

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN CHARGE, DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND IN THE MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI OM MEHTA) : Ten rupees.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Then he will give me three rupees more. So I can easily get this document from the Income-tax Department.

SHRI OM MEHTA : I think he has never paid anything because he does not know how much is it he paid.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You should not treat it like that. All right. But Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury avoids saying "public" although the word "public" is there in his own statement. Now, Sir, this is reported in the Press. The whole country knows about it. Therefore, the Government must make its position clear in regard to this matter. I have said so many other things. I need not go into them. Therefore, I have given notice of short-duration discussion and I hope Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury's statement and the related matters will be discussed in the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : All right, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta,

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You must not let this Minister to get away. Sir, he has been caught red-handed, absolutely red handed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : All right, you have made your point. Let us pass on to the next item.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I hope something will be done on Monday. I am giving prior notice that the Prime Minister should be informed. When she replies, this point has got to be covered in the reply.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Resolutions. Mr. Nand Kishore Bhatt.

SHRI OM MEHTA: We can take it up after Lunch so that there will be continuity.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhatt, do you want to start after lunch?

SHRI NAND KISHORE BHATT (Madhya Pradesh) : All right, as you please.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Then we will adjourn till 2-30.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What about the list of business for next week?

SHRI OM MEHTA : Tomorrow.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, on Friday generally the list of business is announced.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : On the last day of the week.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then he should include in the list of business list- Bill to abolish the privileges and rights of the ICS, that is to say, a Constitution Amendment Bill to delete article 111 from the Constitution. He should find out what happened to this Bill. Secondly, there should be the Press Bill to delink the Press from the monopoly industrial houses and also to bring about diffusion of ownership. Sir, it is said that the Bill is ready. Why are they not bringing this? Is it because some Press barons are opposing it?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : All right, please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am giving them notice so that tomorrow they should announce it also. It will save the time of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : All right. The House is now adjourned till 2-30 P.M.,

The House adjourns in the interval of Lunch at fifty-five minutes past, twelve of the clock.

The House re-assembled after Lunch, at half past two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MAMUNJI) in the Chair.

RESOLUTION *RE* SETTING UP OF A STANDING COMMITTEE FOR ENSURING INCREASED PRODUCTION

SHRI NAND KISHORE BHATT (Madhya Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, with your permission I beg to move the following Resolution :

"Having regard to the urgent need of increasing production and higher productivity in all spheres of the nation's industrial

activity, this House is of opinion that Government should set up high level Com-mittee consisting of Managerial experts, Trade Union representatives, top Economists and Members of Parliament, to make recommendations, within a period not exceeding three months, for the setting up of a standing machinery to implement the said objccii\<".

Sir, before I make my observations on this Resolution I would like to make it clear that by mentioning industrial activity I menu il in i wider sense which, besides industrial ai ti also includes agricultural activity.

Our country since its independem e has bei Q Stl iving for democracy, secularism ar.d socialism i.e., an order which should bring prosperity to the people in a!! aspects of their life. It is this basis which iias consolidated tlie country and has also been the basis for om- economic struc ture. During the last twentyfive years we have had three wars ; we had two droughts. Tlie last war we had was with Pakistan which was thrust upon us by Pakistan. But in spite ol that this country has survived for the r< that the people have faith in the objectives thai I have mentioned above. Now that we have won a big war, it is necessary for us, as has been rightly pointed out by our President in his Address the other clay dial the countiy should set before itself the target of fighting poverty. We want to remove disparities and we want injustice io end in all spheres. For this purpose it is necessary must ci - centrate on how best we can increase pro lion in the country, hon- be-; we can UM n productivity in the country. Wealth, before we talk of distribution, has to be produced. And if poverty has to go, if disparities i\dlr to be banished, it is necessary that the country's attention, the attention of every individual, high or low, in the country, should be dh toseehow best we cm increase production ind achieve higher productivity. Sir, in tlie industrial field, attempts hav been made tt. have work studies as condition precedent foi er production and increased productivity, tt has been said in all expert studies that workers should also li' taken into confid As one who has been connected with the productivity movement in this country, I have found that all the ideas whil li ha e been propagated or advanced by tht National Productivity Council have been mostly theoretical. There have been various ideas, st tions and recommendations and attempts should have been made to see that those intentions and

recommendations are implemented and put through. Then only the amount of confidence and awareness created among the workers can be utilised for increased productivity. Awarness is one thing anti to make the best use of that awareness is quite another. It is in this respect that the authorities, if I may say so, have not been able to rise to the occasion. This is one of the reasons why in spite of all the efforts made by the w.irking class, we have not reached the targets whil li we should have reached.

I had occasions to go to some economically advanced countries and there I have seen the amount of understanding which exists between different sections of society. For instance, take Japan which was completely ravaged during tin second world war. Today by dint of hard labour and by dint of understanding between workers and management, and by the attitude Government has taken to promote agriculturl industry and other industrial sectors, Japan is one of the most highly advanced countries in the world, lake another country, namely, West Germany. Recently I had a chance to visit this country. There some friends spoke to me about East Germany. I was told that East Germany has concentrated its activities on basic industrie-. And as a result ef that, there i^ an apprehension in W. st Germany that East Germany may even surpass West Germany because people there have greater amount of discipline and understanding between the management rnd workers. East Germany can any time not only compete with West Germany, but even overtake it. This has been basically due to the fact that after the war East Germany, West Germany and Japan laid strees on production, more production and still more production. 'l here is some difference between higher produi tion and increased productivity. Higher production may be in the normal ised productivity means that the capacity of th' workers, to contribute his best is put tt.i the optimum use. This should be due to better working conditions or by keeping the workers in a betterstate of mice! or by creating an atmosphere for them where they can put in the best of their energies to increase production. This aspect of productivity needs more attention. Here the Government, th' community, the management and labour have to play thei* respective roles. In any such Qture ii is nut only the workers or management or Government officials who are at stake, but the whole community is al slake. It is the interes! of the community which ls the guiding and motivating factor for higher production and

[Shri Nand Kishore Bhatt] increased productivity. What can Government do? Normally it is expected of the Government to make available standardised raw materials. We see in West Bengal and some other States that many mills are closed. A number of mills have been closed, I mean, jute mills. That is the position with regard to the cotton textile mills also. It may be due to non-availability of raw materials or it may be due to shortage of power supply or it may be due to labour trouble.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI A. D. MANI): Due to strikes also.

SHRI NAND KISHORE BHATT: Sir, when I said labour trouble, I meant strikes and also lock-outs which are generally imposed by the management. Sir, I will talk about the Government later. Now, I will refer to the management side. There are various kinds of machineries in the industrial units. But, Sir, due to lack of interest on the part of the management in our country which is old and conservative, it has been using the machinery as people use the cow, that is, take the milk out of the cow without feeding it. They installed the machinery, but they never cared to look after it properly with the result that it deteriorates and ultimately, they come to grief. They have earned so much profit and can lead a fine life in bungalows. But, the intention the workers are also to be protected. The welfare of the workers also must be ensured. All these need proper planning. Then, Sir, comes the question of sharing of knowledge. In our country, in spite of the legislation or public opinion that has been mobilised by the trade unions, diehard managements have got reservations about sharing the knowledge with the workers. Now, knowledge is such a thing which cannot be the monopoly of either one sector or the other, because, ultimately, we are responsible for the interests of the community and from that point of view, there should be sharing of knowledge.

Then, Sir, comes the question of their attitude in regard to disciplinary matters. Very often workers are charged and disciplinary action is taken and there is no industrial peace. These are all matters which come within the purview of the management in line with the role of the Government. The Government should encourage collective bargaining and the Government should provide effective industrial relations machinery and they should also provide facilities. For establishing research institutes. Sir, the purpose

institutes can do a great deal in giving guidance to the workers and also to the industries on how best their movement can flourish.

Now comes the role of labour. Labour in this country knows its responsibilities and obligations. While they are prepared to contribute everything they can to increase production, the question of productivity depends more on the management, more on the company, more on the government measures, and without these productivity will not increase. Now comes the question of incentives and sharing the gains of productivity. On the question of incentives, I would like to draw your attention to a Report which was submitted by a Team, sponsored by the Government of India and which visited the United States, West Germany and the United Kingdom in 1957. On the question of incentives the team made it very clear that in these countries a very strong and positive attitude in favour of the incentives had been maintained. I mention your fears. It says that it appeared to be the established practice to pay bonus to the employees for achievements greater than those regarded as the standard performance. It further says:

"that the managements are agreed that the gains should be reflected in increased employees' earnings and that they recognised that to produce more with the same amount of human effort is a sound economic and social objective."

Sir, this is the view of this Team as a result of its visit to the various countries which are supposed to be economically very much advanced. Sir, on the question of sharing the gains or productivity, the Report says:

"In August, 1957, a Council on Prices, Productivity and Incomes under the Chairmanship of Lord Cohen was appointed in the United Kingdom to keep under review changes in prices, productivity and the level of incomes (including wages, salaries and profits) and to report thereon from time to time", having regard to the desirability of full employment and increasing and increasing standards of life based on expanding production and reasonable stability of prices."

Sir, these factors are no doubt very necessary. But I do not for a moment say that we should be guided by one or the other advanced

countries. I would say that whatever we do we should do and concentrate on our own resources, on our own efforts and standards so that the objective that we have of building up a new economic structure, should ensure employment, should ensure qualitative goods to the community, should ensure less price and, above all, should ensure better life to the community as a whole. And, of course, since the workers are a part of the society, we take it for granted that they will get their due share in the gains of productivity.

Sir, I do not want to take much of your time. But I would only say that this movement in our country has been no doubt there for the last 10 or 12 years. From this point of view. I say that there should be the involvement of all sections of society—be that labour, be they industrialists, be that agriculture, be that Government, be they economists. Unless we have involvement of all the sections, responsible sections, of society. I am afraid our objective of a better and increased productivity in this country will be difficult to achieve.

I would, therefore, urge upon the House to consider the desirability of making recommendations to the Government to the effect that there should be a standing machinery at all levels, right from the Central Government to the lowest level, where the concerned sections and interests of the society are there, so that whenever there is any problem—maybe due to the non-availability of raw material, maybe due to shortage of power supply, nonavailability of capital, labour or money etc., it is gone into thoroughly and timely measures are taken to remedy the same. That cannot be done by the present set-up because the present set-up—I want to be very modest in my observations—is not so active; it is not committed. From that point of view, I want the involvement of the Ministry of Industrial Development and also the Ministry of Labour with this machinery, so that on an emergency basis whenever there is trouble, whenever there is any requirement, that can be looked into, and our target to have more and more employment, our target to banish poverty, our target to remove existing disparities can be achieved, and this country can reach the highest levels of productivity so that not only we become fully self-reliant, not only we become self-supporting, but we are also in a position to make things available to people outside our country and together share their advancement.

Willi these voids. I move this Resolution.
Thank You.

The question was proposed.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार) :
माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्रस्तावकर्ता के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करते हुए कुछ अपनी बात भी कहना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ पर उन्होंने इन्क्रीज्ड प्रोडक्शन की बात कही है वहाँ पर इस विशाल देश को देखते हुए इन्क्रीज्ड प्रोडक्शन उसके साथ ठीक ज्ञात नहीं होता है। मैं एक उदाहरण आपके सामने रखूँ। जापान और हिन्दुस्तान दोनों ने इस्पात का उत्पादन एक साथ प्रारम्भ किया। जहाँ पर जापान को कच्चा माल हिन्दुस्तान ऐसे देश से मंगाना पड़ता है, वहाँ पर हमारे देश में इस्पात के लिए राँ मेटीरियल अपने ही घर में पर्याप्त मात्रा में है। फिर भी इस्पात के प्रोडक्शन में हम जापान से कितना पिछड़े गए हैं यह किसी से छिपी हुई बात नहीं है। इसी तरह से हमसे राँ मेटीरियल खरीद कर भी वह हमसे सस्ता इस्पात बेचता है और हम उसके मुकाबले इस्पात पैदा भी नहीं कर पाते और उसकी कीमत भी कम नहीं कर पाते। तो जहाँ तक इन्क्रीज्ड प्रोडक्शन की बात है इस वह विशाल देश को देखते हुए अपने लिए हास्यास्पद है।

श्रीमन्, जहाँ तक इंजीनियरिंग गुड्स की बात है, उसमें हमने कुछ प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाया है, लेकिन इस विशाल देश को देखते हुए वह भी पर्याप्त नहीं है। आज हमारी इंजीनियरिंग गुड्स का मार्केट है लेकिन हम उस मार्केट में कम्पीट करने की स्थिति में नहीं हैं।

उसी तरह से कभी भी विचित्र स्थिति हमारी हो जाती है जब हम देखते हैं कि कुछ उद्योगों के मामले में जिन में दुनिया में हमें एकाधिकार प्राप्त थी जैसे अवरक का उद्योग है, तो हम यह पाते हैं जो रिसर्च और डेवलपमेंट के ट्रेड कारण परिवर्तन आया उससे आज हमारा अवरक जो बिहार के खास उद्योग में से था निर्यात के लिये वह आज खानों में और कारखानों में पड़ा हुआ है और उसमें जो हमारा एकाधिकार था वह समाप्त होता जा रहा है।

