

और यह बात सभी को मालूम है लेकिन उसका अभी तक एक्चुअल अपोन्टमेंट नहीं हुआ है। एक फैसला हुआ है और उसकी नियुक्ति पर विचार हो रहा है। इसके संबंध में कुछ दोस्तों का ख्याल है कि अभी शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स कमिशनर का जो प्रावधान चल रहा है उसको हटा देने से और सिविल राइट्स कमिशन की नियुक्ति से सिचुएशन में कोई इम्प्रूवमेंट नहीं होगी। इस संबंध में शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स से संबंधित कई लीडरों के खत मेरे पास आए हैं। मैं उनसे इस संबंध में सहमत नहीं हूँ, लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि इसमें कुछ सुधार की आवश्यकता होगी। एक्चुअली उसका क्या ढांचा हो, कौन-कौन सज्जन उसके मेम्बर होंगे, इन सब बातों पर विचार करने की आवश्यकता है। अभी समय की कमी के कारण हम इस मामले में नहीं जा पाये हैं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि सबसे बड़ा सवाल समाज की वेल्युज का है। सिर्फ कानून या कायदे बना देने से किसी समस्या का समाधान नहीं हो सकता है। इसके लिए समाज की तरफ से भी प्रयत्न किया जाना आवश्यक है। मैं समझता हूँ कि कानून तो एक एनेब्लिंग चीज है। सबसे बड़ा सवाल कानून को एनफोर्स करने का होता है। इस प्रकार की ज्यादातर प्रोब्लम मध्य प्रदेश, बिहार और यू० पी०, इन तीन राज्यों में सामने आई हैं। इंसीडेन्ट्स अगेंस्ट दी शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स ज्यादातर इन्हीं राज्यों में हुई हैं। जो फीगर्स मेरे पास हैं उनसे मालूम पड़ता है कि इन राज्यों में इस प्रकार की घटनाएं हुई हैं (Interruptions)। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि आन्ध्र प्रदेश में इस प्रकार की घटनाएं नहीं हुई हैं। मेरे पास जो आंकड़े हैं उनको देखने से यह मालूम पड़ता है कि इन तीन स्टेटों में अपेक्षाकृत अन्य स्टेटों के इस प्रकार के इंसीडेन्ट ज्यादा हुए हैं। आन्ध्र प्रदेश और तामिलनाडु आदि राज्यों में भी हुए हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि बिहार के लोगों को, चाहे वे किसी भी पार्टी के हों, इन घटनाओं की तरफ

ध्यान देना चाहिए और हमारी सोसायटी अन्दर जो यह एक कर्ष है इसको मिटाने के प्रयत्न करना चाहिए।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; Next question Shri Sisodia _____ (Inter. ructions). There are various ways of raising discussion on important matters. You can raise them, but not during the Question Hour.

Next question.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY: I rise on a point of privilege. A new member from Karnataka, who has taken the oath today, has asked a question. The work of this House and every House of the Assemblies also is done in this way. The language that is used by a Member who asks a question, is used by the Member of the Treasury Benches who replies. Have we made Hindi a compulsory language for the Treasury Benches to be superimposed on us in such a way that even if a question is asked in English, it has to be replied to in Hindi? If the Minister says that he does not know English to express himself, it is all right. But if it is an indiosyncrasy of some person to superimpose some language on the rest of the country, we are here to protect the interest of all the languages of India.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no privilege involved in this.

Revision of industrial policy

*SHRI SAWAI SINGH SISODIA: SHRI PRAKASH MEHROTRA: SHRIMATI LAKSHMI-KUMARI CHUNDAWAT: SHRI R. D. JAGTAP AVERGOANKAR: SHRIMATI SAVITA BEHEN:

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

^tThe question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Sawai Singh Sisodia.

