

Jhitherto, in the light of their experience that they have had both in this House as well as in the other House? I am grateful to my friend, Mr. Naidu for having put this question and brought it to your notice.

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE: Sir, The special steps that Prof. Ranga has suggested are special suggestions for action and we will give special attention to consider those special suggestions.

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : मान्यवर, अभी जो गंगा के पानी में वृद्धि हुई है और गंगा नदी की धारा में परिवर्तन हुआ है उसके कारण पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे में नारायणपुर से लेकर मंनसी स्टेशन तक की लाइन खतरे में है। कभी भी पूरी लाइन गंगा के कटाव में बह सकती है तो उसकी बचाने के लिए मंत्री महोदय क्या कर रहे हैं? हम जानते हैं कि उन्होंने इसके लिये अब तक बहुत कोशिश की है लेकिन वे कोशिशें कहां तक कामयाब हुई हैं, कहां तक उनका खर्च हुआ है और कहां तक और खर्च करने के लिए वे तैयार हैं ताकि सुरक्षा की गारंटी हो सके!

प्रो० मधु दण्डवते : माननीय सदस्य ने जो जानकारी दी है, वे यह जानते हैं कि यह हमारी कोशिश है कि बाढ़ की वजह से कोई नुकसान न हो। जो बाढ़ आई है उसकी वजह से इतनी तो बात रही कि किसी जगह रेलवे लाइन वाश-आउट नहीं हुई है। त्रिजेज नहीं टूटे हैं। ट्रेन को थोड़ी देर हो गई हो तो वह हो सकता है लेकिन ट्रेन सर्विस डिसलोकेट नहीं हुई है। श्रीमन, हमारी लगातार कोशिश है कि जिस क्षेत्र का जिक्र किया है वहां पर हम मैटेनेंस रिह्नफोर्स करें।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : सभापति महोदय, कंडक्टर की सीट की क्या बात, कंडक्टर की कोई भी व्यवस्था आसाम मेल में खासकर

दिल्ली से समस्तीपुर की जो बोगी है वह इनमें उपलब्ध नहीं है। फर्स्ट क्लास का कम्पार्टमेंट पीछे जोड़ा जाता है। और रात के समय कंडक्टर

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH; He is putting supplementary of a different question.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : न होने की वजह से लोगों की कठिनाइयों बहुत बढ़ जाती है। साथ ही साथ जरूरी बहुत खतरनाक हो जाती है। इसलिए मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या वे आसाम मेल से समस्तीपुर से दिल्ली बोगी में

प्रो० मधु दण्डवते : माननीय सदस्य को मैं याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जो प्रश्न श्रीमती नूरजहान रजाक को पूछना चाहिए था उनके बजाय यह पूछ रहे हैं।

Seeking of powers of a Civil Court by the MB.TJP Commission

*605. SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA;

Will the Minister of LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practice Commission has sought powers of a civil court to deal with the large industrial houses' proposals for expansion or for setting up new units; and

(b) if so, what are the details in this regard and what is Government's reaction thereto?

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN): (a) and (b) -

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Bhupesh Gupta.

The Commission is already vested with the powers of the Civil Court under Section 12 of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 for certain purposes relating to the conduct of an inquiry under the Act. The Commission had, however, suggested in July, 1975 to Government that a suitable provision be made in the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 stating that "the Commission shall be a Court of Record and shall have all the powers of such court including the power to punish for contempt of itself". This suggestion is under the consideration of the High-Powered Expert Committee set up under the chairmanship of Justice Sachar to review the provisions of the Companies Act, 1956 and the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969. The Committee is expected to submit its report by the end of August, 1978. Thereafter, the Government will consider the recommendations contained in the report and formulate its views.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, from the various materials furnished to us by the Government itself, it appears that this MRTP Commission is actually proving ineffective. During the recent period between 1972 and 1975, assets of the Tatas have increased from Rs. 634.84 crores to Rs. 909.68 crores, that is, by 43.3 per cent; assets of the Birlas have gone up from Rs. 572.17 crores to Rs. 858.81 crores, that is, by 50.1 per cent; Singhanias' assets have gone up by 72.5 per cent, and like that, of all the top business houses. Besides, many of them have been granted licences during this period despite all the restrictions of MRTP Commission. In 1975, 95 licences were issued. In 1976, 87 licences were issued. In 1977, 77 licences were issued. Now, Sir, it appears that while this Commission goes on—we do not know what exactly it is doing now—the concentration of wealth and economic power is taking place. Firstly, licences are being issued to the big business houses and they are carrying on their business; their profits are increasing. All that I

