

Ministry of Defence (Department of Defence Production) Reservation or Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tri' i+he Defence Public Sector Undertaking.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The Houses stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

#### DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

SHRI PRANAB KUMARMUKHERJEE (West Bengal) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, when I went through the Report of the Ministry of Industrial Development for the year 1971-72, I expected that I would find in it a reflection of the mood of the nation which has been clearly manifested in the two massive mandates in the period under review and the confidence which has been expressed by the nation in the glorious victory of the fourteen days' battle. But I am sorry to say that the Report itself starts with a note of pessimism and it corroborates the apprehension made by the Midterm Appraisal (The Fourth Plan) document, in para 4 of Chapter 17—

"At the beginning of the Fourth Plan industrial production had shown a marked recovery. The rate of growth in industrial production went up to 6.6 per cent during 1968-69 and to 6.9 per cent during 1969-70. This was largely through fuller utilisation of the available capacity. However, during 1970-71 the rate of growth dropped to about 3.5 per cent. There seems to have been a further decline in this trend in the initial months of 1971-72. Thus, during the first half of the Plan period, industrial production has remained substantially below the average levels envisaged in the Fourth Five Year Plan."

It appears from the Report of the Ministry, as the Minister himself has admitted in his reply to the Demands in the Lok Sabha,

because of the poor performance in certain sectors particularly steel, sugar, textiles, transport equipment and certain others, the overall industrial development and the growth rate have declined. Even in the reply of the Minister I find that it does not give any ray of hope, unless these particular sectors improve their lot. In view of all this, I fail to understand how we can expect to reach our target, how we can attain self-reliance, how we can fulfil our commitments to the abolition of poverty, giving employment to the millions of unemployed people—the exact figure the Government itself does not know. Also I fail to understand—if the industrial growth rate declines to such a state—and the Minister himself is not confident about it—what would happen in the future, and I do not know how we can implement our programmes and the pledges given to the electorate.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, when I went through the report I expected that something would be said about regional imbalances. Various schemes have been taken up by the Government itself. Two important schemes were announced by the Minister himself on the floor of the House to remove regional imbalances, namely, financial assistance at concessional rates to new entrepreneurs which covered a large number of schemes in almost all the States and 10 per cent, subsidy scheme for one district in each State ana the Union territories. I do not find anything. What happened to development in those areas about which we talked in the report itself ? How many industries have been established in these backward areas ? How many enterpreneurs have been advised by the licensing committees? How many old entrepreneurs have been advised by the Licensing Committee and the Ministry of Industrial Development to establish their units in those backward areas to develop them ?

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the burning issue today, sofar as industrial development is concerned, is the regional imbalance. I do not find even a word about it in the report itself. I do not know what steps have been taken and what steps the Ministry has taken to remove the regional imbalances there for which there is a crying need from the backward regions.

[ Shri Pranab Kumar Mukherjee ]

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, from a study made in one of the economic papers regarding regional imbalances we find that between 1956 and 1966, ten years, only four States got the maximum benefit of industrial development. The four States are Maharashtra, West Bengal, Gujarat and Tamil Nadu. These four States accounted for 60 per cent, of the licences applied for and schemes approved. Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Kerala, Mysore and Punjab got only 29 per cent, of the industrial licences issued during the period 1956-66. During this period 89 per cent, of the licences went to these States while 11 per cent, went to the rest. I do not know what happened to the States from which the Minister of Industrial Development comes, namely Assam, and other eastern States, Orissa and Bihar. I do not know what happened to these States.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER : What about West Bengal ?

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE : In comparison to others West Bengal got much more.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER : Due to Naxalites' activities.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE : There was no Naxalite activity then.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : You tell him that there was Atulya Ghosh activity at that time.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE : If you take the financial assistance given for industrial development to the various industries you will find that it was concentrated to two or three States; they got the maximum benefit. Out of the total amount of assistance given by the I.D.B.I, from 1964 to 1970 Gujarat alone got Rs. 41 crores, Maharashtra Rs. 119 crores, Tamil Nadu Rs. 42 crores, West Bengal got Rs. 41 crores. As against these our States getting Rs. 245 crores, six States got Rs. 79 crores. The others including the Union territories, got Rs. 24 crores. Similar is the case with the I.F.C. and the I.C.I. C.I. loans. Therefore, so far as industrial licences are concerned, I do not find how regional imbalances can be removed, how the backward areas can be developed, I fail

to understand from the chapter on licences in the report itself what steps the Government have taken while issuing now licences to the concerned parties for the development of backward areas. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Minister himself has stated in the Lok Sabha about the eastern region that "conditions in West Bengal last year were unsettled and Members are aware that close to a quarter of the aggregate industrial output in the country emanated from the eastern States." It appears that nearly 20 per cent of the total industrial output comes from the State of West Bengal. That means only 5 per cent of the total aggregate comes from the rest of the three States in the eastern region. I would like to know from the Minister what steps they have taken to improve the situation in these areas. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, when West Bengal was under President's rule, the Union Industrial Development Ministry took up a scheme for supplying raw materials to 224 engineering industries in the State of West Bengal. There was no popular Ministry then; I am talking of 1971. The administration was being carried on by the Government of India. The Industrial Development Ministry at the request of the Government of West Bengal prepared a scheme for ad hoc allotment of steel to 224 engineering concerns in West Bengal. We all know that the engineering industry constitutes the backbone of the industrial structure of West Bengal. But the Steel Ministry refused to give any ad hoc allotment to the engineering concerns of West Bengal. Now we understand that almost all the engineering concerns in the State remain idle for want of raw material. This scheme was sent by the West Bengal Government. It was approved by the Industrial Development Ministry. It was placed before the Consultative Committee on West Bengal. But the Steel Ministry straightway refused to make any ad hoc allotment of steel. That being the case, I fail to understand how the industrial situation in West Bengal and in the eastern region as such, can be improved.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir it has been stated in the Report itself that the Government is taking speedy action in the matter of giving licences, and large figures about the licences have been

given. It has been stated that against 363 industrial licences and 438 letters of intent issued during the year 1970, as many as 626 industrial licences and 1,015 letters of intent were issued during the year 1971. From the figures, it appears that the Ministry is doing well. But I would like to know to whom these industrial licences have been issued. How many of them belong to the big business houses? Is it a fact that in the name of joint ventures or joint undertakings, the big business houses are being benefited? And is it not a fact that out of the seven cases referred to the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission up to the period of November, 1971, three were kept pending and four were given straight clearance for expansion of big business houses? The Minister has not stated how many units which have got licences belong to the big business houses. On the one hand, we are talking of taking steps against concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, we are having a Monopolies Commission, we are having screening Committees. We are having speeches against the big monopoly houses. But on the other hand, when we issue licences, we give them to the big business houses. I do not understand how these two things can go side by side.

We are talking of self-reliance. And what appears to us? It appears from the paper itself that in the first half of 1971, 166 foreign collaborators were allowed to have their business in the country. The figures for the corresponding periods in 1969 and 1970 were respectively 82 and 94. One hundred and sixty-six foreign collaborators were allowed to have their business in the country. Foreign exploitation is going on. Monopolistic exploitation is going on. And at the same time we are talking of self-reliance; at the same time we are talking of curbing monopoly houses. I fail to understand how these two things go side by side. The Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956 is there. Is it not advisable on the part of the Ministry to give a fresh look at the entire industrial policy? We have restricted it only to the basic industries, the core industries. Is it not high time that the public sector ventured into the field of consumer industries? What has been done by the

Government? There is no mention of it in the report. What steps is the Government taking to expand public sector industries in the field of consumer industries? Again about loans to big business houses only the other day, in the last session, on the floor of this very House, it was admitted by the Finance Minister that out of the total assistance given by the Life Insurance Corporation to the business houses, out of Rs. 194 crores Rs. 144 crores went to the big business houses. Is this the indication of curbing monopoly houses? Is this the indication of bringing socialism? Is this the indication of going ahead towards 'garibi hatao'? I do understand the difficulty of the honourable Minister of Industrial Development. So many things are there over which he has no direct control. Even in the issuing of licences he has no free hand. If press reports are correct, I understand that he took a move of unilaterally disposing of licences in the months of November and December, but his attempt was frustrated—if the press report is correct. I know his handicap. I know his difficulty. At the same time I would like to know what positive steps, what concrete steps, the industrial Development Ministry has taken to boost up the industrial climate in the country with the declared social, political and economic objectives. What steps have they taken to achieve self-reliance? What steps have they taken to curb monopoly houses either through licensing policy or through assistance from the financial institutions or through diversification of industries or by taking other measures? What concrete steps have they taken? I admit the shortcomings. But I fail to find any ray of hope in the report submitted to us on which we are having a discussion, on the working of the Ministry. Therefore, it is high time a fresh look was given to the entire subject. I do not know how long, in the name of mixed economy, these things, this hotch-potch business, will go on. Is it not high time that the Government declared the ways through which they want to attain commanding heights? Is it possible to attain commanding height in economy by controlling merely 10 per cent or 15 per cent of the total industrial production? What steps have the Ministry taken to attain commanding heights in the economy, to

[Shri Pranab Kumar Mukherjee]

bring socialism, to curb monopoly houses, big business houses ? Either through the industrial licensing policy or through the financing policy or through equal and spreaded development all over the country it could be done. I do not find any ray of hope and a sincere attempt to achieve the declared social, political and economic objectives. Therefore, I am sorry to say that the performance of the Industrial Development Ministry is not up to the expectations and it is not in conformity with the spirit, with the mood, of the nation which has been very clearly indicated during the period under review. Mr. Deputy Chairman, the last point I want to make out is about decentralisation of industries towards which, it is said, efforts are being made. But from the experiences of my State, I can point out that nothing has been done in this regard and no serious efforts are being made in this direction. Decentralisation can be achieved by Government only through effective control of licensing institutions and financial institutions. If government does not control these institutions effectively, there cannot be any decentralisation of industries and until and unless there is decentralisation of industries, regional imbalances will remain. Certain States will cry for more money, more industries and more development whereas certain other States will accumulate everything and this may ultimately lead to the total disintegration of the country. I am apprehensive of that, though I am not advocating it. I am against any separatist tendency or provincialism. But at the same time, it must be remembered that each and every part of India has to be equally developed. Each and every part of India is to be economically made viable. Until and unless you do it and if you simply concentrate on certain regions and areas only, I fail to understand how can we reach our declared political, social and economic objective. With these words, I conclude. Thank you.

**श्री प्रेम मनोहर (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** उप-सभापति, आज मिनिस्ट्री आफ इन्डस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट के सम्बन्ध में विचार किया जा रहा है और स्टेटिस्टिक्स की दृष्टि से जब हम देखते हैं तो अपना जो रेट आफ ग्रोथ है वह 2.3 परसेंट है जब कि जापान में

11.4 परसेंट है। यह केवल स्टेटिस्टिक्स की बात है, लेकिन प्रत्यक्ष में अब हम आते हैं तो हम अपने देश में हर चीज को स्टेटिस्टिक्स की दृष्टि से देखते हैं तो हम पाते हैं कि कोई भी चीज ले ली जाय, सैकड़ों हजारों चीजों की लिस्ट हमारे सामने आ जाती है—पिछले 10—12 सालों से लगातार स्केयरसिटी चली आती है और आज तक उन्हीं चीजों की स्केयरसिटी दूर नहीं हुई है। प्रत्यक्ष रूप से हर एक आदमी के व्यवहार में प्रति दिन ये चीजें आती हैं, लेकिन इनकी स्केयरसिटी अभी तक दूर नहीं हुई है। चाहे आप स्कूटर ले लीजिये, चाहे आप टायर ले लीजिये, सोडा ऐश ले लीजिये, सीमेंट ले लीजिये, पेपर और आक्सीजन गैस ले लीजिये, ये जितनी भी चीजें हैं इनकी हम लगातार स्केयरसिटी देखते आ रहे हैं। कम से कम स्कूटर जो कुछ साल पहिले 3,200 रु० में आता था आज उसके दाम 5,000 रु० हो गये हैं लेकिन, फिर भी उसकी स्केयरसिटी बनी हुई है। आज 10 साल हो गये हैं, क्या कभी सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में कोई प्रयत्न किया ताकि इस चीज की कमी को दूर किया जा सके? आज हम देखते हैं कि हमारे मुल्क में स्कूटरों की स्केयरसिटी है, टायरों की स्केयरसिटी बनी हुई है और यह हालत चार पांच सालों से और भी खराब होती चली आ रही है। इसी तरह से सोडा ऐश की भी स्थिति पिछले दो सालों से चली आ रही है। जितनी चीजों की इस समय हमारे देश में स्केयरसिटी है, वह बराबर चलती ही आ रही है और इस वक्त भी स्थिति में कोई चेन्ज नहीं हुआ है।

दूसरा प्रत्यक्ष उदाहरण मैं आपके सामने यह रखना चाहता हूँ कि हम मोनोपली हाउसेज के बारे में रोज सदन में बोलते हैं और कहते हैं कि इन मोनोपली हाउसेज को समाप्त किया जाना चाहिये। मैं इस बारे में अपने मिनिस्टर और मंत्रालय को दोष देना नहीं चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने शायद इन

मोनोपली हाउसेज को खत्म करने का भरसक प्रयत्न किया होगा, लेकिन उनके न चाहते भी आज इनकी तादाद दुगनी हो गई है, लाखों कोशिश करने के बावजूद भी मोनोपली हाउसेज आज दुगने हो गये हैं। हमने इन हाउसेज को इस सदन में जितनी गाली दी, जितनी उनकी टोपी उछाली, इसके बावजूद भी मोनोपली हाउसेज दुगने हुए हैं। मैंने आपके सामने केवल दो उदाहरण रखे हैं। हमारी पाँचसाला चार योजनाएं हो गई हैं और हमारी कोशिशें हमेशा यह रही हैं कि देश की जो इन्डस्ट्रियल ग्रोथ है वह बढ़ाई जाय और जो मोनोपली हाउसेज हैं वे खत्म किये जायें, लेकिन हमारे इस सम्बन्ध में जो एफेक्ट्स हैं उनका नतीजा उल्टा हो रहा है। इसका स्पष्ट मतलब यह है कि जो हमारे एफेक्ट्स चल रहे हैं, जिस डाइरेक्शन में हम जा रहे हैं वह डाइरेक्शन विलकुल गलत है। हम रेल में बैठ कर कलकत्ता जाना चाहते हैं, लेकिन हम बम्बई को जा रहे हैं। इसलिए मेरा निश्चित मत है कि हम आज उल्टी दिशा की ओर जा रहे हैं और जो हमारा लक्ष्य देश के इन्डस्ट्रियल ग्रोथ को बढ़ाने का है वह अभी तक पूरा नहीं हो पा रहा है। हमारी जो इन्डस्ट्रियल पालिसी है जिसके द्वारा हम छोटे-छोटे आदमियों को लाभ पहुंचाना चाहते हैं वह भी हम पूरा नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी रोज कहती हैं कि जो रिच है उनके पास पैसा जा रहा है और गरीबों के पास पैसा नहीं पहुंच रहा है। इस तरह से गरीबों और अमीरों में एक खाई बनी हुई है और पिछले 10 सालों से हम इसमें कोई चेन्ज नहीं कर पाये हैं और न ही इस चीज को दूर ही कर सके हैं।

हम विश्लेषण करें तो मालूम पड़ेगा कि औद्योगिक विकास के लिए यह मंत्रालय केवल यही पर्याप्त समझता है कि हमने साइसेंस इशू कर दिए, जब कभी भी

साइसेंस की बात होती है तो स्टेटिस्टिक्स सामने आती है कि हमने इतने दिनों में इतने साइसेंस इशू कर दिए। तो मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या साइसेंस इशू कर देने से ही समस्या का हल हो जाता है, क्या साइसेंस इशू कर देने से इन्डस्ट्रियल ग्रोथ हो जायगी? जैसा आप लोगों को मालूम है, पिछले 5—7 साल से हम लोग बराबर कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि जो न्यूजप्रिन्ट है उसमें हम सैल्फ-सफीशिएन्ट हो जायें, शायद कुछ साइसेंस कुछ लोगों को दिए भी हैं, उनकी स्कूटिनी भी हुई, पब्लिक सेक्टर में नेपा पैपर मिल है, लेकिन आज भी हम न्यूजप्रिन्ट इम्पोर्ट कर रहे हैं। एक तरफ हम स्कूटिनी करते हैं कि कितना फारेन एक्सचेंज न्यूजप्रिन्ट में लगेगा, लेकिन एक साल, दो साल, तीन साल कितना टाइम आप लेंगे? आप टाइम लेते जाइए और उधर न्यूजप्रिन्ट इम्पोर्ट करते जाइए। इसी तरह से सोडा ऐश पिछले वर्षों में इम्पोर्ट किया है, सोडियम सल्फेट इम्पोर्ट किया है। हर दो-तीन साल में उनकी स्कोयरसिटी आती है। प्लानिंग कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है, प्लानिंग कमीशन का एस्टीमेट है, साइसेंसिंग कमेटी ने साइसेंस इशू किए हैं, लेकिन उसका प्रत्यक्ष अपने देश में असर क्या है? असर है, सिफर जीरो। जैसा मैंने बताया, स्टेटिस्टिक्स में जो ग्रोथ है वह 2.3 परसेंट है, सब चीजें स्कोयर्स हैं, कन्ज्यूमर को कोई चीज ठीक दाम पर नहीं मिलती, हर चीज के दाम बढ़ते चले जा रहे हैं, हम नारे पर नारे लगाते जा रहे हैं गरीबी हटाओ, यह करो, वह करो।

इन्डस्ट्री बढ़ाने के लिए या इन्डस्ट्रियल ग्रोथ बढ़ाने के लिए सबसे आवश्यक चीज है कि गवर्नमेंट के और इन्डस्ट्री के रिलेशन्स कैसे हों। क्या कभी हमने इस बात पर विचार किया है? हम इन्डस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स को गाली देते हैं, जो मन में आता है उनके

[श्री प्रेम मनोहर]

बारे में कहते हैं, उनको चोर कहते हैं, डाकू कहते हैं, बदमाश कहते हैं और जब इलेक्शन आता है तो उनसे रुपया मांगने जाते हैं, मांगने के बाद फिर उनको कन्सेशन देते हैं। चाहे हम लुक-छिप कर कहें, होता यही है। जब तक हम अपने देश में सही क्लाइमेट पैदा नहीं करते, इंडस्ट्री में और ट्रेड में रिलेशन्स ठीक नहीं होते, तब तक देश की प्रगति नहीं हो सकती। जब से आपने कह दिया कि हम शुगर इंडस्ट्री नेशनलाइज करेंगे, इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स ने शुगर इंडस्ट्री का रिनोवेशन बिलकुल बन्द कर दिया। यही नहीं बल्कि उन्होंने उसमें से अधिक से अधिक मशीनों को निकालना, पैसा कम से कम लगाना शुरू कर दिया। जो आप करना चाहते हैं उसके बारे में डिजीजन लीजिए। एक मिनिस्टर कुछ कहता है, दूसरा मिनिस्टर कुछ कहता है, सेन्टर कहता है नेशनलाइज करेंगे, स्टेट कहती है कि नेशनलाइज नहीं करते। आपस में बैठ कर बात करिए और वही डिजीजन लीजिए जो करना चाहिए। इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट और सरकार के बीच में समन्वय होना चाहिए। चाहे मिनिस्टर हो, सेक्रेटरी हो, स्माल इन्टर-प्रेन्योर हो, दोनों के हृदय में देश के लिए वही प्रेम है, दोनों चाहते हैं कि देश की प्रोस इनकम बढ़े, नेट इनकम बढ़े। उसी देश के वासी हम हैं, उसी के आप हैं, आपस में बैठ कर पोलिसी ऐसी बनाएं, जो देश के लिए ठीक हो। हम इस तरह स काम करें, गवर्नमेंट और इंडस्ट्री में सम्बन्ध ऐसे हों कि इंडस्ट्रियल रिटाइजेशन की जगह इंडस्ट्रियल ग्रोथ हो। जिस स्पीड से हमें आगे बढ़ना चाहिए, उस स्पीड से हम आगे नहीं बढ़ पाए। जब तक हम इंडस्ट्रियल क्लाइमेट को नहीं सुधारते, जब तक हम गवर्नमेंट और इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स मोनोपोली हाउसेज और स्माल इन्टरप्रेन्योर्स दोनों के मन में एक दूसरे के प्रति प्रेम, विश्वास पैदा नहीं करते, तब हम