(a) whether there is any proposal under Government's consideration to revise the concept of large industrial houses and to modify the licensing policy in respect of big and medium industries accordingly; and

(to) if so,, what are the salient features thereof?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: I would like to know whether the Minister is aware that the former Industry Minister, Shri Verma, has stated—and the news has appeared in all the national papers—that in his opinion it was proper that the definition of the larger industrial houses was so revised as to raise the value of their assets from Rs. 20 crores to Rs. 50 crores and the medium-sized industries should be abolished. I would also like to know whether any paper in this respect was prepared in the Ministry of industry for the consideration of the Cabinet, whether the thinking of Mr. Verma was in line with the policy of the present Government and whether it is a fact that there was strong reaction by the Janata Party President, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, who said that there was no justification for increasing this limit of assets of the larger houses from Rs. 20 crores to Rs. 50 crores because the disparities had already increased.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, the question is whether the Government has any proposal to revise the concept of large industrial houses and to modify the licensing policy in respect of big and medium industries. The answer given is that there is no such proposal. If individuals and Ministers have made statements well, those statements have been read by everybody. The question is whether the Government has any policy: The Government has no such policy

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: I would like to know from the Hon. Minister whether he has read the statement of Mr. Verma, the former Industry Minister, and whether whatever he has said was wrong or was against the policy of the present Government.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, I read a number of statements. I am concerned with the policy of the Government, and so far as the policy of the Government is concerned, there is no change.

SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA: He has not replied to the question whether he has read that statement and is aware of that statement.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I have replied that I read a number of statements but that I was concerned with the policy of the Government in this House and so far as the policy was concerned, there was no change.

SHRI PRAKASH MEHROTRA: Is the Hon. Minister aware that in the past few years the assets of the monopoly houses have increased manifold, and with the increase in the economic power, there has been concentration of political power also in their hands? What specific steps does the Government propose to take to check the concentration of economic power in a few hands and how does it propose to delink political power from money power?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, the Government is aware that the assets of the big houses in the country have increased manifold in the last 30 years. We have figures as on March 31, 1977. We are also aware that the big business houses used their economic power for political purposes. We would now like to see how best we can curb the tendencies on the part of the big houses which they have developed during the last 30 years.

श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कुमारी चंडावत : मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहती हूँ कि 1956 में

इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी रोज़ोल्फ़ूशन सरकार ने स्वीकार किया था, क्या मीज़ूदा गवर्नमेन्ट उसको रिवाइज्ड करने जा रही है? अपनी पार्टी की नयी पालिसी सरकार रखेगी या उसी पालिसी पर चलेगी, जिस पर पिछली गवर्नमेन्ट चल रही थी?

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज : उपसभापति महोदय, जो 1956 का प्रस्ताव है वह प्रस्ताव धामतौर पर निजी क्षेत्र, सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र, छोटे क्षेत्र, बड़े क्षेत्र, सभी क्षेत्रों पर लागू होने वाला है। जो ग्राम प्रस्ताव है, उसमें किसी भी प्रकार के बुनियादी परिवर्तन वाली बात इस समय हमारे सामने नहीं है। अगर कोई विचार उस पर हो जाता है तो उसको लेकर हम सदन के सामने आ जायेंगे।

श्री आर० डी० जगताप आवरगांवकर : क्या मंत्री महोदय यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्रों में मध्यम और लघु उद्योगों को लाइसेंस देने में सरकार ने क्या कोई खास नीति अपनाई है?

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज : उपसभापति महोदय, हम ऐसी नीतियाँ को जरूर अपना रहे हैं। जो बजट पेश किया गया था उसमें भी गांव में विकास के कामों तथा विशेषकर उद्योग, छोटे उद्योगों, कुटीर उद्योगों आदि की स्थापना करने पर अधिक बल दिया गया है। जहाँ तक गांव में उद्योगों का मामला है यह बात साफ तौर पर सरकार की तरफ से कही गई है कि पैसों की किसी भी प्रकार से तंगी नहीं आयेगी।

श्रीमती सविता बहिन : उपसभापति जी, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहती हूँ कि क्या इस इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी में इस तरह के उद्योग भी रखे गए हैं जिन से कि रूरल इण्डस्ट्री ज्यादा से ज्यादा बड़े, छोटी इण्डस्ट्रीज रूरल एरियाज में जाएँ और वर्कर्स को उसमें ज्यादा रियाज जाए या बड़ी इण्डस्ट्रीज और

छोटी इण्डस्ट्रीज में इस तरह की कोई चीज रखी गई है?