have stated is according to the Government's statistics supplied to us. In view of this, may I know whether the Government is considering, firstly, the advisability of drastically revising this particular M.R.T.P. Act, and secondly, whether the Government have realised that it is not merely a question of mending the monopolies, through this kind of a Commission, or, through certain regulations, which are again being withdrawn, but that, if the monopolies have to be curbed and restricted, in any sense of the term, in the true sense of the term, then, nationalisation has become important? Take-over of the monopoly houses, to begin with, some of the big houses, has now become essential. During Shrimati Indira Gandhi's re-gime, I find, the major monopoly houses had nearly doubled their assets. At the commencement of Independence, in 1951, the aggregate assets of Birlas and Tatas were not even Rs. 200 crores. Today, their assets have almost reached the figure of Rs. 2,000 crores. From less than Rs. 200 crores at the commencement of Independence to Rs. 2,000 crores in 1978. The figure is almost Rs. 2,000 crores. I do not say that it is exactly Rs. 2,000 crores. It is nearly Rs. 1,800 crores now. But if you take the latest figures, it may be higher. In view of this, it is absolutely clear that unless we nationalise them, unless we take over the monopoly concerns there is no way of restricting and curbing them. Every regime has only strengthened them and has helped them in the concentration of wealth and economic power with licences, with liberalisation of imports, with financial accommodation and all that. Therefo're, I would like to know whether the whole thing will be comprehensively reviewed, gone into, with a view to taking some drastic action, rather than this rigmarole being uttered that we are breaking the family business. How do you break the family business when these monopoly houses go on? All this rigmarole is going on by this childish Minister speaking in a childish manner publicly.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: What is the question?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He forgot to ask the question.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA: The question is whether you will take any drastic action.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has understood it.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: Now, Sir, having heard the important things which Shri Bhupesh Gupta has chosen to refer to, one thing I would like, at the outset, to make clear so that there may not be any confusion about it. It is quite true that the economic power of these large industrial houses has been increasing in the past. Shri Bhupesh Gupta has given some figures about the increase in the assets of Tatas, Birlas, Singha-nias and various other large industrial houses between the years 1972 and 1975. He has given some figures. In this connection, I would just like to make one thing clear. I fully accept that the concentration of economic power in the hands of these large industrial houses has been increasing because the undertakings which are under their management and which are inter-linked with similar undertakings and so on have been increasing. Now, when we speak of the assets of these large industrial houses in terms of Rs. 634 crores or Rs. 909 crores and so on, we should remember one thing. Hon. Shri Bhupesh Gupta knows it. These assets do not mean the wealth of these large industrial houses in the sense that for the purpose of this definition under the M.R.T.P. Act, it is the total assets of these undertakings which are under their management which is taken into consideration. The liabilities which these undertakings owe either to the financial institutions or national banks or other people are not taken into consideration for the purpose of computing this figure of assets, because the

purpose of these figures relating to assets is only to determine how much industrial activity is under their control. It has no relation to the wealth which might be owned by these large industrial houses because it is possible that in an undertaking the assets may be only Rs. 50 crores, but the liabilities owed to the financial institutions may be Rs. 45 crores. Therefore, so far as the wealth part is concerned, it will be assets minus liabilities. That is not that concept which is taken in here. But, Sir, at the same time, as I have said, it is the policy of the Constitution to avoid and to prevent concentration of economic power to the public detriment because it is important in a democratic country that there should be no concentration of any kind of power, either political or economic or any other kind of power. Therefore, it is desirable to see how such concentration of economic power can be avoided. The hon. Member has put two questions. One is whether the Government is thinking of drastically revising the MRTP Act keeping this object in view. Sir, as I have already said, the Sachar Committee has been appointed by the Government last year for the purpose of revising the Companies Act as well as the MRTP Act. Obviously, if such a Committee has been appointed, it is clear that the question is engaging the Government's consideration. As soon as the report is received—it is likely to be received by the end of this month—the Government will have to apply its mind and the Government has always been applying its mind to the question. Secondly, the hon. Member has referred to nationalisation. The Government has said that so far as nationalisation is concerned, any proposal of nationalisation has to be examined in the context of its effect on the people, on their interests, because the main object of the Government in a welfare State is to see how it can ensure a proper life, a better life to its teeming millions so that every proposal will have to be examined in that context.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Considering there was no question, you gave a £ mouth fully reply.

. SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I must say when my friend Mr. Shanti Bhushan was replying to the first part of my question, he was trying to make a sort of quibbling over the definition of assets. I felt, Sir, he was taking you as Mr. Jagmohan Sinha of the Allahabad High Court. You see, this should not be done. He is the Chairman of the House, he has nothing to do much with that, nor is this House the Allahabad High Court.

SHRI PILOO MODY: There is no similarity, nor is there any similarity between you and Mrs. Indira Gandhi.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are not speaking over an election petition. There you made a case and you were successful. Here you have made out no case and have completely failed. Now we are not concerned with the definitions of or the distinction between assets and wealth. Whether you call it assets of wealth, the figure shows the concentration of wealth. When I asked the Government to give us an idea of concentration of wealth, it produced these figures, calling them assets. During this Question Hour we asked you to give us figures of concentration of wealth and you give us assets figure

, very rightly. Here are the questions. This is how you indicate the concentration of wealth. Whether it is money, whether it is other things, it is an indication of wealth getting¹ concentrated in the hands of large houses. My point is this. It has tremendously increased. Here again I find that Shri Shanti Bhushan is very happy when I exposed the facts of the Congress raj. This I agree with you. Everything was there because you were not there at that time, he was not there at that time. Therefore,

^everything is good. But this is not a right approach. You have been here for the last 16 months. Have you reversed his trend, or have you accelerated this trend? Have you retreated from the position Shrimati

Indira Gandhi took into this matter or are you going better over her performance? This is the thing. From the figures given by the Government, it appears that this Government is not only preserving what had happened in the past but encouraging it by removing restrictions. They are amending the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act with a view to allowing the concentration of wealth and with a view to allowing removal of restrictions on the multi-nationals, raising their equity shares and all the rest of it. Therefore, I would like to know whether the Government has considered that this is a disastrous policy of going backward, of appeasing, further—I underline the word 'further'—the monopoly class. I know, Sir, just as in the previous regime the ruling party took money for their election funds and other things—which they have revealed, revealingly—they are also doing the same thing. All those forces are in operation. So, kindly tell us where lies the salvation from the collusion between the big money and the politics of power, between the corridors-of wealth and the corridors of power.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: Sir, for the first time, I am constrained to say that hon'ble Shri Bhupesh Gupta, whom I hold in very high esteem, is not correct. He has tried to suggest that the policy of the Government is towards increasing the concentration of economic power.

SHRI BHUPEJSH GUPTA; I contend that.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: All right, he contends. But, Sir, this contention is toally unfounded. The Government has been anxiously considering, because it is wedded to the policy of preventing the concentration of economic power, as to what steps can be taken in that direction without detriment to the economy of the country. There are certain constraints. Therefore, within those constraints, it is not possible to just abolish all large industrial houses

-itimately. That is not possible, but various things have been considered and are under consideration and one of the reasons why this Committee has been appointed is to go into this question so that after its report is received, the Government can go into this question and see how the concentration of economic power can be reduced.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: Sir, the fine distinction that the hon. Minister was drawing between assets and wealth is not very relevant. Maharani Gayatri Devi may be having a lot of wealth in the form of gold, but that does not signify content over productive assets inside the economy. But these assets signify productive capacity which these monopoly houses control—and that is the main question. Now, in this connection, the hon. Minister has stated that the policy of this Government is to prevent the concentration of assets in the hands of these monopoly houses. May I know how is it that this Government has sanctioned the setting up of a big thermal power plant by the Tatas in Bombay and also allowed expansion of the TELCO even though their policy is to prevent such concentration of power?

Secondly, Justice Nain, who was the Chairman of the MRTP Commission, resigned in protest before the expiry of the term because he felt that he did not have sufficient power and a Secretariat of Industrial Approvals has been set up in the Ministry of Industrial Development which screens the cases before forwarding them to the Commission. Justice Nain felt that this so-called Secretariat was acting as a shield for the monopoly houses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your supplementary is longer than that of Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: Will the hon. Minister kindly explain whether this is a fact and what the functions of this Secretariat are and whether these functions will be looked into also?