[श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव]

उसी तरह से कृषि से संबंधित उद्योगों में जो परिवर्तन आ रहे हैं, उससे हम लाख के मामले में भी कम्पीट नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। यद्यपि यह कृषि से संबंधित है लेकिन यह केवल नाम के लिए है। इसलिए मैं औद्योगिक विकास मंत्री का ध्यान इस ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि दुनिया की एकमात्र लाख इंडस्ट्रियल रांची में है, लेकिन जैसी उसको प्रगति होनी चाहिये वैसी नहीं हुई। प्लास्टिक में जिस तरह से चेंज आया हर मामले में दखल देकर के, लाख आज उसी स्थिति में है कि प्लास्टिक के हर मामले में अपना कारनामा दिखा सकता है। लेकिन आज उसको देखने वाला कोई नहीं है। लाख में भारत को एकाधिकार प्राप्त है, किन्तु 50 लाख रु० का भारत को थाइलैंड से लाख का बीज मंगाना पड़ता है। तो जो इंडस्ट्री का बेस है, आधार है वह यहां पर रहते हुये भी हम उसका डेवलपमेंट नहीं कर पाते हैं।

उसी तरह से रूरल इंडस्ट्रीज की बात है। रूरल इंडस्ट्री के लिये प्रस्तावक महोदय ने साफ साफ नहीं कहा है। रूरल बेस्ड इंडस्ट्री को साफ करना चाहता हूँ। हिन्दुस्तान जो ग्रामों का देश है, जिसकी आत्मा ग्रामों में बसती है, उसमें जब तक ग्रामों का विकास नहीं होता है, कृषि के उत्पादन के आधार पर इंडस्ट्री का विकास नहीं होता है तब तक हमारे देश में तरक्की नाम की चीज सिर्फ शहरों में दिखाई पड़ सकती है। और ग्रामों में दिखाई नहीं पड़ सकती है, इसलिये रूरल वेस्ट इंडस्ट्री को भी मुख्य तौर पर नजर में रखा जाय और उसके विकास के लिये कार्यक्रम बनाया जाय।

श्रीमन्, जहां पर इंक्रीज्ड प्रोडक्शन की बात है, वहाँ पर आज इंक्रीज्ड प्रोडक्शन के साथ-साथ इंक्रीज्ड अनइम्प्लायमेंट को भी लेना आवश्यक है। आज देश में औद्योगीकरण न होने के कारण बेकारों की संख्या इतनी बढ़ी है कि अब तो सरकार जो पंचवर्षीय योजना में बेकारों के आंकड़े देती थी, वह आंकड़े देना भी वह बेकार

समझती है। अब तो गरीबी हटाओ और बेकारी हटाओ के नारे से ही सरकार सोचती है कि हम चुनाव जीत लेते हैं और इसलिए उसके बारे में कोई कार्य करने की जरूरत क्या है। जब तक इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट नहीं होता तब तक यह समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती, अगर देश में थोड़ी बहुत भी प्रोग्रेस होती तो आज देश में इतनी बेकारी न होती और वास्तविक दुःख की कहानी तब आरम्भ होती है, जब यहां के इंजीनियर बेकार रहते हैं, अच्छे से अच्छे मस्तिष्क वाले विदेशों में जा रहे हैं, इसलिए कि उनको यहां काम नहीं मिलता। विदेशों में ज्ञानार्जन करके वे यहां आना चाहते हैं, लेकिन यहां की बेकारी के डर से वे यहां आ नहीं पाते और हमारी सरकार भी उनके लिए कुछ नहीं कर पाती है। इसलिए आज समय आ गया है कि जब हमको इंक्रीज्ड अनइम्प्लायमेंट की समस्या पर भी विचार करना चाहिए, विचार करना जरूरी है और जो समिति इसके लिए बने वह यह भी देखे कि सचमुच में किस प्रकार की इंडस्ट्री लगाने से हमारे देश की मैन पावर को काम मिल सकता है। वैसे तो हम सरकार से आग्रह करते रहे हैं कि जो पंचवर्षीय योजना है उसको आप बदलिये और उसे बदल कर एक श्रम प्रधान योजना बनाइये और हम ने एक स्वदेशी योजना बना कर दी। हम चाहते हैं कि सरकार एक स्वावलंबी स्वदेशी योजना बनाये, क्योंकि मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर हमारी विदेशी ऐड बंद हो जाय तो हमारी योजना ठप्प पड़ सकती है। आज सरकार के दिमाग में यह बात आयी है जब अमरीका की ऐड बंद हुई है। आज सरकार कहती है कि हम स्वदेशी और स्वावलम्बी योजना बनायेंगे। ठीक है, यह अच्छी बात है, लेकिन मैं फिर कहूंगा कि यह योजना श्रमप्रधान होनी चाहिए और श्रमप्रधान योजना तभी होगी, जब डेवलपमेंट का बेस इंक्रीज्ड अनइम्प्लायमेंट को दूर करने के लिए होगा।

श्रीमन्, जहां तक प्रबंध की बात है, प्रबंध में लेबर को शामिल किये जाने की बात है, व्यवस्था में उसका पूरा सहयोग होना चाहिए इस बात से हम सहमत हैं। हमारे प्रस्तावक महोदय ने टूट

यूनियन्स के रिप्रेजेंटेटिव्स की बात कही है, लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज जो ट्रेड यूनियन्स के रिकग्निशन की बात घोटाले में पड़ी है, जब तक उसका फैसला नहीं कर दिया जाता कि कौन-कौन सी यूनियन्स किस-किस उद्योग में मान्यता पायेंगी उस समय तक लेबर का रिप्रेजेंटेशन ठीक तरह से नहीं हो सकेगा। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि ट्रेड यूनियन ही नहीं, इस तरह की व्यवस्था की जाय कि हमको प्रत्येक उद्योग की यूनियन्स का सहयोग उसमें मिल सके और प्रत्येक यूनियन को उसमें सही-सही प्रतिनिधित्व मिल सके। हमारे प्रस्तावक महोदय ने जापान की बात कही है। जापान के मजदूर प्रतिनिधि यह विचार करते हैं कि उत्पादन सचमुच में देश की संपत्ति को बढ़ाने का एक साधन है। अगर यह उत्पादन नहीं होगा तो वे देश को आगे नहीं बढ़ा सकेंगे और उसमें उनका कितना शेर होना चाहिए और उसमें उनको कितनी सुविधा मिलनी चाहिए, इस बात का तालमेल दोनों तरफ बिठाया जाता है। लेकिन अपने देश में जहाँ उत्पादन की बात आती है, वहाँ तो उद्योगपतियों के लिए विचार किया जाता है, लेकिन उसके साथ ही श्रमिकों की सुख-सुविधा की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की जाती है। अगर ऐसी बात नहीं होती तो आज जहाँ एक तरफ उद्योगपति दिन प्रतिदिन करोड़-पति से अरबपति होते जाते हैं वहाँ मजदूरों के लिए शुद्ध जल की व्यवस्था भी नहीं होती है, उनके लिए शोपड़ी की व्यवस्था नहीं, उनके बच्चों के लिए भोजन की उचित व्यवस्था नहीं, शिक्षा की व्यवस्था नहीं, अगर वे बीमार पड़ जायें तो अस्पताल में उनको दवा मिल सके, तन ढकने के लिए कपड़ा मिल सके, इसकी कोई व्यवस्था आज आप नहीं कर पाते। तो हम जापान की तुलना केवल उद्योग वृद्धि के लिए करें, ऐसा ठीक नहीं है। जिस प्रकार वहाँ का मजदूर उद्योग धंधों में उत्पादन बढ़ाना अपना कर्तव्य समझता है, वह समझता है कि उत्पादन बढ़ाना देश की सम्पत्ति को बढ़ाना है और उसमें उसका भी हिस्सा है, जब तक आप यह भाव अपने देश के मजदूरों में नहीं पैदा करेंगे और उनको सही वेतन और आवश्यक सुविधायें नहीं देंगे, तब तक इस क्षेत्र

में काम नहीं चल सकता और हम उन्नति नहीं कर पायेंगे।

एक बात और लीजिए। अभी कुछ चीनी की बात चली थी। ईख का उत्पादन किसान करता है। ईख का जो भाव है उसे केन्द्र की सरकार बढ़ाती नहीं, लेकिन चीनी उत्पादन करने वाले जो इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स हैं वे चीनी का दाम बढ़ाते जाते हैं। आज चीनी तीन, साढ़े तीन रुपये किलो बिक रही है। यह दाम आज उसका उपभोक्ता को देना पड़ता है। तो ईख उत्पादन करने वाले किसान के लिए आप कोई सहूलियत दे नहीं सकते, लेकिन आप सहूलियत उनको दे सकते हैं कि जो चुनाव के लिए आपको फंड दे सकते हैं। तो जब तक सरकार की मनः स्थिति ठीक नहीं हो तब तक हम उत्पादन करने वाले और उत्पादन में सहयोग देने वाले लोगों का सही-सही सहयोग नहीं ले सकते हैं।

अब, श्रीमन्, जहाँ पर प्रोडक्टिविटी की बात है तो हिन्दुस्तान एक विशाल देश है और कोई भी साधन, जिसको रिसोर्सज कहते हैं वह कोई भी रिसोर्सज नहीं है जो कि हिन्दुस्तान में उपलब्ध नहीं हो। ऐसा कम से कम हम नहीं मानते। मैं इसके लिए सिर्फ एक उदाहरण बिहार का देना चाहता हूँ। सचमुच में बिहार प्रदेश के अन्दर बहुत रिसोर्सज हैं। जब मैं उसका आंकलन करता हूँ, वहाँ की विधान सभा में पांच वर्ष तक रहने के कारण वहाँ की सारी स्थिति को जानने और देखने का हमें मौका मिला, तो हमने देखा कि बिहार एक ऐसा प्रदेश है जिसको भगवान ने अपने हाथों से रच कर के बनाया है और उसकी शोली में जितने भी प्राकृतिक साधन हो सकते हैं वह डाल दिये हैं जैसे कि जमीन और उसकी सिंचाई के लिए पानी की बात है तो बरसाती नदीका पानी हो या अंडरग्राउंड वाटर हो, पर्याप्त है, उसकी गोद में जितनी भी माइंस हो सकती हैं, मिनरल्स हो सकते हैं वह हैं, वह सारे उसकी गोद में भर दिये हैं। आज का युग स्पुटनिक युग है तो उसके लिए वहाँ यूरेनियम का भंडार है। वहाँ भगवान ने

[श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव]

लोहा और कोयला शक्ति-उत्पादन के लिए दिया है, ताम्बा उसको दिया है, चूने का पत्थर वाक्साइट दिया है, मैंगनीज दिया है, जितने भी प्रकार के संगमरमर के पत्थर हैं लाल, हरे, काले सब वहां है, चाइना क्ले भी बहुत है। तेजाब भी वहां मिलता है, और कीमती पत्थर भी वहां मिलते हैं। कोई भी खनिज-द्रव्य आप ले लें सारे के सारे वहां मौजूद हैं। लेकिन इतनी सारी चीजों के होने के बावजूद भी वहां महंगाई है, गरीबी है, बेकारी है, जिसका कि कोई कोई ठिकाना नहीं है। आप देखें कि रांची में, छोटा नागपुर में जहां कि हमारे कुछ उद्योग-धंधे खड़े हुये हैं, वह किसकी कीमत पर खड़े हुये हैं। वनवासियों की कीमत पर, वहां पर रहने वाले लोगों की कीमत पर लेकिन आज भी सरकार का एक भी उद्योग वहां ऐसा नहीं खड़ा हुआ है जो कि सोशियो-इकानामिक-टेकनो बेसिस पर हो। एक तरफ तो उद्योग खड़ा होता है और दूसरी तरफ वहां के जो वनवासी हैं उनकी आर्थिक और सामाजिक दशा अभी तक सुधर नहीं पाई है और न उन उद्योग-धंधों में उन्हें पर्याप्त नौकरियां ही मिलती हैं जिससे कि उनकी सामाजिक और पारिवारिक स्थिति में सुधार आ सके। तो इसलिए जब मैं बिहार का एक उदाहरण देता हूँ तो यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि प्रोडक्टिविटी के लिए हमारे पास बहुत रिसोर्सेज हैं लेकिन अगर देखा जाय तो बिहार प्रदेश के उन नैचुरल रिसोर्सेज का आज तक सही सही सर्वेक्षण भी नहीं हो सका है और सर्वेक्षण जहां हुआ भी है उसका प्रोडक्टिविटी के लिए कोई उपयोग नहीं है। आप वहां के बरीनी आयल रिफाइनरी के कारखाने का एक उदाहरण ले लें तो सरकार का एक सर्वेक्षण है कि उस आयल रिफाइनरी के वाई-प्रोडक्ट से 110 प्रकार के छोटे-छोटे उद्योग-धंधे खड़े किये जा सकते हैं लेकिन, श्रीमन्, अभी तक सिर्फ एक खाद का कारखाना टिम-टिम करके बन रहा है और वह भी पूरा नहीं हुआ है। तो मैंने एक छोटा सा उदाहरण मंत्री महोदय के सामने रखा और उनको स्वयं इसकी अनुभूति होगी कि अगर वहां एक पेट्रो-केमिकल कारखाना खोला जाय तो फिर

सैकड़ों करोड़ रुपये पूंजी लग सकती है और उससे न केवल हमारे बिहार प्रदेश को बल्कि दूसरे प्रदेशों को भी लाभ होगा और उसमें दूसरे प्रदेशों के भी अधिकतम इंजीनियरों को काम मिल सकता है, सारे उद्योग खड़े किये जायं तो 50 हजार लोग उस आयल रिफाइनरी के वाई-प्रोडक्ट्स में लग सकते हैं, पेट्रो-केमिकल कारखाने में लग सकते हैं। श्रीमन्, दुःख इस बात का होता है कि वहां पर नित्य प्रति इतनी गैस जल जाती है कि वह गैस करीब एक दर्जन नगरों के लिए पूरी तरह से जलावन का काम दे सकती है। वह गैस वहां नित्य जलती है और उसका कोई उपयोग नहीं है। इसलिये जहां प्रोडक्टिविटी की बात करते हैं तो फिर अपने देश में प्रोडक्टिविटी होगी कैसे ! पता नहीं सरकार ने इन बातों पर नजर डाली है या नहीं और अगर उसकी नजर जाती है तो फिर वहां जिस समय आयल-रिफाइनरी का कारखाना हो रहा था तो उसी समय वाई-प्रोडक्ट्स से बनने वाली चीजों के कारखाने भी उसके साथ-साथ खोलती, लेकिन वह भी हमारे यहां नहीं हो सका है। और, श्रीमन्, कृषि के आधार पर जो उद्योग-धंधे खोलने चाहिये वह भी आज तक हमारे इस प्रदेश में नहीं हैं।

श्रीमन्, अब जहां तक कि कमेटी बनाने की बात को प्रस्तावक महोदय ने इसमें रखा है तो उसके अन्तर्गत उसकी परिधि में, उसके रेफरेंस में कुछ और चीजों को भी जोड़ा जाना चाहिए जैसे कि किसी चीज का कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन क्या है और उसका डिफरेंट जगहों से जो कास्ट पड़ता है वह क्या है, और जो इंडस्ट्रीज डेवलप नहीं करती है तो उनके डेवलप न करने का कारण क्या है, उसकी वीकनेसेज क्या हैं और उस वीकनेस को कैसे रिमूव किया जाय, उसका भी हिसाब-किताब किया जाय और कम्परेटिव इकानामिक रिसोर्सेज और टेक्निक्स का भी लेखा-जोखा हो और कास्ट को कंट्रोल करने की व्यवस्था पर भी उसे विचार करना चाहिये।

श्रीमन्, इसी तरफ से कम्परेटिव डाटा कास्ट का लेना चाहिए। आज जिस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान में प्रोडक्शन होता है, उसी तरह के प्रोडक्शन पर

दुनिया के और देशों में उसका कास्ट क्या बढ़ता है और उसकी क्वालिटी भी क्या बढ़ती है इसका अंदाजा लेना होगा। आज का युग रिसर्च और डेवलपमेंट का युग है और उसमें इस बात को देखना अनिवार्य है।

इसलिए मैं प्रस्तावक महोदय के प्रस्ताव का अनुमोदन करते हुए निवेदन करूंगा कि यद्यपि ट्रेजरी बेन्च से वह इसको लाए है फिर भी यह प्रस्ताव सचमुच में बड़ा उपयोगी है, इस मानी में कि देश में प्रोडक्शन बढ़ता है लेकिन कुछ उसमें टूटि रह जाती है, जैसे कि प्रोडक्शन तो बढ़ता है लेकिन क्वालिटी गिर जाती है, साथ ही दुनिया की मार्केट में कास्ट के हिसाब से कम्पिटिशन में वह माल ठहरता नहीं, तो क्वालिटी के साथ साथ उसकी कास्ट को दुनिया की मार्केट के कम्पिटिशन में लाया जाए। इस सारी चीजों पर विचार करने के लिए यह समिति बने। इस समिति में जिन लोगों को रेप्रेजेंटेशन होगा उनमें लेबर की तरफ से रेप्रेजेंटेशन ठीक से आए और हिसाब से आए जिससे कि लेबर भी उस प्रोडक्शन को देश के हित में प्रोडक्शन समझेगा, अपने भी हित में प्रोडक्शन समझेगा।

इसलिए मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करते हुए सरकार से भी आग्रह करूंगा कि इस तरह की कमेटी बनेगी तो सचमुच में देश के अन्दर उत्पादन की क्षमता को देखते हुए, उसको बढ़ाने में समर्थ हो सकेंगे।

SHRI BAIACHANDRA MENON (Kerala) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. I do not know how far this Resolution can be of any help. After having read the Economic Review that has been presented to us recently, I am afraid we have got a picture now of collapsing industries. Our steel mills do not come up to the production targets. Our textile mills are in a crisis. Our major engineering units are not able to produce as they were doing before. All these powerloom factories are closing down. We have come to a stage where something is very bad and we will have to very seriously consider how to put these things right. During these twenty-five years we have found that a huge monopoly has already grown in the industrial field. In the agrarian sector the rich peasant and also the land monopolists control. The result

is that there is no planned production. If you are today in a position to say that you are producing sufficient foodgrains, you will have to yourself admit that you are importing foodgrains. If you say that in certain agrarian sectors production is improving, you will have to admit that in respect of sugar-cane you have not made much advance. You will have to admit that production of sugar is not coming up. Why is this ? It is because there is something wrong with planning. You are trying to have a plan whereby you allow the major sectors to remain outside Government control. It is the monopolists and the private people who dictate. There is monopoly in food grain purchase. Of course, you are trying to see that the Food Corporation comes up, but as it is you are not able to dictate and you are not able to fix the price of foodgrains. The money that is there in the black market tries to control all these important commodities. The result is that the sum of Rs. 4,000 crores black money is able to play havoc with the economy of our country. The huge monopoly stranglehold plays havoc with our industries. The green revolution has benefited only a few in the village where class contradictions have come to such an extent that even village life has become intolerable. This is what you have been doing. All your planning has been wrong. Can we set it right ? There is no use telling us that in Japan the production is so much, that West Germany has increased production and that the East European countries have increased their production. Ours is a developing country, a country which has not yet got out of the feudal stranglehold. It is a country which has already got a monopoly. It is a strange thing. While we are trying to industrialise, while we are just getting out of the feudal stranglehold, we have already established a monopoly in the industrial sector. And this is playing havoc with our economy. The restrictive trade practices of the monopolists and their control of the prices, their refusal to allow the raw materials to the smaller units, their dictating the prices in the case of certain commodities and the help that they get from Government, all create a situation whereby barring the monopolists nobody else can grow. Have we ever thought of the number of small industries that are closing down now ? What is the strategy during this period ? If it is anti-monopoly anti-feudal, you should take strong steps to control the monopoly. No legislation that control the monopoly. There will be loopholes. It is not that which is required.

[Shri Balachandra Menon] Government will have to take a bold step, take over all those industries which are controlled by the monopolists. That is the first thing that we have to do if we have to industrialise because monopoly growth will not allow the smaller industrialists and the medium-size industrialists to come up. The strength of the State sector, the dominance of the State sector, we thought might help the smaller people. But actually it helps those people and not the smaller people. If I want steel for some of the factories which we are running, I will not get it, they will get it. A corrupt bureaucracy and a very dominant monopoly together will blow up the entire planning. If I must get coal, coke or steel, unless I am able to bribe the officer concerned, I will not be given. Most of the small industrialists are today winding up the show and they are doing it because they do not get the raw material; they are doing it because they will not get the help that the Government has promised them. You say the banks are there to help you with the working capital. Some help from the banks might be there. But that will not get your raw materials. If you want them, you have to go to the blackmarket to get them and then you can compete with them. The result is unfair competition is going on, and in that the smaller fellow goes to the wall. Should we not feel sympathy for him? If you want to develop as a capitalist power, I have no quarrel with you; otherwise, the whole planning will have to change and in that we will have to see that we do not allow the monopolists to come up; we will have to see that the foreign Capital is not dominant in our country. And we will have to take over the foreign plantations, we will have to take over the foreign concerns because we cannot allow the drain that is going on from this country every year.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. D. MANI) :
Without compensation?

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON : As Gandhiji has said, about compensation . . .

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA
(Mysore) : He does not say that.

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON : "If my countrymen cannot bear the burden, how can I pay?" While speaking about compensation to the Landlords Gandhiji told Louis Eisher that compensation was impossible.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN
(Kerala) : Why should you be apologetic?

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON : Even their own leaders have been saying that Mahatma Gandhi has said that it is not possible. And how can you burden the poor man who is already starving and has already got a greater burden on him? Why do you compensate those people? They have already taken all that they have invested here, much more they have taken, and why should they continue? I do not know.

So, first of all, will you take over all the foreign concerns? Secondly, will you take over the important monopoly houses? Thirdly, will you have a new policy now of industrialisation? People say that our workers are indisciplined, that there is anarchy in production. The workers have tried their best. But what is the result? There has been increase in production, there has been increase in productivity. But what do they get? Yesterday, while I was reading a paper, I found that the Japanese industrialists were saying that the productivity skill of the Indian worker is 80 per cent of the Japanese worker while his wages are about 20 per cent. This is there, and that is why they say that India is a safe place for them to start industries so that they can have cheap labour. It is this cheap labour which brings them and other advanced countries to invest here. I would say first start with honest deal for the worker. Let us take him into confidence which we have not done. We have got so many rival trade Unions in each factory or industry. This has created inter-union rivalry. Every political party has its trade union. Let us all, including the Government, come to a decision where we will have industry-wise unions single unions and a single Central organisation where our differences can be sorted out by the workers. Why not we do it? You do not have the courage. All of us are making use of our political influence in the trade union circles. Sometimes it brings fratricidal war resulting in killings. The worker is fighting the worker. It often tends to complete annihilation of the militant workers and the cadre that we should develop. I would, therefore, suggest that the Government should come forward with a bold policy against monopolists. The Government should come forward with a bold policy for taking over the foreign concerns. The Government should also have a plan for proper production in the agrarian sector. Today it is

anarchy. You say there is no crisis in wheat. There is no crisis in rice. But you do not *get* groundnut, pulses or sufficient oil seeds. You do not get sugarcane. You do not get cotton. And then you take to importing'. Whatever you gain by stopping the import of wheat is being lost by imports of cotton. This is all because there is no planned production there. Sugarcane, for example, will be given up by an agriculturist if he finds some other crop is giving better return. So there must be assured return for the sugarcane crop. There should be assured adequate return for the groundnut man. There should be assured return for the pulses man, and this return should be almost alike ; otherwise he will switch over to something else. This sort of planning is not there. Every production in the factory and field will have to be planned if you must make a leap over the present unhappy situation. This has not been "done. The main difficulty is that the Government is not yet sure what policy it should follow.

It is good that you have got a huge mandate. I am afraid this will lead to complacency. I am almost afraid that it will again happen as it happened four years ago. I am afraid the same thing may not be repeated. You should make use of this opportunity for real improvement in the condition of masses for whom all of us have been pleading so much and whose case we have not taken up. The question is are we prepared to do it ? In that case a drastic new method of planning is necessary. You have got thousands of boys who are unemployed. Your co-operatives are controlled by fellows who can no more get licences for their industries and, therefore, they have become co-operative men and nothing more than that. The very vested interest is controlling the co-operatives. The very vested interest in the village, the rich peasant, is controlling the co-operative. Why not the producer ? You complain that factories are closing down. Then why not hand over the factories to the workers ? Do you mean to say that he cannot run it ? Give him technical help and you will be able to run every factory which has closed down. I have some experience of five factories which I have taken up. The workers are now controlling them. The only man who is an employee is the general manager. All the others are shareholders. The Government should help such things. A new outlook which places confidence in the producer in the field and greater confidence in the worker, will take you

forward. Otherwise the same old story will be repeated and we will be where we are and after five years, in another election a new situation may arise. Please avoid that, if you have sense. That is all that I have to say.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this House should be grateful to the hon. Member, Mr. Nand Kishore Bhatt, for moving this Resolution. I have no doubt that this is a very well-intentioned resolution because the pace of industrial growth in this country, particularly in recent times, have not been very encouraging. I would only quote two extracts from the Economic Survey of 1971-72 published by the Government of India. At one place this Survey says :

•'All things considered, the performance of the industrial sector is likely to continue to cause concern for some time to come.'

What exactly is the period of time, it does not say. It is like the repeated statement made by the hon. Deputy Minister for Agriculture this morning, when he was asked questions in relation to the difficulties experienced by the large masses of this country because of the very high price of sugar, that "the matter is under the consideration of the Government of India". The Economic Survey which ought to have been more precise and definite in regard to matters which it deals with, has simply stated that this concern is likely to last for some more time. At another place, this Survey says :

"There has been throughout the year under survey deeply felt concern over the pace of industrial growth."

Therefore, Sir, this Resolution is very well timed. In 1969 the rate of industrial growth in this country reached what is now termed as a peak level of 7.1 per cent.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM SAHA) in the Chair]

An industrial growth of 7.1 per cent in any other country would have been taken as no industrial growth at all. If we take the pace of industrial growth in Japan, in some of the East European countries, in West European countries, in Soviet Russia in the 1930's, it will be seen that this so-called peak growth of 7.1 per cent achieved in 1969 is really no achievement at all, and it is really no achievement compared to the problems of this country,

[Shri K. Chandrasekharan] ihe Industrial backwardness of this country, the industrial production that is necessary in this country in relation to its population. But what is the position in 1971-72 ? The estimate for 1971-72 of the industrial growth is put between 3.5 and 4 per cent. This is rather alarming so far as the rate of increase of industrial output in this country is concerned.

Sir, the suggestion of ihe hon. mover of this Resolution for the appointment of a committee is quite in tune—if I may say so with r< ipei I and without meaning any disrespect—with the trend in regard to the apologetic way of dealing with the problems that this country faces. Whenever there is something wrong, something going in a way which is not desired, a report is to be called for. A committee of officials and non-officials is to be appointed. And mors than the financial expenditure, a lot of man-hours of both officials and non-officials are spen on this issue, and the committee's reports never see the light ctf the day except for the formal placing before the Houses of Legislature of Parliament as the case maybe. I submit that so far as the hoour-able Mover's Resolution is concerned, i though the suggestion that a committee may be appointed and a report called for in this regard may be absolutely *bona fide* and made in good faith, I have absolutely no doubt to tell this House that the solution that has been suggested or indicated in this Resolution is no solution at all and that we have got to treat ihe problem of increasing the rate of industrial output and industrial growth in this country in a much more serious way if we are ever to deal with this problem. May I suggest certain aspects of the matter which are likely to solve the problem that we have in the matter of industrial production in this country ? The first and the foremost is the necessity to terminate the scheme of mixed economy which we have been following through in the Plans. And I do not know what exactly ihe Planning Commission is thinking in terms of the Fifth Plan the details of which are being worked upon. I have no doubt to suggest to the Government and to the Planning Commission that if the country has to improve, has to raise its industrial production, as it must, this scheme of mixed economy must be put an end lo. And so far as major industries are concerned, so far as heavy industries are concern I and et en so far as medium industries are com mould all be brought into the Slate sector,

under public undertakings. It is really strange that while we have not succeeded in increasing industrial production in the scheme of things created by mixed economy, the Government is still proceeding even with industrial licensing in regard to the major aspects of industrial production, particularly the location of steel plants, mini steel plants, in ihe private sector. This is an absolutely wrong policy. Some weeks back, probably in the previous Session, the honourable Steel Minister was confronted by large sections of this House to take a leftist and progressive view of things that the location of steel plants in the private sector has got to be countered. The honourable Minister had then stated that it was a decision taken earlier, before he had taken office. So far as the Government is concerned, there should be only one view of things and that should be the view of the Government as a whole, not of a particular Minister, not of a particular former Minister who might have been in charge. The location of steel plants in the private sector, therefore, requires a review, and if that is not done, in the long-range scheme of things industrial production in this country is likely to be endangered. May I now deal with another aspect whil h tied problems for us in the past and is probably continuing to create problems now .' That is the question of external assistance. We have not learnt to be self-reliant. Since ihe days of independence we have always thought of getting more and more of external assistance. The statistics that are being placed by the Government in regard to external assistance are, if I may say with respeei, misleading and inadequate. For example, for 1971-72 the gross estimate of external assistance is of the order of Rs. 778 crores. Again according to the Economic Survey the Mt assistance is of the order of Rs. 328 crores. This net assistance figure is reached after deducting amortisation payments to the extent of Rs. 284 crores, and interest payments to the extent of Rs. 166 crores. What a large recurring liability we have got to discharge in terms of finance is obvious from these figures. It had been stated before this hon. House off and on that financig of our industrial plants and planning by external assistance is not in the scheme of things ac present and that the idea is to reduce external assistance year by year. In 1967-68—if we take that figure—the gross external assistance was over Rs. 1,000 We will find that in 1967-68 external uce on account of P. L. 480 food was of the order of Rs. 285 oors. while in 1971-72 been reduced to the order of Rs. gg

crores. A good portion of the reduction in external assistance is only on account of the fact that external assistance on account of P. L. 480 food has been reduced because food production in this country had increased and there was lesser anti lesser necessity for imports of foodgrains into this country.

A third aspect of the matter is that we should try to import less and less of things into this country. We must be able, on the other hand, to export more of our surplus finished goods, but we should be cautious enough to see that we do not export our raw materials and finished goods which are required in this country just for the purpose of what has been often termed as earning foreign exchange. Here again, steel, which plays a vital part in the industrial economy of this country has not been properly dealt with by the government. We find that iron and steel are being exported out of this country. Figures that have been presented before this House show that in so far as export of finished mild steel during 1967-68 to 1971-72 is concerned the position is as follows. In 1967-68 we exported 4,34,000 tonnes of finished mild steel ; in 1968-69 we exported 6,10,000 tonnes ; in 1970-71 we exported 4,56,000 tonnes and during the months from April 1971 to January 1972 we have already exported 1,80,000 tonnes of finished mild steel. This steel is very much required in this country. Many of the States in this country are suffering from inadequacy of steel in so far as small and medium industries located there are concerned and we find that we have been continuously exporting iron and steel from out of this country just for the purpose of what may be called stabilising our foreign exchange position. Again, Sir, that has been a very wrong approach that we have been taking. The hon. mover of the Resolution rightly referred to the fact that his Resolution, while referring to industries, also referred to tie agriculture-based industries. That is very important and rightly he has referred to them. But, Sir, what is happening in this country ? So far as one or two States in the South are concerned, coconut is an agricultural product and production of copra and production of coconut oil are agriculture-based industries. But, Sir, on account of political consideration, we have decided to import more and more of Ceylon copra into this country and as a result, when the less priced Ceylon copra comes, the price of coconuts here falls, the price of copra falls and the price of coconut oil falls and because of the political considerations that we have had,

probably on account of the compelling circumstances in Ceylon, the price of coconuts and the price of copra in this country have been reduced to almost half in 1971-72 as compared to the price in 1970-71. The agriculturist is, I believe, hard hit. Unless this problem is tackled by the Government properly, no use or purpose will be served by appointing any committees. Thank you, Sir.

DR. K. MATHEW K. URIAN (Kerala) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the discussion on industrial development which is also related to productivity in industry is definitely a very vital one. But, Sir, unfortunately, the mover of the resolution has demanded that a committee be appointed. Sir, we have had the tragic experience, of committees and commissions in this House. On a vital issue like this, with deepening economic crisis, particularly in the industrial sphere as has been pointed in the recent "Economic Review", are we taking the view that committees be appointed rather than revising the basic policies ? I think the discussion should highlight the rotten policies pursued by this Government during the last twenty-five years. Sir, we have the 1948 Industrial Policy Resolution. What happened to these "cherished and wonderful" policies declared and presented to this House ? Sir, if I may say so, all those declarations of industrial policy have had a decent burial. What is left over is a kind of policy which looks to the interests of the monopolists, foreign collaborators and their benefactors abroad. And that is the policy today. Do we have a policy at all ? We do not have a long-term policy and we do not have even a short-term policy which is correct for the occasion.

Sir, in the Economic Survey of 1971-72, we see the very serious problem of declining growth rate in the industry. In 1968-69, the rate of growth in industry was 7.5% and it has been continuously going down to 4.8% in 1970, to 2 to 3% in the second half of 1970 and to 2% in the first eight months of 1971. This is an alarming rate of decline from 1969 to 1971, the period precisely when Smt. Indira Gandhi was talking many things about the so-called "Indira socialism". Industrial development has been going down. Sir, one should look into the basic reasons why industrial growth rate has declined during the last few years of the so-called "Indira Socialism" and the "Indira Wave."

[Dr. K. Mai hew Kurian]

I would, therefore, Sir, like io go back io some basic issues. Before I do that, I would like to refer to an editorial written in the "Times of India", dated the 13th March, 1972. They refer to the very absurd manner in which the Government is treating the question of lower industrial rate. Under the caption "Fooling No one", ihe Times of India, dated March 13, 1972 said the following :

"In November last year, Mr. Moinul Haque Choudhury sought to discredit the official index of industrial production, which showed that industry was in the grip of a recession on the grounds thai it favoured old and obsolete industries and did not give sufficient importance to the newer and more dynamic ones".

"What is more, he argued that these statistics did not reflect the spectacular growth of the small-scale sector at 10 and 11 per cent a year. Many people actually believed this astounding claim until they found out that the growth rate for small industries had been calculated without deducting the rise in the price of their products."

Is this the way in which the hon. Minister in charge of Industrial Development deals with the problem? Sir, the problem is not statistical. By statistical manipulation the Government of India cannot get away from the tragic faci of deepening economic crisis in industry.

Sir, the Economic Survey of 1971-72 very clearly indicates that in the small-scale sector, the industrial growth has not been 10 to 11%. On the contrary, the actual growth in small scale sector in 1969-70 was 3.4%, and in 1970-71 only 3.6%.

Sir, these are the facts. Against these telling facts and declining growth rate not only in large-scale industry but also in small-scale industry, we see the hon. Minister of the Government of India coming forward and saying that things are wonderful purely by statistical manipulation. If this is not to fool the people or to hoodwink the people, what else is it ? I would like to urge upon the Government that instead of statistical devices let us come down to the brass tacks of basic policies.

What is the policy ? Is the Government even trying to implement its own policy enunciated in the early 50s ? J would say 'No'. Instead of building up a self-reliant economy

and building up an independent economy, this Government under the leadership of the ruling Congress has ia fact developed capitalism. We have all the figures of increased foreign colla boration during the years of so-called 'Indira Socialism'. We have also the telling facts tint the hold of the 75 monopohy houses has increased from 46.9 per cent in 1963-64 to 53.8 per cent, according to the figures given by the Company Affairs Research Unit for 1970. We have also seen an increasing tendency on the part uf the Government even after the recent Bangla Desh events to have a second honeymoon with American imperialism. Sir, recently the World Bank Chief McNamara visited India. Sir, if I Understand correctly, there ls an earnest desire on the part ol the Government of India to go back and lean increasingly on American imperialism. They are hoodwinking people by their tall talk about economic self-reliance. There was the recent visit of Sir Kipling from United Kingdom and an industrial mission from there. If I understand correctly, the Government of India has already assured majority participation for the British capitalists even in sectors where that was not allowed till the other day.

Sir, in the public sector bureaucrats are completely hands in glove with the private sector, particularly monopoly capitalism. Unless, therefore, policies are drastically changed, this nation cannot go forward.

Sir, I would also like to mention another tiling. In the Address which the President delivered at the time of the joint session of Parliament the other day, there is a reference to moratorium on strikes and so on. Sir, this idea of moratorium on strikes comes up at a time when the ruling party is moving towards fascism and semi-fascism in West Bengal. Sir, there is a deliberate attempt on *the* part of the ruling party to ransack the trade union offices, particularly of the CITU. At least 110 cases of ransacking of CITU offices have already taken place. A number of trade union leaders have been either killed or injured in this semi-fascist terror operating in Bengal. Similarly, in the Central Government offices, there is a deliberate attempt on the basis of a gang-up between the AITUC, INTUC and other organisations to isolate the rising tide of revolutionary forces and to repress them by use of Police, CBI and so on. Unless these anti-labour policies are reversed this nation cannot have any progress in production and productivity and the willing participation of the workers in the production

process. Therefore what is to be done? I would mention the following :

1. Reverse the present policy of developing capitalism under the dominance of monopoly capital.
2. Nationalise all companies owned or controlled by the 75 monopoly houses, that is, the Birlas, the Tatas, etc.
3. Confiscate all the major foreign private companies without compensation.
4. Reverse the policy of increasing collaboration with foreign finance capital and implement real self-reliance, if necessary with technical and financial help from the Socialist countries.
5. Reverse the anti-labour policy of the Government and allow genuine trade union rights to all the working people.
6. Stop the fascist and semi-fascist repression on the working people as has happened in West Bengal.
7. Give actual control over industrial enterprises to the elected representatives of workers and manage the public sector without the present control of the bureaucrats.
8. Give more powers to the State so that industrial development is possible.

On this last point allow me to elaborate. To-day we have reached a stage when even in the small scale sector which is the primary responsibility of the State Governments, the Central Government has come in with a lot of supervisory staff trying to abrogate even the powers which the State Governments have in this limited area of industrial development. As a result you have so-called experts sitting in the Government of India who have practically no connection with the real facts of the situation in the local areas. For example, take the shortage of iron and steel, aluminium and zinc. I would like to give the example with reference to the State from where I come. There is a wide margin between requirements and actual supply of iron and steel, aluminium and zinc so far as Kerala is concerned. It is not purely a parochial demand for Kerala alone. If you look at the State Governments in the various regions as a whole, practically there is no rationale in the distribution of scarce raw materials between the States. Kerala is only one example. Is there any rationale in the distribution of scarce raw materials like iron and steel, aluminium and zinc? Is there any principle worth mentioning for distribution?

I will give the example of the callous way in which officers sitting in Delhi who have no interest, no knowledge of local issues deal with matters of industrial development. Take for example, the proposal of the Kerala Government for a Petro-chemical Complex. The State Government requested the Government of India, ever since 1964 for the location of Petro-chemical Complex in Kerala. It is also on record that the State Government has shown that naphtha is available. But nothing is being done at the level of the Government of India. Take again the case of the Kerala Newsprint Plant project. The Hindustan Paper Corporation, which is a Government of India undertaking, decided to establish a newsprint plant in Kerala. They selected a site in Kottayam in December 1970 but there is no decision yet regarding the exact requirement of the land for the project. The State Government has already sanctioned the staff for land acquisition but the staff already appointed for land acquisition cannot do anything and they are sitting idle simply because the Central Government has not taken any decision on the exact location of the project.

Take again the case of the Precision Instruments Project, Palghat. The Kerala Government an area of 586 acres of land in Palghat District at a cost of Rs. 8.78 lakhs and handed it over to the Instrumentation Ltd. Kottayam, for the establishment of a Precision Instruments Project in Kerala. The Kerala Government also incurred an expenditure of Rs. 13 lakhs additionally for the water supply scheme for the project was taken away. We are told that in case a second plant is decided upon, Kerala will be considered. Sir, from 1969 onwards nothing has happened. Land has been acquired, money has been spent by the Kerala Government. Is this industrial development? Is it the policy of the Central Government that where State Governments come forward with initiative, acquire land and spend money, by a last minute decision they take it away to some other region? Is this a rational pattern of industrial development?

Sir, before I conclude, I would also briefly refer to questions regarding traditional industries. Sir, we have in the various reports like the Economic Survey, the Mid-term Appraisal etc. the mention of sick mills being closed down, particularly in organised industry; but there is no figure anywhere in these documents about the number of units closed down in the traditional sector, such as coir, in handloom, in

[Dr. K. Mathew Kurian] cashew industries. Hundreds and thousands of units in the traditional small scale and co-operative sectors have been closed down and lakhs of people have been thrown out of employment. There is no mention about this and nobody knows about the problem of the far away Kerala. Is this the way in which the hon. Minister plans to have a higher rate of production?

In the case of handloom, for instance, the Kerala Government has been pressing the Government of India for the establishment of a Weavers Service Centre in Kerala. The Regional Weavers Service Centres at Bangalore and Madras—actually do not serve the far away place of Kerala. Therefore I would urge upon the Government to consider this proposal very favourably so that the additional industry of handloom can be revived.

Similarly in cashew, the Cashew Development Corporation proposed to take over 25 closed factories and the Government of India were requested to fix a quota of 17,646 tonnes of raw nuts for these 25 factories; also an additional quota of 4400 tonnes of raw nuts was asked for 10 additional factories proposed to be taken up. The Kerala Assembly passed a Resolution on 13th April, 1971. But nothing is happening and the cashew industry is languishing. No help is being made available. Even a loan of Rs. 1.5 crores is not being sanctioned. In all these matters there is callous neglect and absolute incapacity on the part of the Central Government to understand the problems of Kerala.

Similarly in coir. In 1968 the Kerala Government formulated and submitted to the Government of India a very comprehensive scheme for coir development costing just Rs. 15.59 crores. This was on the eve of the Fourth Plan preparation. While the Central Government refused this Rs. 15.69 crores for this traditional industry providing employment to over 10 to 12 lakhs of people in Kerala, the Government of India increased the allotment to family planning from Rs. 96 crores to Rs. 300 crores. It was very easy for them to raise the allotment for family planning from Rs. 96 to Rs. 300 crores but to give just Rs. 15.59 crores for the development of this traditional industry was not possible. They of course later on appointed a study group on coir which has come forward with a proposal costing Rs. 699 crores. That is a new plan but even this plan is still on paper with the Coir

Board, the Planning Commission, the Ministry of foreign Trade of the Central Government. What are they doing? The coir industry is going down and the Coir Board with a large representation of the monopoly interests is doing nothing. They are spending crores of rupees on so-called development. Now the entire coir industry has to be remodelled. The Coir Board has to be completely remodelled. Otherwise, nothing will happen.

Similarly, we have a number of other sectors, and the Kerala Government has already submitted detailed proposals to the Government of India for revitalising the traditional and modern sectors of industry in Kerala.

Kerala is only an example. There are similar backward regions in Orissa, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, and so on—I need not mention all the backward regions in India; they are mentioned whenever we discuss the industrial policy. It has been said that industrial development should take place in such a manner that regional imbalances are reduced. There, industry plays a vital role. We had several discussions on the subject in the last five years in the National Development Council, in this House and elsewhere. Ultimately, the Central Government came out with a paltry programme, and in the Fourth Plan only Rs. five crores were allotted for the development of industries in backward districts. See how much money is being spent to correct the imbalances created over the last twenty-five years by an irrational monopoly type of growth. So long as capitalism is maintained under the dominance of monopoly capital it is impossible to reduce the imbalances. Therefore, on the question of regional imbalances, of raising the level of development to accelerate the industrial growth rate and of raising productivity, the primary thing is to completely retrace the wrong and rotten economic policies pursued during the last twenty-five years.

Sir, unless concrete proposals are made in this respect and adhered to, there is no point in discussing about committees and committees. I am not against expert committees if there is a purpose, but not in the context in which this Resolution, brought forward by a member of the ruling party—a Resolution which has no concern for policies—is being discussed. The mover of the Resolution has brought forth a Resolution for a Committee as if this whole question of industrial development, of productivity and so on, has nothing to do with the basic policies. I am not greatly enthused by

additional committees, and I would urge on Government on this occasion to revise the basic policies.

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra) : First of all I would thank the mover of this Resolution, my friend Mr. Bhatt, but at the same time I would like to express a few misgivings where he has asked the Government to appoint a committee consisting of parliamentarians, experts and what not. Sir, I would like to say...

SHRI NAND KISHORE BHATT : Sir, just a clarification. I have not asked for a committee but for a standing machinery to deal with this question at various levels so that the decisions, etc., which take place in the matter of raising production or increasing productivity, can be halted, and measures can be devised to deal with them.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : But the Resolution speaks of a Committee "to make recommendations within a period not exceeding three months" etc. And then only come the words "a standing machinery". What I wanted to say was that enough committees have been created and enough reports are available on almost every imaginable problem, and so far the experience has been that nothing comes out of them. Therefore, Sir, what I would like to point out to Mr. Bhatt is : let us not think in terms of committees at all ; let us think in terms of implementation. And he may suggest to the Government—he belongs to that party—a committee of parliamentarians which will see to the implementation of things. Let us try to identify the various sectors where we would like to give a push to production, and then let this committee see to it that a particular target is fixed and it is attained within a given period. If this is done, then something constructive may emerge. Sir, the other misgiving is that the Government is really in complete confusion as to the industrial policy that they want to adopt. It seems that we have arrived at the cross-roads. So far our policy has been one of mixed economy. Now, Sir, I would like to impress upon the Government that the time has come when they should review the whole position and decide once for all whether they want to continue this policy of mixed economy, or whether they would like to go in for more and more socialisation—nationalisation

or socialisation, whatever they want to call it. I am saying this because I find this hesitation on the part of Government to define their economic policy has become so pervasive that even in the Monopolies Commission there are enough differences, and these differences are being aired in public a few members insisting that those who are in a position to expand industry should be given new licences and a few others saying that this need not be done because it will increase the power of monopoly capital. 4 P. M. Here I would like to point out that the Government has to decide it once and for all. Otherwise, we will be caught in a dilemma. You must have read very recently that nearly fifty of our big enterprises big, houses have been given permission to expand their existing plants. This is on the one hand. On the other hand, we heard that some of the firms in Great Britain have been asked to bring all their machinery here and produce things which they will undertake to export. Now, if this is the policy, then I think the Indian people will never know which way the Government is moving and this is exactly what has come in the way of our industrial expansion. I was recently talking to one of our prominent entrepreneurs. He said that this stagnation had resulted because we did not know what the Government wanted us to do. We do not know whether the Government would like to take over all the big industries, or whether the Government would allow us to expand. So long as this confusion is allowed to prevail, it will be impossible for us to make any advance. Simply saying that the industrial sector is causing concern, stagnation is there, production is falling from year to year and is not going to take us anywhere. This is a phenomenon that has continued right for the last four years. Industrial production is continuously going down. It is not as if there is a sudden slump. It was 7 per cent. It came down to 6 per cent, then 4 per cent. Now, it is somewhere between 2.5 and 3 per cent. To say that this is growth is really making a mockery of the word. In the industrial sector anything less than ten per cent is no growth at all. My friend here just now (I noted the instances of Japan, West Germany and other countries. Their continuous growth rate is about 12 per cent, 13 per cent and 14 per cent. Even a small country like Israel is advancing at the rate of 11 per cent or 12

[Shri N. G. Goray]

per cent. It is only in India that we find that our growth rate is confined to 3 per cent, 4 per cent, 5 per cent and the peak is 7 per cent, 'this is not a peak at all'. It should be the normal rate of growth. Because we are really in a period of stagnation we think that even 7 per cent should be considered high. So, I would call upon the Minister of Industrial Development to look into the matter and see why is it that we have failed. Last time when the Finance Minister made his speech he pointed out that our growth would depend, to a very great extent, on the increase in production in the public sector. Now, Sir, steel, for instance, is one of the major industries in the public sector. What is the position in steel? We are struggling with it. We do not know how to get out of the doldrums. I would like to say that something drastic will have to be done. We shall have to concentrate our efforts and find out why is it that such an important industry as steel is not making any progress at all. Where is the source of trouble? Either it is with management or it is with labour. We have got enough of raw materials. Now, if it is with labour, let us find out who is at fault. So far as Durgapur is concerned, I am told that there are rivalries and because of it production is suffering. You have appointed a new Manager who comes from the trade union ranks. He finds that it is very difficult for him to deal with the situation because one of the major unions belongs to the party in power and another union belongs to the party in opposition. Now, these are the things which are retarding growth. And this is not only the case in Durgapur, it is the same in Bhilai, it is the same in Rourkela. And you are thinking in terms of having more steel plants in Salem and in other places. It is not a question of multiplying the steel plants, it is a question of giving the maximum output out of the steel plants that we already have. I am quite sure that if the existing steel plants were to give us a satisfactory production much of this steel shortage will be removed. If we can push up our production to 90 per cent of the capacity, I am quite sure that India will be almost self-sufficient so far as steel is concerned. But this is not happening. Our production is round about 50 per cent all told. And therefore I would say, let's try to identify the particular sectors instead of throwing the net wide. Let us try to identify some of the main sectors of the industry which are suffer-

ing and let us try to put them right. That is number one.

Then, about the resources which we have to utilise, Sir, time and again, we have been hearing that we want to economise. I would ask you where is the economy? I come from the State of Maharashtra. You might have heard that they are thinking of setting up a new twin city of Bombay over which they are going to spend about Rs. 200 crores. Has the Centre ever thought about it? Has the Central Government ever considered whether a twin city of Bombay is necessary at all? If at all they have to spend so much money, should it be spent there, a city which is overcrowded, a city which does not know how to deal with the problems of water supply, of health, of sanitation of the existing population? Now, the new twin city will add another twenty or forty lakhs and we can have a big like Tokyo without the amenities that are essential. We tried to point out that 100 miles to the south of Bombay there is a spot Dabhol where you can get ample water flowing out of the Koyna Dam, lakhs of cusecs of water is going into the Arabian Sea without being utilised. If we ask, "Why don't you start a city (here? It is only hundred miles to the south of Bombay?)" then they will have no funds or finance. But so far as the twin city of Bombay is concerned, they have got all the finance. Now, it is for the Central Government to pull up the Chief Minister whose pet idea this seems to be, and ask him why Rs. 200 crores are being spent to develop a city which is already overcrowded. Here the question is: Has the Centre the necessary authority or power? Have they the power to pull up their Chief Ministers who are indulging in such day-dreams?

Then there is another thing. You might have heard in this House—about two years ago, the Minister for Petroleum, Mr. D. R. Chavan, stated that they were digging for petroleum at Alia Bet where crores of rupees have been wasted. Therefore, again, I say: The first thing is to keep a check on this type of expenditure which goes to waste. The second thing is, who is responsible for this? Is anybody held responsible for this? Who are the people who gave you advice like this? Why is it that the Minister comes here not only once or twice or three but half a dozen times and says that as soon as the monsoon is over, the Alia Bet operations will continue and we are sure to get results. But nothing comes out of

it. Only a few days back their own expert who has now retired, Mr. Deshpandr, came out with a letter in the Times of India that in Alia Bet they had a very small indication of oil. He said that depending on this how is it that you started digging in right earnest spending crores over it ? So these are the things that we will have to check. It is no use trying to fool the people all along. Only today, Sir, the Food Minister was here and all of us asked him what was happening about sugar ?