अपने देश में औद्योगिक विकास की बात बहुत दूर समझते हैं।

दूसरी परम आवश्यक चीज है इंडस्ट्री के रिलेशन लेबर के साथ। गवर्नमेंट एक वेज बोर्ड नियुक्त करे कि मिनिमम 300 रुपया हर लेबर को मिलेगा, हाउसिंग फेसिलिटी उसके लिए नितान्त आवश्यक है, उसके बिना कोई फैक्ट्री नहीं चल सकती। लेकिन इसके बाद स्ट्राइक, लोक आउट बन्द लेबर को फुल प्रोडक्शन करना पड़ेगा और जो फुल प्रोडक्शन नहीं करेगा उस लेबर को निकाल दिया जाएगा। कोई इज्जत आप लाइए, चाहे कम्युनिज्म लाइए, चाहे सोशलिज्म लाइए, चाहे डिक्टेटर-शिप लाइए, रशा में भी कम्युनिस्ट कंट्री में लोगों को मार दिया गया है, जिन्होंने पूरा काम नहीं किया। लिबिंग वेजेज मिली है लेकिन कम्युनिस्ट कंट्री में काम करने के लिए उनको बाध्य किया गया है। डेमोक्रेटिक कंट्रीज में, कंपिटलिस्ट कंट्रीज में भी देश प्रेम को जगा कर के उन लोगों से काम करवाया गया है। वहां पर भी प्रोडक्शन हुआ है, चाहे वह किसी तरह से हुआ हो। आप भी कोई तरीका निकालिये। तरीके से हमारा कोई मतभेद नहीं है, लेकिन उद्देश्य से हमारा मतभेद है। इंडस्ट्रीज में प्रोडक्शन होना चाहिये। अभी कुछ समय पहले गिरि साहब ने कहा कि स्ट्राइक्स पर हम बैंन लगा देंगे या मारीटोरिया होना चाहिये। मेरा कहना यह है कि आप कोई तरीका निकालिये और तरीका यह होना चाहिये कि हमारा मैक्सिमम प्रोडक्शन हो। देश की गरीबी केवल नारों से दूर नहीं होगी। देश में समृद्धि केवल नारों से नहीं आयेगी। नये-नये शब्द आते हैं हमारे यहां। मैं इंडस्ट्रियल लाइसेंसिंग कमेटी में हूँ। उसमें एक नया शब्द 'टास्क फोर्स' आ गया। इन नये-नये शब्दों से देश की उन्नति नहीं होने वाली है। आपके सामने जो कठिनाइयाँ

आ रही हैं, जिनकी वजह से हम आगे नहीं बढ़ रहे हैं, उनको पहले आप ठीक करिये। देश के अन्दर हमारी जितनी भी औद्योगिक युनिट्स हैं, उनमें लेबर के साथ कैसा व्यवहार हो रहा है उसको आप देखें। आप लेबर के लिये मिनिमम वेज फिक्स करें, लेकिन उसके साथ-साथ आप यह भी निश्चित करें कि इतना प्रोडक्शन करना होगा। आप यह भी कहिये कि अब हम स्ट्राइक की कोई बात नहीं सुनेंगे, एक साल या दो साल हम किसी की कोई बात नहीं सुनेंगे। मैं कानपुर में रहता हूँ। इसलिये मुझे मालूम है कि वहां पर एक इंडियन एक्सप्लोसिव फॅक्ट्री है जिसमें साढ़े तीन सौ रुपया मिनिमम वेज है। लेकिन फिर भी आये दिन छोटी-छोटी बातों पर स्ट्राइक्स की धमकियां होती रहती हैं और पूरा प्रोडक्शन वहां पर नहीं होता है। इसी तरह से हमने देखा कि दुर्गापुर का क्या हाल है और दूसरी इंडस्ट्रीज का क्या हाल है? लड़ाई के समय में हमारे कारखानों में 10 से 15 परसेंट तक प्रोडक्शन बढ़ गया था। उसी स्थिति का हम क्यों नहीं निर्माण करते हैं? अगर लेबर में असंतोष है और वे काम नहीं करते हैं तो आप उनको ज्यादा पैसा दिलायें। एम्प्लायर्स को आप वाध्य करें कि वे लेबर को पूरा पैसा दें। उनको रोटी भी मिले और मकखन भी मिले, लेकिन उसके बाद उनको पूरा काम करना चाहिये। कामचोरी फिर नहीं सुनी जानी चाहिये, चाहे वहां पर कोई भी लेबर यूनियन हो। जब तक आप इस तरह की परिस्थिति का निर्माण नहीं करते, जब तक काम करने वालों में जोश नहीं आता, तब तक स्थिति में कोई सुधार नहीं होगा। आज सीलिंग का ढोंग रचा जा रहा है, लेकिन उससे कोई सुधार होने वाला नहीं है। जिन लोगों के पास टूल्स हैं वही काम कर सकते हैं। जिनके पास टूल्स नहीं हैं वे काम नहीं कर सकते हैं।

आपके पास प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाने का रास्ता कौन सा है।

आज जो मोनोपली हाउसेज हैं 75 या 80, उनको अगर आप चाहें तो बन्द कर दें, लेकिन आप कोई दूसरा रास्ता निकालिये। मोनोपली हाउसेज को लाइसेंस न दे कर क्या आपके पास दो सौ, तीन सौ, चार सौ या पांच सौ लोग ऐसे हैं जिनको लाइसेंस दे कर आप काम करा सकते हैं। वैसे मोनोपली हाउसेज वाले भी इसी देश के रहने वाले हैं। आपके पास कायदे कानून हैं जिनसे उनको आप कंट्रोल में रखिये। आपके पास स्टेटिस्टिक्स हैं। अगर किसी को 10 करोड़ का प्राफिट होता है तो उसमें से 3 करोड़ रह जाता है। वह 3 करोड़ रु० अगर वे एम्प्लाय करतें हैं तो ठीक, नहीं तो आप उनको प्राजिक्यूट करिये। अगर मोनोपली हाउसेज को आप को समाप्त ही करना है तो आप उनको समाप्त कर दीजिए। लेकिन 10—15 साल से आप जिस अनिश्चित स्थिति में चल रहे हैं उससे कोई काम नहीं हो पा रहा है। आप एक डेसीजन लीजिये और डेसीजन ले कर आप को जो करना है वह करिये। आप काम तो शुरू करिये, वरना ढुलमुल यकीन स्थिति जो है उससे कोई इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट होने वाला नहीं है और आज स्थिति जो चल रही है वैसी ही बराबर चलती रहेगी।

एक बात मैं स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। कहने के बावजूद भी लघु उद्योगों को जितनी सहायता सरकार से मिलनी चाहिए और जिस तरह से राँ मैटीरियल मिलना चाहिए वह नहीं मिल पा रहा है। अभी साढ़े सात लाख की लिमिट आपने उनके लिए रखी है, उसके लिए भी मेरा सुझाव है कि वह सीमा दस लाख की होनी चाहिए और मेरा

[ श्री प्रेम मनोहर ]

अनुरोध है कि उन लोगों को रा मैटीरियल भी ठीक तरह से मिलने चाहियें।

अंत में मैं एक बात और अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि जो अपने पिछड़े प्रदेश हैं, जो देश के पिछड़े हिस्से हैं उनके बारे में सब प्रकार के रिस्ट्रिक्शन्स आप हटा दें और आप इस बात की घोषणा करें कि जो पिछड़े प्रान्त हैं या जो पिछड़े जिले हैं उनमें कोई भी किसी प्रकार की इंडस्ट्री लगा सकता है। ताकि जो बैकवर्ड डिस्ट्रिक्ट्स हैं या जो बैकवर्ड हिस्से हैं उनमें इंडस्ट्रीज लगें, यही मैं अपने मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ।

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Sir, the Report of the Industrial Development Ministry for 1971-72 has highlighted certain deficiencies in the industrial growth and has also reported certain contributions made by the Ministry to the increase of industrial production in the country. Before going to the Report I myself am posing a question whether the Industrial Development Ministry is basically a regulatory ministry or a promotional ministry. In a developing country I think, the character and structure of the Industrial Development Ministry must not be only regulatory but must also be a promotional one. And I find in this respect that the promotional character of this Industrial Development Ministry, from this Report, is nil. I am not giving out a very strong opinion but what I feel is that unless all the energies of the Ministry and the officers concerned are tapped, the whole effort will be thwarted and we will not be able to achieve the targets or the economic betterment of the masses.

If you see the figures they have given here, you will find that industrial production has gone down. I think it is round about 2.2% this year which is an absolutely ridiculous figure. Then they have given out certain reasons; they have stated that it is due to paucity of raw materials and things like that. Particularly about the engineering industry with which I am mostly concerned, I find that the lack of production is not there in the

engineering industry at all. It is in textiles; it is in some other industries. And this lacuna is coming up because there are sectoral production spurts, sectoral weaknesses in production and, in many of the cases, the unutilised capacity is the major reason. And so I want to bring before the House that the Industrial Development Ministry must bear the promotional responsibility on a much larger scale than the regulatory responsibility.

I find that this Ministry is just like the ledger-keeper of the Government of India because it is concerned only with the issue of licences of different nature because whether it is the chemical industry or the textiles industry it comes to the Ministry of Industrial Development for licences although the Industrial Development Ministry has nothing to do with chemicals or textiles once a licence is granted. Therefore, I think a review has got to be made by the Government itself so that this Ministry is made very powerful if it has to deliver the goods. Our criticising the Ministry is not going to help. Therefore the Ministry of Industrial Development must have all the powers for promotional licensing and we must give them whatever help they want in all respects.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What ?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Why ?  
What do you want ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What you are suggesting...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : I am suggesting that at present the Industrial Development Ministry is functioning as the ledger-keeper of the Government, It only keeps track of the licences...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Not at all; it does a lot of mischief. Mischief in granting licences.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: That is your aspect; you may view it like that. But I do not want to view it that way. I am viewing it in a constructive way. I am pressing my point that the character of the Industrial Development Ministry must be so much strengthened so that they could deal with not only the issue of licences to



or organisations and firms but also see that the licences are best utilised so that they can have a total concept of production.

We criticise the Ministry and ask: 'Why the refrigerators have increased?' Unless the Ministry takes the total concept and thinks of the whole industrial production they cannot deliver the goods. The Ministry must enlarge its concept and its power so that not only the question of licensing procedures but certain major aspects of the industrial growth and other aspects of the industry must come into the Ministry. Now there is a discussion going on about what should be the total production because it is not only the growth, it is also the staggering problem of unemployment. So the industrial strategy must not only be growth-oriented but also employment-oriented. What have we found? After three Plans and after a formidable industrial base has been created in this country, we have failed to create a proper technology. Employment also can be created to keep pace with the growth in the industrial base. In that respect, the strategy of industrial development should not only be growth-oriented but also oriented towards finding employment with suitable technology for this purpose. In this connection the new strategy of industrial development should be one which will keep in mind capital output and capital labour ratio and which leads to the balance of payment equilibrium instantly. This point comes in because if the Industrial Development Ministry is given sufficient powers, they can utilise their planning for creation of employment. So the industrial development has to be geared not to economic growth in terms of GNP but also to meet unemployment. Instead of giving employment to A or B we must also see that the economy is so raised that 40% of the masses who are at the subsistence level are also helped by the industry. In this regard there must be some structural changes made in the industrial outlook of this country and the industrial policy. We are now practising a mixed economy. I find the mixed economy pattern is not becoming suitable to this country. I do not ask for the abolition of the private sector but my difficulty is, the mixed economy pattern is not delivering goods because the private sector is having a very formidable producing capacity in their hands and we find this sector is not tuning their entire business to-

wards the needs of the majority of the masses. Their major incentive is profit and in this vicious circle the real intention of any formidable industrial growth is lost sight of. Why do I say this? We can well suggest that the mixed economy should be abolished but it is not going to solve the problem as we find that there is an alternative arrangement in our country as to who will take over this industrial management and industrial production. In this connection, the concept of joint sector has been suggested. Here also there is no clear-cut idea about joint sector. That has also to be followed and practised at some level. May I suggest to the Ministry that if we are really serious about the joint sector—and I find there is a silverlining that if we undertake to joint sector, we can achieve some thing, then we should...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal):  
Silverlining in the horizon?

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI : Outside the hall. The Industrial Development Ministry or the Government must come up with a proposal that the present private sector monopoly houses' shareholding must be reduced and the Government must come in because ultimately the LIO and other financial corporations have already put in their money for purchasing the equity and giving them support.

So this type of mixed economy and the industrial policy which we want to pursue should be so adopted that the Government puts in their equity through these financial institutions whereby the Government will have some control as regards production practices, production trends, sales and other \* policies of those concerns.

Similarly other structural rectifications in industrial policy are required particularly in the ancillary character of the industry. Sir, I have spoken so many times already on this aspect of small scale industry that I am not going to devote my time on this today but I want to highlight the necessity of the ancillary character in the industry. So many times in the last session when we pointedly asked the Minister what statutory protection is being given to create ancillary capacity in this country we were always told that it is under consideration. Now we find that

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni] the Government says in the licence or in the letter of intent there is a condition that they shall purchase so much from the small scale industry etc. but this would not do. I have got certain figures which I want to place before the House. It is about Japan where we find that in the chemical and allied products about 20 per cent of the production is by law going to the ancillary industry. Similarly in petroleum and coal it is 32 per cent. In non-ferrous metals it is 27 per cent; and please note this; in metal products it is 72 per cent. Well, that is the way to develop small scale industry. In industrial machinery except electricals it is 47 per cent. There are some more figures also. What I say is the time has come when the ancillary character of the industry has to be given more priority in our licensing procedure. Unless you give some backing through statutory protection merely inserting a condition in the licences or the letters of intent is not going to solve the problem.

Then as has been rightly stated here, it is mere simplification of the problem when we say that we have issued more licences and more letters of intent. Mere issue of more licences and more letters of intent is not going to bring about industrial growth. If we go into details we will again come up against the question of monopoly industries. I do not want to highlight again the 75 monopoly houses and the 20 big houses in this connection but what we actually find is there is rise in the assets of these monopoly houses and we also see that they are getting more licences. Their assets are also increasing by leaps and bounds. But all this is of our own making because the entire licensing procedure. The entire Plan schemes are such that nothing else will happen. Now I was recently told about Japan. In Japan the Mitsubishi Company is a very formidable company. After the Second World War I think at the time of the American occupation of Japan—I am subject to correction—the Mitsubishi family was by law prevented by Government from acquiring any assets. Similarly a time has come in this country when we must by law tell these monopoly houses that they cannot acquire any more assets. And whatever assets they have, as I have already suggested earlier, the equities of these monopoly houses should be taken on Government account through these finan-

cial institutions which have, helped them with funds.

Another point I wanted to make is about the working of the National Small Industries Corporation. The National Small Industries Corporation has given out machinery, I think, worth about Rs. 40 crores.

Sir, I am really surprised that in this Report, this time, the Industrial Development Ministry has not taken any credit whatsoever for the growth in the small-scale industries. Why they have tried not to mention anything in this report, I do not know. Last year they were trumpeting that it was a growth of 11.2%. But it was only, what you call, a notional calculation made by somebody. The point is this. When the small-scale industry is contributing about 7% to the gross production in this country, when you want to create opportunities for self-employment and to find employment for the educated, for the graduates and engineers and scientists, etc. in this field also, only Rs. 10 crores have been given by the National Small Industries Corporation as machinery for starting new industries. This is something ridiculous, Sir. I do not think the National Small Industries Corporation has done its work properly when the Planning Minister has said that within two years we shall employ every engineer and every educated man seeking employment. But this is not the way or the direction the Industrial Development Ministry or the National Small Industries Corporation should take to deal with this.

One point was about self-reliance. Last time, when I asked about the import of some CKD Packs, it was said that A was given a licence. I say: Do not give the licence to A or B. I was suggesting that you have given a licence to a certain A firm or B firm or C firm or D firm. I am not concerned with it, with the import of engines ranging from 25 to 45 hp. Does the Industrial Development Ministry want to say that this type of engines cannot be developed in this country? You are talking of self-reliance. Every time you talk of self-reliance, we see the opposite of it in action. Recently an example was given that some biscuit-making machine was allowed to be imported. We see rice mills are allowed to be imported.

The Industrial Development Ministry is making compromise on principles whenever such delicate instances come up and they, one way or the other, acquiesce in a position where self-reliance only remains at the slogan stage and the actual implementation of the programme is not carried through.

The last point I am making now. It is not only for criticism; the point is I want to be very frank with the whole concept of the Industrial Development Ministry. You must make it a very powerful Ministry, a Ministry which will give the licences, which will promote industrial growth and which will also control the monopolies and their bad effects on the industry. Otherwise, this Ministry will always be criticised and will permanently be condemned.

**श्री श्याम लाल गुप्त (बिहार) :**

उपसभापति जी, हमारी इन्डस्ट्रियल ग्रोथ कुछ भी हो, लेकिन पिछले कुछ वर्षों में हमारा उत्पादन काफी बढ़ा है फिर भी उपभोक्ता को दाम अधिक से अधिक देने पड़ रहे हैं। मैं यह देखता हूँ कि जो हमारे उद्योगपति हैं वे हमेशा दाम बढ़ाते ही चले जा रहे हैं। उदाहरण के लिए मैं कागज के सम्बन्ध में आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करता हूँ क्योंकि कागज से मेरा अधिक वास्ता पड़ता रहता है। कागज पर से ढाई साल पहिले जबकि दामों का नियंत्रण हटा था तो उस वक्त दाम 1.60 रु० प्रति किलोग्राम था और आज तीन रुपया हो गया है। हमारी सरकार का उद्देश्य देश की जनता को ज्यादा से ज्यादा पढ़ाने का है, लेकिन पढ़ने के लिए कागज और किताबों की जरूरत होती है और उनके दामों पर किसी तरह का कोई नियंत्रण नहीं है। मैंने पिछले हफ्ते पढ़ा था कि आन्ध्र प्रदेश में किसी मिल की उत्पादन क्षमता बढ़ाने के लिए लाइसेंस बढ़ा दिया गया है, लेकिन इसके साथ ही साथ पी० ए० सी० की रिपोर्ट में पढ़ा कि गवर्नमेंट को मिल मालिक कागज नहीं देते हैं। वे लोग किसी न किसी तरह दपतर

वालों को या मिनिस्ट्रों को अपने साथ कर लेते हैं और मनमाने ढंग से दाम बढ़ाते रहते हैं। मेरा सरकार से यह अनुरोध है कि जहां तक इन्डस्ट्रियल ग्रोथ का सवाल है वह तो अपने देश में बढ़ना ही चाहिए, 10 या 15 प्रतिशत हर वर्ष बढ़े, लेकिन दामों पर भी सरकार का नियंत्रण अवश्य होना चाहिये। आज हालत यह है कि जो भी दाम बढ़ाने की बात है वह पावर इन्डस्ट्रीज के पास ही है और वे लोग जितना चाहते हैं दाम बढ़ा लेते हैं और जब चाहे किसी चीज की कृत्रिम कमी पैदा कर देते हैं और उसके बाद मनमाने ढंग से दाम लेते हैं।

मैंने यह देखा है कि कागज मिल मालिक 300-500 रुपए टन फालतू चार्ज कर रहे हैं। मामूली कागज पर बढ़िया कागज का ठप्पा लगा देते हैं और ज्यादा पैसा चार्ज करते हैं। बच्चों को किताबें नहीं मिलती, कापियां नहीं मिलती जब कि कागज का प्रोडक्शन बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ गया है। न्यूज प्रिन्ट के बारे में कहा गया, न्यूज प्रिन्ट तो छोटी चीज है। सफेद कागज जिसके ऊपर बच्चों की किताबें छपती हैं, जिसकी कापियां बनती हैं वह नहीं मिलता, बाजार में जाओ तो बगैर पर्ची के कागज मिलेगा क्योंकि मिलमालिक 300 रुपए से 500 रुपए टन कागज की कीमत पर फालतू लेते हैं। दूकानदार कहां से पर्ची पर कागज दें, उन्हें फालतू पैसा देना पड़ता है। जहां तक उत्पादन की बात है उत्पादन बढ़ना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि सीमेंट, लोहा, कागज ये सब जरूरी चीजें हैं जिन पर उत्पादन के अलावा मूल्य पर नियंत्रण भी होना चाहिए। भारत में 11-12 ऐसी फैमिलीज हैं जिनके हाथ में सारे हिन्दुस्तान की इंडस्ट्री है। 4-5 फैमिली ऐसी हैं जो सारे कागज उद्योग को कंट्रोल करती हैं।

[श्री श्यामलाल गुप्त]

क्या सरकार उन 4-5 फैमिलीज के लाभ के लिये 50 करोड़ जनता के हितों की रक्षा नहीं कर सकती? मैं सरकार से फिर अनुरोध करूँगा कि उत्पादन के साथ-साथ, दामों पर और क्वालिटी पर नियंत्रण होना चाहिए। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am glad we are discussing the Report on the working of the Ministry of Industrial Development. There are two aspects to be considered by the House. One is how the Ministry is functioning and the other is the general assessment of the industrial development and the industrial situation in the country. Let me make some observations with regard to the functioning of the Industrial Development Ministry before I come to the question of the assessment of the industrial sector of our economy and the policies relating to the industrial development of our country. I know that I am adopting an unconventional method in taking up the Ministry first and what it has achieved next because many hon. Members in this House and in the other House have spoken about what is ill with the industrial development and how monopoly concentration is growing in the country, thanks to the policies of the Government.

In a discussion of this kind it will be useful if we exercise our parliamentary vigilance on the Ministry's functioning. After all, we are discussing the Report. Now, here the first thing I should like to point out is that now-a-days people have lost faith in this Ministry, that it will ever carry out the commitments to the nation made in the two general elections. At the time of the Second Five Year Plan we declared the objective of rapid industrialisation and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru spoke of reaching the commanding heights of our economy. Insofar as rapid industrialisation is concerned, it has almost come to a dead stop. As you will be seeing from the Report, the rate of growth in the industrial sector is less than 3 per cent as against the Plan target of 9.3 per cent. As far as the commanding heights are concerned, we find that only Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury is at a high altitude and we are nowhere near the commanding heights.

And we start with this thing. It should really be called the Ministry of 3 P.M. Monopoly Development instead of Ministry of Industrial Development. The nomenclature should not be prostituted to mislead the public, because the line of this Ministry under Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury has been one of systematic, calculated, cowardly appeasement of monopoly capital under the aegis of the Minister himself. Now, there is no wonder therefore that there is very great satisfaction among the business circles in the country, among the Tatas, the Birlas, the Dalmia-Jains, the Goenkas and others that after all, a right man has been found for the right place.