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: Sir, first of all, the hon. Member has referred to the distinction between wealth and assets. I hope the hon. Member would appreciate that when I make a statement in the House, I must try to be as accurate as it is possible for anybody to be and should not create any misleading impression for whatever its worth. I entirely agree with him that so far as the concentration of economic power is concerned, it is not the wealth—namely assets minus liabilities—which is the relevant thing because he control over economic activity, over industrial activity is the criterion. For that liabilities may not be irrelevant. And, therefore, even the assets, without taking into consideration the liabilities, is an index of the control of the power of a large industrial house over a certain area of industrial of business activity. Therefore, I agree that that is a yardstick which has to be taken into consideration.

Sir, the hon'ble Member should not resent if I say something for the sake of accuracy so that people know exactly as to what they think and they should not be misled.

SHRI PILOO MODY: You are being scientific and he does not like that.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: Mr. Birla and Mr. Bharat Ram have been advancing the same 'scientific arguments.'

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: The hon'ble Member thereafter raised the question as to how it is that if the present Government's policy is to prevent concentration of economic power licences are being given for thermal power station to Tatas for expansion of TELCO etc. Sir, I would like to tell the hon'ble Member that while the policy is to avoid and prevent concentration of economic power but not to the detriment of the economy of the nation, not to the detriment of the interest of the common man, and if, therefore, at some stage a choice arises either of giving

a licence to a large industrial house or preventing that industrial activity »*to go on, then in that case, Sir, the - policy is that the first interest is the interest of the common man. Therefore, if the interest of the common man is going to suffer, then it is not a feeling of jealousy or anything else which governs us because we have to take decision in the interest of the common man. If somebody else can be encouraged to have that industrial activity, then certainly a person who is not a part of a large industrial house would be encouraged and helped to set up that industrial activity and not a large industrial house. But if anybody else for the time being is in a position to undertake that industrial activity, then we have no option except to grant the licence to see that the country doe^-not suffer.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: He has not replied to the other part of the question about Justice Nain's remarks.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: While I am not in a position to know, as probably the hon'ble Member knows, what Justice Nain has said or done, I have already said that certain proposals were received from the Monopolies Commission in regard to having enhanced powers for the Commission which questions are now engaging the consideration of the Companies Committee, the Monopolies Committee. As soon as their report is received this month, the Government would be applying its mind as to what new powers are to be given.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: *One* part of the question still remains unanswered.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: What does the Department do? It is department of the Government. Whenever -r-any power is given to the Government by either the Companies Act or the Monopolies Act, the Government looks after through the exercise of these powers to enable the Govern-

ment to exercise those powers. This is how the Department helps.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon'ble Minister to say whether the M.R.T.P. Act is or is not in the interest of the common man? If it is in the interest of the common man how can its violation be in the interest of the common man?

Secondly, Sir, about this 500 MW thermal power station, why could the public sector not do it, and has any attempt been made to give it to the public sector?

Thirdly, about the assets and liabilities, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Law Minister if the liabilities are to the financial institutions, these financial institutions are all government money. About nationalisation he has given the policy. Will the Minister think of taking over the management not nationalising, the the industry itself, where they have got large amounts invested and when there is provision for converting them into equity?

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: The first part of hon'ble Shri Bhattachar-ya's question is whether the M.R.T.P. Act is in the interest of the common man. I have no hesitation in saying that the Monopolies Act is conceived *to* be in the interest of the common man.

In the next part of his question he asks if it is so how can the violation of the Monopolies Act be in the interest of the common man? I again entirely agree that the violation of the Monopolies Act cannot possibly be in the interest of the common man. When the hon'ble Member assumed that in granting, the licence to Tatas in regard to the thermal power station there has been a violation of the M.R.T.P. Act, I would like to refute his contention by saying that the Monopolies Act itself contemplates the grant of licences. It only puts an embargo. It does not prohibit it. The circumstance has to be scrutinised.

Then it does contemplate grant of licence to a large industrial house when it is in the interest of the country. It is from that angle that a licence has been granted. The last part of his question is in regard to taking over of the management of those large industrial houses which owe a certain liability to the financial institutions. Sir, when a certain industrial activity should be carried on by the public sector and when it should be carried on by the private sector, is a delicate question which has to be examined in the background of the situation as it may exist, and no doctrinaire approach is possible on this question. Therefore, it is in that context that the Government has been taking different decisions from time to time.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: What kind of decisions, Sir? Was the licence to Tatas for the 500 MW thermal power station cleared by the MRTP Commission? Was it referred to them and was it cleared by the MRTP Commission?

(Interruptions)

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: Sir, I would require specific notice if the hon. Member has a specific question.

श्री सीताराम केशरी : अध्यक्ष जी, कानून और तर्क और बौद्धिक तरजीह के परे है गरीबी को रखा के नीचे स्तर के जो गरीब है उनका हित । इसलिए कामन मैन की बात कहियेगा । प्रश्न मेरा यह है कि अक्सर मैं देखता हूँ कि जब कभी बड़े घरों की बात आती है तो सिर्फ तीन चार घरों का नाम लेकर खत्म हो जाती हैं । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आपको यह पता है कि इस देश में सिर्फ 20 ही बड़े घर नहीं है, तकरीबन डेढ़ सौ बड़े घर हैं जिनकी सौ करोड़ से ज्यादा हैसियत हैं . . .

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : अब तो एक हजार हो गये है ।

श्री सीताराम केशरी : आपकी सरकार जनतांत्रिक आधार पर आधारित समाज की सरकार होने का दावा करती है तो क्या आप बतायेंगे कि 16 महीने के अन्दर कितने ऐसे लोगों को जिनके यह धन एकत्रित हो गया है और अक्सर आप कहते हैं कि 30 वर्ष से हमारी सरकार की वजह से हुआ है, उनका कितना ऐसा स्तर आप लयें कि जिससे गरीब लोगों की गरीबी का जो स्तर नीचा हो गया वह ऊंचा उठे ?

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: Sir, I would require specific notice of the question. He wants certain figures and I can't just now give them.

SHRI SITARAM KESRI: You are always talking, about the common people and that is why I am putting this question.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Sir, I can answer him. I can tell him how poverty levels have gone up—I can quote the figures—and I can tell him how many people have been deprived of... (Interruptions)

SHRI SITARAM KESRI: Physically, Sir, he has accumulated all the flesh of the poor people.

SHRI SYED NIZAM-UD-DIN: Sir, I am sorry to observe that the Law Minister is propounding dangerous theories in the House today. Some of the hon. Members have just observed about assets and liabilities. That is one thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please speak loudly.

SHRI SYED NIZAM-UD-DIN: The second thing is about economic activity and the choice between the private sector and the public sector. It seems he is advocating the cause of the big business houses today. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what has been the position during the last six months, whether these large houses have increased their assets and

what has been the increase, because it is in the interests of the Government if the hon. Minister reveals today that the increase in the last 16 months has been less than that in the previous years. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister what is the position.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: Sir, first of all I would like to inform this House that I have not been propounding any theories, what to say of dangerous theories, as the hon. Member suggests. If stating facts, and stating facts correctly and as far as possible, accurately, amounts to indulging in a dangerous activity, then I do not know how questions have to be replied to in the House. Then, Sir, the question that the hon. Member has chosen to ask is whether during the last 16 months there has been an increase in the assets of the large industrial houses. Sir obviously he wants to know whether there has been an increase in the assets during the last 16 months. So we will have to compute as to what were the assets before the last 16 months and what are the assets today. These figures cannot possibly be available—uptodate figures—and so, if the hon. Member puts a specific question with reference to some specific date, the figures can be worked out.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: Next question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not next question. It is an important question and many Members are interested in it.

श्री कमलनाथ झा : सभापति जी, विधि मंत्री जी ने अभी जो एक सप्लीमेंटरी के प्रश्न का उत्तर दिया है उसकी रोशनी में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जैसा भूपेश गुप्त जी ने कहा कि बिरला और टाटा की आमदनी और उनकी सम्पत्ति 43 परसेंट, 50 परसेंट, 70 परसेंट, बढ़ गई है और इसी रेशों में आपने भी उसको स्वीकार किया और अपने सवान में यह कहा कि पिछले 30 वर्षों में यह चीज हुई है तो आपको यह भी बताना चाहिये

कि इस 30 वर्ष के अन्दर प्राइवेट सैक्टर के अन्दर कितनी बढ़ोतरी हुई और पब्लिक सैक्टर के अन्दर कितनी बढ़ोतरी हुई इस देश में ? आपको यह बताना चाहिये कि प्राइवेट सैक्टर और पब्लिक सैक्टर दोनों में किस रेशो से बढ़ोतरी हुई और पब्लिक सैक्टर में कितना विकास हुआ है ? मैं समझता हूँ तभी लीप साइडिड पिक्चर हमारे सामने आएगी ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not a supplementary.

श्री कमलनाथ झा : दूसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब जनता पार्टी सत्ता में आई थी तो उसने बहुत जोर से विकेन्द्रीकरण का नारा दिया था और कहा था कि हम लोग मोनोपली हाउसेज का तोड़ेंगे और इससे मोनोपली हाउसेज में आतंक फैला लेकिन जब मोनोपली हाउसेज में आतंक फैला तो क्या यह बात सही है कि चैम्बर आफ कामर्स की मीटिंग में बाबू जगजीवन राम और आप दोनों गये और वहाँ उनको आश्वासन दिया कि इन बड़े उद्योग धंधों को रोकने, उसकी उन्नति को रोकने, उसके डवलपमेंट को रोकने की हमारी सरकार की नीयत नहीं है और जनता पार्टी मोनोपली हाउसेज के खिलाफ जो आवाज थी वे भी आपने बन्द कर दी क्या यह भी एक कारण है चौधरी चरण सिंह को हटाने में ? मैं यह आपसे जानना चाहता हूँ ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then I will have to go over to the next question. It is not possible for you to reply to the first question, for you will have to go into the record of 30 years, IM--

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: I can only tell the hon. Member and the House that there is no doubt that there has been a big growth in the public sector of this country during the past years. But, so far as the proportion, the figures etc. are concerned, it is not possible to give the figures now. The other part of the

question which the hon. Member has put is about some assurance being given by some Ministers to the Chambers of Commerce that it is not the policy of this Government to control or prevent the growth of the large industrial houses. Sir, this is totally contrary to facts. No such assurance has been given. On the other hand, I have stated it before, and I have told even the Chambers of Commerce, that the general policy of the Government is to prevent concentration of economic power and growth of the same persons, same individuals, same groups, etc. because a dispersal has to be made with a large number of people engaging themselves in industrial trade—and not concentration of a few groups and a few families. To suggest that any such thing has been said to the Chambers of Commerce is totally wrong.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्रीमन्,

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can give you an opportunity, but you don't deliver a lecture, put your supplementary.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जनता पार्टी ने अपने चुनाव घोषणा पत्र में जो वायदा किया था और भूतपूर्व सरकार जो थी उस सरकार की नीतियों और आपकी सरकार की नीतियों में जो फर्क था उस फर्क पर आप कायम हैं या नहीं ? मैं यह स्पष्ट कर देना चाहता हूँ कि भूतपूर्व सरकार की नीतियों को कार्यान्वित करने में भूपेश गुप्त जी भी शामिल थे लेकिन हमारी सरकार की जो नीति है वह बड़े घरानों को तोड़ कर छोटे घरानों में बदलने की है तो इस पर मंत्री जी का क्या कहना है मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ ?

श्री शान्ति भूषण : माननीय सदस्य ने जो सवाल पूछा है नीति के बारे में तो मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार अपनी नीति पर कायम है ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : श्रीमन्, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी का जवाब सुन कर बहुत ही हताश और निराश हूँ । पिछले 40 साल से हम लोग अपने विद्यार्थी जीवन से और बचपन से इन टाटा, बिरला को हटाने का नारा लगाते रहे हैं । हम लोग जब से आजाद हुए हैं, तब से आज तक देख रहे हैं कि चाहे पंडित कमलापति जी की सरकार हो या श्री शान्ति भूषण की सरकार हो, जहाँ तक बिरला-टाटा का सवाल है, उनके साथ एक जैसा व्यवहार होता है । कोई भी उनको छुने के लिए तैयार नहीं है । हम लोग एक अजीब परेशानी में पड़ गये हैं कि आखिर इस सवाल का क्या होगा ? जो जवाब हम लोगों को पिछली सरकार से मिलता था वही जवाब अब भी मिल रहा है ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your supplementary?

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : श्रीमन्, मेरा सप्लीमेंटरी यह है कि माननीय मंत्री जी ने श्री भूपेश गुप्ता के सवाल के जवाब में यह नहीं बताया कि वह कौन-सा सेक्टर्स है जिसके अन्तर्गत एम० आर० टी० पी० एक्ट की अवहेलना करके टाटा को लायसेंस दिया गया है ? माननीय मंत्री जी ने यह भी बताया है कि इस एक्ट में यह प्रोविजन है कि विशेष परिस्थितियों में इसकी कुछ धाराओं की अवहेलना की जा सकती है । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि वे कौन-सी विशेष परिस्थितियाँ हैं जिनके अन्तर्गत यह लायसेंस टाटा को दिया गया ? मैं यह भी मालूम करना चाहता हूँ कि आपने इस पावर प्लट को पब्लिक सेक्टर में लगाने का प्रयास क्यों नहीं किया क्योंकि टाटा-बिरला इस प्रकार की योजनाओं में जो भी रुपया लगाते हैं वह बैंकों से लेकर लगाते हैं ? मैं साफ साफ जानना चाहता हूँ कि आपने इस पावर प्लट को पब्लिक सेक्टर में क्यों नहीं लगाया और वे कौन से सेक्टेज हैं जिनके तहत आपने इस प्रकार का निर्णय लिया है ?

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: Sir, I have already said that if a question relates to a specific grant of a licence in an individual case, I would require specific notice to answer it properly.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : श्रीमन्, मंत्री जी का यह तो टालने वाला जवाब हुआ। Chairman Saheb, you are the custodian of our rights.

अगर मंत्री इस तरह से जवाब देकर निकल आएंगे तो फिर काम कैसे चलेगा और हम लोग यहाँ पर क्यों बैठे हुए हैं ? इस प्रश्न का जवाब देने के लिए कहां नोटिस की आवश्यकता है ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He wants notice.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : इनके पास फाइल है। उसको देख कर मंत्री जी जवाब दे सकते हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि वे कौन-सी परिस्थितियाँ थीं जिनके अन्तर्गत यह लाइसेंस दिया गया है। चैयरमैन साहब, आप हमारे राइट्स को नहीं देखेंगे तो फिर कौन देखेंगे ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next question.

Expenditure On the maintenance of the Railway Board

*606. SHRI BHIM RAJ:

SHRI SAWAISINGH

SISODIA: SHRI GURUDEV

GUPTA: SHRI PRAKASH

MEHROTRA:†

SHRIMATI HAMIDA

HABIBULLAH:

Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have recently taken any steps to effect economy in the expenditure incurred in respect of the Railway Board; and

(b) if so, what are the details in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE): (a) and (b) Yes, Sir. Economy has been effected by restructuring the

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Prakash Mehrotra.

Board. Other measures have also been taken to reduce expenditure on creation and filling up of posts, travelling and overtime allowances, staff cars, telephones etc.

श्री प्रकाश महरोत्रा : मान्यवर, जिस तरीके से जादूगर हाथ की सफाई दिखलाता है उसी तरीके से मंत्री जी ने उत्तर देने में जवान की सफाई दिखलाई है। उन्होंने यह नहीं बतलाया है कि रेलवे विभाग में कितनी इकनोमी की गई है और इस संबंध में उन्होंने कोई फीगर भी नहीं दी है। जो इकनोमी की गई है उसको गौर से देखने की जरूरत है। जो पोस्ट्स सैवअन्ड थी उनको खाली रखा गया है और कुछ पोस्ट्स को एवोलिज कर दिया गया है। कुछ लोग जो छुट्टी में गये थे या ट्रेनिंग में गये थे या डेप्यूटेशन में गये थे उनकी जगह पर नियुक्ति नहीं की गई है। इस प्रकार से बचत की गई है। इसी प्रकार से कुछ जो केडर्स थे और जिनके लोअर पे-स्केल थे, उनके एरियर्स के लिए जितना प्रोविजन किया गया था उसमें कुछ कमी हुई है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जितनी भी सेविंग है यह नेगेटिव सेविंग है। इसलिए मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि आपने पोजिटिव सेविंग कितनी की है, यह आप स्पष्ट तौर पर बताने की कृपा करें। इस नेगेटिव सेविंग का कितना एमाउन्ट है और बाकी कितना एमाउन्ट है, यह आप साफ साफ बताने की कृपा करें।

श्री० मधु दण्डवते : माननीय सदस्य ने जो जानकारी पूछी है, वह मैं दे सकता हूँ। यह जानकारी मेरे पास है। रेलवे बोर्ड की पुनर्रचना करने के बाद जितनी बचत हम लोगो ने की है, वह 1 लाख 44 हजार है। आप उसका ब्रेक-अप चाहते हैं तो वह भी मैं बता सकता हूँ और आठ एडीशनल मेम्बर्स पर व्यय 2.88 लाख है। जो पोस्ट्स रेलवे बोर्ड ने एवोलिज किये और

less expenditure on operation of the three Advisors and DGRHS