दूसरी बात जो मैं जानना चाहती हूँ वह यह है कि जैसा मंत्री महोदय ने कहा लाइसेंस पालिसी को सामने रखते हुए सिक मिल्स वर्कर्स को दे दी जाए, इसमें क्या पालिसी लागू करेंगे? जो बिग सिक इण्डस्ट्रीज के वर्कर्स इसमें इनवाल्व्ड हैं उसमें क्या करेंगे?

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज : जहाँ तक गांव में जाने का सवाल है, मैं बतला चुका हूँ कि हमारा कार्य कुटीर और छोटे उद्योगों का विकास करना है। इस विकास का यह मतलब नहीं होता है कि जो बड़े उद्योग हैं, उनसे किसी प्रकार के टकराव की बात है। हमारा देश बहुत बड़ा है। इसमें बहुत विकास करना है। हर क्षेत्र का अपना अपना स्थान है। हमारा प्रयास रहेगा कि कम से कम पूँजी लगा कर ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोगों को लाभ हो और यह तो छोटे और कुटीर उद्योगों से ही सम्भव है, इसलिए इस पर अधिक बल दिया जाएगा। जहाँ तक बीमार कारखानों को मजदूरों द्वारा चलाने का सवाल है यह बात मैंने संसद् में हमारे मंत्रालय की मांगों पर बहस के दौरान कही थी। इस विषय में हमारे पास अभी तक मजदूर संगठनों द्वारा कोई ठोस जवाब नहीं आया है। अपनी तरफ से हम लोगों से बात कर रहे हैं। जहाँ पर इस प्रकार के बीमार कारखानों को सरकार द्वारा लेने का सुझाव आ रहा है, वहाँ पर मजदूर संगठनों से इस संबंध में बात की जा रही है परन्तु किसी की तरफ से अभी तक कोई ठोस जवाब प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है।

श्री हर्षदेव मालवीय : मान्यवर, मैं सबसे पहले माननीय मंत्री जी को उनके द्वारा पब्लिक सेक्टर वर्गरेह के बारे में, इण्डस्ट्रियल पालिसी के बारे में संसद् में घोषित की गई नीति पर बधाई देना चाहता हूँ। मगर मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि मैंने अखबार में श्री बृजलाल

वर्मा के वक्तव्य को देखा, उन्होंने कहा मैं तो बिग हाऊसिज को घटा कर 10 करोड़ रुपये पर लाना चाहता था परन्तु ब्यूरोक्रेसी ने एक ऐसी कंस्पिरेसी कर दी जिससे हमारे ऊपर लांछन लग गया और मुझे हटना पड़ा जिसके फलस्वरूप मुझे हटा कर श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज को उद्योग मंत्रालय सौंप दिया गया। तो क्या मंत्री जी ने ऐसा कोई वक्तव्य देखा है? अगर देखा है तो आपका क्या कहना है?

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज : मैंने ऐसा कोई वक्तव्य नहीं देखा है।

श्री हर्षदेव मालवीय : मुझे खेद है मुझे अखबार की तारीख याद नहीं है. . .
(Interruptions)

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज : हो सकता है, मैंने देखा नहीं है।

श्री हर्षदेव मालवीय : देख लो महाराज, इंडियन मे था. . . (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Shri Dwivedi.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am amazed at the manner in which the hon. Minister has chosen to phrase his replies to the question of Mr. Sisodia as well as to the question just now put by Mr. Malaviya. Right from the beginning, since the installation of this Government, the people of this country have been watching with awe and trepidation the manner in which different Ministers have been speaking with different voices. To a certain extent, it is understandable because this coalition Government is based on the quota system and every constituent unit, the CFD, the Jan Sangh and others, have their own representatives so much so that one of the persons who was appointed. Mr. Nana-ji Deshmukh, chose his nominee and he was appointed. Now this House is Well aware of l'affaire Mr. Brij Lal Verma and Mr. George Fernandes is