I have heard, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that those people are saying that a good man has been found for the Ministry. It is a matter of opinion. Personally, I have no quarrel with Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury. But when it comes to public policy, matters of public interest, I shall be failing in my duty, after having been here for 20 years, if I do not tell what I consider to be truth and believe to be the truth. Now, why are those people so optimistic about it, about the Minister and his leadership? And I have made a study of it, why Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury is a man after their heart.

Indeed, Mr. Chondhury's old connections are being exploited by them or are being offered to them, whichever way you take it. Mr. Choudhury was closely connected with the case of Turner, Morrison and Company and who does not know that he is a great friend of Haridas Mundhra? Naturally, the Birlas and others are very happy that one of them.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY): Before the hon. Member proceeds further—I think he will yield—I have no friendship with Mr. Haridas Mundhra.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You will answer later.

Is it not a fact that Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury lived in the Park Hotel, Calcutta, whose General Manager is Mr. Ram Singh, and which hotel belongs to Amin Chand Pyarelal? Can it be denied that Mr.

Choudhury lived in that room where Mr. Mundhra and others used to meet him in connection with the case that was heard in the court of Mr. B. D. Mukherjee at that time? Can he deny that? Go and ask them. We have got hotel unions and others, and we know what is happening there. I will not go into all that. This hotel belongs to Mr. Amin Chand Pyarelal. Mr. Amin Chand Pyarelal has been subjected to criticism here, as you know very well, Sir. And they are happy that Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury is now in charge of this Ministry.

Another gentleman, Mr. N. C. Suri, is also a friend of his. Mr. Suri operates through the Premier Rubber Company. And everybody knows that he is indulging in all kinds of malpractices, and I am sure that Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury will not like to justify it, even if he disowns his friendship with him. But friendship is very deep in this particular case. There is another gentleman, Mr. S. N. Hada, a protégé of Mr. Birla; again, a close friend of Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury. And no wonder, the Birlas are being shown special favours now by his Ministry, and they cleared the application of Century Enke Company, which has been earlier rejected by the Industrial Development Ministry before he came into the picture. Now, Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury has also responsibility; he is responsible for whatever happens in his Ministry, for giving licence to the tyre company for manufacturing tyres in Goa. Well, let him deny it. Mr. N. D. Qureshi is in Mr. Choudhury's personal staff. And who does not know his nefarious activities? Mr. Toka Choudhury of Assam—he comes and lives in posh hotels but is himself not a rich man at all, a poor man perhaps poorer than I am. How is it that he lives in big hotels like Inter-Continental Hotel—big hotels, anyhow—that remains to be explained. A system of liaison is working. And that is why I say that one has to be very careful. Even in Assam, Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury was closely connected with a number of business people like M/s. Budhai Gagan Chandra Rashik Ranjan Saha.

These are well known facts. I am not saying that Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury is doing everything bad. But these connections, close relationships, past associations have created an atmosphere in the business

circle that Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury could be counted upon for getting things done. This is what things are coming to. It is well known that when Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury arrives at the Dum Dura airport no officer goes there to receive him. And he is not very much protocol-minded, I must say. But why should Birlas be there to receive him or the protégés of Birlas be there to receive him. I cannot understand. When our Civil Aviation employees see these things, obviously they are not the people who would keep things secret and we come to know of these things. So this climate is there.

Now let me come to how the Ministry is functioning, what is its modus operandi. C. O. B. licences are being issued liberally. C. O. B. licences are availed of by big business people by claiming that the factory started before the licensing laws came into force or when the licence was required. Generally these people are given C. O. B. licences. In other words, this is a new type of licensing policy and these licences are availed of in order to utilise them for all kinds of expansion activities. Therefore, we should inquire into the C. O. B. licences.

Then larger business houses are also getting certain licences subject to export conditions, the condition being that 60 per cent of their product should be exported retaining 40 per cent for domestic consumption. In any case the pledge is not implemented. The export commitment is not implemented and the backward regions do not have certain facilities whereas licences are given in the name of helping the backward regions. In the name of helping backward regions lot of corruption is going on.

In this connection I want to bring to the notice of the House that there is a Licensing Committee. Mr. Kulkarni should know how the Ministry functions before he asked for more powers for the Ministry. The Licensing Committee deals with the question of licences. Their recommendations come to the Cabinet Committee. The Chairman of the Licensing Committee is the Secretary of the Ministry of Industrial Development, Mr. B. B. Lai, I.C.S. He is very much favoured and liked by the Birlas and others. The Secretary of the Ministry is the ex-officio Chairman of the

[ Shri Bhupesh Gupta ]

the Licensing Committee. The other members are all junior officers \_

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh): On a point of order. May I just inform my friend that it is not good to bring in the names of civil servants without any chance being to them to defend themselves?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do not bother about that. I need not be taught the code of conduct after my 20 years of parliamentary experience. E>o not tell me not to take holy names. The Secretary of the Ministry happens to be the Chairman. Actually things are settled between the Minister and the Secretary, other members being junior officers they have no other opinion but to sanction.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOU-DHURY: These cock and bull stories on the part of the hon'ble Member are no good. He is knitting these cobweb stories without any base. He is saying that the Minister and the Secretary decide everything and the junior members have nothing to do with it. Sir, these members are senior Secretaries and Joint Secretaries and Directors. He is indulging in wild, mischievous, baseless talks because he is unhappy with me after the elections. And he is going on in any way he likes....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How long shall I be disturbed, Sir?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOU-DHURY: How long will you go on telling these baseless things?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I shall go on telling these things till you are out of the Government.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOU-DHURY; Mr. Bhupesh Gnpta, I am not in this Government on your mercy.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you carry on with your speech.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOU-DHURY: I am not on your mercy in this Government,

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have not said that the juniors do nothing. All I have said is that when the juniors are there and the senior people take a position, it is very difficult for them to oppose. That is what I have said, not that they do not do so. (.Interruption) I do not wish to be disturbed. Don't you see that when a senior Minister answers a question, the junior dees not even get up ?

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: Officials should not be named...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Don't tell me. I have been in Parliament longer. They can be named. H. M. Patel was named. Which officer was not named? Don't tell me about it. (Interruptions) Mr. Tyagi, your job is not the Chairman's job. I know my job, I know what I am saying. You say officials should not be named even after H. M. Patel was named in the Mundhra case and so many other officers, including Mathai, were named in the House.

(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have only five minutes more, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, this is how licensing is done and obviously we want a change. The Foreign Investment Board is another body which deals with the question of foreign collaboration, among other things. The Chairman of that body is Mr. I. G. Patel of the Ministry of Finance, and the Secretary of the Ministry of Industrial Development is a member. Basically things are decided by the two and then it goes for approval. Then there is a Capital Goods Committee. There again the Secretary of the Ministry of Industrial Development is the Chairman and the recommendation in this case need not even go to the Ministry. That is how it is done. Now these are the arrangements under which the Ministry functions. Therefore, the top bureaucracy has an upper hand in this matter. Secretariesandin some cases, Ministers settle the whole thing while other officials stand on the sidelines, some good, some may be bad—I am not going into it. But they have really no effective say in the matter. Therefore, some changes are called for.

Recently, Sir, I am getting a little worried. Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury should not needlessly get angry with me. After all, I am a private Member. In one of the Assam meetings, in Silchar—I have brought it to the attention of the Prime Minister—he said, 'Bhupesh Gupta is only of nuisance value'. Well, tolerate the nuisance a little. In the Silchar meeting, he said that Bhupesh Gupta's allegations have been proved to be correct. Still I am supposed to be a nuisance in Parliament. After all, one need not be worried about nuisances very much.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY : I do not know who his informers are. It seems all kinds of tales are carried to my hon. friend, and he believes them, gets excited and makes his own life miserable.

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE (Uttar Pradesh) : He is a bachelor.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Recently, Sir, I am getting a little perturbed about a few things. Mr. Choudhury's connections have become a national menace. I need not go into them. Let him decide how he should handle his affairs. It is for the Government to decide. About this scooter licence, as you know, Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury was sending telegrams to the then Minister of Industrial Development, as a citizen of Assam, recommending some case. They have been read out here. Now, the liaison man connection is very important, the institution of liaison men which has developed, I cannot name any one at this stage. As you know, I have very great affection for our friend, Shri Umashankar Dikshit, the Leader of the House. Somehow or other I find he is getting too much involved with the Birlas and others. They think he is a very good man. Again I do not know what the secret is. (Interruptions) In this House there was a lot of discussion about Mohan Breweries and Mr. V. R. Mohan. Is he here now? I wish he had been here. He has written a letter to the Editor of the Current published on the front page on April 22, 1972:

My dear Mr. Karaka,..... You cannot but be hailed as a giant among

journalists who has shown rare courage to correct and admit the erroneous contents of an issue of your paper concerning my industry and myself . . ."

A tribute is paid to Mr. Karaka who has been a life-long enemy of the family of Jawaharlal Nehru. Jawaharlal Nehru could not even stand the name of this man. In the proceedings of the House he would not even answer the question if the name of the paper was mentioned. But here Mr. V. R. Mohan, patronised somehow or other by the Congress Party, pays a tribute to Mr. Karaka, "a giant among journalists." The little giant in the industrial world should have been here, my esteemed colleague, Mr. V. R. Mohan. Here is a photograph in "Current": "Lt. Col. V. R. Mohan (second from left) and Yashpal Kapur (with glasses) seem coming out of the Council House in Lucknow after their election to the Raj ya Sabha." "While the former is a close family friend of Mrs. Gandhi"—a close family friend of Mrs. Gandhi, and no contradiction has come—"the latter is the Prime Minister's Private Secretary (Political)" . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : How is it relevant ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What am I to make out ?

**श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) :**  
उपसभापति महोदय, प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर।  
हमारे साथी श्री वी० आर० मोहन की बात तो कर रहे हैं कि कांग्रेस की कृपा प्राप्त कर लिए हैं और जेड० ए० अहमद जो उनके साथी हैं वे भी कांग्रेस की कृपा प्राप्त करके यहां बैठे हैं। मैं चाहूंगा कि उनके बारे में भी कुछ बातें कहें।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : This is a point of order which amuses me. What I wanted to make out was that big business people are getting closer to the people close to the Prime Minister; otherwise, one cannot imagine. . . {Interruptions} . . . that people who are close to the Prime Minister would be given so much publicity in Mr. Karaka's Current where I am abused every-day. Even in this issue I am abused . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : How is it relevant to the Industrial Development Ministry ?

SHRIBHUPESH GUPTA : Relevance is connection; it is developing. I have been told that the Tatas, the Birlas and the Goenkas are trying to get rid of Mr. Raghunatha Reddy. I have heard on authority from business quarters that some have been told, "Let the Cabinet reshuffle come, Mr. Raghunatha Reddy will be out of it." And it has been stated and it is being stated in circles in Calcutta, Delhi and Bombay. Mr. J.R.D. Tata has specially commissioned two of his officers in Delhi to lobby responsible Ministers and others to ensure that Mr. Raghunatha Reddy is out of the Cabinet or out of the Union Government, out of the Council of Ministers. They have been emboldened to do it . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It has nothing to do with the discussion here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The main thing is corruption in the industrial world, in the big business world, and it is due to the fact that there is a liaison working between them and people high in authority. And the middlemen are there who operate and they have people already entrenched in key positions. And I do admire Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury, he is a very big man, with all his love and affection he serves the cause of socialism . . .

SHRI MAN SINGH VARMA (Uttar Pradesh) : Is there no time-limit for Mr. Bhupesh Gupta ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No, no. Why are you objecting ? I never objected to your speaking. Why do you object ? You have got certain interesting things today at least. So, Mr. Deputy Chairman, shall I lay this photograph on the Table ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You wind up your speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Now I find that big capitalists are emboldened. They think they can get any licence any time they like they can pull the wool over the eyes of the Government any time they like. They

can influence men in high authority with much better confidence than before. That is why I have said all these.

You have asked me to sit down. I would not say much. But I would like to say that our industrial production has gone down. Our rate of growth is deplorably low and stands at 3 per cent. Obviously we cannot modernise our industrial economy with such depressingly low rate of growth. Surely not. This is only one aspect of the matter. Now look at the private sector. It is creating employment opportunities at a very slow rate—not even 2 per cent. Much of their in stalled capacity—40 to 60 per cent—remains idle. So many bottlenecks are arising and there is no co-ordination between various sectors of the industrial economy with the result a crisis is developing on the industrial front. What is most disturbing is that when the report was given by the Monopolies Commission, the total assets of the 75 industrial houses were Rs. 2,600 crores. Now they have gone up by 54 per cent. Now their assets are worth over Rs. 4,000 crores. Among them, during the period of three years since the Monopolies Commission, the assets of Tatas have increased by 32 per cent, that is from Rs. 417 crores to Rs. 551 crores; assets of Birlas have gone up by 74 per cent, that is from Rs. 290 crores to Rs. 510 crores; Mafatalals have increased their assets from Rs. 46 crores to Rs. 127 crores, that is by 176 per cent. Surely this is not checking of concentration of wealth or economic powers. Today between themselves, these 75 monopoly houses account for 54 per cent of the total industrial assets in the private sector. Can you achieve commanding heights by allowing them to remain in this entrenched position ? Almost all the expansions are made with the help of the government financial institutions like the IDBI, Industrial Investment Credit Corporation, Industrial Finance Corporation, Unit Trust, etc. not to speak of nationalised banks. Almost half of the loans given to big business by the LIC has been grabbed by three big business concerns, namely, Birlas, Tatas and Associate Cement Company. Birlas got 26 per cent, Tatas 15 per cent and ACC 8 per cent. Out of 101 big companies, you find that 98 companies have earned dividend on their investment to the tune of Rs. 137.7



crores in 1969-70 as against Rs. 99.5 crores in the previous year.

Many collaboration agreements have been signed so far and most of them are with West Germany, Britain and United States of America and the result of this has been a very heavy drain on our resources. We are importing foreign technical know-how. This is again a shocking state of affairs. Our scientist has committed suicide. At the same time we go in for this kind of collaboration agreements. This should be stopped. Collaboration agreement is helping the growth of monopoly in our country. What is more, this will lead to lining up of foreign monopolists on the one hand with Indian monopolies on the other. Nothing is being done to check the collaboration agreement and to achieve self-sufficiency in economy.

In this connection, I will point out to this honourable House that they are giving licences to Birlas, Dalmias and Goenkas and Tatas so that they can go outside the country and make investments. This is exporting of capital. Thirty-three licences of this kind have been given and there has even been a scandal in Adis Ababa arising out of a Birladeal. Why should we allow this kind of thing when we have developed our industries. Why should we allow Indian capital to go abroad and exploit resources of our country. Why should we allow these capitalists to embitter relations between the two countries and to create political complications for us? Lately we find that they are importing junks and used and rotten plants to our country. They are coming from United Kingdom and certain other countries such as Italy in order to exploit our country. Now, Sir, in the name of equity capital, well, foreign collaboration is being permitted. Now, Sir, the Prime Minister, in her speech at the FICCI session, in her inaugural address, has developed the fantastic idea of the so-called joint sector, taking the cue from the reactionary economists of Pakistan. Sir, when the Prime Minister speaks extempore, she speaks well. When she speaks from her heart, she is far wiser and better. But Sir, when the Prime Minister's speeches are made by the speech-writers and the so-called economic experts, well and ourselves in this kind of speeches...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : But the Prime Minister does not understand the contents of the speeches when those speeches are written.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : She understands them. I know she understands them and if she does not understand them, I am sure, she will consult Shri Niren Ghosh to fill the gaps.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : She will consult you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : So, Sir, she understands them. But, Sir, as has been reported in the newspapers, some Pakistani economist wrote certain articles on the basis of which the whole theory has been developed. Now, these are all very wrong things that are happening in the country.

Finally, before I sit down, I would like to mention a few things. But there are very many facts Sir, they are imposing taxes on the people of the order of Rs. 2,300 crores in the form of Union Excise Duties and other taxes in order to finance the schemes. Sir, deficit financing is a kind of credit expansion; deficit financing is a kind of inflation; and credit expansion also in the private sector is a kind of inflation. This shows the people are being fleeced by the policy you pursue. Therefore, Sir, the industrial policy calls for a radical change. We want a new industrial policy which will ensure the public sector (Time bell ring!)---- taking the private sector and ultimately eliminating equally the monopoly capital. Sir, such industries as sugar and textiles should be at once nationalised. Why? With an investment of Rs. 1,300 crores in our country, plantation, oil, manufacturing and other industries have the lion's share. Why can't we nationalise them? Why can't we nationalise the chemical industry, oil industry, engineering industries and other industries? Why can't we nationalise the plantations and other industries which are in the hands of the foreign exploiters? I cannot understand this. Why did we pass the Constitution 25th (Amendment) Bill? Certainly not to keep as a piece of decoration in the libraries, but to use it as a weapon in our struggle against the monopoly capital.

[ Shri Bhupesh Gupta ]

Therefore, I say that a structural change in our economy is of fundamental importance today. Where is the question of joint sector and other things? These are all bosh ! It is an attempt to hoodwink the people ;it is an attempt, by a kind of ideological smokescreen, to back out of the electoral commitments on the part of the Government to the people and to thwart them. What is needed is complete elimination...{Time bell rings)...of monopoly capital by nationalisation. Otherwise, the 'commanding heights' may be a subject-matter to be talked about at the time of the elections and it shall never be a reality of life. That is why I say that such things should be done and such measures should be taken. AH I say is that the industrial policy has got to be changed. Mr. Choudhury, I admit I am not having anything except two pens and a broken typewriter and nothing else. But, you are in power today.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Gupta, I think you should wind up now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : By signing one thing, you can be forced to give licenses. I am not doing any such thing. I do hope that these matters will be taken seriously...(Time-bell rings).. One word, Sir and I will sit down.

I would like to recall what Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari said in one of his speeches in 1957. I think sometimes we should remember old men. This is what he said :

"We have served this country well and in doing so, we have served the poor man ill, because we have served the vested interests extraordinarily well. I knew money was going to the black market; I knew taxes were not being paid, I knew huge profits were made, because we gave quantitative protection of a blanket nature. I knew that we have bled the consumer white because we are making those enterprises charge whatever the market will bear".

This is what Shri T. T. Krishnamachari said in his speech on the Budget on the 23rd March, 1957. Sir, Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury has outdone Mr. Krishnamachari. At least Mr. Krishnamachari had the decency to admit his mistake, Mr.

Choudhury also can admit his errors and confess the mistakes he has committed. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA (Uttar Pradesh) : I am grateful for the opportunity given to me. To speak after Shri Bhupesh Gupta, one of the oldest parliamentarians here and a volatile one, is, however, a difficult task. On the one hand, he accused the hon. Minister of being in league with large industrial houses and on the other he is also saying that industrial production, especially in the private sector and headed mostly by large industrial houses, has been rather dismal. This seems to me to be contradictory to each other. But I would like to add one thing more. The general impression in the industrial sector has been that the Ministry of Industrial Development has been acting merely as a post office rather than as a Ministry itself. I will be excused, Sir, for this because I am fully aware of it myself, being in the industrial sector to a certain extent. For various items we have to go to the different Ministries. For example, take sugar. For sugar we have to go to the Ministry of Agriculture. For Petroleum & Chemicals there is another Ministry. For textiles and jute there is the Ministry of Foreign Trade. For loans and finances there is the Ministry of Finance. For excise duty it is again the Ministry of Finance. For shortage of steel, we have to go to the Ministry of Steel. When there is question of coal then it is again the Ministry of Mines. When it is the question of movement of coal it is the Railway Ministry. In fact, I am at a loss to understand as to what is happening...

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY : For large houses licensing it is the Cabinet..

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA : I am not going into large or small houses, because I will be misunderstood. The fact remains that the Ministry of Industrial Development, whose main objective is to develop industries, instead of guiding other Ministries is normally guided by them. If they write something favourable, somebody from this Ministry will raise a particular point and again the whole thing gets

delayed. And if other Ministries do not act and note favourably it is very simple for this Ministry to say that such and such Ministry has not taken favourable view and therefore we are sorry we cannot accede to your request.

I would most humbly suggest that if the economic prosperity of the country has to develop, if the slogan oigharibi hatuo, which has caught the imagination of the entire nation, has to be put into practice, the Industrial Development Ministry has got to play one of the most important parts. What are the steps that have been taken to play this part effectively I am at a loss to understand. They claim that they have streamlined their Ministry, their policies and their activities. But that streamlining has the effect of only reducing its effectiveness. Does it in any way help in the industrial growth of the country? It is rather doubtful. Many a people have started thinking that instead of calling it the Ministry of Industrial Development it should be called the Ministry of Industrial Impediment.

Sir, in this Ministry of Industrial Development, as it is called, the working in some Directorates is such that whenever any request is made, the only factor that strikes favourably is whether it can be cut down to a certain extent or not. I am in a position to give hundreds of examples where for lack of a small, little decision in this Ministry for a small sanction by this Ministry, production worth millions and millions of rupees has suffered, and ultimately things have to be imported. It would have been wiser to take a decision in time rather than taking it up later, when it is too late and it is too expensive for the country.

It is said by the hon. Minister here that the other economic Ministries are also a sort of a difficult thing for him to deal with and give him a lot of headaches. Well, it is for him and for the Ministries and the Prime Minister to ensure that none of the Ministries is in a position to create difficulties and impediments in any other's way, rather than expressing his helplessness before this House and before the country.

I am sure everyone present will agree that the two main avenues where the prosperity

of the country can substantially increased are industrial development and agricultural development. In the field of industrial development the progress is very slow. There are three particular sub-sectors even in the private sector which can be effectively helpful in the development of industries. The one is large industrial houses, the other is medium industrial houses and the third is small industrial houses..

So far as the large industrial houses are concerned, they have become taboo not only to the Government but to most of the people who are politically influential and have strong extremist ideas. If it is considered in terms of their contribution, to whatever extent it is creditable. There is no man on earth, Sir, who can claim that he is doing entirely for charity. Self-preservation instinct is in every human being and he would not be a human being if he does not have that. But if you look to the contribution that has been made and the possibility of the future contribution that they can make, especially in the situation as we are placed today, I am sure it will be considered exemplary. It is essential for the Government to ensure that wherever they find fault they do not try to protect them or hide them but punish them, but majority is not at fault. For a particular person's fault, if any, to punish the entire industrial houses because, they have contributed and developed, I think, will be the biggest crime and anti-industrial development activity. I can say this without any fear of contradiction from any quarter.

Let us not forget that decades ago when these industrial houses came into existence the response from the Government side was not as favourable as it is today and in spite of that they have survived, they have expanded. If industrialisation will be as convenient and at times easy as it is today, there is no reason why most of the people would not have been industrialists by now or would not have tried to make money by being industrialists rather than by some other means which cannot be said to be a honest one or such that will give credit to the persons concerned.

The medium ones are still in a greater dilemma. The approaches that they make

[Shri Sitaram Jaipuria.]

become very expensive for them because the country is very large and they are in distant corners. By the time they understand the techniques they find that most of the money that somehow they had arranged has been spent in the 'preliminary expenses' itself and by the time there is something encouraging for them, they find that the resources they had, have practically been dried up and in disgust they have no choice but to pass on those licences to somebody else or sell them out for various considerations and make up some loss that they have suffered by way of preliminary expenses as it is called, rather than to go ahead with the project as they would have liked it to be.

So far as small scale industries are concerned, I know even in large conferences they are given many high hopes. When they come to the meetings or when they come to meet the persons concerned, specially the politicians, they are given high hopes and very encouraging words. They become jubilant and hope that something beneficial is going to come their way. Somebody is going to shed blood for the welfare of the small-scale industries. But by the time they go back home and analyse and try to implement and act on those very assurances that have been given to them, they find that their reliance was completely misplaced and there is nobody to look after them. Most of the small-scale industries, Mr. Deputy Chairman, cannot come into existence and be profitable to the industrial development until and unless they have sufficient basic raw materials which they need for their industries and the sales out-turn which will give them the money circulation by which they can expand their business. I know from practical experience that most of these small scale industries came into existence for basic raw materials which are being given to them in the name of small-scale industries. And before allotment they are purchased by others. Persons are interested to sell them out to make a little money in the name of small-scale industries rather than actually developing the small-scale industries. If all the three sectors are badly treated and neglected, I have my doubts if the industrial development can come up to the stage as everyone of us would wish it to be.

Coming to the field of agricultural development, there also I am personally not against the land ceilings, but my own fear is that unless the persons who are holding the small pieces of lands are taught and educated as to how to make the best use of it, the result that will be achieved will be rather dismal. In other countries where there are many smaller holdings than what we are proposing, every person who holds that land knows as to what exactly he is going to gain out of it, but here most of the cooperatives—except, however, some in Maharashtra I am prepared to admit especially in the sugar industry—are headed by discredited politicians. Persons in those particular areas are prepared to spend lakhs and lakhs of rupees to be the chief there and by the time their term expires, they find that the agricultural produce has not developed, but their pockets swelled. Take for example, the small tractors or the agricultural implements. The Planning Commission, I am told, has now decided that all the schemes for agricultural implements and all the schemes for small tractors, etc. should be shelved because they are considering in greater detail what should be the type of implements required in the light of the land ceilings. This discussion has been going on for the last several years. Was it not proper for them to have applied their minds earlier. When the fire is on digging the well in the hope of getting water and then putting the fire off is the biggest fallacy that any person can ever indulge. So far as the public sector is concerned, it has done more harm than good. All the highlights are propagated and showed known and every time it is hoped that it will do well. There are some of them that are really doing well and they should be given all the encouragement but such of those that are still not doing well, except the casual observation here and there, what effective steps are being taken regarding them I would like to know from the Minister. This does directly concern him as he has a separate cell and if the production is not coming up, to satisfy himself by either to put the blame on the workers or on the collaborators or on lack of certain machinery or equipment is not going to satisfy this House and even if this or the other House does not make noise, let me tell the Minister that it will not give him the mental satisfaction or the satis-

faction to his Ministry and the entire population and citizens of this country will feel aggrieved that even on this particular aspect where billions of rupees in the shape of tax-payers' money have been invested everything has not only gone waste but it has pulled down the entire industrial economy of this country. It is my fervent hope that the Industrial Development Ministry, instead of being a silent spectator, a helpless like looking girl, will take care that it can be effective and can do its job with greater effectiveness, with purposeness which will be meaningful to the industrial development. On the one hand I feel pity on this Ministry. On the other side I feel agitated as to what is the need of keeping this Ministry when it is only to sign the industrial licences or to approve something not only on the recommendation but on the combined recommendations of a number of other Ministries and would it not be better that a Division of this particular function is put under the charge of the Prime Minister rather than to have a separate Ministry altogether for this purpose? If somebody does not like the PM's Division, as I observe by the nod of their head then, have it in the Ministry of Finance or under any other Ministry but to have a separate Ministry with such high expenses and still cannot be effective for industrial development on which depends not only the future economics of this country but also the entire political future of this country also is something which should not be neglected. Whether it is a question of employment, as was referred to earlier, or the cost of production where we can export conveniently and give to our people in a reasonable manner and rate, because the present type of taxation does not leave any amount specially in the hands of the middle-classes drawing Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 3,000 as salary and whatever they carry home as net pay after payment of tax, even out of that 40 % goes in the shape of excise duty or what they call indirect taxation and even persons drawing Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000 have a carry-home pay of only Rs. 1,000 or Rs. 800—and we in this House drawing Rs. 500 free of tax with all allowances, have no justification of calling ourselves socialists or progressives when we see those very persons who are delivering the goods and are doing the work are not being able to meet their needs and requirements and it will be a sad day for

the country when the entire intelligentsia will be wiped off and there will be only two classes, one the richer classes where sometimes the money may be apparently seen or may not be seen and the very poor class who cannot even maintain themselves. In such a case I feel the future of the country will be very bleak. I most humbly suggest to the Minister that he must look into these problems more objectively rather than subjectively and he should not satisfy himself only by making statements before conferences in a mood and tone which sometimes disrupts the mind and the proper thinking of the people but behave in a dignified manner and make an effective approach and be more constructive. I thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. The requirements and the needs of the country must be supreme and we must tailor the coat according to the cloth that we have and only look forward to achieve the moon.

SHRI KALI MUKHERJEE (West Bengal) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would be very brief, after Comrade Gupta's speech which was very long and which was more or less an indictment of the Ministry and the Minister personally. Sir, industrial\* development in a developing country which is mostly concentrated in urban areas will not help. That is one point I would like to make. More or less since British days our urban areas are being developed through various industries. During the last 25 years since Independence there has been no doubt some development in the rural sectors also where some new industries have come up but really speaking the rural areas have not developed through these ; industries.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU in  
the Chair)]

Therefore I would request the Ministry to bear this point in mind. For instance in Great Britain after the Second World War from 1946 or 1947 to 1953 the slogan was, industry will go to the worker; the worker will not go to the industry. That means the industry will go to the villages. The licensing system was such that the entrepreneurs were given incentives to go to the rural areas so that they can set up industries there. Sometimes it was free land, sometimes it

[Shri Kalli Mukherjee] was free electricity, sometimes free water; sometimes road development was taken up by the Government or the local municipality. These were the sort of incentives given to the various industries after the Second World War in some of the European countries, particularly Great Britain. I had the opportunity of travelling at that time and I had seen this sort of development. The workers had not to go to the slums near the urban areas. In those days after the war the workers used to go straight from the villages to the industry. Transport was supplied by the industry itself for the workers to go to the factories. This is a point which should be taken into consideration by the Ministry. They should not go about in the traditional way setting up factories around the big cities, whether Madras, Bombay, Calcutta, Delhi or Kanpur.

The second point I have is about joint ventures and collaboration. I had the opportunity to be in a conference in the ILO when this question of collaboration was taken into consideration. Most of the industrialists are very much eager to have « collaboration. We have a number of collaborations with a number of countries, whatever they are. My friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, mentioned some of the countries but not all the countries because it may not be convenient to him but I would mention all the countries including even Soviet Russia. The main thing is we should be self-reliant, on our own. It is not necessary that we have to have joint ventures or collaborations with other countries. If I can avoid Soviet Russia I will avoid Soviet Russia. No doubt Soviet Russia is a friend, of ours ready to help. That was the only country left in the world who stood by us in our distress. We have expressed our gratitude for that and we do express our gratitude all the time. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the country has to become self-reliant and is not to depend either on the Soviet Union or the United States or Germany, West or East, or any other. Therefore, in those matters, as I have heard as a trade unionist discussing with the engineers who have been in the Soviet Union or Germany or the United States, the bargaining is very hard. Sir, none of the countries, whether it is red or blue, was charitable in this matter, in the

matter of the wagon deal, because I was concerned with our workers. I know that thousands of workers were laid off in our State of West Bengal because our engineering industry is mainly wagon-based, unfortunately, since British days and we could not change it very much. Due to the failure of the Third Plan and the Fourth Plan wagon-based industries are very much hard hit. Because the Railways are not asking for the wagons, the industry is not in a position to build the wagons. Now, Sir, in those cases, we have heard from the engineers, who had been going over the world and had been bargaining with other countries including Eastern Europe, that their experience is not happy in any way. Therefore, this policy of collaboration is not a good policy for the Government to follow. We should try to avoid it. We have done it in the past no doubt in a number of cases, under duress and under certain circumstances, but henceforward we should not encourage, rather we should discourage it as far as practicable, and we should not give licences where they insist on collaboration as a must. We had paid Rs. 30,000/- a month, Rs. 25,000/- a month, to a technical man. I do not like to mention the name of anyone giving Rs. 15,000 to Rs. 18,000 a month just to attract an engineer or a foreman of a foreign country. This is not fair. On this question of collaboration, they make such a contract in which we are fleeced, the industry is being fleeced. Therefore, I am against this type of collaboration any more. The policy that was adopted in the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1948 or 1956, by and large, is right, is fair; that is, the private sector should continue along with the public sector. Practically speaking, we are not in a position to have the public sector all through, but the fact remains that in a developing country like ours, the private sector is thriving at a high price and on public finance. You go to any private sector firm or concern, you will find that 90%, 95%, 85%, 87%, no less than 65% are being financed by the public through the various financial institutions. Public financing is there. The industry's capital investment is more or less by the public. Some entrepreneurs are there as Managing Director or Chairman, Board of Directors, or Director, who are enjoying the cream of the industry in two ways; one, themselves getting a high

salary. I was in the Company Law Commission for six years, Sir, and from there I have seen the methods adopted in the Industrial Houses. Without mentioning the Houses, I may say that young daughters, young girls, of the Houses are placed as Managing Directors or as Directors, and they are touring all over the world twice or thrice every year enjoying all types of medical treatment, nursing homes, etc., and enjoying with their families. You will find that all the privileges and amenities are made available to them. If you are under the impression that they are fit or proper persons, you will find actually that they are neither fit nor proper. Nevertheless, they have been fleecing the industry all through the year, and at the end of the year, when the whole balance-sheet is drawn, you find that they show a huge loss. Bonus is not payable to the workman. Nothing is available to labour. They simply ask for more money as loan from the Government or from the various public financial corporations. This is the private sector as we see the picture. Now, in the year 1972, after the massive mandate in favour of the socialist slogans, should we follow the 1956 industrial policy which says that the private sector is a 'must' and they should be given allowances as they like? The public corporations will be financing them for their enjoyment all over the world. They will be enjoying throughout their life and we will be paying through our noses. Should that policy continue? I would tell the Industrial Development Minister and our Government that it is high time that we changed the old policies of 1946 and 1956. Are we not adult enough to look into our own affairs and our own industries? Have we not developed a class of entrepreneurs who are honest enough and who will not behave like the monopoly business people? Have we not developed a cadre of our own? If we have not developed them, we must emphasise the need to develop a good number of cadres who can look after the industries. I know that we have not done it up till now according to needs. We have not given that much time, energy and devotion for the purpose of developing such cadres. Therefore, I want to place before you the point that the entire industrial policy which we have been pursuing and following so long must be reversed. It is the public sector which should be a

'must' here in India. We should not encourage the private sector any more because it is only some other people, greedy people, who are enjoying it. They are having a different type of currency and running the country through black money. We must not allow that any more. Therefore, I want you to change the old policy. The two economies are ruling our country through our industrialists—one must stop. Only the public sector should be encouraged. We must go not only into the basic industries, but also we must go into the consumer industries as well. There is a theory that we must not touch the consumer industry. In some places sugar has been touched, but generally it is not. That is why I suggest that we must take over particularly those industries which are foreign exchange earners. Here I would refer to the jute industry. The jute industry normally earns foreign exchange to the tune of Rs. \* 250 crores to Rs. 300 crores every year. The industry made a profit of Rs. 160 crores last year due to the peculiar advantage they got from the position created in Bangladesh. Though they make a profit normally they show a loss every year throughout the industry. Therefore, I would suggest to the Ministry to examine whether we can supply jute through our corporation to the industry. We can offer a good price to the cultivators. Normally the industry controls the price. They depress the price, exploit the cultivators, fleece the cultivators and they make profit out of that. Therefore, here the Government should supply through 4 p. M. the Jute Corporation the raw jute. Let the industry manufacture it. Give it a marginal profit. Let it study and examine the cost of production and export to the various parts of the world, particularly the U.S.A., through our own agencies. Nationalise the export trade completely. If we start with that, then we can get out of the morass, get out of this huge amount of under-invoicing and over-invoicing; and the collusion between the various industrialists and the entrepreneurs which is continuing. We shall be able to stop it. They have got big accounts in international banks. Otherwise, there is no possibility of stopping it.

I referred to a particular industry which is more or less confined to West Bengal—and

[Shri Kali Mukherjee]

that industry is also in various other parts of the country, particularly in Eastern India. So, I mentioned this as an example. The same thing can be done with regard to the other industries also. For instance, take the tea plantation. We can nationalise its export. We are very much in competition with Ceylon tea and we are also in competition in regard to coffee with some countries, mostly African countries. Therefore, I suggested that the export-oriented industries must be taken into consideration immediately for nationalisation and wherever possible raw materials can be supplied by us—public corporations—to protect the cultivators. And we have to look again into the policy that was adopted in 1948 and 1956 giving priority to the private sector. The time has come when the private sector should be discouraged and the public sector encouraged and emphasised, and we must create cadres for the purpose of the public sector.

Lastly, I will mention about one point. There is the Jessops, which has got 12,000 to 14,000 men employed. It is in a very bad condition. It is neither fish nor flesh. It is not actually a Government company, it is not a public sector company fully nor is it in the private sector. It is in a queer position. It is sandwiched—between public and private. I will request the Minister to take it over, to nationalise this particular firm, which has got various branches, employing 14,000 men directly and help and save it.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want to bring out some of the skeletons in the cupboard to expose them to the public view. I do not know whether I would succeed or not. Let me come direct to the small car project because the car under it covers the entire gamut of the sordid business deals that are going on between the Government and big business. Have we not heard of Birlas flying to New York diamond necklaces years ago? Do we not know that the people stand in the queue for two years to get a junk Ambassador? We know of all these sorts of things. Do we not know that for the last ten to fifteen years, over and over again, this House has discussed the question of the small car

project in the public sector? Now what has happened to that? I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister and got a reply today. Her letter is unsatisfactory. I would take up that letter in course of discussing the subject. Is it not a fact that after tremendous amount of beggary this Industrial Development Ministry, in collaboration with Renault, submitted a small car project for approval by the Cabinet? Is it not a fact that it has been turned down by the Cabinet? In whose interest, may I ask? If I say in the interest of Mr. Sanjay Gandhi, son of the Prime Minister, would I be wrong? I think I would not be wrong. Can the Ministry explain, or for that matter the Government of India explain, why the application of Birlas, who wanted to design a new model, for foreign exchange allocation was turned down? And rightly so, why should they be allocated foreign exchange after 20 years of business in car manufacture to design a new model? Should they require foreign exchange? They should not. And if they required they were going against the interest of the country and the Government were a party to it. What a sordid part that for the improvement of the present model foreign exchange allocations had been made. Can you think of it that for the Ambassador car, that junk made of tin plates without chassis, those who have been in this business for 20 years, they require foreign exchange and the Government sanctions it? The Prime Minister did not rebut my charges in her reply to my letter. So I take it for granted that my information was correct. Can the Government explain the sordid deal?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHAUDHURY : May I tell the hon'ble Member that no foreign exchange has been granted to the Birlas?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : The Prime Minister did not deny the charge. Therefore, I maintain that they have been granted foreign exchange. Bring out papers. I challenge you. They have been allocated foreign exchange. In order to make improvements upon the present model I do not entertain your rebuttal. Even the Prime Minister dare not do that. You are doing it. Why should this small car project, in collaboration with Renault, be



stalled? In whose interest? In the interest of the Prime Minister's son, Mr. Sanjay Gandhi. Letters of intent were granted not only to Mr. Sanjay Gandhi but to some others also as cover letters because if you grant only one single licence, the Prime Minister's reputation is immediately tarnished and sullied. Therefore, grant some other licences to private entrepreneurs. We know something about what Mr. Sanjay Gandhi is doing with that licence. But we do not know anything about others. So I take it that it was a cover for her to say that she has not granted licence only to her son but to others too. Mr. Dinesh Singh, while he was Minister for Industrial Development, was chosen to do this dirty job and then he was kicked out of the Cabinet. Can anybody think that with indigenous technical know-how and indigenous technical material, Mr. Sanjay Gandhi is going to manufacture a completely indigenous Indian car? Is he a Messiah come to deliver the goods? I charge the Government of India that black money in foreign exchange is being expanded, and through that black mysterious channels, with black foreign exchange technical know-how, designing and other things have been imported. Mr. Sanjay Gandhi is experimenting with this. If he succeeds, then this foreign manufacture will be dumped on us as an Indian manufacture, and the public sector project will never come up. I make this charge openly and clearly before the House and before the country as a whole. Now what is this sordid thing? Lands at concessional rates were being given to Mr. Sanjay Gandhi. Does he require all these lands for the site of the factory? No, he does not. What does he do with the excess lands? He sells the excess lands at exorbitant prices in order to build up capital. Wonderful. Indira Gandhi brand of socialism to safeguard the interest of the Indira Gandhi family in a sordid manner, in a sullied manner, in a degrading manner. What can we say about it?

Now, the Prime Minister says in her reply to me: Why should public money be expended in building a small car project? It can be better utilised in other avenues. Have you heard it? After the whole country, the two Houses of Parliament had

told the Government again and again, "Do build a small car project in the public sector", the Prime Minister has the cheek to say this to me in her reply! So, this is how the Industrial Development Ministry functions, or I would say, it is the Government of India because he is only a cog in the wheel, nothing more, nothing less. When I make these allegations, I do not make these allegations against his Ministry; I make these allegations against the Government of India as a whole. So this thing has got to be brought up again and again. And our poor people are being bluffed with garibi hatao and what not!

Now, is it not a fact that the Government has allowed the Central Bank of India to merge with TELCO? The Tatas have been specially picked up for some favours. Why? Their paper, Statesman, used to criticise the Government, albeit from the right point of view. So a deal has been struck. The Tatas have been given licences and if you look at Statesman now you will find that there is not a single word of criticism. Like a faithful dog Statesman is toeing the Indira Gandhi line. Those days ago when it used to criticise the Government from the Swatantra point of view. You have given licences for the expansion of TELCO. Not only that you have given licences for the expansion of TISCO. And not only that, you have cleared their Mitha-pur project in which a huge amount of money, Rs. 200 or Rs. 300 crores, is involved. And in the bargain a newspaper has been purchased. This is how Shrimati Indira Gandhi has brought all the newspapers, almost all the newspapers, into the palm of her hands. Do you want to run the Government of India in this manner? This is another skeleton that is in their cupboard.

SHRI KALI MUKHERJEE : You start a newspaper of your own.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE : He has already one.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Now, Sir, another thing is as regards excess capacity. Foreign and Indian monopolists have all violated this regulation. The Tatas, Birlas,

[Shri Niren Ghosh] ESSO, Dunlop, other foreign companies — how many companies?—they have gone on violating Government regulations. They have built excess capacity. Then it has been regularised by the Government of India. All are big business houses. Has any punishment been meted out to them? No, nothing. If I say there is a honeymoon going on between the Government of India and big business houses, would I be wrong? I do not think so. This Government of India is having a honeymoon with the Americans albeit a bit disturbed, they do not touch their basic interests. Whatever fulminations Shrimati Gandhi may be indulging in and however much she may posture herself as an anti-American Indian patriot, nobody can gloss over the fact that not a single person of the American, imperialist interests has been touched by the Government of India. Not only that. On the one hand there have been political debates with them, on the other, simultaneously, they were having deals with Mr. McNamara of the World Bank. So they are having a honeymoon with big business all this time. This progressive Prime Minister for whom your party goes the whole hog...

DR. Z. A. AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh) : That is a different matter. Do not bother about my party. Bother about your own party.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : You are sitting here. So I have got to bother about your party just as you bother about our party. Do not worry. Now, I put the question: has any industrialist, foreign or Indian, who is violating Government regulations been punished? No. Why? Why are these special favours for breaking the laws of the country albeit the laws are in their favour, operating in their favour? Can the Government explain it? No, they cannot. Now, as regards disparities, they are still widening. They say "no concentration of wealth, equal justice, equal favours, the bridge between the high and the low would be narrowed..." But what has happened today? It is widening. The gulf is yawning. Between that side and this side, there is a yawning gulf; ever widening stretch of water flows between the side of the poor and the side of the very rich...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI OM MEHTA) : Imaginary.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Imaginary, yes, as this Parliament is imaginary. Shri Om Mehta may become imaginary, but these are harsh facts. They do not yield to imagination. That is the only difficulty about it. So what has happened? I want a reply. What has happened to that policy of yours? What is your policy? Where is your policy? And what has happened to the implementation of that policy? If your Ministry is serious about it, who stands in the way? The Government of India as a whole? The Planning Commission? Who? Tell us, tell the country, who? You are duty-bound to do so. You have done many sordid things in political life. But at the end please be straight...

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOU-  
DHURY : I do not consider it is my fault. I have got many years.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Of course, since your guruji is 93 years old and still campaigning in Bangla Desh you may live. Sir, he is the disciple of Maulana Bhasani. By the way, you, Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury, caught hold of that old man and almost kept him a prisoner during the nine months here on this side. I repeat it. Take it in your stride.. (Time bell rings) Shall I call this Ministry Monopolies Development Ministry of the Government of India? "Perhaps that would be the right appellation that should be given. Lastly, another thing. For foreign junks India has because the dumping ground, for all foreign obsolete technical know how. A scooter is being planned to be manufactured in collaboration with Italy as if after 25 years the Indian cannot design and manufacture even a scooter. They are sending 11 the junks here. They are introducing modern technology and therefore they do not want this obsolete and discarded technology. Those discarded manufacturing processes are being dumped here. United Kingdom, France and other countries are engaged in the process of modernisation and innovation. Old things they have to dump in the sea. But

they have found a better dumping ground, namely, India. And the government is going the whole hog parading and advertising that they will operate these junks to the benefit of the poor Indian people. How noble the deeds of the government are ! We poor Indians are not able to comprehend, because we are all benumbed. I say, you are laying the basis for neo-colonialism in this country. That is what you are doing. You are not going to achieve self-reliance in economy by importing all this obsolete technology and junk and machinery. These new agreements that you have entered into are laying a secure and firm basis for neo-colonialism in India. Would the country tolerate it ? The coming days and the coming years will give the answer. This facade of monolith, I am quite sure, will crumble to pieces within a few years and then the people's voice will be heard. I hope some of us will at least live to see that. With these words, I conclude.

SHRIMATISUMITRA G. KULKARNI (Gujarat) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I feel somewhat diffident to express my views before this august body. I am so new and so inexperienced and for this reason I seek your indulgence and the indulgence of my hon. Members here, particularly if I am not effective in putting forward in a clear and convincing manner the points that I wish to make on this subject.

I though I should open my account in the Rajya Sabha on this topic of industrial development because it is such a vital subject. All our national problems like reducing unemployment, raising national income, removing poverty and generally improving the lot of common man are heavily dependent on the success of our industrial policy.

Sir, Government, after a detailed consideration, adopted a new industrial policy with a socialist bias in 1970. The success of this policy is becoming slowly evident, though initially there was a great deal of scepticism and opposition to it. Industry, both in the public and private sector, has realised that more growth in the volume of production can no longer be sustained as the basic corner-stone of the industrial policy. Along with it, an equally important objective is social justice, equality of opportunity and

prevention of economic concentration. I would like to emphasize that just as due consideration has been given to ensure that both the objectives of rapid growth and social justice are achieved, equal importance ought to be given by the policy framers to both these objectives at every state of implementation as well — whether it is at the stage of licensing or at the stage of monopoly clearance or at the stage of granting financial assistance through financial institutions like the LIC, Unit Trust, etc. In practice we have found in the past that the well formulated policies have met with failures because they have not been well implemented. My first recommendation, therefore, will be that Industrial Development Ministry, in particular, should spell out in detail well in advance the detailed implications of the implementation of industrial policy at each successive stage of operation. I find that we have great ability to create good pieces of legislation on various social and economic problems facing our country. We are also extremely good at evaluating ourselves and our past performances. But, Sir, most unfortunately, very often we miserably floundered in actually carrying out and implementing the policies. If we do want sincerely to implement and achieve the desired results, it is essential that each Ministry must go through the drill of studying the administrative and managerial implications of every such proposal. These have to be well thought out in advance and properly planned step by step. Equal time has to be spent in working them out and plugging the anticipated problems always bearing in mind the ultimate objective in view. I often find that we have many laudable views. But, when it comes to actual implementation, we are just haphazardly slurring over the whole issue and we leave the details to be taken care of by the future. Instead of doing that, we can enter detailed exercise whereby we can put down on paper what our objectives are and what the steps are by which we are going to achieve those objectives. Today, the Law Ministry to some degree, exercises this control, but feels contented merely by giving some penal clauses to every such proposal. But that does not serve the purpose with the result that the most laudable policies of the Government flounder at the time of imple-

[Shrimati Sumitra G. Kulkarni]

mentation and most unnecessarily we create a sense of frustration and dissatisfaction about our very trusted and really benevolent purposes. This very thing is also likely to happen to our well-thought out industrial policy. I would, therefore, specially suggest that due care must be taken to ensure that in implementing our industrial policy we do not miss the woods for the trees and that equal weightage is given to the twin objectives of rapid growth and social justice.

I very much welcome the concepts of the core sector and the joint sector in promoting rapid development. I am, however, disappointed that even after the policy resolution of 1970, which emphasises the formulation of detailed plans for industries in the core sector by the Government, no plan has been drawn up for any of the specified industries even though two years have nearly passed. In these modern times time is of essence. Today, technology is becoming obsolescent. In the 19th century, when the textile mills were started by Indians, the mill's average life was calculated at 100 years. Today, a complex fertilizer plant has got a life of only ten years and so the time for planning is necessarily short. Under these circumstances, can we afford to delay core sector planning any more? Therefore, my second recommendation is that the Government should take the initiative in establishing a dialogue with the industries in the public and the private sectors in formulating the detailed plans for each of the industries specified in the core sector.

So far as the joint sector is concerned, the concept is really remarkable. But, since the majority of the projects are coming up with the State Governments as the major partners with the private sector and the public at large, it is necessary that the Ministry of Industrial Development takes the initiative in providing guidance to the State Governments in the matter of setting up industries and choosing the partners from the private sector. Here again, time is of essence and we cannot afford to neglect providing the State Governments with assistance based on the Central Government's longstanding experience in setting up of industries.

My third recommendation, therefore, would be that a great deal of thought should be given in the Ministry today so far as the administrative implications of setting up industries in the joint sector are concerned. I wish the Industrial Development Ministry success in this difficult task of implementation of the very well formulated industrial policy. We have formulated good policies. But the test will be when we really implement them and achieve the end results which we have in our minds. Our public will be grateful to us and will recognize us as their worthy representatives only if we achieve the results and objectives that we have in mind.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Mr. Mandal.

**श्री बी० एन० मंडल (बिहार) :**  
उपसभापति जी, हिन्दुस्तान एक गरीब देश है, इस देश की गरीबी सिर्फ खेती की उन्नति से ही दूर नहीं हो सकती। इसके लिए इंडस्ट्री की भी जरूरत थी और जो हम लोगों का प्लान बना उस प्लान में इंडस्ट्री को प्रमुख स्थान दिया गया। जो प्लान हम लोगों का चला वह पहला तो ठीक चला, दूसरा प्लान भी ठीक चला, लेकिन तीसरे प्लान में गड़बड़ी शुरू हुई और वह गड़बड़ी यहां तक बढ़ी कि हम लोगों का जो उत्पादन का रेट था वह घटने लगा। फिर कुछ बढ़ती 67 ईसवी से शुरू हुई और 1969 तक रेट आफ ग्रोथ 7.1 तक आया, फिर घटना शुरू हुआ और 1970 में जाकर वह 4.8 हो गया और 1971 में वह 3 पर आ गया। दिनोंदिन रेट आफ ग्रोथ कम होना शुरू हो गया है। जो मिड टर्म एप्रोजल आया था उसमें और जो अभी रिपोर्ट में दी गई इंडस्ट्रियल डिपार्टमेंट की उसमें बतलाया गया है कि अन्डर यूटिलाइजेशन की वजह से हम लोगों का रेट आफ ग्रोथ ठीक नहीं जा रहा है। क्यों नहीं ठीक जा रहा है, इसके कारण

मैं सिर्फ अन्डर यूटिलाइजेशन कह देने से काम नहीं चलेगा। अन्डर यूटिलाइजेशन क्यों हुआ जब यहां पर प्लान चल रहा है और प्लान के मुताबिक सारी बात हो रही है? इसका मतलब है कि जो कुछ भी हम लोग योजना बनाते हैं उस टाइम में जिन बातों को सामने रख कर योजना बनानी चाहिए उन सब बातों पर पूरी तरह से ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता है और इसका नतीजा यह है कि जब प्लान का अप-रेशन शुरू होता है उसमें कमी मालूम पड़ने लगती है। कहीं पर शॉर्टेज आफ रा मेटीरियल होने लगती है, कहीं बिजली की कमी मालूम पड़ने लगती है, कहीं रेलवे वैगन की कमी मालूम पड़ने लगती है, और इस तरह से प्रोडक्शन में रुकावट होती है और इस तरह जो रेट आफ ग्रोथ इंडस्ट्री का है वह कम होने लगता है। तो सब से पहले इस बात पर ध्यान देना चाहिये कि जो हमारा प्लान है वह प्लान पूरा क्यों नहीं बनाया जाता है। जो इस देश में अभी तक इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट हुआ है उस इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट का यह नतीजा नहीं हुआ है कि समूचे देश में विकास की दर एक तरह की हो। जो पिछड़े इलाके हैं उनमें खास तौर से इंडस्ट्री बगैरह को चालू करना चाहिये। यह काम भी नहीं हो पाया है। इसका मतलब यह है कि प्लान के तरीके से कोई काम नहीं हो पाता है। इम्पार्टेंट आदमी जहां-जहां रहे हैं वहां-वहां कुछ काम हो जाता है क्योंकि उनका इंप्लूमेंस यहां के मिनिस्टर पर रहता है। योजना कमीशन में जो काम होता है उसमें भी ऐसा इंप्लूमेंस काम करता रहता है। इससे जो रीजनल इम्बैलेंस है वह भी दूर नहीं हो पाता है। उसी तरीके से पर्सनल इम्बैलेंस होता है जिस की वजह से कोई आदमी बहुत गरीब हो जाता है, कोई आदमी

बहुत अमीर हो जाता है, किसी को बहुत आमदनी हो जाती है, किसी को बहुत आमदनी नहीं होती है, किसी को बहुत रोजगार मिलता है और किसी को कोई रोजगार नहीं मिलता है, रीजनल इम्बैलेंस भी उसी कारण से होता है।

इसलिए देश में जितने इम्बैलेंसेज अभी तक हो चुके हैं उनको सामने रख कर फिर से योजना को बनाने की कोशिश होनी चाहिए और फिर से योजना बनाने के सिलसिले में हम को कुछ बातों को खास कर सामने रखना चाहिए। उसमें एक बात दाम की है। जब आज योजना बनाते हैं और उस के लिए रुपये का एलोकेशन करते हैं, तो बहुत बार समय के अंदर वह काम पूरा नहीं हो पाता है और उस के कारण उस योजना की लागत बढ़ जाती है। जिस कीमत के आधार पर हमने शुरू में प्लान बनाया था उसके बढ़ जाने के कारण, काम का कम्प्लीशन नहीं हो पाता है। तो मोटी बात यह है कि देश में जो प्राइसेज का प्लक्यूएशन है उस प्लक्यूएशन को कैसे रोका जाय इसके लिए भी सरकार को नीति बनाने की जरूरत है। हम लोगों ने बहुत पहले से इस बात को कहा है कि जब तक इस देश में प्राइसेज पर कंट्रोल नहीं होगा तब तक काम का मामला ठीक नहीं चल सकता है। प्राइस कंट्रोल का वह मतलब नहीं है कि जो सरकार समझती है कि किसी चीज का एक कोई दाम निर्धारित कर दिया जाय। हम लोग समझते हैं कि देश में कोई भी चीज हो, चाहे वह इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोड्यूस हो या एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोड्यूस हो, उस का दाम कैसे तय हो, इसके लिए एक विधेय नीति निर्धारित होनी चाहिए और उस के लिए हमारी पार्टी कह रही है कि एग्रीकल्चर की जो चीजें हैं उन पर जो लागत खर्च आता है और उस में जो एक परिवार लगा रहता

[श्री बी० एन० मंडल]

है, साधारण तरीके से जो अपना जीवन गुजारता है, उन सब बातों को सामने रख कर, उस की मेहनत के लिए उस को कुछ प्रॉफिट देकर कृषि की चीजों का दाम तय होना चाहिये। इसी तरह से इंडस्ट्रियल गुड्स का दाम उन की लागत पर डेढ़ गुना नफा देकर तय किया जाना चाहिए। अगर आप इस तरह से इंडस्ट्रियल चीजों का दाम तय करने लगे तो वह लागत के डेढ़ गुने से ज्यादा नहीं हो पायेगा, लेकिन उसमें आप को एक बात का ध्यान रखना पड़ेगा कि जो आप टैक्स लगाते हैं उसको भी इसमें कंट्रोल करने की जरूरत पड़ जायेगी। इसलिए अगर आप दाम नीति को ठीक से चलाना चाहते हैं तो इस सिलसिले में जो टैक्सेशन देश में हो रहा है, जो बजट आप बना रहे हैं, जो खर्च सरकार कर रही है, इन सब बातों को सामने रख कर आप को चीजों के दाम इस तरह से तय करने पड़ेंगे ताकि किसी भी हालत में वह लागत खर्च से डेढ़ गुने से ज्यादा न जाने पायें। टैक्स का उसमें उतना ही एलीमेंट होना चाहिए जिसमें लागत के डेढ़ गुने के अन्दर ही उसके रिटेल दाम आ जायें। लेकिन इस तरह की नीति सरकार नहीं बनाती है। बिहार में मैं रहता हूँ। वहां बिहार सरकार ने हम लोगों को कुछ पेपर्स दिये थे, जिन में बताया गया था कि केन्द्र सरकार बिहार के लिए जो चीजें एलोकेट करती है वह चीजें बिहार में नहीं पहुँच पाती हैं और उस का नतीजा यह होता है कि बिहार में जो इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट होना चाहिए वह नहीं हो पाता है और उस की वजह से वहां की बैकवर्डनेस दूर नहीं हो पा रही है। इसलिए मैं सरकार से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि खास कर जो कम-जोर और पिछड़े इलाके हैं, उनके लिए सरकार को खास तौर से मदद के लिए तैयार रहना चाहिए। उन की जरूरत

पहले पूरी की जाय, लेकिन ऐसी बात नहीं हो पाती है। बिहार में बैक्स के जो डिपॉजिट्स होते हैं, वे बिहार में खर्च होने चाहिए, लेकिन वे दूसरे प्रान्तों में खर्च हो जाते हैं और बिहार में नहीं हो पाते। इसका मतलब यह है कि जो राजकाज चलाने वाले लोग हैं उनका रवेया पक्षपातपूर्ण है और इसीलिए यह गड़बड़ होती है। इसलिए इन सारी बातों को करने के सिलसिले में जो गवर्नमेंट को चलाने वाला पर्सनल है उसकी तरफ भी ध्यान देने की जरूरत है। यह भी देखने की जरूरत है कि आज कैसे पर्सनल की जरूरत है। आप देखेंगे कि जहां-जहां पिछड़े इलाके हैं, जैसे बिहार है, जहां कोई इंडस्ट्रियल उन्नति नहीं हुई है, वह सब से ज्यादा नेगलेक्टेड हैं। इसलिए एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में ऐसे लोगों को होना चाहिए कि जिन को उन इलाकों से सिम्पैथी हो। आज जो एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को चलाने वाले लोग हैं वह अपने स्वार्थ के कारण अपने दिलोदिमाग से उन लोगों के साथ, बैकवर्ड एरिया के साथ सहानुभूति नहीं रखते हैं। इसलिए सरकार का जो पर्सनल हो उसके चुनाव में इस बात का ध्यान रखना चाहिये कि कैसे लोगों के हाथ में ऐसे एरियाज का राजकाज रहना चाहिए। राजा के जमाने में भले ही वह बात न हो सकती हो, लेकिन आज तो डेमोक्रेसी है और डेमोक्रेसी का मतलब होता है वेशी लोगों की इच्छा के मुताबिक सारे काम होना। अगर वैसा नहीं हो पाता है तो उसके कारण मैं आप को जाना चाहिए। अगर आप उसके कारण में जायेंगे तो आप पायेंगे कि जिन पर शासन होता है और जो शासन करते हैं उनके स्वार्थ आज एक दूसरे के खिलाफ हैं और इसलिए जनता की तकलीफ दूर नहीं हो पाती है और उनका पिछड़ापन दूर नहीं हो पाता है। इसलिए इस बात की तरफ ध्यान देने की जरूरत है।

अभी हमने दाम की बात की तो दाम की बात में एक और क्या एलिमेंट है? उसमें एक एलिमेंट टैक्सेशन का है, लेकिन टैक्सेशन के अलावा उसका जो दूसरा एलिमेंट है वह है डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग का। अब डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग जो होती है वह तो एक ऐसी चीज है जिसको सरकार रोक सकती है लेकिन सरकार नहीं रोकती है। क्यों नहीं रोका गया? इसलिये नहीं रोका क्योंकि हमारा प्लान चलना चाहिये और उसके लिये खर्च की जरूरत है और प्लान चलाने के लिये डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग करते हैं, लेकिन अगर डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग का यह नतीजा होता कि जो देश के गरीब हैं, जो पिछड़े समाज के लोग हैं, जो पिछड़े इलाके हैं उनकी उन्नति होती तब तो डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग का जस्टीफिकेशन हो सकता था, लेकिन जब कि वे ज्यों के त्यों हैं उनके लिए कुछ नहीं हो पा रहा है, फिर भी डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग होती जाती है तो इसका मतलब यह है कि डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग करने वाले जो हैं, उन लोगों की उनके साथ सिम्पैथी नहीं है। उद्योग धंधा जब तक इस देश में नहीं फैलेगा, तब तक इस देश के लोगों की जो गरीबी है वह गरीबी नहीं दूर होगी, लेकिन उस गरीबी को दूर करने के सिलसिले में जिस ढंग का प्लान बनना चाहिये, उस ढंग से प्लान नहीं बन रहा है। तो उस ढंग का प्लान बनना चाहिये और प्लान बनाने के बाद ऐसे लोगों के हाथ में उसका संचालन देना चाहिये—चाहे वह प्लान के आदमी हों, चाहे सरकार के आदमी हों—जो कि उसका एग्जीक्यूशन ठीक तरीके से कर सकें जिससे कि देश की जो गरीबी है, देश का जो पिछड़ापन है वह दूर हो। तो इस ढंग से उसकी कार्यवाही चलनी चाहिये जो कि अभी नहीं हो रहा है।

**श्री बनारसी दास (उत्तर प्रदेश):**  
अधिष्ठाता महोदय, सबसे पहले तो मैं

अपनी महानुभूति उद्योग मंत्री के प्रति प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ; क्योंकि यद्यपि वह उद्योग के विकास के नियंत्रण के मंत्री हैं, लेकिन उनका उत्तरदायित्व बिला अधिकार के है। एक ऐसे बच्चे के पालन-पोषण का भार उनके ऊपर सौंपा गया है जिसके गर्भाधान और जिसके जन्म देने के अन्दर उनका बहुत कम हाथ है। यही वजह है कि आज औद्योगिक नीति के अन्दर मुझे न तो कोई समन्वय नजर आता है और न कोई नीति नजर आती है। औद्योगिक नीति के अन्दर मुझे तो केवल एक अराजकता ही नजर आती है। जब सन् 1956 ई० में औद्योगिक नीति का प्रस्ताव पास किया गया था, प्राइवेट और पब्लिक और कोआपरेटिव सेक्टर को पृथक-पृथक स्थान दिया गया था। यह आशा की जाती थी कि पब्लिक सेक्टर डामिनेंटिंग पोजीशन के अन्दर होगा और प्राइवेट सेक्टर उसका पूरक होगा। समाजवाद, कोई गरीबी का उसूल नहीं है। जब तक कि दौलत का रिजर्वायर हमारे देश के अन्दर नहीं बनेगा, तब तक उससे नहरें दौलत को बांटने के लिए नहीं बनाई जा सकती हैं। इस साल की रिपोर्ट जो उद्योग कार्यालय की देखी तो उसमें हमने देखा कि जब कि हमारे देश की आबादी ढाई प्रतिशत बढ़ती चली जा रही है, उद्योग का विकास केवल दो प्रतिशत के करीब है और गत तीन वर्षों में यह बराबर गिरता चला गया है। चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना में आशा की जाती थी कि हमारी प्रगति साढ़े पांच फीसदी होगी। सन् 1969 में तो कुछ प्रगति हुई, लेकिन सन् 1970 में यह और गिरी और 1971 ई० के अन्दर तो वह प्रगति गिर के दो फीसदी हो गई है। तब किस प्रकार उद्योगों का विकास हो सकता है। आपने अधिकार के लिये रेगुलेशन और नियंत्रण के। वह इसलिए था कि रीज-

[श्री बनारसी दास]

नल डिसपैरिटी नहीं होगी, तमाम देश का सर्वांगीण विकास होगा और यही एक सबसे बड़ा औचित्य था जब कि इंकार किया जाता था प्राविशियल आटोनामी के लिये और उद्योग के नियंत्रण और लाइसेंस देने की नीति को केन्द्र के हाथ में रखने की बात की जाती थी। लेकिन बराबर डिसपैरिटी बढ़ती चली गई है। उत्तर प्रदेश सबसे बड़ा प्रदेश है, पिछली तीन पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं में पब्लिक सेक्टर के अन्दर चार फीसदी इनवेस्ट किया गया। लेकिन जब से गरीबी हटाओ और रीजनल डिसपैरिटीज़ को दूर करने का बड़ा भारी तूफान आया, तब इस बार पब्लिक सेक्टर में जितनी धनराशि रखी गई उसमें केवल एक प्रतिशत उत्तर प्रदेश को दिया गया। लाइसेंस की नीति में भी केवल एक पक्षपात को और एक इलेक्शन फंड के लिये जरिया बनाने की नीति का इस्तेमाल किया गया। जिसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि सार्वजनिक जीवन में आज भ्रष्टाचार एक संस्था बन गई है। भ्रष्टाचार की चर्चा करना आज अनर्गल मालूम पड़ता है। जहां पर भी आज लेटर आफ इन्टेन्स और लाइसेन्सेज इश्यू किए गए हैं, उनके अन्दर कोई मेरिट नहीं है और न कहीं रीजनल डेवलपमेंट का कोई ध्यान रखा गया है। आपके सुपुर्द इस देश के अन्दर कपड़ा, जो कि सबसे ज्यादा बुनियादी जरूरत है, सप्लाई करने का काम है लेकिन हम यह देखते हैं कि कपड़े का उत्पादन देश के अन्दर गिरता चला जाता है और प्रत्येक व्यक्ति को कपड़ा जितना मिलना चाहिए वह कम होता चला जा रहा है। आज जब कि देश के अन्दर बेरोजगारी है, लखनऊ में और तमाम प्रदेशों में वहां के बुनकरों ने बड़ी भारी हड़ताल की, इसलिए हड़ताल की कि जहां गवर्नमेंट मिल के कोर्स क्लाय को सबसिडी देती है, वहां गवर्नमेंट आफ

इंडिया बुनकरों के प्रति उदासीन ही नहीं रही है उनके प्रति पक्षपातपूर्ण रही है जिसका नतीजा यह है कि बड़ी तादाद में बुनकर लोग बेरोजगार हो गए हैं। महात्मा गांधी ने हमारे देश की अर्थ नीति में एक बड़े उसूल का प्रतिपादन किया था कि जब हमारे देश के अन्दर मानव शक्ति, दो हाथ की मशीनें, प्रचुर मात्रा में हैं तो क्यों न हम उनका उपयोग करें। गांधी जी का उसूल एक ऐसा उसूल नहीं था, जिससे कि हम आज के युग के मुताबिक विकास न कर सकें और डाइनेमिक न हों। आज क्या यह नहीं कहा जा सकता है, एक कलम के जरिए कि जितनी भी मिल्स हैं, वे केवल सूत कातने का ही काम करें और तमाम प्रदेशों में, जिलों में जितनी भी कपड़े की आवश्यकता है वह पावरलूम के जरिए, हैंडलूम के जरिए पूरी की जाए? लेकिन इसमें केवल रुकावट यह है कि एक बड़ा व्हेस्टेड इन्टरेस्ट है, बिग बिजनेस है जो बड़ी-बड़ी मिलें चलाते हैं, वे नहीं चाहते कि उत्पादन का विकेंद्रीकरण किया जावे।

हमने एक नारा सुना कि एक आर्थिक स्वराज होना चाहिए, इकानामिक सेल्फ-सफिशिएन्सी होनी चाहिए, एक सेल्फ-रिलाएन्ट हमारी इकानामी होनी चाहिए। लेकिन उधर हमारा कदम क्या गया है? हमने कपड़े के मामले में रीजनल सेल्फ-सफिशिएन्सी के लिए क्या कोई कदम उठाया है? इसी प्रकार से जिसकी सबसे बड़ी जरूरत हमारे हर आदमी को है वह जूते की है, चमड़े के सामान की है। क्या ट्रेनिंग को गवर्नमेंट अपने हाथ में लेकर प्रदेशों में और जिलों के स्तर पर छोटे-छोटे लोगों के जरिए से काम करा पायी? क्यों नहीं जूता बनाने का कार्य, चमड़ा बनाने का कार्य इस विभाग के जरिए विकेंद्रित रूप से पढ़े लिखे युवकों को दिया जा रहा



है। आज ऐसा लगता है कोई दृष्टि-कोण उद्योग में नहीं नजर आता है। एक तरफ मोनोपोलीज बढ़ती जाती है मोनोपोली कमीशन के होते हुए। 35 करोड़ की पूंजी के बड़े-बड़े विजनेस हाउसेज कहलाते थे उनकी पूंजीगत तीन-चार साल के अन्दर बढ़ती गई है—किसी की 200 फीसदी, किसी की 100 फीसदी, किसी की 50 फीसदी, किसी की 75 फीसदी। पार साल का बजट बड़ा भारी प्रगतिशील बजट कहा जाता था, कहा जाता था कि उन पर बड़ा भारी कर लगा है, लेकिन उन करों के होते हुए भी इस साल जितने भी बड़े-बड़े मोनोपोली हाउसेज हैं उन्होंने जो अपना डिविडेन्ड दिया है 11-12 फीसदी वह भी तमाम टैक्स का प्राविजन करने के बाद में। उसको देखते हुए इस देश के अन्दर जिन प्रकार मोनोपोली घो हुआ है? यह हो सकता है कि मोनोपोलीज को रोकने का एक पोलिटिकल स्टन्ट हो। क्योंकि गवर्नमेंट के प्रोत्साहन के जरिए टैक्स हार्लिडे दे कर के, इनकम टैक्स में स्यूलियते दे कर के, एक्साइज ड्यूटी के अन्दर एक्जेंप्शन देकर के, मोनोपोलीज को पैदा किया गया है। एक कपड़े के कारखाने का मालिक है वह स्टील का मालिक बन गया है। एक स्टील का मालिक है वह और पचास तरह की इंडस्ट्रीज का मालिक हो गया है। यह है मोनोपोलीज को रोकने के लिए हमारा तरीका। दस साल पहले बहुत शान शौकन के साथ बड़ा डोल बजा कर इस बात का ऐलान किया गया था कि छोटी कार का कारखाना पब्लिक सेक्टर के अंदर बनेगा। कार की कीमत पांच-छः हजार रुपये होगी, आम लोगों के लिए वह कारखाना बनेगा। एक तरफ गरीबी हटेगी, यह कहा गया, कम्युनिस्टों की की ओर से मिस्टर भूपेश गुप्त भी सबसे अधिक प्रचारक थे कि इस वक्त एक बहुत

तेज हवा बह रही है, समाजवाद की हवा बहती चली जा रही है, जो इस मुल्क के अन्दर एक स्वर्ग लाएगी। लेकिन हमने क्या देखा? इस दिल्ली के ही नजदीक, जब एक तरफ लैन्ड सीलिंग की बात हो रही है, गरीब कारखानों को बरबाद कर के, उनकी जमीनें करीब-करीब छीन कर, 306 एकड़ जमीन संजय गांधी के लिए एक्वायर की जा रही है—एक स्माल कार का कारखाना यहां पर खड़ा किया जा रहा है। पता नहीं, पब्लिक सेक्टर के अंदर यह स्माल कार का कारखाना कब आएगा और यह 306 एकड़ जमीन अगर स्माल कार के लिए जरूरी है तो बड़ी कारों के लिए तो खुदा जाने कितनी जमीन की जरूरत होगी। अभी तो बड़े-बड़े कारों के कारखाने के लिए, जैसे एम्बेसेडर है, मर्सिडीज है, 50 एकड़ जमीन काफी है, लेकिन हम देखते हैं छोटे कार के कारखानों के लिए 306 एकड़ की जमीन चाहिए। उससे तो लगता है छोटे कार के लिए ज्यादा जमीन की जरूरत है।

आज लाइसेंस के अन्दर भी ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि एक पोलिटिकल क्लास पैदा किया जा रहा है। इस देश के अन्दर यद्यपि कांस्टीट्यूशन में समानता बरती गई है, लेकिन एक राजनीतिक गुलामी, एक राजनीतिक क्लाम, जो हमारे देश के शासक महाप्रभु है उनकी एक क्लास ब्राह्मण की है और बाकी जो नई क्लास है वह शूद्रों की है, शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट की है जो यहां पैदा की जा रही है।

आज जो लाइसेंस दिये जा रहे हैं उनके अन्दर घोषणा यह है कि प्रादेशिक असमानता दूर की जायेगी, समानता होगी और जो नये इंजीनियर्स हैं, जो नये शिक्षित वर्ग के लड़के आ रहे हैं, उनको प्रोत्साहन दिया जायेगा और सैल्फ इम्प्लायमेंट के लिए इंडस्ट्रीज

[श्री बनारसी दास]

खोलने के लिए मौका दिया जायेगा। लेकिन आखिर हमारी नीति इस सम्बन्ध में क्या है? अभी माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने इनलप-पिलो फोम के लिए लाइसेंस दिया था। यह एक ऐसी इन्डस्ट्री है जो स्माल स्केल बेसिस पर की जा सकती है। छोटे-छोटे प्रदेशों को तो कई लाइसेंस दिये गये, लेकिन उत्तर प्रदेश जो सबसे बड़ा प्रदेश है, उसको केवल एक लाइसेंस दिया गया। जिस व्यक्ति ने सबसे पहले लाइसेंस के लिए प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया था, जिसकी डायरेक्टर आफ इन्डस्ट्रीज ने भी सिफारिश की थी उसको उठा कर फैंक दिया गया लेकिन एक राजनीतिक आधार पर . . . (Interruption) वह तो अब दिल्ली में है।

तो श्रीमन्, मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि इनलप-पिलो इन्डस्ट्रीज के सम्बन्ध में भी भेदभाव बरता गया। मैंने अर्ज किया कि एक लाइसेंस दिया गया और वह भी उस व्यक्ति को नहीं जिसका प्रार्थना-पत्र सबसे पहिले आया था, जो कि सबसे योग्य था, बल्कि एक राजनीतिक आधार पर तथा राजनीतिक संतुष्टी के लिए एक दूसरे व्यक्ति को लाइसेंस दिया गया। तो श्रीमन्, किस प्रकार से इस देश के अन्दर उद्योग पनपेगा।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश) : किसको दिया गया ?

श्री बनारसी दास : माननीय मंत्री महोदय स्वयं जानते हैं। नाम लेना मैं समझता हूँ सदन की परम्परा के खिलाफ होगा।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : जब आप आरोप लगा रहे हैं तो नाम भी बतलाइये?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : Please do not disturb him.

श्री बनारसी दास : तो श्रीमन्, आज यह जो उद्योग है, जिसमें एक बड़े प्रगतिशील जो कभी पहिले ब्रिटिश सरकार के

स्तम्भ थे और जो बाद में फ्री इकोनोमी के बड़े भारी प्रवर्तक बने आज उनको एक नई रोगनी नजर आई। उन्होंने कहा कि आज एक नया मूर्ध निकला है लिहाजा समाजवाद के दर्शन के लिए चले गये। आज इस उद्योग का एकाधिकार उनके पास है। एकाधिकार को कायम रखने की दृष्टि से दल बदल कर के वे दूसरी तरफ गये और इसकी कीमत उन्हें यह मिल रही है कि आज वे एक मात्र मोनोपललिस्ट रह गये हैं और अब किसी को उद्योग के अन्दर प्रवेश करने का मौका नहीं मिलेगा।

इसलिए श्रीमन्, आज जो आप की नीति है और जैसा मैंने अर्ज किया कि उद्योग में रेगुलेशन और उद्योग के विकास की है। 1970 में बम्बई में एक प्रस्ताव पास किया गया था। यह जानते हुए कि संविधान के अनुसार उस समय राष्ट्रीयकरण का अधिकार नहीं था कि उत्तर प्रदेश के चीनी उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जायेगा। तीन साल हो गये हैं, न मोडर्नाइजेशन हो रहा है, न वहां पर इन्वेस्टमेंट हो रहा है और न ही गन्ने का विकास ही हो रहा है। इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि वहां पर मशीनें बेची जा रही हैं और उद्योग का ह्रास हो रहा है। गन्ने का विकास वहां पर बिल्कुल रुक गया है और केवल एक राजनीतिक स्टन्ट के लिए यह नारा लगाया गया था। जरूरत आज इस बात की थी कि जिस तरह से बैंकों का नेशनलाइजेशन आर्डिनेंस के जरिये हुआ, उसी तरह से अगर गवर्नमेंट नेक नीयत है तो इस उद्योग का भी राष्ट्रीयकरण आर्डिनेंस के जरिये होना चाहिए था। ताकि इस प्रदेश के अन्दर वहां के उद्योग के अन्दर नवीनीकरण होता। आज क्या है? आज वहां एक कमीशन बना है जस्टिस भार्गव की अध्यक्षता में इस उद्योग की जाँच के लिए। दो साल

हो गये अभी तक कमीशन की रिपोर्ट प्राप्त नहीं हुई। राष्ट्रीयकरण तब होगा जब उत्तर प्रदेश के अन्दर चुनाव की घंटी बज जायेगी ताकि वह एक वोट-केचिंग स्लोगन बन जाय। इसलिए नहीं कि उत्तर प्रदेश का जो चीनी उद्योग है, जो इस देश का सबसे बड़ा उद्योग है, उसकी किसी प्रकार से तरक्की हो सके। इस प्रकार से आज हमारे देश की उद्योग नीति चलती है। आज जरूरत इस चीज की है कि शक्ती के साथ इसका उद्योगों पर नियंत्रण किया जाये।

मुझे श्री भूपेश गुप्त के साथ बहुत हमदर्दी है। वे एक चतुर वकील की तरह एक कमजोर मुकदमे की वकालत कर रहे थे। डेढ़ साल तक उन्होंने अपना वरद हाथ देकर उस सरकार की रक्षा की। वे बेचारे मोइनूल हक चौधरी पर हमला कर रहे थे और जो इस नीति की जनक है, जो इस नीति के चलाने वाले हैं उनकी रक्षा करने का प्रयास कर रहे थे। ये मोनोपोलीज आज किसने चला रखी है। 1969 के पहले यह कहा जा सकता था कि कुछ लोग उनके हाथ-पैर खींच रहे थे, लेकिन क्या इन तीन सालों के अन्दर मोनोपोलीज को नहीं रोका जा सकता था, मुनाफों को नहीं रोका जा सकता था और एक आदर्श पेश नहीं किया जा सकता था? मैं जानता हूँ भूपेश गुप्त की कठिनाई। क्योंकि वे अमर बैल की तरह एक आश्रित हैं और मुझे इस बात का बड़ा खेद है कि जो पार्टी अपने को बड़ा प्रगतिशील कहती थी उसने एक तरफ इस बात की कोशिश की कि वह प्रगतिशील दिखे लेकिन नहीं माने में वह स्थापित स्वार्थों की पोषक पार्टी बन कर रह गई है। (Time-bell rings) जो आंकड़े आपने पेश किए हैं, जो आपकी मंशा है और जो गवर्नमेंट कर रही

है उनमें बड़ा भेद है। आज वास्तव में कोई फर्क आपके दल और सरकारी दल में नहीं है। आज दो सी० पी० आइयों का संगम हो गया है, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी आफ इन्दिरा और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी आफ इंडिया। अब दोनों की अलग-अलग क्या आवश्यकता है?

मैं अन्त में आपके माध्यम से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आपकी नीति में समन्वय होना चाहिए। यद्यपि भिन्न-भिन्न उद्योग भिन्न-भिन्न मंत्रालयों के चार्ज में हों लेकिन एक कोआर्डिनेशन होना चाहिए, रीजनल डिस्पेरिटीज रूकनी चाहिए। साथ ही साथ डिसेन्ट्रलाइजेशन होना चाहिए ताकि उपभोगों का उत्पादन लोगों के हाथ में आए, जैसे कपड़ा है, खाना है, जूता है, कागज है, न्यूजप्रिन्ट है, ये सारी इंडस्ट्रीज रीजनल बेसिस पर छोटे-छोटे लोगों के हाथ में आ जायें ताकि उनकी ओनरशिप हो—फिर चाहे सरकार का पंजा हो चाहे पूंजीपतियों का पंजा—त तो मोनोपोली व्यक्तियों की हो, न मोनोपोली चुनाव का फंड जमा करने के लिए सरकार की हो। एक बात साफ हमें अपने दिमाग में करनी होगी कि जिसके हाथ में उत्पादन और वितरण का एकाधिकार होगा उसके हाथ में राजनीतिक सत्ता भी होगी। हम एकाधिकार सत्ता पर खत्म करना चाहते हैं एक पार्टी का। हम नहीं चाहते कि सत्ता का और अर्थ का एकाधिकार चन्द लोगों के हाथों में हो। अगर हमारी निष्ठा डेमोक्रेसी के अन्दर है तो हमको अर्थ नीति भी ऐसी बनानी होगी। उद्योग नीति भी ऐसी बनानी होगी जो डेमोक्रेसी के खिलाफ न पड़े, डेमोक्रेसी की रक्षा कर सके। मिस्टर चौधरी के साथ मुझे हमदर्दी है क्योंकि वे ऐसे बच्चे के गार्जियन हैं जिसको उन्होंने खुद जन्म नहीं दिया है लेकिन

[श्री बनारसी दास]

मुझे आशा है कि वे कोशिश करेंगे कि उद्योग नीति का विकास सही दिशा में हो।

5 p. m.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOU-DHURY : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members for the interest they have shown in the working of my Ministry and for the suggestions they have made. As I listened to the speeches, I began to envy some of my friends opposite who made no attempt to deny themselves the pleasure of criticism without responsibility. This, however, gave way to rather serious reflection on the trends that criticisms of our Industrial Policy have exhibited of late. Criticism is an essential part of debate and I am not trying to cavil at constructive criticism. But let us remember that in an economic and industrial policy a delicate balance has to be struck between several and sometimes conflicting objectives. Criticism of individual policy instruments has to take place within the total perspective of a given industrial situation and constructive criticism ought to point its fingers at possible alternatives. Secondly, once a set of policies with given objectives has been evolved, then it should be allowed to operate and criticism which gives no fair chance for the policies to operate themselves, cannot qualify for appreciation. Lastly, criticism which is trained at persons rather than at policies is like weeds in a garden and has nothing to commend it.

The comments on the slow growth rate, for example, have been a mixture of all these types of criticisms. There is no doubt that industrial growth rate has been slow. But it results from many factors. The slow down of all investments in the public sector, the fructification of the comparatively meagre investment propositions in the past few years and the declining production in critical sectors like cotton, textiles, steel and sugar have been the reasons for the sluggish march of industrial production for the last two or three years. The historical growth of our industrial structure is such that these three industries, among them, along with steel-based industries account for more than half the weights in the manufacturing sector which

inturn, bears only 85 per cent weight in the index of industrial production. In such a context, as I told the Lok Sabha, if I were to promise a very high growth rate, I will be misleading the House, unless I could be satisfied that the three important sectors, namely, sugar, textiles and steel were able to forge ahead. So long as these sectors are not able to do so, for some reason or other, however much I may increase production in the newer sectors, it will not make an overwhelming difference so far as the growth rate is concerned.

I must also draw attention to the fact that quite a number of industries other than those I have mentioned have done well including some which do not figure in the index of industrial production. I have also referred in the past to the substantial growth of small-scale industries which does not necessarily get reflected in the index.

I have been misunderstood when I said that these main industries had recorded a decline in industrial production as if I had tried to deny the collective responsibility involved. It is not my intention to stop with a post-mortem of why industrial growth has been slow. We must organise a strategy for a rapid increase in production, and I would like to indicate what we have done hitherto. First of all, steps have been taken to sustain production through certain amendments to the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, designed to provide greater speed and flexibility in the taking over of undertakings and to rehabilitate such units without let or hindrance as the large number of such industries and closures itself was one of the causes of slow rate of growth. In order to increase production in the quickest possible way and with the minimum expenditure of investible resources, I had the question of the utilisation of existing capacities taken up. As a result we had announced that in 54 selected industries and undertakings which had been licensed on single or double shift basis could manufacture up to three shifts and in the cases of other undertakings they could expand production to the extent of another hundred per cent. We have taken care to see that such facilities are not automatically available to larger industrial

houses and foreign concerns who would have to justify the proposals before a task force and subject also to the requirement of the M. R. T. P. Act. Unjustified concern has been expressed about the clearance by the task force inasmuch as it is said that a new word has been coined. I can tell the hon'ble Members that of the total number of 46 cases from these larger houses and foreign majority of companies that came before the Task Force, they had considered only 25 cases by now. Of these they had rejected ten cases. The rest are still under their examination or the examination of the Government at different stages. We have not yet given the expansion as is sought to be made out that in the name of utilisation of capacity we are very liberal in this matter.

The hon'ble Shri Kulkarni is certainly justified when he said that this must not only be a regulatory Ministry, it must also be a promotional Ministry. I will come to the promotional aspect later. First of all, I will take the question of licences. As my Ministry is constituted today, one of the most important functions of my Ministry is the licensing function, that is to say, creation of capacities to match demand. The different Ministries process the applications at different stages. They send the applications to us and the Licensing Committee considers them. The Chairman of the Licensing Committee is certainly the Secretary of the Department. But he is associated with the other Secretaries and high-ranking officers of the other departments.