Sir, for the last twenty years we have been facing the problem of sugar. Does it really become of a Government which is all powerful, which has the mandate of the people to tolerate this situation ? They told the people that as soon as they got the mandate they will see to it that poverty is removed. Today you find that in the free market sugar is selling at Rs. 3-50 per kilo. Sir, in the international market it is available at about ten annas or twelve annas per kilo. Here in India we have to pay Rs. 3-50. What is this ? Why is it that it is not possible to see to it that one of the essential commodities in life like sugar is sold at a particular rate throughout India ? Is it impossible ? If you cannot control the price of sugar, a commodity which we ourselves are producing and are also exporting, then what is the use of talking that we shall have an industrial policy ? What is the use of saying that we shall have a planned development ? We are talking of planned development, but when we are thinking of planned development all the other factors are ignored. We are not ready to accept the discipline that should follow. Therefore, I would like to say, Sir, Mr. Bhatt should induce the Government to follow a discipline without which it will not be possible for us to control the economy at all. I am not talking of any vested interests. I am not talking of any capitalist or monopolistic economy or going to accuse the American capitalist or the British, this, that and the other. I am not talking in that usual jargon. I am only saying you must fix up the goals and stick to them. Do not vacillate, and whoever comes in the way, see to it that that particular obstacle is eliminated. If it is the trade union, discipline it. If it is your political party, my political party or any other political party, discipline that party. Then you make an appeal to the people themselves and tell them what we want to do. Tell them these are the people who are coming in the way. Seek their co-operation. Remove the obstacle. I am quite sure that the people are now really

in a mood that this country progresses at a fast rate. This is not something that cannot be done. I mean this can be done provided you have the will to do it, provided your own people believe in it. The main difficulty I find is that at the implementation level all our schemes go haywire. This is exactly where we are falling short of our objectives. I am not only blaming the politician or the political party. What about the administrative machinery ? Do they really believe in the egalitarian society that you want to create here ?

Sir, with all respect to our civil service, I would like to say that their mind is so moulded that they do not believe in this sort of thing. They think that there are certain people who are born to rule whereas there are others who are born to serve. Therefore, they lack the enthusiasm. They lack the conviction to bring about the basic social transformation for which all of us are talking. Therefore, this administrative service will also have to be disciplined. And they will be disciplined only if they find that the Ministers at the top also believe in this sort of thing. I would like to point out to you that only last year when the Prime Minister convened a meeting of the Chief Ministers of the States, she recommended that there must be a ceiling on land. There were at least four Chief Ministers who opposed it. The Chief Minister of Maharashtra was one. The Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh was the other. The Chief Minister of Rajasthan was the third and the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh was the fourth. Now, do not suppose that because some of them have been removed, the others who are coming and have taken their place are of any different opinion. It is the same stock. That the Congress has come with such a massive majority does not mean that the social content has changed. No, Sir. I am very sorry to say that if you really try to put to rest those people who have been elected, you will find that they have nothing to do with socialism or democracy. They just wanted to have their seats. They wanted to have their tickets and they were shrewd enough to understand that unless they shouted this slogan of 'Garibi Hatao' they would not get tickets. Therefore, they said, all right, we are for socialism. This is not the party, this is not the Government which will be able to implement all that programme. And if you do not implement the programme, then I am certain that the people of India are not going to pardon you at all. This is not the first time that you have taken them, "Put us in power and we shall see the

[Shri N. O. Goray] poverty is removed." For the last so many years you have been saying it. Since last year, we have been highlighting this slogan "garibi hatao." This Industrial Policy Resolution is not the only thing that should be reconsidered. There should be an agricultural policy also. After all, what is this Green Revolution? If you analyse it, you will find that it has created inequalities, regional inequalities and social inequalities. It is only where there is irrigation available that the Green Revolution has taken place. It is only in certain areas and it is only those who had the land to begin with, who have profited. But what about the landless people? What about the thousands and lakhs of acres of land where no irrigation is available? So the gap between those who have got irrigated lands and those who have to depend on rain, is widening and that is likely to widen still further because all the advantages will accrue to those who have got irrigated lands. How to set this balance right? That will be the question, and for that the Government will have to evolve an agricultural policy also. You will have to control agriculture, you will have to control industry, you will have to control trade. All these things will have to be controlled. And for that, Sir, a real mental revolution is necessary. You must really believe that certain things will have to be done and they will have to be done no matter who feels injured. I would ask the Minister whether his party is willing to bring about such a revolution in this country. If so, there is no time to lose, Sir, it is already late. I think it is quite late in the day, and the sooner we bring about this revolution and a new sense of fulfilment to the people so that the people feel that we are on the move, the better for us. I hope that this Resolution moved by my friend, Mr. Nand Kishore Bhatt, will inspire all of us, and particularly the party in power, to take the right steps. Thank you.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWD : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to Mr. Bhatt for having brought this Resolution before this House, even though I share the misgivings of my friends, Mr. Goray, Mr. Kinian and others with regard to the futility of any additional committee on the industrial growth of this country. We have already had productivity councils and Mr. Bhatt has expressed his views with regard to how the recommendations of these productivity councils have more or less remained as recommendations only on paper without any proper implement-

tation or any effort on the part of either the Central Government or the State Governments to give effect to any of those recommendations. However, looking at this Resolution's suggestion in the end for the setting up of a standing machinery to see that the Government is pressed for implementation of any decisions which might be taken in the committee of experts, manager, trade union representatives, parliamentarians and technical people, I think, from this point of view, it will be a very good idea to have this committee and also have the standing machinery set up as early as possible. Even if the actual implementation of it is not achieved, such a machinery, composed, as has been suggested, of such experts, will, I am sure, definitely be a pressure group to see and press the Government and persuade them to implement whatever policies they decide on with particular reference to growth in industrial and agricultural sectors. I am also happy that he has included agriculture along with it. All the distinguished speakers before me have pointed out the dismal growth in all sectors, industrial and agricultural, and so I need not go into the statistics again. I would limit myself just to quote from the Economic Survey with regard to agricultural (crops, commercial crops and general. With regard to the problems of agriculture, it says, "The success attained in raising the level of foodgrains output only serves to highlight the relative failure in regard to the commercial crops." That is the state of affairs with regard to the commercial crops. Then about foodgrains. "Even in respect of foodgrains there is very little ground for universal satisfaction. The output of pulses in particular has failed to increase in the line of rising demand and has led to considerable pressure on prices in the recent years." This covers the commercial crops and general agricultural crops. Then with regard to industries, from the same report, "The rate of increase of industrial output in the organised sector during 1971 indicates a further decline even from the rate attained in the previous year when industrial growth had been barely of the order of 4.8 per cent as against 7.1 per cent of 1969." This is the state of affairs of all the three sectors. Let alone the figures of industrial growth be quoted of other countries like Japan, Israel and others which are over 10 per cent : here we have not even been able to go beyond 1.8 per cent even though in a year in 1969 we went up to a figure of 7.1 per cent. This is a matter which requires

serious consideration. Apart from what the committee is going to consider or what the standing machinery is going to do, it is a matter of Government's policy as such, both fiscal and ideological. Whatever it is, as Mr. Goray suggested, let some recommendations be made, let some suggestions be made. Let us no more waver on this, whether there should be the public sector or the private sector or any other sector; otherwise, in the bargain we will only come out with slogans and we will not be doing any practical implementation of any programmes. Take, for example, some of the speeches made here in this and in many other contexts. Everytime statements are made, if production falls in any sector, you say that is because of the monopoly houses, that is because of certain vested interests. Take agriculture. You say it is because of the rich peasants and others. If it is so, you remove them and see that production goes up. That you do not do. As my friend just now very pertinently asked, what is the good of having a mixed economy? We have been adhering to mixed economy. If we are convinced that mixed economy is a failure, then let us scrap it; otherwise, let us go ahead with it. I personally feel that mixed economy may be made workable provided there is proper implementation, managerial personnel, managerial methods, and also co-operation from labour and trade unions and also if Government adopts proper fiscal policies with regard to taxation, exports and other things. What is the good of one sector blaming the other? There has been industrial growth both in communist countries and non-communist countries. There has been growth in Central European countries and East European countries which are following communistic economy. There has been growth, industrial growth and agricultural growth, in places like Japan and Israel which are not communist countries. Then how is it that both types of economies are progressing and we are not? One section says because you are not adopting the communist economy, your growth is not going up; another sector says you are not adopting the free enterprise and free economy and so your growth is not going up. We see that countries in the world which have adopted either of these systems have progressed industrially and agriculturally much better than we have in the past years. Take, for example, Korea or Taiwan. Then take some Communist countries. How is it that they have all achieved it and we have not.

The reason is that first of all we do not have a proper policy and we do not stick to whatever our policy is. Implementation of any policy is lacking very badly. That is why we have reached this stage. Whatever recommendations are made by any committee should be implemented. Government should see that they are implemented.

So far as industries are concerned, every time we point out certain lacuna in the private sector and for that reason we say they should be nationalised. I am not against nationalisation of key industries and many other major industries. But what is the achievement of the public sector industries we have? Every one of the public sector industry, without exception, is working to under capacity. None has reached installed capacity, let alone going beyond that. How is it that we can increase production of exportable items unless our cost of production is not competitive in the international market? Simply, because something is produced in a public sector industry, we cannot dictate to the buying country which is outside India to buy it at the price we want it to buy. Our price has to be competitive. One of the basic factors to build up our exports is that our cost of production must be such that it must be competitive with the cost of production in other countries. What about sugar? What about steel? Look at steel. In answer to some of the questions, these are the figures given. In 1967-68 the production was 4,34,000 tonnes; in 1968-69 it was 6,10,000 tonnes; in 1969-70 it was 6,33,000 tonnes and in 1970-71 it came down to 4,56,000 tonnes. And in 1971-72 it was only 1,80,000 tonnes. And it is stated that indications are that the company will sustain a substantial loss this year. What is the explanation given? The explanation is the same that will be given by any private industry. The explanation is—maintenance problems, continued disturbed industrial relations in the Durgapur steel plant and alloy steel plant, certain escalatory factors in regard to wage agreement, etc. If they did not consider the impact of the wage agreement, why did they agree to that? I have served on the Wage Board and I know why certain private sector industries cannot pay such wages. But then my friends in the trade union movement take the private sector to task. I am asking them to do it with regard to public sector and see that result. I am not blaming anybody. I am saying that this is one of the examples of inefficient management because of which public sector undertakings which, according

[Shri U. K. Lakshmana Gowda] to me, are very essential in this: country, cannot function properly, fully support these public sector undertakings. But they should be managed well in order to survive without making losses. Look at the figures of losses incurred by the Heavy Engineering Corporation, Ranchi. In 1968-69 they incurred a loss of Rs. 1,466 lakhs; in 1969-70 it was Rs. 1,818 lakhs and in 1970-71 it was Rs. 1,443 lakhs. If a public sector undertaking cannot at least make both ends meet, how is it going to survive? Who is going to subsidise it? It is the tax-payer. Then it is a vicious circle because you go on feeding a loss making institution and you will also find that the cost of production goes up. Such a loss, I am sure, is mainly because of our being non-competitive in the international market. So, Sir, that is with regard to the public sector undertakings. I want more public sector undertakings to come in. But, whatever public sector undertakings come up, you must see that they work to the installed capacity at least.

Sir, just now some of my friends were mentioning about the monopolists and the Monopoly Commission's recommendations. Sir, one of the crimes which they are supposed to have committed is that they have gone over and above their installed or licensed capacity. On the one hand, we say that we are not able to work even up to the installed capacity and on the other hand, you attack a person or take him to task because he has exceeded his installed capacity and has produced something more. I am not going into the political and ideological questions here. If some industrialists have gone beyond or over and above the installed capacity with the same equipment, we condemn them. But, in our own public sector undertakings we are not even able to come up to the installed capacity. How is this contradiction to be resolved? My view is that if you take the future into account, if it is the imperative necessity that we should increase our industrial growth and production, then we should not worry about somebody going over and above his installed capacity or the licensed capacity. If you want, you take over the industry and I do not mind it.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN : Then, what happens to planning?

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOVINDA : I am not saying that we should do away with planning, Mr. Kurian. I am telling you the

contradiction that is existing. You were not here when I said that the public sector undertakings are working below the installed capacity and so they end up in losses and become noncompetitive in the international market. You condemn a person who, with his own capacity, has increased production beyond his installed capacity. You take over that industry and I do not mind. You have a planning policy and all that. But, what is this? In the end, we neither get any result or returns from the private sector or from the public sector.

Sir, I come from a plantation area and I can give some figures about plantation also. Plantation is one which has increased its production substantially and I can mention coffee in particular. Coffee production fifteen years ago was about 25 to 30,000 tonnes. It came to 60,000 tonnes and last year it came to 1,10,000 tonnes. What is the result? Plenty of coffee is there and yet we are unable to find markets for expanding crops. Even last year's coffee is there. Till the other day 18,000 tonnes of coffee was rotting and new coffee is also coming. What is the use? There is the International Coffee Agreement and we have the Coffee Board co-operative marketing system where everybody's coffee is pooled and sold and it is not a private thing and under this system we can sell our coffee and yet, we are unable to do that also. Why? It is because of the faulty planning. When the government wanted more foreign exchange to be earned by exports, you said, "Export" But you do not do any internal propaganda to send your surplus product to other countries. Now, you have a surplus and you cannot sell that surplus coffee. You have to do internal propaganda. Can you do it in two days? These are all things which have to be done in a period of a few years. So, this is another kind of faulty planning, whether it is internal marketing or external marketing. When there is a shortage of a crop, I would say that we should not export. But, when you want foreign exchange, even at the cost of the internal market you export without seeing to the stability of those industries which have an export potential. So, Sir, these contradictions are there and coffee and tea are the two examples.

Now, Sir, I come to the agricultural sector. There again, Sir, I have already explained how even in the case of agricultural products, except in the case of some plantation crops, there has not been any growth and the marketing has to be done in such a way that the

producer has to be assured of some reasonable price. We say that the price line should be held. I agree. Even the food grains and other commercial crops should be sold cheaper. But we do not see that the inputs are sold to the agriculturists at a reasonable price. I am an agriculturist myself, Sir. N^ov, Sir, the prices of the inputs go up every day : the steel price goes up and so the prices of the implements go up. Fertilizers tax goes up. Fertilizers prices go up. Even small implements like pumps with tillers go up. How do you expect him to sell foodgrains at a lower price ? How can you hold the price-line ? Green revolution is there. I agree with you. My other friends, Mr. Kurian, Mr. Goray, Mr. Balachandra Menon and Mr. Chandra-sekharan, who spoke, said that it has taken place only with certain affluent sections. I agree. But if you want the other persons, small holders, whom you are creating now, to produce more, it is not going to be such an easy task. I am not against a ceiling. What is an economic unit for a family ? It cannot be arbitrarily decided upon by half a dozen persons sitting here, one saying that it should be 10 acres and the other saying that it should be 8 acres. I do not think even in Communist countries, the land holdings are so small as to become uneconomic. I saw a paper somewhere—somebody wrote a letter to the Editor—in which he says that it has been proved that the smaller the unit, the greater the production. Yes, to a certain extent. But there is an optimum there. But I cannot say that everybody can have one acre unit. We have to decide whether we mechanise or we do not mechanise or we continue with the outmoded, old wooden bullock method. If you mechanise I would not have a fairly compact unit which will be suitable for mechanisation. How do the Japanese people do it ? How other East European countries do it ? Last year, when the budget was discussed the Finance Minister said that only the richer sections of agriculture buy tractors and it does not matter if the prices go up. And if a tractor costs today Rs. 29,000, can any agriculturist who becomes an agriculturist after you reduce the ceiling, own a tractor and mechanise ?

(Time bell rings)

Kindly give me two minutes more. This is an important matter with regard to agriculture. We want agricultural production to go up. We want to put a ceiling. We do not know what is an economic unit. We do not provide

things at a reasonable price. How can we expect the production to go up ?

I am very happy that Mr. Bhatt has brought this subject. These things will be discussed, I hope, in detail, in the Committee . . .

SHRI N. G. GORAY : We are not going to have a Committee on this.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA : I know the Minister will reply and there will be an end to it. But if you participate, you must do full justice to (he subject.

I would like to say another thing. Mr. Bhatt is a trade unionist. He has brought a very legitimate subject about labour and management. Sir, I ask Mr. Bhatt and Mr. Balachandra Menon, who are trade unionists : What is the commitment of the trade unions to the public sector undertakings ? Is it not your commitment that the public sector undertakings work satisfactorily ? I am not saying that you should not agitate for proper wages and bonus, a proper wage-fixing machinery, relate the bonus, to profit, and so on. But you must also have some commitment, otherwise many a time the standing argument of the trade unionists is that bureaucrats have done that or the private sector people have sabotaged the work of this. These are all only slogans, just like election slogans ; they are not practical things so far as the growth of industries or agriculture is concerned. My friend, Mr. Balachandra Menon . . .

(Time bell rings)

One minute. Mr. Balachandra Menon himself has started some very good co-operative venture of unemployed engineers and of others in Kerala. And what happened was that the poor man was *gheraocd*; he had to go on a hunger strike to get out of the difficulty. So, you please try from that angle also, and try to solve the problem so that we have a better industrial relationship with the labour so that production is not impeded. I hope the Minister sitting here, will take all these into consideration and give some serious consideration to this so that the interests of everyone of us assembled here is looked after and it will be seen that both agricultural and industrial production in this country increase and we will be more self-reliant and will stand on our own legs.

औद्योगिक विकास मंत्रालय में उपमन्त्री (प्रो० सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, श्री नन्द किशोर भट्ट जी का मैं हृदय से धन्यवाद करता हूँ कि उन्होंने माननीय सदस्यों का ध्यान इस बात की ओर आकृष्ट किया कि औद्योगिक विकास की गति में जो मन्दी आ गई है, उसमें प्रगति लाने के लिए कौन से कदम उठाये जायें। सदस्यों ने इस सम्बन्ध में जो अपने अमूल्य सुझाव दिये उसके लिए भी मैं उनका हृदय से धन्यवाद करता हूँ।

कई माननीय सदस्यों ने इस बात के लिए गहरी चिन्ता प्रकट की कि न केवल औद्योगिक विकास की गति धीमी पड़ गई है, बल्कि दुनिया के कुछ देशों में जहाँ औसतन 10 प्रतिशत औद्योगिक विकास होता रहा है, वहाँ भारत में जब 7 प्रतिशत तक औद्योगिक विकास होता है तो हम काफी संतोष का अनुभव करते हैं। लेकिन बात ऐसी नहीं है। और जब हम दूसरे देशों की चर्चा करते हैं तो हम अक्सर इस बात को भूल जाते हैं कि उन देशों में 10 प्रतिशत से अधिक औद्योगिक विकास की गति लाने के लिए न केवल कुछ वर्ष या दशक लगे, बल्कि काफी लम्बे असें तक उन्हें तैयारी करनी पड़ी और और तब ही उन देशों में औद्योगिक विकास में तेजी आई और उसका एक कारण यह भी रहा कि वहाँ आर्थिक क्षेत्र में कृषि को आधुनिक बनाने के लिए काफी पहले कदम उठाये जा सकें।

हमारे देश में पंजाब और हरियाणा जैसे सुबों में जहाँ खेती को आधुनिक रूप दे दिया गया है, वहाँ पर औद्योगिक विकास की गति पश्चिमी जर्मनी, अमरीका, रूस और जापान से कम नहीं रही। अभी चार, पांच महीने पहिले ब्रिटैन के प्रसिद्ध अर्थशास्त्री प्रोफेसर हिक्स ने इस सम्बन्ध में एक विस्तृत विवेचन किया था और उन्होंने अपने उस लेख में लिखा था कि पंजाब और हरियाणा जो भारत और उप महाद्वीप का एक हिस्सा है, वहाँ पर किस तरह से तेजी से विकास हुआ है। इस बात की तरफ भी हमें ध्यान देना चाहिये। जो परिस्थिति इस देश के कुछ हिस्सों में है, उसी तरह की परिस्थिति देश के दूसरे हिस्सों में भी

लाई जाय, जहाँ पर इतनी तेजी से औद्योगिक विकास नहीं हुआ है। इस समय संतुलन लाने के लिए सरकार इस बात का प्रयत्न कर रही है और हम इस बात का विशेष रूप से ध्यान दे रहे हैं कि जो हमारे देश के पिछड़े इलाके हैं, जहाँ पर क्षेत्रीय असंतुलन पैदा हो गया है उसको कैसे दूर किया जा सकता है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, माननीय सदस्यों का ध्यान इस बात की ओर भी गया होगा कि दूसरी और तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में सरकार ने इस बात का विशेष ध्यान दिया है कि पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्रों में खेती का आधुनिकीकरण किया जाय, सिंचाई की व्यवस्था उन्हें दी जा सके, अच्छे बीज उन्हें दिये जा सकें तथा खाद की व्यवस्था की जा सके। ऐसे उन्नत कृषि के साधनों का उपयोग किया जाय जिससे खेतों में हरित क्रान्ति लाई जा सके। इन्हीं प्रयत्नों के कारण आज देश में हरित क्रान्ति ला सके हैं और यह बात सबको अच्छी तरह से मालूम है कि इसी चीज की वजह से हम खाद्यान्न के मामलों में आत्म-निर्भर हो गये हैं।

यह बात सही है कि जिन क्षेत्रों में आधुनिक कृषि की सुविधा नहीं हो सकी है, वहाँ पर विकास की गति मन्द हो गई है, लेकिन हम इस ओर भी विशेष रूप से ध्यान दे रहे हैं। हम देश में औद्योगिक विकास में प्रगति लाने के लिए जो नियंत्रण लाये हैं, जो हमने इसके लिए नीति बनाई है, इसके लिए जो स्ट्रैटेजी बनाई है वह काफी हद तक सफल रही है।

दूसरी जिस महत्वपूर्ण बात की तरफ माननीय सदस्यों ने ध्यान आकृष्ट किया था वह यह थी कि हमारी जो इस सम्बन्ध में नीति है वह स्पष्ट नहीं है। हमारे संविधान के 39 वें अनुच्छेद में नीति के सम्बन्ध में, आर्थिक नीति के सम्बन्ध में जो निश्चित व्यवस्था दी गई है, सरकार संविधान के उन्हीं निर्देशक तत्त्वों के प्रकाश में नीति निर्धारित करती रहती है। और उसमें यह बिलकुल स्पष्ट रूप से बताया गया है कि हम आर्थिक शक्ति का केन्द्रीयकरण नहीं होने देंगे, हम लोगों को रोजगार की सुविधाएं प्रदान करेंगे और

इस ढंग से हम आर्थिक व्यवस्था का संचालन करेंगे, जिसमें सबको काम के समान अवसर मिल सकें। इसलिए पिछली तीन योजनाओं में जिसे हम पब्लिक सेक्टर कहते हैं उसका उत्तोरत्तर विकास किया है और उसके साथ साथ जो बड़े उद्योग धन्धे हैं, जिनको मोनोपोलीज कहते हैं उन पर नियंत्रण लाने के लिए कदम उठाए गए हैं। मोनोपोलीज कमीशन के एक-दो निर्णय एक दो कार्य-वाहियाँ ऐसी हो सकती हैं जिनसे एक-दो माननीय सदस्यों को मतभेद हो सकता है, लेकिन आम तौर पर इस बात को स्वीकार किया गया है कि इसकी वजह से इन मोनोपोलीज के विकास में या उनकी बढ़ोत्तरी में कमी आई है, उन पर अंकुश लगा है। अगर माननीय सदस्य इस सम्बन्ध में किसी स्पष्ट सुझाव की ओर संकेत करेंगे तो सरकार उन पर निश्चित रूप से विचार करेगी और जब कभी आवश्यकता होगी तो एम आर टी पी एक्ट में परिवर्तन की बात भी सोच सकती है। इसके लिए जो भी रचनात्मक सुझाव आएंगे, सरकार उन पर पूरी गहराई से विचार करेगी।

मैं दो-एक ऐसी बातों की ओर भी संकेत कर देना चाहता हूँ, जिनके लिए माननीय सदस्यों ने चिन्ता प्रगट की है और श्री नन्द किशोर भट्ट के मूल प्रस्ताव में भी उसकी ओर संकेत किया गया है। मैं सदन की जानकारी के लिए यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जैसी समिति की उन्होंने चर्चा की है, वैसी समिति सरकार ने पहले से बना रखी है, उसमें संसद् के सदस्य भी हैं, उसमें अर्थशास्त्री भी हैं, उस समिति में उद्योगपति भी हैं, समिति में मजदूरों के प्रतिनिधि भी हैं। जो सेन्ट्रल एडवाइजरी कौंसिल आफ इंडस्ट्रीज है उसमें ये सारे व्यक्ति या उनके प्रतिनिधि मौजूद हैं। इसकी स्थायी समिति भी है। जिस स्टैंडिंग कौंसिल की बात इस रिजोल्यूशन में की गई है वह स्टैंडिंग कौंसिल भी है और वह समय-समय पर इन सारी बातों पर विचार करती है। सरकार की नीति क्या होनी चाहिए इस पर भी वह सलाह देती है और जो सरकार नीति निर्धारित करती है उस नीति का ठीक प्रकार से पालन हो रहा है या नहीं, ठीक ढंग से उसको कार्यान्वित किया जा रहा है या

नहीं, उस पर भी यह कौंसिल विचार करती है। और उसकी जो स्टैंडिंग कमेटी है उसकी बैठक अक्सर होती है और वह इन बातों पर ध्यान देती है। इसके अलावा दूसरी समितियाँ हैं, रिज्यूइंग कमेटीज हैं। इसके अलावा स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज बोर्ड भी है। उसकी भी बैठक होती है। उसमें राज्यों के मन्त्री भी होते हैं, उसमें मजदूरों के प्रतिनिधि भी होते हैं, उसमें उद्योगों के प्रतिनिधि भी होते हैं और वे भी इस बात पर विचार करते हैं। इसके अलावा सदन को पता होगा कि नेशनल प्रोडक्टिविटी कौंसिल है, वह भी इस बात पर विचार करती है। लेकिन जैसा कि इस सदन में माननीय सदस्यों की भावनाओं से पता चलता है कि इन बातों से माननीय सदन संतुष्ट नहीं है और यह ऐसी बात है जिसकी तरफ सरकार का भी ध्यान गया है अभी जो मिड टर्म एप्रैजल रखा गया है, जिसकी कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने चर्चा की या जो अभी आर्थिक सर्वेक्षण प्रस्तुत किया गया उसमें भी इस बात की चर्चा है कि कैसे इनमें ज्यादा तेजी लाई जा सके और जहाँ कहीं कमियाँ या कमजोरियाँ हैं उनको दूर करने के लिए कैसे कदम उठाए जायें। इसी बात को ध्यान में रखते हुए अभी योजना आयोग ने अपने एक सदस्य की अध्यक्षता में ऐसी समिति बनाई है कि हम केवल बड़ी-बड़ी बातों की चर्चा न करें, हम केवल विल-कुल आम बातों की चर्चा न करें, बल्कि इस बात को जानने की कोशिश करें कि कौन-कौन से ऐसे उद्योग हैं, जिनमें किसी वजह से विकास में शिथिलता आ गई है। इसी बात को ध्यान में रख कर 54 उद्योगों का अध्ययन किया गया कि जो मांग और इन्स्टाल्ड कैपेसिटी में बहुत बड़ा गैप है उस को दूर करने के लिए कदम उठाए जायें। इस बात का हम सदन को पूरी तरह से पता है कि हमारे यहाँ श्रमिकों की अधिकता है, लेकिन पूँजी की कमी है। अगर हमारे यहाँ इन्स्टाल्ड कैपेसिटी है और हम थोड़ी पूँजी लगा कर उसमें ज्यादा मजदूरों को रोजगार दे सकते हैं तो ऐसे कदम उठाए जाने चाहिए। ऐसी मांग इस सदन में भी बार-बार हुई है, सदन के बाहर भी हुई और दूसरे सदन में भी हुई है। सरकार इस बात पर विचार करती रही है। कई बार इस माननीय सदन में

[प्रो० सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद]

भी और विभिन्न दलों के नेताओं के द्वारा इस प्रकार की मांग की गई थी और इसी मांग को ध्यान में रख कर मैं कहता हूँ कि सरकार ने इस तरफ ध्यान दिया है, जब हम एक तरफ सरकार का ध्यान आकृष्ट करते हैं कि विदेशी सहायता पर कम से कम निर्भर रहें और दूसरी तरफ जब इस बात की मांग करते हैं कि ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोगों को रोजगार दें और तीसरी तरफ इस बात की मांग करते हैं कि उत्पादकता में वृद्धि हो तो यह बिल्कुल स्वाभाविक हो जाता है कि हमारे यहां पहले से जो उद्योग धंधे लगे हुए हैं, उनमें जो मशीनें हैं उनका पूरी तरह से उपयोग हो। ऐसी मशीनें चाहे सरकारी कारखानों में हों, चाहे निजी कारखानों में हों, लेकिन इस नीति का निर्धारण करते हुए सरकार ने जो बुनियादी महत्व की बातें हैं उनका भी ध्यान रखा है और उसकी तरफ भी मैं सदन का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। पहली बात यह है कि ऐसा करते समय जो बड़े औद्योगिक घर हैं, जिनको मोनोपोलीज हाउसेज कहते हैं, उन पर अलग से विचार किया जायगा। जिन कारखानों में विदेशी पूंजी लगी हुई है, उन पर भी अलग से विचार किया जायगा। ऐसा करते समय इस बात को भी ध्यान में रखा जायगा कि लघु उद्योगों को संरक्षण देने की जो सरकार की नीति थी उस पर किसी प्रकार का उलटा प्रभाव न पड़े। यानी लघु उद्योगों को पूरी तरह से संरक्षण मिलेगा। अगर 54 उद्योग का विस्तार करते समय लघु उद्योगों पर बुरा प्रभाव पड़ता है तो सरकार वैसा नहीं होने देगी। इसलिए अगर हम ऐसा कदम उठाते हैं तो उन उद्योगों की उत्पादकता में वृद्धि होगी और रोजगार भी लोगों का ज्यादा मिलेगा। इससे औद्योगिक विकास में जो शिथिलता आ गई है उसमें भी गति आयेगी।

इसके अलावा योजना आयोग ने जिन उद्योगों का अलग-अलग अध्ययन किया है वे पेपर एंड पेपर बोर्ड, वाल रोलर बियरिंग, प्रिंटिंग मशीनरी, मशीन टूल्स, एग्रीकल्चरल मशीन टूल्स, एग्रीकल्चरल मशीनरी, आटोमोबाइल टायर्स एंड ट्यूब्स, कैल्शियम कारबाइड, पेपर एंड रबर इंडस्ट्री, सीमेंट

इम्स एंड फार्मेस्युटिकल्स। और उद्योगों का भी वे अध्ययन कर रहे हैं। वे एक-एक आइटम को लेकर औद्योगिक दृष्टि से विचार करते हैं। आर्थिक दृष्टि से, प्रबन्ध की दृष्टि से और मजदूरों की तरफ से अगर कोई रुकावट आती है तो उसपर भी वे विचार करते हैं। यानी पूरी इंडस्ट्री के मामलों पर हम सर्वांगीण दृष्टि से विचार करते हैं। अगर दुर्गापुर के कारखाने का मामला है और हम अनुभव करते हैं कि अगर मजदूरों के साथ सम्बन्धों में सुधार होता है तो उससे उत्पादन बढ़ सकता है तो उसके लिये हम प्रयत्न करते हैं। दुर्गापुर में उत्पादन 36, 37 प्रतिशत है, लेकिन सरकार के दूसरे कारखानों में उत्पादन 70, 75 प्रतिशत है। तो अगर हम उसमें थोड़ा सा सुधार ला सकते हैं और मजदूरों के साथ सम्बन्ध सुधार सकते हैं, तो हम वैसे कदम उठायेगे।

दूसरी तरफ अगर कहीं मेटीरियल की कमी है तो उसमें हम सुधार ला सकते हैं। अगर विदेशों से मंगाने की बात है तो हम विदेशी मुद्रा का प्रबन्ध करने का प्रयत्न करेंगे जिससे हमारा उत्पादन बढ़े।

अगर कहीं प्रबन्ध व्यवस्था को बदलने की जरूरत है, सरकारी उद्योग हो यह निजी उद्योग, तो सरकार उसके लिए भी कदम उठायेगी। इस सदन को पता है कि अभी कई सरकारी उद्योगों के प्रबन्धकों को बदला गया है। सरकार के सामने यह नीति रही है और सरकार इस बात पर भी विचार करती है।

सरकार ने इस बात का भी फैसला किया है कि अगर एक औद्योगिक इकाई में एक ही मजदूर संगठन हो तो मजदूरों को प्रतिनिधित्व उस उद्योग के बोर्ड में देने के लिए हम तैयार हैं। अगर मजदूर प्रतिनिधि मंडल में स्थान लेना चाहें तो हम इसको प्रोत्साहन देना चाहते हैं लेकिन अगर उनमें प्रतिस्पर्धा हो, उनके चार, पांच संगठन हों और एक दो संगठनों के कारण वहां हड़ताल या तालाबन्दी आदि की स्थिति उत्पन्न हो जाती हो तो वह उत्पादन की दृष्टि से कभी लाभदायक नहीं हो सकती। इसलिए सरकार ने ऐसा निश्चय किया है कि जहां कहीं भी मजदूर

संगठन आपस में एकता का परिचय देकर अपने प्रतिनिधि मनोनीत कर देंगे वहां हम उसको सहर्ष मान लेने के लिये तैयार हैं। इसके साथ-साथ मैं इस बात की ओर ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं कि योजना आयोग ऐसे उद्योगों का भी अध्ययन कर रहा है जिसमें ऐसी गुंजायश है कि हम वहां उत्पादन बढ़ा सकते हैं और उनकी समस्याओं को सुलझाने के लिए हम कोई कदम उठा सकते हैं। इस पर कार्यवाही करने के लिए हम तत्पर हैं। लेकिन इतनी ही बात नहीं है कि हर जगह कारण ऐसे आसान हों कि जिनको हम आसानी से हल कर सकते हों। ऐसे कुछ कारखाने हैं जिनमें ऐसे कुछ सामान बनते थे कि जिनकी अब मांग नहीं रह गयी है। उदाहरण के लिए डिजिल पम्पिंग सेट्स बनते थे। रूरल इलेक्ट्रिफिकेशन हो जाने के बाद डिजिल पम्पिंग सेट्स की मांग कम हो गयी है और इलेक्ट्रिक पम्पिंग सेट्स की मांग ज्यादा हो गयी है। इसलिए डिजिल सेट्स का उत्पादन कम हो जायगा। इसी प्रकार और कुछ सामान ऐसे बनते थे जिनकी अब मांग नहीं रह गयी है, उनकी जगह आर्टिफिशियल चीजें आ गयी हैं। चमड़े के जूतों के उद्योग को इस प्रकार काफी धक्का लगा है। चप्पलें और जूते प्लास्टिक के बनने लगे हैं, इसलिए उस उद्योग को धक्का लगा है। लेकिन एक तरफ हम समाज को आधुनिक बनाना चाहते हैं और दूसरी तरफ जो पुरानी और सामंती विचारधारा है अगर उससे हम चिपके रहें तो उस में परिवर्तन नहीं हो सकता। इसलिए माननीय सदस्य श्री गोरे ने जिस वैचारिक क्रान्ति की ओर ध्यान दिलाया, वह भी बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है। यदि हम तेजी से आर्थिक विकास करना चाहते हैं तो हमको अपने दृष्टिकोण में परिवर्तन लाना पड़ेगा। हमारी जो सांस्कृतिक और आर्थिक विचारधारा है उसको आधुनिक बनाने के लिए हम जब तक कृत संकल्प नहीं हो जाते, तब तक हम तेजी से आर्थिक विकास नहीं कर सकते; क्योंकि आर्थिक विकास अपने आप में कोई अजाहिदा चीज नहीं है। यह एक दूसरे से संबद्ध है, जुड़ा है। उसे एक दूसरे से हम अलग नहीं कर सकते। इसलिए जब सरकार

उस तरफ कदम उठा रही है और माननीय सदस्य के मन में जिस प्रकार की समिति की बात है उस के लिए सरकार पहले से ही कदम उठा चुकी है, और एक के बाद एक जो कदम उठाये गये हैं, जिनके बारे में मैंने सदन के सामने जानकारी रखी, उस को देखते हुए मैं अपने मित्र श्री नन्द किशोर भट्ट से यह आग्रह करूंगा कि वह अपने प्रस्ताव को वापस ले लें और माननीय सदस्यों ने जो सुझाव दिये हैं उनको ध्यान में रखते हुए औद्योगिक विकास की गति में तेजी लाने के लिए जो भी कदम उठाने की आवश्यकता है, उस पर सरकार गंभीरता से विचार करेगी। इतना ही नहीं, अगर माननीय सदस्य किसी खास उद्योग के बारे में अपने अमूल्य सुझाव देंगे, सरकार उन पर भी गंभीरता से विचार करेगी। धन्यवाद।

SHRI NAND KISHORE BHATT : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at the outset I wish to express my grateful thanks to all the friends and hon. Members of this House who have participated in the debate on this Resolution. I am also grateful to the hon. Minister who has tried to give information on some of the points that have been raised in the House. I have no intention to go into the details of the various points that have been raised by hon. Members, but I would like certainly to make a few observations.

At the outset I would like to say in all humility that there is no demand for a committee as such. We have got committees and committees as the hon. Minister has rightly pointed out. What I want is and what my other friends are concerned with is that we want results. Today we are faced with a situation where talks will not do. We have to ensure implementation. Mr. Goray was pointedly clear and I am very grateful to him for the various points to which he has referred. Our approach should not be political in such matters. Our approach should be constructive...

SHRI J. P. YADAV : W; are all supporting you.

SHRI NAND KISHORE BHATT : I would like to make one thing clear. The working-class in this country, irrespective of different political parties—may be there are some people here and there and there otherwise—we are all very much committed to the

[Shri Nand Kishore Bhati] public sector and are bent upon making it a success. I would not like to quote so many examples...

SHRI NAND KISHORE BHATT: I will

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री राम साहय) : मेरा ऐसा खयाल है कि पांच बज गये, अब आप खत्म कीजिये।

not take more than five minutes to complete ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM SAHAI) :
The House stands adjourned 'till 11 A. M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Saturday, the 18th March, 1972.