? आप भाषणों में तो कहते हैं कि "मिनी स्टील प्लांट हमारी देन है, हमारी डिस्कवरी है।" हमने देखा कि हम सीमेंट प्लांट में ज्यादा से ज्यादा इम्प्लाइमेंट उपलब्ध करेंगे। इस पर हमने तजुर्बा किया—असम के अन्दर तजुर्बा किया, दूसरी जगहों पर तजुर्बा किया क्योंकि मैं इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुँचा कि लाइम स्टोन जगह-जगह पहाड़ों में छिपा पड़ा हुआ है, वहाँ पर और साधन नहीं, रेल नहीं। वहाँ पर ज्यादा से ज्यादा एक्सप्लायटेशन के लिए, ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोगों को रोजगार देने के लिए और सीमेंट भी उसी क्वालिटी को पैदा करने के लिए हमने कहा कि मिनी सीमेंट प्लांट बनाये जायें। आज उसको जिस तेजी से आपको बढ़ावा देना चाहिये था—मेरी यह शिकायत आपसे है—उतनी तेजी से आप नहीं कर रहे हैं। राजस्थान में लाइम स्टोन छिपा पड़ा हुआ है, वहाँ से आप रेल निकाल नहीं सकते हैं। आप 30-40 करोड़ रुपए का सीमेंट प्लांट लगा नहीं सकते तो फिर आपके सामने एक ही रास्ता रह जाता है कि मिनी प्लांट वहाँ लगाये जायेंगे—और यही इतिहास नार्थ इस्टर्न रीजन का है, यही इतिहास आन्ध्र प्रदेश का है और यही इतिहास तमाम जगहों का है जहाँ पर लाइम स्टोन बहुत अच्छी क्वालिटी का है, जहाँ पर क्वालिटी में कम है या इंडीरियर में है—वहाँ उसको बढ़ावा मिलना चाहिये था लेकिन उसको बढ़ावा जिस तरह से मिलना चाहिये वह नहीं मिल रहा है। उसमें भी राजनीति ज्यादा हो रही है। क्या आप आंकड़े दे सकेंगे जिस समय आप मंत्री बने, उस समय मिनी प्लांट की कितनी दरखास्ते थीं और कितनी मंजूर हो चुकी थीं और उसके बाद आपने एक साल तक मिनी

सीमेंट प्लांट की कितनी दरखास्ते प्राप्त करके उनको मंजूरी दी है या उसको और आगे बढ़ाने को या मदद करने की कोशिश की है? क्या आप इसको बता सकेंगे?

आपसे कहने को बहुत कुछ है परन्तु श्रीमन्, मैं सदन का ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता। मैं केवल यह कहना चाहूँगा: राजनीति को कुछ देर के लिए, जब मंत्रालय में बैठ करे, तो भूल जाया करिए ताकि यहाँ पर ज्यादा से ज्यादा हम उद्योग को बढ़ावा दे कर इस देश को मजबूत बना कर आगे ले जा सकें। स्लोगन्स हम भी दिया करते थे। स्लोगन से क्या होता है। एक आशा जग जाती है, कार्यकर्ता एक आशा जग जाती है। सब में एक आशा जगने के बाद जब उसको पूरा नहीं किया जाता तो निराशा हो जाती है। वह देश जो शांतिपूर्वक चल रहा था—वे यूनिवर्सिटियाँ जो शांतिपूर्वक चल रही थीं, वे कारखाने जिनका उत्पादन सही तीर पर हो रहा था, आज क्या हो रहा है? हर जगह कबड्डी हो रही है, हर जगह अराजकता का शैतान जन्म लेता जा रहा है। यह आपकी देन है। जहाँ तक कांग्रेस की 30 वर्ष की देन है वह 30 वर्ष की देन है कि जहाँ पर बिजली देवताओं के मन्दिरों के लिये नहीं थी, वह आज गांव-गांव पहुँचाने की कोशिश की गई। जहाँ 13 फी सदी पढ़े-लिखे लोग थे वहाँ 43 फी सदी पढ़े-लिखे लोग किए। जहाँ पर 50 मिलियन टन अनाज पैदा होता था, वहाँ 120 मिलियन टन अनाज पैदा होने लगा। अब 125 का दावा आप करते हैं। वह आपकी देन नहीं है, वह उन 30 वर्षों की मेहनत है जो हमने की थी। बच्चा एक दम से जवान नहीं हो जाता। लेकिन हम नहीं चाहते आप हमारे उन कार्यों के लिए हम को यश दें जो हमने किए थे लेकिन आप उस बात को यश दें कि आज इन 30

[श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मौर्य]

बर्षों में दुनिया के तीन बड़े मुल्क हैं जिनके पास सबसे ज्यादा विशेषज्ञ है, जिनके पास सबसे ज्यादा टेक्नोक्रेट है, जिनके पास सबसे ज्यादा इंडस्ट्री के जानकार टेक्नोक्रेट्स, स्काल्ड और सेमीस्काल्ड लोग हैं और उन तीन मुल्कों में हिन्दुस्तान का नम्बर आता है। अगर आप 30 वर्ष रहे होते तो शायद डेढ़ सौ नम्बर में भी नहीं आ पाते। मैं श्रीमन्, इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ . . .

श्री पीलू मोदी (गुजरात) : दुनिया में कितने देश हैं।

श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मौर्य : 135 आपके हिसाब से, मेरे हिसाब 150 से अधिक। आप अमरीका से बोलते हैं और मैं हिन्दुस्तान से बोलता हूँ।

तो श्रीमन्, मैं इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ फिर उस शेर को दोहराना चाहता हूँ कि जो बार-बार मुझे याद आ रहा है

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, while discussing the Industry Ministry we can discuss its promises or policies and we can also discuss its performance and see what it has done because there is a world of difference between the declarations of the Industry Minister and the performance of his Ministry. The declaration is that they will increase production, the performance is that they have decreased production. The declaration is that they will reduce the concentration of economic power, the performance is that they have encouraged large houses and multi-nationals. The declaration is that they will not give up planning, the performance is that they have weakened

the public sector. Sir, the Janata Party Government has, on the one hand, a declared policy and, on the other hand, an effective and operational policy. What we are concerned with is not the declared policy but the effective and operational policy which has reduced production which has led to firing on the workers, and which has led to Open-arm invitation to multi-nationals. This is what the Janata party Government have done. And, they have said that in the last thirty years nothing has happened, everything has gone wrong and we shall give you a new policy, which, however, amounts only to a tinkering of the Old policy. I shall come to that policy later. The new Industrial Policy Resolution is nothing but an appendix to the old Industrial Policy Resolution of the Congress Government of 1956.

Sir, all this talk would have been good, would have been edifying, if the performance had been good. But all this talk of a new policy is designed to cover up the dismal performance of the Janata Party Government in the industrial sector. What was the position in the year before the Janata Government took over? What was the rate of growth? It was 10.6 per cent. What is the rate of growth under the Janata Party Government? What was the performance last year? It was 5.6 per cent, about half. Are we concerned with the declared policy that they will increase production or the operational and effective policy whereby they have decreased production. Not only that. Not only has the growth rate gone down but it has a downward trend. In 1974-75, the rate of growth in industry was 2.6 per cent. In 1975-76, it was more than double, it was 6.1 per cent. In 1976-77 it was about double, i.e. 10.4 per cent. Therefore, not only was there an increase but the growth rate increase was nearly double. And, in the first year of the Janata Party Government not only is there no increase but there is a decrease and

the decrease is by about half and therefore there is a declaration in the trend and there is a decline in production.

Sir, what is the reason? There is some reason for this. We can take the reason as given in the Economic Survey or we can take the reason as given by the Industry Minister: What does the Economic survey say? The Economic Survey says that the reason is that in power generation, in coalmining, textiles, etc. there was stagnation. Should he not be ashamed to say this? Who is responsible for power generation? Who is responsible for coal-mining? Has not the Government the responsibility for that? Can the Government shirk its responsibility by saying that these are the reasons? Sir, the country is not interested in reasons or alibis or excuses. The country is interested in performance.

We have the freedom but the freedom is not to make or commit mistakes or the freedom to ensure that there is no performance. Sir, how can a Government justify a decline in production? Whenever there is a decline in production, they attribute it to power which is under their control; they attribute it to coal, but coal mining is under their control. This is the explanation in the Economic Survey. What is the explanation of the Industry Ministry? One explanation is power—the same common explanation for which they stand self-condemned. The other explanation is industrial unrest. Is it an explanation? Does not the Government have a responsibility to avail that? Should there be firing on the workers? What is the position, Sir, so far as the man-days lost are concerned? In 1976, the man-days lost were 6 million. In 1977, under the Janata Party Government, it was just about double, 11 millions. That is, the industrial production decreases by half and the man-days lost are doubled. Sir, what is the reason?

259 RS—

SHRI PILOO MODY; How many man-days were lost in 1974 and 1975?

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE; It is a wrong approach when they ask: What happened in 1974-75. Sir, the country is not interested in past history. The country is interested in performance. Sir, if this is the kind of approach, then they will not only not know that the country is suffering, they will also not know the reason why the country is suffering. They will not know the reason of it and will not know how to remove that suffering.

What is the position so far as the public sector is concerned. That is the pride of India. India has given a lead to the developing countries this respect. But why this denigration of the public sector? Now we hear of the industrial policy of reservation of about 504 units. It is good; I congratulate the Industry Minister on that. But before he introduces this reservation, may I ask for another reservation? And that reservation is that subject to Cabinet control, there will be no encroachment on poaching by the other powerful Ministers in the domain of the Industry Minister. Sir, is there any reservation with regard to the Industry Department under the Industry Minister? Is not the Home Minister-cum-Economist in his double capacity or character dealing with certain matters which pertain to the Industry Ministry? Is the firing on workers a matter of Home Ministry? Has not the Industry Ministry something to do for preventing that?

Sir, the other day we read in the papers banner headlines: 'Vajpayee Foreign Minister: Foreign capital is welcome.' It was in banner headlines and no contradiction has come. What is the position. I want to know. Is it that introduction of foreign capital is a matter which does not belong to the Industry Ministry? Does it belong to the Foreign Minister? Is it how the business has been bifurcated or compartmentalised?

[Shri Sankar Ghose]

We understand from the Industrial Policy Resolution of the Industry Minister that concentration of power will go and small-scale units will be encouraged. But the Finance Minister says: Give concessions to large houses. In the first Budget, Sir, the total amount of new taxes imposed would exactly amount to concessions given to large houses. Therefore, it seems that the Industrial relationship and firing on workers is outside the Industry Minister's Department and comes under the Home Minister's Department; welcoming foreign capital and multi-nationals is a matter for the Foreign Minister Mr. Vajpayee and Steel Minister Mr. Patnaik. Concessions to big houses is a matter for the Finance Minister and deprivation of credit to small-scale sector, that is the operational policy of the Banking Department is the concern of the Finance Minister. That is all 1 P.M. taken out of the Industry Minister's jurisdiction. Before we have this reservation in regard to these 504 items, I would suggest that the Industry Minister's department should not be poached or encroached upon by other powerful Ministers like the Foreign Minister, the Finance Minister, the Steel Minister and so on and that our industrial policy should not be distorted.

What is the result? What is the position in regard to the public sector? The public sector had been attacked in the past. But it had proved its worth. It had increased its production. It had increased its surplus. But what has happened last year? In the public sector the big monopolist has no control. It is the Government which has the control. What is the position? I am quoting from their own official documents. In the public sector, between April and December, last year, the rate of growth was 4 per cent and in the corresponding year previous to that, what was the rate of growth? Eleven per cent. About three times more.

This is position of the public sector. What is the use of having an industrial policy and what is the use of saying that we will do this,, we will do that and so on, if this is the performance? This is not a matter for which the private industrialists are responsible. This is the result of continuous denigration of the public sector. This the result of the continuous neglect of the public sector. Sir, so far as the public sector is concerned, . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn now. You can continue after lunch.

अब सदन की कार्यवाही दो बजे तक के लिए स्थगित होती है ।

The House then adjourned for lunch at one minute past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at three minutes past two of the clock. Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE: Mr. Deputy Chairman,, Sir, I am still speaking on the operative industrial policy. With regard to employment in 1975-76, in the organised sector increase of employment was 2.3 per cent. But last year, the first year of the Janata Government, the rate of production in the public sector having come down from 11 per cent to 4 per cent this employment has also been affected. When the growth of employment in 1975-76 was 2.3 per cent in the organised sector, two-thirds of that increased employment was in the public sector. Now the public sector performance,, as I have said, has come down from 11 per cent to 4 per cent. So this is the position as to employment, the repercussion on employment of this industrial policy.

It is said that small-scale industries, khadi industries will develop. It is a good thing. And when the Finance

Minister,, Mr. Patel, had provided about Rs. 36 crores for khadi and village industries in the Budget, it was said that employment for 25 lakhs will be provided. Very good. But now we understand that employment not of 25 lakhs, not of 20 lakhs, not of 10 lakhs but of only 3.46 lakhs has been provided. This is the repercussion on the employment position.

Sir, on employment, the impact or incidence of the operative industrial policy of the Janata Government is this that so far as the live registers in the employment exchanges are concerned, as on October, 1976, there were 9.6 million people on the live registers. After one year, in October, 1977,, what was the position? It was 10.8 million. What was the rate of increase of the unemployed, as reflected in the employment exchanges? The rate of increase of the unemployed was 12.5 per cent. Unemployment is to be abolished within 10 years. In the first year, the rate of increase of unemployment is 12.5 per cent. And not only that, we have got the budget of two years. Therefore,, of the so-called five years, if it is there, of the Janata Party Government,, two years have already elapsed in the sense that the policy has been declared. With that,, we have increase in the growth of unemployment of 12.5 per cent. And the promise held out is that in 10 years, unemployment will disappear.

What is the position? Decline in industrial production, increase in the man-days lost, increase in unemployment—this is the impact of the actual operative industrial policy. This has taken place when? In a background where all Government documents have said that never before in the history of the country,, the country was in a more favourable position for industrial advance and economic growth. They have said—it is not me, it is the Government documents—

the Economic Survey and other documents which have said that in the past there were two constraints to economic growth. One was the shortage of food reserves and the other was the shortage of foreign exchange reserves. And they say that for the first time these shortages have been removed. These were the inheritances that this Government received. There was enormous stock of food reserves and an unprecedented foreign exchange reserve. In that background, the industrial production, instead of increasing at double the rate, as in the past, has decreased considerably, as I have indicated.

Sir, what has happened? In 1975-76, the rate of savings was 15.5 per cent. And what was the rate of investment because the industrial growth will depend on investment? The year before the Janata Party Government came, the rate of savings was 15.5 per cent, but the rate of investment was 16.1 per cent. It was higher than the rate of saving. There was investment in the economy, there was growth in the economy, there was employment in the economy. But what was the position last year? The rate of saving was 15.7 per cent. And can I ask how much did the investment outstrip this rate of saving of 15.7 per cent, because in the previous year the investment was more than 1 per cent higher than the rate of saving? Sir, the investment was 14.3 per cent when the rate of saving was 15.7—11 per cent of the saving was not even invested. How can there be growth?

Before the second budget was presented by the Finance Minister, he was asked in a press conference what was the industrial prospects. He said that it was sluggish. He was asked why it was sluggish and he said: "I cannot say. I do not know because I have given so much incentive to industry. I do not know why they are not picking up".

[Shri Sankar Ghose]

So, Sir, this is the position. So far as the industrial policy is concerned, 'industry' means different things among the different Janata constituents. 'Industry', so far as the Home Minister-cum-Economy Minister is concerned, means that the industry as we know it should not be there; the only industry is agriculture. So far as the Finance Minister is concerned, industry to him means concessions to big industry. So far as the Foreign Minister is concerned, industry to him means welcome to foreign industries. The Steel Minister's view is also likewise. So far as the Industry Minister is concerned, he has given an Industrial Policy Resolution. For him industry primarily means small scale industry and village industries which are to be encouraged. Sir, it is welcome. So there is reservation policy.

But what has actually happened is that the declared policy of the Janata Party Government has been reserved for the Socialist Party, the C.F.D. and the Congress (O). The declared policy is reserved for them. The operational policy of the Janata Party Government has been reserved for the Swatantra Party, the Jana Sangh and the B.L.D. Therefore, the declared policy of the Janata Government is for small scale industries for removal of concentration of power. The operational policy of the Janata Party Government is encouragement to multi-nationals and to big houses.

Sir, according to the Industrial policy as announced by the Industries Minister, he has increased the reservation from 180 to 504. It is good. But if it is said that it is a dynamic change, it is a basic restructuring, the answer is "no", a categorical 'No'. It is a tinkering with the old Industrial policy of 1956. It can be demonstrated that here also the declared policy and the operational policy are diametrically different. First, I take this item of 504, an increase from 180 to 504, a good increase. Can you analyse this increase? How much of this increase is really genuine?

Sir, one item of this new addition is "brushes of all types". What is another item? Paint brushes? So, if brushes of all types are there you get one mark. Then you get another mark for paint brushes. The third mark is for wire brushes and fibre brushes. And the fourth mark is for tooth brushes. Therefore, it is only, a game of numbers. This is one illustration.

I will give another illustration. One increase for this 504 is "adhesive based on starch gum" What is the second increase? That is "gum paste", adhesive gum. Adhesive gum is one mark. Gum "paste" is No. 2 "Glue" is No. 3.

SHRI GHANSHYAMBHAI OZA (Gujarat): All these are not produced in the same factory. They are manufactured at different places.

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE: Has learned friend come to defend it? Or are you opposing it, then I will deal with it. And if you are defending it, I will deal with it also.

SHRI GHANSHYAMBHAI OZA: But all these brushes are manufactured at different factories.

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE. Do I understand if it is said "Brushes of all types", it is not brushes of all types? And that is one item. And paint brush can be another item. Tooth brush, another item.

SHRI GHANSHYAMBHAI OZA: There are many factories at different places.

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE: Why do you there put an item, brushes of all types? Will the English language lose its meaning? Therefore, I say it is not a game of numbers. You increase reservation. I welcome it. But give the true number, not 504, to that I have some fundamental objection. If you want to help the small scale industry, do it by all means. It is a good thing. I will give you support. Everybody will give you support. But

merely this number game and inflating the figures will not help. And what is the position?

The census of the small-scale sector for 1973-74 discloses that there are 2,400 items in which the small-scale industries are operating. The Janata Party Government said that what can be produced in the small-scale industry will not be produced in the large-scale industry. If so, the reservation would have been not for 504 but for 2,400 items... I am only indicating that if really the idea is to implement the Janata Party policy that what can be produced in the small-scale industry will not be produced in the large-scale industry, then there are 2,400 items in the small-scale sector but you are giving reservation only for 504 and not 2,400. Therefore, that policy is not implemented. That is point number one.

Then, how many units are there in the small-scale sector? The census for 1973-74 discloses that there are 2.58 lakh units in the small-scale sector. How many of them are genuine? Sir, it was disclosed that 1.4 lakhs are genuine. Fifty per cent of the small-scale units are not genuine. If you are a small-scale unit then you have the advantage in getting licence. Now some of the 'big business houses operate through *benami* small-scale units for the purpose of utilising import licences, for needing the so-called export obligation and for carrying on business (C.O.B.). Therefore, one is C.O.B.; one is export obligation; one is foreign technology. Under this three head, they enter the field preserved for the small-scale industry. Therefore, I say, if you really want to help them, by all means help them, it is a good thing. You do not help them merely by increasing the numbers artificially that is not a genuine manner. You have to give them a package of incentives; you have to give them the infrastructure; you have to give them the raw materials; you have to give them financial support. Is Mr. H. M. Patel, the Finance Minister, giving the financial support?

Forty per cent of the bank credit goes to large houses. A substantial amount goes to the big traders. Only 10 per cent of the bank credit goes to the small units. Therefore, I say, help the small units, help the small-scale sector, but not merely by reservation. The infrastructure should be there. There should be co-ordination between the industrial policy, the financial policy, the banking policy and the fiscal policy.

But the most crucial thing of all is this industrial policy is that if you really want to help the small-scale sector, then the test will be how much out of your Plan funds you are giving to the small-scale sector because that is the operational test and not the declared test.

Sir, it is said that last 30 years' planning was all wrong. Panditji was influenced by the Soviet example. We had given emphasis on capital-intensive industries. We had gone by the Mahalanobis model of the second Five-Year Plan. What was the Mahalanobis model of the second Five-Year Plan? How much emphasis was given on small-scale industry? Sir, we have got the figures. In the second Plan, when the Mahalanobis model was there, when Pandit Nehru's model was there, out of the total Plan funds of Rs. 4,600 crores, Rs. 175 crores was given to the small-scale sector—3.8 per cent. It is very important to remember what percentage of our Plan allocation we gave in our second Plan for the small-scale sector. It was 3.8 per cent. In the third Plan we gave 2.8 per cent of our Plan allocation for the small-scale sector. What is the Plan allocation under the so-called sixth Plan for the small-scale sector? Is it a Gandhian allocation and is it a higher allocation for the small-scale sector? That is the crucial test. Sir, it is two per cent. When Panditji gave 3.8 per cent for the small-scale sector out of the Plan funds in the second Plan, 2.8 per cent out of the Plan funds in the third Plan, only two per cent has been given now. Therefore, I say, there is no

[Shri Sankar Ghose]

use blaming the past. If you want to help the small-scale sector, help the small-scale sector by all means. But give them a package of incentives and from the Plan funds at least to prove your *bona fides* that from the Plan funds you are proportionately giving higher amount, to the small-scale sector.

Sir, another thing. There are two types of units in the small-scale sector. There is one small-scale sector which produces for the small markets, local markets, village markets. There is another small-scale sector which produces for the big business. Now, in certain things like bidi and footwear in the small-scale sector, there are multi-national companies who are the sole traders, who give the inputs, the raw materials, to the small-scale sector and purchase their products at cheap prices and even export them. There is one Canadian multi-national company which gets 22 per cent of the production from the small-scale sector at a low price and export it and earn super profits. Sir, if you are supporting the small-scale sector, then you have to find out which is the small-scale sector that you are supporting. You should give them the infrastructure the inputs, the marketing facilities, the financial support, and also see that you break its linkage with the big business houses. The big business houses, the capitalist enterprises establish a linkage with this small-scale sector and purchase at a throw-away price, their products and then establish a linkage with the capitalist market of the world by exporting. This is an exploitative type of relationship between the big business houses and the small-scale sector. If you want to help the small-scale sector with finances and other things, this exploitative relationship between the small-scale sector and the big business houses must be broken. The small-scale sector must be classified into those sectors which are really bringing the small-scale sector into direct relationship with the consumer, not with the sole

trader, the representative of the monopolist who gives them the inputs, purchases that products at a low price and then export it and earn super profit.

Therefore, on the question of this industrial policy, if we really want to reduce concentration of power, to increase employment, to increase production, then the industrial policy, the operational policy, should be reserved, as I say, for the Socialist members, for the CFD members and the Congress (O) members of the Janata Party. If the operational policy is so protected, the declared policy can be taken over by the Jana Sangh and the BLD, it will not matter. But in the operational policy let these elements not encroach.

Otherwise, if we do not take a lesson from the past, if we do not understand why in spite of so many favourable factors last year our production went down so much, if we do not analyse that, or if the analysis ends by saying that for the past 30 years nothing has happened and we shall give something new, things will not improve. Even in the 'new' policy instead of giving 3.8 per cent out of plan funds for the small-scale sector, we have given only 2 per cent. Therefore, the operational policy is still not Gandhian. It is still not for the small-scale sector. It is still not labour intensive.

Ultimately the aim of our industrial policy is to generate growth, to diminish the disparity between the rural areas and the urban areas, to ensure that the mass consumption goods are produced by the masses and to ensure that the domination of the foreign multi-nationals and the big business houses is eliminated or diminished. Then we have to give emphasis not to big business houses which produce for the elitist consumption but to the small-scale sector which produces goods for the masses or consumers. Then only the disparities between the cities and the villages will be reduced.

So far as the declared industrial policy of the Industry Minister is concerned, I say that those things are there. I will ask him to implement that policy and to prevent his Ministry being poohed down or encroached by other powerful Ministers—the Foreign Minister, the Finance Minister and other Ministers—who want to bring the multi-nationals and the big business houses. Let him implement this industrial policy. What has been happening in the last year is something which is depressing. It was a year of wasted opportunities. With so much goodwill, with so many resources, we have wasted it. I will ask him and implore upon him to take full control of his house, to prevent encroachment of other elements therein and to implement the policy which will be for the benefit of the masses.

Thank you.

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I welcome the new industrial policy of the Government which they have announced. But in the announcement they have failed to mention about nationalising of the 20 big industrial houses. We thought the Government would come forward to nationalise these 20 big houses. Sir, in this country they are having about 5000 to 6000 crores of rupees worth of property. Compared to the entire wealth of the country, they are having about 45 per cent of the wealth of the country in these 20 industrial houses. If these 20 industrial houses are nationalised, the country will benefit.

Sir, in the industrial policy, they have not mentioned much about the small scale industries. They have only said that the small scale industry will be helped. They have reserved 180 items and have increased the reservation to 500 items. It is a welcome feature. But, Sir, they have not done anything to help the small scale sector by a statutory assurance. Now many entrepreneurs are starting industries in villages or in towns.

How many small scale industries have become sick? The Government has not thought of it and how to rectify it. For various reasons they have become sick. For want of financial help, want of electricity or want of raw material they have become sick. But the Government have not thought of enquiring why they have become sick. The Government must come forward and appoint some committees for each State, not only with officers but with some MPs also attached to them, to find out the reasons why the small scale industries are becoming sick. Unless they do that, there is no use.