giving the impression that he represents Dr. Jekyll while Mr. Brij Lal Verma represents Mr. Hyde. The question that I am raising is of great importance for the parliamentary system. Now this confusion has been worse confounded by a pointifical pronouncement of the honourable Prime Minister the other day that while the Prime Minister represents the viewpoint of the Government and the policy of the Government, every other individual Minister can speak only on behalf of his own Ministry. This is a position which strikes at the very root of collective responsibility of Government. There is a great deal of confusion here. It is not a question that Mr. Brij Lal Verma or for that matter Mr. George Fernandes was expressing his own viewpoint. No Minister, so long as he is a Minister, can express publicly his own personal viewpoint and no other Minister can say that it was his personal view. I want a clarification from the Prime Minister who happens to be present here as to whether he has taken this position that no other Minister can speak on behalf of the Government of India and that the Prime Minister alone can speak out the policy, or that the report that has appeared in the press is wrong. This question is causing us great anxiety. That is one Number two: In regard to the Industrial Policy Resolution of course, Mr. Fernandes made a statement the other day in the Lok Sabha but those were stray comments: he made certain points . . .

DR. RAMKRIPAL SINHA: Mr. Dwivedi can raise these points in the debate on the Appropriation Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dwivedi, please ask your supplementaries on the present question.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: My Question is; Does the Government intend to bring forward a new Industrial Policy Resolution which will replace the old Industrial Policy Resolution? Does the Government have that proposal before it?

Before the Minister answers this question, I would very much like to request, through you, the Prime Minister to clarify the question who represents whom in this country.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: In regard to the last point, Sir, he made a special request to you. Insofar as the first part of his question is concerned I do not think it arises out of the present question. Insofar as the second part is concerned, there is no proposal at the present moment to bring forward any policy resolution amending the 1956 Resolution.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: My question is very simple. Mr. George Fernandes has rightly pointed out the clear policy of the past regime was to boost up the big monopoly houses and the big business and they increased their assets by getting licences—Birlas, Mafatlals, Goenkas and so on. My question is: During the last few months how many licences have been issued to these monopoly houses by the present Government and how many are pending and what is the attitude of the present Government towards these licences to the big business houses?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I shall require notice.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: That means some licences *have* been issued.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY: Through you, Sir, I want to request the Prime Minister to clarify one thing arising out of the reply given by the Industry Minister. The Industry Minister repudiated the statement given by the previous Industry Minister. It is for the Prime Minister to decide which one of them will correctly tell us the policy of the Government, we will be very grateful if the Prime Minister clarifies the position. That is number one. Number two; The statement of Mr. Brij Lal Verma who was the Minister of Industry has been repudiated by Mr. George Fernandes, and I congratulate Mr.

Fernandes on that because we stand by the public sector and we will help the Government in achieving the target if he wants our cooperation. But since in the system of functioning of the Cabinet one Minister cannot repudiate the other Minister, will the Prime Minister tell us whether Mr. Brij Lal Verma is still continuing in the Ministry or whether he has been punished for his past statements and who authorised Mr. George Fernandes to make a statement like this that any person can go to the press and make any statement? We want a categorical assurance from the Prime Minister that there will be a smooth functioning of his Cabinet and that there will be no contradicting statements from one Minister repudiating the other Minister's statements,

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I do not think the question calls for an answer.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The question has been addressed to the Prime Minister. He is present in the House—I am not saying 'she'. The Prime Minister made a statement that only he can speak for the Government and other Ministers can speak only about their own departments, and nothing else. We should like to know where in the Janata scheme of collective responsibility we stand. This we would like to know: We would like to know whether a Minister, when he goes to a meeting can only speak about his own portfolio and nothing else. What are the norms laid down?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us take up the next question.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY: The Prime Minister was prepared to reply.

Allocation of Newsprint Quota

*94. SHRI SHRIKANT VERMA: Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state: