

it was settled like this. Dr. Ram Kripal Sinha, on behalf of the Business Advisory Committee, will go to the Prime Minister and ask him to give a statement in the House on what he wants to do on these books. This decision was taken. I want to know from the Chairman and Dr. Sinha if this is true.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I stand by my right. . . (Interruptions).

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्री
(श्री राजनारायण) : लीडर भी कह रहा है . . .
(Interruptions;

जरा मुनिये रैमिनिसेसज आफ नेहरू
इस पर डिस्कशन चाहते हैं । मैं तो . . .

SHRI SAN AT KUMAR RAHA: Dr. Ram Kripal Sinha should say something.

श्री राजनारायण : लीडर आफ दी अपो-
ज़िशन की राय जाननी चाहिए ।

DR. RAM KRIPAL SINHA: You were also present in the meeting.

The members raised this point and this was included as a 'no-day-yet-named' motion.. .
(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Short duration discussion also.

DR. RAM KRIPAL SINHA: The rest the hon. Member has put before you. So, it was decided like that and I was asked to consult and it was decided that a decision would be taken after that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, Sir, you keep it pending. If this is the Motion, I would move a motion, I would move an amendment to your Motion, to the Business Advisory Committee's recommendations, that this be included and, tomorrow, when you bring forward the Motion, it would be put to vote.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It will be considered. The Chairman has gone through the proceedings of the

House. Shri Rajnarain has not said anything objectionable or derogatory to the Chair.

सदन की कार्यवाही 2 बजे तक के
लिए स्थगित की जाती है ।

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

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

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, on a point of order. You informed the House that Mr. Rajnarain has not made the remark attributed to him by Shri Amjad Ali. When that issue was raised, Mr. Rajnarain said that it was not he who made that remark and that it was Prof. Ranga who made the remark. The Members asked the Chair to look into the proceedings and inform the House who has made the remark, and that whoever has made the remark should apologise to the House. I will request you, Sir, to look into the second aspect of the matter.

THE GRESHAM AND CRAVEN OF INDIA (PRIVATE LIMITED (AC- QUISITION AND TRANSFER OF UN- DERTAKING BILL, 1977—contd.

SHRI KALYAN ROY; Sir, I was just referring to one stark naked fact that on the one hand the public sector was improving its performance and was doing a magnificent job; on the other side, in the private sector the picture is dark, dismal and one of total gloominess. Then, I come to the point, what was the sickness. And there, unfortunately, there is one dimension, enormous dimension.

However rigorously Mr. Fernandes may try to find out the other dimension, there is no other dimension. As

[Shri Kalyan Roy.] a matter of fact, so far as this Gresham and Craven of India (Private) Limited of Calcutta is concerned, there was a question of mine dated the 6th April, 1972. I asked whether the Government was aware that according to a recent survey so many units had closed down and, if so, whether it was because of mismanagement. The reply at that time given by Shri Moinul Haque Choudhury was: "The following industrial units in West Bengal which had closed because of various reasons, including mismanagement, have been taken over under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act." I am replying not only to the point of view of Mr. Fernandes regarding the other dimension, but I am also referring to a regular propaganda barrage which has been built up by the private sector today saying that this takeover is a dogmatic approach. The management is not entirely responsible. They are not so dishonest and scandalous as we make them. They are better than what they are actually. They also carry on a propaganda now supported by the big business press saying that it is because of labour indiscipline, go slow, and the strike that the factory has closed down. The Government of West Bengal made two analytical studies regarding the causes for closure of industries. In reply to my question of 8th April, 1972, it was stated that the first study of 54 units closed down employing more than 100 workers per unit showed that labour unrest was the cause in the case of 29 units. A subsequent analysis of 76 cases of closure which occurred during the year 1971 and continued to remain closed on December 1971, revealed that the causes were as follows: labour violence—nil; Gherao—nil and litigation and inter-management disputes—10.5 per cent. These are stark realities which any analysis of the situation will reveal and it was revealed by a Committee set up by the Government of India to go into the causes. Now, Sir, I come to the question of compulsory cost auditing of industries. It should have been introduced long back. But

the previous regime delayed it and did not like this cost auditing of industries. Then a question was asked on 28th November, 1977. Shri Shanti Bhushan replied. I asked about the number of units subjected to cost auditing system and the findings thereof. The findings are under-utilisation of capacity in some cases and high profitability in some cases. These are the factors and the causes which are making the good industries and the basic industries which are absolutely essential for the people sick. Sickness was nurtured in this manner with the collusion of the past Government. But they at least took some steps. This Government is faltering. That is my allegation. Sir, the question about underutilisation of capacity in the private sector industries again came up. The question was asked on 19th August, 1976 when Mr. Pai was the Minister. He gave a long list of unrelated issues. He was avoiding, if I may be permitted to say so, to reply to the question which was put to him categorically as to how far this underutilisation was deliberate.

Sir, even Mr. Raghunatha Reddy said on 21st May, 1976 that more man-days were lost not because of workers' action but because of the action of the management. Sir, I am quoting what Mr. Pai said; "Industrialists are not utilising the capacity because it may be that some of the units are having problems and we are looking into them. We are calling for statements in most of the major industries as to why some of the units are not capable of going as high as others have gone." I would like to know from Mr. Fernandes whether this has been further pursued. Then, Sir, when I further pressed him that I would like to know whether some action would be taken against those employers who are deliberately cutting down production, Mr. Pai replied: "We propose to bring forward an amendment to the industries (Development and Regulation) Act, and if there is any deliberate cutting down of production in order to manipulate the market, then we shall severely deal with that unit." I would like to know from

Mr. Fernandes—of course, he is there for the last 8 months and he has recently taken over the Industries Ministry—as to what action has been taken against those industrialists and manufacturers who are deliberately cutting down production. Or, is it his case that there is not a single industry, not a single unit which is guilty of this offence? What about the jute industry? What about certain textile units? What about certain engineering units? Is he aware of them? But neither the past Government nor the present Government have taken any action against those who are deliberately unutilising their capacity or are not fully utilising their capacity. And there, I say, Sir, the units have been slaughtered deliberately because the money is being invested elsewhere where the profit is high.

Sir, I may give some examples, not many. Take, for example, the National Rolling and Steel Ropes Ltd. This reply was given on 5th December, 1977 by Mr. Shanti Bhushan. What are the irregularities as found out by an investigation conducted by the Company Affairs Department? I quote from the reply: "Irregularities in the sale of some of the machineries of the Galvanising Plant and 4-Block Wire Drawing Machine, valuation and consumption of lead and zinc, purchase of raw materials like M. S. rods, billets and square bars; (iv) Certain payments were found to have been made without proper supporting vouchers." Then, Sir, there are various other charges of misappropriation of provident fund. The Kinnison Jute Mills Company has defaulted in making provident fund dues to the extent of Rs. 99 lakhs. Amounts payable to the Jute Corporation of India by the Kinnison Jute industries amount to about Rs. 83 lakhs for the jute purchased by them. So, Sir, this is the picture. I have pointed out about the Kinnison Jute Mills. Mr. Fernandes must be aware that these Mills have not paid nearly Rs. 83 lakhs to the Jute Corporation of India. No step has been taken. If the Government has been serious to tackle

the economic crimes of the industrialists, by this time they could have taken some steps. But no steps have been taken. As a matter of fact, one after the other these mills are being closed. But the investigation by the Company Affairs Department, the investigation by the Finance Ministry show that the mills are being closed not because I go on slow or I go on strike or I am not giving proper co-operation to the management, but because you are taking all the money and investing it in multi-storied buildings or in buying up property and this and that.

Then, Sir, there is the Aluminium Corporation of India which belongs to the house of the Singhanias and one of the biggest units. They have closed down for the last four years. That is one of the best aluminium factories near Asansol. And what are the findings of the Department of Company Affairs? I asked this question on the 5th December, and Mr. Shanti Bhushan replied. I am quoting a few paragraphs from his reply.

Amongst the many economic offences he has pointed out that one is apprehension of undervaluation of the property sold and the other is the issue of bonus shares on capitalisation at reserves and surplus in the year 1971-72 and non-compliance of various other provisions of the Company,lew. •

Even the massive financial assistance which was given by the I.R.C.I. to various managements has been misappropriated. Mr. Patel has himself admitted in this House that about 13 industries which have got massive assistance are not giving any report to the I.R.C.I. and they are on the verge of closure. One of the reasons is that the present board of directors also consists of the old directors, who go on playing the same game, making the industries sick. The I.R.C.I. has been a failure in my opinion because the I.R.C.I. has kept the old structure in tact. When they took over the Bengal Potteries they kept the old people

[Shri Kalyan Roy.]

there. Result, Sir, is that misappropriation and loot continues. The alternative was to drive away those people who were responsible for sickness, for misappropriation, for plunder, for loot but they have been kept in tact. Naturally, what do you expect from them? They carry on their old game. They take more money from banks, more money from the I.R.C.I. and invest it here and there. One of them, Shri Dharama Vira, I.C.S., formerly Governor of Bengal, who is also responsible for the present position of Bengal Potteries, has been now given a high position and he is requested to go into the various police laws in the country.

Sir, in the Hindustan Pilkington—I am giving one after another—, a multinational company, which was managed by Mr. Talukdar, who has recently died, all the balance sheets are false and the factory is on the verge of closure. It is employing about 1600 men and it is in Asansol and the Thapars are going to take it over and the same loot continues. There was a mention about the Mundhra Shalimar works in this House. I think last year the Minister for Company Law Affairs, Mr. Gokhale, admitted that the Mundhras have looted that concern. The C.B.I. investigation is over and cases have been filed. But, you know Sir, in the present judicial set up there is hardly any advance in these cases. The Birla cases are wailing for the last ten to fifteen years. The Mafatlal cases, the Mundhra cases and other cases, including income-tax cases, involving some present senior Cabinet Ministers are waiting for the last ten years, 15 years and 20 years. Am I right? This is the state of affairs in our judiciary.

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI BIJU PATNAIK): You are barking up the wrong tree.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: I mean to say that under the system of judiciary as it is at present we are not advancing at all.

This is what is being done by the private sector and the Government is totally callous about it. Not only that. Sir, Unfortunately, the public sector seems to be the victim now. Definitely there is a deliberate attempt, I do not know whether on the part of the entire Cabinet, but I feel, the Party feels, the working class feel, this working class in the public sector feels, very strongly that even though they have shown this magnificent achievement, even though they have shown this magnificent performance, the public sector is being cut down, and all preferential treatment which was previously given to the public sector is now being withdrawn.

Sir, I can give you one more case regarding coal washeries,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief. There are other speakers also.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: After all we get Rs. 51 per day. So we should not adjourn before 5 o'clock.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, but there are other speakers also.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: In regard to the coal washeries, there was a contract to be given. The tenders of the M.A.M.C. and the E.P.I. were lower. But thereport is that it has been given to Messrs. Tata Fraser and Robinson whose tender is high and who are introducing a third rate, outmoded and discredited technique from West Germany. Mr. Fernandes was there recently. He was in West Germany and he must be able to throw some light on it. This is the country from where Indian doctors and Indian nurses are being thrown out as per reports. This discrimination against the public sector is going on. Let him say whether it is true or not; let him satisfy us. He has got command over the language. He says that he can speak in three or four languages and, therefore, he should be able to satisfy us on this issue. This private sector, which should be the target of the Ministry, as I pointed out.

is the very sector which is being favoured. In reply to a question on the 6th December, 1977, in regard to the survey of luxury houses for tax purposes, the Minister admitted that that survey is now nearly stopped. These industrialists are closing down their factories in this country. My point is this. These industrialists are clamouring for more raw materials, more financial assistance, more financial help, more cutbacks, more drawbacks and so on. These are the people—this was revealed in reply to my question on 30.8.1976—who are setting up factories in Malaysia, in Thailand, in Philippines, in Singapore and so on. The company which has closed down its concern in Calcutta belonging to the Birlas, Messrs. Electric Construction and Equipment Limited, set up a factory Uganda. Birla did not know what was going to happen in the political scene in Uganda. After he set up the factory, it was nationalised.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: You must be happy.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: I am extremely happy. I am happy that the Ugandan people have taken over the vital means of production from the hands of a robber. This is a new feature. In our country, these industrialists who are getting such financial assistance from the public sector banks, from the LIC and so on and who are monopolising the bulk of money, are the very people who are laying off workers, who are retrenching workers and who are clamouring for more concessions and who are, at the same time, going abroad to set up new factories. This is a dangerous trend, this is a dangerous growth and this is against the unity of the developing countries. After all, what is the conclusion? The conclusion is this. Whatever Mr. Fernandes may try to do, our industrialists, like the industrialists in other countries, are for making maximum profits. They are for making super profits. Mr. Patnaik the

other day addressed some of the mine-owners. He said that these absentee mine-owners should go. He also said that they are expected to make reasonable profits and that they should not go in for excessive profits. But the tragedy or the basic fact is this. In the private sector, the position is either maximum profits or closing down the unit or reducing the number of workers and adding to the unemployment figure. You cannot get out of it. This is the logic. So long as the means of production, the basic means of production are in the hands of these 75 families, who are guilty of various offences, your attempt, however big it may be will not succeed and you will not be able to save the small scale industries about which you are shouting so much.

Sir, in reply to a question put by me yesterday, Mr. Shanti Bhushan gave the figures in regard to the perquisites and allowances given to the Chairman and the Directors of the Indian Explosives Limited, Union Carbide Limited, Dunlop Limited, Brooke-bond India Limited, Indian Duplicator Company Limited, Indian Aluminium Company Limited, Guest, Keen and Williams Limited, Philips Carbon Black Limited and Hindustan Lever Limited. Rs. 10,000 minimum per month. One per cent of their salary and then he says, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, I do not know what all this means. Then I went to the annexure. Here I find A stands for Provident Fund benefits, B for Pension/Superannuation fund benefits, C for Gratuity, D for Medical benefits, E for passage benefits, F for Leave Travel Concession, G for Leave, H for Free/Concessional furnished/unfurnished accommodation, I for Free use of Company's car, J for Personal Accident Benefits, K for free telephone facilities and L for Fees of clubs.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: K for Kalyan Roy.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA (Karnataka): What about the income-tax he pays on that?

SHRI KALYAN ROY: If you please go through the replies of Mr. Patel and the replies of Mr. Subramaniam previously, you will see the extent of evasion of income-tax by these houses. Perhaps he has not reached that level. (Interruptions). Well, I am not defending Mr. Subramaniam, nor am I defending you. This hunt for super profits and high perquisites, high salaries and high allowances in the private sector and funnelling of funds from one to the other is making them sick. If you really want to save the sick units, you have to take them over and the take-over of the Gresham and Craven is a step in the right direction. You should continue to move in this direction instead of being engulfed by the other lobby which is totally committed to the private sector.

Thank you.

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चूडावत (राजस्थान) : उपसभापति महोदय, आज जो बिल हमारे सामने पेश हुआ, जहां तक बिल का सवाल है हम सब ने इसका स्वागत किया है। यह एक ठीक कदम लिया है। लेकिन जब इंडस्ट्रीज का सवाल आता है जिसको सिक मिल के नाम के ऊपर टेक-ओवर किया जाता है तो उसके बारे में कई प्रश्न पैदा होते हैं। मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहती हूँ कि उनके विचार तो बहुत सुन्दर रहे हैं, वे मजदूरों के भारी स्पोक्समैन रहे हैं, मैं उनके सामने अपनी बात रखना चाहूंगी कि आज हमारे मुल्क के अन्दर कितनी सिक जूट मिल्स और टैक्सटाइल मिल्स हैं जो कि बन्द पड़ी हैं, उन्हें आप सिक कहेंगे या कैंसर का मरीज बतायेंगे या वे बहाना किए हुए हैं? आज इतनी हमारे देश में सिक मिल बढ़ गई हैं और उससे इतनी अनइम्प्लायमेंट बढ़ रही है कि करीब करीब जूट मिल और टैक्सटाइल मिल के दो लाख मजदूर बेरोजगार हो गये हैं और अपने घर बैठे हुए हैं। मंत्री महोदय ने तथा आपकी सरकार ने बार

बार यह एलान किया है कि आप बेरोजगारी को समाप्त करके बेरोजगारों को रोजगार दिलायेंगे ऐसी पालिसी बनाएंगे जिससे कि लोगों को रोजगार मिले, लेकिन यह इन आठ महीनों में देखने में आया है कि जो लोग काम कर रहे थे, मिल बन्द होने के कारण उनका रोजगार छूटता जा रहा है। जब हम अपने मुल्क के अन्दर नजर डालते हैं तो लगता है कि चारों ओर से हमारे कारखाने बन्द होते जा रहे हैं। आपकी कांस्टीट्यूसी बम्बई में कितने कारखाने बन्द पड़े हैं, दूसरी जगह हैं, वहां भी बन्द होते जा रहे हैं। मैं मंत्री महोदय (Interruptions).

श्रीम तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (डा० राम कृपाल सिंह) : माननीय मंत्रीजी की कांस्टीट्यूसी तो मुजफ्फरपुर है।

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चूडावत : हां, हां आपके वहां भी बहुत काम हो रहा है।

डा० राम कृपाल सिंह : मैं तो कांस्टीट्यूसी की बात कर रहा हूँ।

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चूडावत : मैं वहां के रेलवे मजदूरों से मिली थी। आपकी बहुत तारीफ कर रहे थे। एक दफा मैं वहां पर ए०आई०सी०सी० सेशन के लिए गई थी, तब हड़ताल करवाई थी तो सामान उठा कर ले गये थे। इसलिए मैं जानती हूँ कि बम्बई में आपका बहुत बड़ा असर है। तो बम्बई में एक तरह से बाढ़ आ गई है, वहां पर भी कारखाने जो चल रहे थे, वे बन्द होते जा रहे हैं। क्या मंत्री महोदय यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि आखिर यह कारखाने क्यों घड़ाघड़ बन्द होते जा रहे हैं? किस वजह से यह किये जा रहे हैं, उनके पीछे क्या कारण है और उनके बन्द होने की वजह से बेरोजगारी है।

श्री बीजू पटनायक : कल्याण राय है उसके पीछे...

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चंडावत : दूसरा मैं आपसे यह जानना चाहती हूँ कि आपकी पार्टी के द्वारा बार बार यह एलान किए गए कि आप छोटे कारखाने देश में लगाएंगे, बड़े कारखानों के पक्ष में आप नहीं हैं और छोटे छोटे कारखानों को संरक्षण दिया जाएगा। लेकिन मंत्री महोदय जो आपकी पालिसी है उसके अनुसार उनको संरक्षण मिल नहीं रहा है। छोटे कारखाने बड़े कारखानों के मुकाबले में आगे नहीं बढ़ पा रहे हैं, जैसे छोटी आल्मारी बनाने के स्टील के कारखाने हैं। ये इसलिए बन्द पड़े हैं क्योंकि गोदरेज की आल्मारी बनाने वालों के ऊपर जितनी एक्साइज ड्यूटी पड़ती है उतनी ही ड्यूटी इन छोटे कारखाने वालों को भी देनी पड़ती है। छोटे कारखाने वालों की इतनी हैसियत नहीं हो सकती कि बड़े कारखानों के कम्पीटीशन में वे उतर सकें। इसलिए अगर आप छोटे कारखाने वालों को संरक्षण देना चाहते हैं तो इस डिस्पैरिटी को हटाना होगा क्योंकि कहां गोदरेज और कहां छोटे छोटे स्टील बनाने वाले यूनिट।

दूसरे छोटे छोटे इंजीनियरिंग काम के यूनिट बन्द पड़े हुए हैं। क्या यह सही है कि इंजीनियरिंग की जो मोटरें बनायी जाती हैं उसमें एक सिलीकान नाम का धातु लगता है और वह आजकल बाजार में बिल्कुल नहीं मिल पा रहा है। उसके न मिलने की वजह से इन कारखानों का काम रुका हुआ है। मंत्री महोदय की तो जानकारी में होगा और खूब अच्छी तरह से होगा कि इसको एक मोनोपोलिस्ट कम्पनी टाटा कम्पनी है। पहले टाटा कम्पनी से दूसरे कारखानों को यह सप्लाई हो जाता था लेकिन आजकल एक बहुत बड़ी इण्डस्ट्रियल कम्पनी वह सारा का सारा माल टाटा कम्पनी के यहाँ से डायरेक्ट ले लेती है। यह कम्पनी सारा का सारा माल ले लेती है और अपनी जरूरत का रख कर बाकी के सिलीकान को ब्लैक में बेच देती है। इस ब्लैक में, 2 हजार रुपये

के प्रीमियम पर छोटे कारखाने वालों को वह सिलीकान खरीदना पड़ता है। इस ब्लैक के नाम को हटा कर आज कल उसे एक सुन्दर नाम 'प्रीमियम' दे दिया गया है। इस प्रकार छोटे कारखाने वालों को 2 हजार रुपये का प्रीमियम देने के बाद ही सिलीकान मिल पाता है। सिलीकान न मिल पाने के कारण और मंहगाई होने की वजह से कम्पीटीशन में न उतर पाने के कारण ही ये कारखाने बन्द हैं। बड़े कारखाने वाले तो 2 हजार से ज्यादा भी प्रीमियम दे सकते हैं परन्तु छोटे कारखाने वाले उनके कम्पीटीशन में नहीं उतर पायेंगे।

क्या यह भी सही है कि दुर्गापुर का प्लांट सिलीकान का उत्पादन करने वाला था उसकी महीने, 6 महीने में उत्पादन करने की प्लानिंग थी। इससे कारखाने वालों को उम्मीद थी कि जब दुर्गापुर में यह सिलीकान बनने लगेगा तो उसकी उपलब्धि हमें आसानी से होगी और एक मोनोपोलिस्ट, टाटा से छुटकारा मिलेगा। लेकिन महोदय, दुर्गापुर स्टील प्लांट बंद पड़ा हुआ है। पेपरों में बड़ी बड़ी हैडिंग्स के साथ कहा गया कि :

It has come to a grinding halt.

ऐसा मामूली बंद नहीं हुआ है, आइन्डिय हाल्ट हुआ है। क्या इसके पीछे आपकी पालिसी ऐसी नहीं है कि जिसके कारण यह कारखाना बन्द पड़ा हुआ है। दूसरे महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान उन्हीं के शब्दों के ऊपर आकर्षित करना चाहती हूँ। आज से कुछ महीने पहले आपने ऐलान किया था कि मैं वर्कर सेक्टर अलग, पब्लिक सेक्टर अलग और प्राइवेट सेक्टर अलग कायम करना चाहता हूँ। आप वर्कर सेक्टर के हामी हैं। वर्कर्स को कारखाने दिए जाएं, सौंपे जाएं और इसमें हमको कोई ऐतराज नहीं है, लेकिन मंत्री महोदय, जो आप ने वर्कर सेक्टर की स्थापना करने की घोषणा की थी उसका क्या हुआ? वर्क सेक्टर में कितने कारखाने लिये गये और जो वर्कर सेक्टर में

[श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चूडावत]

आप देना चाहते हैं उनको फाइनेंस की मदद किस प्रकार से दी जायगी, उनको एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के मामले में किस प्रकार सहयोग देकर आगे बढ़ाया जायगा ? आज तक आपने अपनी उस घोषणा के अनुसार वर्कर सेक्टर कायम किया है या नहीं ? आगे आप क्या करने वाले हैं उस रूप रेखा से हमें वाकफ़ करायें कि आप किस प्रकार से वर्कर्स सेक्टर को आगे ला रहे हैं ? हमें उम्मीद है आप, जो उनके रहनुमा हैं लीडर रह चुके हैं और आज भी हैं, उनके लिए जरूर ठीक काम करेंगे । हमें यह बताया जाय । हालांकि मुझे नमूना कुछ और ही नजर आ रहा है आप वर्कर्स के इतने हिमायती हैं लेकिन कल ही, अखबारों में हमने देखा, स्वदेशी काटन मिल में मजदूरों के ऊपर फायरिंग की गई, उस फायरिंग में 12 मजदूर मारे गए हैं ।

श्री कल्याण राय : बाकई पैसा बिलकुल नहीं दिया । मैनेजमेंट ने 3 साल का पैसा खा लिया ।

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चूडावत : मजदूरों को कई महीनों से तनख्वाह नहीं मिली है, वर्कर्स भूखे बैठे हुए हैं । इसी वजह से वे जानते थे कि हमारे यहां मजदूर हड़ताल करेंगे उन इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट की शादी आज दिल्ली में हो रही है । खैर मैं उसमें न जाकर मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहूंगी कि आपने रहते हुए यह मजदूरों के ऊपर फायरिंग क्यों की जा रही है, उनका खून क्यों बहाया जा रहा है ? यह किसलिए हो रहा है ? आप जब पहले कभी ऐसा होता था तो उससे खिलाफ ऐक्शन लेने को कहते थे । आपने उनके खिलाफ आवाज बुलन्द की है और आज आपके हाथ से, आपके आर्डर से, आप के हुकुम से, गोलियों से, मजदूरों के खून से उन मिलों का आंगन लाल हो रहे हैं । आपने चूंकि स्वदेशी काटन मिल के मालिकों के ऊपर

पहले यह एक इल्जाम था कि उन्होंने बिजली की चोरी की, बिजली की चोरियों का बहुत बड़ा इल्जाम था, क्या आपने उनको बचाने की कोशिश नहीं की ? खजाने से, ट्रेजरी से—बैंक ही नहीं ट्रेजरी से—पहले उन मजदूरों की तनख्वाह चुकाने के लिए आपने उनकी मदद की, और अब आपका रिसीवर बैठा है तो भी मजदूरों को महीनों से तनख्वाह नहीं मिल रही और उन के बाल बच्चे भूखे बैठे हैं, खाने को नहीं मिल पा रहा है । तो फिर मैं आपका ध्यान इसी को लेकर आकर्षित करना चाहती हूं । मंत्री महोदय, आपने कुछ दिनों पहले—मैंने अखबारों में पढ़ा था कि—कहा था कि सीमेंट के जो बहुत बड़े कारखाने हैं उनकी बजाय छोटे-छोटे सीमेंट के कारखाने लगाए जाएं तो कई जगह कारखाने लग जाएंगे और लोगों को मजदूरी मिलेगी और उसमें आपने कहा था कि छोटे कारखाने कैसे बनाए जा सकते हैं, कैसे चलाए जा सकते हैं । उसका नोहाऊ वेस्ट जर्मनी से इम्पोर्ट करने की आपने बात कही कि वेस्ट जर्मनी से हम उसका नोहाऊ इम्पोर्ट कर रहे हैं । मैं बहुत ही विनम्रता के साथ मंत्री महोदय को याद दिलाती हूं और पूछना चाहती हूं कि क्या उनको जानकारी है कि नहीं कि हिन्दुस्तान में वह नोहाऊ मौजूद है, उसी नोहाऊ के कारण हिन्दुस्तान में सीमेंट के ऐसे छोटे-छोटे कारखाने चल रहे हैं । तो उसी नोहाऊ को डेवलप करने की जरूरत है, उसका विस्तार करने के लिए हमारे यहां और कारखाने जमाने की जरूरत है । तो यह नोहाऊ होते हुए भी क्यों वह जर्मनी से उसका इम्पोर्ट करना चाहते हैं, घर में जो नोहाऊ है उसको डेवलप करने की ओर ध्यान न देकर आप इन्विटेशन दे रहे हैं मल्टी नेशनल्स को कि दुनिया के मल्टी नेशनल्स, हिन्दुस्तान में आओ, एक चरागाह हिन्दुस्तान में आ गया है तुम यहां आओ और यहां से माल लेकर जाओ । अगर आपकी जगह कोई दूसरा मंत्री होता तो मैं सोच और समझ सकती थी लेकिन जैसे आप हैं, आप जिन

विचारों के कायल और हामी रहे हैं, उस के होते हुए यह कसा हो रहा है ? ऐसा लग रहा है कि आप कहते कुछ हैं और करते कुछ हैं। दो दिन पहल मैंने देखा, हमारे श्रद्धेय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने गुजरात में एक नया फारमूला अपनाया इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स को लेकर, और मैं सोचती हूँ आपकी जानकारी से, आपकी सलाह से, किया गया होगा। प्रधान मंत्री ने गुजरात में 42 गांवों को चुना है; उन 42 गांवों को इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स लोगों को सौंपा गया है कि आप यहां पर अपनी इंडस्ट्री लगाइयेगा। उसके साथ में क्या पंचायत समिति जो वहां की होगी वह इंडस्ट्री वालों की राय से, उनके कहने से, उनकी आज्ञा से काम करेगी और वहां पर आमदनी होगी उसके ऊपर उन इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स से इनकम टैक्स नहीं लिया जाएगा। क्या मंत्री महोदय ये इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स लोगों के हाथों में अब गांव वालों को भी देना चाहते हैं, सारे देहात उनको सौंप रहे हैं ? प्रधान मंत्री ने तो इतना कहा। लेकिन इसके साथ में, आज की प्लानिंग कमिशन के मेम्बर श्री राज कृष्ण ने कहा—उन्होंने तो उसके ऊपर दो कदम आगे चल कर कहा है—कि अगर इन इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स ने अच्छा काम किया तो भविष्य में सरकार की तरफ से जो धन दिया जाता है, जो बैंकों से लोन दिया जाता है या और भी तरह का खर्च होता है, वह भी इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स की मार्फत दिया जाएगा। और हर साल हम उन्हें कई ब्लाक सौंपते जाएंगे। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि तीन साल के अन्दर-अन्दर इस पालिसी के अनुसार गुजरात के राज्य का जितना भूभाग है उसका एक बड़ा हिस्सा आप इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स के हाथ में सौंप रहे हैं। क्या आप हमारे किसानों और मजदूरों को सर्फ बनाने की सोच रहे हैं ? क्या आप उन इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स के हाथ में उनको दे रहे हैं ? क्या आप वहां उनकी स्थानीय जागीरदारी कायम करने जा रहे हैं ? क्या यह डेमोक्रेसी है ? क्या यही आजादी रहेगी और क्या इसी तरह से हम

किसानों और मजदूरों को आगे बढ़ायेंगे ? तो मैं स्पष्ट रूप से जानना चाहती हूँ कि आखिर आपकी इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी क्या है ? आप इंडस्ट्री को किधर ले जाना चाहते हैं ? आप इस बारे में हमारे सामने खुल कर अपने विचार रखें। आप की इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी को ले कर आपके बयान कुछ और होते हैं, आपके गृह मंत्री जी कुछ और कहते हैं और आपके प्रधान मंत्री जी कुछ और कहते हैं और जो काम किये जाते हैं वह कुछ और ही होते हैं। मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहती हूँ कि नेहरू जी के समय में एक इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी थी और उस समय उस पर इस हाउस में और उस हाउस में विचार किया गया था। दोनों हाउसेज की उस पर मोहर लगायी गयी थी और देश में भी उसपर चर्चा हुई थी और उसके बाद उस इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी को मंजूर किया गया था। पिछले सेशन में मैंने एक सवाल पूछा था कि आप उस इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी को चला रहे हैं या उसको छोड़ रहे हैं तो आपने कहा था कि हम उसको चला रहे हैं। लेकिन आपकी जो घोषणायें हो रही हैं, जो कदम उठाये जा रहे हैं वह उसके खिलाफ उठाये जा रहे हैं। अगर आप उसमें तबदीली करना चाहते हैं और आपकी कोई निजी पालिसी है तो कृपा कर उसको आप हाउस में लाइये। आप अपनी पालिसी हमको बताइये उस पर आप दोनों सदनों की छाप लगवाइये और उस पर डिस्कशन करवाइये ताकि देश को पता चल सके और व्यापार करने वाली जो जनता है उसके सामने एक सीधी और साफ तस्वीर आपकी पालिसी की आये कि हमारी इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी क्या है। आज कई लोग जो उद्योग में पैसा लगाने वाले हैं, ठप्प होकर बैठे हुए हैं। उनको उद्योग में पैसा इन्वेस्ट करने की हिम्मत नहीं पड़ रही है क्योंकि उनकी समझ में नहीं आया कि आप किधर जा रहे हैं। बात आप पूर्व की करते हैं, जाते हैं पश्चिम की ओर और आप का काम होता है दक्षिण की ओर। तो जब तक आप का दिमाग साफ नहीं है,

[श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चूडावत]

जब तक आप की पालिसी स्पष्ट नहीं है आप इस मुल्क को इंडस्ट्रियल क्षेत्र में आगे नहीं बढ़ा सकते। इन दो, तीन, चार वर्षों में हम ने काफी बड़े क्षेत्र में एक्सपोर्ट करना शुरू किया है। हमारी इंजीनियरिंग गुड्स दुनिया के दूसरे मुल्कों में पहुंच रही है। आप की इलेक्ट्रॉनिक गुड्स इंग्लैंड जैसा मुल्क ले रहा है। जोधपुर जैसे शहर में बनने वाले मोटर पार्ट्स आज अमरीका ले रहा है।

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Are you aware that Mr. Subramanian Swamy is alleging that our public sector is bringing people not to purchase the products in order to scuttle the public sector?

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चूडावत : तो आप इस मुल्क में अपना दिमाग भी खुल कर स्पष्ट करें और हमारे सामने एक साफ तस्वीर रखें कि आप क्या करने जा रहे हैं। अभी हमारे पटनायक साहब भी उधर विराजमान हैं जोकि बहुत बड़ी इंडस्ट्री को देख रहे हैं। (Interruptions)... इसी तरह से दुर्गापुर स्टील में जो ग्राइंडिंग हाल्ट हुआ है वह कैसे हुआ है? क्यों हुआ है? आखिर उसकी आप यहां खपत करना चाहते हैं या उसे बाहर भेजना चाहते हैं। मजाक करने से काम नहीं चलेगा कि यह डेमोक्रेसी है। डेमोक्रेसी है तो क्या आप इसीलिए उसका मजाक उड़ा रहे हैं? या उसको आप सही मायनों में ले रहे हैं। आप की बात से तो पता चलता है कि आप उसका मजाक उड़ा रहे हैं जब हम सेंट्रल हाल में बैठते हैं तो इस तरह का मजाक ठीक रहता है, लेकिन इस हाउस में आपका एक एक जवाब आपकी एक एक बात ठीक होनी चाहिये उसकी कुछ कोमत है। संजीदगी के साथ होना चाहिये और उसके यहां आने के बाद ही हम डिबेट कर सकते हैं, सवाल पूछ

सकते हैं, प्रिविलेज उठा सकते हैं। इस-लिए मैं इस वक्त आपसे यह निवेदन करूंगी कि आपकी जो इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी है, उसके बारे में एक साफ चीज हमारे सामने रखें।

श्रीमन्, सदन के पास इतना समय है। छोटे-छोटे बिल लाये जा रहे हैं। किसी तरह वक्त काट रहे हैं। क्यों नहीं आपके पास जो खास खास बिल हैं जिनके ऊपर विचार करना बहुत जरूरी है, उनको आप सदन में लाते? इसके पीछे क्या कारण हैं? हमें पुरा अंदेशा है कि आपने इस-लिए इन बिलों को दबा रखा है कि जब अप्रैल में राज्य सभा के कुछ सदस्य इधर के कम संख्या में हो जायेंगे तो आप उन बिलों को लाना चाहेंगे। आज आपको हिम्मत नहीं पड़ रही है। इसलिए किसी तरह समय निकाला जा रहा है। अतः हमारी यह पुरजोर मांग है कि जो बिल हमारे देश की किस्मत का फैसला करने वाले हैं, उन बिलों को अभी लाया जाए, डिस्कशन किया जाए और इस तरह से टाइम न सरकाया जाए।

श्री बीजू पटनायक : आपने जोधपुर और दुर्गापुर को मिला दिया, इसलिए गलती हो गई। जोधपुर का दिवाला हो रहा है, लेकिन दुर्गापुर ठीक चल रहा है। दुर्गापुर बहुत ठीक चल रहा है।

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चूडावत : दुर्गापुर स्टील के लिए अर्ज कर रही हूं।

श्री बीजू पटनायक : वह जोधपुर से काफी बड़ा कारखाना है।

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चूडावत : इतना मैं भी समझती हूं कि जोधपुर और दुर्गापुर में कितना फर्क है।

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the scope of this Bill is limited to the take-over of the Gresham and Craveii company. We have traversed over a long list of matters connected with the industrial policy and Mr. Kalyan Roy has produced all the answers to his questions which he has been putting for the last few years. I do not know how the Minister of Industry will be able to handle them because these questions have been coming up for the last two years in every one of his speeches he quotes them and asks for decisions on policy matters.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: I have been quoting since 1972.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA: I know that. But I would confine myself to the provisions of the Bill and make a few references to the subjects provoked by Mr. Kalyan Roy in which he has raised so many other issues.

So far as this Bill is concerned, I congratulate my friend Mr. George Fernandes for having come up with the suggestion to take over the Company and also for the proposal to merge it with Braithwaite and Company Limited. Sir, this Company was taken over in 1971 because it had fallen sick for various reasons and now when the time limit is lapsing on certain moratorium on declared debts it became very necessary to take immediate action and so an ordinance was issued and now he has come forward with a Bill. It is very good that after taking over this establishment has made certain progress, has improved its production and is doing fairly well. It is time that it is taken over to see that further improvement in the establishment is brought about. Sir, there have been certain objections to it and I am told that there were some petitions in the other House asking the Government not to merge these two establishments, *i.e.* Braithwaite and Company. The major objection came from our trade union friend

—I do not know whether Shri Kalyan Roy's party was there or not, but I know some others were there—and the main point was that it might affect the interests of the workers. I think, Sir, that they were thinking about the bonus. Because the Braithwaite and Company has been a company which has been making a loss, they thought that by the merger their prospects of a higher bonus which they expect from this particular company might be jeopardised. That is one reason. It has some validity. But other than that, I do not think they have any valid reasons to say this. So far as sick units in general are concerned, we have sick units in textiles, we have sick units in tea plantations and we have sick units in so many different types of industries. I personally feel that it is always better—that such sick units are merged with the other better functioning and prosperous units and it should be seen that their sickness is done away with and they are brought to a position of profit-making concerns; or, if my friend, Mr. Kalyan Roy, is allergic to the word "profit", let us say that they should become units which will make progress and improve the production and become viable units. If a sick unit is directly taken over and run by the Government, it cannot be that just because the Government takes it over, the sickness will disappear immediately as if by a miracle and the unit will become prosperous. As long as the sickness continues, who is to bear the expenses for it? How is it to be financed?

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Have you ever seen a sick industrialist?

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA: It will be the tax payer, including Mr. Kalyan Roy, who will be asked to pay for improving these sick units. Mr. Kalyan Roy has only one idea and that is that the sickness always is the result of mismanagement.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Misappropriation, loot and plunder.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA: His argument is that one of the major causes of sickness is higher salaries to the managerial personnel. But I would like him to kindly calculate the overall expenses of the establishment and see what percentage of it goes towards expenses on the management and staff. If, for example, the management's salary is reduced to one rupee, does the unit immediately get over its sickness and become prosperous? There are various causes. There are fiscal policies, availability of raw materials and so on. In certain instances, Mr. Kalyan Roy and his friends are also responsible in a way, to see that the establishments become sick. There have been many instances in which they have also been responsible for it. So, it is the result of the cumulative effect. It is for the Government to find out why the sickness is increasing and also it is for them to see in what way the sickness can be reduced because any sick industry anywhere is a drain on the national exchequer. Whether it is taken over by the Government or straightway nationalised or it is merged with other companies, it will be a drain. So, between the two, it is a good thing that the Government has more or less taken a decision—we can see it from the last Budget—that merger with prosperous units will be encouraged by providing certain tax concessions. This is much better than the Government exchequer being drained and the money made up by more levies on the taxpayers. So I am in full agreement with this and I support the merging of this unit with Braithwaite and Company which is also a sick unit.

Sir, so many questions have been raised in the other House also about Braithwaite and Company and the same arguments that were put forward here by Mr. Kalyan Roy were also put forward there. But the principal customers of this company and Braithwaite and Company are the establishments of the Railways and Defence

which are not in a position to pay the price for the products. Because of the increase in the cost of production of these items, these companies have not been able to market their products to Railways and Defence, and that is one of the reasons why Braithwaite and Company has become sick. I am glad that when this question about management came—I am sorry Mr. Kalyan Roy is not here—the Industry Minister pointed out in the other House that in the case of Braithwaite and Company, the very loss on subsidising the canteens went up from Rs. 40 lakhs to Rs. 80 lakhs. So, Mr. Kalyan Roy and his friends are also responsible for that—other than the management. We should not say that it is only due to mismanagement alone. I know in many instances mismanagement is one of the reasons for industries to go sick. But we should not be blind to the other factors which also influence many industries going sick. I am glad that in the Ministry of Industry they have got a monitoring cell now to find out through banks and other sources about industries going sick, getting indications of industries going sick, so that they can be tackled even before they become completely sick and eventually be a drain on the public exchequer. So, this is a welcome idea and I hope more attention will be paid to it and it is better to see that industries do not go sick; it is better to take timely steps rather than allow the industries go sick and then take them over.

So far as other matters are concerned, in this compensation to shareholders is denied because the unit was taken over long back and also because it was a loss incurring concern. But in the case of previous management a certain amount of money was provided. Then I would like to make in general one suggestion here. I would like to ask the Industry Minister what he has got in his mind about this. There are many public limited companies which become sick. Maybe, it is due

to mismanagement or whatever it is, there are a large number of shareholders, small stockholders, who have invested 'in this company because it is a public limited company. Now, what happens to them? The people who have mismanaged, drained, the money, they get payment for their management expenses and walk off. But what about the large number of small stockholders? Because these are public limited companies listed in the Stock Market, people, with an idea of getting small income over their money, make investments. And if no shareholder is going to be paid anything, it is going to be very harsh. Therefore, as a matter of policy some review has to be made about that. In the present case this company might be such that the number of shareholders may not be very high. But then what of those industries like textiles, tea, etc.? Some consideration has to be given to this aspect because companies like textiles, tea, etc. have got a large number of small shareholders. In future as a policy some consideration should be given to them whenever or wherever nationalisation or takeover of companies with small stockholders takes place. These small stockholders have in good faith made these investments.

Then there are certain references made in general about policy matters—the Industrial Policy Resolution. I do not think the Janata Government has anywhere said that it has completely given up the 1956 Industrial Policy Resolution. They have accepted the role of the public sector and also the role of the private sector. The only thing that has been said is that there should be a greater accent on small scale and cottage industries for consumer goods. I do not think there has been such a wide change in the policy direction. So far as multinationals and other foreign companies are concerned, now this Government has not done away with the FERA. It is still there. And in fact many of the Sterling and other foreign companies have been asked to Indianise their

shareholdings to the limit which has been fixed under the FERA. That is being done. There might have been some delay. But it is the previous Government also which gave considerable leniency and time for these companies to change over. That is being done; And in the case of multinationals also I agree with the statements made earlier by the Industry Minister, and I do not think we should have any apprehension that the present Government will give a wholesale go-by to the earlier policy and do away with the public sector. I do not think the policy of the present Government is properly understood. The only comment I have to make on this is, as it is stated, if we ask the small scale and cottage industries alone to cater to the consumer goods in the country,

we should have to take care 3 P.M. that the standards are maintained. Otherwise the consumers will suffer. All along we have got so many small-scale and cottage industries. Many of them have become sick. A considerable number of them are sick because those units were started in a hurry without any proper appreciation of the facts about the availability of the raw-materials. They have been producing sub-standard goods. Should the Indian consumers suffer always by getting only sub-standard goods? Speaking about larger industries, they have at least maintained standard and their distribution system has been very efficient. We must learn that also. So far as their distribution system is concerned, take, for instance, a soap manufactured by a larger industry such as the Hindustan Lever. Their soap is available in the remotest villages. If you say that the larger units will confine themselves only for export purposes and the Indian consumers will get goods only from small-scale and cottage units, then it will become impossible. There have been discussions on this and that is why I am mentioning this. It has not come as a policy statement. I am not one of those who believe that all the foreign companies should concentrate on the

[Shri U. K. Lakshmana Gowada.]

manufacture of consumer goods such as tooth brushes and tooth pastes and should not go in for core sector and other large-scale industries. It is certainly necessary that you should encourage small-scale and cottage industries. But you have to see that they maintain strict standards.

Another point I want to mention is the industrial relations. We have been seeing lot of industrial unrest lately. So many explanations have been given. The extreme commitment of the present regime to civil liberties, to a certain extent, has given a chance for the anti-social elements and others to take advantage of the situation. For 24 months everything was bottled up. And now there is extreme commitment to civil liberties. It is not only Shri Kalyan Roy and his friends, but others also take advantage of the situation. Shri Kalyan Roy may have some legitimate grievances. But there are others also. Therefore, something has to be done about it.

Also there should be a comprehensive labour policy. Otherwise, it will be very difficult to achieve the Industrial growth which is expected to reach an average of 7 or 7.5 per cent. I am sure the Industries Ministry will apply its mind to this and the Janata Government will shortly finalise its industrial policy. I am sure they will be in a position to handle these matters.

I am glad that my friend, Shri Fernandes, has brought this Bill today. One other point I would like to mention because Shri Kalyan Roy is now present here. When Shri George Fernandes took over this Ministry, perhaps Shri Kalyan Roy thought that he would announce nationalisation which he considers to be a panacea for all the ills. This has been the consistent demand from the CPI friends all these years and therefore Shri Kalyan Roy is a little disappointed. The Ja-

nata Government have a very pragmatic approach to the industrial policy. They do not say that nationalisation is the panacea for all illnesses. I for one do not believe that let them not use this instrument of if you nationalise all these industries, we can achieve the desired Industrial growth. It is a pragmatic policy that is necessary and I congratulate the present Industries Minister. And having taken up that pragmatic policy, I am convinced that they will continue this policy of having public and private sectors, with more accent on public sector, large-scale and core industries and certain developmental aspects for the small-scale and cottage industries with a strict watch on the standard of production. Without that it will not be possible to satisfy the consumers. I cannot understand why the Indian consumers should suffer for want of proper standard. With these words, I support the Bill.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, while supporting this Bill, I would like to know from the honourable Minister one thing.

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

In the Statement of Objects and Reasons attached to the Bill, it has been said that this is being done for "various reasons". I would like to know what those reasons are. I would like to know whether there are other reasons or this is only because of the mismanagement of this industry. I would like to know whether this has been closed down only because of mismanagement. Now, Sir, when a sick unit or industry is proposed to be taken over by the Government, I would like to know what the policy of the State is. In the Bill itself, under clause 32, Sir, it is said that the policy of the State in this connection is in accordance with article 39 of the Constitution. But that is a general clause and that is a general statement in the Directive Principles of State Policy mentioned! in the Constitution. But I would like to know

whether the Government propose to take over all the sick units and relieve them of their sickness. In my view, this would be putting a premium on inefficiency. I raised this question even when the previous Government was there and the then Minister of Industry had said that that was not the policy of the Government, but only certain units would be taken over. Otherwise, we would be reducing the Government to a sanatorium of sick industrial units. There are so many sick units in this country, And, Sir, In fact, many friends on the other side have said that a large number of units are falling sick. What is the reason? The basic reason, in my view, is the lop sided economic policy of the previous Government which gave undue importance to heavy industries and not due importance to the development in the rural areas where eighty per cent of the people are residing. If this was done in a balanced way, the sickness would not have been there and the closure of industries would not have taken place. One of the main economic reasons for the sickness of these industries, apart from mismanagement which is one of the main reasons, is the economic imbalance and because of this economic imbalance, there is no purchasing power amongst the people. Naturally, the markets dwindle and this is one of the reasons why so many industries are growing sick.

While talking of the general economic policy, I would like to say that it has been repeatedly said by Mr. Kalyan Roy and other friends that nationalisation is the solution. The thinking of those friends has been, right from the beginning till today, that nationalisation is the panacea for all the evils. On ills in the industries. But it has been proved by many advanced countries, after a study of their industrial development and the problems they are facing, that it is *not* a panacea for all these ills. I am sure that the policy of the Government is to strike a balance between the public sector and the private sector. Sir, here I would like to say that the 1500 RS—7.

term 'public sector' is a misnomer. I would like to call it the State sector. One is the private sector, that is, the individual sector and the other is the State sector and the real public sector, in my view, would be the workers' sector. Now, Sir, I would like the honourable Minister to consider seriously this aspect and see that this third sector develops in this country. A beginning can be made now. For instance, in several of these Industrial concerns, bonus is being paid to the workers. Now, you can persuade the workers to invest their bonus in the shares of the concerns in which they are working and if about thirty per cent of the shares are owned by the workers, there will be a psychological change amongst the workers and they will feel that they are also the owners of the industry. But, Sir, today, their feeling is that they have nothing to do with the industries in which they are working. They are only wage earners. They are only concerned with the wage. And, therefore, for any small thing they go on strike. They go on slogan raising, and the industrial production is hampered. In the interest of industrial development, this aspect of the workers' sector is very important. In Yugoslavia, this has been developed. We can also start in many of the Government undertakings. When we give them bonus, we can persuade them to invest in shares and also take them in the management. So I would request the hon. Minister to seriously consider this aspect of developing the workers' sector in the industry.

Sir, I would like the hon. Minister to enlighten us regarding this industry. It is said that it used to manufacture certain items used by the Railways. The management was taken over in 1971 and now it has been decided, because of certain moratorium and other things, to complete the takeover. I would like to know whether this is one of the main industries which have been supplying these materials to the Railways or if there are other industries which would have

[Shri R. Narasimha Reddy.]

supplied to the Railways even if this industry had gone out of production.

Sir, coming to the point of compensation, now we are paying Rs. 177 lakhs. I would like the hon. Minister to enlighten us about the criteria on which this figure has been arrived at. On what basis has this been fixed? I would like to know in this connection, when was this industry started, what was the original investment, what is the present capital asset and how much of profits have been pumped out of this country by this industry? I would like to know whether all these facts have been taken into consideration in determining the compensation.

Sir, there is a very interesting thing in this. There is one aspect of compensation. It is said in Chapter III clause 9(1): For the deprivation of the Company of the management of its undertakings _____ Rs. 3 lakhs. In the Statement of Objects it has been said that it is because of the mismanagement that it has been closed. Now, are we paying for the deprivation of the management or its mismanagement? Sir...

SHRI N. G. RANGA (Andhra Pradesh) ;
 Its mismanagement also.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: For saving the Company from mismanagement we are paying Rs. 3 lakhs. It is anomalous that we are paying the Company for depriving it of the management of the undertakings. I would prefer that this clause 9(1) is completely deleted. The amount is very little—Rs. 3 lakhs. But it is not a question of amount but the principle involved in it. It looks rather strange.

Regarding priorities, I would like to give just one suggestion. In the Schedule there are two parts. One part is post-takeover management period. Part B is Pre-take-over management period. I do not know why this distinction has been made. Regarding the workers who have worked and whose wages are in arrears, I am glad

that under the Post-take-over management period, it has been put at Category I relating to wages, salaries and other dues of the employees of the Company. It is very good. But regarding pre-take-over management period, it comes as Category VI. I do not know whether the money that is being given now will be enough up to Category V. If it is enough up to Category V, then the poor workers will get their arrears, otherwise not. I would prefer that this Category VI regarding arrears of wages, etc. should be made as Category II. Banks have given loans and the Government have given loans. This is public money. But I would place the workers' wages and other arrears of the workers who have worked for this concern at Category I. It should get first priority.

Finally, I would refer to one more point. I would like enlightenment on this question. It is said that after paying all these claims, any amount that is pending for three years should be there. Does it mean that this Commissioner will be there for three years and we will have to pay from the Consolidated Fund his salary and all that for 3 years? Why is it necessary for us to pay this for three years? It is clearly stated that any other claim can be asked for from the Government. When that provision is there, I think this three-year period is a little too much. It can be reduced to one year. With these words, I support this Bill.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विधेयक पर भी विरोधी पक्ष के जो विचार आए हैं और इसके लिए विरोधी पक्ष ने जो रुख अख्तियार किया है उसको देख कर और सुन कर मुझे कुछ पुरानी बातें याद आती हैं। 1938-39 में जब हम लोग काशी में कालेज के विद्यार्थी थे तो उस समय बहुत से सी पी आई के मित्र कहा करते थे कि यह गांधी तो अंग्रेजों से लड़ना नहीं चाहता है। यह तो अंग्रेजों का दोस्त है और वे गांधी जी की बड़ी निन्दा करते थे और सी पी आई

के लोग कहते थे कि हम को तुरन्त अंग्रेजों से आजादी की लड़ाई छोड़ देनी चाहिए। और 1942 में जब गांधी जी ने अंग्रेजों के खिलाफ लड़ाई छोड़ दी तो सी पी आई के लोगों ने यह कहना शुरू कर दिया कि गांधी जी तो हिटलर के दलाल हैं और मुझे याद है कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के बार पर पीपुल्स वार का कार्टून बनाया गया उसमें सुभाष चन्द्र बोस को तोजो का कुत्ता बना दिया। सुभाष बाबू के गले में जंजीर बंधी थी और उसे तोजो के हाथ में पकड़ा दिया गया था। तो जब गांधी जी नहीं लड़ रहे थे तो वे उनको अंग्रेजों का दलाल कहते थे और जब गांधी जी ने कहा 'क्विट इंडिया' और अंग्रेजों के खिलाफ युद्ध का ऐलान कर दिया तो उन्होंने उनको हिटलर का दलाल कहना शुरू कर दिया। इसी तरह से आज हमारे दोस्त एक तरफ यह कहते हैं कि जनता पार्टी राष्ट्रीयकरण की विरोधी है, पब्लिक सेक्टर की विरोधी है और जब राष्ट्रीयकरण के लिए कोई विधेयक आता है तो उस के खिलाफ उन को नाराजगी होती है। इससे बड़ा और क्या सबूत हो सकता है कि जनता पार्टी पब्लिक सेक्टर के पक्ष में है, राष्ट्रीयकरण के पक्ष में है कि जो विधेयक आज से 6 साल पहले आना चाहिए था छह साल जो कांग्रेस सरकार नहीं लाई उसका जनता पार्टी ने राष्ट्रीयकरण करने यह बिल यहीं लाई।

श्रीमन्, रानी साहिबा ने जिक्र किया मल्टी-नेशनल का और बहुत से लोगों ने उधर से गीत गाए और गायकर करते हैं कि यह सरकार तो मल्टी-नेशनल की दोस्त है। मल्टी-नेशनल को इस देश में किस ने इतनाइट किया? कोका कोला और आई०बी०एम० को इस देश में पंडित जवाहरलाल ने आएं और जनता पार्टी की सरकार ने आते ही कोका कोला और आई०बी०एम० को यहां से बिदा कर दिया। इस सबका इससे बड़ा और क्या सबूत हो सकता है कि मल्टी-नेशनल को अगर इस देश से निकाला तो जनता पार्टी ने निकाला।

श्री देवेन्द्र नाथ द्विवेदी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
कोका कोला की जगह यूनी कोला आ गया।
..... (Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Shahi, for a change let us talk about the Gresham and Craven of India Ltd.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : श्रीमन्, इस बात के लिए जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज को बधाई देनी चाहिए कि अपनी जिन्दगी की शुरूआत से जो उनका उसूल रहा, जिस बात की वह तार्द करते रहे और जिसकी मांग करते रहे, उनके हाथ में सत्ता आने के तुरन्त बाद उस पर अमल कर दिया। मल्टी-नेशनल को निकालने का श्रेय, इस देश से निकालने का श्रेय जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज को है। मैं जानता हूँ कि मल्टी-नेशनल का सम्बन्ध कांग्रेस पार्टी से था। एक बार नहीं, सैकड़ों बार हमने यह मांग की कि कोका कोला को हटाओ, कोका कोला जो कि 1 लाख का इन्वैस्टमेंट करके 10 करोड़ रुपया इस देश से बाहर भेज चुका है, उसको हटाओ, मगर वही कोका कोला, वही सरदार चानना जो कांग्रेस पार्टी के नेता थे और कोका कोला का कारखाना दिल्ली में चलाते थे, जो डिस्ट्री-व्यूशन एजेंट थे और कांग्रेस के हर सेशन में लाखों डेक्कीगैट्स को फ्री कोका कोला पिलाते थे और कांग्रेस को लाखों रुपए चन्दे में देते थे, कांग्रेस के सदस्यों की मांग के बावजूद कोका कोला यहां से नहीं हटाया जा रहा था। वही हाल आई०बी०एम० का था।

SHRI N. G. RANGA; Everybody is in favour of their going out. We are all glad that they are sent out.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : श्रीमन्, स्वदेशी काटन मिल का जिक्र किया गया। स्वदेशी काटन मिल है क्या? स्वदेशी काटन मिल सीताराम जयपुरिया एण्ड कम्पनी की है। सीताराम जयपुरिया को इस सदन में क्यों ले आया? क्या हमारे आदरणीय मੈम्बर नहीं जानते हैं? (Interruptions).

श्री देवेन्द्र नाथ द्विवेदी : आपको कौन ले आया ? (Interruptions)

श्री नानोदेवर प्रसाद शाही : सीताराम जयपुरिया रुपए से बोट खरीदकर सदन में आये और मैंने जब इस सदन में मांग की कि रुपए के बल पर आने वालों को हटाया जाए तो मेरी जुबान बन्द कर दी गई क्योंकि वह कांग्रेस को चन्दा देते थे। उसी सीताराम जयपुरिया की वह स्वदेशी काटन मिल है। मजदूरों का खून चूसकर उसने कांग्रेस पार्टी के फंड में पैसा डाल दिया। उसके पास इतना पैसा भी नहीं रहा कि वह मजदूरों की मजदूरी दे सके। जनता सरकार ने क्या किया? जनता सरकार ने यह किया कि उस मिल के मजदूर जो भूखों मर रहे थे, उनकी मजदूरी जो बकाया थी। वहां की सरकार ने, स्टेट गर्वन्मेंट ने मजदूर होकर कदम उठाया। उस कारखाने के पास पैसा नहीं था, कारखाने का दिवालिया निकल चुका था, मजदूर भूखों मर रहे थे तो सरकार ने खजाने से मजदूरों को मजदूरी दी गई। श्रीमन्, आज क्या हो रहा है। आज पूरे देश में सेवोटेज कराया जा रहा है। आज मजदूरों को हड़ताल करने के लिए भड़काया जा रहा है। आज विद्यार्थियों को हड़ताल करने के लिए उकसाया जा रहा है। इन लोगों का एक ही मतलब है कि जनता के दिमाग में यह बात बैठ जाए कि इमरजेंसी के अलावा इस देश में शांति स्थापित करने का अन्य कोई तरीका नहीं है। यही कारण है कि ये लोग मजदूरों को और विद्यार्थियों को तथा दूसरे सेक्शन को हड़ताल करने के लिए उत्साहित कर रहे हैं। सेवोटेज किया जा रहा है और कराया जा रहा है। कांग्रेस के लोगों को तो खुद यह मांग करनी चाहिए कि कांग्रेस के फंड का रुपया कहाँ चला गया? आज कांग्रेस पार्टी की संस्था दिवालियों में चल रही है। उसके फंड में इतना पैसा नहीं कि अपने कर्मचारियों को तनखाह दे सके। कांग्रेस के नाम पर जो डेढ़ हजार या

दो हजार रुपया आया वह चन्द व्यक्तियों की पाकेट में चला गया। उस रुपए के आधार पर आज देश में सेवोटेज हो रहा है। उस रुपए से विद्यार्थियों से हड़ताल कराई जा रही है और मजदूरों को हड़ताल करने के लिए कहा जा रहा है। आई०एन०टी०यू०सी० और ए०आई०टी०यू०सी० के लोग कानपुर में अशांति पैदा कर रहे हैं। वहां पर जो कारखाने चल रहे हैं उनको बन्द कराने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। इसी स्वदेशी काटन मिल के मजदूरों ने वहां के मेनेजर का घेराव करके इस तरह से उसकी पिटाई की कि वह बेहोश हो गया। वह हार्ट का पेसेन्ट था। बहुत समझाने पर भी लोग उसको छोड़ने के लिए तैयार नहीं हुए। अन्त में उसको अस्पताल में पहुंचाया गया। उसके बाद फिर इस प्रकार की घटना घटी जिसके लिए आई०एन०टी०यू०सी० और ए०आई०टी०यू०सी० के लोग जिम्मेदार हैं। ये लोग नहीं चाहते हैं कि इस देश में कारखाने चलें। ये लोग नहीं चाहते हैं कि युनिवर्सिटियों में पढ़ाई हो। इन लोगों का मुख्य मकसद यह है कि किसी तरह से फिर कुर्सी मिल जाए। देश में भले ही अशांति पैदा हो जाए। ये लोग चाहते हैं कि इस देश में सम्पूर्ण जन-जीवन अस्त-व्यस्त कर दिया जाय और सारा कारोबार ठप्प हो जाय। ये लोग शासन से बाहर नहीं रह सकते हैं? पांच साल तक भी ये लोग इन्तजार करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। सन् 1982 में तो फिर चुनाव होंगे। उस वक्त ये लोग फिर सत्ता में आ सकते हैं। वर्तमान सरकार ने प्रजातन्त्र की इस देश में फिर से स्थापना कर दी है। जिस संविधान को इन लोगों ने बरबाद कर दिया था उसको फिर से प्रतिष्ठित कर दिया गया है। लेकिन फिर भी ये लोग पांच साल तक इन्तजार करने को तैयार नहीं हैं।

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चंडावत : पिछले साल इसी सीट से क्या आपने ये बातें कहीं थीं?

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : आप इस हाउस का रिकार्ड देख लीजिए। जिस समय यहां पर संविधान के संशोधन का विधेयक आया था मैंने उसमें मदाखलत की थी और कहा था :—

This is a fraud on the people, on the party and on the country.

शाम को मुझे चेतावनी मिली थी। उसके बाद से मुझे बोलने नहीं दिया गया। आप जाकर रिकार्ड देख लीजिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): What about the Bill?

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : यह विधेयक इस बात का सबूत है कि वर्तमान सरकार सम्भवतः धीरे-धीरे पूंजीपतियों को समाप्त करना चाहती है। धीरे धीरे निहित स्वार्थों को समाप्त करना चाहती है, वह ऐसी स्थिति से यह नहीं करना चाहती है, जिस स्थिति से आपने इमरजेंसी लागू की थी और आज जब उसकी जांच हो रही है तो शाह कमीशन के सामने जाने से भी कतराते हैं। देश के हित को दृष्टि में रखते हुए संवैधानिक व्यवस्था पर ध्यान देते हुए देश के उस वर्ग को जो शोषण के आधार पर जीता है, देश के उस वर्ग को जो आम जनता का शोषण करके पनप रहा है, उसको समाप्त करने की ओर एक बड़ा कदम है।

श्रीमन्, एक बात और कह कर मैं समाप्त कहूंगा : मैं हिन्दुस्तान मशीन टूल्स कम्पनी के बारे में, एच० एम० टी० के बारे में मंत्री जी का ध्यान दिलाना चाहूंगा।

एक माननीय सदस्य : प्रजेन्ट बिल पर तो बोलिए।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : प्रजेन्ट बिल पर ही बोल रहा हूँ।

एच० एम० टी० जीटर ट्रेक्टर की मोनो-पली अख्तायर किए हुए है। एच० एम० टी० ने जब से जीटर की मोनोपली ले ली तब से इसकी कीमत 10 हजार रुपए बढ़ गई है

और यह कांग्रेस के शासन में हुआ। आज से तीन साल पहले इसके सम्बन्ध में मैंने यहां तत्कालीन इंडस्ट्री मिनिस्टर श्री टी० ए० पै के सामने सवाल उठाया था। पहले उसकी एजेंसी विभिन्न राज्यों के एगो के पास थी। मगर मोनोपली का फायदा सभी उठाना चाहते हैं। ज्यादा मुनाफा दिखाने के लिये इसे एगो के हाथ से छीन करके एच० एम० टी० के हाथ में डाल दिया गया और आज मुझे बहुत दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि एच० एम० टी० एक सरकारी कनसर्न होते हुए भी किसानों का शोषण कर रही है। इतना ज्यादा मारजीन मुनाफे का रख दिया है कि उससे किसानों का शोषण हो रहा है। मेरा मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन है कि वे इस मारजीन आफ प्राफिट को देखकर इसे कम करें या इसको एच० एम० टी० के हाथ से निकाल करके पुनः एगो को वापस कर दें। यू० पी० एगो इस काम को बहुत दिनों से करता रहा है। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक को लाने के लिए मंत्री महोदय को बधाई देता हूँ और अपने दोस्तों से कहता हूँ कि वे कृपया कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का रबैया अखिल-यार न करें। धन्यवाद।

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डो : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, यह खुशी की बात है कि सारे सदन ने इस विधेयक का स्वागत किया है। मगर इस स्वागत के साथ कई सवालों को भी उठाया है—औद्योगिक नीति से लेकर प्रजातंत्र और उसकी व्यवस्था तक को, जिन में से कुछ सवालों का जरूर जवाब देना पड़ता है।

जहां इस कम्पनी के राष्ट्रीयकरण का सवाल सामने आया है, वहां एक दो और बातें जो कई सदस्यों ने उठाई हैं, कम्पनसेशन के बारे में और इस कम्पनी के कुल व्यवहार के बारे में। कम्पनसेशन का जो पैसा दिया जा रहा है, श्रीमन् उसमें से न पुराने हिस्सेदारों को पैसा दिया जा रहा है और न पुराने मैनेजमेन्ट को। जिस किसी हिसाब से पैसे

[श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डोज]

को सेक्शन 9 में देने का काम हुआ है, मुख्यतः यह पैसा जायेगा मजदूरों को। जो उनका बकाया है उसको पूरा करेंगे और बैंक का भी पैसा इस कम्पनी के पास पड़ा है, जो भी राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक हैं। इसलिये पैसा तो सरकार को ही किसी और रूप में वापस आने की बात है। पुराने किसी भी हिस्सेदार को एक पाई भी नहीं दी जायेगी, न पुराने मालिकों को इसमें से एक पाई दी जायेगी।

श्री नरसिंह रेड्डी ने इस कम्पनी की कुल इस समय की आमदनी के बारे में इसके असैट और लायबिलिटीज के बारे में यहां सवाल छोड़ा। 31 जुलाई, 1977 को इस कम्पनी के असैट्स थे एक करोड़ 76 लाख रुपये और लायबिलिटीज रही तीन करोड़ उनहतर लाख रुपये। जहां तक कम्पनी की पेड-अप कैपिटल का सवाल है, वह है 9,33,320 रुपये। यह कम्पनी बुरी अवस्था में क्यों आई, इस पर एक दो सदस्यों ने सवाल उठाया है। श्रीमती आडिवरेकर ने कुछ ऐसा एक सिद्धान्त भी बैठाने का प्रयास किया चूंकि अंग्रेजों के हाथों में यह कम्पनी थी हो सकती है अंग्रेजों ने जान-बूझ कर इस कम्पनी को बीमार बनाने का कोई प्रयास किया हो। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, इसमें अंग्रेजों का व्यवहार था इस पर बहस करना कठिन है क्योंकि इस कम्पनी की जो बीमारी है वह 1966 में शुरू हुई और 1966 में बीमारी शुरू होने के कारणों में एक कारण यह भी रहा कि नयी कम्पनियां यहां माल बनाने के लिए निर्माण हो गयीं और इस कम्पनी की जो मोनोपली थी वह समाप्त हो गई। कम्पीटीशन होता बुरा नहीं है, यह होना ही चाहिए। मगर जब एक नया कारखाना बन गया, 1966 में कम्पीटीशन होने लगा, नये यंत्रों को लेकर यहां के पुराने यंत्र थे तो स्वाभाविक था कि पुराने यंत्रों से इस कारखाने के बने हुए यंत्र कुछ मंहगे होने लगे और आधुनिक यंत्रों पर बनी हुई चीजें कुछ

सस्ती हो गई। तो इस कम्पनी का सारा माल चूंकि रेलवे को जा रहा था तो रेलवे की ओर से आर्डर जाने में कुछ कमी होने लगी और आहिस्ता आहिस्ता बन्द होने जैसी स्थिति में पहुंच गई। तो इसलिए अंग्रेजों का इसमें कहां तक जान-बूझ कर प्रयास रहा यह मैं नहीं कह सकता। बीमारी की चर्चा, कारखानों के बीमार होने की काफी चर्चा हुई है, यह कहना मुझे ज़रूरत नहीं है कि सारी बीमारी अकेले 'मिसमेनेजमेंट' के शब्द के साथ आप जोड़ सकते हैं। जोड़ने में कोई हरकत नहीं जैसे श्री कल्याण राय जी कहते हैं, फिर हम इलाज नहीं कर पाएंगे। अगर इलाज करना हो तो फिर बीमारी को ठीक ढंग से समझने का प्रयास होना चाहिए। एक नाम रख कर सारी बीमारियों को एक ही नाम से पुकारने का काम करेंगे तो फिर सही इलाज नहीं हो पाएगा। बीमारी है, बड़े उद्योगों में है, छोटे उद्योगों में भी है—विदेशी कारखानों के जरिये चलाए जाने वाली कम्पनियां भी बीमार होती हैं और देशी तो होती ही हैं लेकिन यह सारी चीजें एक ही नाम से पुकारें—मिसमेनेजमेंट की स्थिति या बीमार हो गई तो इलाज होना नामुमकिन हो जाएगा। जैसे मैं आपको एक उदाहरण देता हूं। हिन्दुस्तान में साढ़े पांच लाख छोटे उद्योग हैं जिसमें लगभग 80,000 उद्योग बीमार हैं। यह बहुत छोटे उद्योग हैं जिनमें पांच-दस या पंद्रह-बीस आदमी काम करते हैं। अब आप कहें कि वहां पर भी मिसमेनेजमेंट की बात है, उचित नहीं है। कई लड़के अभी-अभी इंजीनियरी पास हो गए। सरकार की ओर से विज्ञापन दिए गए कि भाई आप आर्टिप्रानर्स बन जाओ तो उन्होंने कहीं से कुछ पैसा लिया, कुछ सरकार से लिया, कुछ बैंक से लिया और वे भी आर्टिप्रानर्स बन गए। इस तरह के मेरे पास और भी सैकड़ों उदाहरण हैं। अनुभव उनके पास नहीं था। एक-आध सरकारी शेर ले लिया या निजी जगह पर ले लिया। किसी ने उसमें अमुक चीज बनाई तो इसकी मार्केट का या बेचने का जहां तक

सवाल है, वह उसको मालूम नहीं है। माल कारखानों में बन गया। बैंक वाले कहते हैं कि इधर उधर दौड़ो, कारखाना बंद हो गया। तो कुछ माल बना था, वह भी बीमारी के कारण जमा हो गया। तो कुछ अनुभव न होने के कारण इस तरह के छोटे-छोटे उद्योग बीमार पड़ गये यह बात कल्याण राय और उन जैसे सोचने वाले लोगों को जो एकतरफा दिमाग चलाते हैं, सोचनी चाहिए। ऐसे लोगों से मेरा यह अनुरोध है कि वे अगर समस्या का हल चाहते हैं तो फिर उसका सर्वांगीण दृष्टिकोण लेकर ही उसे देखने का प्रयास करें। मुझे मालूम है कि यह बहुत मुश्किल काम है क्योंकि उन लोगों को जिनकी शिक्षा बचपन से ही इस प्रकार की हुई है कि वे सभी चीजें बराबर से सोचते हैं। नेता जो कहे वही सोचना, किताब में जो लिखा है उसके बाहर कुछ भी नहीं बोलना चाहिए। तो इस प्रकार का जो दिमाग बना है वहां एक सर्वांगीण दृष्टिकोण लेना आसान नहीं है, फिर भी प्रयास करना चाहिए अगर समस्या का हल चाहते हैं। परन्तु हम समस्या का हल चाहते हैं। हमें हिन्दुस्तान के बीमार उद्योगों को जितना तन्दुरुस्त और दुरुस्त किया जा सकता है करना है। इसलिए एक तो यह कारण है कुछ नौजवान अनुभव के बगैर जाते हैं।

श्री देवेन्द्र नाथ द्विवेदी : लेकिन बड़े उद्योगों के लिए।

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डो : आ रहा हूं। समाप्त नहीं किया है। आपने एक घंटा बोला है तो मुझे भी आधा घंटा दीजिए। अध्यक्ष जी, तो हम अब बड़े उद्योगों को शुरू कर रहे हैं।

अब बड़े उद्योगों की बात लीजिए। मैं यह बात स्वीकार करता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान के उद्योगपति से दुनिया के उद्योगपतियों में सबसे बदतमीज बदमाश, आपको देखने को मिलेंगे। मैं हमेशा इस बात को

स्वीकार करता हूं और इनमें से कहीं कहीं लोगों को पिछले 3 महीनों में गिरफ्तार भी किया गया है। नाम आपको मालूम नहीं है, रमा गोयनका से लेकर कई लोगों को गिरफ्तार किया गया है। आप तो जानते होंगे क्यों गिरफ्तार किया, आप जानते होंगे उन रिश्ते कहां कहां पहुंचे थे। अभी सबको नहीं किया है, जरा इंतजार कीजिए, सब आर्येण, बड़ी मछलियां तो अभी बाहर हैं। (Interruptions) सियासी पड़ गये। इनका सियासत के साथ रिश्ता था। सियासत और हिन्दुस्तान का भ्रष्ट उद्योगपति इन दोनों के जो रिश्ते बन गये थे इसने हिन्दुस्तान के उद्योग और सियासत दोनों को बरबाद कर दिया (Interruptions) तकलीफ हो जाएगी, परेशानी आपको रहेगी। सत्य हमेशा बहुत कटु रहता है, असत्य बहुत आसानी से चलाया जा सकता है। मगर इस बात से इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता और इतिहास इस बात का सबूत होगा कि हिन्दुस्तान के भ्रष्ट उद्योगपति और हिन्दुस्तान की राजनीति करने वाले व्यक्ति इन दोनों के जो रिश्ते थे, इन रिश्तों ने दोनों को तबाह कर दिया। उद्योगों को भी किया और राजनीति को भी किया। अब हमारी कोशिश यह है कि इनको इस देश से बाहर निकालें। शाह कमीशन प्रयास कर रहा है लेकिन आप लोग प्रस्ताव करके भाग रहे हैं।

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: It is a new interpretation of the Shah Commission.

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डो : खोज हो रही है कि कहां कहां पहुंच थी, किसकी किसकी उद्योगपति के साथ। हर चीज की खोज हो रही है वरना कैसे पता लगेगा। इसलिए उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह नहीं कह रहा था कि कोई उद्योगपति बगैर दोष के है। मैं तो यह बात हमेशा कह रहा था और आज भी कह रहा हूं कि मुनाफाखोरी से और

[श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज]

काला पैसा जुटाकर ही आप लोग सारे चुनाव लड़ते थे

श्री देवेन्द्र नाथ द्विवेदी : आप कहां से लड़ते थे आपने भी 30-40 लाख रुपया इस चुनाव में खर्च किया ।

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज : हम तो जेल में रहकर लड़े । मुझे मालूम है कि मुझे नतीजा आने के 2 दिन बाद रिहा किया गया । हमारे लिए लोगों ने बूट पालिश कर कर के पैसा जुटाया । यूनिवर्सिटी के प्रोफेसर ने, कालेज के लड़के लड़कियों ने जो जिन्दगी में कभी सड़क पर नहीं गये थे उन्होंने बूट पालिश कर के पैसा जुटाया हमें जिताने के लिए । मुझे कहां आप लोग जिताने वाले थे । सवाल ही कहां है ? आपको मालूम है कि ऐसी कितनी कम्पनियों की सूची कल्याण राय ले आये । और सभी चीजों को ले आये होते तो अच्छा था । कितनी कम्पनियों की सूची ला मिनिस्टर ने पेश की थी अभी कुछ दिन पहले दी जिसमें लिखा था कि ये ये हैं, जिनका नाम चूड़ाबत जी ने भी लिया और उन्होंने भी लिया कि कहां कहां कौन-कौन कम्पनियां कैसे कैसे मोनोपोली लेकर बैठी हैं । मगर मोनोपोली के साथ चुनाव कोष में कितना पैसा जुटा था वह भी हिसाब निकालिए तो पता चले कि क्या रिश्ता था ? रिश्ते तो गहरे थे और उन रिश्तों ने बड़े उद्योगों को भी करप्ट करने में काम किया था और उद्योग में खुद जो बदमाशी रही उद्योगपतियों की, उस से भी यह काम हुआ है । मगर मैं फिर आऊंगा उसी मुद्दे पर कि सिर्फ किस व्यक्ति की कितनी बेईमानी है, बदमाशी है, इसी चीज को लेकर आप बीमारी का इलाज खोजने जाएं तो गलत होगा ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, बिजली की कमी है हिन्दुस्तान में और अगर अल्युमीनियम फैक्ट्री अथवा सीमेंट फैक्ट्री जिसमें करोड़ों रुपए, बीसियों करोड़ रुपए लगे हुए रहते हैं पचास-पचास फीसदी उनकी बिजली को

आप बन्द कर दें और छः महीने इसी स्थिति में कारखाना चले तो एक वर्ष में उसके सारे रिजर्व खत्म हो जाएंगे, दूसरे वर्ष में केपीटल खत्म हो जाएगी और तीसरे वर्ष में तो बोलेगा मैं बीमार हो गया, मुझे ले लो । तो बिजली के साथ जुड़ा हुआ है यह, रा मैटीरियल के साथ जुड़ा हुआ है । कई चीजें आपको हिन्दुस्तान में मिल नहीं रही हैं । तो कहीं रा मैटीरियल्स की कमी है, कहीं कैपेसिटी का युटिलाइजेशन नहीं होने के कारण कमी है, कहीं नीतियों के गलत होने के कारण कमी है । अब अगर रा मैटीरियल आप को न मिले और आप उद्योग से कहें ; तुमने जितनी पूंजी लगाई है, पूंजी का तुम को व्याज देना चाहिए, डिविडेंड देना चाहिए, रिजर्व बनाना चाहिए, सब कुछ करना चाहिए, तो यह संभव नहीं है । स्वाभाविक है, अगर रा मैटीरियल न मिले तो बात बिगड़ जाएगी ।

मार्केटिंग की भी समस्या है उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जिस के बारे में सरकारी नीतियों में सोचने का कार्य ही नहीं हुआ है । इसलिए गरीब का शोषण होता है । बड़ा आदमी तो अपना हिसाब जमा लेता है लेकिन जिसका अपना कोई बहुत बड़ा मार्केटिंग इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर न हो वह छोटा आदमी तो बिलकुल ही मारा जाता है । और यह बड़े कुल को बढ़ावा देने की नीति किस की रही ? हमारी तो नहीं रही । यह तो पुरानी सरकार की नीति रही । कल्याण राय जी, आप बहुत गुस्से में बोलते हैं लेकिन—1969 से यहां होंगे आपसे 1969—कितना उन्होंने समर्थन अपना किया है ?

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Please go through the proceedings. Without going through the proceedings you cannot say I said this. Your talk about saving and middle sector is just a bluff to the people.

DR. V. P. DUTT (Nominated); He has always spoken.

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज : हां, वे सर्टिफिकेट दे रहे हैं तो मैं आगे नहीं कहूंगा। इसलिए उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, ये जो बड़े उद्योगपति हैं जिनके पास मार्केटिंग इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर है, जो कि छोटे धंधे वाले के पास नहीं है, तो वे इन छोटे लोगों को मैदान से हटाने के लिए सिलसिला चलाए हैं इस नीति का कि बड़े को और बड़ा करो। इससे हिन्दुस्तान में बीमारी बढ़ाने का काम हुआ है—आपको उदाहरण दूँ जूते के कारखाने का। हिन्दुस्तान में नामी जूतों का कारखाना एक ही है हालांकि वह जो जूता बनाता है वह हिन्दुस्तान में पांच फी सदी भी जूता नहीं बनता है। लेकिन प्रचार है अखबारों में, रेडियो पर, टी० वी० में, सिनेमा में प्रचार है। इस से एक कंपनी का नाम सामने आ जाता है। लेकिन उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, वह जितने जूते बेचता है उस से आधे से कम जूते अपने कारखाने में बनाता है—लगभग 25-30 फी सदी अपने कारखाने में बनाता है बाकी जूते छोटे छोटे मोचियों से बनवा कर उनकी लूट करवाता है। मैं नाम नहीं ले रहा हूँ। ऐसे कई एक उदाहरण आपके सामने रख सकता हूँ, मगर उन के नाम लेना ठीक नहीं होगा क्योंकि जिनके नाम लूंगा वे नाराज हो जाएंगे और जिनके न लूँ वे समझेंगे हमारे लिए माफ है। तो इसमें किसी के लिए माफ नहीं है। इसलिए मैं किसी का नाम ले कर नहीं कह रहा हूँ। आपने पिछले 30 वर्षों में जो बड़ों को बढ़ाने के सिलसिले में नीति चलाई उस के चलते छोटा उद्योग बीमार हो गया, मीडियम सेक्टर बीमार हो गया, इसलिए जब आप बीमार की बात करेंगे तो कोई एकांगी दृष्टिकोण से उसको न देखा जाए। ये सारी समस्याओं को मद्देनजर रखना चाहिए। उस में से क्या हल हम लोग निकाल सकते हैं, यह देखा जाए। कुछ टेक्नालाजी का भी फर्क होता है। टेक्नालाजी में फर्क हो गया, नयी टेक्नालाजी

आ गई, अब तो नयी टेक्नालाजी के सभी लोग हिमायती हैं और जैसे जैसे रिसर्च एण्ड डेवलपमेंट हो जाएगा, नयी टेक्नालाजी आती जाएगी और पुरानी टेक्नालाजी जिस कारखाने में चालू होगी, वह बीमार हो जाता है। क्योंकि वह कंपीट नहीं कर पाता है। फैशन बदल जाते हैं कभी कभी। जैसे रेडीमेड गारमेंट्स के जो छोटे छोटे इंटरप्रनर्स हैं, साल दो साल में विदेशों में फैशन बदल गये और उनका माल चला नहीं। वह बीमार पड़ गये। कई कारण खोजे जा सकते हैं। तो यह सब चीजें कैसे हल करें इस पर हम को सोचना चाहिए। मिस मैनेजमेंट भी एक कारण है और बहुत बड़ा कारण है। मैं उस को छोटा कारण नहीं मान रहा हूँ और कैसे इस बीमारी को हम रोकें इस बारे में सरकार ने कुछ कदम भी अभी उठाये हैं। पिछले चार, 6 महीनों में जो हम ने काम किया उस में बीमारी शुरू होने के पहले ही अगर हम उस का कुछ इलाज कर सकते हैं तो उस दिशा में हम ने कोशिश की और इस दिशा में कुछ कदम उठाये। रिजर्व बैंक में एक मानिट्रिंग सेल है हम ने उस का रिश्ता इंडस्ट्रियल मिनिस्ट्री से जोड़ दिया है। हमारी समझ में अगर कोई उद्योग के बीमार होने के पहले ही पता चल जाता है तो उसका इलाज आसानी से हो सकता है और इस हालत का पता सब से पहले बैंक को लगता है क्योंकि उद्योग बैंक के पैसे पर ही चलते हैं। अपना पैसा लगा कर कौन उद्योगपति आज उद्योग चलाता है। सारे उद्योगपति कर्जा लेकर बैंक से पैसा लेकर अपने उद्योग चलाते हैं। तो जब बैंक का ब्याज आना बंद हो जाता है या उसकी किश्त भरनी बंद हो जाती है तो समझ में आने लगता है कि उद्योग कुछ बीमार हो गया है और मामला कुछ ठीक नहीं है। या तो उसमें कुछ मिस मैनेजमेंट हुआ है या कोई और कारण है बीमारी का। तो हम इस बात को करने जा रहे हैं कि इस मानिट्रिंग सेल से हमें उद्योगों के बारे

[श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज]

में कुछ अर्ली वार्निंग मिल जाय। अर्ली वार्निंग सिगनल अगर बैंक से हम को आ जाय तो अपने मंत्रालय से या दूसरे संबंधित मंत्रालयों से, जैसे फाइनेंस है या दूसरे कोई हैं उन के जरिये हम तत्काल जांच करके उस बीमारी के शुरू होने के पहले ही कुछ न कुछ कदम उठाते हैं और अगर बीमारी शुरू हो गयी है तो उस को बढ़ने से रोकने का काम करते हैं। दूसरा कारण बीमारी का जैसे पावर है। पावर और बैंक का कोई रिश्ता नहीं, लेकिन आज हिन्दुस्तान में 3000 मेगावाट बिजली की कमी है। तीस वर्ष की गलत नीतियों को चलते 6 महीने में, एक साल में या दो साल में हम इस बिजली की कमी को दूर नहीं कर सकते। हम को इस कमी को दूर करने में 3 या चार साल लग जायेंगे। हम उसे करेंगे और जब इस बिजली की कमी पूरी हो जायगी तो इसके चलते जो बीमारी होती थी वह बंद हो जायगी। इसी तरह से रा मँटीरियल की जहाँ कमी है उस को भी हम सुधार लेंगे। काफी विदेशी मुद्रा है, हालांकि इन बीस महीनों में बड़ा प्रचार चल रहा था और मैं तो रेडियो सुनता नहीं था, पिछले दस वर्ष से मैंने रेडियो सुनना बंद कर दिया था क्योंकि वह एक ही व्यक्ति का गुणगान किया करता था इसलिये, लेकिन लोग कहा करते थे कि प्रचार ऐसा चल रहा है कि नयी रोशनी आ गयी और एक बड़ी अच्छी बात हो रही है। हमारे मुल्क में विदेशी मुद्रा भी भर रही है, लेकिन इससे ज्यादा झूठ और गलत बात कोई और हो नहीं सकती थी। विदेशी मुद्रा आप के व्यापार के चलते आप के पास सरप्लस नहीं हुई। विदेशी मुद्रा का आज जो सरप्लस आप के पास है लगभग चार हजार करोड़ रुपये के, यह रकम हिन्दुस्तान के लड़के और लड़कियां, इंजीनियर्स और मजदूर, जो पंजाब से लेकर केरल तक के सारे हिन्दुस्तान के मध्य एशिया में और उत्तरी अफ्रीका में और बर्तानिया में और जर्मनी में गये और विदेशों में जाकर

वहाँ अपनी कुशलता बेच कर जो रुपया कमा कर वह इस देश में भेजते हैं वह है आप का फारेन एक्सचेंज का सरप्लस। मगर यहाँ बात चली कि यह तो सब देवी की महिमा है। फारेन एक्सचेंज रिजर्व बढ़ रहा है। मगर उसका इस्तेमाल नहीं हुआ। हमारे लड़के लड़कियां रुपया कमा कर देश में भेजते हैं लेकिन उस का इस्तेमाल नहीं हुआ। हम उस का इस्तेमाल करेंगे। जहाँ रा-मँटीरियल की कमी हम को नजर आती है हम उसको विदेशों से मंगायेंगे। उसको मंगा रहे हैं। अब इसमें लोग शिकायत भी कर सकते हैं कि यह सब विदेश से मंगाने लगे। मगर हम इस सिद्धान्त को लेकर चल रहे हैं कि जिस चीज को विदेश से मंगाने से हमारे उद्योग को बढ़ाने में, उसकी बन्द होने से रोकने में, उसको स्टिमुलेट करने में मदद मिल सकती हो तो हम उसका विदेश से आयात करेंगे। विदेशी मुद्रा का इस्तेमाल किया जाएगा। इस तरह से रा-मँटीरियल की समस्या को दूर करना है और हम करेंगे।

फिर उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, हम यह भी सोच रहे हैं, कुछ इस पर दिमाग अभी बना नहीं है, पर हम सोच रहे हैं कि जहाँ बेइमानी से कारखाने बन्द करने का सिलसिला चल रहा हो, उसके बारे में जो कोई भी आदमी बेइमानी से अपने कारखाने को बीमार कर दे और इसका सबूत हम ला सकते हैं तो उसके लिए उपाय करें। वगैर सबूत कुछ नहीं होना चाहिए, हम किसी को वगैर सबूत के जेल में नहीं भेजेंगे, वह जमाना मैं आशा रखता हूँ कि हमेशा के लिए खत्म हो गया। (Interruptions) . . .

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : मुकदमे उठवा लेंगे। (Interruptions)

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज : हमें मुकदमे उठवाने की जरूरत पड़ेगी, वहाँ जरूर उठा लेंगे। मगर मुकदमा किस काम के लिए है ? अगर लोगों का रुपया चोरी करके

मोटर गाड़ी बनाने के नाम पर मुकदमा ले जाते हैं तो जरूर चलायेंगे लेकिन अगर तानाशाही को उखाड़ फेंकने के लिए कोई आदमी अपनी जान की बाजी लगाकर लड़ता है उस पर मुकदमा चलाते हैं तो वह दूसरी बात है। जो भी हो, तानाशाही को उखाड़ फेंकने के लिए कोई भी रास्ता दुनिया में सही है, यह मेरी अपनी राय में ठीक है। इंसान की जान न जाए, इंसान घायल न हो जाए, यह कहना था श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण, डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया, आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव और अच्युत पटवर्धन, इन सब लोगों ने सन 1942 में जो रास्ता अपनाया हम उस रास्ते को अपनाने वाले आदमी हैं। जान न जाए और किसी को चोट न लग जाए, यह हमारा सिद्धान्त है। (Interruptions)

आप न्यायालय की बात करते हैं। मुझे जंजीर से बांधकर ले जाते थे। हम नहीं चाहेंगे कि हमारी तरह आप लोगों को इस प्रकार न्यायालय में कोई ले जाए। तो जो भी तानाशाही को उखाड़ फेंकने के लिए जरूरी हो, जो भी रास्ता इस्तेमाल करना पड़े उसको हम मानने वाले हैं। आप हमसे क्या मांग रहे हो? तानाशाही को उखाड़ फेंकने के लिए मैं कुछ भी करूंगा, लेकिन तानाशाही को इस देश में नहीं आने दूंगा। (Interruptions) जब आई थी तानाशाही तब जान की बाजी लगाकर लड़ा और फिर कभी आई तो फिर लड़ूंगा। उसका आपको मालूम नहीं है। मेरा एक भाई है उसके कान भी बन्द हैं अभी तक, वह सुन नहीं सकता है। उस लड़के को पन्द्रह दिन तक पुलिस थाने में जूतों से, लाठियों से, हथियारों से मारा (Interruptions) द्विवेदी जी, आप हमारे मित्र हैं आपको मालूम होगा।

श्री देवेन्द्र नाथ द्विवेदी : आप के यहां जब चोरी हुई थी तो उस समय मैंने पुलिस से उस चोरी के सम्बन्ध में तहकीकात करने के लिए कहा था।

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज : आप हमारे अंडर-ग्राउंड में होते होते बच गये बरना आप भी फंसे होते। मगर बात वही है। मेरे भाई को चोटे लगाई गई। स्नेहलता को घर में मारा गया। सवा सौ लोग जेल के भीतर मारे गये। क्या कुछ नहीं हुआ। मेरे भाई की जिन्दगी बरबाद हुई। पन्द्रह दिन तक पुलिस थाने में उसको पीटा गया। 7 दिन तक मेरे भाई के पेट में खाना नहीं दिया गया। पानी मांगने पर पेशाब की बात कही जाती थी। 15 मई को दोपहर में थाने में खड़ा करके उसको कहा गया—बताओ तुम्हारा भाई जार्ज किधर है? आधा घंटे में नहीं बताओगे तो तुम्हारी मां को यहां लाकर बलात्कार करेंगे। यह मेरे भाई के साथ किया। मेरा भाई आज तक ठीक नहीं हुआ। डाक्टर कहते हैं शायद कभी ठीक नहीं होगा। यह है तानाशाही। इस प्रकार की तानाशाही हिन्दुस्तान में कभी न आवे, यह मेरा कहना है। जब आई तब हम लड़े, फिर कभी न आवे, इसके लिए हम लड़े। इस को किसी भी तरह उखाड़ फेंकना है। मुकदमे की बात नहीं है इसमें। (Interruptions)

खैर आपने मुझे उधर खींच दिया, इसलिए यह कहा। न्यायालय की बात नहीं है, इस तरह की तानाशाही के साथ लड़ना चाहिए। जो हमारे साथ हुआ आज इस देश में कल यह आपके किसी रिश्तेदार के साथ भी हो सकता है। अगर उस सिद्धान्त के साथ लड़ना हो तो तानाशाही को हिन्दुस्तान में कभी मत आने दीजिए।

राजनीति के रास्ते पर हम चले और उस पर हमारी लड़ाई हो, विचारों का झगड़ा हो तो यह बात समझ में आती है। मगर तानाशाही का समर्थन कभी नहीं किया जाना चाहिए। आज भी कभी कभी उधर से तानाशाही का समर्थन सुनने में आता है। मैं चाहता हूं कि वह समाप्त होना चाहिए।

[श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डोज]

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, बीमार कंपनियों के बारे में जो बात चल रही थी, उसके संबंध में हमारा कहना यह है कि अगर किसी बड़े आदमी की तरफ से कोई कारखाना चलाया जाता है और बाद में वह उसको बीमार कर देता है तो यह नहीं होने दिया जाना चाहिए। इस संबंध में मेरे दिमाग में एक बात है जिसका इस समय मैं नीति के रूप में कोई प्लान नहीं कर रहा हूँ, लेकिन जो शब्द मेरे मन में है उसका मैं जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ। अगर किसी बड़ी कंपनी का मालिक कोई कारखाना चलाता है और उसको बाद में बीमार कर देता है तो इस बारे में हमारा यह सोच है कि ऐसे आदमी को फिर उस उद्योग में नहीं आने देना चाहिए। उसके उस उद्योग में आने पर रोक लगाई जानी चाहिए। अगर कोई उद्योगपति जानबूझ कर किसी कारखाने को बन्द करता है तो उसको फिर उस उद्योग में नहीं आने देना चाहिए। वह किसी अन्य धन्धे में जा सकता है, लेकिन उस उद्योग में नहीं आ सकता है जिसको उसने बीमार कर दिया है। हमारी यह कोशिश होगी कि हम इसी दृष्टि से सोचें और इस पर देश भर में चर्चा हो।

SHRI KALYAN ROY: That was the assurance given by the previous regime also.

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डोज : इस प्रकार का एक विचार हमारे मन में है और इस पर हम चलना चाहते हैं। इसमें कोई दिक्कत नजर आए या इसके अमल में कोई कठिनाई हो तो उस के लिए हमें रास्ता निकालना है। Nothing is foolproof, but we can make an attempt to see that whatever it is that we are going to do, it does not have loopholes that will enable the concerned person to get out once again and create problems for us.

इस पर

पूरी तरह से सोच-विचार करना है। मैंने एक विचार आपके सामने रखा है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इस पर अपनी राय दें

और अगर यह चीज हो सकती है तो इसको हम करना चाहेंगे।

इसके अलावा इस वक्त एक बड़ी समस्या मार्किटिंग की भी हमारे सामने है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह समस्या हमारे सामने एक चुनौती है। इसको सरकारी स्तर पर हल करने के लिए कुछ प्रयास चल रहा है। राज्यों से भी सहयोग लेने का प्रयास किया जा रहा है। छोटे उद्योगों के लिए किस प्रकार से एक मार्किटिंग अम्ब्रेला तैयार की जाय, इस पर विचार किया जा रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि चाहे सरकारी कंपनी हो या गैर-सरकारी कंपनी हो, जब तक मार्किटिंग फेसिलिटीज नहीं दी जाएगी तब तक छोटे उद्योग पनप नहीं सकते हैं। इस दिशा में सोच चल रहा है। वह काफी आगे बढ़ भी चुका है। कोई निश्चित राय लेकर हम आपके पास आएंगे। जब इस संबंध में हम अपनी नीति पेश करेंगे तो उस वक्त इस बारे में भी अपनी बातें सदन के सामने रखेंगे।

हमारे मित्र श्री कल्याण राय जी ने और श्रीमति चूंडावत जी ने काफी बातें सदन के सामने रखी हैं। श्रीमती चूंडावत ने एक शिकायत की कि मैंने एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में यह कहा था कि सन् 1956 की जो उद्योग नीति है उसी के आधार पर अभी काम चल रहा है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि उसी आधार पर काम चल रहा है, मगर उसको बदलना जरूरी है। सन 1956 की उद्योग नीति क्या है, मैं चाहूंगा कि माननीय सदस्य उसको एक बार जरूर पढ़ लें। अब तक पिछले 30 वर्षों में आप लोग नारों के जाल में ही फंसे रहे।

डा० विद्या प्रकाश दत्त : यह आपने ही सिखाया है।

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डोज : हमने सिखाया होता तो आप उस तरफ नहीं होते। आप

लोग इतने नारों में फसे रहे कि आपने 1956 की उद्योग नीति को पढ़ा ही नहीं।

What is the 1956 Resolution? What is the essence of that Resolution?

हमको यह बता दे कि 1956 की उद्योग नीति क्या है? सन् 1956 के उद्योग प्रस्ताव में तीन बातें हैं—शेड्यूल-ए, शेड्यूल-बी और नान-शेड्यूल। शेड्यूल-ए को देखिये जिसमें कहा गया है कि—

Schedule A is reserved for the State. The State will dominate. However, the private sector can also be allowed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Half and half.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Not half and half. It is reserved for the State. Having said that, it is stated, this is essential, this is this, that is that. Having raised it to a certain level you say, "However, this was typical Nehru's style", "Nevertheless". After saying the whole sentence on socialism you add, "Nevertheless it is necessary that we also plead for capitalism". You always add "Nevertheless". You make speeches and add always, "Nevertheless", "however" —

DR. V. P. DUTT: Nevertheless you bring the law.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: This is the point I am making. This is the 1956 Resolution: Schedule A—reserved for the States. At the end of Schedule A the proposition is qualified with "but it shall be open for the Government ..". That is, the Government may, however, allow the private sector also to operate.

फिर शेड्यूल बी। शेड्यूल बी में सरकार भी रहेगी और निजी क्षेत्र भी रहेगा। तो हम दोनों रहेंगे। नान-शेड्यूल जो इंडस्ट्रीज हैं These are, by and large, reserved for the private sector. However, the State

also may go in for it. शेड्यूल 'ए' Slate will be there. However, the private sector can come in शेड्यूल 'बी' The State and the private sector both can go. शेड्यूल 'सी' The private sector will be there, but the State also can come. तो क्या फर्क है। Nothing is wrong. The point I am making is ..

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Isn't it a fact that Tata Power Supply Corporation were not allowed to expand during the last 20 years? For the first time new Tatas have been allowed to expand and increase their power?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I think Mr. Kalyan Roy is completely off the tangent when he refers to Tatas and power supply. Tatas have been in power supply. The only decision that I had to take was whether I should wait for another three years or five years till some public sector corporation or the State Electricity Board comes in or till we have a Government led by comrade Dange in Maharashtra for insisting on running all power supply units on his own, or whether, in order to meet the present shortage of electricity in Bombay which is to the tune of 1,000 MW—which means there is a shortage of a thousand crores of rupees in production in Bombay alone because of your faulty planning over the years—I should immediately go in for power through a company which is already in power business, which is prepared to take over power generation. And may I submit here that power generation is a prerogative of the State Electricity Board, the State Government with whom your party will soon be having an electoral adjustment in Maharashtra.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: No, no.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Well, I am glad to hear that it will not. I

[Shri George Fernandes.] hope his word will be listened to by his comrades and cousins in Bombay also . . .

SHRI KALYAN ROY: You will know it. You were defeated from there.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Yes, yes, when you go to Bombay you will know it.

तो उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, हमने राज्य सरकार से पूछा । बसंत दादा पाटील से मैंने बात की । मैंने पूछा कि दादा यह बिजली वाला मामला है । 5 वर्षों से पड़ा है । 75 करोड़ रुपये की योजना थी अब इसके 175 करोड़ रुपये दाम हो गये । बम्बई में एक हजार मेगावाट बिजली की कमी है । क्या आप इसको लेने को तैयार हैं ? उन्होंने कहा कि नहीं भैया, इसको टाटा को दे दे, वह इसको करेगा । उससे संभव है । हम 17 करोड़ रुपया दे रहे हैं, वह 25 करोड़ रुपये रोज़ कर रहा है । वर्ल्ड बैंक कर्ज देने को तैयार है । इसको जल्दी कर दो । तब मैंने निर्णय लिया और यहां शिकायत की जाती है । कलकत्ता की कम्पनी That Calcutta company is not even a multi-national. It is a Sterling Company. Its Head Office is in London. It is based in London

बंगाल की सरकार ने हम से कहा कि इस कारखाने को आप तत्काल इजाजत दीजिये । अब जो बंगाल की सरकार है वह हम से कहे—आपके दोस्त हैं, हमारे भी हैं, आपके कोई शत्रु नहीं है, आपका जमा नहीं है बीच के समय में, वह बात छोड़ दीजिये, लेकिन पिछले दिनों से आप प्रस्ताव कर रहे हैं कि फिर जुड़ जाओ, फिर जम जाओ—तो वह हम से बोले कि आप हमें इजाजत दीजिये । हमने कहा कि आप इजाजत मांगिये हम दे देंगे । तो उन्होंने मांग ली और हमने दे दी । कलकत्ता को अगर 220 मेगावाट बिजली मिलेगी कल्याण राय जी

तो आपके घर में वहां रोशनी ज्यादा हो जायेगी ।

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Rs. 4,000 crores is there. You can utilise it in . . .

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES:

वह वहां हो रहा है बिजली पर ।

उपासभाध्यक्षजी, यही है मुख्य बात कि जब एक बार आदमी किताब पढ़कर अपना दिमाग बना देता है तो वह कुछ सोचने के लिए तैयार नहीं होता । मैं कह रहा हूं कि राज्य के इलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड ने हम से कहा कि इसको दे दो ।

The Chief Minister and the Cabinet of West Bengal tell me, please, (interruption)

SHRI KALYAN ROY: B.T. Ranadive is opposed to it.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I don't deal with Ranadive. I am concerned with the State Government. I am not concerned with party views.

अभी आप शिकायत कर रहे थे कि हमारे दल में अलग अलग विचार हैं, आपके दल में भी अलग अलग विचार हैं, शिकायत क्यों होती है ? इसलिए उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, जहां तक बिजली का सवाल है जिसके बारे में आज इन लोगों ने हम से शिकायत की तो इसमें यह लोग समझ लें कि हम यह नहीं सोच रहे हैं कि बिजली को किसी के निजी हाथों में दे दिया जाए, हम नहीं देने जा रहे हैं । 1956 का प्रस्ताव सब को मालूम है, किसी न किसी माध्यम से टाटा, बम्बई इलेक्ट्रिक सप्लाय सूरत अहमदाबाद में बिजली निजी हाथ में थी । आज भी है । यह तो सारे निजी क्षेत्र के उद्योग हैं । यह कोई हमने नहीं दी है । पहले से चले आ रहे हैं और इसमें हर एक क्षेत्र में बता सकता हूं । यह सिक्सिला चला था 1956 के प्रस्ताव में । इसलिए अबु अब्रहाम ने पूछा कि So what ?

The point I am making is that it is necessary to change it. It is a Resolution which pertains to all; it is everything to everybody; it never specifies what are the areas where, which sector would operate or whether there is going to be any opportunity or special facility available to the small sector, or whether employment was the concern of the industrial policy or whether only production was the concern of the industrial policy. In fact you can expect Jawaharlal Nehru only to say a number of things one way or the other. He was a person who was in public life for over 50 years and when he made about 50 statements a day, you could find in them a number of contradictions. In the industrial policy the main thrust of his argument was 'modernise and produce'; 'modernise and produce'. Our attempt is to put the man in the centre so that his problem can be solved . . .
(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: Do it.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: By all means. But we are operating with certain constraints—financial constraints, constraints of size, constraints of communication and umpteen constraints. Any policy which does not take into account all these constraints, circumstances and conditions in which we are operating can lead us to a situation where it will be difficult to provide jobs to 40 million unemployed—that is the present backlog—plus six millions every year because in another three months, schools, and colleges—right from matriculation to graduation and doctorate—will be throwing out another six millions and we will have to provide jobs to the educated, uneducated, literates and illiterates, and urban and rural people. You have this problem. Therefore, the industrial policy has to be an integrated policy which is also concerned with agriculture. Somebody may ask: What has the industrial policy to do with agriculture? It has, because I am talking about the total employment generation

and therefore it has to be an integrated policy which takes into account the biggest asset in this country. What is our biggest asset? The biggest asset in this country is our man-power. Any policy that does not put man at the centre, any policy which does not use to the maximum the man-power we have is a policy that is bound to fail, as the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956 has, with great respect to Shri-mati Chundawat, failed. Therefore, do not be carried away by the old slogans. . .

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI KUMARI CHUNDAWAT; I am asking you as to what change you are making?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We are putting the man at, the centre. We start with that. That is the starting point. The Government's industrial policy will be presented before this session ends and we shall then have the chance to discuss it at great length when that is submitted.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, there are one or two points. A number of questions have been raised and I shall not be able to answer all the points. Some of the basic issues will be hammered out at the time of the presentation of the whole industrial policy.

Much has been made out of the multinationals. It was said that we are going to sell the security of the country and Shri Kalyan Roy has lot of obsession with all these foreign companies and multinationals....

SHRI KALYAN ROY: I do not think I have mentioned multinationals. In fact I congratulated you

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I know you are very clever. You first congratulate and then say something else. You are also the follower of Nehru's style. You make a statement and then say 'however'. I would like to submit that I hold no brief for any multinational. If anything, two multi-

[Shri George Fernatides.]

nationals have been asked to go during the last six months which I consider to be a very good beginning, that is, the Coca-Cola, which is not just Coca-Cola, which is not just another multinational, but which was the standard-bearer of all the multinationals in the world. Coca-Cola was the standard-bearer, whose standard flies very proudly right outside the Kremlin in Moscow and they have been asked to go away from the Red Fort in Delhi. It flies very proudly there in Moscow. . . . I know that it is embarrassing to the communists, of course. I know that it is very embarrassing to Mr. Kalyan Roy. ... (Interruption)

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Not at all. But there is no Birla there; there is no Tata there.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: What, if they are not there"

SHRI KALYAN ROY: There is no Birla there; there is no Tata there; and there is no Mafatlal 'here.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I do not know. I do not know if the Birlas and the Tatas are the concerns of the Coca-Cola.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: There is nothing there like here which is dominated by so many of these people.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I do not know whether Mr. Kalyan Roy thinks that they can be there. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am getting a new theory from Mr. Kalyan Roy and the new theory is that the multinationals must be allowed to operate in the Soviet Union. Now, two hundred of them are operating just now, two hundred of them ...

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Be sure.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I can give you a list of the multinationals, top multinationals. 200 of them, who are opera'ing there.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: With whom?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: In the Soviet Union.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: But with the Soviet power only and not directly with the capitalists as it is here.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, Comrade Kalyan Roy has a new theory and his theory is that.

रूसियों को अपने राष्ट्र के हितों की जानकारी है, मगर हिन्दुस्तान में जो राज करते हैं उनको अपने राष्ट्र के हितों की जानकारी नहीं है।

श्री कल्याण राय : टाटा बिड़ला ...
(Interruptions)

श्री जार्ज फर्नंडीज : टाटा बिड़ला गये भाड़ में। मैं कह रहा था उसे जाने दीजिए भाड़ में। सवाल मल्टी नेशनल का है। सवाल है कोका कोला और पेप्सी कोला का। कोका कोला और पेप्सी कोला हम नहीं चाहेंगे हमारा तो 077 आ गया, मैंने आपको कहा था कि आप एगो एक्सपो जाईये और वहां 77 पीजिए। बहुत बढ़िया चीज है।

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चूंडावत : पी लिया है।

श्री जार्ज फर्नंडीज : अच्छी चीज है ना। तो मल्टी नेशनल का सवाल है।

I am not a spokesman and I do not hold any brief for any multinational That is No.

1. न० 2 हम यह बात बार बार कहते आये हैं तो फिर लक्ष्मी चूंडावत जी बात हर बार क्यों छेड़ती हैं, हो सकता है कि उनको मजा आता हो हमको छेड़ने में। लेकिन हम बारबार यह बात कहते हैं और फिर आज इस बात को दोहरायेगे कि जिन क्षेत्रों में हमें विदेशी पूँजी की आवश्यकता महसूस होगी वहां हम अपनी शर्त पर मदद लेने के लिए तैयार हैं। वे शर्तें क्या हों उसको हम अपनी नीति में पेश करेंगे जब नीति आयेगी। मगर ऐसे

क्षेत्रों में जहाँ विदेशी पूँजी, विदेशी टेक्नालाजी की जरूरत नहीं है, वहाँ उनको हम नहीं आने देंगे। आई० बी० एम० ने यह शिकायत की कि हम तो सोफिस्टिकेटेड टेक्नालाजी हैं, हम कम्प्यूटर बनाते हैं।

They were manufacturing adding machines and renting them out. The first generation or second generation computers, that is, the old pieces they used to bring into this country and rent them out and make colossal profits out of that and take them out of the country, in the name of sophisticated technology. How were they able to do this? I wish Shrimati Chundawat addressed herself to this question. How did they survive all these days? How did the IBM survive? How or why were they allowed to survive in spite of this kind of defrauding the Indian people? How? By whom? Why? I will only give you a clue and you may follow it up. Do you want me to give you the clue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: The clue is this; The IBM office is located in the "National Herald" office. This is the clue. Now, you may follow it up. This is only a clue. Their office is located in the "National Herald" building.

SHRI PRAKASH MEHROTRA (Uttar Pradesh): So what?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You follow it up. Don't ask me to elaborate it. The IBM Office is located in the "National Herald" office.

SHRI PRAKASH MEHROTRA: So what?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: It is for you to find out now, because you said, "Give us the clue." I am giving you the clue now and it is for you to find it out now.

DR. V. P. DUTT: Now, there is a suspicion that these two multinationals

have been closed down because of their association with the previous ruling party, but the other multinationals are having a field day.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, the honourable Member would like to suggest that these multinationals have been asked to close down....

DR. V. P. DUTT: I am not in favour of them.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You do not accept it?, You are not going to accept it.

DR. V. P. DUTT: I said that I am not in their favour and I am in favour of your closing them down.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, there is a general suspicion which the rumour-mongering mil] in the country has been churning out for the last few days that these two multinationals have been closed down because of their intimate association with the..... with what? ... with the previous ruling caucus. Well, Sir, I would like to submit with great respect to everyone concerned that the decisions that -we took were based on a correct interpretation of the law of the land. These were based on a correct interpretation of the law of the land as it had been enacted earlier. If there are other companies, we are on the look-out. For instance there is a company in India, a multinational company, which produces tooth paste, tooth brushes, and so on; and which declared a dividend of 8000 per cent. Eight thousand per cent dividend was declared by them. The year before last, they declared 5000 per cent dividend—during the days of the 'glorious emergency'. In normal times, it was 8000 per cent. We are looking into it. We will take care of these people. All those who have fattened themselves on the blood of the poor people of this country—I am sure this appeals to your heart, it warms your heart—we will not allow them to exist in India. We will not

[Shri George Fernandes.]

allow any such multinational company to exploit India. We shall not allow anybody to circumvent the laws of this country in any way. And, therefore, Sir, when we discuss multi-nationals, we would like to see that if we have to have them in any particular area, we have them on our terms. I have always said that. I will not say that I am misquoted, because that is everybody's prerogative, but I have been misinterpreted. It has been said that I hold a brief for multi-nationals. If I spend a day in West Germany in the course of an effort to make the EEC buy our textiles, everyone sees in it a great conspiracy, with West German capitalism. I spent a day and a half in East Germany, discussing with my old Socialist comrade, who is Minister of Technology, Mr. Hans Matyoph, appropriate technology, because he is concerned with science and technology and he is a committed socialist and also spent a little time with Mr. Willy Brandt, former Chancellor, and meeting people in the trade unions and in the industrial and political fields—after all, I am the Industries Minister of India and we have a large number of collaborations with West Germany, including our premier public sector undertaking BHEL which has collaboration with Siemens, a West German company, and with Crafts Works Union which is also a German company, and we have a large number of collaborations with them—now, this is all interpreted as if there is an effort on my part to sell out the whole thing. They are in the private sector and I admire them very rightly, whereas—ours are a part of the public sector here. I think, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir; that there is a great misconception about the role which international capital, the World capital and others play.

Now, I forget whether it was Comrade Kalyan Roy or it was Mrs. Chun-dawat, who said.... (*Interruptions*) We will roll it; we will roll you with it. It was stated that Indian industrialists are going abroad.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Yes, I said

that.....

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES; Yes, you gave a whole list. They are putting up factories elsewhere. Now, if they are closing their factories, we will take care of that. Whenever they go abroad, if they are going abroad against the interests of our country, we will prevent that. If they are going because other countries are inviting them, particularly countries of the third world, we shall look into that, because there are various situations. Today we are trying our best to use Indian skills, use Indian know-how, use Indian workmen, use the money in the Arab world, use technology available, the best technology, available in Japan, Europe or America, to develop industries in the third world countries.....

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Where the labour is cheap,

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: There is no cheapness of labour involved... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI KALYAN ROY; The Birlas are closing down factories in Calcutta and setting up a factory in Thailand.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, these are two different issues. International co-operation is one issue; a factory going sick or an industrialist cheating the exchequer of the country or robbing it, is another issue. We should not confuse these two issues. This is the trouble. I go on telling my friend, Mr. Kalyan Roy that these are two different issues. You are a scientific socialist. Be scientific in your approach to this problem also. How can you mix up these two issues? I have the Industries Minister of some developing country in the world almost everyday calling on me. I have industrial delegations, sometimes two or three, visiting me every day. They want Indian skills to be made available to develop their countries' economy at the level of the State.

AN HON. MEMBER: How can we help?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: They believe in us. I am not speaking about George Fernandes or the Janata Government. I am speaking about the Indian people. I am speaking of Indian skills, Indian technology and Indian workers. I do not say anything about Janata workers.

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: They were there for 30 years.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am not disputing that. What is your quarrel? We are today, as a Government, making efforts to see that our cooperation with the countries of the third world does not stay at the level of exchange of mere platitudes like third world, all of us together, shoulder to shoulder and hand in hand. Not just that. We want something more. How are we going to use Indian skills, Arab money, western technology or any sophisticated technology from any part of the world to develop Indian economy and the economy of the countries of the third world? (Interruptions) Mr. Kalyan Roy, I do not know whether there is anyone living in the world whom you accept. I believe that the most revolutionary party and the most revolutionary Government in the world is the party and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam. I do not accept anyone else to be more revolutionary than the Vietnamese. No one has done more to establish the dignity of man, to struggle against imperialism, to struggle against colonialism and to struggle against all the might of money and weapons in the world. Will you accept what they say? Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I knew that Mr. Kalyan Roy would want some evidence. Here is the report of the FICCI delegation to Vietnam, July 6—13, 1977.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: The working class controls the power there unlike **here**.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: This is the trouble. Mr. Vice-chairman, how does one convince a man like

Kalyan Roy? Someone must help me. What do the Vietnamese say? What does this delegation say? This is a relegation of Indian industrialists, many of whom, I am sure, you will not like to talk to. There are many against whom there are a number of cases pending in the various courts of law today. But this delegation, at the highest level, was invited by the Government of Vietnam. They went to Vietnam. This is what they say. They say: "FICCI is not a stranger to circles that matter in SRVN (that is, Socialist Republic of Vietnam). H.E. Mr. Phan Hien, Special Envoy of the Prime Minister of SRVN, visited New Delhi in February and at that time met the representatives of the Federation and welcomed the visit of a FICCI Delegation to his country as it will open new vistas of economic and commercial co-operation between two friendly nations." Further they say: "We were received in Hanoi by the Minister of Trade H.E. Mr. Dang Viet Chan, who spelt out the areas in which SRVN would like to receive support from Indian enterprises." It is a long report. All the things are there. The point I am going to make is how Vietnam, a socialist country, looks at foreign capital. What is its approach to foreign capital? It is high time we started understanding it and we are not carried away by some old thinking and prejudices. What do the Vietnamese say? I am now quoting from their law and not from the report of our delegation: "In Vietnam, private foreign investment may take one or three forms—Comrade Kalyan Roy, underline 'private foreign investment' (1) investments in solely-owned private enterprise, specialising in production for total export in "which case 100 per cent equity ownership is possible. In other words, 100 per cent of foreign money by a private enterprise, by a multi-national can come into Vietnam and can exploit Vietnam; (2) investment in an enterprise jointly set up by foreigners and Vietnamese State-owned organisations in which case foreign equity ownership is limited to a maximum of 49 per cent and a minimum of

[Shri George Fernandes.] 30 per cent of the total capital; and (3) investments by way of co-operating with Vietnam in the production and sharing of output. Production-sharing is subject to negotiations." And this is all for the private enterprise. Now, what are the areas where foreign investment is admitted, because some one here spoke about the Tatas, etc. Comrade Kalyan Roy spoke about the Calcutta Electricity and all that. I was amazed with some of the sloganeering that we generally get ourselves involved in.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Capitalist class is not involved there.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am not concerned with the classes in Vietnam, I am concerned with the conditions. Vietnamese people have a certain social and political system. We respect their social and political system. We have a certain social and political system. Some of us may be in complete agreement with it and some of us may not be in complete agreement but we have a certain social and political system. Whatever be the social and political system of Vietnam or of India, we are all interested, each one of us is interested in the development of our respective countries. The Russians are interested in their country, the Americans are interested in their country, the Vietnamese are interested in their country and we are interested in the economic development of our own country.

SHRI ABU ABRAHAM (Nominated) : What you say is that Vietnam and Soviet Russia are in a position to accept these foreign companies without their economy being disrupted.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: This is the point, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir.

One has to have confidence in one's ability to withstand the temptations of foreign monopolists. We had to take a decision regarding Coca Cola. Every conceivable kind of pressure was applied, even the workers of Coca Cola were mobilised to come and have a 24-hour non-stop *dharna* outside my house. Nothing was left undone.

DR. V. P. DUTT: So, you are proving Mr. Kalyan Roy's point.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: So, Sir, it is the character of your leadership, it is the character of your people. Why do you want to permanently live in a world where you think you are saleable? Why can't you stand up and say that we are not saleable, we shall have any equity participation, we shall have anybody to come here but we shall have on our terms and if it suits us, we will have and if it does not suit us, we will not have? I do not understand this crisis of character. What is this crisis of confidence where responsible people constantly say, "But they may purchase us"? Are you available for sale? I do not understand this. This is the point that I have been trying to repeat for the last several months, and this is the point that is constantly thrown at me. But the Russians can manage, the Vietnamese can manage. The Vietnamese are a very pragmatic people. They have confidence in themselves. It may be surprising to Comrade Kalyan Roy and this is what the Vietnamese say. What are the areas where the foreign investment is allowed there? The foreign parties may invest in the exploitation—you mark this term—of natural resources, in various branches of agriculture, industry, building, transport, etc. with the exception of those branches which the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam reserves for itself. In other words, excepting defence, excepting public services, every other sector of the economy is available for

exploitation by even a multi-national. Obviously they know their country's uests. They would allow 100 per cent foreign equity provided whatever is produced is exported and the money comes to the country on their terms. They would allow 33 per cent or 49 per cent equity provided there is adequate agreement on profit sharing. They would negotiate with you the terms if the domestic market is to be totally exploited.

Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, my submission is that where the multi. national question is concerned, it is not an issue which should unnecessarily agitate us. We shall have foreign investment in areas where we find it is absolutely necessary on terms that we shall lay down. We shall define them. We shall refine them whenever it is necessary. Even in the case of existing multi-national concerns, as has been done in two cases, someone might be asked to divest him. self from a certain area of production. If someone has to be asked to pack up and go for any particular reason, I would like to assure the House that we shall not hesitate to do so.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, this debate has given me the chance to state these things. Comrade Kalyan Roy raised all these questions. Shrimati Chunda-wat too raised some of them but she must have felt that enough is enough. But this debate has given me an opportunity to make some of these clarifications.

Now, there is this question of monopoly houses also, namely, that monopoly houses are the cause of sickness. I have already responded to this point. I believe, we will also need to take a correct look on this problem of monopoly houses. There is a certain definition under the M.R.T.P. Act which has been given to large houses, small houses and monopoly houses. There is a certain amount of growth in industry which, I believe,, is inevitable if you do not want an industry to get sick, if you do not want to have sick giants on your lap. Just now

you are having some sick babies. If you do not want to have sick giants, I believe a fresh look on many of your past policies in regard to industrial houses is also generally called for. Now, when we discuss monopoly houses in India, there are two ways of looking at it. One is that you have houses which have grown horizontally in a big way. I remember a couple of years ago, three or four years ago, one of the giant industrial houses in India wanted to market pickles.

SHRI N. G. RANGA: There is 5000 per cent profit in that.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: They said: We have a marketing organisation, we have an export organisation and we can handle pickles. Now, in this way there has been a proliferation of a number of companies, satellites, inter-related, interlocked, and you have a huge monopoly house; a group of companies, under the overall umbrella of one house. Then, you have companies "which are giants in their own right. Today our biggest cement units in the country are of a capacity of 1200 tonnes. The M.R.T.P. Act says that if the investment is Rs. 20 crores, it is a monopoly house. In a 1200-tonne cement plant the investment today is Rs. 27 crores. So a 1200-tonne cement plant is a monopoly house. Across the world today they are going in for 3000-tonne cement plants. 4000-tonne cement plants. Here we have cement plants of only 1200-tonne capacity just now. That is all. We are now going in for 2000-tonne plants. By the present definition, Mr. Vict-Chairman, if there is one cement plant with investment of Rs. 20 crores plus, then it is a monopoly house. Of course, you would then say that cement is excluded. Then you try to find various loopholes. The point I am making is that when we discuss these matters we have to look at these questions from all aspects: Is it one single company, with the monopoly of the market, with resources with which they can manipulate or is it a proliferation

[Shri George Fernandes.]

of companies with horizontal growth that has taken place over the years, and a number of companies having control, spreading their tentacles everywhere and liquidating or otherwise taking over the medium and small units? I believe that these two are different questions and one will have to apply one's mind to them. We are applying our mind to them. We will come out with a policy to deal with this problem as it is before us today. But there is one aspect which again was touched by my friend, Comrade Kalyan Roy, and others, where, I feel, we shall have to do something, namely, no company should have the monopoly of the market or the monopoly of the production. Then, you run into trouble. The sector may be anything. It is not very important. Perhaps, one can go on debating on this whether it should be 31 per cent or 29 per cent and whether it should be 20 per cent or 25 per cent. One can go on debating on this. But I would think that 30 per cent could be the reasonable limit. One could say that no one should have more than 30 per cent of the production. One could say that no one should have more than 30 per cent of the market. That is how you see that you take care of the economies of scale also. The idea is not to squeeze out anybody. The idea is not to make the units sick. But nevertheless, when we discuss about the big houses, when we discuss them by their size and when we discuss them by the monopoly status they occupy, I feel that it is necessary for us to look at this point from various angles. After all, these monopoly houses are there. I know Comrade Kalyan Roy dislikes all these industrial houses. But they are there. They are a fact of life today. None of us have the mandate today to say that these industrial houses should not exist. We cannot wish them away. They are there. Everybody is trading with them. The world is trading with them. From Vietnam to the Soviet Union, from Western Europe

to America and to Japan, public companies, private companies, Governments and non-Governments, everybody is trading with them. To that extent, they are also contributing to their growth, everyone. The world order is so intertwined with each other today that each one is contributing to the growth of the other, in some form or the other. Therefore, Sir, they are there. How could we control them? How could we see that they do not create problems? There, I believe, Mr. Vice-Chairman, when we come with our industrial policy, all these issues will have been clarified and Comrade Kalyan Roy won't have any major grouse or grievance while dealing with our policies on these matters.

A question was raised by Shrimati Chundawat about cement. She said that I had spoken about mini cement plants and German technology. She asked 'Why not Indian technology?' Mr. Vice-Chairman, there is a difference between the German technology and the Indian technology so far as mini cement plants are concerned. The Germans have developed a technology where for the mini cement plants, they are using the rotary. She referred to two units. Both the units are now closed down. The two units have been there, one near Trichy and the other near Lucknow. But they are not working for a long time. Our technology is based on the vertical shaft. Now, obviously, the rotary is a far more developed technology. But even there, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is very interesting how the previous Government used to deal with it. I was in Jorhat a week back. The head of our institute there, the Director of the Regional Research Laboratory, met me and he showed me the drawings and the documents and all the work that they had done at the Regional Research Laboratory in Jorhat during the last three years to develop a single vertical shaft to produce cement through the mini cement plants with a capacity of 30 tonnes per day. Now,

for three years, this technology has been there in the Regional Research Laboratory in Jorhat. But the Government of the day did not allow it to come to the surface, just as for the last three years, even though the 'C.F.T.R.I. had an alternative, had a soft drink alternative, to Coca Cola, it was not allowed to come out of the Laboratory. So, by one decision, concerning the C.F.T.R.I., Mysore, you helped the foreign monopolists to operate in this country and you helped the multi-nationals to operate in this country, and even though the Regional Research Laboratory, Jorhat, had developed a technology in the mini cement plant sector, you had suppressed that for the last three years and you had allowed your own big tycoons to go into cement. The consequences are there. We are having a tremendous cement crisis today. There has been no building up of capacity in the last three years. We are doing whatever we can. We are immediately setting up three mini cement plants in the Eastern Region. One of the plants is now under erection and by the end of this month it is expected to go into production in Bhuj. And there, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to make a submission in the context of what Mrs. Chun-dawat and some other Members said about import of foreign technology. I believe that wherever it is necessary we should import foreign technology. We need not wait. Because five years hence we shall be developing our technology, so we should wait, I do not subscribe to that theory. We shall have to start with other experimentation now. We do not have to start with analysing every scientific theory now. If a technology has advanced to a certain stage and if that technology is available for a price, we should buy it, we should ply it, we should refine it, put our scientists on the job of - refining it. But telling a scientist to start his work on finding out what qualities are there in coal, although someone has already found out what qualities are there in coal, I do not

subscribe to that theory. If anyone tells in this country a scientist or a politician or an industrialist or an academician that already a technology is available, all the qualities of coal are known, you say: No, that is foreign, you should start with scrap—now this is the proposition which I say is absurd. I will not subscribe to this theory. This is not to say that we should not develop our technology. It must develop. We are putting a lot of money for research. This year for science and technology there has been a budget allocation of Rs. 350 million. Next year it will be more. This is not to speak of the research and development which a number of private sector undertakings or public sector undertakings are going to put in. Therefore, so far as technology is concerned, there are certain things to be done and we shall do them.

So far as the mini cement plants are concerned, we will use our technology and if German have something to offer—their own rotary type plant is being commissioned this month, I am sending a couple of engineers to size up that plant, to see whether we can bring that technology here, to see whether it is economical and useful and to see whether it fulfils all our requirements—we shall use that technology here.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Swadeshi Mills was referred to and a lot of tears were shed. Of course, it was referred to in the course of the debate by Mrs. Chundawat, but earlier also, in the afternoon I think it was Shrimati Habi-bullah who made a reference to it and in the process she almost shed tears. I am glad to see that Congressmen also can have some time for tears. Talking to me about workers being shot. . . . (Interruptions). We will have to find that out.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVE-DI:
And not crocodile tears, I hope.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We will have to find out that. Now you

[Shri George Fernandes.]

are talking to me about firing en workers. Of course, no one should use guns, but hypocrisy must have also some limits. Words must sound genuine. Even if there is no genuineness, at least the words must sound genuine. Even if a political point has to be scored, it must appear to be genuine, howsoever hollow it may be. Mr. Vice-Chairman, true, in Swadeshi Mills there has been an incident. According to the 'National Herald' 12 people have been killed and according to rest of the papers five people have been killed. It is a tragedy. To me it is a tragedy beyond words. My life has been with the working class of the country and it will always be with them. Comrade Kalyan Roy was saying that there is a question. There is no question. I do not accept the *khandani* idea of sitting in this chair and we are here by sheer accident. The people of Muzaffarpur elected me, the Janata Party was returned with the majority, so we are here. The people of India decided; otherwise, we will be there. Then we do not know whether some of you will let us be alive or not, whether you will allow us to be there or you will send us to the Tihar Jail or to some other jail, I do not know. But I do not subscribe to this theory, none in my party subscribes to this theory that we are destined to remain here. My grandfather, my father, now I; then my son and then my grandson—we do not subscribe to this theory. We know, there are people in this country and probably, Mr. Dwivedi, you know who they are who subscribe to this theory. We do not. So, my life is with the workers, with those people with whom I have spent 30 years of my public life. I have gone on the pavements with the workers, with the students, with the youth, with the landless labourers, leading the struggles, getting beaten up. And now you are shedding tears. Were any tears shed all these years? Condemn police firing arrays not only when one is in the Opposition. Human life is

human life. The value of human life does not suddenly get magnified when you go into the Opposition and its value is not devalued when you are in power. If anybody has done anything wrong in Kanpur in the Swadeshi Mills, such people should be punished. It is not for me to speak on the subject. The Home Minister will make a statement if a statement is called for. If a statement is called for, he will make a statement. But I am only submitting that it is not my area; I am not qualified to speak on it. But certainly as a trade union man, I will most certainly condemn it and will most certainly condemn any police firing anywhere as I have condemned and as I have fought against any kind of victimisation of workers, any kind of effort to crush the working class movement or the working people. But again the Swadeshi Mills problem, is it a new problem? It is a problem which we have inherited from you. Whosoever is running it—and I think it is Mr. Raja Ram Rajpuria who is responsible for running it—we have inherited this problem from you. But we have to solve it. That is what I have to say. I am not saying that because we have inherited a large number of problems from you, therefore, we shall do nothing about it. We shall go on speaking about it. But please bear with us. Let us go by certain values, go by certain standards, accept certain standards, certain values. Let there be sincerity, let there be genuineness. Political differences are one thing. . . .
(Interruptions) . . . Yes, by all means. Political differences are one thing. But where human values are concerned, let there not be any hypocrisy involved there, as some times one sees. That way, we will not succeed in building any new quality of life in our country. That is how we take every issue.
(Interruptions) . . . This has nothing to do with the point made about the Swadeshi Mills.

DR. V. P. DUTT: Haven't your Prime Minister, your Defence Minister, your Minister for petroleum and Chemicals also been from this side?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Yes, it is. Ultimately, as it is said, we will one day all be dead and gone and we are all children of some man somewhere. So one can always have that point. But we are concerned with principles; we are concerned with policies. Today there may be many people who are fed up with what is happening, who are upset at the way the things are being taken. But we are concerned with the way many of you are, once again, being able to accept one leader, one voice, one opinion, one this thing and one that thing. If you suddenly see the light of the day and say, "Alright, enough is enough", we shall welcome you with open arms. We shall forget and we shall forgive the past. But We shall not forget and forgive the crimes of the criminals. That is different. We shall make a distinction there... (*interruption*) ... I always said this in all my underground bulletins. It is not of today. I did not give up hope for the Congressmen. I said, "I am sure, at some point of time they will go through a traumatic experience which will restore to them their values". This is my hope. I always used to say so. "For many of you," I said, "I always have hope and I still have hope".

So, Mr. Vice-Chairman, so far as this Bill...

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: ... is concerned...

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Well, you asked for it, Mr. Dwivedi. You cannot make a complaint. You asked for it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): The lesser the interruptions, the better it is. It is getting on to 5 O'clock.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Well, all of you have been asking for it. I would have liked this Bill to be passed in exactly five minutes. It did

not need more than five minutes. But you raised all the points.

SHRI D. P. SINGH (Bihar): It has been interesting to hear our hon. friend, Mr. George Fernances, in many meetings at Chowpatty and in the trade unions. We love him and admire him. But will he kindly be considerate to us and look at the clock and come to the point of the Bill under consideration?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Vice-Chairman, if I were to deal with all the points that Mr. Kalyan Roy has raised, I will have to carry over the debate...

AN HON. MEMBER: That credit goes to Mr. Kalyan Roy.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: And also Mrs. Chundawat. You cannot absolve her and also some others who tried to ask questions from that side. Mr. Vice-Chairman, as far as the Bill is concerned. ..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Not much to say.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: ... as I said, the Bill has been accepted by the entire House. We are happy that this company has turned the corner, and we expect the company to do better this year and show a profit this year. The suggestions made by the hon'ble Members on how we should see that this company is run properly and particularly about its amalgamation or otherwise at a later date will be kept in mind and we shall take a decision at the appropriate time. I commend this Bill for consideration.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the acquisition and transfer of the undertakings of Messrs. Gresham and Craven of India (Private) Limited

[The Vice-Chairman]

for the purpose of ensuring the continuity of production of goods which are vital to the needs of the Railways and of the industries manufacturing engineering products and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): We shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the bill.

Clauses 2 to 33 and the Schedule were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula, the Preamble and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was proposed.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: Sir, I wanted to seek certain clarifications from the hon'ble Minister. Mr. George Fernandes has the enchanting habit of speaking for hours together and talking about almost every subject under the sun and yet not saying anything of substance.

Sir, I heard him for more than an hour. I had a meeting of the Congress Parliamentary Party but I decided not to attend it because I thought that he was going to say something new about the so-called new Industrial Policy. But after hearing him I feel a sort of constraint to ask a few questions of him.

Sir, he has a philosophy, and that philosophy is to the cake and it too, to go on saying things which are contradictory to each other. He has given a few examples. He has criticised the Congress for having done nothing in the past thirty years. He has taken pride in the manner in which the

Indian skill is being solicited by the countries of the third world. It is not as if the Indian skill which is being solicited in the third world countries was catapulted into the atmosphere the day the Janata Party was installed in the Government. If he is proud of the Indian skill—and I am proud that he is proud of the Indian skill—it is the result of the thirty years of achievement under the Congress rule. It is because of our policies, industrial, agricultural and the overall economic policy, that we are in a position to export technology to the third world countries.

He has spoken against dogmatism and doctrinaire approach and went on asking Comrade Kalyan Roy as to what was the latest book that he was relying on. I think it was his way of emphasising that doctrinaire approach which has not helped and yet he took strong exception to Nehru's flexibility and Nehru's love for "Nevertheless" and "However". Sir, when you say "Nevertheless", when you say "However", he was saying that you are not "dogmatic", you are not "doctrinaire". There is "however" side of the picture also. When you are taking a "pragmatic view" rather than a "doctrinaire" approach view then you talk of "Nevertheless".

Mr. Fernandes quoted from a certain publication from the Government of Vietnam and he very rightly said that the Government of Vietnam is the most revolutionary today. Probably he was saying this for the benefit of Mr. Kalyan Eoy. He also talked about how pragmatic they are. Then he criticised the 1956 Resolution and "However" and "Nevertheless" approach of Nehru, and said that after enumerating the fields which, according to the Resolution, should be under the State or the public sector, there was a proviso that even the private sector may have a role to play.

Now, is this not what the Government is doing? In this not what the hon. George Fernandes has done by allowing Tata to operate in a field

which, in his own opinion, legitimately belongs to the public sector? He is adopting a flexible approach. At least that is what he says. He has criticised the previous Government for having allowed multi-nationals to grow and he goes on saying things and then immediately after that he says that multi-nationals are a fact of life, and then he advises Mr. Kalyan Roy to accept multi-nationals as a fact of life and talks about the compulsions of international economic co-operation. Of course, we are living in an inter-dependent world. Of course, we believe in flexibility. We should be proud of the fact that this country did not adopt a doctrinaire approach, thanks to the dynamic leadership of Nehru for whom he has nothing but allergy. It is due to his dynamic leadership that we are in a position where we have created an infrastructure for planned development in this country.

For the past seven months, all the spokesmen of this Government including his erstwhile predecessor, Mr. Brij Lai Verma, have been talking about the new industrial policy. I waited for him to say something, I thought he would give some glimpse of the new industrial policy but all that I could get from him is: According to the new industrial policy, man is in the centre of the cosmos. Let me remind Mr. Fernandes of a little article that Nehru wrote and which has been published as "Basic Approach". That article was published in the *New York Times* magazine, and he said just that. He said that the difference between democracy and other forms of Government is that in a democracy man is in the centre of all the value systems in our approach to everything. And he said, inasmuch as certain other forms of Government do not accept this basic premise that man is the centre of everything, to that extent he believes in democracy and to that extent, therefore, he rejects the other forms of Government. Then he went on saying that a stage has been reached when, for all practical purposes, both America and Russia adopt more or less a

similar approach to various problems to which exception was taken. And Toynbee protested in the West, saying "No; the West did believe in democracy and all that". And there was a certain Russian academician who protested.

I have just given a little detail only to make one point: That this is not a new discovery of Mr. Fernandes. This is what the builder of this country, Nehru, said a long time back and according to whatever he said unconsciously today, I am absolutely convinced that Mr. George Fernandes is an unconscious student of Jawaharlal Nehru, an unconscious disciple of Jawaharlal Nehru ...

DR. V. P. DUTT: And an unwilling follower.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVE-DI: ... and an unwilling student of Jawaharlal Nehru. I am glad that he believes in flexibility and that is what Nehru meant when he talked of "However" and "Flexibility". Now, as a matter of fact, I wanted only to seek certain clarifications. I want to ask two or three questions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Quickly, please.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVE-DI: Very quickly. And I hope he will show a little bit of brevity. What is the basic difference that he has with the 1956 Industrial Policy Resolution? Now I admit that there is nothing sacrosanct about the 1956 Resolution. For that matter, I believe there is nothing sacrosanct about anything political, economic or anything. But, then, what is the fundamental basic difference that he has—this Government has—with the 1956 Resolution? That is No. 1, No. 2, with regard to the approach underlying the 1956 Resolution....

DR. RAM KRIPAL SINHA: Do you want another?

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVE-DI: No. Are you criticising the Minister, your colleague?

,

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
 U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): We
 do not have to sit beyond 5.15.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI:
 No. 2: Have those differences been spelt out
 so far by the Government? And, if so, how
 soon should this House expect that the so-
 called new industrial policy spelling out the
 bright ideas, which will usher this country into
 a 'brave new world' will come about and
 whether this House in this session will be
 allowed to discuss that Resolution? And,
 lastly, I just want to give a piece of advice to
 Mr. George Fernandes, if I may say so,
 without being presumptuous—he and I are of
 the same age and he and I have known each
 other and I have always admired his radi-
 calism. I have been a Member of the Rajya
 Sabha only for three years; I am not an old
 parliamentarian; but I know something about
 parliamentary traditions and parliamentary
 conventions. Party differences are there. I
 think that every Opposition man, anybody
 who is in the Opposition, must criticise the
 Government and everybody who is sitting
 there should defend himself and criticise the
 Opposition. I am reminded of what Winston
 Churchill had said: "Whenever I am the Prime
 Minister of Great Britain, I am absolutely
 convinced that the Opposition Leader is
 talking rot. And whenever I become the
 Leader of the Opposition. I am absolutely
 convinced that the Prime Minister is talking
 rot." So this kind of rule is inherent in the
 system. But, all the same, Mr. George
 Fernandes is not the Minister of Industry of
 the Janata Party. He is my Minister of
 Industry; he is our Minister of Industry; he is
 the Minister of Industrial Development—or
 whatever is the nomenclature—of India. I ap-
 preciate his agony. I am very sorry for what
 has happened to his brother—I am as sorry as
 he is. I knew when it happened because I
 know him, I have met him and he has met
 me—his brother I am talking about. Really, it
 is such a human thing that it will shock any
 man worth his salt. But.

must he bring partisan approach to every
 speech that he makes in this House or in the
 other House? Must he always indulge in past-
 ism? Must he continue to be an Opposition
 leader and the Minister one at the same time?
 Yes, he has thrived as an Opposition leader.
 But now he is a Minister and I think as a
 Minister he should talk only as a Minister.
 That is the piece of advice I want to give to
 him. And then I will request him to reply to
 all the points that I have made.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Vice-
 Chairman, Sir, I am grateful for the advice
 that my esteemed friend Mr. Dwivedi has
 given me. While I think he has a point when
 he says that as a Minister I am a Minister of
 the Government, when I speak for the
 country, I speak for all of us, which will
 include Mr. Dwivedi and everyone else who
 sits with him. But when we are engaged in
 discussing policies, those policies cannot be
 completely divorced from the past. After all,
 we have inherited a certain past—political,
 economic and social past. Some of it is good;
 some of it is not so good. Now, such a thing is
 bound to happen in certain situations where it
 will become necessary to remind people of the
 past so that the future may not be as bad as the
 past and none of us may create situations
 where the future will once again be full of
 pitfalls. I am certainly grateful to him for his
 very friendly and very appropriate advice, but
 I hope he understands and appreciates that any
 positions that are taken here or any statements
 that are made here are not with a malice but
 with a desire to see that things are rectified so
 that the future at least does not go the way
 some of us sometimes fear may go.

He has asked me three very specific
 questions. What is the fundamental difference
 that we have with the 1956 Resolution? Have
 all those differences been spelled out? How
 soon will the new Resolution come? And will
 the current session have a chance to dismiss
 it? My hon. - friend here said

that it will take me into another hour's discussion at least. I made it clear earlier that I did not wish to discuss the Industrial Policy. I thought that we should discuss some of the points that were raised, that were constantly being hammered by the Members. If the record is seen, they raised questions some of which I have not answered.

Now, I have off and on stated what the differences are. In fact, even now, in the course of this hour and more, I had mentioned as to how the 1956 Resolution was primarily an all-things-to-all-men kind of resolution. Putting man in the centre is an abstract thing, but we want to concretise it by taking the industry, by diffusing the industry from the urban to the rural, from the big to the small, from the small to the cottage. And the spelling out of these policies is being done, and the new Industrial Policy will be presented to this House before the House adjourns in the current session. So the House will have a chance to discuss it and I will have my say on the Industrial Policy in all its manifestations and ramifications when the time comes, before the end of this session which, I think, closes on the 23rd or 24th of this month.

He has also made one or two points arising out of my speech. I do not want once again to get into one more debate. Of course, I am proud of India's skills and I have been speaking about India's skills for years. In fact, it has been my case that there is so much skill available in this country and so much talent is available in this country, and it is all being wasted by the wrong policies of the Congress Government. But I do not think the Congress Government can take credit for the skills in this country. Now, these are two different things. For instance, five years from today, if my party will be out of power, I do not think it will be proper for me to say that we developed India's skills. India's skills have been there, India's skills are inherent; they are there. The kind of carpets that our people

produce, they have been producing for I do not know how many hundreds of years or thousands of years. And this kind of silk, this kind of anything— you name it, our people have been producing it. I was told that in the area of ship-building, we were among the pioneers and I think even Nelson's fleet had ships that were built in Bombay. Therefore, if you say that the skills are something that we have acquired in the last 30 years, I think it is something on which we are on two different wave-lengths.

Again when we discuss development, I have said this before and I do not want to repeat myself, but nevertheless I would like to say that we cannot make the point that when the British ruled this country for 100 years, they built in these 100 years 60,000 kilometres of railway lines, but the Congress ruled this country for 30 years and in these 30 years, they have built only 2,800 kilometres of railway lines. How does one compare in the matter of development? One may say that the British did everything to develop this country because they built 600 to 800 kilometres of railway lines every year when they ruled over us, and the Congress built only 100 kilometres of railway lines per year in the last 30 years? Therefore, how does one bring out these differences of a country moving forward and a certain dynamism which takes the country forward, of the inherent skills manifesting themselves and a certain normal routine development taking place, while the entire country, the whole country is being pushed backwards? The same point is there about the Industrial Policy. Thirty years of industrialising and twenty-one years of the famous 1956 Resolution—I am sure you do not like to mention it as 30 years; let us say, 17 years of Mr. Nehru's effort to build India—has taken the country to a point where 60 per cent of your people live below the poverty-line, where 75 monopoly houses, in your own words and in words of many of our esteemed colleagues, are dominating India's economy

[Shri George Fernandes.] and are having a stranglehold on India's economy, where we have inherited 40 million unemployed people, where next month or in the next two months we are going to have six million more unemployed. All this is the heritage which the great builder has left for us. Therefore, when we discuss these questions, I am sure we understand the nuances, we understand the points which each one of us is trying to make. I am not trying to score a debating point. I am sure Mr. Bwivedi is also not interested in scoring a debating point. Obviously we belong to two different parties. He believes that I have something very personal perhaps about Mr. Nehru and his family. I have nothing personal, nothing at all that is personal about them.

He also believes and he has discovered that I am in fact—he used the term— an unwilling follower of Mr. Nehru. And I only hope. not of his daughter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): The question is:

That the Bill be passed".

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at sixteen minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 8th. December, 1977.