With regard to the core sector industries, and cases of larger houses and foreign companies, whatever may be the decision of the Licensing Committee, this is not only to be submitted to the Minister, but apart from MRTP clearance where required the Minister in his turn has got to submit it to the Cabinet Sub-Committee and there these cases are cleared ultimately. Therefore, it is very unfair to condemn the Secretary or to talk of some kind of conspiracy between him and the Minister as if they can come to some kind of understanding and do anything they like. This is not the real truth. Therefore, with regard to the larger houses, with regard to the foreign companies, with regard to the core sector cases, they have got to be sub-

mitted to the Minister first of all. The Minister may himself reject all these cases or some of these cases. This is the first scrutiny over the Licensing Committee.

The second scrutiny is by the Company Affairs Department from the M.R.T.P. angle wherever statutorily required. Then it is submitted to the Cabinet Sub-Committee which is to go into each one of these cases. I do not understand why this kind of fling is thrown here and there and a division is sought to be created between the Minister and the Congressmen. It may pay somebody. This role has been played for a long time. But I think my party is sufficiently strong enough and alive enough not to fall victim to this kind of machination. I can assure the hon'ble Member that I am open to any scrutiny. In fact all the above scrutinies are being made before any licence is given to any large house or to any core sector industrialist.

Sir, on the one hand it is said that we are very liberal with large houses. One of the hon'ble Members went to the length of saying that because we have struck a bargain with the Tatas and others we have been able to corner not only statesmen but one after another all the large house newspapers. But every morning when I open some of the newspapers of the large houses, I find that one thing is clear, that is, they want I should be dropped from the Ministry or my portfolio should be changed. I do not understand it. Who are throwing these hints to these newspaper tycoons or to their press representatives to write like this? I also see an unseen hand behind it. Therefore, it is not limited to what is being sought to be said before the hon. Members. There is something more than that.

SHRI S. D. MISRA (Uttar Pradesh):  
It is not an unseen hand.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOU-  
DHURY: It is a seen hand, I know. There-  
fore, it is high time that we take note of it.  
Praising some Minister, trying to disparage  
some Minister praising somebody  
sometimes, condemning somebody some-  
times, trying to bring about a rift between  
brothers and brothers, between partymen and

[Shri Moinul Haque Choudhury]

partymen, this is a game which we have seen for the last three years. I hope, therefore, when I said some minutes back that I was not here as Minister on the mercy of anybody of the opposition, my party will take note of it.

**श्री गनेश लाल चौधरी (उत्तर प्रदेश)**  
इसीलिये हैं आपके साथ भूषण जी।

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY : sft [f, fejW I Now, as it is constituted to-day, one of the most important functions of my Ministry is the licensing function that is to say creating the capacity to match demand. In this sphere, I have no hesitation in saying that we have been able to show vovy substantial results. As against 221 licences and 334 letters of intent issued in 1969, and 363 licences and 438 letters of intent issued in 1970, we have issued in 1971 626 licences and 1,015 letters of intent, which is double that of 1970 and thrice that of 1969. Cases of foreign collaboration approved were 245 in 1971 as against 183 in 1970 and 135 in 1969.

SHRI MONORANJAN ROY (West Bengal) : That has also increased.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I will explain. The hon. Member will see that it is not as if every case that comes to us is cleared. If the hon. Member will see, the performance of the Ministry in clearance of letters of intent and licences being three to four times more than any previous year, if there is a slight increase in the number of foreign collaboration agreements, that should not upset the hon. Member. I can give the hon. Member the number of cases we have rejected. We rejected 187, 246 and 200 applications or collaboration in the years 1969, 1970 and 1971 respectively. With increased industrialisation, we are entering into highly sophisticated fields. And as we enter into highly sophisticated fields, the question of collaboration in some cases comes. Some hon. Members seem to think that collaboration means foreign domination. It is not so. We have issued a guideline. When we go in for foreign collaboration, we allow a royalty of two to three per cent or a maximum of five per cent, which is again taxable. Then, normally we allow collaboration for five years

and a maximum of ten years under certain circumstances. That is all. Beyond that, we do not allow units registered with the collaboration.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not merely that. Royalty is not much; I agree. But under the collaboration agreement, sometimes they try to import things from the collaborating countries. Intermediates come from those countries. Technical knowhow comes, personnel come and then equipment also comes. All these things are to be taken together.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I agree with the hon. Member that all these things are to be taken into consideration. The number of foreign personnel who are working in (his country has come down sharply. The number of people employed, the outgo of foreign exchange, all these things are coming down sharply! I can give these figures at any time if a question is put. We can justify our position. There is nothing to be ashamed of in our performance in this matter.

And there is nothing to hide also. I can tell the honourable Member, it gives no pleasure to anyone, far less to a Minister, to agree to a foreign collaboration. Every kind of examination is made from every angle whether the technical knowhow is available in the country, etc. and we check up with the Science and Technology Department, we check up with the DG TD, we check up with the various Regional Laboratories. Not only that. Even in cases of machineries we advertise them in the trade journals and if there is anyone coming and saying that he is capable of producing the same, in such cases we refuse import.

The performance in the small-scale industry field is equally substantial. Capital goods licences clearance for the small-scale industries have also shown a marked increase. The estimated gross value of output in the small-scale sector, both organised and unorganised, is of the order of Rs. 4050 crores. The estimated employment in the small-scale sector is of the order of 33 lakh people. The estimated investment in the fixed assets in the small-scale industries sector is Rs. 475 crores. The number of small-scale industrial Director of Industries is 2,81,418.

ShriKulkarni said that the NSIC has given machinery worth Rs. 10 crores to the small-scale industries sector. This was for one year only. The actual figures for the last few years are for 1968-69 Rs. 4.49 crores...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: We are discussing one year old report.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I agree with the honourable Member. I am only pointing out this thing. 1969-70 Rs. 4.56 crores, 1970-71 Rs. 5.55 crores and 1971-72 Rs. 10.70 crores. The honourable Member will kindly see that the difference between 1970-71 and 1971-72 is about double, I mean the provision has been made double. The total value of machinery given by the NSIC till now since its inception is nearly Rs. 55 crores. I agree with the honourable Member that this provision is far short of the requirements. And that has given scope for Shri Banarsi Das to complain that we have not been able to meet the requirements of U.P. It is not only U.P., from various areas demands are coming and we have not been able to meet the demands. That is true. In the ancillary industries the total number of units which make supplies to the larger units is estimated to be 10,000. The estimated production of these units in 1970-71 is of the order of Rs. 33 crores and the employment in this sector is near about one lakh people. The units enlisted by SSIDC are 397. The value of purchases made by 21 public sector undertakings from about 279 small-scale units in 1970 is of the order of Rs. 865 ;48 lakhs. I welcome the suggestion made by Shri Kulkarni that we should give legislative protection. For this, I had already said in the House, a committee is working and as soon as its report is ready, I once again reiterate that we will come forward with the requisite legislation to give protection to the small-scale units, if need be, to the ancillary industries.,.

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI: On a point of explanation. It is for you to clarify: when you say Rs. 800 lakhs, it means Rs. 8 crores. You know the total public sector production and you see how ridiculous the figure is. The public sector itself has to be condemned for this.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I share the concern of the honourable Member. That is why when a few months back I went to Bihar, I called the authorities of the public sector units there, held meetings with them, impressed upon them the desirability of making more purchases from the ancillary industries. Not only that, I requested them to sponsor ancillary industries. In the same way my colleague, wherever he has been going in public sector industries, he is doing the same thing. I agree with the honourable Member that there is a lot to be done in this field. Sir, the increased pace of issue of licences and letters of intent, foreign collaboration approval and of capital goods approval have now set the stage for accelerated production possibilities in the coming years. They have thrown open opportunities for new entrepreneurs and thus fulfilled one of the major aims of our liberalised licensing policy. Likewise the elimination of rigid capacity constraints has set the stage for a production system based on surpluses rather than shortages. There is no longer scope for protected markets. The issue of liberal licences has also contributed to the revival of the investment climate to some extent. An important endeavour of my Ministry has been to spot areas of marginal shortages and create capacity to match new demands about which our pointed attention has been drawn in his speech by Shri Prem Manohar. In fact the absence of that has cost us dearly in the past. In the past one year or so, we have issued press notes for a large number of items where we found that capacity constraints have begun to rear their heads and we have issued licences liberally in such sectors. In this manner, we have allowed very substantial capacity in the field of paper, cement, automobile tyres and tubes, soda ash, calcium carbide, automobile ancillaries, dry batteries, commercial gases and so on. In many of these fields, the capacity added has really been substantial. That is why I made a statement sometime earlier in the course of my speech that one of the main functions of my Ministry, namely, the creation of capacity to match demand, has been charged by me in more than ample measure.

The very large number of letters of intent and licences having been issued naturally bring to the fore the question of implemen-

[Shri Moinul Haque Choudhury]  
tation about which reference has been made . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Distribution of licences has also been questioned.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I will come to that. It is true that hitherto this Ministry had acted more or less as a licence-giving Ministry. It should also work as a Ministry which should promote industries. This was done in the past, but not to that extent as one would desire. That is why this question is engaging our special attention and in the course of the coming year, I propose to institute a special implementation drive through a regular implementation committee of officers. This will enable us to review the progress of implementation systematically, to revoke licences where necessary, and to assist the entrepreneurs with speedy clearances where called for. Similarly, we have decided to bring about all the advantages near about an entrepreneur so as to remove his difficulties in a package manner so that a new entrepreneur can set up an industry. This is not a problem for larger houses or large industries with experience. But this is a problem with small man and this has got to be tackled only in a package manner. This is currently exercising our mind.

There had been some apprehension about the foreign majority companies. Let me assure the hon. Members that there has been no dilution of the government policy. Our foreign investment and collaboration policies continue to be selective. The guidelines in this regard continue to be observed and approvals are given only in areas of sophisticated technology. The comparatively higher number of foreign collaboration is in line with the large number of clearance by way of letters of intent and licences. About this I have said earlier in the course of my speech. Not all the cases that come up to the Foreign Investment Board are approved. I have also quoted the figures in that connection. There has been some apprehension expressed that we are going to allow foreign sub-sidiaries or branches come in, in the case of export-oriented labour intensive industries, Shri Ghosh has made a pointed reference about that. We

have taken no such decision. Whatever was mentioned in the discussions of the Indo-British Technological Group, from which this apprehension flows, was only to elicit the response of the other side. This apprehension arose because of certain publications in the newspapers. It was only to elicit the response of the other side in that discussion...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: How then do you say that certain discussions took place wherein your Secretary made some statement? You issue a clarification from the Government also.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I am coming to it now. In that discussion, the Secretary gave certain views to elicit the opinion of the other side. But, as I said in this House, after the talks, a Press note was issued which contained the Government's view. I do not know why, instead of reading the Press note, we should read the newspaper report and give more value to it than the Press note of the Government. This is my contention. My contention is that the view of the Government is contained in the Press note. Now, in the case of discussions of an exploratory nature, many things may take place. But that may not be the Government's view. After all, whatever discussion takes place at the official level has got to be placed before the Cabinet, if need be, has got to be placed before the Minister and it has got to go through these stages and then only a policy is changed. But, even at the stage of the official discussion, after the discussion was over, they issued a Press note and that Press note did not contain any such reference to any change of policy. Therefore, there is no question of the Government changing the policy or issuing a contradiction. Even after the official discussions, the policy was not ultimately changed. There might have been some discussions at some stage. But, the ultimate decision was not in favour of a policy change. So, there was no such change.

In any event, Sir, as we have done in the few cases approved so far, there has been no question of import of second hand machinery with or without foreign collaboration unless there is an overwhelming, export advantage. The quality and working life of the plant to



be imported will have to be certified in every case by a qualified engineer and decisions will be taken on a case-by-case basis.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: After all, it is an old machinery and what is the use of certifying them? We have seen what happened in Faridabad. An American company has duped an Indian company.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: They are handing over all the junk. They are enamoured of it.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: We are not enamoured of it.

In a vast country like ours, how many old machines have been brought according to my friend, Mr. Ghosh? We should not exaggerate a problem.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: My information is on the basis of the news contained in the newspapers that you have entered into an agreement with certain countries to import those plants from those factories which do not need them.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Pardon?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I mean the factories which the advanced capitalist countries do not need at present will be dismantled and those factories you are bringing here and, for whose benefit, it is for you to tell us.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Will you then clarify one thing? You have allowed them to produce hydraulic jacks. Is not the same thing produced abundantly here either in the small sector or the big sector?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I had replied to that question giving elaborate justification in each case. There are cases of this nature. If I remember aright six or seven cases were allowed, there is one case in which the machinery has been temporarily loaned to India with an underwriting that at the end of the tenth year the machinery will be taken back by the country concerned and, in the meantime, the entire production will be exported to that country. Now, if a machine is brought

from Great Britain to India on the stipulation that she will take back the machine ultimately and in the meantime whatever is produced in India shall be exported to Great Britain and we approve it, what is the disadvantage?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: What is the advantage?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: The advantage is that not a pie of my country goes out; the advantage is that my man gets employment; and the advantage is that I earn foreign exchange by the export. What is the economics of not agreeing to it? What is the economics of not agreeing to such a proposal?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, on a point of order. This is with regard to the machines. The statement refers to Starred Question No. 420. It is also 420. In answer to that question in the Rajya Sabha it was stated that it was a transfer of a plant of a value of Rs. 13.5 lakhs by a UK company to the Indian company; the plant is being purchased and it does not involve any foreign exchange...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): What is the point of order?

{Interruptions}

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: There are six or seven cases. In one case Rs. 13½ lakhs has to be paid but the entire production will be taken away. If the total production is worth more than Rs. 13½ lakhs...

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Let him clarify.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Without a guarantee, how can you give permission. Before permission is given the man has to give a guarantee. These are different cases. There are cases in which some money is spent but in lieu we are earning much more. That kind of thing is there. In the scooter case, for example, the Italians say that it is...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Why you import that?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I have explained times without number that the fee and price asked for drawing as well as supplying new machine and the technical know-how are fantastic. We had made a comparison. We found that not only the fee is very high but also it would take seven to eight years from the drawing board stage.. (Interruptions). These are the facts. I have already given all these facts to the House. There is nothing new...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: To the extent of 49 per cent they will exploit you. INNOCENTI of Italy...

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: INNOCENTI will have 20 per cent share in this case...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Messrs. Automobile Products will have...

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: This is a joint sector project. Messrs. Automobile Products will have 40 minus twenty. That is the position. Government will have 51 per cent. This is a joint sector...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): One of you must sit. Both cannot stand...

(Interruptions).

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: In this case it is a joint sector project. 51 per cent of the share will be of the Government. The Indian party will have 49-20, i.e. 29 per cent. The Italians will have 20 per cent. We have made them to agree that when the question of sale of their shares will come they will have to sell it to the Government. We keep them associated at the moment because it is an old plant. They are to erect it. They are to see that it is properly run. To that extent we shall keep their money. That money is kept in the shape of 20 per cent shares. That is what we have thought right. Someone may think a man's judgment is wrong, but there is nothing mala fide about it. That is what we have thought right for the country...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: You thought it right?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: At the moment, this is our right to think about the country (Interruptions). It is our right. It is not yours. After five years term if it comes to you we will gracefully give it up; you will have that right to think.

Sir, the next area of criticism is that larger houses and foreign concerns are being given a free hand. Before I quote figures to show how there has been a sharp decline in the number of Letters of Intent and licences issued to larger houses, I would like to ask what exactly do some of the hon. Members want and what concrete alternative policy they have?

I have been given a policy to implement by the Government and that policy is that larger industrial houses and foreign concerns will be allowed, on merits and along with other entrepreneurs to participate in the core and heavy investment sectors and expansion will be allowed to them in other sectors only in the interests of cost efficiency or export obligation. This policy has been evolved only two years back, after careful consideration and in line with the recommendations of the Industrial Licensing Policy Inquiry Committee. Once such a decision has been taken then it has to be implemented. The Government's decision is based on a conscious compromise between the need for preventing concentration of economic policy and encouraging new entrepreneurs on the one hand and utilisation of existing managerial and entrepreneur resources on the other. I do not, therefore, understand the kind of criticism which...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, on a point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): What is the point of order in that?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, I am on a point of order. I am not provoking anybody. The point is that I asked the question about hydraulic jacks.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Where is the point of order? You can say that he has not given correct information.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: He has made a wrong statement. He has now made a statement which says that the plant is on a loan basis.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I made it clear that my statement did not necessarily refer to the hydraulic jack. I referred to six or seven cases. I have not got the facts of each case.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: The point is with regard to the transfer of a hydraulic jack plant of the C.O.D. value of Rs. 12 lakhs by a Netherland Company where Indian company will have the production of hydraulic jacks of the order of 75 percent and 25 per cent of the production shall be exported. The foreign company would have a share holding of 40 per cent. If that is so, where is the loan programme implied here?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I am not saying about that.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Once the hydraulic jack business was an outright business, why does he say that it was on a loan basis? You can correct your answer. You can allow him to correct the record.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: No, I have never replied to the question of the hon. Member. I was giving an illustration out of the six or seven cases.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: No. You check up with the record. You can correct the information that you have given.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Mr. Kulkarni, you have made your point.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I again reiterate that the information which I gave was about the six or seven cases. One case about which I was speaking is also there. (Interruptions). I have said that my illustration does not relate to hydraulic jack. The hon. Member is speak-

ing about the hydraulic jack and what I said need not necessarily relate to hydraulic jack. Where is the point of difference I do not understand. I have not hidden any information. I have given all the information to the House and there is nothing to hide.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Sir, on a point of clarification. He is saying that in 1970, 20 licences were issued to larger houses. In 1971, 113 or something like that were issued. How many licence applications he has received and out of them how many he has rejected should also be made known to this House. If this is the policy for narrowing the gap and preventing concentration of wealth, we require an explanation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is a very wrong way of answering a question. We are not concerned with rejection. Supposing 10,000 applications have been received and the Minister has rejected 9,000 applications, he has every right to do so. Therefore, we are not much concerned with those which have been rejected. But from the statement that is made and also from the findings, it is quite clear that big business houses are being favoured. This is the thing. The hon. Minister has every right to reject any application but what about those which you have accepted? How do you explain for them? Why are you showing such big favours to big houses?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Sir, I was referring to the speech made by Shri Pranab Kumar Mukherjee in particular and later on, if I remember aright, by Shri Kali Mukherjee. They were telling that after the Resolution had been taken why we were allowing licences to large houses. I was making it clear to them that the Resolution taken originally and as amended by the revised licensing policy in February 1970 has reserved a place for the large houses.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Do you mean to say that the Resolution favours the large houses?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I cannot proceed in this way.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): You need not respond to this.

[The Vice-Chairman]

We cannot carry on the debate like (his. You had asked for some clarifications about the licences. He is going to say something. Before he completes the sentence, if you interrupt, how can he complete?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: That Policy Resolution as elaborated has allowed the larger industrial houses and foreign concerns that they would be allowed on merit and along with other entrepreneurs to participate in the core and heavy investment sector. Therefore, so far as the larger industrial houses are concerned or foreign companies are concerned, if it in any body's mind that they would not be getting any licence, it would be wrong. They would get some.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : May I intervene now?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: At the end. If he speaks later it would be better. I am only trying to remove the misconception that some friends may have about the policy. It reserved a particular area the heavy investment sector i.e. about 5 crore projects and the core sector have been given to large houses as stated earlier. They can come there. Therefore there will be some licences given to them. The question is have they been given licences at the cost of some other entrepreneurs or at the cost of somebody else? If it is a case of favouritism or a mala fide, then certainly I am answerable or my Ministry is answerable but if it is said that it is a violation of the Industrial Policy Resolution ipso facto because licence has been given, I am disputing that point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I ask now?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Let us have a procedure. Afterwards if you have anything, you can ask. The debate cannot proceed like this,

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Your statement is wrong.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I may be wrong. But my understanding is not that and therefore I am telling...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: He says in effect that the Government Resolution favours large houses.

SHRIBHUPESH GUPTA: I am quoting from official documents. First of all the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956 does not say many of the things that he is saying now.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Therefore I must respectfully submit that I have inherited that policy. This policy was taken by the Government of India before I became the Minister of Industrial Development. A policy has been given to me as the Minister. Till that policy is changed, my test is, am I faithfully administering that policy or not? If I am not faithful, certainly I am not faithful to my Government, I am not faithful to my Prime Minister, certainly I am not faithful to my Party but till that policy is changed by my Party or the Government or my Prime Minister, it is unfair to direct criticism against me personally and to make a hill out of a mole. Now I come to the figures. In 1970, 20 licences including one COB licence and 22 Letters of Intent have been issued to them when the total licences issued in the country were 363. COB licences are licences which are to be given with respect to the delicensed period.

There was a delicensed period with respect to certain industries. If somebody has set up an industry in that period or taken effective steps, after the modified Industrial licensing Policy Resolution came into effect or after the industry is brought within the scope of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, then that company or that undertaking or that businessman has got to be given the COB licence. Now 1970 is the year in which a lot of changes were made. Naturally every application for COB licence did not mature in that year; they did not reach their logical end for consideration. Many of them came up in 1971. Therefore there is no comparison between 1970 and 1971. In 1971, 114 licences including 87 COB licences and 38 letters of intent have been issued, out of a total of 626 licences issued. Taking out these COB licences which, we have been advised by the highest legal authority of the Government of India

cannot be refused, if effective steps had been taken or the project itself had been set up during the delicensed period prior to 1970, the percentage of licences issued to larger houses, when compared to the total licences, is only 7.9 per cent in 1970 and 8.5 per cent in 1971.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, on a point of order. You should protect the Members from this sort of thing. Percentage is not required. Everybody knows that terms of percentage it may be...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, under the shelter of point of order you cannot go on interrupting.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: What about the value of the licences?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): No, no. This cannot be; the Minister will go on.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Sir, repeated reference has been made to the Dutt Committee. The Dutt Committee found that the share of the larger houses was very high, in fact it was 14.3 per cent, 14.46 per cent and 17.19 per cent in the years 1967, 1968 and 1969 respectively.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: What is the value involved?

(Interruptions)

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Sir, this is not the way to maintain decorum in the House. The percentage has got to be given because this change of policy took place as a result of the Dutt Committee.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is what the Dutt Committee said in its...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Let the Minister continue Don't go on interrupting.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Minister is deliberately misleading the House,

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you must co-operate with the Chair.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: But he is misleading the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Let us understand the procedure.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : A series of distorted statements are being made and you want us to sit tight here.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): If there is distortion there is a way of tackling the Minister but you cannot go on like this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have got the Dutt Committee Report here. I knew this; I anticipated he would say this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Please do not interrupt.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And this is what the Monopolies Enquiry Commission has said. 'Proliferation of different industries and multiple licensing were not necessary'. This is what they have said. And now we are told that it is insignificant.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Please allow the Minister to proceed.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Sir, the Dutt Committee found that the share of the larger houses was very high but I am now giving the figures. I can tell the hon. House that the share of the larger houses was 14.3 per cent, 14.46 per cent and 17.19 per cent in the years 1967, 1968 and 1969 respectively.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Percentage of what?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Of the licences issued.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: What is the amount of money involved?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is not the point. Can you explain to the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta] Minister ? I have failed. The number of licences which the Birlas may get or the 75 monopoly houses may get may constitute one percent of the total but they may get away with 30 per cent in value involved by the licences. That is the finding of the Mahalanobis Committee; that is the finding of the Monopolies Commission; that is the finding of the Hazare Report; that is the finding of the Dutt Committee.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: The percentage of licences issued to the larger houses is 7.9 per cent in 1970 and 8.5 per cent in 1971. Certainly this is a significant decrease. Similarly, if we look at the letters of intent which is the real test in as much as licences have to be given if a letter of intent was issued before my taking over and the effective steps taken, the percentage of letters of intent issued to the larger houses was 5% in 1970 and only 3.7% in 1971, when I have been the Minister. So far as licences go, hon. Members know that they are mostly by way of conversion of letters of intent and only a portion of them were issued as direct licences. Hence, in most of the cases where licences were issued, they have been issued with reference to approvals given earlier to 1971 or 1970, as the case may be. The number of new undertakings allowed in these licences is only 2 in 1970 and 3 in 1971. Similarly, among the letters of intent issued, 3 are for new undertakings in 1970, and 4 in 1971. These approvals have been given after careful consideration in line with the Government's policy of channelling resources of those houses in the core and heavy investment sector. I alone do not deal with these cases of large houses. There is a definite procedure laid down for it. Each one of the cases is carefully considered on merits and cleared by the Cabinet Committee Economic Coordination wherever necessary after following the requirements of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, whenever an undertaking is registered under that Act. None of these letters of intent or licences for new undertakings either in 1970 or 1971 has gone to the Birlas.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: What of that ?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Reference was made about a company by Shri Gupta, about Century. I do not know what Century. Is it Century Enka

or what ? Shri Bhupesh Gupta referred to it and he referred to one Hada of the Birlas and then spoke about a Century which is going to get from my hand a licence. If he is referring to Century Enka Company, Century Enka Company's case is with the Petroleum and Chemicals Ministry. I do not directly deal with it. The Petroleum and Chemicals Ministry I do not directly deal with it. The Petroleum and Chemicals Ministry is dealing with it in consultation with the Law Ministry. While sitting here and after hearing the charge, I wanted to have a note on it. And from the note I find that Petroleum and Chemicals Ministry is taking a paper to the Cabinet on it. But wild charges have been made against me that I am trying to give them the licence. I am not the Petroleum and Chemicals Minister, nor am I dealing with this case directly nor this has anything to do with any Hada of any Birla. It is the Petroleum and Chemicals Ministry dealing with it and they will be going to the Cabinet certainly and collectively the Cabinet will take a decision. But this kind of throwing charges against people only to blacken the mind of the people through newspapers is not fair. This is certainly very condemnable and without having facts, an hon. Member should not do it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): How much time do you want more, Mr. Minister?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Another ten or fifteen minutes Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tomorrow.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not after six.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: He has brought certain personal charges against me. He said that I was a lawyer of Turner Morrison Company. I understand that this morning also, during the Question Hour, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta as well as Dr. Mathew Kurian referred to Turner Morrison & Company and my fees as their lawyer at the rate of Rs. 1700/per day. I am glad that they pay tribute to me as a lawyer and that I was worth Rs. 1700/-perday. I am deeply obliged to them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We were also surprised a little to hear it. So you need not be obliged to us,

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY : Please take your seat and kindly listen to me. I am a lawyer. Certainly in the period when I was not a Minister either in Assam or here, I resumed my practice. I had practised in the Assam High Court as well as in the Calcutta High Court and in some of the famous litigations I was appearing as a lawyer. What is wrong in appearing for some of the directors of Turner, Morrison and Company? I do not understand it. Why has it to be brought in here? I appeared for some of the directors of Turner, Morrison and Company, including one director who was an ex-Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India. He appointed me as his lawyer. I appeared for him and in that connection in Calcutta I stayed in hotels like Grand Hotel, Park Hotel and Inter-Continental Hotel. I do not understand the reference to the hotel called the Park Hotel. I know Shri Jyoti Basu has some connection with Park Hotel. I have no connection with that hotel owner. I as a person paid for my stay or my client paid the bill as part of my fees, if the understanding was that the bill would be paid as part of my fees; it was paid. What is wrong in that ?

SHRIMAHAVIR TYAGI: The point is clear. Do not bother about it.

SHRI MONORANJAN ROY: On a point of order. He has mentioned a gentleman who is not present in the House and he has wrongly mentioned him.

(Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Order, order.

SHRI MONORANJAN ROY: I am on a point of order...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It does not reflect his heavy earnings from the Mundhras.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): What is your point of order?

SHRI MONORANJAN ROY: I am on a point of order. He mentioned that

he was in Park Hotel when he was practising before he became a Minister either in Assam...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): What is your point of order?

SHRI MONORANJAN ROY: \_\_\_\_\_ or here as a Central Minister, but he said he has not got any relation with Park Hotel, only Mr. Jyoti Basu has. How does he know it? He is not a Member of this House. He cannot mention something about a person who is not a member of this House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): No point of order here...

(Interruptions.)

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I should be given protection.

(Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Order, order.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I should be given protection. In the same way when I came to the Supreme Court in connection with cases I used to stay in the Ashoka Hotel or in the Inter-Continental Hotel. If there is anything against the management, am I to be answerable for it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I never objected to his living in a hotel. He was sitting with Mr. Mundhratill midnight and the latter was giving him extra fees.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Along with you !

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): This way we cannot complete the debate.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I did not want it, but unnecessarily these things have been brought in.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Calcutta Bar knows and a number of lawyers know that Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury was brought from Gauhati to appear,

[Shri Bhupssh Gupta]

I would not go into the other part of the story. That is also in my record. That story would be a bad story. But he was brought from Gauhati as if the Mundhras did not have a lawyer.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Please go on.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: If that be the anger of a Calcutta citizen that an Assamese came to Calcutta for practice. I cannot help it. Nor can I put out that fire. I cannot help it,

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): The House must be prepared to sit very long if this is the way the discussion goes on.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Moin-ul Haque Choudhury was sitting with the Mundhras till midnight. We can sit longer.

6 p. m.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Let the Minister complete his say. If you have anything more to add, you can add. Please continue.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Choudhury was canvassing for somebody being appointed as a Judge. Well, shall I say more?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: All kinds of things like this are said. Sir, a reference has been made that when I go to Calcutta, Birlas men receive me. This is really a serious aspersion on the hospitable Government of West Bengal. They have got cars, there is the Governor's A.D.C. to receive me every time. When I go to Calcutta, Congress friends also come.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have no objection. I only admired Birlas' hospitality.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: When I go there, many people come to receive me. And one or two industrialists might come to receive me along with others on some occasions. I was not asking them to come. (Interruptions) Please listen. After the last alliance of the Communist Party and the Congress in West Bengal in all my election campaigns, every-

where Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's party's people also came to receive me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: If such casual association changes a man, if it changes his character, his impartiality, I would have been a CPI man, and I would have completely changed by that association in the one month in West Bengal where I also was canvassing for his party men. I do not think that this House should take note of this kind of aspersion. This is playing to the gallery. I have been received by CPI people, garlanded, eulogised as a great leader. I do not know what has happened in these few months. When the Coca Cola debate took place in this House if the record of this House is seen he himself complimented me as a man of honesty and integrity.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I never said that; neither did I say the other things.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I do not know what has happened since then.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: About the election fund, you said it as your personal property.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: You have spoken enough about the election fund.

{Interruptions.}

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): This kind of debate between the Minister and the hon. Member is not good.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: If the hon. Member thinks that it is his right to bring charges, we have to defend ourselves.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): You need not actually answer every point and every comment.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Sir, I am not looking at him. I am talking to you.



SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What about Mr. Suri and others?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): You cannot bring in new things. Mr. Gupta, he is replying to the debate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is a debate. That is why I mentioned it.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: It is quite out of order to cast personal reflections. Let him reply to the debate. These things are irrelevant.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You may not like it. But I raised this point and I am entitled to a reply.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI V.B. RAJU): Let the Minister complete his reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If he does not feel like, let him not reply.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I do not know what has happened to him. On every occasion such abuses are being hurled against me by a senior Member. I would request him as an elder Member to have some consideration for a younger Member and a younger brother and not to treat me like this and bring such charges. He can ask me about all these things outside and I can clarify. But this is not the way and by this he is not serving either himself or me. I can tell him that he may not understand me, but the bulk of the Hon. Members are convinced that there is something personal between him and me. Otherwise, this kind of things should not happen. I did not send telegram as a private citizen to the then Industries Minister recommending anybody for a scooter project.

(Interruptions)

He has mentioned Mr. N.C. Suri Mr. Toka Choudhury. These people have never come to me for any favours or anything to anything to be done about anything. He has said that I had connections with Mr. Ranjan Shah or Vijay Shah. I do not know the man far less of any connections with him. He has brought the name of one Mr. Qureshi, a P. A. in my Ministry. There are so

many officers in that Ministry. He is one of the lowest men. Nobody has spoken a word, about that boy. If there is any charge against him, I welcome it. Mr. Qureshi is not my relation. He was another Deputy Minister's P. A. When I became Minister he came to my staff along with many others. If there is any charge against him, instead of mentioning about him in the House, he could have come to me and I could have looked into the matter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He had two diaries, one for shady deals and another for for official deals.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: In the same way I was really very much pained to see him bring the name of a very senior colleague of mine, Shri Umashankar Dikshit, who was not present in the House. His name was brought in and a hint was thrown but not elaborated. I do not know what answer I am to give. He is not in the House. No notice was given to us. If a charge has to be brought against him...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have brought no charge. All I said was that Birlas are trying to get close to Mr. Uma Shankar Dikshit. I said I have very great regard for him. But he should not allow such things to happen. Here is a picture of Mr. B. R. Mohan along with Mr. Kapur, a Member of this House, Mr. B. R. Mohan paying tribute and claiming to be a family friend of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, paying tribute to Mr. Karaka, a Nehru bairer all his life. All these things are becoming mysterious for us. I wanted a clarification. It has nothing to do with that. Here is a picture of a family friend of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru paying tribute to Mr. Karaka who had attacking Mr. Nehru during his life time. Even in this paper Mrs. Indira Gandhi is attacked by Mr. Karaka. It says that Mr. B. R. Mohan is embracing Mr. KaDur, a Congress Member on that side, who claims to be the political Private Secretary. I do not know.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: If I am not to reply to this debate who is to reply I do not know. If he did not mean anything against Shri Uma Shankar Dikshit his name should not have been brought in. If he had so much of respect,

[Shri Moinul Haque Cloudhury]

even before I pointed out and even after that, he should, have privately advised Shri Dikshit that his name should, not be mixed up with the Birlas instead of bringing his name in the House. This is not the way. The honourable gentleman is using his privilege in a very, very special way.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, on a point of order. I am not abusing my privilege. I never linked up the name of Mr. Karaka...

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I did not say "abusing".

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : All I said was these big business people, who have already got you, are trying to come near Mr. Uma Shankar Dikshit and people close to Mrs. Indira Gandhi. I maintain it. I can prove it. Let there be a commission of enquiry and I shall prove that Birlas and others are trying to lobby very high quarters. People close to Mrs. Indira Gandhi are being approached by Birla men, Tata men, by other people. Therefore, I expressed apprehension for my friend, Mr. Dikshit.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I wish Mr. Bhupesh Gupta God-speed in trying to divide us. This is the last weapon in his hand. But I am sure he will fail.

Sir, I now come to Mr. Niren Ghosh...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is what Mr. Morarji used to say. I do not want to divide you.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I now come to the speech of Mr. Niren Ghosh. While speaking about the car project...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The honorable Minister knows how a financier came here. I should, like to know who brought these financiers.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: You will bring all of them. I am now coming to the car project to which Shri Niren Ghosh referred, to. He said that Birlas have been given foreign exchange. Now for the manufacture of the present

cars, every company gets some foreign exchange because 100 per cent Indianisation has not been achieved in any of the car plants. So a percentage is still to be imported. Somebody has Indianised 98 per cent, somebody 99 per cent and somebody 97 per cent. This is with regard to the three car companies. So some foreign exchange has to be released for normal production. But beyond that, if the hon. Member says that for changing any of their machines or any such thing, they have been given foreign exchange, I would say that no foreign exchange has, been given...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: No, no. I put a straight question to you. You are forgetting it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. R. RAJU): Let him complete.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: He has not replied to my question. I seek your protection. I said, that for the improvement of the present model, Birlas were allocated foreign exchange. Is it true or not.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: It is not true that for improving the present model, Birlas have been given any foreign exchange. It is my straight answer.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: It is not true?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: No.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I question it. I will come back...

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: You may come back. There is no point in threatening. I will be guilty of breach of privilege if I am making a false statement.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Birlas themselves say so. {Interruptions}

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): When the Minister has denied it, you should not pursue it further.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: The hon. Member likes Birlas

to be more truthful than us. What can we do?

Then the next thing is rather very painful.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Painful?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Yes. He said that in order to help Sanjay Gandhi, the present small car proposal of the Government of India has been shelved. This is not true.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: 100 per cent true.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I refute this allegation that the public sector project has been given up for other than valid reasons. First of all, it has not been given up.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: No, Sir, I seek your protection again.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): No, no, plc.se sit down.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I have got a letter from the Prime Minister in which she says that public money should not be tied up in such projects and it should be better utilised elsewhere. I would, like to know whether he is true or the Prime Minister is true.

AN HON. MEMBER: Read the letter.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I do not know what the Prime Minister has written. I have not got a copy of it.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: What are those valid reasons?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I am giving you the facts. About this car project, for collaboration with the Renaults we went to the Cabinet. Now the position is that in the list of drawing up the priorities for the Fifth Plan, this project has also to be fitted in. This is a test which all public sector projects are subjected to. This is indeed rightly so. It will take some more time before the Planning Commission brings up before the Government the scheme of priorities for the Fifth Plan. Till

that time the Government is not in a position to take a final decision about this car project. And to that extent the decision has been postponed.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: We were told the other day that it has been rejected by the Planning Commission.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Who told you?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Mr. Subramaniam was here. We were discussing the Mid-term Appraisal of the Fourth Plan.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: I never said that. It is no use attributing such statements to me. I never said that the Car project has been rejected. What I say is that the decision has been postponed...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : It is stalled so that Sanjay Gandhi can come up.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY : ...till the priorities in the Plan are re-fixed.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: It is being stalled and it would never come.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Well, it will certainly be considered on its merits. If it does not get the priority, that is a different position. But till now the priority question has not been decided. I talked to my colleague, Shri Subramaniam, the Minister of Planning. He told me that by about September they would be able to decide about priorities and, by that time probably we will be able to decide about it. Therefore, to attribute motives about it...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I reserve the right to bring the Prime Minister's letter and read, it before the House.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: ...and to say that the Government has rejected this project only to help Sanjay Gandhi is really unfair...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: It is true.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: With all the emphasis at my command..

(Interruptions.)

AN HON. MEMBER: He has got every right to emphasis this point, the Prime Minister's son cannot be barred from attempting it.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: There is also a distinction between the letter of intent given to Sanjay Gandhi and our project. In his case he has been asked to develop the technology indigenously. He has not been allowed any foreign collaboration and he is making an effort about it. In our case it is a case of foreign collaboration with a renowned company Renault of France. There is a distinction between the two. Sanjay Gandhi was not the only person who has been given letter of intent. Many others have been given letters of intent...

SHRI MAHAVIRTYAGI: How many?

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: As many as eight letters of intent have been given. Therefore, Sanjay Gandhi is not the only blue eyed person. There are others, and every one of them has been given this privilege to develop local technology and to produce cars, if possible, in India. None of them has been stepped. Therefore, to single out Sanjay Gandhi probably only for the fault of his being the son of the Prime Minister of India, I feel, is not fair. And to think that the sons and daughters of Ministers have no right to live is also not fair. They have also the right to live. If others' sons and daughters can develop indigenous technology, can become industrialists, what fault has this young man committed that he should be denied this privilege? It cannot be the privilege of the opposition to drag the name of the Prime Minister... (Interruptions) it cannot be the privilege of the honourable Member in the Opposition to take the name of the Prime Minister like this or to drag the name of her Ministers in season and out of season to say anything they like, sometimes putting with Birlas, sometimes accompanying the Mundhra, to the hell or heaven...

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order. The honourable Minister should not compare himself with Mrs. Indira Gandhi. He has said one thing. Mine is quite different. Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury, although you said in Assam... (Interruptions) Do not mix up the two.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): There is no point of order.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY: Once again I beseech my honourable friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, not my friend, but my honourable senior, who is senior in parliamentary experience, senior in age, to have a little consideration for me. I would not mind being guided by him. But let him give me advice bona fide; when he finds anything wrong, he can take me aside and tell me and see whether I correct myself. This is not the way on every matter he comes up without having facts with him. Somebody tells him something and he believes it. Somebody told him that I stood in the way of a samjhota between the Congress and the CPI (Assam) and he believed it. Somebody told him that I said in Assam that he was of nuisance value in Parliament, he believed it. He does not ask me. Can I not have the privilege of being asked, "Did you say so?" should he be so unfair? I pose this question: Should he be so unfair? I may have many enemies for I am in charge of a sensitive Ministry. In this Ministry I am liable to make enemies. People go and whisper to him. Is it not his duty as my senior to give me a chance and ask me "What did you say? Did you say that I am only a nuisance value?" After training for 20 years in parliamentary life in Assemblies and now in Parliament, can a senior be referred to like that by me? Lot of things are carried to him. I know that. Things were attempted to be carried even to the Prime Minister, sometimes by twisting the proceedings in the House. Such are some of the people around us. I respectfully once again request him not to treat me like this. I have nothing against him personally. I have the greatest respect for him as a Parliamentarian and as a leader. If there is anything, he can take me into confidence and talk to me about it. If I cannot satisfy him, he can then come to the House.

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV: On a point of order. May I ask the hon. Minister whether he has not learnt the lesson from his experience that his company or association will only do him harm and it will not strengthen democracy?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You leave aside that. I had brought to the notice of the hon. Minister in this House the question of unauthorised expansion. In reply to Question No. 557 he said that no industrial licences were issued to regularise illegal and unauthorised expansion. Even today he has said that Messrs. Chaliha Rolling Mills (Pvt) Ltd., 5, Mission Row, Calcutta, was given COB Industrial Licence No. L/IA/(7)(2)/71/LE-II-1141/70 dated 21.1.1971 for capacity expansion of (a) 3,700 tonnes of galvanised barbed wire and (b) 1,300 tonnes of Concertina barbed wire per annum, though it was reserved exclusively for small scale industrial sector. It was in the reserve list. Then it was in the banned list. But this was ignored and licence was given. Can he deny that I have given the Licence No.

SHRI MOINUL CHOUDHURY: From the date it appears that this was given two months before I became the Minister. But I would certainly look into. I cannot say anything off hand on this,

श्री गणेशी लाल चौधरी : मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से एक क्लेरिफिकेशन यह चाहता हूँ कि अभी जब माननीय श्री बनारसी दास जी बोल रहे थे, तो उन्होंने इनलप-पिलो की बात कही और साफ शब्दों में कहा कि यह राजनीतिक दबाव पर दिया गया। मैं मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि वह कौनसा व्यक्ति है जिसको इनलप-पिलो के सम्बन्ध में उत्तर प्रदेश में लाइसेन्स दिया गया। क्या माननीय मंत्री जी उसका नाम बतलायेंगे ?

श्री मोइनूल हक चौधरी : अगर कृपा करके नाम बतलाया जाय तो कह सकता हूँ। इतने लाइसेन्स दिये जाते हैं, मुझे कैसे मालूम हो सकता है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): The House now stand adjourned till 11 A. M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at twenty-five minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 10th May, 1972.