The Government have come forward with an announcement that they will provide employment for all within ten years. If they have to do this, they must start village industries. They must start small scale industries in the rural areas. Now they are giving licences for big industries. When they give a licence for a big industry, they must put a condition that they must start some ancillary industries attached to each big industry, otherwise, if they do not do it, the other people cannot get employment. They have to do it. The first duty of the Government is to put the condition when they grant licences.

Sir, we are having a shortage of power. We are having 3,000 megawatts power shortage. Due to this power shortage we are having a loss of production worth Rs. 3,000 crores every year. If we are going to continue this, there will be unemployment also. When there is power shortage, the labourers working three shifts will work two shifts or one shift. Then there will be unrest among labour. To avoid this, they must start producing more power. For this they must instal power generating sets in so many places so that they can produce more power.

Coming to cement, for starting a factory and for construction of a building cement is required. But

[Shri N. P. Chengalraya Naidu] there is shortage of cement. I do not blame this Government for the shortage of cement. But the planners did not envisage that the cement consumption will increase. Due to the planners' mistake the shortage has occurred now. Now the Government are thinking of issuing licences. They have already issued some licences. If you want to start a cement factory in the private sector, it needs about Rs. 20 crores. For getting Rs. 20 crores, they have to raise about Rs. 3 crores at least as share capital. Nobody can do it. In the private sector it is very difficult now to raise Rs 3 crores. So, those people who have got the licences are not able to start cement factories. Only the big industrialists can do it. So, when these people, the private sector, is not starting it, it will go to the big industrialists. It is unfortunate. I suggest to the Government that they should start cement factories in the public sector. There are the State Government industrial corporations. They can give licences to the industrial corporations in every State. If licences can be given to the State Governments, they can start cement factories in the public sector. The licences of those who have not started these cement factories so far must be cancelled and the State Government's Industrial Corporations must be asked to start these factories.

Sir, in the small-scale sector they have to do much. Now educated people, unemployed engineers and technicians are coming forward and starting some small-scale industries. The Government should not give licences to them if they want to start these small-scale industries in municipal areas or in major panchayat areas. They must insist that these small-scale industries must be started in rural areas. Then only they will give employment to the rural people. To do this the Government must come forward to give some subsidy and help to the small-scale sector people. Sir, previously" the big industrialists

used to formulate the industrial policy through the Government. Now the Government itself has formulated this policy. This is one good thing. But some people are not happy. Now the industrialists who used to formulate these Government industrial policies are sore with the present Government. Not only these big industrialists but their henchmen are also sore. So they are crying wolf on this new industrial policy. This has to be countered by the Government.

Sir, the Chairman of the Khadi and Village Industries Commission has said that if Rs. 75 crores are given to him, he will provide jobs for five lakhs of people. But the Khadi and Village Industries Commission is not having that amount. The Government must come forward and give Rs. 75 crores to the Khadi and Village Industries Commission so that they can give employment to five lakhs of people. There is no use of announcing that we will provide employment, to all the people within ten years. We must also start formulating policies to give employment to the people. Thank you.

SHRI MAQSOOD ALI KHAN (Karnataka): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I shall confine myself this afternoon to the small sector only. Sir, before I proceed to the subject, I would like to invite the attention of the treasury benches and "especially of the Ministers to a suggestion that has been given the other day by the Honourable Speaker of the Lok Sabha that it would be in the interest of the working of the departments and in the interest of the public in general that we may convene Parliament sittings specially to consider the working of the departments. We have now the Budget Session, the Monsoon Session and the Winter Session. Apart from these, we may convene one or two sittings of Parliament in a year to take up the working of the departments. I think it is a good suggestion. If we take it up,

the Members will be able to offer their suggestions to the Ministers and to the Government.

Coming to the subject itself, Sir, the Industrial Policy that was announced by the hon. Minister on the 23rd December, 1977 speaks of certain distortions in the past of "the industrial economy and then, in Sir's wisdom, he went on to elaborate it.

He said:

"The main thrust of the new Industrial Policy will be on effective promotion of cottage and small industries widely dispersed in rural areas and small towns. It is the policy of the Government that whatever can be produced by small and cottage industries must only be so produced."

Later on he says:

"The list of industries which would be exclusively reserved for the small scale sector has been significantly expanded and will now include more than 500 items as compared to about 180 items earlier."

-And he says:

"While the existing definition of small scale industries will remain, within the small scale sector; special attention will be given to units in the tiny sector, namely, those with investment in machinery and equipment up to Rs. 1 lakh and situated in towns with a population of less than 50,000 according to 1971 Census figures, and villages."

This is not an expression of a new faith so far as the small scale sector is concerned. Actually if the honourable Minister has to learn something from the past industrial policies of the Government and even if he in his own way assesses them as mistaken notions on the part of the earlier Government, he will come to the conclusion that this was the policy announced even by the earlier Government; dispersal of industries to

the villages and encouragement of these industries in the villages. When we started our Plans, the First Plan did not lay much emphasis on industrial development. It was on agriculture. When we took up the Second Plan the stress was placed on industrial development. And especially when the Third Plan was being formulated we realised that there was a lopsided development of industries in towns and in big cities and villages had been left out without any development whatsoever, and it was thought that villages should also get the benefit of new industries, and the climate that was thought better for the villages was the small scale sector. Having assessed the situation like that, how is it that the earlier Government could not do much even if we make an assessment today? What were the impediments in the way of the Government? When we take up the broad wings of the small scale sector or an industry for that matter, there are usually five wings. The first is finance, the second is technical knowhow, the third is management, the fourth is marketing and the fifth is—in my own way I would place stress on this—the geographical location of the industry. Regarding finance no doubt the Government was doing much about it, and even this Government is prepared to do much about it. There is no question of doubting the bonafides of the Government. Technical knowhow, you have ample, because from the reports of the SISIs—Small Industry Service Institutes—and the survey reports that you have, you know that you have ample number of technicians to assist the new entrepreneurs. Then the three wings that remain are the most difficult wings. They work as impediments in the way of young entrepreneurs. The management; the management difficulty is largely due to its being loose. There will not be any production; overheads will be more; you may be giving them training in management by conducting seminars and other things. But actually for a good manager a certain aptitude is required. It is more or less the

[Shri Maqsood Ali Khan] personal aptitude of a person towards an industry which matters rather than an injection from outside that may be given to the person. Here also a personal evaluation will have to be made of the manager. Then comes the fourth wing, marketing. Marketing is a very important wing. I had a number of chances of attending seminars and of meeting industrialists, especially, small scale industrialists. I think the greatest bottleneck in their way is marketing. They know how to produce a thing. They know how to place the commodity in the market. But actually they do not know whether the commodity has a market or not. Even when I took my friends to the SISI and had discussions with the officers there, what did they do? They showed some project reports. I would draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that all the project reports they have were prepared about 20 years ago. Today what they do is to make some subtractions or additions or multiplications regarding the machinery, value of the land, interest, etc. About marketability of the goods they are very much silent. They will simply say: There is short, age of this material. It has a good market. There is a mention of this in the report. I have got with me the report for 1977-78. It speaks about the SISI holding a lot of seminars all over the country and they take up the question of marketing also. But I do not think it is quite sufficient. When a man takes loans from the banks, produces certain things and finds that the things are not sold, he is completely non-plussed. This is the crux of the problem. Therefore, what I want to suggest is that the marketing section of the SISI will have to be revitalised and it has to be manned by persons who can make very good survey of the marketability of goods and who are posted with up-to-date facts and figures regarding sale and purchase of these goods. Unless you do it, it will not be possible to help young entrepreneurs in starting small industries.

Coming to the question of geographical location, what I want to say is that this factor is the most important one. Why is it that a young man or would-be industrialist wants to start his industry in a city? He selects the city for certain reasons. Firstly, availability of power. Secondly, availability of water facilities; and the third is the most important, namely, labour. Skilled and unskilled labour is available in the city to a degree not comparable with this facility in the villages. The last one is marketing of goods and transportation. How about haulage? If a man starts his industrial unit in a place far away from the consumers, who is going to bear the transportation charges? When you want to put up an industry in a village, you will have to look to these facts. Then, can you compete with other industrialists who are already there? If you cannot compete, then there is no use putting up your unit in a village.

All your schemes will indicate that the net profit that a man can make -will be 15 or 20 per cent. The person invests Rs. 1 lakh, Rs. 4 lakhs or even Rs. 5 lakhs in an industry. He will see whether it is worth his while to start an industry and earn just 15 per cent, profit. The banks give 10 per cent, on deposits and some banks give even upto 13 per cent. Why should he then take this risk of running an industry and spend his time and labour just to earn 15 per cent profit?" Unless the industry gives him a return of 25 to 30 per cent, why should one get tempted to start an industry and that too in the village sector? Sir, in the Industrial Policy Resolution, I think, for the first time, a new phrase has been used and I think it must be the brainwave of the Department or it may be that because of the expansion of industries or because of the economic expansion, these are all relative terms that we use. An industry which was a large-scale industry becomes a small industry after a few days and an industry which is a small industry becomes a large industry.

Similarly, an industry which is a tiny industry becomes a medium industry and alter a few days a very small col-tage industry becomes a tiny industry. Now, you have said that there is a tiny sector. For this, Sir, what is the reservation that they have made? You have said that 504 items have been reserved for production in the small-scale sector. Will you be able to work them? How are you going to implement this reservation? Sir, our honourable colleague, Prof. Ranga, is there and I still remember his feelings about the handloom industry and the mill industry. Right from the year 1946 or 1947, I think, he has been clamouring for the reservation for this sector and he has been clamouring that the reservation made in favour of the handloom sector should be implemented. But, up till now, the mills have been encroaching upon the commodities that are made by the handloom sector. Sir, I can just take up the list and show you whether it is possible to manage this. I am reading out from page 158 of the Report which contains the items reserved for the small sector. Now, I will take up a few items. There is an item here—"Domestic electrical appliances and accessories"—reserved for this sector. But who are Philips? Who are Bajaj? Are they in the small sector? Then, there is another item—"Cooking ranges". Who are the people engaged in this? Are they small people? Are the Bajaj people small people? Then, there is another item—"Storage water heaters and geysers"—reserved for this sector. Now, who are these people, the Spencers and the Kleertone people? Who are they? Then, there is another item—"Mixers/Grinders"—reserved for this sector. Who are the people engaged in this? Rallis India. How are you going to eliminate all these people? Then, Sir, I would like to go to page 160. There is another item—"Laundry soaps"—reserved for this sector. Who are the people here? M/s. Hindustan Lever, the Tatas, the Godrej people. Then, coming to paints and varnishes, the Asian Paints, the British Paints and

other people are there. Just I had a random glance at this and on going through this list I found these items. I can mention all the items, but that will take much of the time. If the honourable Minister has some patience and even some time at his disposal, he can go to the market and see that these small-scale industry goods, these goods reserved for the small sector, are actually being produced by the big sector and I do not know how he is going to make a distinction between them. There are two ways of doing that. Either you say that any big sector producing these goods would not be given power. Stop their power. I do not know whether you are going to do that. That is a big 'if. Or, you stop their raw materials. Do not give them any raw materials whatsoever. If you don't do that, then I will have to use the phrase that you become nothing but an animated version of the highly eloquent policies of your Secretaries. Nothing but that. What is the use of telling the country that you have reserved so many items which are actually impracticable. So, I would request the honourable Minister that when he has such a thinking about the development of the small-scale sector, he must be very much practical and anything that goes against this reservation should be firmly dealt with.

Lastly, Sir, I have one point to make and it is about the silk industry in Karnataka. Sir, the silk industry is such an industry that it can give you crores of rupees so far as exports are concerned. But, in Karnataka, we have been making requests to the Government for the last so many years that a bank for the purchase of raw materials or what is called the silk raw material bank, should be set up and a scheme was forwarded to the Government by the Central Silk Board and it is with the Government for the last four or five years. I would request the honourable Minister to have a look at it. If that bank is set up or if that corporation is set up.

[Shri Maqsood Ali Khan] then it will go a long way in helping the silk industry in getting its raw materials from this bank and the weavers would be very much benefited. Thank you very much, Sir. I have done.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, first of all, let me congratulate the Minister for the bold step that he has taken in taking over the Swadeshi Cotton Mill, Kanpur.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Thank you.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I wired to him as early as on the 20th January, when he was at Bangalore and later gave him the details as to how to take it over. I know how the bureaucracy works, but I am glad that he has been able to overcome the resistance of the bureaucracy and other powerful forces take it over. Secondly, before I go to other questions, I want to read out a letter which I have received from my comrades in Indore for the Industry Minister's attention. It says;

“इन्दौर में 7 सूती मिलों में लगभग 18-20 हजार अस्थायी और स्थायी मजदूर कार्यरत हैं पिछले समय 2 जून, 1969 को इंदौर नगर में मा० चंदगीराम के जलूस को लेकर साम्प्रदायिक दंगा कराया गया था । इस दंगे की जांच कमीशन की रिपोर्ट अभी तक सरकार ने प्रकाशित नहीं कराई है । इस दंगे के फलस्वरूप सारा शहर कई माह तक साम्प्रदायिक विद्वेष की भयंकर जकड़न में रहा । उस समय इन सूती मिलों में काफी तादाद में मुसलमान लोग काम कर रहे थे । लेकिन तब तक उन्हें बदली, जात, कच्ची आदि पास दिये जाते थे । परन्तु उन्हीं दिनों में इन मिलों के अन्दर मुसलमान मजदूरों के बहिष्कार की घटना हुई । काफी मुस्लिम मजदूर या तो छंटनी कर दिये गये या नौकरी छोड़ने को मजबूर हो गये । तब से अब तक इन मिलों में

मुसलमानों को बदली पास तक भी प्रदान नहीं किये जाते हैं ”

I got this letter the day before yesterday. Hindu and Muslim riots took place in 1969. At that time, because of the conditions there all the Muslim workers in all these factories were removed from service, and since then not a single Muslim worker is being recruited in these factories. This is the position prevailing there. You may say: it does not concern you because it is a private factory. But I think when the Industry Minister is giving them licences, he should somehow compel the management to have Muslim workers also; otherwise what will all the Muslims feel in this country? I am giving this letter to you. You can go through it and make inquiries. I would like an immediate action to be taken. Within 24 hours these facts can be found out, whether they are true or not. I would like that action should be taken almost immediately—not that you are appointing this committee or that committee. Do you want this letter?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I will collect it.

SHRI N. G. RANGA (Andhra Pradesh): You are giving the order, and they are following them.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: It is not like that.

Secondly, with regard to the performance of the Ministry, I need not say much about it, because the Janata Party's Resolution the day before yesterday itself is a sufficient indictment of the performance of the Government. Therefore, I need not add to this self-condemnatory statement. The statement itself says: Our party has not made any mark and, therefore, the whole gamut of our entire economic policies must be gone into—agrarian as well as industrial—and they had made so many points. Here I am concerned with the problems

concerning the industry. What are the solutions they have found out? I am not going into the questions as to how much production was there during the last year, how much per capita production was there or what the percentage of increase of production is, and so on. These things do not matter much. The real question is that in the conditions in which we are, what is the policy that the Janata Party whose policy is going to be the policy of the Government of the day, has laid down? My other friend from the Indira Congress was shouting against the growth of big and foreign industries and that even small things like tooth paste, this and that *were* being manufactured by Hindustan Levers. I wish they had awakened to that all these years when they were in office. Now, when they are out of office, they complain that all these big monopoly houses have been given licences for tooth pastes and all these small things. Who gave them licences? Now they are saying all these things when they have come in the opposition. That is a wonderful thing. I wish they had the sense when they were in office. I do not think they are going to get any sense hereafter.

What I want to point out is that the policy statement issued the day before yesterday, which I am sure the Government of India is going to follow, is the same old wine in new bottle. Only the words are changed. What is the crux of the problem? Everybody in this country accepts that big business houses are very powerful, the growth of big business houses in this country has been phenomenal and the grip of foreign concerns over the economy of the country is also phenomenal. All these things have got to be broken. This is the commonly accepted in words. When the Congress was in power, they accepted it. When the Janata Government is in power, they also accept it as far as the words are concerned. The power of the monopolists must be broken is a commonly accepted thing. But how to solve that problem? The Congress Government were saying that they

would prevent the concentration of economic power. The Janata Government is talking about decentralisation of economic power. It is the same thing. Only the bottles are different. They are saying that they would have dilution of equity capital. What does it matter if 40 per cent shares are being held by a group and that group has got the capacity to control the entire industry? What does it matter if 60 per cent shares are held by 6000 different people? How does it remove the control of the big business houses from those industries? The same old wine in new bottles. New words. That is what is being done. I want to point out that this way it is not possible to break up the power of these economic houses. The Congress Government had passed M.R.T.P. Act, and Foreign Exchange Regulation Act. They had also abolished the Managing Agency system. Despite all that, big business houses did grow and are growing. Nobody can stop them. Even today, with all these new measures that you are suggesting, you will not be able to do anything. Their power over the economy, officials, bureaucrats and executives of this country is so tremendous, that I am sure it will not be possible for you to get out of the clutches unless you are prepared to attack them lock, stock and barrel. This is the main question. I know, Sir, that when Comrade George Fernandes—I will not use the word 'Minister' for him; I still think that he is comrade—was with me in the opposition, he used to thunder.

SHRI S. W. DHABE (Maharashtra): He is the employer now.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: At least in thinking, he is still my comrade. Sir, when he was in opposition sitting with us, he attacked the Government of India for allowing these monopolists to grow. He attacked the Government for the fact that they had not been able to take action against the Birlas despite all their crimes. Now what is the action you have been able to take against the Birlas during the

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

last one year? They have got the power. Whatever action you may take, they have got the power to go to the High Court to get stay orders, this and that and all sorts of things. Anything you are attempting to do within the present framework is something which will not be able to break their power and all this talk about dilution of equity shares will do no good because when they dilute, they *sell* the shares to their kith and kin. There is only one thing to do and you will not dare do it

And that is, nationalise these 3 P.M. big business houses, take them

over. It is anathema to some people in the Janata Party, to some powerful people in the Janata Party, though I know that Comrade George Fernandes still swears by that. He will tell me, "What am I to do? I am bound down by certain constraints that are there in the present situation." Within these constraints, if you want a solution to a deteriorating problem, to a problem that is insoluble, what can you do? You can do nothing, I will give you illustration after illustration how exactly the power of these big business houses acts on this Government and how they are not able to overcome them, and how the power of big business houses is so strong in the bureaucracy that even the Ministers find themselves powerless to do anything unless they have got the guts against them. I may give you a few examples. Take, for example, the coir industry. You are talking so much of encouraging the small scale industries. Some months ago I brought to the notice of the Industry Minister that a certain gentleman was given the licence for mechanisation of the coir industry which employs about 20 lakhs of people, if I remember right, in Kerala, and mechanisation would make them lose their jobs. Then the officials come and argue with us. I was there and his Secretary was arguing. "If we don't mechanise we will not be able to compete, we will not be able

to export. But the smaller people who employ 10 or 15 workers and who manufacture without mechanisation are able to export. They are also against this mechanisation for they cannot invest huge sums and they also face ruination. Therefore, what is more important today? Getting a few rupees of foreign exchange, a few pounds of foreign exchange or the loss of jobs to hundreds of thousands of people, what is more important? As far as the officials are concerned, as far as the bureaucracy is concerned, they will argue in any way because their palms might be greased. There are hundred of ways by means of which the big business people are able to influence them. I am not blaming anybody. I am not here to bring any charges. But it makes me believe that their palms were greased. There were sufficient people in the Ministry whose palms might have been greased and as a result of that they are made to put up notes and "they are made to find arguments for seeing that the jobs of these people are lost. This is what is mechanisation if it is allowed to continue. So, we went on a deputation and Mr. George Fernandes told us that he would look into the matter. They are still looking into the matter. It is more than two months now. The files go to the officers and the officers go on writing something. Meanwhile, thousands and thousands of people are now lying unemployed. This is what is happening, the same functioning the bureaucratic functioning. They are the people who are ruling the country, who are ruling the economy, who are deciding the economic policies. My friend, Mr. Naidu, of the Janata Party said just now that previously the industrialists used to decide the policy, now the Government decides the policy. And what is the Government? It is not the Minister that is the Government. It is the officials that are the Government, the bureaucracy that is the Government, the executive that is the Government. And, therefore, the industrialists in this country, the big businessmen in

this country now decide the policy of the Government through the bureaucracy. And if they say that we are all angry with the Government, it is a *natak*. It is a drama that is being enacted that the business houses are very angry with" the policies of the Government. Actually, they are extremely happy about those policies. This is one instance that I wanted to point out.

There is another instance, the story of the polyester fibre yarn. I have got a big correspondence with the Ministry on that. I do not want to go into the whole story but I just point out that on the 22nd January—at that time, Mr. George Fernandes had nothing to do with this—suddenly a notification appeared that polyester fibre yarn can be imported against the export earnings of any commodity by any one. Suddenly it appeared on the 22nd January. Immediately I took it up with the Prime Minister. On the 24th, I went to the Prime Minister and pleaded with him, "How is it that you are allowing this? Today the polyester fibre yarn can be bought by anybody against the export of fish, against the export of leather, against the export of anything." Then the Prime Minister took some action. It took some 11 days. After 11 days it was changed. After it was changed again, what happens is that I again plead with the then Commerce Minister under whom the textile industry then was, and told him that you are now going to canalise it, you are going to do it through the State Trading Corporation, but do not give it to the textile mills because all these years the textile mills were prevented from using this yarn, all these years this yarn has been reserved, this cloth has been reserved, for what is called, the art silk sector most of which is in the small scale sector. This must go to the handloom sector or the powerloom sector. Therefore do not give it to the mills. Then I was told that they are the actual users. I asked how could they be the actual users. I can

quote chapter and verse to prove it that they were prevented from using this yarn. In 1962 the Bombay Dyeing and Weaving Company were given the licence to manufacture this cloth only on one condition, namely, that 90 per cent of the production will be exported. After that time application after application for licences were rejected by the Industrial Licensing Committee, at that time composed of officials of three Ministries and of Planning Commission. This has been the continuous policy. I want to ask the Minister can he deny that these applications had been rejected all these years? I am prepared to prove that. I have given you all the facts, the correspondence, the inner-governmental correspondence also I had given. In the face of all these things today the question is still being examined. Meanwhile the units continue to get the yarns through the S.T.C.

Then, finding that the question is not solved, last month we sent a memorandum signed by 130 Members of Parliament, belonging to all parties, the Janata Party, my party, the Indira Congress and the other Congress, in fact, every section of the House, and I got the reply to the effect that the question is now being examined. This is the reply that I got after more than one month and the officials are still examining it. I ask why don't you appoint a committee of Members of Parliament to examine it who will see whether this thing can be given to the textile mills at all? Therefore, I say that the textile mill magnates are so powerful in the Ministry, they are so powerful with the officials, that whatever be your policy of helping the small scale sector, the way in which they will implement it and the way in which they will guide you is to see that these small scale sector industries go *phut*. This is what is happening. I can give you instance after instance. I have already given you the coir instance.

Now, take, for instance, slag, cement. You are talking of increasing cement production in this country. I

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

do not want to go into the whole story of how slag cement was first introduced in this country in 1962. In 1960 Russians fabricated the machine for manufacturing granules slag, what is called the grandulating machine, and they immediately gave us the process and We immediately started on the process in Bhilai. Out of grandulat-ed slag, cement can be manufactured the cost of production of slag cement which is otherwise known as Portland cements today is only Rs.90 to Rs. 95 per tonne as against Rs. 130 to Rs. 140 for the other tonne of ordinary cement. Today the cost of production of slag cement is much cheaper. The slag is there, which is a waste product of the steel industry. But, then, what happens? The A.C.C. another big monopolist company in cement, they were so powerful and told the Government, said, no, you do not produce it, and even if you produce it, you sell it at the same price at which we are selling."

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH (Gujarat): When was it?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: It was in 1962.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Mr. Maur-ya will appreciate when it happened.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: I believe you are going to change it,

SHRI PILOO MODY: At least now you have hope.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: At that time the price was fixed at the same rate although its price was much cheaper. And, then, subsequently, when year after year, the price went on changing—at that time it was Rs. 62—, went on increasing, the price of the slag cement also increased along with the other cement? And who manufactured it? Eight thousand construction workers in Bhilai at that time were retrenched. And those construction workers who could have been absorbed if a slag cement factory had been put up. But they were

beaten up by the police and sent away. But at that time, this process was stolen by the A.C.C. The designs were stolen by the A.C.C. The officers concerned were sacked, I know. But the Indira Government dared not take action against the A.C.C, the powerful A.C.C. who stole those designs and they also fabricated a small machine and put up a factory in Bhilai. The officers sacked were immediately taken as Directors of the A.C.C. I think in Durgapur, the Birlas put up a factory. So, the slag granules produced in Bhilai were taken over by the A.C.C. unit transported to Bagalkot which is nearly a thousand miles away from Bhilai. The slag granules are sold to Digvijay cement factory also. They purchased it at cheap price and sell it at the same price at which the other cement is sold. Now, today, slag is mounting in Rourkela. Slag is mounting in Bokaro and other places. The Government is talking in terms of increasing cement production and all that. I do not want the Steel Ministry to take it over because cement falls under the Ministry of Industry. So, why should not the Industry Ministry take over slag from the steel plants and tell those people: 'You are purchasing it at cheap rate; therefore, we would not allow you to loot the people of this country.'? The public sector is not to serve the interests of the big business. In reality what is happening today is. the public sector happens to be the servant of the Tatas, the Birlas and all those people. This is the reality that we see. Therefore, Sir, it was happening like this before and it is still continuing. New words are coined like decentralisation, devolution and all that but they do not mean anything. Therefore, I say, you will not be able to make any dent on the economic front whatever you might do. The power of big business is so great in this country that people can be purchased; whatever might be the Government, people can be purchased. Unless you are able to attack at least some of them, you will not be able to go far.

Sir, my friend Mr. Naidu just now talked of nationalisation of these top 20 business houses. I do not know whether the Government will have the guts and the courage. If you have the courage, you can do it tout you do not have the courage for a simple thing. And that simple thing is the taking over the distribution of the polyester filament yarn. This was being produced in this country only by half a dozen or a dozen big business houses, like the Birlas, Gwalior Rayons, Baroda Rayon and some 4 or 5 of them. Now they were selling it at Rs. 230 per kilo. How to bring down the prices? After all, the distribution is not very difficult because this yarn is being used only in half a dozen centres in India. It is not a commodity like cloth to be sold to the common people. It is being purchased by the handloom weavers and the power-loom weavers in Bhiwandi, Surat, and in Tamil Nadu in the Salem district, in Chinalapatti, in Madurai and like that, in just about half a dozen places this is being used. It is easier to procure this material from those factories at control price through the S.T.C. and tell them. This is your cost of production plus your profit. And on this basis, the Government can procure this material and distribute it through the S.T.C. at proper price. Instead of doing that, the Government is importing polyester fibre yarn which is a huge waste of our foreign exchange.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Import is going on for the last several years.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Previously, the Government of India was allowing imports against export obligations. Now, the import has been tremendously increased. It is being increased to cater to the needs of these mill-owners. I know, as a result of these imports, the prices have come down but the beneficiary again is some big business house, not in the form of polyester filament yarn manufacturer but in the form of cotton textile manufacturer. The same Birlas profit here. What does it matter, whether the pro-

259RS—7.

fit comes from the side or that side. It only results in the ruination of the handloom weavers.

SHRI PREM MANOHAR (Uttar Pradesh): There was black market.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: This is what I am saying. There has been a ban on the polyester filament yarn used by these textile mills and, now, all sorts of interpretations will be given. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: The prices were very high at that time

SHRI PREM MANOHAR- There was black market.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I agree! The simple way to deal with the black market is to take over the entire production from these half a dozen people and distribute it to these people. This is a simple thing. This is not very difficult. That is what I suggest.

SHRI PREM MANOHAR: It would not stop the black market.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: The entire production from these people could have been taken over and this could have been distributed to these half a dozen centres at controlled prices. There is no difficulty about that. This is not a very big problem. This is not a problem like distributing cloth or edible oil or some other thing. Some half a dozen centres are there in this country here the handloom weavers are using it. Even this thing the Government cannot do. Therefore, when it comes to the question of attacking the big business houses, whether it is in the case of slag cement or the handloom industry or filament yarn or coir whatever it be, when it comes to the question of attacking the big business houses the Government will not have the courage. There are powerful vested interests. I do not know whether these vested interests are vested inside the party. Anyway, the philosophy of some powerful leader of the party is that. You should

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

attack at least some of the big business houses. You will be doing a very great service to the country if you are able to attack some of the big houses. Mr. Naidu had suggested that the twenty big business houses should be taken over. He is your own partyman. Immediately, if you are able to take over the two big business houses in this country, the business houses of the Tatas and the Birlas, I will have some satisfaction. Immediately, if you are able to do this, you will be making a beginning. If you are not able to do any such-thing, any number of speeches...

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Mr. Ramamurti, you have made a mistake in the sense that the polyester fibre yarn which you are talking of which is being used in Surat, Bhiwandi and so on is riot polyester fibre yarn, but it is rayon yarn. The Birlas, the Baroda Rayons and the Nirlons produce that. The polyester fibre yarn is being produced in the co-operative sector. We have got a plant in Baroda and we are supplying the entire polyester yarn to the handloom and the powerloom sectors.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I know. The operative sector is producing it. This is a new plant. I know that. Apart from that, there are also private factories which are producing this. I know these facts. This is what I am saying. What I am saying is that it has so far been restricted to the handloom and the power-loom sectors. It is not being supplied to the mill-owners.

Therefore, Sir, in conclusion, I would say that the Minister of Industry should at least take up this position in the Government, fight for it and openly fight for it. Now, we hear so many fights between personalities in the Janata Party. Let there be a fight for policies. Let there be "a clear-cut fight and division inside the party and inside the Government on the question of policies. Let us see

whom the people support. That will be the decisive way by which a new alignment of forces in this country can really come about. Otherwise, I am sure you are again going to do the same thing as the Congress Party, will be very bad.

SHRI PILOO MODY: This is an open invitation.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: This is an open invitation to revolt.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (उत्तर देश) :

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, उद्योग मंत्रालय के ऊपर आज चर्चा हो रही है और मुझे प्रसन्नता है कि वर्तमान उद्योग मंत्री जी ने देश की वास्तविक समस्याओं को प्रधानता दी है। क्योंकि यह कटु सत्य है कि देश में विषमता और बेकारी बढ़ी है और यह सभी लोगों ने माना है कि भूमि पर अब अधिक लोगों के निर्वाह की व्यवस्था नहीं की जा सकती। तो स्वाभाविक बात है कि हमें अन्य उद्योगों में, रोजगार के अन्य साधनों पर ही लोगों की इन समस्याओं को हल करना पड़ेगा और इसीलिए जब यह नीति बनी कि उद्योगीकरण को हम श्रम-प्रधान बनाने की व्यवस्था करें तो उसका देश ने स्वागत किया और विशेषकर उस समुदाय ने जो अंडर इम्प्लाइड था। जो भूमि से भी जुड़ा हुआ है परन्तु केवल भूमि पर जिसका निर्वाह पर्याप्त मात्रा में नहीं हो रहा हो तो इन रोजगार के साधनों को हमें अधिक और अधिक उस व्यक्ति तक ले जाने की आवश्यकता होगी जो अपने स्थान को छोड़ने के लिए मजबूर नहीं हो सकता और इसी लिए उसके काम को उसके रोजगार को उसके गांव में, उसकी आवादी तक ही, उसके निकट पहुंचाने की आवश्यकता पड़ सकती है।

जो परिवर्तन दिशा में आया है काम करने के तरीके में आया है, उसका मैं स्वागत करता हूँ। मुझे केवल इस

बात की तरफ ध्यान दिलाना है कि उद्योग मंत्रालय के अन्दर काम करने वाले कर्म-चारी, नौकरशाही इस परिवर्तन के साथ किस हद तक मेल बिठा पायेंगे ? क्योंकि जैसे ही विकेन्द्रित उद्योगों की, छोटे उद्योगों की, ग्रामीण उद्योगों की चर्चा होती है, तो जरा नाक-भौंह सिकोड़ने की परिस्थिति निर्माण होती है, विशेषकर ब्यूरोक्रेसी की तरफ से ।

मैं यह चाहूंगा कि मंत्रालय इस बात पर ध्यान दें कि जिस नीति को स्वीकार किया गया है, देशहित में जिसे उपयोगी समझा गया है, मंत्रालय ऊपर से नीचे तक उसी मानस के साथ काम करे तो उसकी सफलता, उसकी व्यावहारिकता अधिक योग्य बन सकती है । जब हम छोटे उद्योगों की चर्चा करते हैं, ग्रामीण उद्योगों की चर्चा करते हैं, तो यहां एक गलत धारणा फैलाए जाने की कोशिश हो रही है, आंकड़े देकर भी और बाकी बातों से कि जो देश के बेसिक उद्योग है, उनकी उपेक्षा हो रही है । मैं समझता हूं कि कोई भी देश उपेक्षा के आधार पर प्रगति नहीं कर सकेगा । प्राथमिकताएं जरूर बदलेंगी, परन्तु जिन चीजों के आधार पर ही छोटे उद्योगों का भी बेस तैयार होगा और उसके लिए आवश्यक साधन तैयार होंगे, उन बड़े उद्योगों की उपेक्षा न किसी को करनी चाहिये और न यह देश ही वर्दाशत कर सकेगा ।

हां, यह बात सच है कि अब ऐसे उद्योगों के लिए साधनों का प्रश्न खड़ा होगा और मैं समझता हूं कि सरकार ने यह उचित निर्णय लिया है कि इन साधनों को हंडने की व्यवस्था इन उद्योगों को चलाने वाले लोगों को स्वयं करनी चाहिये । लेकिन इसके लिए जरूरी है कि हम अपने देश की कार्य-पद्धतियों में, योजना में इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था करें कि उसमें से बचत निर्माण हो और उस बचत का उपयोग

उन उद्योगों के विस्तार और बढ़ती हुई मांग की पूर्ति में काम दे सके ।

अगर हमारा टैक्स स्ट्रक्चर एक ऐसा रूप धारण करे, मुझे खुशी है कि वह दिशा प्रारम्भ हुई है, जिसमें सेविंग के लिए गुंजाइश बढ़ती जा रही है, तो इन बड़े उद्योगों के क्षेत्र में साधनों का अभाव नहीं रहेगा और जो हम प्राथमिकता देना चाहते हैं अधिक लोगों को काम देने के क्षेत्र में, उसकी तरफ सारे साधनों का, सार्वजनिक धन का अधिक से अधिक उपयोग हो सकेगा ।

यह नीति कि अगर इन क्षेत्रों में अग्र-प्रधान योजनाओं को काम करना है, तो उन्हें प्रतिस्पर्धा से, विशेषकर बड़े उद्योगों की दृष्टि से बचाना होगा । इसलिये मैं स्वागत करता हूं कि जिन क्षेत्रों का आरक्षण किया गया है छोटे उद्योगों के लिये, वह सही दिशा में है । मैं उन आंकड़ों पर या कौन से आइटम्स लिये गये हैं और उन आइटम्स में बाल की खाल खींचकर जो अन्तर या समानता प्रदर्शित करने का प्रयत्न किया गया है, मैं उस पर जाना नहीं चाहता । मैं इस बात पर आश्चर्य करना चाहता हूं कि यह दिशा एक वाजिब दिशा है और यह दिशा हम प्राप्त नहीं कर सकेंगे यदि प्रति वर्ष हम प्रोप्रेसिवली आरक्षण के क्षेत्र में उत्पादन की मात्रा निर्धारित करते नहीं जायेंगे । एकदम से स्विच-ओवर नहीं कर सकते । हमें 10-20 प्रतिशत प्रति वर्ष उन क्षेत्रों के लिये जाना पड़ेगा । लेकिन मुझे यह बात समझ में नहीं आई कि हम आरक्षण करें छोटे उद्योगों का उस तरफ विकास के लिये जाएं । पर अगर देश के अन्दर उन चीजों की कमी पैदा हो तो इंपोर्ट करके भी उसकी पूर्ति करने का प्रयत्न करें । इन दोनों में मेल नहीं बैठता है । हम उन चीजों के इंपोर्ट पर क्यों जायें । अगर हमारे लघु उद्योग, छोटे उद्योग एकदम से उत्पादन क्षमता उतनी निर्माण नहीं

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

कर सकते तो स्वाभाविक है कि हम घीरे घीरे उस दिशा की तरफ बढ़ें। केवल उस चीज की कमी की पूर्ति करने के लिए हम आयात के मार्ग को स्वीकार करें, यह उचित नहीं होगा। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि इस आयात के प्रश्न पर हम थोड़ा रेशनल थिंकिंग करें। अगर हम समझते हैं कि जो छोटे क्षेत्रों में सभी प्रकार के प्रश्रय, प्रयत्न और संरक्षण देने के बाद भी कुछ समय आवश्यकता की पूर्ति में लग सकता है तो हम उसको थोड़ी धीमी रफ्तार से या परसेंटेज के मामले में धीमे होकर चलें लेकिन दूसरी सीमा पर पहुंचने के लिए हम इंपोर्ट सब्सिडीयूशन के आधार पर चलें, यह उचित नहीं होगा। विशेषकर इस बात का प्रयत्न करना पड़ेगा कि जिन उपभोक्ता वस्तुओं का उत्पादन बड़े उद्योगों के क्षेत्र में हो रहा है, जहां पर उनकी जो लाइसेंसिंग कंपैसिटी थी उससे भी जो आगे बढ़ाकर उत्पादन कर रहे हैं उनके सम्बन्ध में जरूर कठोरता की नीति हमें अपनानी पड़ेगी। जब तक यह कठोरता की नीति नहीं होगी हम छोटे क्षेत्रों में, उपभोक्ता वस्तुओं के उत्पादन के क्षेत्र में, आत्म-निर्भर नहीं हो सकेंगे।

कुछ ऐसी वस्तुएं भी हैं उपभोग के क्षेत्र में जो कि इंटरनेशनल ब्रैंड के नाम से चल रही हैं। इंटरनेशनल ब्रैंड नामों के आधार पर आज उनकी साख जम गई है और लोग अंधे होकर उनकी खरीद की तरफ आकर्षित होते हैं। यहां पर इस बात के लिए प्रोत्साहन दिया जाए। जब हम इन उपभोक्ता वस्तुओं को जैसे साबुन, जूता आदि इनको जब हम निश्चित रूप से छोटे क्षेत्रों में लायेंगे तो यह वस्तुएं अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नामों से न जायें, यह निश्चय करें। नये नामों से जायें और अपनी क्वालिटी और अपनी ऐफिशियेंसी के आधार पर अपने लिए मार्केट पैदा करें, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नामों की गुडविल के आधार पर ही वह आपके यहां की इंडस्ट्रीज के ऊपर हावी

होने का प्रयत्न न करें, तब ये उद्योग हमें आत्म निर्भरता की ओर ले जायेंगे।

श्रीमन्, पब्लिक सेक्टर में भी ऐफिशियेंसी की आवश्यकता है। अभी तक हम इनमें ऐफिशियेंसी लागू करने के लिए अधिक नहीं कर पाये हैं। मैं चाहूंगा कि मंत्रालय इनके मैनेजमेंट में जो लोग हैं जो लोग लगे हुए हैं उस बारे में गम्भीरता से विचार करे। कई नियुक्तियां पिछले दिनों में योग्यता के आधार पर न होकर फेवरेटिज्म या उनको स्थान देने के लिए हुई हैं, शायद राजनीतिक कारणों से भी हुई हैं, हमें इन पर विचार करना चाहिए। उद्योग अच्छे चलें, यह उसकी प्राथमिकता है। उन उद्योगों में ऐफिशियेंसी से काम न होने का एक कारण यह भी है कि वहां पर काम करने वाले तकनीशियंस वहां पर काम करने वाले कर्मचारियों के अन्दर शिकायत है कि उनके प्रति न्याय नहीं हो रहा है, अपाइंटमेंट्स में, प्रमोशंस में और वहां पर ही काम करने वाले लोगों को पदोन्नति देने के बजाय बाहर से लोगों को ला लाकर उनके माथे पर जब बैठा दिया जाता है तो उनका काम करने का उत्साह घटता है। मैं चाहूंगा कि इन पब्लिक सेक्टर कंसन्स ऐफिशियेंसी और उनकी कार्यक्षमता बढ़ाने पर भी हमें विशेष आग्रह करना चाहिए ताकि जो पूंजी हमने वहां लगा रखी है और हमारा सारा ढांचा विकेन्द्रीकरण का जिन बेसिक उद्योगों के आधार पर निर्भर करता है वे अच्छा काम करें और आवश्यक सामग्री, कम कीमत में लोगों को पहुंचायें ताकि वह उनका उपयोग कर सकें। मैं यहां पर इस बात के लिये बधाई दूंगा कि इस विकेन्द्रीकरण के काम की धुरी को डिस्ट्रिक्ट इंडस्ट्री सेंटर बना कर पूरा किया जा रहा है। मुझे इस बात की खुशी है और मैं बधाई देना चाहता हूं मंत्रालय को, कि जो काम पहले तीन-चार वर्षों में पूरा होने के लिये सोचा जा रहा था। अब इन जिला केन्द्र, इस प्रकार के सन्टैस स्थापित करने का काम उन्होंने दो वर्ष में पूरा करने का फैसला किया है।

ये केन्द्र जहाँ बनेंगे वहाँ पर छोटे उद्योगों को चलाने के लिये एक ही छत के नीचे सब प्रकार की सुविधाएँ प्राप्त होंगी। लेकिन मैं यहाँ पर यह कहना चाहूँगा कि इस प्रकार के केन्द्रों के लिये भी एक स्पेशल मैनेजीरियल टैलेंट चाहिये। ऐसे लोग अगर नहीं आयेंगे तो यह एक व्यूरोक्रेसी का नया अखाड़ा बन जाएगा। काम जल्दी होगा इसकी गुंजाइश कम है जब तक कि एक स्पेशल मैनेजीरियल टैलेंट नहीं होगा। मैं यह भी कहना चाहूँगा कि जो भी देश में मैनेजीरियल टैलेंट उपलब्ध है उनका उपयोग करने की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये। इन सैन्टर्स की प्लानिंग में अगर हम उनको भागीदार बना सकें तो यह अधिक उपयोगी होगा, तब जो आवश्यक व्यवस्था या मदद हम इन छोटे उद्योगों के लिये देना चाहते हैं उसका ठीक प्रकार से प्रबन्ध हो सकेगा।

यहाँ पर यह बात भी सही है कि उद्योग मंत्रालय को इस बात का भी प्रबन्ध करना होगा कि जो उद्योग हम छोटे गांव में बनाना चाहते हैं, छोटी जगहों पर बनाना चाहते हैं उसमें जिन बाधाओं के लिये संकेत किया गया, वहाँ पर मीन्स आफ कम्प्युनिकेशन का अभाव है और वहाँ पर पावर उनको उपलब्ध नहीं होती। चाहे हम कितनी ही योजनाएँ बनाएं, अगर तालमेल नहीं बैठेगा तो इन तीन चीजों में तो जो हम सफलता प्राप्त करना चाहते हैं, जिन उद्योगों को हम कामयाब बनाना चाहते हैं वह हम कामयाब नहीं बना पायेंगे। इसके लिये कोऑर्डिनेशन की, मीन्स आफ कम्प्युनिकेशन की, रोड की और आवागमन की सुविधाओं की जरूरत होगी। रेल के द्वारा या और दूसरे तरीके से इन केन्द्रों को जोड़ा जा सकेगा, कच्चा माल और मार्केटिंग के लिये मार्ग में कोई बाधा पैदा नहीं होगी तो इनका विस्तार जिस तेजी से हम देखना चाहते हैं वह इतनी तेजी से हो सकेगा।

जब इन विकेंद्रित चीजों की हम चर्चा करते हैं और विशेषकर जब हम हैडलूम्स

से पावरलूम्स की तरफ जा रहे हैं तो फिर मैं चाहता हूँ कि एक इन्टीग्रेटेड टैक्सटाइल पालिसी की घोषणा में अधिक देरी न की जाए। जल्दी से जल्दी जितना हम कर लेंगे उतना ही हम इनका विकास कर सकेंगे। जहाँ पर जिसका संरक्षण मिलना चाहिये, जिसके लिये प्राथमिकता मिलनी चाहिये और फाइनेंस की सुविधाएँ जहाँ प्राप्त होनी चाहिये वह हमें प्राप्त हो सकेंगी हम इन चीजों में खड़े हो सकेंगे।

सिक मिल्स के बारे में भी नीति घोषित होने की आवश्यकता है क्योंकि जब तक इन नीतियों का अभाव रहेगा तब तक मैं समझता हूँ पर्सपेक्टिव इसमें नहीं आ सकता। लेकिन जब हम यह सब कर रहे हैं तो यह जो आज फंशन की क्रेज होने से वैराइटी का फर्क है इसके कारण अनावश्यक रूप से मल्टीप्लेसीटी बढ़ रही है। इसलिए इस वैराइटी के मामले पर भी हमें विचार करना चाहिए। अनावश्यक रूप से हम अपनी शक्ति व्यय करें और विशेषकर हम इस छोटे सेक्टर को अधिक उपयोगी बनाना चाहते हैं। आज भी हमारे देश में यह स्थिति है कि लोगों की पसन्द क्या है, इसकी जानकारी छोटे प्रोड्यूसरों को नहीं हो पाती है। छोटे प्रोड्यूसर जो चीज पैदा करते हैं उसके लिए उपयुक्त मार्केट नहीं मिल पाता है। इसलिए आवश्यकता यह है कि इन दोनों कामों में तालमेल बैठाया जाये। हमारे छोटे उद्योगों के क्षेत्र में विशेषकर टैक्सटाइल के मामले में विदेशी व्यापार की काफी गुंजाइश है। लेकिन आज विदेशी व्यापार में कमी पड़ रही है। मैं जानता हूँ कि हमारे देश में भी टेस्ट बदलता है, लेकिन हमारे देश में टेस्ट बदलने की जितनी रफ्तार है, विदेशों में टेस्ट, फंशन और पसन्दगी बदलने की रफ्तार हमसे काफी ज्यादा है। और इस तरह के आइटम्स जो प्रोड्यूसरों की तरफ से विदेशों में भेजे जा सकते हैं। वहाँ पर किस चीज

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

की मांग है और कौन-सा किस प्रकार का टेस्ट वहां पर डेवलप हो रहा है, इसका अध्ययन करने के लिए विदेशों में प्रोड्यूसरों की तरफ से टीम भेजने की जरूरत है। हमारे देश के छोटे उद्योगों में जो माल तैयार होता है उसके लिए हमें बहुत बड़ा विदेशी मार्किट भी मिल सकता है। लेकिन यह विदेशी मार्किट तभी हमको मिल सकता है जब हम अपने माल को लोकप्रिय बनायें। अगर हम ऐसा करेंगे तो हमारे देश के नागरिकों के लिए रोजगार के भी अवसर उपलब्ध हो सकेंगे।

सूत के संबंध में इन उद्योगों की यह शिकायत रही है कि जो सूत इनको दिया जाता है वह सब-स्टैंडर्ड होता है जो रंग उनको दिया जाता है वह भी सब-स्टैंडर्ड होता है। अभी हमारे देश में स्थिति यह है कि जो लोग सब-स्टैंडर्ड सूत देते हैं उनके खिलाफ कानून के अनुसार कोई कार्यवाही नहीं हो सकती है। ऐसा लगता है कि वर्तमान कानून में ताकत नहीं है। इसलिए इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि कानून को मजबूत बनाया जाये और छोटे उद्योगों को जो सूत और रंग देने वाले लोग हैं और जो सब-स्टैंडर्ड माल सप्लाई करते हैं और जानबूझ कर इनके क्षेत्र में बाधाएं पैदा करते हैं और लोगों में उनके माल के प्रति नापसन्दगी पैदा करते हैं, उनके विरुद्ध जल्दी से जल्दी कदम उठाया जाये। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि हमारे मंत्री महोदय इन बातों की तरफ भी ध्यान देने की कृपा करें।

[The Vice-Chairman. (Shri U. K. Lakshmana Gowda) in the Chair].

इन बातों के साथ-साथ मैं उद्योग मंत्रालय का ध्यान अभी लोक सभा की इस्टीमेट कमेटी ने जो हैण्डलूम और पावरलूम के बारे में अपनी रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित की है, उसकी तरफ भी दिलाना चाहता हूँ। उस

कमेटी ने विस्तार से एक-एक चीज की तरफ ध्यान आकर्षित किया है। इस वक्त मैं इन सारी बातों में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ, लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि उद्योग मंत्रालय उनकी सिफारिशों को गम्भीरता से ले। जिन जिन बातों की तरफ उन्होंने संकेत किया है, अगर उनको हम जल्दी से जल्दी कार्यान्वित करा सकें तो इन क्षेत्रों के विकास में और इनके माध्यम से सारे देश की अर्थ व्यवस्था को सुधारने में और जो आदमी आज हमारे देश में गरीबी की रेखा से नीचे की लाइन में आता है, उसकी दशा सुधारने में भी बहुत मदद मिल सकेगी। आज हमारे देश की इकोनोमी में एक बोटलनेक पैदा हो गया है। हमारे देश में उत्पादन की क्षमता तो है, लेकिन लोगों में क्रय-शक्ति का अभाव है। यह स्थिति बड़ी भयावह होती जा रही है। इन दोनों बातों में हमें तालमेल बैठाना होगा। मुझे विश्वास है कि अगर इस आधार पर इन कामों को किया गया तो उद्योग मंत्रालय इस देश की एक बहुत बड़ी समस्या को हल कर सकेगा और लोगों को रोजगार दिलाने में अधिक से अधिक मदद कर सकेगा और लोगों की क्रय-शक्ति में सुधार करके एक विषम समस्या का समाधान कर सकेगा अन्त में मैं यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने देश के औद्योगीकरण की जो आशा दी है और आम आदमी की क्रय शक्ति को बढ़ाने में और इस प्रोडक्शन के क्षेत्र में अधिक से अधिक लोगों को भागीदार बनाने के प्रयास में, मैं उनके प्रयत्नों का स्वागत करता हूँ और इस काम में उन्हें सफलता मिले, यही कामना करता हूँ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Before. I call the next speaker, I would say that substantial time has already been consumed by the major parties and now rest of the Members have to be satisfied with only less than 10 minutes each. I have to make this. announcement. I just mention this so that other speakers who are there do

not misunderstand me when I ring the bell just after 10 minutes. I now call Shri Indradeep Sinha.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA (Bihar).-Sir, you give me 15 minutes' at least.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA).- You go ahead.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I will straight, away come to the central point of discussion, i.e. the direction of the Janata Government's industrial policy. Now the new industrial policy that has been declared by the Janata Govern. ment, in its opening paragraph, correctly notes some of the problems that our country is facing as a result of the policies pursued by the Congress Government in the post-Independence period. Now these problems are well known. A low rate of growth of national income, a low rate of growth of industrial production, growth of unemployment, sickness in industry, crisis of market, and many more features can be added. I am not disputing these. But the Janata Party's policy statement gives a solution which indicates that the Government have a particular understanding of the causes of this industrial situation. Now the statement says; "The main thrust of the new industrial policy will be on effective promotion of cottage and small industry widely dispersed in rural areas and towns and it is the policy of Government that whatever can be produced, a small and cottage industry nW only be so produced.

Now, what is the understanding behind this solution? This statement does not give us that understanding. But the understanding is given by the new political guru of our Industry Minister, Comrade Fernandes, i.e. Chaudhary Charan Singh. Chaudhary Charan Singh has written a book, *India's Economic Policy*, which he calls a 'Gandhian blue-print.' In that hook, Chaudhary Charan Singh says: "There are two main causes of our

failure on the economic front: mis. allocation of financial outlays between industry and agriculture and introduction, rather multiplication, of the big machine. So there are two main remedies. The revision of the allocation in favour of agriculture and dis. carding of the big machine to the ex. tent possible." The Industrial Policy Resolution even literally borrows some of the formulations made by Chaudhary Charan Singh.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I totally disagree with this diagnosis of the problem. Factually it is not true that during the last five Plans the 'allocation to agriculture has been less than the allocation to industry. That was true only of one Plan, i.e. the Second Five-Year Plan. Otherwise, in every other Plan the allocation to agriculture and village and small industry has been higher than or equal to the allocation to industry. So this statement is factually not correct. I will not take the time of the House in quoting figures. Secondly, in the Industrial Policy Resolutions of the Congress Government, in the Resolution of 1948 and in the Resolution of 1956, emphasis on small and cottage industries is to be found. As a matter of fact, along with the growth of big industry, cottage and small industries also have been growing in certain sectors and languishing in certain other sectors, and even now small and cottage industries have an important position in the industrial structure of the coun. try. So, both these points of the diagnosis of the disease are not substantiated by facts. Then, what is the reason? Why has this situation come? We must remember that our country started industrialising when major part of ,w jdvanced capitalist world had already industrialised itself more than a hundred or two hundred years ago. We are in a different situation. Big giants are sitting in the western capitalist countries in Europe, in America, in Japan, and international markets are already monopolised. We are dependent on them primarily and what is the result of the dependence?

[Shri Indradeep Sinha]

Again, Sir, I will not go into details. I will just quote one figure from our foreign trade that we have with these countries:

In 1975-76 the unit value of our exports was only 70 per cent in terms of trade—in terms of parity with the unit value of imports. In 1976-77 it was 76 per cent. This means, that if we export commodities worth Rs. 6,000 crores, we lose about Rs. 1,500 crores due to unequal exchange on the international market, and who gains? The western monopolies and the big industrialised capitalist countries. They take away Rs. 1,500 crores through unequal exchange on the international market, crores or Rs. 1,200 crores by way of aid, and we are grateful to them. Would it not be better that we stop this drain through unequal foreign trade, secure proper price for our commodities and dispense with foreign aid altogether? Comrade George Fernandes—I would also call him comrade; Comrade Rasnamurthi recommended that we should do that—in his Industrial Policy Resolution has not a word to say about this unequal exchange on the international market and the need to protect our interests. On the contrary, not only the Janata Government, but also the Congress Government have been pursuing a policy of integrating our economy with the crisis-ridden world capitalist economy.

In this year's report of the Ministry of Commerce and Civil Supplies we find a perceptible shift in the pattern of industrial development emerging in which the developed countries are increasingly concentrating on highly -sophisticated and capital intensive areas. As a result, many less complex and labour intensive areas of industry are being vacated by the developed countries partly due to rising labour costs and partly due to dependence on imported raw materials. This development has widened the scope for collaboration between

the developing countries in various fields that have now been vacated by the industrialised countries. Recently we read in the newspapers a report that some of the West German monopolies have placed orders for some automobile parts on the Indian manufacturers. We are happy that we have secured export orders. This is happening. The western capitalist countries are transferring a part of th* labour intensive production to the backward countries. And we are adopting that. But what is the result? The result is that we are becoming more and more dependent on them. I will cite one example. We entered into a long-term contract with the Japanese steel industry for the export of iron ore. Now a crisis has overtaken the Japanese steel industry and production has been cut down by 20 to 25 per cent. As a result, the export of iron ore from India has been cut down and now workers are being retrenched. And Shri Biju Patoaik, Minister of Steel and Mines, says that one lakh miners are going to be retrenched. So if the Japanese industry prospers, then our ore mining industry will also prosper. If the Japanese industry is in crisis, then we are also in crisis. So, why develop an economy like this which is dependent on the crisis-ridden 'Western capitalist countries? I have no time to go into details but I will point out to the Industry Minister that that is one of the basic reasons for the crisis in Indian industry. Thus the Industrial Policy has completely overlooked.

Now, the second factor was pointed out by Comrade Ramamurthi, that is the grip of monopoly. Now monopoly controls most of the essential commodities. And what is the policy of monopoly? The policy of monopoly is not the policy of free competition which was the policy of earlier capitalism. Monopoly has a different policy: draw the maximum of profit on the minimum of production. So monopoly is not interested in increasing production. Rather monopoly seeks to restrict production. And it

is not surprising that during the first year of Janata Party's rule more man-days have been lost due to lockouts than due to strikes. One of my friends sitting here was telling us that 11 million man-days have been lost due to strikes. That is what the capitalists are telling us, that workers have become 'indisciplined', that the Congress Government was better, that it was 'disciplining' the workers and the Janata Government cannot 'discipline' the workers and so strikes are increasing and production is declining. But more man-days have been lost due to lock-outs in 1977 than due to strikes, which has never happened in the post-independence period except during the days of the Emergency. So, far as the industrial field is concerned, the capitalists are having the same freedom as they had during the worst days of the Emergency. What does the Janata Government propose to do to discipline the monopolists? No mention in the Industrial Policy. You only say that you will encourage agriculture and you will encourage the small-scale sector. But what about the tycoons who are already sitting there? I will tell you how they are eating up even the small industries and how they will not allow the small industries to grow.

Now, Sir, the third point, which the Industrial Policy Resolution has only indirectly mentioned, is the crisis of the market. My friend over there has referred to the latest report of the Estimates Committee of the Lok Sabha. The Committee has noted that during the last few years, the consumption of textiles per head has declined and declined particularly in the rural areas because the income per head has declined. So the crisis in the rural area, the growth of poverty in the rural area affects the textile industry and production has to be reduced. The market is oversaturated and the products are not sold. So this affects the textile industry both in the organised sector and in the decentralised sector. Now, what is the reason? The

reason is maintenance of the landlord system. Fifteen per cent of the big landowners own 60 per cent of the land and 66 per cent of the total assets in the villages, and less than 4 per cent of the landowners own 30 per cent of the land. At the other extreme and 50 per cent of the land-holdings are below one hectare and they own only 9 per cent of the land. If most of the peasants and the agricultural labourers are so poor with, out means of subsistence, without work, without any tangible means of production, who will purchase the commodities produced by our industry? So, even though India is not yet fully industrialised, still there is a crisis of the market and this crisis is becoming chronic—how to solve this crisis?—the Janata Party statement says we increase small industries, cottage industries and village industries; that will solve the crisis. Will it? According to the figures given in the Estimates Committee Report an ordinary handloom produces 5 metres of cloth per day, a powerloom produces 45 metres of cloth per day. So in productivity a powerloom is 9 times more productive. And if I remember aright, according to the figures quoted by Choudhuri Charan Singh in his book, an automatic loom in a textile mill produces about 96 times more. So if we build these industries with backward techniques, where to sell that product? The poor people who are unable to buy the products of powerlooms and the textile mills, will they be able to buy this high cost production? Secondly, spinning is already killed. I am a khadi wearer. I know very well that the khadi I purchase is not out of hand-spun yarn. Hand-spun yarn has now vanished. It is mill yarn which is purchased by the khadi bhandars and given out . . .

SHRI GHANSHYAMBHAI OZA: No, no.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: Yes, I know it personally. It is mill yarn out of which even this khadi is made

SHRI GHANSHYAMBHAI OZA:
Not even a fraction of it.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: So far as weaving is concerned, the entire handloom weaving and powerloom weaving is now dependent on the yarn produced by the mills. You buy mill yarn and sell it at a premium. The Congress Government and now the Janata Government have both failed to control yarn production, to control distribution of yarn and to make yarn available at controlled rates to the handlooms and powerlooms. I am not now going into the details about the reservations that have been made. In what field of industry do these reservations come? I think hardly 20, 25 per cent, not even that much. They cover a very small portion of the industrial field. And many of the so-called small industries and tiny industries are just subsidiaries, are ancillaries of the big industries. I know, for example, the Bata Shoe Company buys nearly 1/5th of its total production from small shoe producers in Agra, affixes its name and sells it at a profit. Bajaj Electricals buy their electrical products from small producers, paste their name and sell them in their name. This is what big capitalists are doing. And many of the ancillary industries and small industries are subsidiaries of the big monopoly firms. Now the Janata Government proposes that these subsidiaries of the big monopoly concerns should be given various facilities and aid. Now naturally the monopolists welcome it. They are not opposed to it, because it serves their interests well. Why should they oppose it? And it is wrong to think that some of these small industries are more labour-intensive. As a matter of fact some of them are as capital-intensive as the big industries are. Only they are on a smaller 4 P.M. scale. Your theory of reservation for all the small industries, irrespective of their ownership, their link with big industries and the big technology they employ, is not going to solve the problem.

So far as the cottage industries are concerned, a two-fold process is taking place. On the one hand, you give protection for the handloom industry. On the other hand, you give protection to the power loom industry. The power loom industry is eating up the handloom industry. Why does the Government pursue these contradictory policies? Similarly, you also give assistance to big mills. Now, the Janata Party's policy resolution gives a new slogan—Nai Khadi. What is this Nai Khadi? Nai Khadi is polyester and cotton mixed yarn. If cotton yarn is spun on the spinning wheel, this polyester and cotton mixed yarn cannot be spun on the spinning wheel. The entire spinning will be handed over to the mill sector for production of new khadi.

AN HON. MEMBER; That is also wrong.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA; No. The blending of cotton and polyester cannot take place in the cottage industries. It has to be done in a mill. Now you are integrating even the khadi industry with the mill industry and taking it subservient to the mill industry. This is hardly going to help.

Now, what is the real purpose of the Janata Party resolutions? The real purpose is to invite foreign multinationals. Our Industries Minister, Comrade George Fernandes, if I remember aright, went to West Germany, came back and said that the West German monopolists have assured him that they are prepared to invest thousands of millions of Marks in India. Are they going to invest this amount for our benefit? Do they have some interest in our development? Have they given up their class character? The Industries Minister must have read at least some writings of Marx. Despite his association with Shri Charan Singh, Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee and Shri Morarji Desai, he must still remember

that the *uuw* belong to a particular class who exploits other people and the bourgeoisie of the developed capitalist countries exploit the underdeveloped and less developed countries. Why are the West German monopolists coming? Why are the American monopolists coming? Why are the other monopolists coming? They are coming to exploit our resources. This is one object. What does this resolution say? It says that once they dilute their equity holdings to 40 per cent then they will be treated at par with Indian monopolists and then they will enjoy all the advantages. I do not think it is anything new. This policy was initiated by Shrimati Gandhi herself at the instance of the World Bank. My only complaint is that the Janata Party is carrying forward this policy in the name of giving a new industrial policy to the country.

Similarly, Janata Party Government is also giving assurance to the Indian monopolists, that so far as they are concerned, the Government is going to protect their interests. And even the State sector will be treated at par with the Indian monopoly sector because now both the sectors have to find their own resources. The State sector will be starved of resources because the Indian monopolists will not allow the State sector products to be sold at a reasonable profit. The Government will not allocate any resources and it will be starved of resources and, later on, wither away. That seems to be the real objective which the Indian industrialists would welcome. Now, Comrade Fernandes perhaps does not agree. If you do not agree, Mr. Fernandes, then, I would give you just two suggestions, rather three suggestions. One is outside your sphere and two are within your sphere. Firstly, you please nationalise the 20 monopoly houses, if you want really to advance the industrialisation of the country. Secondly, you nationalise all the foreign monopoly concerns and ban the import of foreign capital into spheres in which

the Indian industries exist or can grow. Thirdly, you persuade your Government to fix appropriate ceilings and to distribute all the surplus land within the next one year so as to expand the rural market and solve the crisis of the market. Thank you, Sir,

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, when economic policies are decided and influenced by the game of politics and when there is a competition in populist demagogy, there is bound to be a lot of confusion which we witness in the field of industrial policy during the last one year in spite of a fairly consistent, internally consistent, policy statement placed by the honourable Industry Minister in this House.

Sir, I am speaking in the midst of a chorus of "Small is beautiful", and I do not propose to join that chorus. I do not also propose to give suggestions to this Government and to the Minister in spite of his socialist background to bring about a radical transformation in the economy, because that would be an academic exercise and also an exercise in futility and I would confine my suggestions and observations to the specific problems which the Indian industries are facing and to the realm of feasibility and possibility in the given situation today. Sir, in the Statement which the honourable Minister placed before this House, he made an observation that past experience shows that the Government policies have not succeeded in restraining the disproportionate growth of the large houses. This is a statement with which I agree and it is true that in spite of the various measures to restrict the monopolies and the growth of the large houses during the last thirty years, concentration of economic power in the hands of a few has increased in our country and also the disparities have increased. I would only like to ask him to examine the industrial policies and the measures

[Shri Rishi Kumar Mishra]

that the Janata Government is taking and is proposing to take with a view to ensuring that his policies and his measures also do not frustrate the declared objectives of the Janata Government and the declared objectives enunciated in the statement itself. Now, sir, there is a talk that small industries and the cottage industries would be protected. There is also a promise that concentration of economic power will be discouraged and, Sir, here is a Government which is pursuing a policy of dismantling all the instruments which can regulate, which can control and which can guide the prices, the profits and the investment decisions of industries in the public and the private sectors. Now, you have taken a decision to delicense industries up to an investment of three crores of rupees. I would like to know from the honourable Industry Minister what the practical implementation of this decision is— As soon as you have taken this decision, you are allowing investors up to three crores of rupees to enter into an area without taking into account the fact as to how it is going to affect the small industry and the cottage industry, in spite of your reservations and also the objective that there should not be regional concentration of industries and that there should be dispersal, regional or locational dispersal, of industries. Your policy of de-licensing is going to encourage concentration, regional concentration, of industries, because naturally the investor will go into areas where facilities are available and where market is easy, where credit is easily available and therefore, there would be a tendency to do this. Similarly, Sir, if you examine the performance of the Indian private sector, specially the 101 top business houses in our country you will find that while, on the one hand, the growth rate of the top 101 industrial giants in the private corporate sector has slackened during 1976-77, their profits have increased. And, inter-

estingly, the profits of the top 10 biggest profit makers have increased by leaps and bounds. Gwalior Rayon profit increased from Rs. 16.5 crores to Rs. 29.1 crores, Hindustan Lever profit from Rs. 21.2 crores to Rs. 28 crores, Tata Steel profit increased from Rs. 11.1 crores to Rs. 18.7 crores, TELCO profits increased from 9.3 crores of rupees to 11.5 crores of rupees and Larsen and Toubro profits increased from Rs- 8.2 crores to Rs. 12.7 crores. And we also find that while their growth has declined, their profits have increased, and the total capital employed by these 101 corporations expanded by 8 per cent as compared 12.8 per cent in the previous year. Therefore, the point that was being made hon. Shri Indradeep Sinha was that the tendency in the private corporate sector has been to maximise their profits and depress investment and depress production.

Now, in your Industrial Policy statement— you have made very interesting observations, and I would like the hon. Industry Minister to examine two implications of that policy statement also. We have witnessed during the last few years that in spite of the concessions given to the private sector the equity participation, the fresh capital investment, has not increased. What happened is that since the profits of these large houses have increased, internal surpluses have been generated and they have been forced to re-invest their internal surpluses and that has made the big bagger, while the small and medium ones have continued to suffer. Now, your Industrial Policy Statement seeks to legitimise this situation. It says that the large houses will have to rely on their own internally generated resources for financing new or expansion projects, in fact the taxation policy of the Janata Party has shown that instead of trying to mop up savings or its profits that are generated in the private corporate sector, they are allow-

ing the private corporate sector, especially the Digger sector, to reinvest it in areas where they want, the de-licensing policy will only enable them to diversify their production and to enter into small and medium sector.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would also like the hon. Industry Minister to clarify certain issues on which there is a lot of confusion. When Shri George Fernandes became Industry Minister there was an impression in the country that he would definitely try to pursue policies which may not be socialist, because it is a party where there are heterogeneous elements and some sort of reconciliation of the various viewpoints has to be achieved, but that he would definitely try to pursue a policy which is in national interest, so that the industrial policy of this country would "not make India more dependent and would not expose the Indian economy to what Shri Asoka Mehta said recently: the womb is ripe and only the seed has to be planted, and this shameless approach would not form the industrial policy of this country
(Interruptions).

AN HON. MEMBER; That was long back.

SHRI RISHI KUMAR MISHRA: This is a recent statement—very, very recent statement. So, I would like to know what is the approach of the Government in regard to investment by multi-national corporations of foreign private capital. Studies not by socialists and communists and radicals but by liberal academic experts have revealed that the foreign capital in India has played a very insignificant role in terms of resource mobilisation, bringing in foreign exchange and bringing in technology. Instead what it has done is that starting on a very narrow investment base, they have reaped huge profits, redeployed those profits, repatriated those profits and prevented indigenous technology from developing. Therefore, when the state-

ment was made that a billion dollar bonanza is coming from West Germany, there was no "need to be panicky because nobody makes investments unless he is assured of maximum return. The profit rate is 11 per cent in India. It is 23 per cent in America. Therefore, nobody would come and invest in India. But what is our Government's approach towards investments by multi-national corporations and foreign private capital? There is a feeling and an impression and I would like that to be clarified that an open-door policy towards the multi-national corporations is being assiduously somewhat surreptitiously, pursued. That is not in national interest and a Government which claims to support the small and cottage industries, etc. etc. should not do it. All these clichés are being indulged in. By any standards, you should not support such a move. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, while we are debating the industrial policy, we should also keep in view the interest of the consumer. I know that in the small range, the cottage and small scale industries play an important role for expanding employment opportunities. But we have also to ensure that the people get their essential goods at a price range which is within their means, if this is not done, neither the objective of providing employment nor the objective of supplying essential goods to the masses at a reasonable price will be achieved. What has happened in the case of textiles during the last few years? While 3 to 4 years ago, about 70 per cent of textiles produced in this country were within a price range of Rs. 5 per meter, we find that this has gone down and now only 40 per cent of the textiles that are produced are within that price range. This has resulted in a situation in which the Indian people are less clothed today than what they were a few years ago, say in 1973 or so. The availability of cloth per capita has gone down from 14, something meters to 13 something meters last year. This has happened not only in the rural areas. What we find is that the

[Shri Rishi Kumar Mishra]

poor people both in the rural and urban areas are wearing less cloth and buying less cloth. Only the middle class and the affluent class people are using more cloth. Their consumption of cloth has gone up. A study was conducted by the Institute of Regional Planning, Wardha in Seelu Block which is a cotton growing area. They came to the conclusion that when cloth is produced from ordinary *charkha*, it costs Rs. 17 per meter. When it is produced by *Amber Charkha*, it costs Rs. 7 per meter. If you produce it in a mill, it costs Rs. 5 per meter. This is a dilemma, the dilemma of maximising employment on the one hand and of being able to supply the necessary requirements of the people at a reasonable price level on the other hand. Therefore, instead of sounding the chorus of smallness and saying that everything that is small is beautiful, we have to blend these two objectives in a manner so that we are able to meet the requirements of the common people at a price range which is within their reach. The phoney controversy of agriculture versus industry is ruining this country. A climate has been created that the Janata Government is against industry. Might be, Mr. George Feraandes may say that the Opposition has carried on this propaganda but this is not so. Though some attempts have recently been made to correct and rectify this impression, a general climate has been created that this government is against the industry. Now 60 per cent of the raw materials for the industry come from agriculture and the linkage between the requirements of agriculture and industry are too obvious to be mentioned in great detail. Whether you go in for power or fertilizers, etc.; which are the basic requirements of agriculture, they are industrial products. Therefore, this climate should not be created. The Government must be clear in its mind and must make it clear to the people that we want to make this country as

a whole a progressive industrialised country which does not mean that you are going to neglect agriculture. It means that we want to walk on two legs. A cart moves on two wheels and there is an inter-relationship between agriculture and industry which has to be preserved and which must be ensured by our economic policies. This imbalance which has come in the approach, and the climate that has been created needs to be corrected. Sir, there is one question on which we should be clear, and that is whether we want efficiency or we do not want efficiency and whether we want to have an inefficient economy or we want to have an efficient economy. You can indulge in polemics by trying to say that inefficient economy is very necessary because a large number of people are there unemployed and during the last 30 years, unemployment has increased and, therefore, that type of approach was wrong. But that is a short-sighted approach and will be ruinous because the Governments may come and the Governments may go and if you once distort the direction in which the country is moving, then the long-range effects are very very harmful. Therefore, the Government should be clear and make it unambiguous that they are not against industrialisation, they are not against industrial development, and that they stand for it. Again, in the industrial development, what is the role of the public sector? It is not enough to say that the public sector will continue to have the commanding heights and then you do everything to weaken the public sector. There was a very unfortunate decision taken that the Government would not take up the sick units and that they would be allowed to die or, if the State Governments want them, they can have them. It was this disastrous, short-sighted decision which led to the massacre in Kanpur. There was a recommendation of the UP Government by the Janata Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh that the Jaipuria Mills should be taken over.

that they were being mismanaged thoroughly, the wages were not being paid to the workers and, therefore, they should be taken over. But the Central Government, whether it was the Commerce Ministry - the Industry Ministry or both of them decided at that time not to take over the Jaipuria Mills. Why was that decision taken? It is necessary that the Government should give an explanation to this House as to why the Jaipuria Mills, in spite of the recommendation of the Uttar Pradesh Government, were not taken over and a situation was allowed to be created which led to that dastardly incident in Kanpur and which has shocked the whole country. And subsequently those Mills have been taken over. Therefore, Sir, I would say that sickness is a disease in Indian industry which is caused by mismanagement. And, therefore, it is not proper, as the Government's present policy is, to allow only the big private sector units to take over small units in order to make them efficient. Why don't you give this role to the public sector? Are we not proud of the managerial excellence that we have achieved in the public sector? It is beyond doubt and beyond controversy that in the Indian public sector today, the level of managerial excellence that has been achieved is second to none in the whole country. And if you entrust to the public sector this responsibility, I have no doubt that it will expand the role of the public sector and the public sector will be able to rescue many of our industries from the present state of sickness.

Before I conclude, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would also like to refer to one decision of the Government. I understand that there is an approach that the protection that is enjoyed by the Indian industries today should be discontinued. It is being done on the ground, on the plea, that this protection breeds inefficiency, that the cost of products of Indian industries is more and therefore they should be allowed to compete with foreign com-

panies. This is a very, very wrong policy because this is the one way of allowing the foreign industrialists and foreign companies to come in and kill the Indian industry. It applies both to the private sector as well as to the public sector. I say that we must strengthen our industrial base, which includes the private sector, which includes the public sector, and therefore a reasonable amount of protection which is being given to our own Indian industries should not be denied to them. I hope that the tendency to deny this protection to them will be discontinued and an attempt will be made to see that Indian industries grow rapidly.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would only submit, in conclusion, that the battle in India today, as we know, is not whether we are going to have a socialist economy or whether we are going to have a capitalist economy. It is a battle which will not be decided here by this debate. The battle between the socialist India and the capitalist India will have to be decided by forces outside after they have acquired sufficient strength. The issues involved today are whether a backward economy will be imposed on this country or whether our economy will move forward, whether we will have industrial development or whether we will not have industrial development, whether we will have an economic system which leads to large scale impoverishment of the rural poor and of the urban poor or whether these sections, the rural poor and the urban poor, will also share in the prosperity and progress of the country and whether they will be brought into the mainstream of the economic system of this country. These are the issues involved. I am quite sure that all patriotic Indians, irrespective of the political parties to which they may belong, will agree that anything which imposes on this country a backward economy is anti-national, anti-patriotic and anti people and all those who can contribute to taking the coun-

[Shri Rishi Kumar Mishra]

try forward on the path of progress, modernisation, industrialisation, development of science and technology, must be encouraged and must be defended against attack by multi-nationalism, foreign capital and such other obscurantist and backward looking forces within the country.

SHRI S. K. VAISHAMPAYEN (Maharashtra); Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I consider today's discussion on this industrial policy as very important and essential for two/three reasons. Firstly, industrialisation, as one of the instruments for development has a very wide-ranging effect on a number of sectors like agriculture etc. and, at the same time, it is linked with several other, spheres of our life. Secondly, Sir, this discussion is important because the hon. Minister has, through his policy statement, introduced certain new elements in the working and functioning of the Ministry of Industry. Thirdly, Sir, it is important because I come from a region which is backward and, therefore, any change in the policy so far as industrialisation is concerned, is vital for me. Therefore, I have decided to express some of my views. Of course, a number of opinions have already been expressed here and I would not like to repeat them. I would only like to make three or four new points altogether.

First of all, I would like to go into the merits of the policy statement that the Minister has made in December, from two points of view, from two yardsticks. The first yardstick is how far his new policy, namely, his emphasis on small scale industries, and helping this process, which I call as rural industrialisation process, is going to be helpful so far as the consumers are concerned. And, this is very important. Just as you must see that Industrialisation must result in more employment, similarly we should also see that the production of consumer goods is there in such a quantity that it raises the living standards of our people living below the poverty line

whose number today, as we came to know in this House, is more than 60 per cent. That is one yardstick from which I shall try to see this new industrial policy without going into other considerations of contradictions between the large industrial houses and public sector undertakings or large houses. All these points have been discussed. That is one yardstick from which I shall try to see at the new industrial policy.

The other yardstick is, how far this particular new industrial policy is going to affect the regions which have been declared industrially backward on definite criteria. Let us not push aside this particular point which I am making out. The present criteria are formulated by the Planning Commission and areas have been defined as backward and if I have to give the figures, there are about 250 districts which are industrially backward and they have been declared as industrially backward on the definite criteria formulated by the Planning Commission. How far this particular policy is going to affect these new backward areas as such?

Now, considering the first yardstick, if you go into the details, you will find that the Minister has expanded the list. The list has been expanded from 180 to 500 or more. Has the Minister underlined the industries which are to be started in the small-scale sector which are going to help production of consumer goods? The Minister may see if he has prepared a list of essential industries as such. He has categorised it only into small-scale sector and tiny sector. I would wish the Minister to have one more category of essential industries in small-scale sector which should go to help production of consumer goods; I say which would go to help production; they will not produce the consumer goods but they will help production of consumer goods. If he would have prepared such a list, at least that should have been mentioned in the policy statement. The list has been expanded from 180 to 500 to be reserved for the small sector but

in that there is no such list or category which I would term as 'essential industries' in the interest of the consumer as such. And when I say 'consumer', I mean the common man who belongs to economically weaker section in the country. That should have been the attempt while bringing in a new industrial policy, particularly when you are trying to aim at rural industrialisation. I see no such categorisation. I wish the Industry Minister gives consideration to this point.

Secondly, the Industry Minister, in order to give a fillip to the small-scale sector and tiny sector, has planned for having one roof which he has called in his policy statement as district industries centre. What would it mean so far as the backward areas or the backward districts are concerned? There have been many concepts evolved up till now for industrially backward districts. There have been concepts of growth centres; there have been concepts for a special treatment to the backward districts giving them weightage in financial assistance. Will the Minister clarify that in having this new set up, what will happen to those concepts? Are they going to be neglected to the background? What about the backward districts already declared as backward? Will they be given some special treatment? These are the questions which arise in *my* mind as a member coming from the backward area. These points should be clarified by the Minister of Industry.

Then, with regard to the set up of one roof in each district or one industrial centre in each district, there are about 400 or 410 districts in our country. It would mean 400 district centres. It would mean manning all these district centres by men who should have—if at all this policy of rural industrialisation has to succeed—vision as well as devotion. Has he thought of it? If he has not thought of it, if he has not thought of putting up men of devotion and zeal, then all these plans of giving a fillip to the small-scale industries would be only

259 R.S.—8.

a dream; it would be only a sort of bureaucratic set up in each district. This is necessary so far as the field set-up is concerned. May I know from the hon. Minister whether some guidelines have been issued in regard to the functioning of these industrial centres? I do not know. At least, I have no information that such guidelines have been issued to the States to see that these industrial centres function in a particular way and help the small scale industries or the tiny sector as such. In doing that, they should see that they give preference to the small-scale industries which are consumer-oriented. I would put it that way. Has he issued some guidelines or not? This is the second point to which I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister so far as this new set-up is concerned.

The third point which I would like to raise for the consideration of the hon. Minister is: What about the powers for these officers or these men incharge of these district centres? There are various institutions. There are various infrastructures agencies. There are some Government agencies. There are so many commercial banks and nationalised banks. What powers these officers and these men incharge of these industrial centres will have to co-ordinate the activities so that the entrepreneurs wishing to set up small-scale industries get help on the spot without any delay? What about the powers? It should be spelt out. Otherwise, keeping *it* loose would only add to the delays so far as the initiation of small-scale industries is concerned.

The last point is very important so far as the small-scale industries are concerned. The long arm of the large industry or large houses will reach the rural areas; it will go to the rural areas now. Instances have been mentioned. Take, for example, Bata. They are mopping up all the production that is there in the shoe industry. They make purchases at a lower price and sell at a higher price as

[Shri S. K. Vaishampayan]

their products. What protection is there so far as the products or the goods that are produced by the small-scale industries are concerned? Some protection should be given. Otherwise, the small-scale industries which will come up in the initial enthusiasm of this policy would wither away because their products will not be marketed properly and they will not be able to get a proper price for their products. Therefore, it is necessary that instructions should be issued to the Government departments, particularly, those departments which make purchases on behalf of the Government. The products which are produced by the small-scale industries should be purchased by the D.G.S. & D. or the Supply Department or the purchase department. Only if this is done, the small-scale industries will be able to survive.

Then, Sir, I have only two more points which I would like to place before this House and the hon. Minister. Firstly, I welcome the policy of dispersal of industries and the announcement that no new industrial licence will be given to any industrial unit in metropolitan cities having a population of one million or in urban areas having a population of five lakhs. It is allright. But has he given any directions? Has he given the direction that these new units which would like to come up should be located in the backward areas. This is also a direction which should be given. If this direction is not given, the new industrial units will try to enlarge themselves on the periphery of the metropolitan cities. This is happening. This has happened so far as Bombay is concerned. In the Bom-foay-Thana area, this policy was adopted by the Maharashtra Government. New industrial units have come up on the periphery of the Bombay and the Thana areas. They started the industries, they got all the incentives and they got all the assistance from the Government and, that way, they have tried to escape from this policy of

dispersal of industries. Therefore, Government should see that a proper direction is given to the effect that licences should be refused for setting up new industrial units on peripherics of metropolitan cities with one million population and in urban areas with Ave lakhs population.

Then, when applications for setting up new industrial units are considered, the entrepreneurs should be directed to establish these industries in the backward districts and in the backward areas. Lastly, in the Industrial Policy, there is no categorical declaration in regard to the starting of public sector undertakings both in the Centre and in the States sector. I say this because setting up of public sector projects both in the Centre and in the States sector would be an instrument in creating a new industrial climate. And I am of this firm opinion that any new public sector project both at the Central and the State levels shoul[^] be opened in a backward area. I come from a backward area like Marathwada. "We have been trying for locating a public sector project there, but that public sector project is not sanctioned. It is taken away somewhere in an area which is already full of industries. Thus the benefit of having a public sector project in a backward area is lost. My request to the Industry Minister is that he should categorically say what will be the policy with regard to the opening of new public sector projects in backward areas. Thank you.

SHRI M. R. KRISHNA (Andhra Pradesh);
Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Minister certainly needs the encouragement of this House and also the support from the entire country for the bold steps which he is trying to take. At jleast the attempt which he is honestly making, well, that requires encouragement from the entire country. He also knows that the mood of the country today is that whatever promises have been made all these years should be ful-

filled and implemented. Therefore, even though some of the Members have expressed certain doubts about his capacity to convince other members of the Cabinet, I think Shri George Fernandes will be able to score through since the policies which he is going to adopt are nothing new, they are the policies which are really demanded and needed for the welfare of this country. Therefore, he will be having the backing of the entire House and the country.

Sir, industrial development of any country is more essential than the agricultural development for one reason that the industrial development certainly ensures a casteless society and also takes the country towards socialism. The makers of modern India, like Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, had a lot of difficulties to implement the policies which the Congress and various other political parties had assured this nation. It is not an easy task for any one to make dent into the existing industry. The industrial development of this country was purely in the hands of people who are today monopolists. The bigger giants, like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Shri Krishna Menon and Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, had not only to face the Cabinet colleagues, but they had to face the industrialists who are not only controlling the economy of this country, but also the press of this country. Therefore, for a person like Shri Fernandes to attempt to bring discipline and also to decentralise industries is not a joke. None of the Members who have participated in this discussion has said that the policies which Mr. George is going to follow are something bad to the country. On the other hand, everyone wanted that the policies should be seriously implemented and he should not cow down to the biggest industrialists or even to the powerful Ministers in his Cabinet. None of them said that the policies are bad. Therefore, Sir, I also would like to join with other friends who have spoken against these monopoly houses. Sir, these

monopoly houses had to be enriched because the makers of modern India wanted that the country should first be industrialised. They knew that simply agricultural development would only enlarge the feudal system in this country and, therefore, they wanted that industrialisation should take place. In the process, it had become imperative to help some of the existing industries because they had the technical know-how, they had contacts all over the world and they were having the best markets in the world where they could sell their products. At the same time, they can cripple any new-comer in the field. We have seen how some of the industrial houses which sprang up after Independence have been crushed by some of the houses like Birlas and Tatas. Therefore, Sir, taking this experience into account, the great leader had chosen to introduce the public sector industries without harming the private industries, allowing the private industries to grow, helping the private industries to get all the money they wanted, including the tariff concessions. Some of the industries got tariff concessions for years together. The steel factories of Tatas, the car factories of Birlas have enjoyed tariff concessions for years together. The leaders of this country never wanted to kill any industry which was really producing goods for the local market and also for export. While doing so, they also encouraged the public sector. When public sector industries were started, both in the Defence as well as in other Departments, the amount of criticism levelled against these public sector units was something which we cannot forget. Even those people who are supposed to be the biggest national leaders cast a lot of doubts and called even Jawaharlal Nehru a Communist. Today the public sector undertakings have gained a lot of experience and biggest national leaders cast a lot of experience and they have started really paying dividends, this Govern-

[Shri M. R. Krishna]

ment should be able to not only maintain these undertakings, but they should be in a position to increase the number of public sector industries.

Sir, many of my friends advocated that some of these big houses should be nationalised. Now, the Government of India has been taking over the sick mills and there is also provision that the Government can take over any factory, even in the private sector, which is mismanaged. If the factory owners are not paying the labour properly, if the mill-owners are not having the interests of the country at heart, such mills can be taken over by the Government. If Mr. George Fernandes and his Government could declare the policy that those industries which are faltering and defaulting could be taken over, all that the Government has to do today is to give the reasons, or give the causes. And the causes can be plenty. Many of the industrial houses have not been able to utilise the amounts set apart for the construction of houses for the labour. Many of the industrial houses are not in a position to maintain cost-accounting. There are many houses which do not have proper relations with the labour. There are hundred and one causes which could be taken advantage of by the Government to nationalise some of these industries. Unless this is done, there cannot be discipline in the private sector industries.

The previous Government had said that there should be participation of labour in management in most of the industries. Now when the Government is thinking of nationalising the industries, is there anything wrong, or is it not a trial worth trying to introduce this as a compulsory measure to see that labour participation is definitely ensured in almost all the industries which are getting finances from the Industrial Finance Corporation and from other Govern-

ment financial agencies like the LIC? Sir, probably in the beginning because of the advice given by the officials there was only one system introduced, namely, whenever a private industry borrowed money from the Industrial Finance Corporation, a representative of the Industrial Finance Corporation or the L.I.C. was sent to their meeting as one of the directors. This was just a check on these industries from misusing the funds. But that does not take the industry too far. There were many instances where such a nominee reaped advantage out of this system. This Government nominee during the last days of his service would want to make sure that after his retirement he found comfortable berth in some of these industries. Either he became an adviser or a director. And for that all that he had to do was to get the permission of the Government of India. This kind of system does not help either to discipline the private industry or help in the requirement of the country, namely, to bring them under the government control. Therefore, this system of allowing the workers to participate... (*Time Bell rings*) I do not think I have taken even five minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): You have taken ten minutes. Therefore, I have to restrict the time, otherwise we cannot cover every speaker.

SHRI M. R. KRISHNA: I am going so fast in order to complete my speech.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): You have to run faster, Mr. Krishna.

SHRI M. R. KRISHNA: The Minister has pronounced the Government policy that if the rural areas are to develop, rural industrialisation will have to take place. This is a good system. But this is nothing new. For rural development very many

Committees have been constituted such as the Pande Committee, the Wanchoo Committee to determine which are the backward areas. There were other committees also to suggest industries which could be taken to the rural areas. But for all these year rural development did not take place. The rural areas are in the same old fashion as they were. For example, my own State, namely Andhra Pradesh, excepting the city of Hydera. bad, not even Secunderabad, is just a desert. Though there are many areas in Andhra Pradesh where various precious minerals are avai'abJe, not even a single industry exists. Therefore, Sir, rural development just does not mean anything. If the Minister or the Members were to say that rural development will take place, them proper planning will have to be done.

May I tell the hon'ble Minister that I am definitely not happy with the functioning of the Khadi and Village Industries Board. I attach greatest importance to khadi and village industries since this was considered to be an ideal thing for developing the rural areas particularly the backward ones. But after spending so many thousands of crores I do not think it has helped the rural population in a big way. I have written a letter to the Minister also to think of the rural areas and also to constitute certain expert committees which may be conversant with the rural areas. I also know about the backwardness of the rural areas and then I would suggest what are the industries that could be located there.

Sir, it does not help anybody if it is just said that the rural areas could be developed. When I was in the Defence Ministry I wanted defence personnel who retired from service in big numbers to be associated with these industries. Some thousands of men and officers retire every year. We wanted that some of these people

should be given some of the small-scale industries and various other industries, but most, of the people would be suitable only to become watch and ward people or security officers. Even the biggest General would not be able to manage industries because it is not in their blood and they have not been managing industries; it is a completely new thing to them. Similarly, take members of the weaker sections. It is not something which you can give over and they could take over.

Now, for example, take the small-scale industry. It is good that they want to decentralize the bigger industries and the small-scale industries have come into being because of that. I would request Mr. George Fernandes to find out which category of people are having this small-scale industry, who takes these Rs. 8-10 lakh grants from the Government. If he takes the statistics he will find that none of the poorer classes have benefited from the small-scale industry. It is mostly the big business houses because it is they who have got the certainty and the assured market for their products. Therefore, the big industrialist makes one of his family members or someone of his community start a small-scale industry—because he has got the technical know-how and a ready market. That type of thing is not available to the common man who starts a small-scale industry. Now he is reserving a lot of things for the small-scale industry. He has been successful in certain things like matches and soap.— But to decentralize a big thing and allow the small man to take over, it needs a lot of training. If you want to give me Rs. 10 lakhs and ask me to start a business, it is impossible for me. Even Mr. George Fernandes will not be able to start any industry; he requires previous experience for that. And that experience can come only by associating somebody-connected with the industry. Otherwise it is impossible. Therefore, Mr. George

[Shri M. R. Krishna]

Fernandes will have to think seriously as to how we can help the weaker sections, what type of training he would like to give them and what type of industries he would like them to start. These are vital things which the Minister and the Government will have to think of and they will have to give consideration to this.

Sir, since you and the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs are really angry with me, I do not want to prolong my speech. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Prof. Kamble, you can take ten minutes. This is the third round and it has to be restricted in ten minutes or less.

PROF. N. M. KAMBLE (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Ministry of Industry plays a very important part—I may say a pivotal role—in the life of a developing country because the economic progress of the country and the generation of employment largely depend on the performance of this Ministry.

We had very high hopes when, after 30 years, a Government with a new look took over the reins of this country and specially when my friend, a stormy petrel with a socialistic background, became the Minister of Industry. But when, we look at these two fronts, that is, economic progress of the country and generation of employment and in that background if we look at the performance of the Ministry of Industry, it is very disappointing and also very dismal.

Sir, I do not want to go into the jugglery of statistics but I would like to give two instances as far as industrial growth is concerned.

In 1976-77, the industrial growth was 10.6 per cent, but last year up to December it was only 4 per cent. Why has it come down? Then if we look at the heavy

industry, in the year 1976-77, the production was worth Rs. 829 crores and the profit was Rs. 65 crores. The target fixed for 1977-78 was Rs. 1013 crores, but during the last 10 months the production has come only to Rs. 450 crores. This is the position as far as the heavy industry is concerned. This means that there would be a loss. What is the reason for this fall also? It is only because the Government, or the Ministry of Industry, is having a very wrong conception about the heavy industry. What is it due to, I do not know. Maybe that the policy which they have announced . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Because of their Raj Guru.

PROF. N. M. KAMBLE: May be because of their Raj Guru who has written a book. But one thing is certain that unless the small-scale sector, the cottage industry and the heavy industry come together, the stress which you lay on the agricultural sector and the small-scale sector will not be achieved. The Industrial Policy Resolution had come as late as December, 1977. They took nearly 10 months for the formulation of the policy. Of course, the Minister of Industry had on many occasions issued statements on the same lines. But actually, as my friend, Mishraji, earlier told, because of the various groups having various policies, having various attitudes, it may not be possible for the Minister of Industry to achieve consensus on the industrial policy. Even today I find that, though the policy statement is issued, the economic policy of the Finance Minister and the industrial policy of the Minister of Industry have not matched together. The policy of the present Minister of Industry lays stress on small-scale, cottage and household and rural sectors. But can this alone achieve the goal of economic growth and the generation of employment? I do not think so. Sir, they have announced from the house-tops that within 10 years unemployment would be eradicated. I do not know whether with this policy and with

this pace they will be in a position to do it. Sir, as far as the generation of employment is concerned, I will just quote two instances. In the small scale sector, take, for instance, the Bidi industry. In the Bidi industry, nearly three million workers work today. But because of the new tax that is levied on bidi, the cigarette industry is benefited and these three million bidi workers have been affected. Similarly, take another small-scale industry in Kerala, the coir industry. There also nearly 1J lakh people are there. But, because of issuing licences for mechanisation, these people have been affected. I do not know what the report of the Sivaraman Committee is going to be and how the Government is going to implement that particular report. Sir, it is heartening to note that because of this new policy, the consumer goods would be mostly produced by the small scale and the cottage industries. Many of the earlier speakers have made out this point. The reserve list, as a matter of fact, has been shot up from 180 items to 504 items, and Shri Sankar Ghose has already pointed out how this list has been inflated by adding the same products in different names.

But one thing is there, Sir. Unless there are curbs on the monopoly houses and the multinationals and also on the foreign capitalists, we are not going to achieve this object. Is the Government prepared to have curbs on these multinationals and foreign capitalists? Is it prepared to nationalise forthwith the big houses and the big monopolies? I do not think. Of course, much is heard now-a-days in the Janata Government policies and from their party executives. Some people say that there are 20 big houses; some say, 100 big houses; "some, 75 big houses. But one thing is certain. About 800 corporations are controlled by these big houses and monopolies. If the Government really wishes that the small scale sector should be encouraged, then the first thing it should do is to nationalise the multinationals and the big houses. As

a matter of fact, Sir, the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission has miserably failed to impose curbs on the growth of these monopolies and these foreign companies which produce consumer goods. I do not know what the Minister of Industry is going to do about them. What is the policy as far as the multinationals are concerned? At least I have failed to understand it. In the beginning at least we had high hopes when the Minister of Industry announced that in our country these multinationals have no place. But, I do not know what happened after his visit to the Soviet Union. Probably he might have thought that if a country like Russia could adjust with the multinationals, we could also do so. Just stopping one Coca Cola company does not even touch the fringe of the problem because the West German multinationals and the American multinationals are still there in tact. They are enjoying at our cost and are looting our country. Sir, we should be very careful about these multinationals. What does rolling a red carpet for them would mean? If we allow them to operate without any restrictions, they would not only ruin our industries, but I am afraid they will also ruin our public sector and also would blow up our democratic structure. I would not go into the details, but we know how these multinationals and these big industrialists rule over the rulers. Even the rulers are being ruled by them. Therefore, I would request the Minister of Industry to finally decide and announce the policy regarding these multinationals.

Now, the industrial policy, as I have stated just now and as many of the speakers have also stated, is just to encourage the cottage industries and the rural sector so that there should be employment growth and consumer goods. All these big houses should be prevented from taking advantage. But unless we have an integrated policy on supply of raw materials to these small scale industries, unless we

[Prof. N. M. Kamble] provide marketing facilities, unless we can give them proper guidance through the district industrial centres which we are now going to have and unless we break the linkage, as has been stated by so many speakers, between the big houses and the small scale industries which as a matter of fact act as subsidiaries or as ancillaries of these big industries, the policy which has been announced is not going to be a successful one.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Professor, you will have to wind up.

PROF. N. M. KAMBLE: Two minutes, Sir. Now, I come to sick industrial units. The hon. Minister has announced that workers' participation in such units will be the first priority. But why these units fall sick, I do not know. Many people have said here that because of mismanagement, because of shortage of power, because of so many other things, these units become sick. This has actually become a disease. And we go and take over these sick units not when they are sick but when they are completely dead. I would suggest to the Government that as soon as we come to know that a particular unit is likely to be sick, the Government must take all efforts to take it over and as far as possible, as announced by the Minister of Industry, to have workers' participation in that particular sick unit. Sir, we are, as a matter of fact, pumping enormous funds into these sick units. Therefore, it is our bounden duty to see that no sick units are taken over when they are only scrap, that we do not take the liability and thereafter close down.

Sir, I would make one request to the Minister of Industry regarding the public sector units. Of course, we give all praise for them. But the fat-flaried administrative set-ups which are working in these public sector units are so dangerous, especially to

the weaker sections of the society; the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are treated as untouchables there. You will find in these public sector undertakings that the percentage that is granted under the Constitution to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes is not at all observed. Leave aside the big posts, even at the lower level these weaker sections have not been given any chance whatsoever. My friend, Mr. Krishna, just now pointed out that whichever be the Government in power and whichever be the industrial policy of that Government it must be such that these weaker sections must find a place in it. Otherwise, if those who form one-fifth of the population of this country are deprived of their due place in any development, industrial or otherwise, that particular policy of that Government will not succeed. With these words, Sir, I conclude.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Dr. Zakaria, you will have to take just ten minutes.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA (Maharashtra): I will try to be within time. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, Mr. George Fernandes is a good friend of mine, but I am afraid he is getting increasingly lost in the Janata jungle. I have affection for him and, therefore, I cannot doubt his sincerity of purpose. A lot has been said about the Industrial Policy of the Government by Members before me. I have, therefore, no intention of repeating what has been urged here. But there is one aspect of this Industrial Policy, a very healthy aspect, to which I would like to draw the pointed attention of the hon. Minister.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Syed Nizam -ud-Din) in the Chair]

I am reinforced in my urge to do so in view of the declaration or resolution of the national executive of the Janata Party which has recommended to the Government decentralisation of the private corporate sector and sug-

gested that because of the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few big houses, temptation to abuse that power is an ever-present danger. Mr. George Fernandes has fought against this danger all through his public life, and, I am, therefore, quite prepared to believe that he is not only sincere but keen to see that this power is not only curbed- but ultimately finished. But I would like to remind him that when our party was in Government, we also made similar declarations—the Monopolies Commission, the various restrictions that were put on the big houses. But what has been the result? Declarations have been there, but whenever they come up for implementation, somehow or the other, vested interests are so entrenched everywhere, that we are never able to fulfil these declarations, we are never able to implement the policy. I would like to quote a couplet to my friend, Mr. George Fernandes, a couplet of the Chairman of our House Committee, Mr. Arif, because it is very apt and very significant:

एक ही होता है लैला-ए-हकूमत का मित्राज
झूठे वादों की अदा कल भी रही, आज भी है।

I do not want that this should be true as far as my friend, Mr. George Fernandes, is concerned. And what I am going to tell him—I have already taken him into confidence—will come as a surprise to him. I feel it is like a bit of a bomb which I am going to explode. I have in my possession a case which is typical of our declaration on one side and failure in the implementation of that declaration on the other. And that is the case of the Indian Tool Manufacturing Company Limited, a Birla concern. It has been so managed that none of the Birlas are there on the Board of Directors. But Mr. Ashok Birla is the adviser to that company. Now, this company applied for an industrial licence in August, 1977 for manufacturing 5000 marine containers. The location of the factory is in Thana in My State. Their capital outlay is only

Rs. 2 crores and 60 lakhs. The Screening Committee for industrial approvals consisting of twelve top officers representing different departments of the Government, at its meeting held on 27th October, 1977, came to the conclusion that the existing establishment and its licensed capacity of containers was in excess of demand, and took a decision to reject the proposal. On 13th December, 1977 Mr. Fernandes' Ministry conveyed to the Indian Tool Manufacturing Company that the Government decided to treat the application of this Birla concern as closed. Yet, in spite of the Screening Committee's finding, shortly thereafter, on 31st December, 1977—earlier the decision was conveyed on 13th December, 1977—the company's application was suddenly approved.

I would like to know from Mr. Fernandes how and why such a change came about in contravention of the Screening Committee's decision and in contravention of the declared industrial policy of this Government, about which I know Mr. Fernandes is sincere and keen.

Now, the total installed capacity of containers in India is over 30,000 per year. This includes two public sector units—Balmer Lawrie in Cochin and Bridge and Roof Limited in Calcutta, each with a capacity of 5,000 containers per year. This capacity of 30,000 containers per year is far in excess of the demands and cannot be utilised at least for the next ten years. Two units have already been established in Maharashtra with an installed capacity of 8,600 containers. Besides, the capacity at the Bombay port is also so limited. The loaded containers come with import cargo and when emptied at the port these are used for export cargo. At the most the Bombay port can presently inject 500 to 1,000 containers per year in the world container traffic. These two factories in Maharashtra and the two public sector units will remain unutilised for several years. The Birlas have

[Dr. Rafiq Zakaria]

contended that there is a world capacity and somehow or the other they would be able to see that this capacity is utilised. If this Birla concern is allowed to be established, the public sector units and the other small private units will certainly be elbowed out. They will be finished and the Birla Concern will certainly flourish. But is that the policy of this Government? Is that the policy of my friend, Mr. George Fernandes.

Not only that. There is another important aspect to which I would like to draw the attention of the Industries Minister. It is the policy of his Government that even the Government units must seek technical know-how from the Indian parties only, unless there are very exceptional circumstances. But in this particular case, despite the fact that there is no special technical know-how required, this particular company is authorised to give a lumpsum royalty of Rs. 10 lakhs. Why has this special treatment been received by the House of Birlas in contravention of not only the industrial policy which Mr. George Fernandes announced some time ago, but also in glaring contravention of what the National Executive of the Janata Party has only recently declared I know that it must have happened at a lower level. I am quite prepared to believe that the Minister of Industries cannot be aware of everything that goes on in his Ministry. I have myself been a Minister for more than fifteen years and, therefore, I will hesitate very much to put the blame at the door of Mr. Fernandes.

What I want to emphasize upon Mr. George Fernandes is that our policy is getting diluted because of the whole paraphernalia which is there. These big houses are so powerful that whatever we may say, they see it that whatever they want, they get.

There is only one other point to which I would like to make a reference and that is about the special concessions that are given to the backward areas. Sometime ago Mr. Fernandes visited Aurangabad.

Now, that happened to be my constituency as far as my Assembly career was concerned and for fifteen years I, represented it and I am in love with it. With great difficulties, we have been able to develop Aurangabad industrially. But, in the last ten years, despite all our efforts and despite all the concessions given by the Government, still I cannot say that it has reached the take-off stage. But, suddenly, I am told that the Government is thinking of withdrawing all those concessions that are being given to the backward areas, especially the backward areas in the urban regions, because the feeling is that they have got already industrialised. Now, please do not withdraw these concessions at a time when these industrial areas are getting consolidated. They need a little more attention, a little more treatment of a special kind, so that we would be able to see that they are established on a sound footing.

Sir, I am grateful to you for the time that you have given me. As I said earlier, there are many aspects. But I do not want to dilate upon them now. There was this particular matter which disturbed me greatly and I felt that it was my duty, after taking the Minister of Industry into confidence, to place it before this House. Thank you, Sir.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : उपसभा-
ध्यक्ष महोदय, यह प्रस्ताव जिस पर चर्चा
चल रही है उसके बारे में मुझे कहना है कि
उद्योग संबंधी एक मूल नीति जो सरकार
द्वारा बनायी गयी है, उसकी जो रूपरेखा
तैयार की गई है वह बड़ी अहम है। कामरेड
राममूर्ति जी यहाँ नहीं हैं। जल्दीवाजी में
उन्होंने कह दिया कि पुरानी वाइन नयी
बोटल में या ओल्ड वाइन इन न्यू बोटल।

हकीकत में उपसमाध्यक्ष महोदय, 1948 की जो इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी है और 1953 की जो इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी है उन दोनों को सामने रखें और नयी उद्योग नीति जो सरकार के मातहत बनी है उससे तुलना करें आरज-विटव्ही स्पीकिंग जिसको आप कहते हैं, तो वह करने पर फर्क मालूम होगा और यदि उतना फर्क न हो तो उसकी वजह यह है कि इस सरकार को बहुत दूर की मंजिल पर जाना है। यह सरकार, आप जानते हैं, एक क्रांति के दौर से हो कर आई है; एक क्रांति देश में हुई। अब इसकी मंजिल है 'संपूर्ण क्रांति'। अब संपूर्ण क्रांति की मंजिल पर यह सरकार पहुंचेगी तो औद्योगिक नीति में जो खामियां हैं, कमियां हैं, उनकी पूर्ति हो जाएगी और इसलिए थोड़ा धीरज रखने की जरूरत है।

उपसमाध्यक्ष महोदय, उद्योग अर्थ व्यवस्था का इंजन होता है। उद्योग जैसे जैसे चलता है वैसे ही अर्थ व्यवस्था को दिशा देता है। उद्योग के बिगड़ने से मोटे तौर पर सारी अर्थ-व्यवस्था बिगड़ती है। उद्योग के विकास का इतिहास बताता है कि यदि अच्छाइयां हुई हैं, दुनिया का विकास हुआ है तो खराबियां भी आई हैं। अब मैं तफसील में नहीं जाऊंगा। खराबियां जो हैं उसमें एक तो है केन्द्रीकरण—कांसंट्रेशन प्रोसेस—जिसकी चर्चा हुई। दूसरी बात उसी के मातहत है कि दुनिया में औद्योगिक रूप से जो मुल्क आगे हैं वे और आगे हो जाते हैं यानी विकसित ज्यादा विकसित हो जाते हैं। नतीजा इसका है कि दुनिया दो हिस्सों में बंट गई है—विकसित दुनिया और अविकसित दुनिया, डेवलपड दुनिया और अनडेवलपड दुनिया। यह उद्योग का विकास होने की खराबी है, जिस रूप में विकास हुआ है। अब किसी देश के अंदर जब उद्योग का विकास होता है तो इलाकों में असंतुलन कायम हो जाता है, अनबैलेंस्ड डेवलपमेंट जिसको कहते हैं। हर मुल्क में चाहे अमरीका हो, इंग्लैंड हो, यह असंतुलन कायम हो जाता है।

इसके साथ एक खराबी होती है कि बेकारी होने लगती है दुनिया के विकसित उद्योग जहां भी हैं ये बातें हर मुल्क में हैं; हिन्दुस्तान में भी है। अब जो केन्द्रीकरण की बात है उस पर मैं बाद में आऊंगा। उद्योगों का विकसित होना या कम विकसित होना, इस मुद्दे की ओर आता हूं। भारत में जो उद्योग का विकास हुआ, इसमें कुछ इलाके ज्यादा विकसित हुए, कुछ इलाके पीछे रह गये। पीछे रहने वालों में बिहार भी एक स्टेट है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बिहार औद्योगिक रूप से कितना पिछड़ा हुआ है इस बात को आप जानते हैं। बिहार में भी जो उत्तरी बिहार है वह ज्यादा पिछड़ा हुआ है औद्योगिक दृष्टि से। मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूं कि उत्तरी बिहार जहां से कि वह खुद भी आते हैं प्रतिनिधि के रूप में उसके विकास के लिये कौन सी रूपरेखा बनायी गयी है उद्योग नीति में इसको वह बताने की कृपा करें।

श्री रामानन्द यादव (बिहार) : डा जी, अब वह वहां से नहीं लड़ेंगे इसलिये उत्तर बिहार की चिन्ता उनको नहीं है।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : आपकी नीति में जो डिस्ट्रिक्ट सेंटर्स की बात है वह एक बहुत अच्छी बात है और जो दूसरी योजनायें हैं वह भी काफी अच्छी हैं, लेकिन मैं आप से जानना चाहूंगा कि एक तो जनरल बिहार और खास कर उत्तरी बिहार के औद्योगिक विकास के लिये क्या क्या योजनायें हैं उन पर आप रोशनी डालने की कृपा करें और एक दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि उत्तरी बिहार में रा मैटीरियल एग्री इंडस्ट्रीज के लिये बहुत हैं। और रा मैटीरियल को छोड़ भी दें तो ग्राम और लीची उत्तर बिहार में बहुत हैं। मुजफ्फरपुर, दरभंगा, मधुबनी के आस पास एक कौनिंग फैक्टरी आसानी से लगायी जा सकती है। कैलीफोर्निया में एपिल्स आदि को केन करने के लिये फैक्टरियां हैं।

[श्री शिवचन्द्र झा]

मैं उनमें काम कर चुका हूँ जब मैं वहाँ पढ़ता था। उसी तरह से उत्तर बिहार में मुजफ्फरपुर, दरभंगा और मधुबनी में एक कैनिंग फैक्टरी ग्राम और लीची के लिये हो सकती है। एक शुरुआत हो सकती है एगो इंडस्ट्री के रूप में और आप बड़ी फैक्टरी न लगा कर उसे एक छोटे रूप में ही शुरू करें, लेकिन इस तरह से वहाँ के कच्चे माल को इस्तेमाल करके उस प्रदेश को औद्योगीकरण के रास्ते पर चला सकते हैं। इसी तरह से वहाँ के लिये और दूसरे उद्योग भी हो सकते हैं। टेनिंग फैक्टरी, चमड़े का उद्योग आप वहाँ लगा सकते हैं। तो क्या आप का लक्ष्य है यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ। एक टेनिंग फैक्टरी वहाँ लग सकती है यह मैंने जनरल तौर पर बताया लेकिन इससे पहले जो पुराने उद्योग हैं उनका भी आज वहाँ बिगड़ा हुआ रूप है जैसे चीनी का उद्योग है। मंत्री जी तो कह देंगे कि यह तो एग्रीकल्चर का विषय है। थोड़ी देर के लिये मान लें कि आपकी यह बात सही है और उसे हटा दें लेकिन वहाँ जूट मिल के लिये आपकी क्या ध्योरी है। कटिहार जूट मिल को कैसे बढ़ाया जायगा इसको आप बतलायें। इसी तरह से अध्यक्ष महोदय, उत्तरी बिहार जो बहुत अविर्कसित है, बहुत पिछड़ा हुआ है उसका उद्योगीकरण हो सके, उसका विकास हो सके उसके लिये क्या किया गया है। उसका विकास हो सकता है लेकिन वह अभी तक नहीं हुआ है और हम उम्मीद करते हैं कि आपकी नयी नीति से वह होगा फिर दक्षिणी बिहार की बात है। वहाँ तो इंडस्ट्रियल रा मैटीरियल का भंडार है। इस बात को दुनिया जानती है और वहाँ बहुत से उद्योग लगाये जा सकते हैं। मेरी एक मांग है, मेरा एक सुझाव है कि दक्षिणी बिहार में एक एटामिक प्लांट लगाया जाय। आप कहेंगे कि उसकी जरूरत नहीं है। इसमें, बड़ा खर्च होगा, लेकिन आप मेरे इस विचार पर, मेरे इस सुझाव पर

गौर करें। दक्षिणी बिहार बहुत उपयुक्त है एक एटामिक कारखाने के लिये। इसी तरह से बिहार के उद्योगीकरण के लिये उत्तरी बिहार हो या दक्षिणी बिहार हो, मैं सुझाव दूंगा कि आप एक उत्तरी बिहार डेवलपमेंट बोर्ड बना दें। आज वहाँ जो कुछ हो रहा है उसे आप अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं, मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप सुचारू रूप से एक अथॉरिटी बना दें उत्तरी बिहार के इंडस्ट्रियलाइजेशन के लिये, विकास के लिये और वहाँ उद्योग खड़े करने के लिये। इस तरह से जो रीजनल डेवलपमेंट है जो देश का पिछड़ापन है वह दूर हो सकता है। इस और मैं मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। इसी तरह से देश में और भी अविर्कसित राज्य है। उन के विकास का काम हो सकता है। अब सारे देश में जो विकेंद्रीकरण है उस के बारे में आप का ध्यान खीचना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ पर नायडू साहब ने कहा कि राष्ट्रीकरण किया जाय...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संयद निजामुद्दीन)

अब आप खत्म करें।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : नायडू साहब ने कहा कि यह हिन्दुस्तान में बीस बड़े घराने हैं उन को ले लिया जाय। उन का राष्ट्रीकरण कर दिया जाय। यह एक रास्ता है। सरकार के माफ़त यह किया जा सकता है और उन के उद्योग लिये जा सकते हैं। लेकिन एक दूसरा रास्ता भी अपनाया गया है और वह ट्रस्टीशिप का रास्ता है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय गांधी जी ने इस की रूपरेखा बनायी थी। गांधी जी की ध्योरी है ट्रस्टीशिप की। डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया जब लोक सभा में थे तो उन्होंने उस को साकार करने के लिये अपना एक विधेयक रखा था लोक सभा में। दुर्भाग्य से वे नहीं रहे, बात आगे नहीं बढ़ सकी, बात रुक गई। अब जनता सरकार है और हमारे मंत्री

महोदय अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं, डाक्टर राहव जानते हैं कि इसकी क्या रूपरेखा थी। ट्रस्टीशिप का एक रास्ता है जिसकी बदौलत, जिसके जरिये इन बड़े घरानों को, मैं घरानों नहीं कहूंगा, इन औद्योगिक राक्षसों को आप अपने काबू में ला सकते हैं, इनका आप बंध कर सकते हैं। यह घराने नहीं हैं, यह राक्षस हैं। यहाँ पर मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ, मुझे गेर भाद आता है,

चार बांस, चौबीस गज, अंगुल अष्ट प्रमाण,

बैठे टाटा, बिरला हैं, मत चूको जार्ज फर्नान्डीज।

यह मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह अच्छा मौका है, इतिहास पुनर्हारी राह देख रहा है, इतिहास गलामी देगा, यह मौका मत चूको। इन घरानों को बन्द करो, खत्म करो।

इसी तरह से उन्सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह विकेन्द्रीकरण जो है विदेशी कम्पनियाँ है, कोका-कोला को बन्द कर दिया गया। बिल्कुल ठीक हुआ। मुझे बहुत पसन्द है कोका कोला। मैं जब अमरीका में था, बहुत पीता था और यहाँ पर भी अब कोका-कोला चलती थी बहुत पीता था। लेकिन क्योंकि कम्पनी मुनाफा बाहर भेजती थी, बन्द करना अच्छी बात है। लेकिन और कम्पनियाँ हैं जो मुनाफा भेजती हैं, उन पर कितनी तेजी से धक्का हो रही है, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ। प्लान्टेशन और टी० गार्डन्स भी उद्योगों में ही आते हैं। मुनाफा का मिलसिला इंग्लैण्ड भेजा जा रहा है। इन सब पर कण्ट्रोल लगाने की जरूरत है और फिर आपका विकेन्द्रीकरण का जो मिल-मिला है, उसमें रोक लगाए। लेकिन जो नये उद्योग, मीडियम और काटेज इण्डस्ट्रीज खोलने की बात है, स्माल इण्डस्ट्रीज के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। देहाती इलाके में उद्योग लगाना अच्छी बात है। आपकी योजना अच्छी है। लेकिन मैंने देखा कि दिक्कतें आती हैं। नौजवान एण्टरप्राय्जर्स

जो देहात में उद्योग करना चाहते हैं, उनके सामने नियमों और कायदों की इतनी दिक्कतें हैं, पेचीदगियाँ हैं, न लोग मिलता है और इतने क्लस हैं कि वे हतोत्साह हो जाते हैं। मैं आपसे निवेदन करूँगा कि नये एण्टरप्राय्जर्स जो देहात में उद्योग चलाने के लिये तैयार हैं, उनके लिये आप क्लस को सिम्पलीफाई करें ताकि उनको उत्साह हो और देहाती एरिया में आप उद्योग को जो ले जाना चाहते हैं जो आपकी नीति है, डिसेन्ट्रलाइजेशन जो आप करना चाहते हैं और जो आपके आदर्श हैं, यह सब बातें होंगी अब आप प्रोत्साहन का रास्ता प्रशस्त करेंगे और बड़ा बनायेंगे।

इन सब बातों को मद्देनजर रख कर मैं चाहूँगा कि औद्योगिक प्रगति का जो इंजन चल रहा है, वह चलता रहे और चलता रहेगा। तो पूरा विश्वास रखें कि जो प्राइवेट सेक्टर की धक्का है, वह खत्म हो के रहेगी। दुनिया का इतिहास बताता है कि जहाँ कहीं भी पूंजीवाद है, उसकी बदौलत यह सब खराबियाँ आती हैं और कल नहीं तो परसों आपको इसे खत्म करना होगा और जनता सरकार उसी रास्ते पर चल रही है, यह मैं आपको और सदन को विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful for the criticism that has been made of the industrial policy and also of the performance of my Government in general and the Industry Ministry in particular during the last year. A lot of criticism has been very constructive and I would like to assure the hon. Members that our Government will benefit from it. And in the course of my work in the coming months, I shall try to personally benefit from it. There has also been criticism that was not so constructive. But I can certainly appreciate the thinking of those Members who felt that our Industrial Policy has nothing to offer and that if anything it has taken the country back not 15 or 20 or 30 years but 500 years.

SHRI N. G. RANGA: Who said that?

SHRI GEOHGE FERNANDES: A couple of hon. Members said that, I can only say that I sympathise with those Members who see no good in «ur Industrial Policy even while I hope that as days go by) they will have occasions to revise their views. Mr. Sankar Ghose was to say that our policy is nothing but an appendage of the 1956 Industrial Policy Resolution. Having said that, he went on to attack it. If our policy is nothing but the 1956 Resolution, then I see no reason why Mr. Sankar Ghose should attack our policy. He should be very happy because that was the policy he was implementing till two years ago. A'nd if we are now, concerned with implementing the same policy, then why is the quarrel? What is it that you want to find fault within that case? May be, this is a part of the confusion, and I only hope again that in course of time people learn to come out of this confusion in wjsich they were operating for a large number of years. Our policy, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, does make a complete departure from the 1956 Industrial Policy. While we say that we are making a departure from the 1956 Industrial Policy it does not mean that we are now going 500 years back or even 30 years back. We have consistently said that there is room for the large, for the medium and for the small. But the thrust of our policy is (on the small, the cottage, the household, the rural. Why? Because there is nothing else that one ca*i do today. If this country has just now 10,000 megawatts of additional electricity, this u'ould not be our industrial policy. But it is going to take us next five years to have another 20,000 megawatts of electricity. By then we will have more problems because just now we have inherited only 40 million unemployed, and in the course of the next ten years, we are going to have 60 million unemployed and each years 6 million are coming into the employment market

Hon. Members were to express concern and distress and some were also upset that we are thinking within the timeframe of ten years. They wondered whether we had plans to stay on for ten years. We have a mandate of five years of which one year is over. And we shall not extend the life of Parliament. That I would like to assure the hon. Members. In fact, the life that was extended for six years, thank God and thank the people of this country, it ended with six years. Even that is now going to be set right with the Constitutional Amendment, an amendment to the earlier amendment, to make Parliament and legislatures have a life of only five years. But, when you plan, Mr. Vice-Chairman, you do not plan only for five years. The planner, the administrator, must have a long-range perspective. You cannot have a perspective only of today because if you have the perspective only of today then the perspective is not only of today, it comes only to you and this is what happened with the hon. gentlemen all these years. This is what happened. I was asked about cement. How come that as soon as the Janata Government came into office cement disappeared? The planning was not for a length of time and that is why in the year 1975, in the year 1976 and in the year 1977, during all these three years, the annual increase and capacity installed was only of the Order of two lakh tonnes against the additional requirement of twenty lakh tonnes per year. Then, how could you have cement? It takes three years to put up new plants. But this is not to discuss the cement question. I will come to it later. This is only to suggest that the planner's job, the administrator's job is not only to think of today (or of tomorrow; his job is to think far ahead. And, if we have got the time-frame of ten years—in my own opinion the ten-years time frame is also primarily concerned with the problems of unemployment—it is not just a ten year time frame; we have a much longer perspective than that and it is not a

perspective of sticking to the chair by hook or by crook. This is not the perspective. The perspective is what to do with this country? How to build this country? That is the perspective. And, it is in that perspective that we have a ten-year plan, that we have outlined a ten-year plan for eradicating unemployment which was very systematically, in a very planned way, built in this country in the last thirty years through five Five-Year Plans and three One-Year Plans.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: Mr. Minister, will you kindly tell us whether the unemployment graph in the course of the last one year has gone up or gone down?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I hope the hon. Member will not interrupt me. I did not interrupt any single Member while any one of them was speaking. I hope the hon. Members will show me the same consideration. I shall reply to all the points, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I hope the House will have the time and the patience to listen to me. I shall answer all the points, including the graph of unemployment. There is not any single point which any hon. Member has raised which I am not competent >or capable of answering and meeting, to the best of my ability, of course.

Therefore, if we have this policy where the emphasis, as I said, is on the rural, on the small, on the cottage and on the household sectors, the objective and the immediate task is to provide employment to 40 million unemployed who are there today and to another 60 million who will be coming in the unemployment market in the next ten years, at the rate of six million every year, and that within the next ten years we solve this problem.

Sir, we have had enough of abstract discussion on eradicating poverty, quitting poverty. Quitting poverty was the slogan in English; wrong grammar also apart from the wrong slogan. Now we have had all this abstract discussion for years. We

concretise this question today. And, while concretising it, we try to find out what the areas are where jobs can be created immediately and how they can be created immediately. Some hon. Members were to suggest that there is nothing new; the Khadi and Village Industries Commission has been there, handlooms have been there and the village industries have been there. What is new? Well, firstly, it is the thrust, and, secondly, which I consider is perhaps still more important, it is the determination to implement our policies. I do not certainly want my work to be judged by what we are saying today or by what we said yesterday or by what we shall be saying tomorrow because as Ministers we have a large number of former Ministers 'xiow occupying the Benches. As Ministers we make lots of speeches, some of them totally unnecessary. But then these are occupational—I would not say 'hazards' though sometimes I feel they are hazards but these are . . .

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH; Occupational pleasures.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: No, these are not occupational pleasures either. A lot of time is wasted in making speeches though they need not be made. Somehow, everyone gets into this act and I find that I am also getting into it though I hate it and I would like to get out of it; but somehow, one gets involved into it. And the All-India Radio goes on saying: "*Mantri ne kaha*". People at some point ;of time are bound to get bored in hearing all the while what the Minister said, not what the Minister did. So, we would certainly like to be judged not by our intentions, not by our utterances but by our actions and our performance. You can judge us on our one year's performance as a large number of hon. Members have tried to judge but I will come to that later.

As far as the implementation of our industrial policy is concerned, we certainly want to be judged by what we do with our policy. We have;

[Shri George Fernandes] taken certain specific decisions, Mr. Vice-Chairman. We have said that from now on, that is, from the 23rd of December, any town or city with a population of half a million, shall not have any more new industrial licences issued. Now, for years, everybody appealed to the industrialists: "You must go to rural areas because that is where the masses are; that is where the people are. You must go and serve them there." We decided that appeals to the industrialists are not going to work. Whatever your ideological colour or convictions or whatever your individual loyalties to who so ever, no appeals are going to work. People are accustomed to a style of life. There is a certain culture that has been cultivated in this country over the years and the people are accustomed to it and they are not going to the rural areas. Neither the industrialists nor anybody else is willing to go to the rural area. We are having a problem in finding officials to go to rural areas. When I called a meeting of the Ministers of Industries of the State Governments to discuss our industrial policy, and later a meeting of the officials of the state Governments, they said: The officials do not want to go to the districts, to the backward districts of Bihar or Madhya Pradesh, to the adivasi districts. Who wants to go there? Nobody wants to go there because one gets accustomed to a particular style of life. I get more letters from the Members of Parliament, Mr. Vice-Chairman, requesting that an official or perhaps even some Stenographer who is transferred from Delhi from some corporate office or undertaking in Delhi to a place hundred miles away, be retained in Delhi because his mother is sick or his wife is expecting, and therefore, he must be retained here. And this is the culture. This is the culture which we have cultivated. We are all a part of this. So, we decided that it is no use making appeals to the industrialists. In our policy statement which is now a part of our policy

from 23rd December, we decided that no new licences should be given in any moment to an entrepreneur unless he wants to set up an industry or wants to invest his money in an industry or he wants to expand an industry in the rural area, and smaller towns. They argue on one point and that is a very interesting point—when I tried to discuss with them with the captains of the industry; their Chambers of Commerce and Federations and all of them to the metropolitan cities of this country—and while talking to them, they would raise this point, and including the managers, they would raise this point: "How can we go to the rural areas? Where is the infrastructure?" "What is infrastructure?" ask them. "Water and railways they reply. I had to tell them that there are 7,000 railway stations in India and there is more water in rural areas than urban areas and even urban areas get their water from the rural areas. In Bombay they get water from Vaitarni, which is 100 kilometres away from Bombay. They spend a lot of money to get that water. The industrialist believes that water is available only in Bombay. But he forgets that Vaitarni is only 100 Kms. away and if he goes to Nasik, he will get better water, cleaner water, even for his potable use. At the level of managers, at the level of executives and also at the level of industrialists, there is another very interesting argument. They ask 'what are infrastructures, but what about the facilities?'. What are the facilities? Children's education, wife's treatment and, of course, the rest of the things that go with it. Where are the facilities? In other words, one is concerned only with one's own facilities. Eighty per cent of the people of India live in the villages. Education of the children, out there; treatment of the children, out there and essential things to the people, out there. But this has never figured in the planning during the last thirty years; never figured. People talk today about the

kind of India they have built for us

and for posterity. Eighty per cent of the people of India live in places where the industrialists, the managers and the officials do not want to go because certain facilities which are available in the urban areas in respect of education, health etc. are not available there. Therefore, we decided that now there will be no more appeals and no more requests. It is the law and it is the rule. For industries, go out; and they will go out. This is a positive decision. This is a departure. This is a departure in many ways. They will see the socio, logical impact of this; they will see the impact of this on pollution, on urbanisation, on diffusion of wealth, on creating the infrastructure in the villages, on setting up schools, communications, roads and health centres in the villages; they will see the spin-off from this, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I would urge the hon. Members to have a little patience. They will see it. This is their problem. Some of them are sharp enough to understand this. Some of them are clever enough to realise what we are really doing, where the country is going and how in the next two or four years, the policy that we have initiated, the policy that we have enunciated and the policy that we are now implementing will have its impact. They know what the impact of this is going to be on the rural life of this country and this is worrying some of them, as politicians, of course. Since some of them have appealed to me not to think as a politician, but as someone who is concerned with the country, I hope, my hon. friends will also have the same thought. I hope, where our industrial policy is concerned, they will look at it as a new effort of nation-building and not from the short realm or the short run of their own political future and how that political future may turn even bleaker than it is today with the success of this industrial policy. But this is one aspect.

We are setting up these district industrial centres. Despite all the criticism which has been made against

259 RS—9.

our policy, I am indeed happy and delighted that every State Government has welcomed it. Today, we have eight different political parties running the State Governments in this country. It is not only the Janata Party, it is not only my party, which is running the administration. Those parties which are determined to see that my party's Government does not survive are also running the Governments in some of the States; they are also running the administration in some of the States. But all parties, irrespective of their political ideology and irrespective of their opposition to my party and to my Government, have endorsed our industrial policy. I am delighted at this. I am not saying this just to embarrass anybody. They have seen that the district industrial centres are, in fact, going to provide the stimulus that is required to bring about change in the rural areas. Not solely. After all, the entire development of this country is not going to be only through the Industry Ministry. There is the Ministry of Agriculture. There is the Ministry of Health. There is the Ministry of Steel. There is the Ministry of Petroleum. There are umpteen other economic Ministries and departments and the whole Government is concerned with all this. But nevertheless, to the extent that additional jobs in this country from now on will have to be provided only through industry, for a greater part, these district industrial centres will act as catalysts and they will provide the stimulus to take industries to the rural areas. For the first time, all the 460 districts in this country will be covered by these district industrial centres. In the past, experiments had been done with rural industries projects, rural artisan projects, backward districts and so on. Now, whatever benefits were given in regard to backwardness or in regard to certain special projects, we are not doing away with them. But every district is going to be covered by a district industrial centre. Its concern will be to provide the necessary infrastructure to

[Shri George Fernandes]

have industries within the district.

This will function under the 6 P.M. overall jurisdiction of the

State Governments. About 112 of them, may be 120 of them will become operational in the next four days, on the first may. By the middle or end of May another 70 or 80 will become operational, and by the end of this year, I hope, Mr. Vice-Chair-man, may be 400 of them will become operational. Earlier while formulating this resolution or this policy some of us had a kind of perspective whether it is going to take long time in getting the right type of people, in giving right type of training and all that because it is not just putting one more official in some place and saying. Come forward and industrialise. It is not going to happen. Just now, people are being trained, officials are being trained. General Manager in charge of the district industrial centre, seven managers looking after seven different wings of the khadi and village industry are being trained in marketing, in research and development, in finding out finances for the entrepreneur, in finding out the necessary tools, the implements, the machinery, the equipment, identifying the project, identifying even the entrepreneur in the district and under one roof, literally under one roof. The people had to go from pillar to post, from one office to another. Up till now for a small-scale industry, people had to rush to the State Capitals. Now it wont be Vicecessary any more for anybody to rush to any State Capital. He will have to go to the district headquarter or wherever the DIO is located. Under one roof, just by entering through one door— may be, it may be necessary for him to go to two or three desks—he gets all his things done to become a small-fcale entrepreneur, in order to set up a small-scale industry. He will get everything, from identifying the project to getting the machinery and equipment, from finding out the finances and marketing arrangements to getting research and development

knowledge, anything and everything that he wants. And we will make them succeed, Mr. Vice-Chairman. We will make the district industry centre succeed. We will also use the other machinery that the Government has had over the years.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: How many small-scale industries have been closed down during your one year?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am sorry, I won't be able to give you the statistics right now, but I will certain, ly give the statistics in the next 48 hours.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: One after another they are closing down. Try to save them.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: They are closing down and, of course, we win try to save them. That is why we are here. We have no other justification for being here except trying to save them because I have discovered that over the years the sickness in the small-scale industry is larger than in the large-scale industry.

श्री वीरेन जे० शाह : कंसर हुआ थ...

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: It is our task to see that the sickness goes away. It is our task to identify the reasons of the sickness and to remove them.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, along with the district industry centres, take the other instrument that we are going to use—the Khadi and Village Industries Commission. One of the Chairman of the Khadi and Village Industries Commission is a Member of this House now. The Khadi and Village Industries Commission is now 22 years old. It was used but in a limited way, in a very limited way. It was there. I was a Member of Parliament, of the Lower House for four years and it was very interesting, Mr. Vice-Chair. man, to find in this country people who made it a profession to snipe at the Khadi and Village Industries Commission in Parliament. If one looked to the questions in the Fourth Lok Sabha, there were more questions

asked on corruption and mismanagement, on transfers and all that and all that in the Khadi and Village Industries Commission-administered units than in any other sector perhaps. There was a lobby which kept snipping at the Khadi and Village Industries Commission, people like me, who otherwise were in the opposition to the Government, but who had convictions about khadi, about village industries, about their role, it was left to a man like me to set up a little lobby for the Khadi and Village Industries Commission in Parliament. And this happened in 1967. And no one allowed that organisation to be really used because the big industry in this country—and the Government of the country functioned for big industry—saw danger in the Khadi and Village Industries Commission, in this little institution run by old Gandhians, or run by people who were newly motivated—may not be Gandhian but who were otherwise motivated—who realised that India lives in the villages and that is where they have to act and create jobs. All these people—the big industry, the big business—saw to it that somehow this organisation was not allowed to grow, that it was constantly put on the defensive. Maybe there were black sheep and there are still some black sheep. There are black sheep every where. Let none of us make a virtue " about our own being Simon Pure. I do not believe any one of us is pure. All of us have our faults. And the Khadi and Village Industries Commission would have their own black sheep. But under a constant barrage of attack, they would be on the defensive and the big industry would then go on merrily because they saw in this a danger—in this instrument, in these 24,000 institutions in the country, little cooperatives run by little people. But imagine, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that is the biggest network of stores. There is no greater, what you call, supermarket chain that one sees in America, or perhaps even in the Soviet Union. There is no greater super-market chain anywhere in the world than the

Khadi and Village Industries Commission institutions in India. You have 24,000 institutions, if you want to use them. We are using them and we shall use them. We shall give people all the assistance. I shall not bother the House with statistics and figures. It takes time to lift them from the papers and read them out. But we asked for more money in the Khadi and Village Industries Commission this year than was put in the previous three, four, five or six years. We are telling the Khadi and Village Industries Commission, "Take as much money as you can spend. No project, no job which the Khadi and Village Industries Commission and its institutions through the State Boards undertake will suffer for want of money. No project, nothing at all will suffer for want of money. You can get as much money as you are in a position to spend". That will be the only test—how much you can spend this year? That money will be made available.

People are concerned about my party having a red flag and a blue flag and my Finance Minister, Home Minister, the Prime Minister included, come under attack. This is an old technique with a certain section of the political opinion in this country. We are used to it. People like me are particularly used to it. To some Nehru was very good but Morarji was bad. And to some Nehru was very good but Menon was bad. We took the position that neither Menon was bad, nor Morarji was bad. There was only one bad man—the man at the top. If the man at the top is good, then it is no use saying that the man below him is this or that. Identify the man at the top. If he is really the man at the top and if he has men down below him who are bad, then the man at the top cannot be good by any yardstick. But this is the split mind which has been partly the bane of our public life and that still operates in certain areas. And, therefore, Sir, our Finance Minister is always the target of attack—Swatantra

[Shri George Fertiandes]

Party, an old civil servant, moth-eaten—all the epithets are used. Mr. Vice-Chairman, for 30 years the Congress Party ruled this country. I challenge the hon. Members on the other side to produce one budget of the Government of India where a pie was set apart to provide drinking water in the rural areas. I challenge. It was left to Mr. Hirubhai Patel, the Finance Minister of the Janata Government, to modify the very first budget, because we inherited a budget from them. We cannot do the budgetary exercise overnight. The budgetary exercise starts as soon as the current Finance Bill will be passed some time next week. Then for next year's budget, the exercises will start. So it was left to Mr. Hirubhai Patel to provide Rs. 40 crores in the very first budget that he was to present,

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: You are proud of Rs. 1000 crores deficit.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Rs. 40 crores, Sir, and in the current year's budget, Rs. 60 crores have been provided by Mr. H. M. Patel in the Janata budget. So Rs. 100 crores in ten months have been provided. Mr. Ranga, this should make you happy. It was left to Mr. H. M. Patel, the Finance Minister of the Janata Government, to provide Rs. 100 crores within a span of ten months to provide clean drinking water to India's villages. Our friends took Coca-Cola while we are taking water. That is the difference.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: You are running very fast.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Coming, to the Khadi and Village Industries, we are using this institution today to advantage to further our industrial policy.

Regarding these handlooms and handicrafts, in our policy we have decided that there shall be no additional loomage in the organised sec-

tor including the powerlooms. I know Comrade Indradeep Sinha was concerned about the powerloom sector and he saw no worthwhile shift coming out of the handloom, perhaps, because the productivity was more. I am afraid he stretched that argument too far. I can appreciate his intention. But how long does one stretch that argument? On handloom it is only five metres a day. On powerloom you can have 45 metres a day. Therefore, it is ten times of productivity. Then why not the most modern up to date mills which will give you much more? Where does one stretch this? I know one need not take any point to absurdity. There are lot of people who try to take our industrial policy to absurdity by trying to suggest that anything that can be done by hand shall not be done by machine. It means that the Janata Government left to itself or some of its leaders would do away with electric fans and have the old style of pankhas where people will sit and pull. One can review things to absurdity. But that certainly is not the way of a debate or argument. We should know the industrial policy of our country which will affect the lives of 630 million people and 700 -million people in another five years from today. But we have decided that no additional loomage will be allowed where power is used. All additional loomage will be provided in the handloom sector.

SHRI N. G. RANGA: Very good, Sir.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES; I know you are in the wrong place sometimes. There are two aspects of the handloom. One is that we propose to see that the looms are improved. Today the weaver who, perhaps, works for four hours, or two hours or three hours will work for 8 hours and in the process will be able to produce more and earn a little more. We mean to pay him a little mere money. Secondly, we mean to see that more looms are installed.

The current year's production, that is, for 77, the production of handloom cloth in the current year was about 2,300 million metres, 2,500 million metres. In the next five years our effort is to see that the production in the handloom sector goes up to at least 3,600 million or 3,700 million metres. We shall see that he produces still more. Now, is this not a major shift? This is a major shift.

Now we shall use the Handloom Board. In the Handloom Board, it has been in existence for a number of years but it never came to be used to the extent it should have been used. Now we mean to keep it up, provide it more money and see that it is used effectively not only to produce more cloth because in the dynamic decade the use of cloth per capita in this country kept declining, from 16 metres per annum to 13.5 or so metres per head per annum.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: Most probably because of the quality of the cloth.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am glad that my friend is now discovering new justification for providing lesser cloth to our people.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: Durability is changing. That you must know.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am glad that my friend now discovers that styles have changed and people are wearing more durable cloth. In other words, there is so much affluence in the country during the last ten years in the "Dynamic Decade" that the consumption of cloth per capita declined from 16 metres to 13.5 metres. I am sure the country will be delighted to hear this. People will be delighted to hear this outside this house also.

SHRI PILOO MODY: These are new fashions in nudity.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Secondly, Sir, I was saying about how to provide to the people, to those who are in the rural areas, more job opportunities through hand-looms and handicrafts. We have the All-India Handicrafts Board—well-meaning people on the Board discussing the kind of handicrafts that would adorn, maybe my home or the home of Mr. Viren Shah, but not handicrafts really for the masses, for the people. Go to Assam go to Tripura. They produce the finest bamboo cane baskets anyone would produce anywhere in the world, but every shop is full of plastic baskets produced in Bombay and shipped all the way to Tripura. Sir, it is a different culture which has developed over the last several years.

Last year our handicrafts exports were \Rs. 400 crores. This includes about Rs. 200 crores of jewellery. And of the remaining Rs. 200 crores, about 60 crores were carpets. Now I shall illustrate how we are going about this job. At the beginning of our Government, we decided to set up 190 training units for carpet weavers, boys and girls, where we would give them stipend and where we would provide them with training and make them self-employed people at the end of six months of training, where they would be earning even while they were under training. We started this work in right earnest, and instead of the targeted 190 training centres we ended the year with 490 training centres in operation. And we provided training for 20,500 young boys and girls not only in the two carpet-producing States of the country—Jammu and Kashmir and Uttar Pradesh—but also in those States where people believed one could not produce carpets—in Karnataka, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Bihar. In all these States we were able to set up carpet training centres and provide jobs. It is jobs being created. People ask: Have you been able to create jobs? Well, in this one

[Shri George Fernandes]

little sector, just through the training centres that we set up—and I am not talking of the fillip that we gave to the carpet industry in general, I am not talking of the overall stimulus that the carpet industry has received because of a series of other measures but I am talking merely of the initiative of the Ministry of Industry of the Government of India in the last nine months—20,500 boys and girls were on job, producing carpets and getting their bread and earning foreign exchange for this country.

There is an unlimited market for these carpets outside our country. And we mean to strengthen the handicrafts. As I said earlier Mr. Vice-Chairman, there is an alternative. My friend, Mr. Shiva Chandra Jha, was to mention about the north of Bihar. I think it was Mr. Mishra who was to complain that he does not believe that small is beautiful. Please don't if you don't want to. You may find beauty in something else. You are most welcome to do it. Ultimately beauty lies in the eye of the beholder. Take the north of Bihar. Apart from the small, what else can you do in the north of Bihar? Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the power available for the whole of the north of Bihar, where live 25 million poorest of the poor of our countrymen, at present is 110 MW. Mr. Maurya complained; What is this 10-year period? What are you fellows up to? You have a mandate only for five years, of which four years are left now. It is a perspective that we have inherited from the predecessor Government. The north of Bihar, so far as electricity is concerned, is going to have another 80 MW in the next 10 years, so that by the end of 1987, left to their old dispensation, the north of Bihar would have a generating capacity of 190 MW for a population of 25 million today, which would become about 30 million in the next 10 years. Now we have, of course, changed the perspective. We are immediately com-

missioning 220 MW of additional electricity generating capacity in the north of Bihar within the next three years, work has started. We have changed that. Nevertheless, it takes three years time to put up a new power generator. It takes time to provide enough power in the north of Bihar where everything can be mechanised, where even a canning factory can go. Now, with the existing 110 MW of electricity, out of which we may be getting 80 to 90 MW per day, to the best of our performance, the whole Barauni industrial complex consumes most of that electricity. Now what do you do for the rest of the north of Bihar which is in darkness? You cannot go there after 5 O'clock in the evening. It is all dark. There is darkness for everybody there which is inherited after 30 years of the darkness into which you have plunged the people. No hope; no light. So, what do we do there? We take to cottage; we take to household; we take to handloom; we take to handicrafts. This is what we are doing. To some persons like Mr. Mishra, the small may not be beautiful. He may like glittering things. But gutter is here in Delhi; it is there to some extent—to a very limited extent—in Patna; it is there in Bombay. But in the north of Bihar there is no glitter. Whether anybody likes it or not, but anyone who is concerned with man, finds it so. As Gandhiji said, man is the supreme consideration. So, if man is the supreme consideration, then in the north of Bihar, it is not large, it is not mechanisation, it is not electricity just now. It is the small. It is the cottage; it is the household; it is the handloom; it is the handicraft. That is the relevance of our policy, Mr. Vice-Chairman. It is a policy that has not come out of the fanciful ideas of anyone of us, as was sought to be made out by some of the hon. Members, the red flag or the blue flag amongst us. It is not so. There were no Raj Gurus involved in this. The people of India were involved

in the making of this policy. Our policy is related to them. Our policy is not related to anyone else. There-fore, this whole new concept of the thrust to the small, to the cottage, to the rural, to the household.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA:
What about the HEC's functioning?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Now points were made as to whether this would not mean that the large is being neglected, the large is being ignored. In fact, charges were made that the public sector is going to be dismantled and that the public sector is going to be completely finished. People do have some whipping boys. First they create them and then they start their exercises with them. One of the issues on which a lot of campaigning has been going on in the last 9 months or one year is that we are going to destroy the public sector. Which one? Let us take public sector by public sector. I challenge any hon. Member on the other side of the House to give me the name of one public sector undertaking which we have dismantled.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Subra-manian Swamy . . .

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES; I am saying any Member may give me the name of one public sector undertaking. Mr. Subramanian Swamy is not a public sector undertaking. He is an hon. Member of the Lower House.

Name one. And I can name, Mr. Vice-Chairman, every public sector undertaking which is being expanded rapidly, in which we are putting in money. Perhaps the other side of the House, if it had had a chance, would not have put in. I will give the case of the HMT. We inherited a smugglers economy as far as watches were concerned. If did 'not take us six months. In two years from today, the HMT will be producing 3 million watches. Rs. 30 crores are being spent on the HMT in this year, and 16 watch assembling plants are

coming up in 16 different States of the country in the next 12 months. A mother plant producing components is coming up in Tumkur in Karnataka. They will become operational in September next year. And, yet, we are told that the Janata Government is dismantling the public sector. Which unit?

The BHEL is today equipped to produce 4,500 MW generating equipment and it will produce that much generating equipment per year in the next five years for the domestic market and *for* exports.

You have had Coca Cola. We are having the Modern Bakeriea marketing 77. You were allowing a crore and 25 lakhs of rupees to go out of the country every year. A crore and 25 lakhs is a lot of money in any currency. The Coca Cola's total investment in the country was Rs. 6,00,000. In the last 10 years you allowed it to take Rs. 12 crores from this country. The Modern Bakeries today is making money. On the CFTRI produced essence the Modern Bakeries is making money. It is a public sector undertaking. The Coca Cola man was a candidate in Delhi, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra, my hon. colleague in the Lower House made him bite the dust. Otherwise, there would have been a powerful Coca Cola lobby in the Central Hall. You should thank the Janata Patry and the people of course.

Name one undertaking, name one unit. I know that some people are so habituated to speak the same thing over and over again because someone in Germany once said, "Tell a lie a hundred times; the people will believe, it is true." The art has been perfected in this country by some people. It goes on and on. They say that the public sector has been dismantled. In every debate in this House and the other House and in every Question Hour in this House and the other House, it is said that

[Shri George Fernandes]

the public sector has been dismantled Name one unit, or else stop it.

The public sector has its role al-o. Large has also its role. In the next five years, 20,000 MW of additional electricity generating capacity is going to be created. In the next seven years the cement production in this country will be doubled. From its present 22 million tonnes installed capacity, it will become 45 million tonnes in the next 7 years, our effort will be to make it in five years. Otherwise the people will throw me out. We will not tell them that they should not. In fact they had been telling them, but that is a different thing. No holding on to the chair at any cost, even at the cost of democracy or civil liberties.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, they say that we are somehow dismantling the public sector or that the whole industrial policy of the Janata Government is going to take the country back by 500 years. Twenty thousand megawatts of electricity that is being produced now is almost going to be doubled in the next five years. How can any hon. Member, Mr. Vice-Chairman, who wants to criticise our industrial policy and who has all the right to criticise our economic policy, when we are going to double the 20,000 MW electricity generating capacity in the next five years, say that we are going to take the country back by 500 years? This is the position today. This year 4,000 MW of additional electricity generating capacity will be installed in the country. It is not sufficient. There is a shortage of 4,000 MW. There is a shortfall of Rs. 4,000 crores in production in the country.

SHRI GIAN CHAND TOTU (Hima-chai Pradesh): Who planned it?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES; You planned it. I hope, the hon. Member understands that electricity generation by the Janata Government does

not mean putting on some more switches on walls and switching them on.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: If it is all correct, why is the HEC running in loss, which was making profit earlier?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: There are a number of undertakings, not only the HEC. . .

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: What do you say about it?

SHRI. GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Vice-Chairman, as I said, I shall answer all the questions. I want hon. Members to have a little . . .

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: When you are making yourself a hero of electric power, why is the HEC suffering losses?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES; I would earnestly appeal to the Member to have some patience. I shall answer all the questions, including the question why the HEC is making loss. (Interruptions) I shall answer Please have a little bit of patience. Everything has its time, everything has its place. Have some patience. I can see your impatience. I know why you are impatient. (*Interruptions*) After all, you cannot set things right overnight. You must have some patience. Electricity, Mr. Vice-Chairman, cannot be produced overnight. In 1967 the Government that is no more went about setting up a 105-MW hydel project in a place called Loktak in Manipur, 26 miles from Imphal. The project was expected to cost Rs. 6 crores and generate 105 MWs of electricity. On the 23rd of April, 1978 I went there. I went down 90 metres through the shaft to the place where the workers are working, through the slush and mud; I went there four days ago. Now that project is estimated to cost Rs. 80 crores.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH; Why?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: This is implementation. Everybody is asking about the HEC. This is the implementation. That project that was designed to cost Rs. 16 crores will now end up with Rs. 80 crores. It is not Rs. 16 crores, it is Rs. 8 crores. That will now end up with Rs. 80 crores.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: We made it run in profit last year, Mr. George Fernandes. Why is it running in loss this year?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I think the hon. Member has a fixation with HEC. I will tell you why the HEC suffered a loss. The HEC'S production came down last year to Rs. 40 crores for two reasons. One, during the Emergency a large number of workers and supervisors were thrown out of employment, and as soon as the Emergency was ended, workers went on strike. That is number one. Two, Mr. Vice-Chairman, for the last several years there has been no additional generating capacity of electricity in Bihar, as a result of which not only the HEC was affected but even Tata's TELCO could not produce all the trucks that were expected to be produced last year.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: This is not Chowpatty.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: This is Rajya Sabha; I am very much aware of the fact that this is Rajya Sabha. *(Interruptions)* When things hurt, Mr. Vice-Chairman, people remember Chowpatty. If they don't hurt, if things go in their style, then of course this is hon. House. Otherwise it is Chowpatty.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: He is misleading the House, *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: There is a limit, Mr. Vice-Chairman. He wanted an answer. He <ept on interrupting. I did not inter-upt him for all the things he said about my Government, about my parly, about our individuals. I did not say a word. I did not interrupt him for half-an-hour when he held on.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: Mr. Minister, when you are misleading the House, it is *my luty . . . (Interruptions)*.

SHRI GEORGE FER> ANDES: Mr. Vice-Chairman, you must protect even the Minister's interest here. I am not yielding. Constantly he is interrupting.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: If you wish, I will not interrupt, but you should not mislead the ' louse.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: The production in the HEC seems to be the fixation of the hon. Member. I said I shall answer every question. But he says HEC. If I am discussing electricity, he says HEC. If [am discussing cement, he says HEC Finally I said this is the answer. I s m giving this answer on the floor of the House. *(Interruption)* HEC is the Heavy Engineering Corporation in ^anchi in Bihar, where production last year came down to Rs. 40 crores and for these two good reasons, wl ere the workers, because they were dismissed and summarily thrown out, a large number of them, for wrong reasons. , .

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: A reign of terror was let loose.

SHRI PILOO MODY; Demoralisation.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: . . . they went on strike. We lad to set matters right. And power to the extent that was required in that area for the HEC was not available. And these two factors were the most im-

[Shri George Fernandes]

portant factors. There were other factors also. After all, one has to go in for orders, and one makes efforts to get orders. So there are other factors, but these are the two primary factors. So, Mr. Vice-Chairman, when one discusses the large sector and the role of the large sector, my submission is in various areas of our industrial activity and economic activity, in steel, in cement, in aluminium in heavy engineering and all that which goes as the infrastructure, there is a tremendous scope for the large sector even while the main thrust of our policy today is to go to the rural areas, to the small, cottage, household, industries and create jobs for those people who during the last several years have been given no hope.

Then, certain other questions have been raised, particularly about multi-nationals and foreign investments. I thought our Industrial Policy Statement was very clear on this subject. We have said that we shall allow foreign collaboration wherever necessary; wherever we need modern technology, we shall get that technology from wherever it is available. We shall not fight shy of going in search of that technology. Why should we fight shy? There is no reason why we should fight shy to get that technology, provided it is necessary, it is relevant, it is appropriate and is within our reach, within our means.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA
(Gujarat): From wherever it is available?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES; Yes, from wherever it is available, from any part of the world, any part of the world, from Vietnam and China and the Soviet Union or from West Germany, Britain, United States or Canada, and if there is any other country that you want to name, I am prepared to accept that also; from

anywhere it is available, provided, as I said—some of these conditions are fulfilled.

Now, we are supposed to be breeding multi-nationals. Our Industrial Policy is supposed to be breeding multi-nationals. Our suggestions that once you bring your equity to 40 per cent, you will be treated as an Indian company for all purposes, is supposed to be breeding multi-nationals. I have said constantly. And I know when you go on repeating something, it sounds rather stale in your own mouth. We did not invent the multi-nationals. They have been there. I should not be saying this; maybe, I should not say it; but nevertheless the International Business Machines packed up and went, because our Government was not prepared to come to terms with them on their terms. International Business Machines is housed in a house in Delhi whose name I would not like to take just now. They provided advance rent to put up a house in Delhi—I do not want to take the name of that house just now.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Name.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES; I shall not. And people accused us, people accused our Government, people accused our Prime Minister! It beats me. D3M left. Coca Cola, as I said a candidate in Delhi.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA:
Gold Spot?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES:
Gold Spot, I do not think, so, I do not think it was a candidate in Delhi or anywhere. But surely I know Coca Cola was a candidate, because I saw it myself. Coca Cola was a candidate. I used to be driven from Tihar Jail to the Tis Hazari Courts everyday in handcuffs

and chains. At that time I used to see pictures of Coca Cola with folded hands, one at the top and another at the bottom, one lady and a gent, both with folded hands, with Coca Cola, seeking votes. That is how I know it. One lady and a gent, with folded hands...

SHRI PILOO MODY: With a bottle in between.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Well, bottles were there, all over the place, for the people. And we were supposed to be bringing multinationals. They go on repeating it *ad nauseam*. When I went to Germany, they asked: Why did you go to Germany? Well, this was not the first time I went to Germany was in 1954, that is, 24 years ago. I would like to know: Who has not gone to West Germany? What is this question? You went to West Germany, and now West Germans are coming to this country. If there is nothing else to say, they bring in West Germany, Willy Brandt. Yes, Willy Brandt. He was one of those who supported not just me, but who stood by those who fought for restoration of liberty and freedom in this country. As Chairman of Socialist International, he is known to most of the people in the world. He spoke of freedom, liberty and democracy in this country. We did not have freedom in those days to speak on these subjects. So, the bogey of West Germany was raised. Somebody said that I went to the Soviet Union and came back convinced that multinationals are good for our country also. I am not sure who made that suggestion that I went to the Soviet Union and came back convinced that multi-nationals have a place in India. There are 200 multi-nationals in the Soviet Union, including Pepsi Cola.

AN HON. MEMBER: Coca Cola also.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Thank you for the information. All right, there are two hundred multinationals, including some of the largest banks from America and some of the largest multi-national} from all over the world.

I have always said that the most revolutionary people on the earth are the Vietnamese, in terms of sheer will to fight and will to change things. The Vietnamese have a law on foreign capital. The Vietnamese invited the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry and gave them a right royal red carpet reception in truly literal terms. They suggested to the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry: "Please come to our country and set up industries". The Vietnamese allow 100 per cent foreign equity investment provided hundred percent products are for export. They provide 50 per cent foreign equity and 50 per cent State equity, provided 50 per cent of the products are for export and 50 per cent of the products are for domestic consumption and the profits are shared fifty-fifty. The Vietnamese allow 30 per cent of foreign equity and 70 per cent of State equity if all the products are for domestic consumption and the profits are shared thirty-seventy. This is the Vietnamese law.

I am sure everybody hails the Vietnamese. And of course in this country and outside we have people who have hailed the Soviet Union. But when it comes to discussion on foreign equity, when it comes to discussion on getting the best of technology, or when it comes to the question of buying the best of technology or collaborating with others on terms suggested by us, then the Janata Party Government is accused of selling national security, letting down the country and sending the country down the drain. That is why in our industrial policy statement, we have stated our position clearly. That" is the position we hold on to. As long

[Shri George Fernandes]

as foreign companies are operating in this country today and if foreign companies are desirous of coming to this country tomorrow they must conform to the rules we have, including the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act and Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act and any other legislation that we may introduce from time to time. As long as these companies conform to these laws and stay within the perimeters prescribed for them, we shall allow them to operate. I have said this on the floor of the House before and I would not repeat it. If any hon. Member believes that the Janata Government is not capable of looking after the interests of this country, I would request that hon. Member to speak for himself and not for the Janata Party, nor for the country. This Government is capable of taking care of the country's interests and we are taking care of the country's interests. If hon. Members on that side have different experience about themselves, let them speak for themselves, not for the people of this country. This country is too big and the people of this country are far greater than most people think they are. Therefore, if any petty multi-nationals or their standard bearers like the Coca Cola or their muscle men like the IBM had influenced some people in the Government as they did, they shall not influence this Government. In fact they have failed to influence this Government and that is why they have packed up and left. They have packed up and left this country. Let not the people again make a bogey of multinationals. Some people make a bogey of multinationals or public sector and then start attacking us. It would not work for all time. Then, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will come to the question of our own performance during the last one year. My friend, Shri Maurya, devoted most of his speech to telling us how badly we performed last year. We could not have performed better, Mr. Vice-Chairman. As I said earlier, we were

returned to power in the last week of March and we formed the Government in the last week of March. Immediately we presented a Vote on Account, a Vote on Account on a Budget drafted by the predecessor Government. We could not have helped it. After all, the Government had to go on. The States, the Centre, the public sector, the private sector or any other sector, had to go on and the Government had to be carried on and the people had to be paid and the jobs had to be carried on. Just because a set of people who were in office were thrown out of office in this country and a new set of people had come to power, it did not mean that things could wait. So, we went in for a Vote on Account and for two months we did whatever exercise was possible within our limitations and within those constraints. Comrade Ramamurti was terribly upset over Mr. George Fernandes having to operate within constraints. I would like to tell him—of course, he is not here and he told me that he would not be here—having provoked me, it is not fair not to be here. He talked of my having to operate within constraints. But what about him? What about West Bengal? When I suggested that Lily Biscuits be taken over by the Modern Bakeries, the West Bengal Government said, "Not Bakeries, but Britannia Biscuits."

AN HON. MEMBER; shame.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Don't say 'shame'; but 'constraints'; You must understand that, after all, they are running a Government that they have inherited. They have inherited a Government from Mr. Siddhartha Shankar Ray. They cannot change things overnight and I am sure they want to change, but they cannot change things overnight. There are sick industries in Bengal, galore. Mr. Jyoti Bosu, with the best of intentions, cannot change things overnight. They need power in Bengal. There has been no planning for power in West Bengal. The Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation is a

nundred per cent bterring Company with its Headquarters in London in the United Kingdom and this is thirty years after our independence.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Shame.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Jyoti Bosu had no alternative but to suggest to the Government of India, "Please give us 220 MW of power generating capacity". The Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation is there. Here I share the views of my honourable friends, the honourable Members on the other side, when they say, "These are sharks. Be careful about them. We have had experience. Some of us escaped. But many of us have gone through their stomachs". When they say all these things and they sound these warnings, I know that they speak from experience, because the Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation, an English Company, a British Company, a hundred-per-cent Sterling Company, went to Mr. Jyoti Bosu and said: "We shall double the capacity and we shall give you 220 MW of power. We shall give you our expertise, our skills, and our engineers are available. We shall expand it provided you find the money". And, Sir, I know that such an experience must have been an odd kin, of experience for Comrade Jyoti Bosu to think of industry, to think of having power, and then to raise the money and make it available to the Sterling Company and to let them give him 220 MW of electricity for the Calcutta electricity system; Constraints: But one had to operate and we had to operate within constraints and in two months we did some exercises. I said earlier how, as a part of these exercises, we were able to make available forty-crores of rupees to sink wells for drinking water in the villages. We did it. To the extent it was possible, we brought about a change. Then we have said about the job of doing serious exercises to bring about "rasic and radical changes in the entire planning, in the entire structure. That is how the Industrial Policy

Resolution came into existence and we were able to present it on the 23rd December, hardly three or four months before.

Then, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Plan that was there which was designed to create unemployment in the country, a Plan which went on creating unemployment in this country.. .

(Interruptions) SHRI, N. G.

RANGA: Is it?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I think Rangaji would agree with me on this at least. You agree on the right things that we say. So, Sir, on this Plan, we had to say, "Enough is enough.", and instead of allowing the Fifth Five Year Plan to run its full course of creating unemployment in this country, we decided to put a stop to it on the 31st March. So, we operated within the constraints of the Fifth Five Year Plan, a Plan that was designed to create unemployment in the country. I am not trying to explain away the problem; I am serious, Mr. Vice-Chairman. To the extent it was possible for us, we did it. I am prepared to sit with my hon. friends and discuss the number of additional jobs that have been created during the last 12 months. In one small sector of carpet weaving, we created 20,400 jobs through training centres. We moved away from machine-made carpets to hand-made carpets. We moved away from what has been done with machine to what can be done with the hands. And, therefore, these jobs were created. We had to work within the constraints of the Fifth Five Year Plan. Here was a Plan that was devised by you and which was inherited by us and which, whether we liked it or not, we had to implement.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: What about the First, Second, Third and Fourth Plans?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Maurya, if I were only to remind

[Shri George Fernandes]

you of the speeches you made in 1967, if only I had known where you would be at this time, I would have taken some of the speeches in the Sunder-bhai Hall, not on the Chowpathy, and I would have...

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: Your Prime Minister was a party to it— the First, Second, Third and...

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Since you are now holding the baby, why put it on my Prime Minister. My Prime Minister has openly said that it was wrong. My Prime Minister says that it was wrong. My Prime Minister has the greatness, has the humility, to accept that it was wrong. But you are not showing that humility. He is displaying that humility.

In the course of the debate, a number of hon. Members made the point that Nehru was the father of the public sector...
(Interruptions)

जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने देश में पब्लिक
सेक्टर को जन्म दिया, यह बात हिन्दी में हुई
थी।

SHRI PILOO MODY: That makes him the 'mother'... (Interruptions).

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want to ask: What is public sector? Are the Railways public sector or private sector? The Railways were private sector in the year 1935, 1936 or 1937. Who nationalised the Railways and made it a public sector? Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do not want to go into the question of fatherhood or motherhood, but...

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: The Railways are also industry.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Not only the Railways, but everything is industry, according to the Supreme Court. According to the Supreme Court, even this Government is industry. What the Supreme

Court lays down is the law of the land. According to the latest judgment of the Supreme Court, even Government is industry. And I am glad that I stand vindicated.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: Where is the bonus?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We will produce that also. We will produce everything. We won't let you have a chance on that.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, we had thus to function within certain constraints, within the constraints of a certain Budget. But we have set things right. The Sixth Five Year Plan is already into motion, with Rs. 116 crores more investment during the next five years than all the investment during the last 30 years. This is what has gone into the Sixth Five Year Plan. You are perfectly justified in asking why we were not able to do this and that. I would say that we did it to the extent it was possible for us. For instance, in March, 1978, the cement industry in this country gave a production of 104.4 per cent of its installed capacity.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: Why don't you talk of the entire period? It is 87.67 per cent only.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: The production for the year 1977-78 was 89 per cent. The production for the previous year, i.e. 1976-77, was 87 per cent and the production for the year before that was 86 per cent. Compared to the previous years, we had the highest production in March of this year. Thanks to effective monitoring. Thanks to the total commitment of the men who work there and thanks to the best of efforts by all those who were concerned with it in the Ministry of Industry* with the production and distribution of cement, we have been able to achieve 104.4 per cent cement production in the month of March, 1978. Our efforts are to keep it up.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: Let us not confuse the issue. What was the production for the entire year?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I said that it was 89 per cent for the entire year. Compared to last two years, it was up by 2 per cent. (Interruptions) Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am aware of the fact that the hon. Member was a junior Minister for Industry till the Government was thrown out. I am fully aware of this act. I am prepared to stand on a motion of privilege if I mislead the House. I may submit that against 87 per cent in 1976-77, the production of cement in 1977-78 was 89 per cent. Also, the production of cement in the month of March, 1978, the last month of the year, was 104.4 per cent.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: What was the total production of cement in million tonnes? It was 18.79 million tonnes in 1976-77. This time, it was 19 million tonnes, *i.e.* almost the same, Mr. George Fernan-des.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: As far as figures as concerned, stand by my statistics. If somebody asks me how many million tonnes the production was, my mind is not a computer and it is going to take me some time to cull out the figures. I can send them tomorrow or I can give them in this House the first time there is an opportunity to make a statement on this. Despite the constraints. ...

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Why do you import 60 crores worth of cement?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We are importing cement because for the first time in several years, the economy has started looking up. There is construction activity all round all over the country.

SHRI PILOO MODY: In any case, you won't understand it.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You are absolutely right in your concern as to why we are importing cement. We are importing cement because we are not producing adequate cement. Why are we not producing adequate cement? It is because the installed capacity for production of cement in the country did not increase during the last three years. It stood stationary. You should have put an additional capacity of two million tonnes every year. Instead of putting two million tonnes of additional capacity every year, you installed only 2 lakh tonnes of additional capacity every year because you did not have the perspective or because you wanted to create black market in the country through the economy of shortages. I did not want to say the latter part. But since you insisted on it, I say it.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: There was no black market in 1976-77. Today, there is black market. There was no black market in 1975. There was no black market in 1976. There was no black market in 1977. But there is black market in 1978.

7 p.m.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Vice-Chairman; Sir, my friend as I said earlier, was a junior Minister for Industry, I can appreciate his sense of guilt or his discomfiture or his embarrassment. I can appreciate all that. But, I think, at the moment, discretion would be the better part of valour and silence, perhaps, would be much more discrete than all the eloquence because the statistics are against them, the history is against them, the facts are against them and everything is loaded against them. Why did you not produce cement capacity? There was no capacity, and you did not leave behind any capacity for us to produce. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, if the House desires, I am prepared to have a full-dress debate on cement. Let us have a debate on cement. Let us find out where the things went wrong, why

[Shri George Fernandes]

the things went wrong and who made the things go wrong. I am prepared for a full-dress debate on the cement industry in this country, a debate on mini cement plant, on the majd cement plant, on the people who are in the cement industry, the "mairer in which it has been run, and on every aspect of the cement industry.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: "Will you please tell us why you have entered into an agreement with Czechoslovakia for three giant cement plants when you are advocating the case of mini cement plants and when there are small reserves in the country for the use of the mini cement p'ants? Why have you entered into an agreement with them?"

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: As I said earlier, we need to double our cement capacity in the next seven years. Our capacity to produce the machinery, to produce the equipment is limited. We need to hurry. We have no time to lose because as far as cement is concerned, it is one of the impprtant and essential inputs. That is the only reason. If this explanation does not satisfy the hon. Member, I am prepared for a debate on this question. I would very much want the country to be told what has glone wrong with cement, when things went wrong and why the things went wrong. I would like the country to be educated on this subject. Let us have a debate on this subject. I am not running' away. I am prepared to have a debate. Why don't the hon. Members respond? Let us have a debate on cement at any time.

SHRI PILOO MODY: They don't want cement. They want *salami*-

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, where the performance of last year is concerned, we operated within certain constraints. We had our problems. But within those constraints, we did what we could. Sir, figures were trotted out. I am sorry, my friend, Mr.

Sankar Ghose, who did most of the figure-trotting is not around.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sir, tet u* continue the debate tomorrow.

SHRI GEORGE FEFJNANDES: Sir, I shall complete in five or ten minutes. Sir, a point was made about the growth having dome down. What was the growth? Everyone is now concentrating on the year 1976-77. That was the year of greatness, the year of greatness in terms of production, in terms of achievement, and in terms of everything. And Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am sure you know that it was not but it was Disraeli who said that there are lies, there are damned lies and there are statistics. And people used statistics to suit their convenience. They say that 1976-77 is the great year in the history of our country ana the industrial production went up by 10.6 per cent. And that is being told to the world—"This is what we did and came the Janata Government and the industrial production came down to 5 per cent." Correct. The industrial production last year was 5 per cent. But may I ask the hon. Members to look at the other statistics that the gross national income in the year 1976-77, in that great year, went up only by 2 per cent whereas in the first year of the Janata administration, the gross national product of this country went up by alnwst 6 per cent? Now, nobody wants to discuss that. 10.6 per cent of industrial production—excellent—came down to 5 per cent. Bad. I am not happy with it. I would have liked it to be ten per cent. I vjould like to keep UP that momentum. It was not possible, as I said, for a variety of reasons. But, in terms of the gross national product, you won't like to discuss that because those statistics are not convenient. You say, let us take only the figures df industrial production. Why do you take the statistics for only one year? Let us take the statistics for the last ten years. What was the production? In 1971-72 the industrial production

went up by 4.8 per cent, in 1972-73 by 4 per cent, in 1973-74 by 2.2 per cent, in 1974-75 by 2.6 per cent, in 1975-76 by 6.1 per cent, to give you the average of 3.4 per cent. As against your average of 3.4 per cent over six years or seven years, this year's industrial production has been 5 per cent. What is wrong? As I said, I am not happy. Along with that 5 per cent industrial production growth, due to the efforts that we have made, due to the efforts that our Government has made, in the agricultural sector we have been able to register a gross national product increase of 6 per cent against the 2 per cent that was made by them in the last year of their rule. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, where statistics are concerned, well, one can go on discussing statistics, but let me again make a mention of this 10.6 per cent industrial growth—they are very interesting statistics, I know—many of my own colleagues will not be happy, particularly, Shri Pилоo Mody will not be happy with me on this one point.

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO (Orissa): Shall we keep statistics for some other day? Can we not confine ourselves to the first two points?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I need to answer the point of statistics because that was the essential thrust against us, namely, that industrial production came down, that it was 10.6 per cent last year, that it has come down to per cent this year. You went on hammering on this point and now when I am coming out with counter statistics and say that against your 2 per cent gross national product we registered a gross national product increase of 6 per cent, you do not want me to speak and you say let us not have statistics. Mr. Vice-Chairman, you must protect me. (Interruptions).

Mr. Vice-Chairman, out of this 10.6 per cent, beer and tobacco contributed one per cent of the addi-

tional growth, then power generation 2 per cent. Coal and steel, whose stocks remained at the pitheads and in the stock yards, contributed -9 Per cent and then an additional reason was the; extraordinary increase in cars, jeeps and chemicals, where there had been distortions in the previous years. Therefore, there was an extraordinary increase of 19 per cent and 25 per cent. There was a net total additional contribution of 5 per cent minus beer; minus tobacco, minus Ambassador minus the chemicals, minus all these the growth rate was just 5 per cent only. But then, statistics, as I said, people use without trying to understand them with-put trying to delve into them. Statistics are not just to be quoted. They must be used effectively. Otherwise one lands in serious trouble.

AN HON. MEMBER: They need to do more home work.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Therefore, where our own performance of the last year is concerned, we shall never rest contented. We shall never feel happy or satisfied with anything that we did because we have a mission, because we have a job to do.

A certain point was made by my friend Dr. Rafiq Zakaria. I need to answer that because the Birlas were brought in and since there is no love lost between some of us, I might as well clear the misunderstanding. We have been under tremendous pressures in the last few months in regard to this container problem, Mr. Vice-Chairman. A lot of companies have been pressurising, lobbying and to the best of my ability we have done away with all these com- men, con-women, lobbying and perfume in the corridors this year. There is fresh, clean air now. And Sometimes, the attack comes from the most unexpected quarters. Here again, it gets distorted. Now, this country is supposed to have more than enough for the next 10 years. What are the needs of this [country for the next 10 years? What

[Shri George Fernandes]

are the needs of this country in respect of these marine freight containers in the next 10 years? If someone can tell me, as my friend Dr. Zakaria said that the needs of this country are more than met by the existing capacity for the next 10 years, I am sure Dr. Zakaria has not the cue of this country in the next 10 years because whosoever asked him, does not himself know what are the needs of this country in the next 10 years.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: Licence to a Birla concern has been given for export. It has not been for internal capacity and I did not raise that point. I also told you what is the core capacity and the various reasons for which, in fact if you will go through the report of your Screening Committee, you will find that they have themselves opined that it is not possible even if the capacity is created, for that export to be made.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I shall go through this entire case and if it is necessary for me to come before this House with any explanation, with any clarification or any correction, I shall come before this House. But since this point has been made, let me clear the situation. Our own requirement of marine freight containers is negligible. We have just now only two units in production. The total installed capacity is only 8600 numbers per annum, and not 30,000. Both these units have been set up with an export commitment of 75 per cent because there is no domestic market. Since Letters of Intent have been issued to 4 more units; Balmer Laurie, Bridge and Roof, Indian Tools Manufacturers and Sea Lord Containers, to the first three, 5,000 numbers each per annum, and to the last one for 6,000 numbers per annum. All of them have received Letters of Intent and have not as yet been issued a licence. All these 4 units have been told—and the Letters of Intent are conditional—that 75 per cent of their production will be for export and 25 per cent for domestic-

tic market. Therefore, it is not that only this Indian Tools has been asked export. Every single unit in this country which has been given a licence or a Letter of Intent to produce marine freight containers, has to export 75 per cent (75) of its production.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: On a point of interruption You cannot export because the capacity of the Bombay Port, unless the capacity is increased by Nhava-Sheva Port, is limited, which may take another 10 years.. I challenge the Minister. It is impossible; you may put any condition of 75 per cent but if it is manufactured you will not be in a position to export because the capacity of the Bombay Port is—as it is—so extremely limited that your 2 public sector units and 2 private sector units will not be—as far as their capacity is concerned—able to export. And another thing which is very interesting and which the Minister is not replying is that on the 13th of December, the Government tells this Birla concern that their application rejected and it cannot be granted and that the Screening Committee has come to the conclusion that there is no further need for increased capacity, and on the 31st of December, within 17 days, the entire attitude of the Government changes to this whole question.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I have already said that I shall examine this entire case but I am only trying to remove some of the—shall I say—misconceptions that in so far as licensing in the marine freight containers industry is concerned, every licence carries 75 per cent export obligation. That is number one. Secondly, when these licences were given, since the hon. Member was kind enough to brief me before he made this observation in the House and I was able to get some of the information immediately available; I will go through the file and if anything wrong has been done, or there has been any special favour shown to anybody, if

the rules have been broken Or violated, Well, that will not be allowed. We shall see that things are set right. in that kind of a situation. Now, this point about this Birla company has been raised. We are formulating new policies and we are now trying to see how to dismantle these family-owned houses and how to dismantle these large houses. But during the last thirty years, these large houses have been very assiduously and very carefully planted, nurtured and built UP- N]ow, they are there, staring at us like mjonsters, as my friends, Comrade Shiva Chandra Jha, was saying. Therefore, they are there. They have built them up and they are now threatening us with them. They are asking us 'Why don't you dismantle these large houses?' in the hope that these tycoons and these big business houses will then provide them with the necessary muscle power to deal with us. We are aware of this. We will take them on. We are aware of this. We will take everyday on this. (Interruptions). We are absolutely aware of this. We are aware of this whole game. They are now asking us 'why don't you dismantle them?' That is where the strength is. That is where the clout is. That was the clout which came out in the streets of Delhi ipn the 26th June, 1975. We shall not forget it. Mr. Vice-Chairman, we shall not forget that on the 26th June, 1975, . the man who led the first demonstration in support of the dictatorship in this country was a man called Mr. K. K. Birla and no one else. We shall not forget this. We are njot g'going to forget this. We are aware of the size of the problem. The Government is aware of the size of the problem. We have fought this. That is blow we are here.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: Why do ypu give special licences to them?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We have not given. This is the point I am coming to. In spite of my best intentions, in spite of the best intentions of my Government and in spite

of my best efforts, it has ntot been possible for us to identify every house by the various ramifications that it has had. I go by the definition that I have inherited fr^om your Government. Now, the definition that I have inherited from your Government says that India Tools is not a part of the Birla family. (Interruptions). I have the definition given by your Government that India Tools does npt belong to the Birla family. You have said it. I am not saying it.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: If you will only spend five minutes of your time on this.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES; I shall spend five days on this. But as of now, as I stand before you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, as I stand before this House, I shall carry with me the definition given by the predecessor Government given by my critics just now.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: It can be changed.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: This definition says that India Tools is not a Birla company. Mr. Vice-Chairman, this raises a very fundamental point. The fundamental point is that the Government and the people of this country have been misled. It raises the point that you had deals with the Birlas and you did not show India Tools as a part of the Birla empire. You made a deal with them and kept it out of the Birla empire. Now, I have to carry that baby. If this is true, if what Dr. Rafiq Zakaria has said is true, then, your Government has committed a fraud on us, your Government has committed a fraud on the people of this country. Your Government has not o'nly built up these big business houses, but your Government has also, very surreptitiously, and in a very cunning way, damaged the interests of the people of this country by not naming some of these enterprises as part of the large houses.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA; In the prospectus that has been issued, Mr. Ashok Birla has been shown as . . .

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am not yielding. Secondly, in the year 1975, on the 16th December, 1975, the Department of Company Affairs, which, I think, was then headed by my dear friend, not of those days, but of a few days before that, Mr. H. R. Gokhale, if I am not mistaken, has given a letter to this company, which letter is to the records of my files now, in the context of the licence that has been given, that this is not a MRTP house, that this is not related to any family. On the 16th December, 1975, a letter went from Mr. H. R. Gokhale, the architect of the new Constitution.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: He is no more.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: He was a friend of mine. He was an erstwhile colleague of mine. He was a very close and very dear friend of mine. That is not the issue, but I am basing myself on those records. And as late as only a few days ago when certain representations came to our Ministry from some of the rivals of competitors of this company that this is an MRTP house, the Department of Company Affairs has told us that the India Tools are not registered under the MRTP Act, nor has any show cause notice been issued to them. This means, as far as my records show, it is not a part of the Birla House. Now I will certainly go into it, I will find out who is responsible for keeping it outside the Birla house, what the manipulations are and we shall set things right.

Mr. vice-Chairman, I have taken a lot of time of the House. I know there are one or two questions which Mr. Maurya has raised. I hope he will

appreciate if I do not deal with the questions relating particularly to TAFCO and Bharat Leather and the personnel who are involved in it. I will talk to him later about it. I think I have discussed the general issues and he will appreciate if I do not deal with these questions now.

With these words I thank you very much, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

The Appropriation (No. 3) Bill 1978

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:—

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1978, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 27th April, 1978.

2. The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."

Sir, I lay a copy of the Bill on the Table.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED NIZAM-UD-DIN): The House stands adjourned till 1.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at twenty-two minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 28th April, 1978.