

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 176 RE DEMAND FOR NATIONALISATION OF THE SUGAR INDUSTRY

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am grateful to you for having agreed to have a discussion on a very vital and important problems, particularly an economic problem. We are all along wasting our time on so many other matters, but the country can only prosper by the development of the economy. Today what we are discussing is a problem of the sugar industry and a demand for nationalisation from various parts of this country. The sugar industry is an industry which is like the textile industry as regards capital involvement, as regards employment, as regards production. (*Interruption by Shri Chitta Basu*) Why are you coming in unnecessarily? I want to educate you also in this. You are having radical ideas. You have some education on constructive side of the problem.

What I want to state is that the sugar industry is also a problem. Industry because, sugar, though it produces a sweetening agent, has never satisfied either the consumer or the producer, that is, the agriculturist who produces the raw material for it. The entire blame for the muddle in the sugar industry is squarely to be put at the door of this Government.

Sir, during the last twentytwo years we are seeing various phases of the sugar industry, excess production at some time and scarcity at other, and so on. I would like to quote from the report of a Commission appointed by the Government called the Sugar Enquiry Commission. What I want to say is I am apportioning the blame on the Government and charging it with the responsibility in this matter. The same Commission has found out that the Government policy is one of *ad hocism* and not one of planning on a long-term perspective for sugar production in this country. The Commission states, I quote :

Sometimes the so-called measures for stabilisation have themselves prevented a return to normalcy and have tended to prolong the instability. Short-term palliatives have postponed long-term remedies. *Ad hoc* measures to deal with specific problems as they arose from time to time have only too quickly militated against comprehensive solutions being sought. In fact *ad hocism* has been one of the worst man-made causes of instability faced by the industry.

Sir, why I have quoted this is because it is a very valuable report. When the Government has appointed a Commission, they have given this certificate to the Government that the entire policy on sugar is based on *ad hocism* and is injected with politics wherever certain solutions are demanded.

Sir, I want to bring to the notice of this august House that the sugar problem should be seen in a long-term perspective, that is the perspective of the better land use in the different parts of this country and an adequate return to the grower and also the question of the by products of the sugar industry to be processed with the full encouragement at the Government level. Unless all these aspects are gone into, the sugar problem will always remain with us. I say this because this is the opportunity now when we produce round about 35 lakh tonnes, and next year we expect to produce 40 lakh tonnes. And we will have a chance of devising a realistic and logical plan for the sugar industry for the coming one or two Plans. I demand this because this year the Government has shirked its responsibility in fixing incentive prices to the sugar-cane growers. The demand was something between Rs. 10 and Rs. 15 per quintal, while the Government has fixed it at Rs. 7.3 or whatever it is though it is national ? I am afraid next year the sugar-cane growers will not come forward to grow sugar-cane in the context of the increased capacity that is licensed and the demand of the industry for crushing. At that time again the prices of gur or jaggery or khandsari will rise and within a period of three or four years the Government will again come to the same sorry state of a scarcity condition. I say this because if you see the production in this country, the production figures of the sugar-cane grower here are very low as compared to the other international competitors. We find that while in Hawaii the average is about 80 tonnes, our average has never exceeded between 17 and 20 tonnes; when their recovery is between 11 and 14 per cent, our recovery has never gone more than 9 or 9.8 per cent. This is an industry wherein is invested a capital Rs. 400 crores-the entire production is about Rs. 600 crores. And if you see the total impact of so much of capital being invested in this industry and of so many people concerned with this industry, it is natural that the demand for nationalisation should come because of the failure of the industry to pay remunerative price to the growers and also their failure to deliver the goods to the consumers at a

price which the consumers can afford to pay.

Another aspect of the problem which I am highlighting is that it is actually a problem more of the agriculturists, as I call it. It is not an industrial problem, as it is. It is a problem wherein the sugar-cane grower has to get the maximum or an incentive return so that he can supply cane to the factory. What is it? Twenty-five per cent is for wages, 75 per cent has to be given for raw materials. And that is the crux of the problem. What I have found out is this. Nowhere in this whole world is there sugar production in a belt where there is extreme heat or extreme cold. Nobody should take it that I am talking with a biased and regional view. I have to submit that I am talking from a scientific view. . . . (*Interruptions*) Do not talk any nonsense. I am giving this view that in tropical countries only they can produce this crop better. But what about extreme conditions of cold and heat? I challenge. Let the Government say that in such conditions anywhere else sugar-cane is grown to a proportion which you can get from the tropical countries.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair]

Let the Members and the representatives of the sugar-cane growers from U.P. and Bihar consider this dispassionately. Do not take it that I am only pleading for them because you cannot blame if there is a demand for steel plant to be started in Bombay where there is no raw material. Naturally, in this country, agricultural strategy has to be based on the better and effective land use. If the raw-material say, wheat or something else can be grown in B area better, it is the B area only where it can be grown and processing factory organised. If this is grown in C area, the Government must give encouragement to the C area, because you will have to find out where national interest is best served. When I said that politics has entered this sugar trade, it is because the Government wants to satisfy the demands coming right up from moment to moment. And you will find that in this country today the price of sugar has got a difference of Rs. 40 per quintal. You will never believe—between the prices in U.P. and those in the South, there is a difference of Rs. 40 per quintal. The difficulty is why there is this difference of Rs. 40 per quintal. It is not that they want to give anything to the industrialists or any profit to them. They want to say that they want to give it to the sugar-cane growers. That alone is not the problem? In the Northern

part, the yield has been not more than 20 to 30 tonnes. And that is why the difficulty has been that the sugar-cane growers are not getting a proper return. That is why I am claiming that the perspective of a long-term sugar policy should be included in the development of industry. You have got a Research Institute at Lucknow. Develop certain strains which can grow in the colder areas also. Do that research. That is why . . .

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-OPERATION (SHRI ANNA SAHEB SHINDE) : The Kanpur Institute is not sugar-cane Institute.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : I am sorry, Lucknow. Develop that type of strain there. That is what I am saying. It is a problem of major land improvement, major agricultural development, major research on the development of different strains. I re-emphasise that it is the failure of this Government not—an individual or the industry or a worker or somebody else—to have this perspective. They have injected politics into the sugar industry. That is why the entire thing has collapsed.

In this country, the agriculturists have never failed, particularly in sugar cane wherein, I can say, we have reached certain targets between 130 to 150 tonnes per acre; we have achieved that. That shows that we are not lagging behind international competition, and our agriculturists have proved more than a match in development new strains, in growing new strains, in getting yields which are commensurate with and even better than others in the world. Similarly, in respect of recovery, we have achieved between 13 to 14 per cent on an average. There also you cannot blame the agriculturist. I want to say that the agriculturist has caught up with the new development techniques with all agricultural developments.

I only plead with the Government. Let them not play with this industry. It is playing with fire. Please devise some method when there is over production in this country. Do not inject politics for whatever reason you may want to say. I do not take that nationalisation is the panacea for removing all the ills in this country. Nationalisation has to be selective. The main point is production. It is the availability of a particular item to the consumer and the cheapest price and incentive price to the grower. As long as

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni]

10 years back, the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee resolved that there should be the nationalisation of banks of the import and export trade and that all agricultural produce should either come within the co-operative sector or the nationalised sector. That was a demand made by my State's Pradesh Congress Committee. I am highlighting this because we are not lacking in the proper understanding of the problem.

As for nationalisation I again say that nationalisation will increase bureaucratisation, and that is why I am not going to allow any increase in bureaucratic authority whereby corruption starts and we again mismanage the whole thing.

Coming to the U. P. problem, Sir, it is unique nowadays. If you go through the U. P. problem...

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa): Mr. Kulkarni, I am not wasting your time. The discussion is supposed to be raised on the nationalisation of the sugar industry. The argument that you are advancing is indirectly against nationalisation.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Starting with a preamble I am coming to nationalisation. What I was saying was that in U. P. particularly there is a complete mess in the sugar industry. You have to study the production figures of U. P. right from 1960. Having reached 14.5 lakh tonnes, it came down to as much as 7 lakh tonnes. Now it is 11 lakh tonnes. That is why it has been a very mismanaged affair. For that, Sir, I blame the Government...

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : As against the total national production of 35 lakh tonnes, U.P. gave 14.5 lakh tonnes. Up and down is a national characteristic. It is nothing peculiar to U. P. alone.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Mr. Pande, I will again reaffirm that in U. P. particularly the entire sugar-cane production has been at the vagaries of the industrialist of U. P. They have not done justice to the sentiments of the growers who are supplying them sugar-cane. That is why from 14.5 lakh tonnes it came down to 7 lakhs tonnes. (Interruption by Shri C. D. Pande) I know you are an industrialist...

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Order, please. Mr. Pande, you will get the chance to explain your case.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : ...he will have time to explain his case. Let him not mix up issues. My hon'ble friend, Mr. Pande, denies it. I have got another figure with me. Let him deny that too.

In U. P. there have been the maximum number of investigations under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. What do you have to say against this? There were investigations about mismanagement...

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Only in U. P., and not in Bihar? Does he mean to say that this thing was confined to U. P. alone?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : What I want to say is that U. P.'s case is unique.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : In Maharashtra co-operative people are eating up lots of money. They have become magnates out of the co-operatives...

AN HON'BLE MEMBER: Mr. Pande will have ample time to speak.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Sir, I should get five minutes more because of Mr. Pande's interruptions. Therefore, Sir, the maximum number of investigations took place in the U. P. sugar factories. The maximum difference in production is in U. P. and Bihar.

Again, Sir, if you look at the figures of payment to the cane-growers in U. P. it is Rs. 3 crores at the end of the season compared to Rs. 11 crores of last year. The U. P. sugar factories are getting deferred payment from ... (Interruption) the poverty-stricken sugar-cane grower in U. P. That is the fun of the whole game. Therefore, the U. P. industrialists are getting all sugar-cane free, no payment. So Rs. 11 crores were due in February. The U. P. sugar factories are yet to pay about Rs. 5 crores as sugar cane cess....

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Out of Rs. 100 crores.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Order, please.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: ... my knowledge is much better than that of all of you put together.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): Yes, I know your knowledge is much better in favour of the U. P. sugar magnates...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Order, please.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Sir, why should he interrupt? Has he got your permission to interrupt him ?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : I must explain what I wanted to say. He says that in U.P. the sugar-cane grower has to be paid and that Rs. 5 crores has to be paid as cess. He is giving a misleading picture... (*Interruptions*)... If out of Rs. 120 crores, Rs. 5 crores remains unpaid, does it lie in his mouth to say that nothing has been paid. He should be reasonable ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Why should you, get restless and interrupt ? You can note down the points and when your turn comes you certainly refute that allegation.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Vice-Chairman, he is speaking as if they are paying from their pocket. This is the price of raw material.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : The sugar industrialist has been charging him for his ignorance. They are deriving the maximum price from the Government as well as the consumer. They get round about Rs. 165 per quintal. Out of that they have paid very little to the Government and to the sugar-cane grower... (*Interruption by Shri C.D. Pande*) ... Here is another Pande arguing with me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You have to finish in two minutes.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : I am losing time. I am not going to yield to anybody.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : That is why I allow you up to 5 o'clock.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : No, Sir. Before 3-10 I cannot finish. Sir, I was saying that the U. P. Government has got to be blamed. For the last twenty years every government, the Maharashtra Government, the Gujarat Government or the Mysore Government, has been using this cess for improving the quality of sugar-cane, for building good roads in factory areas. But what has the U. P. Government done ? They have been just

the hand-maid of the sugar industrialists of U. P. and nothing more. That is what I charge that Government with. That is why the demand for nationalisation has come from Bihar, U. P. and some other areas, including the Southern parts. ...

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana) : Haryana also.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : I do not know about Haryana. Sir, I throw a challenge. There are 22 lakh growers in U. P. In the co-operative sector U. P. has a well-knit sugar-cane growers' organisation. Let him deny that. Why are they not going into this co-operative sector? Why are they not collecting from every grower some money to form a viable share capital to acquire sugar factories from the industrialists, I do not understand. I raised this problem with the Prime Minister and she said that whereas my State co-operative has developed, her State has not developed. Again, the Prime Minister stated in Lucknow that in U. P. everybody was interested in politics . . .

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh) : In U. P. it is the State Government which is not encouraging co-operatives.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : That is correct. Now it is on the authority of the Prime Minister that I say that if the U. P. Government could manage their own affairs in the interest of the agriculturist in the interest of rural welfare, they could meet the challenge. I will help them. The point is that with these co-operatives you can co-operativise. Out of the 71 odd factories, 21 are in U. P. alone . . .

(*Interruptions*)

AN HON'BLE MEMBER : You have specialised only in U. P.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : ... Recently the Konda Rao Committee made a study of this nationalisation problem. They have said that in the whole country about Rs. 90 to 100 crores would be required for the take-over of these mills. A certain estimate has been given for the modernisation problem also. What I want to suggest is that in the case of U. P. the immediate solution, as I have said, is nationalisation of the mills which have misbehaved, which have not paid to the agriculturists, whatsoever they may be. I would add that the Government should not nationalise this industry permanently because ultimately this is an agricultural processing activity and I do not stand for the creation of bureaucracy in this industry.

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni]

3 P.M.

So I only suggest that in this agricultural processing industry, it is the cane-grower or the agriculturist who is himself more interested in the development of his own wealth. There are so many other states. There are various examples like Gujarat, Maharashtra, Mysore, Andhra, Madras and so on. You can take them and find the solution. But nationalisation is the only solution now as far as U. P. and Bihar are concerned. (Time bell rings) Sir, I have got only two points to make.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Kulkarni, you must appreciate that this is a 2½ hour discussion and you must listen to the other people also. I will not give you more time.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Sir, I will only take two or three minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : All right.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Sir, my party people are also willing to give me some time.

Now, Sir, there is also a demand for nationalisation in Maharashtra. I do not want to deny that. But by which class it is demanded? It is the private sector class. In the private sector mills, there is a demand going on that nationalisation should be there. But actually this nationalisation is a problem which is to be solved on merits. For this purpose, I demand that this Government must face this problem squarely. I learn the Government is still thinking of appointing some committee here or some committee there. But umpteen committees have been appointed and their reports are on the shelf. There was the Sen Committee report, but nothing has been done. Only Government has taken steps to earn more money by way of excise and so on. Actually, a perspective of healthy development of the sugar industry has not been planned by the Government. That is why I say in U. P. particularly this problem can be solved. There is another way also. Just as you form a textile corporation, you can form a sugar corporation whereby you can give loans, modernise the sugar mills, etc. I do not object to that. That is also another way, particularly where, for instance U. P., cane co-operatives are there. They are active and they are prepared to take up the responsibility. The

State Government must immediately go there and help the cane-growers even at some risk for themselves.

My last point is, why so much discussion is going on here? Mr. C. B. Gupta, the Chief Minister of U. P., suggests 'let the Centre take a decision. Here at the Centre they say 'let the State take a decision'. I want only to plead with the Government of India that this is not a State problem. I want to give them a warning that it is an all-India problem. Only one State cannot solve that problem. You will have to take an all-India perspective and find a workable solution. And for that, the present time is the right time. You have got ample production, ample buffer-stocks. You can really plan a long-range perspective of the sugar industry where the sugarcane growers will get the pride of place and get maximum encouragement at the hands of the Government. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. T.N. Singh.

श्री मानसिंह वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमान मुझे एक प्रश्न पूछना है ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Not now.

SHRI T. N. SINGH (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am sorry that in a discussion on this subject, provincialism has been unnecessarily imported. It was not necessary to raise provincial feelings in this unfortunate country of ours. I wish the hon. Speaker who preceded me had not raised provincial issues.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Sir . . .

SHRI T. N. SINGH : Please keep quiet.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Sir, he is making an aspersion on me. At the outset I had stated that I am putting the problem in a perspective in which we can understand it scientifically. I have never said about any provincial considerations. I only said what is scientifically possible.

SHRI T. N. SINGH : Whatever may have been the speaker's intentions, the fact is that sitting here, I did feel that U.P. was being picked out for a special attack. Let me take the agriculture aspect first. The previous speaker has not put the whole agricultural problem in the proper perspective. Agriculture in U. P. may be backward. We may be suffering from many failings. We have got a very large population and a high pressure on land. I know

of the poverty in East U. P. It is easy to condemn a poor man whose holdings are uneconomic, for failure to do his agricultural work properly but it is not desirable to do so. I belong to East U. P. I know what the problems are, what the difficulties are; half an acre of land, one acre of land—that is the average holding. It is all right for people who have 20 or 30 or 40 acres, the bourgeois farmers to say that they are doing this or that thing better. But the man in U. P. knows what agriculture means, what odds he has to face. Lack of capital resources, lack of inputs, hardly any irrigation facilities and the vagaries of monsoon make agriculture a perpetual gamble. Then the issue of location of sugar mills has been raised. Why? In U. P. and Bihar, and for that matter in North India, sugarcane is only a 10-month crop as against the 16 to 18-months crop in the South and Maharashtra. Now this means that 50 per cent more land is occupied for this purpose. And yet people go on calculating all kinds of advantages, disadvantages and so on for location of sugar mills in South. That is why I say it has been made a provincial issue. I can understand you saying that agriculturist in U. P. should do much more than what it is doing. But do we realise the real plight of the poor agriculturist in our province and in other neighbouring provinces? The hon. Member—I do not know whether he is an agriculturist or a Khasan . . .

SHRI BALKRISHNA GUPTA (Bihar) : He is neither.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: He is a co-operative magnate.

(Interruptions)

SHRI T. N. SINGH : I know what it means to be a Khasan in East U. P. It is not an assured rainfall area like Konkan or other fortunate parts of India.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Sir, . . .

SHRI T. N. SINGH : Please do not disturb me.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Do not interrupt, please.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Sir, he has asked whether I am an agriculturist or what I am. Perhaps Mr. T. N. Singh does not know what agriculture is. I am

a basic agriculturist. And he does not know that the Maharashtra sugarcane crop is for 11 months as in U. P. Perhaps it is he who does not know agriculture.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You can reply later.

SHRI T. N. SINGH : Sir, I wish to be heard patiently by Members. They will have time to say whatever they want.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप श्री कुलकर्णी जी को रोकिये वरना दूसरों को उन्हें शांत करना पड़ेगा। जब वे चाहते हैं खड़े हो जाते हैं और आप उन्हें रोकते नहीं हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I object that he should not do like this.

श्री राजनारायण : आपके आब्जेक्शन का क्या मतलब हुआ जब कि वे उसे इसजोब करते हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I can only say that Mr. Kulkarni or Mr. Rajnarain should not do like this. If they do not listen to me . . .

श्री राजनारायण : ठीक है अगर वे जोब करते हैं, वरना हम चेयर से रिक्वेस्ट करते हैं कि आयन्दा वे खड़े होंगे तो हम उन्हें रोक देंगे।

SHRI T. N. SINGH : Now, Sir, it has been my greatest complaint that in all our four Plans, agriculture has been most neglected. We have not given that attention or priority to agriculture which we should have given it. And mind you, in the words of Jawaharlal Nehru, it is the biggest private sector in the country, but of the small man; and he should have been encouraged as against industrialisation. This is where, I say, will be real socialism, to help the poor agriculturist to see that he finds his feet. And this has not been done, this task has been neglected, all these years. And it has not been done even in the Fourth Plan. That is my grievance.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : In the First Plan something was done.

SHRI T. N. SINGH : Oh, that was only marginal.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Singh was a Member of the Planning Commission.

SHRI T. N. SINGH : I am coming to that. Have patience, Mr. Arora ; do not worry. When some of us in the Planning Commission in those days wanted this, priority for agriculture the whole House here and everyone there, all wanted industrialisation first. They wanted big industrial plans to be prepared. Giganticism was the order of the day and mine was a very small voice, a weak voice, against the voice of the House and of the late Prime Minister Nehru. So, let us not go into the records of the Planning Commission. It is no use opening up that chapter. But let us at least now realise what we have to do. And the prime question today is to see that agriculture really flourishes. If it flourishes, I say, it will bring about a greater economic transformation than industry. And in U. P. even there will be increased output as much as anywhere else. The peasant in U. P. is second to none as a hard-working cultivator, and unfortunately second to none also in his poverty. Therefore, be a little considerate and kind to the peasants of East U. P. instead of being critical in this House. I wish a peasant from U. P. were here to answer the criticisms. But I am here and I am answering on his behalf. A most unjust criticism has been made against the hard-working, toiling peasants in U. P. and I stoutly strongly, protest against such attacks.

Now, coming to other problems, we want nationalisation of the sugar industry in U. P. I wish my friend and others who may follow me hereafter would take care to read the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1950 which is the guideline even today for all our industrial planning and investment programmes and by which they also swear. In that resolution there are two categories of industries schedule A and schedule B. The sugar industry does not find a place in any of these two. Schedule A has been reserved exclusively for the public sector and schedule B for both public and private sectors. The rest have been left generally to the private sector. Though the public sector has the right to enter any field it wants, that proviso is there. Now, what has been our Governments' record and attitude? Since the honourable Member has tried to recall to me the past days of my membership in the Planning Commission, I want to point to him—and none of those great ad-

vocates of socialism has got up to say—that in the year 1963-64 out of the 17 items listed in schedule A, only 6 or 7 are today reserved exclusively for the public sector and all the other categories have been thrown open to the private sector also. I am talking of schedule A. Before 1962 it was exclusively reserved for the public sector. Now it has been thrown open to the private sector also, not by the Planning Commission, but by a decision or decisions of the Cabinet from time to time after 1963. Does anyone want me to repeat all these things? I had no intention. That is a sorry tale by itself. Today we are taking advice of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari. But what was his record in those days? I was a victim of his policy to liberalise the Industrial Policy Resolution. I opposed him that this should not be done, that the scope of schedule A should not be reduced in this manner, and I was virtually hounded out of the Planning Commission. This is what happened. It is easy for people to talk of socialism and nationalisation.

I happened to be the Minister of Industry in 1964-65. We started what was called the Cement Corporation, we started the Paper Corporation, to enter the consumer field. What has happened to those Corporations? How far have they progressed? Five years have gone by. Where are they? What progress have they made? And here we talk of big nationalisation. Why indulge in empty rhetoric? We may have disputes. We may have political differences. But let us not go that far and distort facts. I would not like you to do that if you really mean nationalisation of sugar industry. If you mean it, nationalisation of sugar industry should be on an all-India scale as rightly observed by my friend, the previous speaker. The fate of this proposition will be what it has been of similar others; God help us when such propositions are made, the purpose being to think in terms of a province and not on an all India basis. I remember what has been happening in regard to other such proposals. Cement is going to be decontrolled. It is being decontrolled now as a great socialist process, a socialist action. And we have given six months notice of decontrol. What happened when we decontrolled it four years ago? It was done suddenly. No notice was given to the private sector that we were going to decontrol it from such and such date. But here we have given six months' notice to the producers of cement that it is going to be decontrolled from such and such a date. When have you heard of such a notice

being given ? And we call it socialism. It is not the correct and proper thing to do. Let us be really socialist. What is our way of life ? Is it the simple life of a real socialist ?

Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, addressing us here, rightly said, "Socialism is not so much a matter of doctrine. It is a way of life." Living in Delhi, this affluentsity from from month to month, from day to day, we have forgotten the poor in our villages. And yet we talk glibly of socialism. I know what socialism is, what hunger is, what poverty is. I had my difficult days. There was one Prime Minister, the late Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. He knew what poverty was and he knew and appreciated the urg's and desires of poor masses. I wish if you really mean socialism, let us do it in the right way. This capital city is not the right environment for thinking of socialism. When you live in Delhi, every day, every hour, that you pass in this gilded city of ours, every decision of ours, every action that we take, is bound to taint and dilute socialism. The very way we live, is all against socialism. I am saying it from my heart. I mean it. Therefore, I say if we really want socialism, let us forget this high affluence-tainted social life, this alien and Western modernism.

Let us see what the purpose of the Industrial Policy Resolution was. It was for the State to control the commanding heights of economy. Now, I ask you: When we abandoned the Forging and Foundry Casting Plant at Allahabad, the heavy pressure pump at Allahabad, and also many other important industries, nobody had a tear to shed. Here we are waxing eloquent on sugar industry, for what purpose? Somebody in the private sector invested some money somewhere and you want to compensate him because under the Constitution you will have to compensate him. What ignorances we are ? It was suggested by some people : select those mill which have not paid their taxes and nationalise them. We seem to be ignorant of our Constitution. I tried to do it in the case of one or two firms. But then they said, "You cannot pick and choose particular concerns like this." Nationalisation has to be of a whole category of industrial units. The mere fact that somebody is not paying this or that due is not going to put him in a separate category. Why do we talk in this manner ? This is a responsible House. We should say something which we can really do. Therefore, I would in all humility say, let us make a proposal which

we mean to implement, which we should and we can implement. Let us not try to be fool others and the masses. They can befooled for some time, but not for all times, and they will retaliate in a big way if you go on in this way. I do not want such things to be done.

Then, people have talked of co-operatives. I think Maharashtra has a very good record in this regard. Some public-spirited mean have done a good job. I pay all tributes to them. But taking the whole country in view, you will permit me an honest expression of opinion when I say the co-operatives have so far been a failure in India.

I must say that it was on co-operatives that we built up our hopes but the co-operatives have not succeeded. We have got infinite capacity to quarrel, blame and accuse each other; we are torn by all sorts of quarrels and casteism; there is a lot of corruption and other evils. All these things have been there to kill the co-operative movement in India, a very laudable movement. In this connection I do not remember the full Sanskrit verse. Yudhishtira was asked by the demon—he had earlier killed his four brothers for not replying to questions किमश्चर्यम् ?—"What is the greatest wonder ?" Yudhishtira replied that the greatest wonder was that people were dying everyday, yet we all think that we will go on living indefinitely. So is the case with our co-operatives. We see that they are making no progress and their performance is far from satisfactory, still we are going on trying to maintain them and have pinned our faith in them. The conditions in the country are growing from bad to worse; there is growing population; there is large-scale unemployment. Therefore you cannot afford to play with the economy of the country.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : What should be done ? We would like to have your positive opinion.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: I wish I had time to explain all these things and my ideas on the subject. But within the limited time at my disposal I will not be able to explain all these things in detail.

Now I will take up this question of nationalisation. According to our Constitution it will not be possible to nationalise sugar mills in U. P. alone. The Centre will have to come in. Let us assume that we have decided to set apart Rs. 150 or Rs. 200 crores out of our Plan for this purpose.

[Shri T. N. Singh]

Then according to our own classification in the Industrial Policy Resolution certain industries will have to be given higher priority and they have to be taken over in the public sector first by the Centre. Wherever there is concurrent jurisdiction the Centre prevails. Therefore in this case, the Centre's responsibility will prevail. Some people have been crying hoarse for nationalisation of the car industry; I have opposed it, yet some people have really been crying hoarse about it. I have been asking "What about the tractor industry? It has not been nationalised. It is of a much higher priority than the car industry." Not only that Sir, in 1965 I had myself negotiated for the setting up of a tractor factory in the public sector with Czechoslovak collaboration. That project has not yet seen the light of the day, although five years have elapsed.

What this country needs most today—and this is what our late Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri one day told me—is an honest administration. The poor man in the village is crying for an honest administration. Assure him all that instead of frittering away your limited resources in this manner. As it is, the administration of our public sector has been disappointing. I will be unfair to the public sector if I do not say that. Our administration has not been able to take up the responsibility to the extent it is expected to do. Similarly we have not got an honest administration as we should have. What are we going to do about it?

In regard to agriculture again, I would say that it is better if we give a little more emphasis on agriculture. Our small agriculturists should be given fertilisers and water at cheap rates and other facilities. We want the States to raise more resources. But the States raise resources by taxing these very items fertilisers, water, etc. which are useful to small agriculturists. The whole point therefore is that the inputs in agriculture should be low-priced if you want real agricultural revolution. Up till now we have given all kinds of concessions to industries. The STC, the MMTC, etc. have devoted themselves to importing material so that the private sector can get it cheap. All sorts of concessions like double depreciation, tax rebate, and other things have been given to the private sector. But when it comes to the question of giving concessions to agriculturists, we say that the States should raise taxes. I can tell you the day

will come when the States will revolt against the Centre. Already there are enough signs of conflict between the States and the Centre. Gone are the days when one party used to rule both at the Centre and in the States. Now you are going to have more and more tension conflict. Therefore I do not want the Centre to do anything which will compel the States to raise their banner of revolt. We should not do that.

(Time bell rings)

I have suggested that we should take up high priority items first. I have also suggested to do something urgently for the poor agriculturists. If you want to bring real socialism in this country, it is desirable that you should concentrate on getting a hold on the commanding heights of the economy. Let us not fritter away our limited resources. As it is, we are indebted to the various other nations to the extent of Rs. 6,000 crores. With our total exports being of the order of Rs. 900 crores a year, our imports are of the order of Rs. 1,200 crores. Therefore I would like you to apply your mind more objectively so that the country's resources are invested only in those things which are really essential and which will help in boosting the economy of the country. Now take the case of co-operatives—an important item of our Plan strategy. What has been their performance? I am all in favour of co-operatives but they should be run honestly and efficiently. I do not believe in giving any special certificate to the private sector. The private sector has many faults today; I am fully aware of its shortcomings and sometimes very wrong things have been done in the private sector. I want the public sector to expand but I do not want to lose my head in that process. I want to have the public sector where it is absolutely necessary. Our resources are very limited. Let us not go by Slogans; like people crying 'thief' 'thief', we should not also cry 'thief' and run with the crowd. We should ascertain problems and facts as they are and then act in their light.

With these few words, Sir, I conclude.

SHRI S. D. MISRA (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, on a point of order, the other day when this question was raised in the Question Hour, we requested the Chair to give a direction to the Minister that they must get the legal opinion about this matter of nationalisation.

In that although the Minister had said that they would consider whether they would give it to us, we have not yet got either the opinion of the Solicitor-General or of the Law Ministry or of the Food Ministry or of the Ministers concerned. I do not agree that it is such a confidential thing that it should be hidden from us, because, otherwise, it precludes a real discussion of this issue. The State Government is saying that they cannot do it because the Centre is competent to do it. Now we are at a loss to understand as to who can do it or will do it. Thus we are groping in the dark and we cannot understand why it is being hidden from us.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Sir, no direction was given by the Chair in regard to whether copies of the legal advice should be placed on the Table of the House. In fact, the suggestion was made by the hon. Member, and the Chair said it might be considered. But there was no direction from the Chair.

SHRI S. D. MISRA : What is the objection to it ?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : It is not the system, it is not the convention to lay such documents on the Table of the House and, therefore, Sir, I regret very much my inability to make this documents available.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, एटार्नी जनरल को इस सदन में बुलाया जा सकता है और मेरा आप से यह सजेशन है कि आप एटार्नी जनरल साहब को कहें कि वह इस सदन में आयें और आ कर के हम सब के सामने अपनी राय व्यक्त करें ।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : किस प्वाइन्ट पर ?

श्री राजनारायण : इस पर कि शुगर इंडस्ट्री का समाजकारण करने के लिये केन्द्रीय सरकार सक्षम है या राज्य सरकार सक्षम है क्योंकि हम एक नोट पढ़ रहे हैं . . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : नोट न पढ़िये ।

श्री राजनारायण : ... जिसमें श्री ए० पी० जैन का भी है और जिसमें सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट का भी है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : ठीक है, समझ गया ।

श्री राजनारायण : सुनिये एक मिनट । इसमें यह है : because the authority for doing so vested only in the Central Government, यह राय लोकसभा में व्यक्त की गई है । तारीख को ।

श्री शीलमङ्ग याजी (बिहार) : कौन सा पेपर है ?

श्री राजनारायण : यह आपका ही है हमारे दीक्षित जी ने लिखा है, उन्हीं का आर्टिकल है । वह बता देंगे ।

तो, श्रीमन्, यह बड़ा वैलिड प्रश्न है जो कि उन्होंने उठा लिया है ।

श्री पीताम्बर दास (उत्तर प्रदेश) : यह इनकी स्पीच का एक भाग है क्या ?

श्री राजनारायण : स्पीच तो हम बाद में देंगे ।

SHRI S. D. MISRA : Sir, it is my information that the Law Minister has given a different opinion and the Law Secretary has given a different opinion. Is it a fact or not? Let them say.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: Sir, I was astonished to hear Mr. Shinde say so; the Chairman might not have directed that day, but how can he say that this is not the procedure? If the Minister wants, he can give it out. (Interruptions) There is a debate now there is a conflict now, between the U. P. Government and the Government of India, as regards the legal aspects of this take-over of the sugar industry. When there is the conflict now, somebody has to resolve it. The Government may do it on their own behalf or, if the Members of this House want it, the Government should come forward, and clear the whole air. I do not think there is any Member who will say, "Let

[Shri Banka Behary Das]

us not resolve this issue." So we are competent enough to resolve the issue, and I want that the Minister here should come forward and say—if they have already taken legal opinion—whether the State should do it or the Government of India should do it, because this is a national debate and we cannot discuss it in the air.

SHRI A. P. JAIN (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, the question of legislative competence is irrelevant to this discussion, because this discussion refers to the Central Government and nobody has questioned that the Central Government has the power to nationalise the sugar industry. The only question is whether the State Governments have correspondingly the power to nationalise it. But as we are discussing this question in Parliament, our discussion is addressed to the Central Government, and the Central Government has unquestionably the power to nationalise the industry. So the question whether the State Government has or has not the competence to nationalise the sugar industry is irrelevant to this discussion.

SHRI S. D. MISRA : No, no.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : On a point of order, Sir. Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain said that it is because we are discussing it here it is immaterial whether the State Government has the legislative competence or not. Today we must take the whole background of the case into consideration when this issue has been before the public for the last two months and it has been said by the spokesmen of this Government that this matter relates to the State Government of U. P. And the U. P. Government, naturally, said, "No, we are not alone; because it is an all-India question, this question should be decided by the Central Government." In that connection the hon. Minister said that it is not the practice to give the legal opinion in the matter to this House. I say we want it. Why do you object to it? We can call the Attorney General here.

(Interruptions)

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN (Gujarat) : On a point of order. At present there is no need to call the Attorney-General here. The subject of the discussion is to raise a discussion on the demand for nationalization of the sugar industry in the country. In the subject-matter of the discussion there can be no U. P., no Maharashtra and all that.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : What is the background to this? That we should know.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have heard with care and attention the observations of the hon. Member from U. P. He is right that the issue in that sense does not compel us to call for legal opinion. But that does not end the matter because, even if the Centre is competent—and here we are concerned with the Centre—two other important issues remain. Number one; is it possible, even if we have the competence, to nationalise the sugar units in one State only to the exclusion of nationalising the sugar industry at the all-India level? That is issue number one. Issue number two is whether, while nationalising, we can nationalise only the privately-owned mills and keep the co-operative mills out of its purview, or not. That is another issue. Therefore, it is not correct to say that in view of the language of the subject-matter of the discussion legal opinion need not be called for.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) : I am really surprised at the argument advanced without reading the subject-matter of the discussion itself. It is "to raise a discussion on the demand for nationalization of the sugar industry in the country." It is nowhere said that the nationalization is to be in U. P. or Bihar or other places.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : What is the background to this?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Secondly, even if any legal expert.

SHRI S. D. MISRA : Just an interruption if you don't mind. This will help you. Here it is said "in the country." And in the country, you know, there is the Centre; there are the States. You already know that since the last two or three months this talk has been going on of nationalising the industry in U. P.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : There is that background.

SHRI S. D. MISRA : Yes, the background is very relevant. Now the Government of Uttar Pradesh, in its Cabinet meeting, passed a resolution that they are for nationalisation of the sugar industry. But they also put in writing that they are not competent because this will mean

discrimination between one State and another and so they are not competent to do it. Therefore they referred this matter of the Central Government. Therefore this becomes a vital question.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : My submission is, even if any legal expert is called here in this House and his opinion is taken, ultimately it is not the opinion of that legal expert, or even of this House, that prevails. But it is the opinion of the courts concerned, may be the High Court or the Supreme Court or wherever it may be challenged. So ultimately it has to be decided there. Now this discussion today has given an opportunity to all the Members, particularly to the constitutional experts in the House, to express their opinions as to what will happen, if the whole of the industry is to be nationalised, what are the problems, if the sugar industry in a particular State has to be nationalised, what are the problems, whether the co-operative industry can be kept as it is. So this discussion has given an opportunity to all the Members to express their views. Naturally, these views and the views of the Law Ministry and of other experts can be considered by the Government, and thereby we can facilitate the Government to come to some conclusion. So, instead of assisting the Government, just to make a demand as to what is the opinion of the Government does not help matters. I feel that, if the Government has made up its mind without listening to the Members, when the Government is not democratically functioning, Government should say in this House that this issue is absolutely open so far as the Government is concerned, and I feel that the Government has kept it open and the Government would like to have the very valuable advice of this House. And let us tender that advice to the Government.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would particularly like you to recognise that there are certain constitutional and legal problems which arise in the consideration of a measure of this kind. Some problems have already been referred to by the hon. Member but I would not, even if I am in a minority of one, agree with the proposition that some units in any industry cannot be nationalised. And recently...

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Mishra, you are expressing opinion on the subject

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I am raising a constitutional doubt on which I would like the opinion of an expert. Here as you see, the position that has been taken up by many hon. Members, broadly, is that we are talking of nationalising the industry in the country as a whole and, therefore, no problem arises. *(Interruptions)* I am explaining the position as I see it. The hon. Member Mr. Dharia and the hon. Member Mr. Jain also said that we are talking of the problem as a whole, that we are not thinking of the problem in segments. But what I want to assert is that the problem can be considered in segments. I am speaking only in a constitutional sense. If the Government wants to nationalise an industry in a particular State or even some units of industry in a particular State, would constitutional or legal problems arise? If there are any constitutional or legal problems, I would like to have the opinion of the Attorney-General. As has been urged by the hon. Mr. Rajnarain we do require in this connection the expert opinion of the Attorney-General. So I would like to support that demand. The Attorney-General is there to give his advice in such matters. Probably the Attorney General has never made his appearance in this august House and this is the one subject on which we would like to get the expert opinion of the Attorney-General.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : Sir, I have two submissions to make. The first is about the point raised by Mr. Sinha that we have to consider whether the Central Government is authorised to nationalise the sugar industry in only one State, or for that matter only two or three States, or whether it is constitutionally essential for it to nationalise it in the whole country. I was surprised to hear Mr. Dharia. I have been noticing since my entry in this House that Mr. Dharia talks very sensibly but today I was surprised to hear him.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : May be, your company might have affected your judgment.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : May be, I was labouring under wrong illusion since the last 1½ years.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : I am sorry if the hon. Member requires that much time to understand me. What can I do ?

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : My friend Mr. Dharia . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Leave Mr. Dharia kindly come to the point.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: My friend Mr. Dharia says that after looking at the Resolution he comes to the conclusion that it is to be nationalised in the whole country. That is what he says. I would request him to look at the Resolution once again. We are not discussing the nationalisation of the sugar industry in the country. What we are discussing is the demand for nationalisation of the sugar industry in the country and every one of us knows that it is only one State in the whole country that has demanded the nationalisation of the sugar industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: You may agree or you may not agree. But tell me a second State which has demanded nationalisation of the sugar industry. It is only U. P. where this demand is made.

श्री रिजक राम: (हरियाणा) : कौन से स्टेट का कह रहे हैं ।

श्री पीताम्बर दास : मैंने यू० पी० का जिक्र किया है । यू० पी० में ही डिमाण्ड उठी है ।

श्री एस० डी० मिश्र : वहां कैबिनेट में आया है ।

(Interruption)

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : In addition to U. P. there is perhaps another State which has demanded this, namely, Bihar. But I want to know whether there is any third State which has asked for this. In this country there are 15 or 16 States. So virtually speaking this discussion is only about the demand for nationalisation of the sugar industry in U. P. and Bihar. That is submission No. 1.

My second submission is that when the question of getting the advice of the Attorney-General comes I am surprised that some of my friends should be anxious to keep the House in darkness. Why should we remain in constitutional darkness or constitutional ignorance? If some of us feel that light would come through the Attorney-General what objection can others have? We say तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय: From darkness lead us unto light. So let us have more light on this matter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Chandra Shekhar.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT (Delhi) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have been getting up to catch your eye so many times and every time you have been calling somebody else. Why should I not be given a chance to express my opinion?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I will give you.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: You have been calling nearly half a dozen Members but still I do not get the chance.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Your party members have already spoken.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Gujarat) : Are you calling party-wise? If you are going according to the parties, then the question is different.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: You have been calling so many others.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I will give you a chance after Mr. Chandra Shekhar.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have every sympathy for my friend, Mr. Pitamber Das for whom I have great respect and also for Mr. Mishra. They are so eager to know the views of the Attorney-General but there are certain points of procedure. The Attorney-General is not expected to give advice on legal and constitutional points in order to enlighten the Members and to enable them to make their speeches on a particular issue.

(Interruptions)

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Sir, may I . . .

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: All right, you get up ten times. I have not just completed one sentence even and the hon. Lady Member gets up immediately.

I was just saying that the Attorney-General is expected to make his observations or is opinion here if a law point is involved when the Parliament is taking any decision in regard to the enactment of a law or a decision which is going to influence the enactment which will influence the life of the society or of the country.

SHRI S. D. MISRA : This is so.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : That is your opinion.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Unfortunately, Mr. S. D. Misra does not know anything except the brief he gets.

SHRI S. D. MISRA : We do not know the wrong things like Mr. Chandra Shekhar. We know the right things.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. S. D. Misra knows only one thing that somehow today the debate on nationalisation should not proceed and for that we should be got involved in these technicalities.

What I mean to say is, today there is neither any Bill nor any Resolution. It is only a motion for a short duration discussion. I should like to know any precedent from the hon. Mr. Pitamber Das or from the hon. Mr. Mishra in any part of the world in any parliamentary history when the Attorney-General has been summoned to give opinion on a short duration discussion motion. If it were a question of childish curiosity on the part of some new entrants in parliamentary life I could have understood but if two veterans, old Members, want to be curious like children then I have nothing to say.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have a right to express our views.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT : Kindly listen. I am glad that I can reply after Shri Chandra Shekhar has shown his ignorance by making that statement. Please hear me patiently, as you heard these people on the opposite. I want you to be patient. My point is this. Government in a parliamentary democracy means getting the views of all sections of the House and it is for the Government to govern by mutual consultation with various parties and the representatives of the people of the country. No., the House is entitled to know the legal opinion. Whenever any matter is raised by Members or even by private persons the Government often take legal opinion for their own guidance and their own functioning in the particular matter. It does not have to be related to a Bill and it does not have to be related to a Resolution. You may take legal opinion even at various stages of a certain situation developing. Therefore, the Government

are always within their right to ask for legal opinion at any stage on a particular question.

(*Interruption*)

याजी जी आपको तो हमेशा बोलने की आदत हो गई है। जब आपका टाइम आयेगा तब बोलियेगा।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You address me.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT : The Government has already taken legal opinion in this matter. This particular discussion should not develop, like all other discussions, into a battle of wits between the Government and the parties. I am sure the Government and particularly the Minister concerned are interested in getting the views of all the people and also ultimately of giving their views. We do not expect the Government always to agree to what we say, but we do expect the Government to listen to the various views expressed in the House and then to take their final decision. It is the right of the House, that, when there is any doubt about a certain legal question and if the legal opinion is there, the Government may enlighten the House about it. If they have got it, they should also say it, so that Members are able to participate in the debate in the context of the view that is expressed in the legal opinion rather than everybody saying what he or she feels. The legal opinion being there and Members not knowing about it is not good. If Members know it, the debate can be more relevant and more to the point. I am sure the Minister is very sympathetic and would want to enlighten us if it is feasible. If he gives the legal opinion, I think the debate can be more fruitful. Thank you.

SHRI OM MEHTA (Jammu and Kashmir) : I would draw your attention to one thing ...

SHRI ANNASAHAB SHINDE : Sir, ...

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : He wants to quote a rule. The Minister should not get precedence over him.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI OM MEHTA : I am not saying anything, but before you give your ruling. I want to say this. It is a Short Duration Discussion under rule 176. Rule 178 says :

"There shall be no formal motion before the Council nor voting. The

[Shri Om Mehta]

member who has given notice may make a short statement and the Minister shall reply shortly. Any member who has previously intimated to the Chairman may be permitted to take part in the discussion."

So, there is no formal motion and no voting.

श्री राजनारायण : हम यह निवेदन करना है कि ट्रेजरी बैचेज वालों को एक सीनियर और समझदार आदमी को विहप बनाना चाहिये ।

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : जब आप जैसे आदमी आगे गये हैं तो कोई बात नहीं ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I have asked the Minister.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: I think all this controversy can be avoided because as far as the legal opinion is concerned, we have consulted the Law Ministry. Legal opinion has been given that the State Government is also competent to acquire the sugar industry.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN (Kerala) : Correct, absolutely correct.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I want to make one point clear.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Please hear me. The position is that the House has approved of a two-and-a-half hour short duration discussion on the sugar industry. While discussing it the question has arisen whether we should take the advice of the Attorney-General or not. After hearing so many, there are at least half a dozen more who want to speak on the same point. I have no objection, let the whole time be taken on this preliminary matter, but I think that will be against the very idea or object that there should be a discussion. If senior people like Mr. Mishra, after speaking twice, want to speak again, I have nothing to say, but I would like you to help me in carrying on the discussion on the sugar industry and nothing else. One more thing. Please sit down. Do not get impatient. I asked the Minister concerned. He said that he had consulted the law department and he has given his opinion. Pitamber Dasji, we may agree with him or we may not agree with him. Even if the Attorney-General has given his opinion, we may agree with it or we may disagree with it. Now, the main

question is we want the views of all the people, people with different shades of opinion. Their views should be ventilated on the demand for the nationalisation of the sugar industry. I would appeal to you now to close this. I had already called Mr. Dikshit. Let him speak on the motion itself. I am in possession of the House. Whatever you decide I will carry out.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I am very sorry that we are not being helped. My submission is that the House has to be helped in certain circumstances by the Government. Now, it was a very humble submission made to the Government that we should be given some idea about the advice tendered, legal advice tendered to the Government, on various constitutional issues which arise in this connection. But the Government has been extremely secretive in this matter. The Government do not want to share the legal advice it had received and, again, when the hon. Minister spoke on this at your instance he spoke to us only about one single point. There are many other points which arise and, therefore, I would say . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Let him speak.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : In half a sentence I will finish. I never take time more than absolutely necessary. So, we want that on various issues we should get the expert legal advice. It is nowhere mentioned in the Constitution, as has been sought to be made out, that it is only in the context of Bills or formal motions that the advice of the Attorney-General could be sought. The advice of the Attorney-General can be sought on anything . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Please read that. Let me hear him.

श्री राजनारायण : यह एक कांस्टीट्यूशनल प्वाइंट है ।

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: According to article 88 of the Constitution of India there is no such mention . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Please read it.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: It says :—

"Every Minister and the Attorney General of India shall have the right

to speak in, and otherwise to take part in the proceedings of, either House, any joint sitting of the Houses, and committee of Parliament of which he may be named a member, but shall not by virtue of this article be entitled to vote."

That is the only thing. There is no other condition. Then, with regard to his functions also, on any subject his advice could be sought by the Government of India. Since the Government of India is not sharing with us the advice that it has received, it becomes absolutely necessary for us to get legal opinion.

(*Interruptions*)

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद : आप एक बात तय कीजिये । इस तरह से डिस्कशन कैसे होगा ।

श्री राजनारायण : यही तरीका है और हमेशा सदन में होता है ।

4 P.M.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Please sit down. Please sit down. After hearing the latest point of Mr. Mishra, the opposition leader, I am of the opinion that I would like to decide this matter after I hear all those persons who want to speak on this. No more discussion on this question. Mr. Dikshit.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : On a point of clarification.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Please sit down.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, आपने हमको कहा कि आप हम ने एक मिनट सुनेगे ।

SHRI C. D. PANDE : The Minister has said that the Law Ministry has given this opinion. This is a very serious thing . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Your leader has spoken. Please sit down. Kindly sit down.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Kindly hear me. If you hear, the whole House would agree with me.

SHRI JAGDISH CHANDRA DIKSHIT (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, you have called me.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : The legal opinion is that the State can acquire. May I also know whether the legal opinion is that the Centre can take action in one State alone ? This is another question. The third question is, suppose the West Bengal Government decides to nationalise the jute industry, the Bombay Government decides to nationalise the textile industry. Is it competent to do it ? No. Then we have to decide about plantations . . .

श्री राजनारायण : वाइस चेयरमैन साहब बेकार हल्ला हो रहा है । पाइन्ट उठाया हमने और हमारे पाइन्ट पर ही डिस्कशन हो गया । आधे मिनट हमको सुन लीजिए । मैं अपने मित्र चन्द्रशेखर की मदद करना चाहता हूँ । अगर उनकी यह इच्छा है तो । अगर हमको एटर्नी जनरल की यह राय मालूम हो जाय कि राज्य सरकार भी काम्पीटेन्ट है तो हम अपने राज्य की सरकार पर दबाव डाल सकते हैं कि चाहे केन्द्र जहन्नुम में जाय तुम अपने राज्य में ऐसा करो । इसलिए हम चाहते हैं कि एटर्नी जनरल की ओपीनियन यहां पर आ जाय । हर राज्य में एक पार्टी की सरकार नहीं चल रही है । उत्तर प्रदेश में एक पार्टी ही चला रही हो तो भी दूसरे लोगों की मदद कहीं न कहीं होगी । तो हमारे यहां से कुछ पाइन्ट दिए गये हैं कि इन-इन कामों को किया जाय । अगर राज्य की सरकार काम्पीटेन्ट है और एटर्नी जनरल की राय हम जान लें तो हम इस पर बहुत ही जोर दे सकते हैं कि श्री चन्द्रभान जी गुप्त आप सबसे पहले उत्तर प्रदेश में शुगरकेन इंडस्ट्री का समाजीकरण करो ।

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : I would like to say . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Please sit down. I do not want anybody to dictate. Mr. Dikshit.

SHRI JAGDISH CHANDRA DIKSHIT : Sir, I have found in the House that senior Members, always encroach upon the time of the younger Members in regard to speech. I think it was half-past three when I expected to get a chance to speak. But nearly an hour has been taken on parliamentary quibblings and so on without realising the fact that the House was debating a very important economic

[Shri Jagdish Chandra Dikshit]

and social question in which about two crores of people are interested. You would be interested to know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that about 30 lakhs of cultivators cultivate cane, supply cane to the sugar industry which is manufactured into sugar. The industry employs about 2,30,000 workers. These 33 lakhs of people, if computed in terms of family members, would come to about 2 crores of people. You are thus at the moment considering a subject which concerns about 5 per cent of the population and, therefore, I expect hon. Members to bear with me and to apply their mind to the question seriously and with consideration.

While doing so, I would first of all like to precisely state the grounds that have been advanced or that might be advanced to oppose the request or demand for nationalisation. The first is of course that some of the factories are now very old, that their plants have become obsolete, that their machinery has become outdated and, therefore, to invest money on them, or to pay compensation for them would be in a way frittering away the very precious resources of the nation. If I take this argument as sound, I want to know what the Government or this august House is thinking of the cane cultivators, who must cultivate cane, must harvest cane and wait for its being crushed by factories which are obsolete or outdated and which are in the process of whittling away. Is that your concern for the peasants and the cane growers that you commit their future to the mercy of unpredictable fate or chance? Then it has been very easily and lightly said by one of the most respected speakers that only Rs. 3½ crores remains to be paid to the growers by some factories and therefore it should not be made a ground for demanding nationalisation. The argument is not so simple, Mr. Vice-Chairman. You can imagine if the peasant does not get the price for his cane this year, how can he then be expected to invest in the cultivation of cane to be able to make cane available during the year to come? The money he gets by selling is cane is his only resource to meet his consumption needs, to meet the necessities of his life, as also the capital needs for further cultivation. If he is not going to get the cane price he has earned through his toil, to invest in agriculture, how can you expect any improvement either in per acre yield or quality of cane; and how can you think of accomplishing the green revolution or improved agriculture about which you and I have been crying

hoarse for days and years together? Kindly remember sugar is grown in the fields and not in factories.

Then again, only yesterday on the newspapers the spokesmen of the sugar industry said that in U. P. alone 56 sugar factories invested Rs. 43 crores on rehabilitation. The earlier argument goes a begging because of this statement. Because if Rs. 43 crores had been invested by 56 factories, then they are no more obsolete plants. And if they remain obsolete plants as claimed simultaneously, then how could it be said that they have invested anything? If you take the two arguments together, the fallacy of both stands exposed. Further, if you go into the sugar statistics, you will find that the capacity of private sector had doubled. What does this increase in capacity show? It shows that there were a few business houses, who were intelligent enough to know how the proceedings of the Licensing Committee could be manipulated to their advantage; they did not allow any new unit, or new entrepreneurs to come into the field, they, thus, skillfully pre-empted new capital from coming into the field. They took advantage of all that procedural and routine mechanism and could afford to expand the capacity of their plants. What I want to underline is that, to say that if the industry is nationalised or if a demand for nationalisation is made it would be scaring away the capital is a phantom deliberately created. I challenge the merit of such propositions. Out of 207 sugar factories that exist today, 137 came into being before the Second World War. Each of them was then established at a cost of Rs. 10 to 14 lakhs. And if you take the total capital investment at the time they were erected, it would not come to more than 14 to 15 crores for the country as a whole, and not more than Rs. 9 crores so far as UP is concerned. The figure which I am stating about U.P. is from employers' own document, namely, the Birla Committees' Report published in 1954. Cannot the nation find Rs. 15 crores to nationalise this industry? Is a sum of Rs. 15 crores going to be an unbearable burden for the nation? I do not know what Dr. Pande was talking about. He said that a capital of about 100 crores of rupees was locked up in U. P. Sugar Industry. I do not know wherefrom he got that figure. Whether you look into the report of the Tariff Board or that of Birla Committee, better authorities than he, you will find that he was making a claim which cannot be objectively sustained. I must also rejoin

the argument here and now, that because the services are corrupt and because public undertakings have failed to operate successfully therefore to nationalise the sugar industry would be like throwing it into the hands that would kill it. I do not know on what basis such a malicious attack is made on our services. I am reminded at the moment of a tribunal's decision; of course, it was given about two decades ago, when the industrial dispute of the Bihar sugar factory workers went for adjudication to Mr. B. P. Sinha, who later became the Chief Justice of India, he had then occasion to observe 'it is not without justification that the spokesman of labour characterised balance sheets as cooked for the purpose of showing losses', and he found that it was not safe to base any conclusion in regard to losses on the data adduced in the balance sheet of sugar factories. In another adjudication case following it, when the matter was adjudicated upon by Mr. Shiv Pujan Rai, another judge of the Patna High Court, he went on record to say that some of the sugar factories had suffered losses because they had invested money in share speculation, financed other business, and undertook money lending business. In regard to the factories taken over by the Government of India under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, the report of the Tariff Commission of 1959 states that they had made good profits during a period sugar factories working in the private sector had claimed losses. Here, I am quoting not from a trade union record or as a trade unionist, I am quoting from the judgements given by celebrated judges and reports composed by recognised authorities.

Therefore, to say in the face of these pronouncements of authorities like Mr. Sinha, Mr. Shiv Pujan Rai and Tariff Commission that the public sector in sugar would not be a boon, but would be a curse, is not fair. Let me restate the position and revert back to argument from where I had digressed. Today, out of 207 factories, five are in the public sector, five to ten are under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, being looked after by the Government of India and 66 are operating in the co-operative sector. Hardly seven to ten parties of the private sector have entered the industry after the Second World War. How can one say that in the face of such a record of the entry of new capital, capital would be scared away by the demand of nationalisation? When the factories in the private sector have grown older than their technically estimated life, why this cry

to protect them? Now you will ask me why I want nationalisation of the Indian Sugar Industry. I want it because, in 1932 when the Central legislature legislated the Indian Sugar Industry Protection Act extending protection to the sugar industry, it stated clearly in its preamble, that the protection is being given to the Sugar industry to protect the cane-growers. Protection of the cane-grower was the main reason for giving protection to the industry. The thought about cane-growers leads me to retrospect.

In 1893 late Shri Mahadev Govind Ranade had contributed three articles to the Times of India, Bombay, pleading for giving protection to the sugar industry on the ground that cane-growing peasantry needs protection. That was also the ground that Madan Mohan Malviya took in the Industrial Commission whose report was published in 1916 to seek encouragement from the government for the industry. It was on that basis that the (Indian Sugarcane Committee) McKenon Committee was appointed in 1920. Then followed the Kisan Movement in U. P. with an accent on the no-rent campaign and the Bardolai and Khedda Movements in Gujarat and strike of cane-growers in Bihar. The Government of India was forced by these movements to think of taking measures to pacify the peasants. While the Kisan leaders in U. P., Bihar and Gujarat were prosecuted, and the peasantry was prosecuted, the Royal Commission on Agriculture and a Tariff Board for Sugar Industry were also to consider the problem of peasants. On the recommendation of those bodies, protection was granted to the growers. What happened then? Immediately after protection, it became clear to the Government that the sugar industrialists were not going to protect the cane-growers. The Government was forced to bring in another piece of legislation in 1934, called the Sugar Cane Act. This Act for the first time made it obligatory for the sugar mill proprietors to pay the price which the Government fixed for cane, to the cane-growers. This was the first Government intervention in the field of cane-transaction; it was the first restrictive measure taken by the legislature. Why did the industry yield to it? But then what happened? The mischief of the private sector to defeat even this legislative mechanism to benefit the peasantry became public in 1937 in U.P. and Bihar. Great national leaders like Mr. Sri Krishna Sinha in Bihar and Mr. Govind Ballabh Pant in U. P. had to take coercive measures against the industry by putting the Sugar Control Act of

[Shri Jagdish Chandra Dikshit]

Bihar on the statute book of Bihar in 1937 and the Sugar Control Act of U.P. on the statute book of U. P. in 1938 through which they established Sugar Control Boards in the two States. These two great leaders had made it obligatory on every sugar factory to obtain an annual licence from the Government before starting their crushing operation. They had, through the two legislations acquired all the powers to control the erection, expansion and operation of factories except the power to take them over. What happened then? Soon after their Governments resigned in 1939, they went to jail. What happened was, when these people went to jail, finding Kisans of U. P. and Bihar bereft of their leaders the Sugar Syndicate—the organisation of the employers, refused to conform to the schemes envisaged in the U. P. and Bihar Acts. This provoked even the foreign government—the then British Government to punish the Syndicate by withdrawing recognition to carry on the transaction on behalf of the industry, in April 1940. Recognition was restored to in July after much humiliation and diminution in its authority. Then came 1946, when Shri Babu and Pantji were back into power in U. P. and Bihar. This time they dedicated themselves to greater cause, namely, the abolition of the Zamindari. All minds since then to 1954 in the two States were concentrated on abolition of Zamindari. This programme was of great relevance to the cane-growers because till then they were the double slaves. Firstly they were serfs to their own landlords and, secondly, as members of the cane co-operative societies they were under an obligation to supply their cane to the factories to which they were allotted. So, it was a kind of two-fold slavery. After producing the cane, they had to sell their cane to factories at the price fixed by the Government not in consultation with their representatives but in consultation with the employers of the factories to which they had been allotted. In their enthusiasm for redeeming peasants from the serfdom of Zamindars, Sri Babu and Pantji relegated late Hari Har Nath Shastri's demand for nationalisation made in November 1946 to the back-ground. Soon after zamindari was abolished, the demand for nationalisation revived. In 1957 the question was brought to the fore by Klauswaqat Rai in Lok Sabha, and in 1959 by Dr. Sampurnanand (the then Chief Minister of U.P.). Their efforts failed as on both occasions the Central Government came in the way.

The cane-grower continued to be neglected, even the Plans ignored him.

Therefore, what I want to say is that while each one of you sitting in this House is committed to protect the interest of the peasants, the peasantry is being ruined and no symptom of agitation on this count is visible in this House. Here is the sugar industry which has prospered and profited in the name of the peasants with no bliss, whatsoever to the grower. May I ask every Member of each party represented here to stand with me and see that these poor people are no more denied justice—economic and social—due to them?

Concluding, I would urge that the best scheme for doing so would be to adopt the scheme of nationalisation like the one which has been envisaged in the Indian Electricity Act of 1948. When electricity was nationalised, what was done? The statute created provincial electricity boards. They were given the power to acquire the units individually or severally as also to exempt those whom they deemed necessary. I am not enamoured of the word 'nationalisation'. In fact I want Rationalisation in the sense it has been used in the Electricity Act of 1948. I prefer to call it rationalisation because what I aim at is the integration of the ownership of sugar factories and sugar cane fields. All over the world sugar industry is not treated as an industry but as a plantation. Therefore we should see that ownership of sugar factories is taken over from the private sector and handed over to the peasants. The best way possible to do so is to adopt the scheme of nationalisation, formulated for the electricity industry, i.e. of creating boards at the State level analogous to electricity boards and reminiscent by and large, of the old sugar control boards of U. P. and Bihar with added powers to acquire as also with power to exempt privately operated undertakings for the purpose. If the peasants were to be organised on co-operative lines to take over factories, their co-operative organisations must follow and not precede nationalisation. The nationalisation of the sugar industry on the lines indicated is both urgent and necessary.

डा० भाई महावीर (दिल्ली) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, चीनी मिलों की समस्या कई दिनों से देश के अन्दर एक बड़ा प्रश्न बन कर के खड़ी हो रही है। कुछ ऐसी मिलें हैं, जो कि बीमार हैं, घाटे पर चलती हैं, कुछ ऐसी हैं, जो

कि बन्द हो चुकी है, कुछ ऐसी भी हैं जो कि गन्ने की कोमत के तौर पर जितना पैसा उनको किसानों को देना चाहिये था उतना दे नहीं पाई है, कुछ ऐसी हैं जिनको कि सरकार की जितनी एक्साइज ड्यूटी चुकानी चाहिये थी वह पूरी नहीं उन्होंने चुकाई है और इस सारी स्थिति के कारण देश के अन्दर चीनी की मिलों की एक समस्या बन गई है और सब तरफ यह सवाल उठने लगा है कि चीनी की मिलों को इसी तरह से चलने दिया जाय जैसी कि आज वह चल रही हैं या उनके लिये कोई नया रास्ता, कोई नया प्रबन्ध सोचा जाय ।

एक पहलू हमारे देश में ऐसा है, एक पक्ष हमारे देश में ऐसा है जो कि हर समस्या का इलाज राष्ट्रीयकरण में देखता है ...

श्री शीलभद्र गाजी : एक पक्ष नहीं बहुत से पक्ष ।

डा० भाई महावीर : ... उनको किसी भी तकलीफ का इलाज यही दिखाई देता है कि सरकार उसको अपने ऊपर ले ले और फिर सरकार उन मिलों को चलाये । अगर बन्द कपड़ा मिले हैं तो कहा जाता है कि सरकार उनको ले ले, अगर बन्द चीनी मिलें हैं तो कहा जाता है कि सरकार को उन्हें ले लेना चाहिये, अगर किन्हीं चीनी मिलों के मैनेजमेंट के खिलाफ, प्रबन्ध के खिलाफ, शिकायतें आती हैं टेक्स न देने की या गन्ने की कीमत पूरी न देने की, उसके दकाया बच जाने की, तो कहा जाता है कि इसके सिवाय और कोई इलाज नहीं है कि चीनी मिलों को सरकार अपने हाथ में ले और अपने स्वामित्व में चलाये । और जब इस तरह के सवाल के पीछे राजनैतिक हेतु भी आने लगता है जब किसी के दिमाग के अन्दर यह भी आ जाता है कि एक तीर से दो शिकार मारे जा सकते हैं, अपना राजनैतिक उल्लू भी सीधा किया जा सकता है और लोगों में बाह-वाही भी कमाई जा सकती है, फिर तो सोने में सुहागे का काम होता है और फिर न ज्यादा सोचने विचारने की किसी को जरूरत रहती है और न उसकी गुंजाइश बचती है ।

श्रीमन्, हम लोग जिस दल से सम्बद्ध हैं जिस दल से सम्बद्ध होने का गौरव मुझे प्राप्त है, वह नेशनलाइजेशन को, राष्ट्रीयकरण को कोई ऐसा "खुल जा मिम सिम" नहीं समझता कि जिम मंत्र को जपते ही दुनिया की सब कठिनाइयों को हम हल कर सकेंगे, सब तकलीफों को पार कर सकेंगे और एक स्वर्ग का, सुख का, ऐश्वर्य का द्वार हमारे सामने खुल जायगा । राष्ट्रीयकरण किन्हीं परिस्थितियों में आवश्यक होता है, किन्हीं परिस्थितियों में अनिवार्य होता है, किन्हीं परिस्थितियों में उचित होता है, लेकिन हम इस तरह से आंखों के ऊपर पट्टी बांध कर न चले, हम ऐसी किताब के उस फतवे को माला के मनकों की तरह न जपते बैठे रहें कि हर बीमारी का इलाज राष्ट्रीयकरण, हर तकलीफ का इलाज राष्ट्रीयकरण, और इस वास्ते बिना सोचे समझे ही सरकार इन मिलों को ले ले । इसलिये इस तरह इस फैसले पर हम छलांग लगा कर नहीं पहुंचते । हम समझते हैं, देखते हैं, कि सरकार आज तक जितने उद्योगों को चला रही है, सरकार की प्रबन्ध करने की क्षमता का जो हाल है और जिस तरह से गरीब टैक्सपेयर की गाढ़ी, पसीने की कमाई बर्बाद होती है, अक्षमता के कारण जिसको डाउन दि ड्रैन कहते हैं, उस तरह से परनाले के रास्ते से बहाई जाती है और उसको देख कर के हम यह आशा नहीं रखते कि सरकार के पास कोई ऐसा जादू का डंडा है जो कि सारी समस्याओं को हल कर देगा और खाली स्वामित्व बदलने से ही सब तरह की तकलीफें दूर हो जायेंगी ।

सरकार ने पिछले दिनों में बैंकों को अपने हाथ में लिया । सब तरह के लोगों को बहुत धूमधाम से, ढोल बजा कर, कहा गया कि अब सच्चा समाजवाद आसमान से उतरने वाला है लेकिन अभी तक वह समाजवाद मुझको उतरा हुआ दिखाई नहीं देता । अभी तक सरकार यह फैसला नहीं कर सकी कि जो राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक हैं उनकी साखनीति क्या होगी, किस आधार पर कर्जा देंगे, किस आधार पर नहीं

[डा० भाई महावीर]

देंगे । यहां ही नहीं बल्कि जो कंसल्टेटिव कमेटी है, मलाहकार समिति है उसके अन्दर भी यह सवाल आया और मैंने पूछा कि क्या सरकार ने अपने हाथ में आये हुये बैंकों को इस तरह के आदेश दिये हैं कि वह उपभोग्य के कामों के लिये भी कर्जा देना शुरू कर दें, उपभोग्य के लिये, कंजम्पशन के लिये कर्जा दें, तो जवाब यह दिया गया कि नहीं, प्रधान मंत्री महोदयों बैठी थी उन्होंने कहा कि ऐसा नहीं है, हमारे बैंक जो हैं वह उपभोग्य के कामों के लिये कर्जा नहीं देते । मैंने उनको कहा कि शायद आपकी नज़र से वह विज्ञापन नहीं गुज़रा, समाचार-पत्रों में जो विज्ञापन छपा है वह आपने नहीं देखा, जिसमें कि यह है कि बैंकों की ओर से अगर गृहणियां चाहें तो उनको अपने किचन इक्विपमेंट के लिये कर्जा मिल सकता है, रेफ्रिजरेटर खरीदने के लिये बैंकों से कर्जा मिल सकता है, कूकर खरीदने के लिये बैंक से कर्जा मिल सकता है । अब बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण के बाद जो लोग इस कारण से परेशान हैं कि उनके घर में कूकर नहीं है या रेफ्रिजरेटर नहीं है या जो छोटे दर्जे के लोग हैं जिनके घर में बिजली का पंखा नहीं है उनके वास्ते, उनको यह चीजें देने के वास्ते, बैंकों से साखनीति बना कर कर्जा क्यों न दें, उन लोगों की जो ज़रूरत की चीजें हैं वह उनको क्यों न दी जायें, लेकिन फिर जब यह नहीं होता तो क्या उद्देश्य था जिसके लिये बैंकों को सरकार ने अपने हाथ में लिया । आज तक कितने महीने हो गये लेकिन सरकार बैंकों के बोर्ड्स आफ डाइरेक्टर्स नहीं बना सकी । डाइरेक्टर्स के बोर्ड बनाने में सरकार को इतनी देर लग सकती है, साखनीति का निर्धारण करने में इतनी देर लग सकती है तो फिर क्या होगा । कल या परसों यहां प्रश्न उठा कि बैंकों के लिये किस प्रकार की साखनीति का निर्धारण होगा तो हमें जवाब दिया गया कि अभी फैसला नहीं हुआ है, बैंकों के ऊपर फलों काम के लिये कोई रोक नहीं लगाई गई है लेकिन इन कामों के लिये ऋण दें इसका फैसला हम अभी नहीं कर पाये । तो सरकार के हाथ में केवल आ जाने से राज-

नैतिक उल्लू तो सीधा हो सकता है, किसी को हटाना, किसी को गिराना, किसी को ऊंचा चढ़ाना, यह लक्ष्य तो शायद पूरा किया जा सकता है लेकिन केवल यही लक्ष्य ले कर के अगर हम अपने देश की अर्थ-नीति को चलायेंगे तो मुझे लगता है कि अर्थनीति के साथ भी अन्याय है और राजनीति के साथ भी अन्याय है, हम न इसमें राजनीति के साथ इंसाफ करेंगे और न हम इस तरीके से देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था सुधार सकेंगे ।

इसलिये, महोदय, मेरा निवेदन है कि चीनी मिलों की समस्या है किन्तु जिस प्रकार के आधार को ले कर ही यह कहते हैं कि सरकार उनको अपने हाथ में ले ले उन आधारों के अन्दर मुझे कोई ज्यादा तथ्य नहीं दिखाई देता है ।

कहा गया कि चीनी के जो कारखानेदार हैं, चीनी की जो मिलें हैं, वह बहुत बड़ी मुनाफा-बाजी करती हैं, मुनाफाखोरी करती हैं, लेकिन मेरे पास यह रिजर्व बैंक की बुलेटिन के आंकड़े हैं जो कि 1967 के दिसम्बर में प्रकाशित हुई । इसमें 1960-61 से ले कर 1965-66 तक के आंकड़े हैं और इसमें कुछ 18-20 किस्म की जो इंडस्ट्रीज हैं उनके आंकड़े हैं । उन आंकड़ों को हम देखें तो ग्रास प्राफिट एज पर परसेंटेज आफ कैपिटल इम्प्लायड यह सब का दिया है । चीनी मिलों के लिये 1965-66 में जो इसका प्रतिशत है वह 9.6 है जब कि और बाकी के जितने उद्योग हैं उन सब का इससे ऊपर है । अगर ग्रास प्राफिट को ही केवल देखें, जो मुनाफा है उसका आंकड़ा ही लिया जाय तो उससे यह दिखाई देगा कि चीनी उद्योग बाकी उद्योगों से नीचे है । तो कम से कम इस आधार पर यह मांग करने का कोई कारण नहीं रहता कि मुनाफा हो रहा है इसलिये चीनी मिलों को सरकार अपने हाथ में ले ले । इसी तरह से हमारे पास दूसरे और तथ्य हैं । यह बात लाकर रखी जाती है कि पूंजी का जो मुनाफा हुआ उस मुनाफे को प्लाऊ-बैंक नहीं किया गया, फिर से पूंजी बढ़ाने के लिये, उत्पादन को अधिक अच्छा करने के लिये, नई मशीनरी डालने के लिये उस मुनाफे का इस्ते-

माल नहीं किया गया। अब अगर इनवेस्ट-मेंट और प्लाऊबैक आफ प्राफिट के आकड़े लिये जायें, इन आंकड़ों को हम देखें, तो किसी एक फैक्ट्री के बारे में जिसको ग्रास-ब्लाक कहते हैं, यानी एक ब्लाक के तौर पर जिसको मैं समझता हूँ कि एन हजार टन की कपेसिटी के साथ जोड़ा जाता है उसके आंकड़ों को हम देखें तो 1936-37 में यह लगभग 16 लाख था, यह फिगर थी, और वह 1957-58 में 62 लाख थी और 1967-68 में 120 लाख थी यह कुल इनवेस्टमेंट है और प्लाऊबैक प्राफिट जो है उसके आंकड़े भी हम देखें तो 6 प्रतिशत के करीब जो डिब्रिड है वह बांटा गया और बाकी जो प्राफिट है उसका एक अच्छा प्रतिशत लगाया गया, प्लाऊबैक कर के उन्हीं मिलों को अच्छा चलाने के लिये और डिप्रिसियेशन को पूरा करने के लिये। महोदय, हाँ, कुछ इस तरह की बात जरूर है कि पूरी कीमत शायद केन ग्राउंस को नहीं दी गई। . . . केन ग्राउंस को पूरी कीमत नहीं दी गई, उसको भी हम केवल एक पक्ष लेकर सोचें तो मैं समझता हूँ यह स्थिति कोई बहुत ठीक नहीं होगी, क्योंकि दूसरी ओर हमारे सामने इस तरह के भी उदाहरण हैं कि सरकार जिस फैक्ट्री को चला रही है—सरकार के एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में, सरकार के नियंत्रण में हाथीडांडा की जो मिल है—जितना उसको एक्साइज देना है जितना उसको गन्ने की कीमत देनी है वह भी अगर पूरी न दे पाय तो समझना चाहिये कि ऐसे कोई कारण हैं कि सरकार के हाथ में आने से भी चीनी मिलों में सुधार नहीं हुआ है, उसके सामने भी कठिनाई है। अगर सरकारी नियंत्रण में चलने वाली मिलों के अंदर भी यह है तो यह सोचना पड़ेगा कि यह कठिनाई दूसरों के मामले में भी हो सकती है। जो आपरेटिव फैक्ट्रियों के ज्ञाता हमारे कुलकर्णी साहब हैं, उनका कोआपरेटिव फैक्ट्रियों का काफी अनुभव है मैं उनसे जानना चाहता था कि क्या सहकार मिलों की स्थिति आज ऐसी है कि जिसके बारे में हम कह सकें कि सब ठीक है क्योंकि अगर सारी चीनी मिलें एक ही कीमत पर गन्ना खरीदती हैं, एक ही कीमत देने के बाद

गन्ना उत्पादकों को जो प्राफिट है, नफा है, जिस नफे के ऊपर सरकार को इनकमटैक्स मिलेगा, जिस नफे के ऊपर सरकार की आय बनेगी वह नफा अगर कोआपरेटिव फैक्ट्रियों में आता है, तो जैसा कि मुझे पता लगा कि ये जो जौइन्ट स्टॉक कम्पनियाँ हैं, उनका अगर 10 लाख रु० ग्रास प्राफिट था तो कोआपरेटिव फैक्ट्रियों का 4 लाख रु० है, अब यह 10 लाख और 4 लाख का इतना बड़ा अंतर कहाँ से आया। इसके सिवाय जिस वक्त प्राफिट एन्ड लास एकाउन्ट बन जाता है, बैलेन्स शीट तैयार होता है, तब फैसला किया जाता है कि गन्ना जो खरीदा गया उसकी कितनी कीमत हम दें। पहले जो मिनिमम स्टेट्युटरी रिक्वायर्ड प्राइस है वह दे दिया जाता है, बाकी का बैलेन्स प्राफिट एन्ड लास एकाउन्ट बनने के बाद किया जाता है। परिणाम यह होता है कि जो प्राफिट था, जिसके ऊपर सरकार को रेवेन्यू नहीं था, वह रेवेन्यू न देते हुए गन्ना उत्पादकों को मिल जाता था। (Time bell rings) मुझे इसमें सिद्धान्ततः कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। मैं दो मिनट में खत्म कर रहा हूँ। इसमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं है कि गन्ना उत्पादकों को ज्यादा कीमत मिले लेकिन आखिर वह रुपया अगर गन्ना उत्पादकों को इस तरीके से मिलना है कि जो रेवेन्यू है, सरकार का जो टैक्स है, वह टैक्स काट कर बांटा जाना है, तो फिर सरकार अगर सारी ऐसी मिलों को छूट दे दे तो उसका परिणाम देश के रेवेन्यू पर क्या होगा। फिर उसके परिणामस्वरूप दूसरे कितने प्रकार के और टैक्स लगाने पड़ेंगे, यह पहलू हमें आँख से ओझल नहीं करना चाहिये।

जब मैं यह सब कहता हूँ तो इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि चीनी मिलों को जो चलाने वाले हैं वे देवता हैं, उनके ऊपर बिल्कुल आक्षेप नहीं किया जा सकता है, उन पर कोई अगुली नहीं उठा सकता। उनके अंदर जो त्रुटियाँ हैं, जहाँ वह गोलमाल करते हैं, जहाँ वह ब्लैक करते हैं, ब्लैक में चीनी बेचते हैं, वहाँ उन सब बातों की रोकथाम का प्रबन्ध करना पड़ेगा और मेरे दिल का यह मत है कि आज इस सवाल का हल

[डा० भाई महावीर]

यह नहीं है कि खाली सरकार अपने हाथ में शूगर इंडस्ट्री को ले ले, हल यह है कि धीरे धीरे जो गन्ना उत्पादक हैं उनको मैनेजमेन्ट में शेयर और उनका शेयर ओवरशिप में बनना चाहिये, गन्ने की क्रिमत का एक अंश शेयरों के रूप में गन्ना उत्पादकों को दिया जाय, धीरे धीरे उनको आवाज उन चीनी मिलों के प्रबंध के अंदर आय और ग्रैजुअली और प्रोग्रेसिवली कोओपरेटाइजेशन हो शूगर इंडस्ट्री का। आज जो चीनी मिलें सहकारी आधार पर चलती हैं उनमें कहां कहां सुधार की गुंजायश है, कहां-कहां कमियां हैं, इसको देखने की आवश्यकता है। हमारे पास इस प्रकार के तथ्य हैं कि कहीं कोई डाइरेक्टर बनता है जिसको उस उद्योग का पता नहीं है, उद्योग का पता हो या न हो जिनका प्रभाव है जिनका रसूख है, जो जरा चौधरी है, जो दूसरों को दवा सकते हैं और व्यक्तिगत लाभ उठाते हैं। इसका इलाज सिर्फ यह है कि हम चीनी उद्योग को एक नयी व्यवस्था की दिशा में आगे बढ़ाएं, उस व्यवस्था में गन्ना उत्पादकों का हिस्सा हो, प्रबन्ध हो और उस मिलिक्यत में उसी तरह से जो लेबर हैं, कर्मचारी हैं, उस उद्योग में काम कर रहे हैं उनका हिस्सा हो और कुछ हिस्सा जो कन्ज्यूमर्स हैं, उपभोक्ता हैं, उनको भी दिया जाय। इस तरह एक नयी दिशा अपने सामने रखकर चलें, केवल सरकारीकरण के नारे में न भागें, क्योंकि सरकार के हाथ में जाने से ही सही परिणाम निकलेगा इस आशा पर हम नहीं जी सकते। हमें लगता है सरकार के हाथ अभी बहुत भरे हैं, हैंड्स टू फुल हैं, और यह उसके वश की बात नहीं है कि इस समय उसको ठीक से चला सके।

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the question before the House today whether the sugar industry in this country should be nationalised or not has arisen because of the basic fact that this industry had Government protection for a number of decades.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) IN THE CHAIR]

Before independence the British Government gave protection to the sugar in-

dustry and after independence, the Government of India continued to give protection to the sugar industry. The question is whether that protection has been used in fulfilment and achievement of the objectives for which this protection was given. The industry was given protection to see that the cane growers got protection and secondly to see that sugar production in the country increased and the consumer was able to get sugar at an economic price. We should now examine whether the two objectives have been achieved or not by giving protection to the industry. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we feel, after so many decades of protection, that these objectives have not been achieved. The peasants and the cane growers have not been able to get protection. Those who got protection are the sugar magnates and the sugar industrialists and they gained money out of it. The sugarcane grower has been reduced to a position of grower and supplier of raw material to the sugar magnates just like hewers of wood and drawers of water. He still suffers under the reign of the industrialists who are in league with the officials and the Government there. Even the prices of cane are fixed by a third party at the instance of the political pressure of the sugar industrialists and magnates. Under these conditions the prices of sugar have gone up. Our prices are two-and-a-half or three times the international market price. So the consumer here has to pay more and the producer has to get less. Under these circumstances, we have to see whether protection to the industry should be continued or not. Now, why is this demand for nationalisation? It has come out of this frustration of the consumer and the producer of cane.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, there can be another solution for this. Give no protection to the industrialists and allow import of sugar. But in the competition our sugar industry will fade away. This will not be a solution because we cannot do it as it would involve foreign exchange and so many other things. So this solution goes out. What other solution is before the country? That solution is to regulate the industry. How to regulate the industry? We have seen so many regulations in this country, as Mr. Dikshit has said. Sir, this demand for nationalisation of the sugar industry is not a new one. Of course, it has got a new dimension now, a new intensity, because of the interference of the sugar magnates in the political life of this country. Whether it is this State or that State, there is this political inter-

ference. Just as the Birlas have started interfering with the political life of the country and they want their pound of flesh, in the same way the sugar magnates have started interfering with the political life of the different States. That is why this demand for nationalisation of the sugar industry has come, so that the political life of this country may be purified.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, Mr. Rajnarain and others will remember that the Congress Socialist Party in its constitutional had said that the sugar industry should be nationalised. At that time the Congress Socialist Party was part of the Indian National Congress. In 1946, when the U.P. and Bihar Sugar Workers' Federation was formed—it was affiliated to the INTU—with Hariharnath Shastri as the President, one of the objectives enshrined in the constitution of the Federation was nationalisation of the sugar industry. So, this demand for nationalisation is as old as 1956 or even earlier when the Congress Socialist Party was functioning in the Congress organisation.

The workers of the sugar industry were the pioneers in the movement for the nationalisation of the sugar industry. The demand has grown now because the whole sugar industry, the sugar industry magnates, have functioned and behaved indifferently towards the consumer and the workers in this country. Even Mr. Nehru while speaking in the Constituent Assembly on 8th December, 1947, said the Government must find out who were particularly responsible for the situation that had been created and find out who were guilty and they should be taken to task. Not only that. The Tariff Commission which gave its report in 1950 said that if really we had not relied on the figures supplied by the factories in each year, there would not have arisen any scarcity. Not only that. They did not even cooperate with the Sugar Commission which was appointed of which Mr. Gangannath Jha was the chairman. The Sugar Ordinance was issued in 1950 so that the whole thing could have been properly gone into. But the difficulty is the Tariff Commission's report says we are getting the figures only from the factories, but nobody knows actually the statistical position, the costing of production, etc. Even since 1950 there has been no change. The Tariff Commission's report said that dependence on the figures supplied by the factories for the formulation of official data should cease and the present machinery for the collection and compilation of the sugar statistics be strengthened

so as to be able to obtain correct and complete statistics of production and the costing of production. Even for the last 20 years that has not been done and the Government and its agencies are functioning on the statistics provided by the sugar magnates, the sugar industry, and till this day they have not developed their own sources of economic intelligence. They have not so far developed their own system of collecting statistics. Why are not the representatives of cane-growers consulted while fixing the prices of sugar-cane? Sir, this demand of nationalisation is not new. Shri A. P. Jain is here. He will remember that it was Mr. Kushwant Roy who had brought about this thing as long back as 1955. Though he did not agree with him, I think he will himself reply why he did not agree. But you will find, Sir, these forces were there, the Syndicate people. Then what happened? What did Morarjibhai do? Morarjibhai announced in April, 1959 the revised excise duty of Rs. 5.04 per hundred-weight and Rs. 3.9 for khandsari. So what happened? The cane-growers who are producing khandsari and other things diverted their produce to the factories so that they could get a higher rate. What happened? Not only that. A bad situation was created. The cane-growers in U.P. and other places were feeling frustrated. At that time in the U.P. Planning Board on the 14th September, 1959 this question of nationalisation of sugar industry was raised. Dr. Sampooranand went into the proceedings and appreciated the idea and indicated that a high-power committee would be appointed to go into the details of the inter State implications and the economics of the whole thing. When the industrialists and the sugar magnates came to know that the sugar industry might be nationalised, they ran to the house of the Food Minister who happened at that time to be Mr. S. K. Patil in the Government of India. They took Mr. S. K. Patil to U.P. and while speaking in Kanpur on the 22nd October in the year at the All-India Conference of Sugar Merchants Association, he observed that the Government would not be interested in nationalising one more industry because it was already overburdened with the running of too many public sector undertakings. This was what he said while Dr. Sampooranand who was in the State and who understood the problems of the cane-growers, said that the problem was grave and they were going to think of nationalising the sugar industry. At that time Mr. S. K.

[Shri Krishan Kant]

Patil came from the Centre and said it could not be done. What happened? Morarjibhai opposed it. Mr. S. K. Patil opposed it. And I am sorry to say today Dr. Bhai Mahavir was also saying something on those lines. Looking into all those things one has to see what other way is there to solve this problem. I think after a lot of discussion, after a lot of study into the whole thing, it seems that this trade should be completely nationalised, because the industrialists are making money on the hard labour of the sugar-cane growers. In these conditions I am astonished to find that the demand of nationalisation is raised not only from U.P. and Bihar, according to my friend, this demand is growing even in Haryana also. My friend comes from Haryana and he must have full facts of the situation. Dr. Gadgil, the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, goes to U.P. and says there can be no nationalisation. Why? Why should Dr. Gadgil have gone to U.P. and say all this? He has no right to give this verdict. He says cooperativisation. For cooperativisation, do you think the industrialists will let the cane-growers being cooperativised? The only way out is the Government should take over the sugar industry and slowly hand it over to the cooperatives formed from among the cane-growers, labourers, technicians and the consumers so that this industry could be properly run to the benefit of the consumer, the cane-grower and the weaker sections of the people of the country.

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, when I was hearing the debate here, I felt a little amused and also a little distressed, amused because some of my friends who were supposed to be well-informed and very much being in the thick and thin in the so-called benefits arising out of the sugar industry, suggested that nationalisation or cooperativisation is necessary to remove the evils that are there in the sugar industry at certain places, and distressed because they named the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, our revered leader, that he was for nationalisation. He is supposed to have suggested that something should be done in that respect. My attention is drawn to his speech on a very pertinent resolution which he moved when he said,

"The average idea, well, of some people apparently, is that the whole function of the Government should be

for them to seize hold of the private sector factories with or without compensation, and having done so, well, we have gained socialism and there the matter ends. That, if I may say so, is a primitive and infantile notion."

If such a wise counsel of one of the greatest men of history cannot influence our decisions even now, I am afraid, there is something wrong in the country's thinking. My friend, Mr. Kulkarni, for whom I have the greatest respect, has been trying to compare the sugar industry in U.P. in the private sector with that in the cooperative sector in Maharashtra. I have great respect for my friend for his knowledge not only of sugar and textiles, and other industries, there is hardly any field in which he would not like to enter, any cooperative movement, anything. But so far as I can claim to know, I know the difficulties....(Interruptions) Anyway I do not want to go into all that and I will confine myself to the present debate as it is being held. The point is that if you compare the sugar industry in the private sector with that in the cooperative sector in same State, I am prepared to stand the test and scrutiny of any independent body, and I say that the private sector has done much better than any other cooperative industry in that particular State. But an effort is being made here that the sugar industry, the cooperative sugar industry, in Maharashtra should be compared with the private sector sugar industry in U.P. There could not be a bigger fallacy of comparison. It is most unfair and unjust. I would venture to ask : Is there any sugar industry in U.P. in the cooperative sector which has paid higher wages than the private sector? Is there any sugar cooperative factory which has paid more bonus than the private sector? Is there any cooperative sugar factory in U.P. which has paid higher cane price than the private sector? So far as the arrears of sugar-cane prices are concerned, I will come to that a little later, but I do not want to justify that because the cooperative sugar factories also have not been able to pay the arrears of the sugar-cane prices there is any justification for the private sector to be allowed to be free from this responsibility of not paying the sugar-cane arrears.

In fact I for one will never hold any brief on that account and I will say with all humility that with the powers that the Government possess and with the right that they have they are absolutely in a position to take whatever action they like.

Here I would like to quote from 'The Law Relating to Sugar Factories in Uttar Pradesh' where penalties have been mentioned. Section 22 says :

"If any person contravenes any of the provisions of his Act or any rule or of order made thereunder, he shall be liable to imprisonment up to six months or to a fine not exceeding rupees five thousand or both and in the case of continuing contravention to a further fine not exceeding one thousand for each day during which the contravention continues."

(Interruptions)

The point, Mr Vice-Chairman, is this: When such measures of punishment are available to the State Governments, do you suggest that by nationalising the industry, when the entire thing belongs to the State sector who are the colleagues of the bureaucrats all over the Administration, they are going to take any action, if they have not been able to do it so far in spite of these provisions? My submission, Mr. Vice-Chairman, is that we have to look into the whole problem objectively rather than find a scapegoat. If there is one purchaser in the whole country, will that purchaser of sugarcane pay a higher price of sugarcane to the growers? Last year and before that, i.e. within two years the sugar mill industry has paid Rs. 6 crores approximately—extra—to the sugarcane growers in Uttar Pradesh itself over and above the minimum cane price that had been fixed. Similarly it will be very pertinent to note that one purchaser can dictate to the growers and wherever nationalisation has been done, we know the results. The questions and answers in this House and the other House will more than prove and convince everyone that after nationalisation the tears in the eyes of the public have been very much more. I remember a story which was told to me once. There were four people sitting together. There was a doctor, a lawyer, a consumer and a preacher. The Minister-preacher said "I pray for all". The doctor said "I prescribe for all." The lawyer said "I plead for all." The poor consumer said "I pay for all." *(Interruption)* Mr. Vice-Chairman, I consume after production but there are many friends who think that they consume only by destruction, and that is the difference between the two,

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, let us know what exactly are the criteria for the nationalisation of any industry. It is

normally said that it is in the public interest. Now who is affected by this? I think the first is the consumer, then is the worker, then the cane-grower and finally what amount goes to the State exchequer or the Government. Now so far as the consumers are concerned, the sugar prices are determined after very detailed examination by the Tariff Commission. There have been many statements by the Minister, by even Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain, our most revered leader, who had been the Food Minister earlier, even he has mentioned that the sugar industry is such a highly controlled industry that there is hardly any scope left for any one to manipulate. I would not like to go into the question of dividends but I am quite sure that if the consumer is to be benefitted, the first and foremost thing we must do is to bring down the cost of sugar. If the cost of sugar is to be reduced, then the question of sugarcane prices naturally comes in, because it constitutes nearly 70 per cent. of the cost of sugar. I would venture to submit that the wages that have been fixed by the Government and by the Wage Boards and the cane-growers being completely under the grip of co-operative unions. *(Time bell rings)* Sir, I may kindly be permitted to take two minutes more.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, even during the previous year many sugar factories have been paid cane prices as high as Rs. 180 per ton in U.P. as against the minimum cane price of Rs. 70. Thus you will see that neither the workers nor the cane-growers nor the consumers nor the State exchequer are going to be benefitted by this nationalisation which is going to be demanded by a large number of people. People who speak loudly claim to have bigger voice than those who like to place things in their proper perspective.

Even in the matter of co-operatives I know very well Haryana's history; they have not succeeded there. Punjab is one of those places where the co-operatives have absolutely failed. The State of U. P., what do we find there? Half of the cooperative factories are losing. Andhra and Kerala have suffered badly. Yes, in Maharashtra the sugar co-operatives have done well and I would like to congratulate them for their very successful performance. But it is because of the co-operative movement? Certainly not it is because the soil and climate of that State is such where any sugar industry will do very well. If you compare the contribution of the sugar industry in the private sector in Maharashtra with that

[Shri Sitaram Jaipuria]

in the co-operative sector, in spite of it^s being 40 years old, it is still younger than many of the new mills. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Vice-Chairman, even the Chairman of the I. F. C. which has advanced quite a substantial amount of money in the co-operative sector as said about the textile co-operatives as follows on the 25th September, 1969 at the 21st Annual General Meeting of the Shareholders of the Corporation :

“ The question of financing textile co-operatives was reviewed by the Board of Directors of the Corporation. The Board felt that as these units could not be regarded viable in the strict commercial sense the responsibility for financing the same must be shared with the Corporation by the concerned State Governments. ”

The Chairman has further stated :

“ I regret to have to repeat that, in spite of the Corporation's loans to co-operatives being guaranteed by the Central and State Governments, the concerned guarantor Governments have not done all that could be expected of them towards clearing the defaults. ”

Obviously, Mr. Vice-Chairman, my submission is that sick mills are all over the country and there is no reason that because one particular mill is sick, there should be efforts to compare it with a strong unit and then try to plead the case for nationalisation.

I would, therefore, submit that, once you think of nationalisation of sugar mill the question will arise and I would ask Mr. Shinde or Jagjivan Ramji to answer this question while replying the debate that, if one state, i.e. U. P. is authorised to nationalise sugar industry in their State, can there be any reason for them to stop Maharashtra from nationalising cotton industry or Bengal from nationalising jute industry or Assam from nationalising tea or the South from nationalising coffee ? This trend will be most dangerous.

I have mentioned all these points Mr. Vice-Chairman, which, I feel, need to be calmly thought of and discussed about, and I would suggest, before the Government takes any decision in this matter, that they should find out the exact position, discuss with the people

concerned as to what exactly are the maladies and what are the remedies before they come to any conclusion. Nationalisation is neither going to help them, nor is going to help the Government, nor the consumers, and I would therefore strongly support that the Government should consider this thing in proper perspective, more in the economic sense of the term than in any political sense or political thinking as was seen here in the House a little while ago.

Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have been referred to by the speakers on both the sides. About a decade and a half ago there was a Motion moved by a member of the Lok Sabha, Mr. Kishwakt Rai for the nationalisation of the sugar industry. I was the Food Minister at the time and I opposed that Motion. The Motion was dropped. Now it is natural that hon. Members should expect me to explain why I rejected the Motion at that time and why today I am in favour of the nationalisation of the sugar industry. I want to inform hon. Members that at the time when the debate took place the climate for the nationalisation was not so favourable as is the case today. Out of seven speakers excluding myself who participated in the debate, only three speakers, that is the mover and two others—all Members of one party—supported the Motion, and the remaining Members, who participated in the debate, to whatever party or group they belonged, opposed it in one or other manner. Some suggested that a committee might be appointed to consider the question. Others suggested that the private industries might be taken over by the co-operatives. But there was none except the members of one party who supported the nationalisation of the industry.

SHRI LOKANATH MISHRA (Orissa) : But does that mean that the hon. Member gets guided only by the wind, not by any reasons ?

SHRI A. P. JAIN : Please have a little patience. Be a little quiet and you will have all the answers.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I have been listening to what you said.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : But you have not listened fully. (*Interruptions*) Yes, Mr. Vice-Chairman, at that time I said that the sugar industry was one of the most highly controlled industries. From the

time of the purchase of the sugarcane right up to the sale of the sugar, one or other type of control was applied to this industry. Sugar cane price was controlled by an order. Releases of the sugar took place only with the permission of Government. Government could retain 25 per cent. of the sugar to be acquired and to be sold at a prescribed rate. The minimum wage were laid down for the workers. Government has the power to control the location and the working of the sugar industry. Further, Government has the power to take over the sugar mills which were not working properly. These were the considerations which I advanced at that time. Now, Sir, fifteen years have advanced and during these fifteen years we have learnt many lessons, and one of the biggest lessons which the nation has learnt is that controls have failed to answer the national needs. Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, you will remember that so many times there have been talks on the Dutt Committee report. We prescribed a very complicated system of licensing for the industries. And the main object of the system of licensing was to avoid monopolies. But, instead of curbing monopolies, monopolies have in fact been encouraged. Again we tried to control the prices of foodgrains by physical controls. We again failed there. Today I find that the controls, applicable to the sugar mills have failed to put them in a proper condition. I come from Uttar Pradesh and that is the State where the sugar industry was established at the earliest stage. What were the reasons for this, I need not go into. Perhaps there were fortuitous reasons why the sugar industry was established there. Now the cane-growers in U. P. are making an unanimous demand for the nationalisation of this industry. The labour unions there are agreed that the sugar industry must be nationalised. And what about the Government, the Government in U. P. headed by Shri Chandrabhan Gupta, the Chief Minister ? He cannot be accused of having any animus or enmity against the sugar millowners. Now the U. P. Government has passed a Resolution which runs as follows. This Resolution was passed on the 5th of October, 1961, and the Resolution is :

“ The Cabinet (the U. P. Cabinet) endorses the Correspondence of the Chief Minister with the Prime Minister and the Union Minister for Agriculture on the question of nationalisation of sugar factories. The Cabinet is of the view that sugar factories of the

private sector be nationalised (this is what the Cabinet decided) in accordance with an uniform policy formulated for India as a whole. The Cabinet appeals to the Government of India to kindly take a decision in this regard before the commencement of the ensuing crushing season. ”

In other words they realised the importance of the matter. The U. P. Cabinet also realised the importance of timing ; they wanted that the sugar industry should be nationalised before the crushing season—it should already have been nationalised, i.e. before the current crushing season started. Now why has a change come about in U. P. ? Because the sugar industry in U. P. is one of the most backward industries.

I have heard with great patience and attention to my friend, Mr. Jaipuria. He did admit that there were certain faults with the industry. But if you look at the sugar industry today, its principal features are that the yield of sugarcane per acre, for the last 25 or 30 years, has remained constant at round about 15 tons per acre. As against that, Maharashtra produces 40 to 45 tons. South has about 30 or 35 tons. Now the condition of labour in the U. P. sugar factories is the most miserable. I have seen some of the factories abroad, in Egypt, in Hawai and the factories are like slums as compared to the factories abroad. In other words, the factory-owners here in U. P. have never tried to improve the condition of the factories. As regards yield, sugar recover is only about 9.5 per cent in U. P. while in Maharashtra it is about 11 to 12 per cent. In the south also it is higher.

Now, look at it from another point of view. Out of about 75 mills about one-third of the mills are in the red. They are sheer scraps to be rejected. Further, the sugar mills in U. P. are located in a most irrational manner. There are factories which have common walls ; there are factories which are situated at distances of two to three miles away from one another. There is a speciality in the case of the sugar industry ; that is the material, the sugarcane, must be reaped immediately before it is taken to the factory. So it becomes necessary that a sugar mill must have an area of sugarcane for its supply. But because the factories are irrationally situated the result is that one factory peaches upon the sugarcane supply of another factory. In other words, the sugar industry in the U. P. today is in doldrums. The same is the condition in

[Shri A. P. Jain]

Bihar too. It is not that I have any enmity against the sugar magnates, but I am convinced that the sugar industry in U. P. cannot be saved unless it is taken over by the Government. That is why I plead for its nationalisation. There is no other alternative left.

Take the question of irrational location. One factory belongs to A and another factory belongs to B. Which of the factories is to be closed? Please remember that the loss of the factory owner, whose factory is closed, would be total. He will simply go out of trade. At one time we tried to remove certain factories which are wrongly situated to some other places within the State and outside the State but the resistance was so great that it could not be done. The industry, in my opinion, must be rationalised in the matter of location; it must be modernised in the matter of machinery.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, you will be surprised to know that since independence not one single factory owned privately has come up in U. P., only four new factories have come up during the plans and they are all in the co-operative sectors. That shows how the industry in U. P. particularly in the sector owned by private owners, has become stagnant. It is not a growing industry.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Factories did not come into existence in U. P. because the licensing system in U. P. was such that no licence was given to the parties who applied. The four licences that were given were given

SHRI A. P. JAIN : I completely repudiate that. As nobody applied, nobody got.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : They have all been given to South India.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : One of his friends applied and I gave him a licence—Mr. Dan Singh.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : How many years back was it?

SHRI A. P. JAIN : But Mr. Dan Singh did not run the factory; it is a monument of his failure.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Because the poor man died.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : That is the condition of the sugar industry in U. P. It is stagnant. It is not improving. Yields

are low; labour is discontented; the farmer is dissatisfied. About half a dozen mill-owners themselves have approached the Government and said that their plant may be taken over. It is for that reason I want nationalisation and not because I am opposed to any person.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Mr. Vice Chairman, whatever has been said by Mr. A. P. Jain regarding request by some of the industrialists for their mills to be taken over, there is some difficulty in my understanding probably or there is some difficulty in his putting across the thing. The point is whether there is also a permanent instruction from the Centre to the State or an understanding in the State Government that no mill should be allowed to be wound up or should be allowed to die. They are sick all the time and they are not allowed to be wound up because the local pressure is so much. One of the Ministers I am told—I do not know whether it was in U.P. or Bihar—resorted to satyagraha for non-closure of a mill. They want all those mills to continue as sick mills, and some of the mills might have said that they might be taken over instead of continuing in such conditions. So the way in which he says that is completely misleading the House.

SHRI RIZAQ RAM : Sir, I want to make one submission. Actually more than an hour has been taken in interruptions by the Opposition and in seeking clarifications speeches are made. The time of the Members who are keen to speak is consumed like this. I would beg of you to please clarify whether all Members who are movers of the motion will get time or not. What is the position? Will the debate go on and continue tomorrow?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : I will speak about it afterwards. Now kindly take your seat. Have you finished Mr. Jain?

SHRI A. P. JAIN : Sir, my friend, Mr. Lokanath Misra, has provided me with the strongest argument for nationalisation. Every Minister, every public man, every Congressman, in U.P. is keen that sugar mills should run because if a mill stops crushing, thousands and thousands of farmers are affected by it. Therefore if a Minister went and staged satyagraha that the mills must be run, what he did is the right thing. And the reason why I am pleading for the nationalisation of sugar industry is that if it is not nationalised in U.P. about 12 lakhs of cane growers will be ruined. As long as the

sugar industry remains in the hands of the private owners it cannot survive, it cannot continue. It may be there for a period of five years or ten years but the industry will be extinguished. Because I am keen about the welfare of my State which has no other big industries except the sugar industry. I am . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Which you were not 11 years back as Minister?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Mr. Misra, the time is limited. No interruptions.

SHRI A. P. JAIN : . . .pleading and pleading with all earnestness that the sugar industry must be nationalised. After that whether it will be handed over to the co-operative sector or not, I am not concerned.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Shri Z. A. Ahmad.

श्री राजनारायण : इसके बाद तो हमारी पार्टी का नम्बर आता है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : आप बैठिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : इनको आपने बुला लिया, कारण बता दीजिये, हम बैठ जाते हैं ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : कारण बताने की बात नहीं है, हमने उनको बुला लिया है ।

श्री राजनारायण : आप हमको एक्सप्लेन कर दीजिये, अगर श्री जेड० ए० अहमद को कहीं जाना हो तो हमको कह देते हम अपना चांस फारगो कर सकते हैं ।

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद : हां, यह समझ लो कि जाना है । मुझे बोलने दो ।

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये, हमारी पार्टी को नेगलेक्ट नहीं कर सकते हैं । अभी हमारी पार्टी आयेगी । हां, अगर यह कहते हैं कि उनको जाना है तो वह हमसे दरखास्त करते ।

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद : मुझे बोलने दो, मैं अब दरखास्त करता हूँ ।

श्री राजनारायण : ठीक है, लेकिन अगर चेयर में बैठ कर के कोई हमारी पार्टी को नेगलेक्ट कर दे, दिस इज बैड । हां, आपके कहने से मैं अपना चांस फारगो करता हूँ ।

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : Certain strange considerations have been brought to bear on this discussion. Some of our U.P. friends have been very touchy about this demand for nationalisation of the sugar industry. I do not know why they should be so touchy. The question here is that the sugar industry in the country as a whole should be nationalised but I smell a rat in their very touchiness. I feel they are touchy because as we say in Hindi : चोर की डाढ़ी में तिनका ।

श्री सीताराम जेपुरिया : डाढ़ी तो आपके है ही नहीं, हुजूर ।

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद : मेरे डाढ़ी हो या नहीं । हा, मेरे डाढ़ी नहीं । मैं आपकी डाढ़ी के बारे में नहीं कहता हूँ, मैं दूसरों की डाढ़ी के बारे में कहता हूँ ।

The sugar magnets have been the source of political corruption in U.P. That fact must be recognised.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Which industrial house is not ?

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : Particularly the sugar magnates of U.P. have played havoc with our politics. They have financed certain groups, certain parties, certain individuals and what I am afraid is . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Anti-C. B. Gupta.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : It may be anti-C. B. Gupta, anti-X, anti-Y but they have done that. And I smell a rat in this sense that . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE : It is anti-C. B. Gupta alone that . . .

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : Again and again Mr. C. D. Pande is saying the same thing. I am referring to one thing that . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE : The Government of India said you do it and you want to put the onus on U.P. The U.P. Government had made it clear why it should be done by the Centre.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : We, as Members of Parliament, have every right from time to time to discuss such vital national questions and to review our industrial policy. Again I say that the whole question of Mr. C. B. Gupta was brought in because they have a sort of guilty conscience. Some of our friends like Mr. C. D. Pande have a guilty conscience. We never raised the question of Mr. C. B. Gupta. We are talking about an all-India problem, a very important problem relating to the welfare of millions and millions of our people, a problem connected with the industrial and agricultural development of our country and you brought in that. Therefore, I ignore it for the time being. I have said what I wanted to say. Now, Sir, we should see this question in the larger context. Mr. T. N. Singh stated that the sugar industry does not come either in Schedule A or Schedule B. Schedule A is the national sector and Schedule B is the mixed sector. He says it is neither in Schedule A or Schedule B. I think that is no argument at all. As our life advances, we can put certain items, certain industries either in Schedule A or in Schedule B. There is nothing fixed for all time to come. We can review our industrial development. If we feel the need for nationalising an industry, we can certainly put it in the concerned Schedule. Parliament has every right to do so. Therefore, to say that since it is not there it is not open to discussion, I think, is a totally wrong methodology, and not only a wrong methodology, but a wrong argument. Of course I do not want to say much about Mr. T. N. Singh's speech. I think it was a most irrelevant speech. It was a speech out of which nothing emerged.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Theoretical.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : I shall take it theoretically. It was not at all theroretical. For example, socialism is way a of life. What does it mean. Socialism is a way of reorganising our production. It relates to our economy, our system of production, our system of distribution and in relation to that our political set-up. It is our political set-up and our State. That is socialism. For me socialism cannot be brought about sitting in Delhi. If you go to some remote village where there are no trains and you sit in an Ashram, how can we build socialism ? What type of people you put in the Planning Commission, I want to know. Can they bring about socialism with those who talk about this type of socialism ? This is how

everything got bungled in the Planning Commission. He is a senior man. He says something should be done for the peasants. There is poverty and that is taken for granted, but tell us what should be done. Poverty is not disputed. The poor condition of the peasantry is not disputed. But what is to be done—that is my question. He was not able to give an answer. I think his whole line was the line of *status quo*, do nothing. Put up Ashrams and weep about the poverty of the people. You cannot do anything. You cannot mend matters. That is why I do not give much importance.

Now, in the larger context of the problem of developing agriculture, developing industry, developing agro-industries, improving the conditions of our people, it has to be viewed. Now, it has been very clealy stated and I do not want to say again that it is a major industry. Somebody said that it is a plantation industry. It is a plantation industry. It is an agro-industry. It is an industry which affects the conditions of work of about, as Mr. Dikshit said, five per cent of the population. About 30 lakhs peasant families and about 2.5 lakh working-class families depend on it. It is a very major industry. This major industry is not only in a bad state, it is in a state of chaos. There are some factories here and some are there. Some are absolutely outdated and in a bad condition. They are dying out. Those who take the cane from the peasant cannot pay him. Is it an ordinary thing? You get the cane and then you do not pay anything to the peasant. Go to the Meerut factories, Bijnor factories, the Gorakhpur factories, the Eastern UP factories. They do not pay to the peasant crores and crores of rupees. Why does not the Government step in ? The Government has a constitutional duty to protect the rights of the peasant. Now, that affects the cane development in the next year. The peasant has no money. About the conditions of the workers, Shri Ajit Prasad Jain, who is an ex-Food Minister and a senior Member of this House, has spoken. Shri Arjun Arora will tell you more eloquently what the conditions of the workers are. Shri Chandra Shekhar will tell you about the bad condition of the worker. I do not know much about it, but I have heard that the condition of the workers is bad. I know the production is low. I know that there is inefficiency. The debate is not adequate. Is there a case or is there not a case for nationalising this industry?

Then, Sir, this is an industry in which the record of the private sector is very bad

Where is my friend ? He has gone. He said that the private sector has done well. Let us examine what the private sector has done. There is bungling all round, inefficiency, loss of national wealth. Has the private sector done well ? Then, he said that the UP industry should not be compared with the co-operative sector in Maharashtra. Why not ? Maharashtra is not an island. It is a part of India. If the co-operative movement has developed in Maharashtra, why not in UP ? It can be developed.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : He said that if there is to be comparison, it should be between the co-operative sector of Maharashtra with the co-operative sector in UP.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : The whole thing is the co-operative sector has not developed in UP just because of the cancer of corruption that was there. That cancer is still there. They would not allow anything to come up. They would not allow the price for the sugar-cane. (*Time bell rings.*) I have not even spoken for twelve minutes.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : The Bajpore Co-operative Society in UP has got the highest rate. It is in UP. Let there be no such twisted version here.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : The Vice-Chairman has rung the bell though I have spoken for twelve minutes only. There are speakers who have spoken for half an hour or thirty-five minutes. I am on record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : There are many speakers.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : I have spoken less than anybody else.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, हम आपसे निवेदन करते हैं कि इस विवाद में हम लोग समझ जायें कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का विचार क्या है। इसलिये इनको मौका दिया जाय हर पार्टी की विचारधारा पुरो तरह से हमारे सामने आ जाय।

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : Now, much has been said. In the main the sugar factory owners have fattened at the cost of both the sugarcane growers and the consumers. That is a fact. They manipulate prices. They manipulate prices at which they will buy the cane and manipulate the price of sugar. It is scandalous. The Government does not step in adequately in order to stop their manipulations. So, this is a third factor. Now, if the sugarcane grower and the consumer are to be protected, we have no alternative except

to take this big industry in the State sector. When I say the State sector I include in that the co-operative sector. I do not exclude the co-operative sector. I think we will have to go stage by stage. In many places we will have to develop the co-operative sector. In many places we will have to take the industry into the nationalised sector, i.e., nationalise it and put it under State ownership.

Now, Sir, in the end I would say after saying all this that this old-fashioned, antiquated opposition to nationalisation—we got an example of that type of opposition from Dr. Bhai Mahavir who said, “we want this, we want that, but nationalisation is not a panacea”. How can I reply to it ? That means they are so outdated.

AN HON. MEMBER : Confused.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : Not confused. They are very conscious, not confused. If you say confused, I know it is a very conscious attitude, a very conscious exposition, a very deceptive exposition of their point of view, that is, “we are for the people; slowly and steadily bring them together; guide the people to share in industry; but do not nationalise”. How do you guide the people to share in the industry unless you rapidly develop the co-operative sector and at the same time take steps to nationalise the industry as a whole within a few years ? There will be Mr. Rajnarain who will say, not nationalise but socialise. He is going to say that, I do not accept it. For socialisation you have first to socialise the State. You have to socialise the State and then you get socialisation. Everybody is a socialist now without understanding what socialism is. Mr. T. N. Singh says socialism is away of life. That means you sit in the Ashram and talk of the poor people, that is socialism. No. Socialisation has a different content, different meaning. Nationalisation has not that meaning. Nationalisation today means handing over that factory or that industry to the State and to that extent breaking the economic power of the vested interests in that industry. We are interested in breaking the economic power that they wield in our society. The political power that they wield through this, we want to break that. That creates the preconditions for our advance to socialism. By itself nationalisation is not socialism. But by nationalising industry we curb monopolies. We curb the strength of big money and thereby we create conditions for advance of the people towards a socialist order. That is

[Shri Z. A. Ahmad]

how it should be understood. Technically sepeaking, nationalisation may mean State capitalism also.

AN HON. MEMBER : Stateism.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : Stateism or State capitalism, it does not matter. It is a step forward. It is not Stateism. It is State capitalism. The establishment of State capitalism in the present society where monopoly is growing, where the strength and political influence of monopoly are growing, curbing through these measures their power, their intervention in the political and economic life, is an advance, in which direction ? It is an advance in the proper direction, in the direction of establishing a society in which the real economic power will be vested in the people and the political apparatus of the State will be controlled by the working people. That is my contention. Therefore, I tell Mr. Rajnarain that there is no difference between him and me. He wants to work out a fundamental difference between the Communists and the socialists. The socialists are for socialisation. The Communists are only for nationalisation. To that extent you do not understand the content of socialism. Socialise the State. Fight for the socialisation of the State. Political struggle for the socialisation of the State and handing over power to the working people, that is the basis of it. In order to develop that struggle we may take all sorts of measures including nationalisation of industries to curb the power of big money, to curb the power of monopoly.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : I seek the co-operation of the House in one respect. There are many names. Secondly, even some of the groups have not yet expressed their viewpoint. Earlier we had decided that we would sit up to 6 o'clock. You will appreciate that before 6 it is not possible to do justice to different names and different groups. So, will the House kindly agree to sit longer because the discussion cannot be carried over ?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : Representatives of groups must be called so that they can have their own say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : That is what I am saying.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA : Dr. Ahmad said that socialism is not a way of life. Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan said and even

the Prime Minister said that socialism is a way of life. Perhaps Dr. Ahmad's socialism is Communism.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : Socialism means reorganising production, reorganising the State apparatus handing over power to the people...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Socialism can come only when the working class in power.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Some of us have given our names. We do not belong to any organisation. Shall we get any chance?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : I am trying to accommodate as many as possible, but it may not be possible without the co-operation of the entire House. That is only request. Mr. Rajnarain.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal) : Mr. Rajnarain should not take more than ten minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Everybody will be given the same time. I think he will not take more than that.

श्री राजनारायण : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं 5.37 पर बोलने के लिये उठ रहा हूँ। मैं सर्वप्रथम डा० जेड० ए० अहमद साहब को मुबारकबाद करूंगा कि उन्होंने बहुत ही सफाई के साथ इस बात को कबूला है कि मौजूदा जमाने में जो नेशनलाइजेशन का नारा चल रहा है वह सचमुच में स्टेटिज्म है, वह शायद स्टेट कैपिटलिज्म है और इन दो शब्दों का प्रयोग उन्होंने किया है। इसलिये मैं आज पहले मर्तबा सफाई के साथ उनका इन दो शब्दों को निकालने के लिए मुबारकबाद देना चाहता हूँ।

श्रीमन्, मैं एक बात डा० जेड० ए० अहमद साहब को पहले बतला देना चाहता हूँ कि किसी सम्पूर्ण वस्तु को यदि टुकड़े टुकड़े करके देखेंगे, तो वस्तुस्थिति पर सही नहीं पहुंचेंगे। मैं उन की बातों से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि समाजवाद एक जीवन की प्रक्रिया नहीं है।

Socialism is a way of life; capitalism is a way of life; feudalism is a way of life

मैं समझता हूँ कि समाजवाद के बारे में हमारा अपना अध्ययन है और इसीलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि समाजवाद एक दर्शन है। समाजवाद जीवन का एक दर्शन है। जिस तरह से अन्य बातों में जीवन का दर्शन है, लेकिन समाजवाद में जीवन की प्रक्रिया भिन्न होती है, पूँजीवाद में जीवन की प्रक्रिया भिन्न होती है और सामन्तवाद में जीवन की प्रक्रिया भिन्न होती है। हा, इतना कहना सही है कि समाजवाद में जीवन की प्रक्रिया बनाने के लिये हम को उत्पादन सम्बन्ध के मामलों में परिवर्तन करना होगा और उत्पादन की शक्तियों को विभिन्न स्वरूप देना होगा। यह अगर कहते हैं तो मैं समझूँगा कि यही समाजवाद की दिशा में चले जा रहे हैं।

हमें खुशी है कि डा० जेड० ए० अहमद साहब हमारी बात सुनने के लिये बैठ गये हैं क्योंकि हमने उनसे रिक्वेस्ट किया था कि जब हम बोलेंगे तो आप बैठे राहियेगा। हम अपने उन मित्रों से भी कहना चाहते हैं जो उधर बैठे हैं कि हम किस जमाने में जाना चाहते हैं, इस चीज़ को ज़रा ध्यान से लें। To build socialism in a single country is a petty bourgeois ideal. श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने इस नारे को याद करने की कोशिश की है कि समाजवाद एक मुल्क में प्रतिष्ठित होगा। जो लोग इसको मानते हैं वे पेटी बुर्जुवा हैं, छोटे छोटे पूँजीपति हैं तथा टुट-पूँजिया हैं। क्या इस प्रश्न पर फिर चला जायेगा? मैं डा० जेड० ए० अहमद से कहना चाहूँगा कि केवल दर्शन का नाम लेकर किसी बात की उपेक्षा नहीं की जा सकती है। ट्राट्स्की ने जो कुछ कहा है वह पूर्णतः सत्य है। जब ट्राट्स्की ने कहा कि कम्यूनिस्ट डेवलपमेंट, सम्मिलित विकास, तो उसका अर्थ होता है। अगर पिछड़े मुल्क अपने विकास की गति को शीशे में देखेंगे, तो इस युग में जो सब से विकसित मुल्क होगा, उस मुल्क के शीशे में अपनी शकल देखेंगे।

कोई भी जरूरत नहीं है कि रूस आज जिन सीढ़ियों पर चढ़ कर पहुँचा हम भी उन तमाम

सीढ़ियों से चलें, हम जम्प करके पहुँचेंगे। मैं डा० जेड० ए० अहमद से कहूँगा कि वेनेज़ुएला-इज़ेशन के चक्कर में न पड़ें, सोशलाइज़ेशन की बात करें। श्रीमन्, मैं पहले ही बता दूँ आपके द्वारा सम्मानित सदस्यों को कि निजी हाथों में उद्योगधन्धे रहें मैं इसका घोर विरोधी हूँ; विरोधी ही नहीं बल्कि दुश्मन कहना चाहिये। यह केवल सिम्पल कन्ट्रिडिक्शन सामान्य असंगति नहीं है, मैं डा० जेड० ए० अहमद से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह बेसिक कन्ट्रिडिक्शन है, मौलिक असंगति है। इस मौलिक असंगति को दूर नहीं किया जा रहा है।

डा० जेड० ए० अहमद: उस्ताद, बहुत ऊँची बात कर रहे हो।

श्री राजनारायण : जब डा० जेड० ए० अहमद के सामने बोलना पड़ेगा तो जरूर करेंगे। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा सामाजीकरण का नारा मौलिक परिवर्तन लाना चाहता है।

बोलने के लिये उठने से पहले मैं डाक्टर साहब से बात करता रहा था। हम भी समाज बनाना चाहते हैं, वे भी समाज बनाना चाहते हैं, भूपेश गुप्त भी समाज बनाना चाहते हैं, चन्द्रशेखर जी भी सोचें। बहुत पार्टियाँ हों हम इसके पक्ष में नहीं हैं। हम नहीं कहते कि एक मुल्क में अनेकों पार्टियाँ हों लेकिन एक मुल्क में सर्वहारा की एक ही पार्टी रहे डा० जेड० ए० अहमद की इस राय से भी हम सहमत नहीं हैं। हम ट्राट्स्की की राय से सहमत हैं कि एक मुल्क में समाजवाद की एक नहीं, अनेक पार्टियाँ रह सकती हैं। यह विवाद बड़ा लम्बा है। 1924 में कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी भारतवर्ष में बनी। कांग्रेस पार्टी एक थी। तो फिर 1934 में कांग्रेस सोशलिस्ट पार्टी क्यों बनी? यह नहीं है कि हम लोगों ने इस पर विचार नहीं किया है, पूरा साहित्य है। हम लोगों ने विचार किया कि क्या कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी समाजवादी आन्दोलन का हथियार बनेगी या है? हम इस निर्णय पर पहुँचे कि जिस समाजवादी आधार

[श्री राजनारायण]

शिला को हम प्रतिष्ठित करना चाहते हैं कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी उस समाजवादी आन्दोलन की आधारशिला नहीं है, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी समाजवादी आन्दोलन के लिये हथियार नहीं है, इसलिये हमको कांग्रेस सोशलिस्ट पार्टी बनानी ही होगी। इसलिये 1934 में हमने कांग्रेस सोशलिस्ट पार्टी बनाई। डा० जेड० ए० अहमद इस बात को अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि 1936 तक कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी कांग्रेस संगठन के पेरिल थी, कांग्रेस में शामिल नहीं हुई थी, 1936 के बाद ये लोग कांग्रेस में शामिल होना शुरू हुए।

डा० जेड० ए० अहमद : पर्सनली तो मैं...

श्री राजनारायण : पर्सनली नहीं, मैं कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की बात कर रहा हूँ। थर्ड इन्टरनेशनल के बाद मामला चेंज हुआ है, तब कांग्रेस में शामिल हुए हैं। फिर कैसे हटे, क्यों हटे, क्यों अलग हो गया है उस पर कहूंगा तो शायद झकझक हो जायेगी, उसको मैं छोड़ रहा हूँ। इतना समय, वाइस चैयरमैन साहब नहीं देंगे। तो संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी समाजवादी दर्शन पर चलना चाहती है। मार्क्स ने कभी सोशलिज्म और कम्युनिज्म की बात नहीं कही। मार्क्स ने कहा —

“First phase of the society and the next phase of the society”.

मार्क्स ने कहा कि पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था के बाद जो व्यवस्था आयेगी उसके दो चरण होंगे, प्रथम सोपान और दूसरा सोपान।

श्री नन्द किशोर भट्ट (मध्य प्रदेश) : श्रीमन् पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर। जिस विषय पर बोलना है उस पर आइये तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा क्योंकि और लोग जो बोलने वाले हैं उनको मौका मिलना चाहिये।

श्री राजनारायण : हमारे मित्र ने, मुझे अफसोस है, विषय की गुंता नहीं समझी है। अगर मैं सोशललाइजेशन की भूमिका न दूँ और कहूँ कि मैं सोशललाइजेशन चाहता हूँ तो

डा० अहमद कह सकते हैं कि सोशललाइजेशन तब तक न हो जब तक सोशलाइज्ड स्टेट न हो जाय। ऐसे बड़े डाक्टर हैं और इनका दिमाग खाली नहीं है, डाक्टर का दिमाग भरा है, डाक्टर के दिमाग रूपी ब्लैक बोर्ड पर कुछ लिखा है, जब तक ब्लैक बोर्ड पर लिखी चीज को हम मिटायेगे नहीं तब तक हमारी चीज कैसे बैठेगी? इसलिये उस लिखी हुई चीज को मिटाने के लिये हम थोड़ी सी भूमिका बांध रहे हैं। मैं बहुत ही इज्जत करता हूँ डा० जेड० ए० अहमद की और मैं अपने मित्र भूपेश गुप्त की बहुत इज्जत करता हूँ। इसलिये मैं थोड़ा मेहनत करके तर्क-वितर्क करना चाहता हूँ। मार्क्स ने कहा— “The State will wither away” राज्य-शक्ति पतझर की तरह मुरझा कर झर जायगी। गांधी जी ने कहा कि मैं चाहता हूँ कि एक हरिजन की बेटी प्रधान मंत्री हो और जवाहरलाल सरीखे उसके सलाहकार हों। लेनिन ने कहा कि मैं चाहता हूँ— “Every cook must learn how to rule the State.” लेनिन ने कहा कि मैं ऐसी व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ जिसमें प्रत्येक गृहिणी, खाना बनाने वाली भी राजसत्ता पर सर्वोच्च अधिकार रख सकती हो, राजसत्ता को चलाने के योग्य हो।

श्री एन० श्री राम रेड्डी (मैसूर) : अभी वैसा है।

श्री राजनारायण : ये तीन महान व्यक्ति थे। गांधी जी अपने समय के विश्व के सबसे बड़े पुरुष थे। गांधी कहते रह गये कि प्रधान मंत्री और राष्ट्रपति के पद पर एक हरिजन की बेटी हो। इसमें भी बड़ा भारी अर्थ था। गांधी जी को मरे हुए 21 साल हो गए, जो लोग उस समय पैदा हुये होंगे वे बालिग हो गए, मगर सत्ता हरिजन की बेटी के हाथ में नहीं आई। इस साल दो चुनाव हुए, दोनों में द्विज, ब्राह्मण बैठ गये। लेनिन एक महान आदमी था, क्रान्तिकारी था, थ्योरी को प्रैक्टिस में लाने वाला था, मगर लेनिन का जहां राज है वहां क्या है? क्या आज वहां गृहिणी, रसोईदारिन राजसत्ता में समान अधिकार रखती

है ? क्या स्टेट पावर की तरह मरझायी ? पतझर की तरह मरझायी नहीं, मगर स्टेट में पावर और सेन्ट्रलाइज हुई ? भूपेश गुप्त कहते हैं कि पहले सत्ता सम्पूर्ण हो । जब सम्पूर्ण सत्ता हो जायगी तब उसको कोई गिराएगा ? कोई नहीं गिराएगा । तब मेक्सिको में ट्राटस्की मारा जायगा, प्रधान मंत्री के डिक्टेसन पर बड़े बड़े उनके विरोधी समकालीन नेताओं का आपरेशन होगा और आपरेशन में उनकी हत्या कराई जायगी । एक नहीं अनेक उदाहरण हैं । तमाम देशों के उदाहरण देने के लिये मैं तैयार आया था कि किस-किस देश में प्रधान मंत्री के इशारे पर हत्या हुई । स्टालिन ने आर्डर किया डाक्टरों को कि फ्रुन्ज का आपरेशन करो और वह खत्म हो गया । तो यह सब तमाम चीजें हैं । Workers of the world unite. Dictatorship of the proletariat. डिक्टेटरशिप आफ दि प्रोलीटेरियेट । सर्वहारा डिक्टेटर बने । सर्वहारा ही सर्वहारा का एकाधिपति बना हुआ है और यही हमारे देश में चलाना चाहते हैं । श्रीमन्, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम समाजवादी हैं और जनतंत्री हैं । हमारे लिये तो चन्द्रशेखर जी भी हैं और हमारे कृष्ण कान्त जी भी हैं, हमारे मित्र बांक विहारी दास भी हैं, समाजवादी भी हैं और जनतंत्री भी हैं...

एक माननीय सदस्य : मैं आप का मित्र नहीं हूँ ।

श्री राजनारायण : आप सब हैं (Interruption) भूपेश जी कुछ निश्चित विचारधारा के प्रतीक हैं इस लिये मैं उन को मित्र तो कह सकता हूँ लेकिन हमारी और उन की विचार धारा का टकराव है और यह खूब जानते हैं कि अंत तक टकराव हमारा और उन का ही होगा । यह कांग्रेस-वाग्रेस अब लुप्त हो जायगी ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : अब आप समाप्त करिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं बहुत जल्दी समाप्त कर रहा हूँ । तो मेरा प्वाइंट यह है कि मैं

आज अपने मित्र को कहना चाहता हूँ, जो विरोधी कांग्रेस पार्टी है कि वह सरकारी कांग्रेस पार्टी से इस तरह से मत लड़े । इस को उत्तर प्रदेश और महाराष्ट्र का सवाल मत बनाओ अनावश्यक ढंग से । यह सवाल आज से नहीं, आरम्भ से ही उठा हुआ है और मैं आज कहना चाहता हूँ कि 15 लाख से ऊपर जितने भी उद्योग हैं उन सब उद्योग धंदों का समाजीकरण हो । उस में चीनी सब से पहले ले ली जाय । मान लीजिये कि हमारी शाहगंज की चीनी मिल है । उस के एक एरिया के किसान गन्ना उत्पादन करते हैं । वह अपना गन्ना मिल को देते हैं और उन्हीं का गन्ना चीनी की शक्ल में आता है, तो उन किसान उत्पादकों की संस्था, जो मजदूर वहां लगे हुए हैं उन के प्रतिनिधि और सरकार, तीनों के नियंत्रण में, प्रबंध में, और संचालन में वहां की मिल हो । उस में उत्पादक भी हों, श्रमिक भी हों और सरकार भी हो । तीनों के बराबर प्रतिनिधि रहें और वे रह कर अविलम्ब, फौरन, अभी तमाम देश की चीनी मिलों का समाजीकरण कर दें । मैं समाजीकरण शब्द का प्रयोग केवल इस लिये कर रहा हूँ कि तब कंट्रोल सरकार के हाथ में नहीं रहेगा, बल्कि वह सरकार के हाथ की परिधि के बाहर चला जायगा ।

श्रीमन्, मैं थोड़ा सा समय और लूंगा क्योंकि इस विषय के हम जानकार हैं ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : लेकिन सब को बोलना है ।

श्री राजनारायण : मुझे बड़ी खुशी है । हमारे मित्र चले गये श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन...

श्री ए० पी० जैन : अजी मैं यहां हूँ ।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं चाहता हूँ कि मैं श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन की इज्जत करूं । लेकिन मुझे इतना तो निवेदन करना ही है कि वे अपना स्वभाव ऐसा बनायें कि हमारे मन में उन के प्रति सहज आदर का भाव पैदा हो । जब हम मंत्री हों और उस समय नेशनलाइजेशन का प्रस्ताव आये तो हम उस का विरोध करें और

[श्री राजनारायण]

जब हम मंत्रिपद से हट जाये तो राष्ट्रीयकरण के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करें यह दो आचरण उचित नहीं हैं। श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन के ये दो आचरण हैं। 14 मितम्बर 1957 को जब हमारे मित्र खुशवक्त राय जी ने राष्ट्रीयकरण करने का प्रस्ताव पेश किया था तो उस समय हमारे मित्र ही मंत्री थे और हमारे मित्र ने उस का खूब विरोध किया और जम कर के विरोध किया।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : अब खत्म कीजिये।

श्री राजनारायण : तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ चन्द्रशेखर जी से भी कि हम बेकार ही पत्ते पर क्यों बड़ रहे हैं। बेकार का झगड़ा मत बढ़ाओ कि कौन मिल किस के यहां रहे और कौन मिल किस के यहां। सब का समाजीकरण कर लो, लेकिन अगर सचमुच का समाजवाद चाहते हो तो समाजवाद का अर्थ भी समझो। समाजवाद का अर्थ सदा ही आर्थिक विषमता को घटाना रहा है इस लिये आर्थिक विषमता को घटाने की राह को पकड़ो। जो राह आर्थिक विषमता को बढ़ाने वाली है वह राह है समाजवाद की दुश्मन। तो एक वाक्य मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर हम एक ही कानून बना दें तो हम इन तमाम झंझटों से बच जायेंगे, हम इन झंझटों से भी बरी और उन झंझटों से भी बरी। कानून बनाओ कि आज हमारे देश में कोई भी व्यक्ति 1500 रुपये महीने से ज्यादा न खर्चा कर सकता है और न आमदनी कर सकता है। अगर यह काम हो जाय तो बहुत सा काम बन जाय। अगर कोई अपने को समाजवादी कहने का दम भरता है और अगर हमारी प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी में कुछ क्षमता और सूझ बुझ है तो उन को घोषणा करने दीजिये कि आमदनी और खर्च पर प्रधान मंत्री यह एक प्रतिबन्ध लगा रही है। अगर यह प्रतिबन्ध हो जाय तो जितनी दिक्कत हमारे मित्र दीक्षित जी ने बतायी या हमारे कुलकर्णी जी

ने बतायी या श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन जी ने बतायी वह सारी दिक्कत समाप्त।

और एक दूसरा प्रश्न उठता है कि...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : You have to wind up very soon.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं कहता हूँ, कहने दीजिये। there must be parity between Industrial and agricultural produce. कृषि जन्य पदार्थों और कल कारखानों से उत्पन्न हुए आवश्यक जिनगी के पदार्थों की कीमतों में न्याययुक्त संतुलन होना चाहिये। 1955 से यह सारे अख्तियार सरकार ने अपने हाथ में ले लिये हैं। सारे अख्तियार फडामेंटल नेसि-सिटीज आफ लाइफ की जो चीजें हैं उन की कीमतों को कंट्रोल करने के बारे में केन्द्र की सरकार के पास है। तो जैसा कि मेरे कुछ मित्र कहने लगते हैं कि एक प्रगतिशील दिशा का उदय हो रहा है, तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्रगतिशीलता इस में नहीं है... (Time bell rings) आप मुझे 5 मिनट और दे दीजिये...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : पांच मिनट नहीं। आप किसी पर अन्याय नहीं करेंगे। सब को टाईम दिया गया है।

श्री राजनारायण : केवल पांच मिनट दे दीजिये।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : 5 मिनट नहीं, 2 मिनट में आप वाइंड अप कीजिये।

श्री राजनारायण : बहुत अच्छा। जल्दी जल्दी कर कहा हूँ। आज अगर श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी प्रगतिशील हैं तो यह उन के हाथ में है। इधर उधर क्यों जाती है? कानून के झगड़े में क्यों पड़ती हैं। प्राइस फिक्सेशन की पालिसी चल रही है। क्यों नहीं कह देती कि आज इंसान की जिन्दगी के लिये जो जरूरी चीजें हैं, लागत के डबौड़े मूल्य के अन्दर उन की बिक्री होगी। श्रीमन् यही अजित प्रसाद जैन हैं, यह उस समय मंत्री थे। 1951 से 1958 तक किसानों

के गन्ने पर कंट्रोल और चीनी मिल के मालिकों को चीनी पर टैट ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : गलत है ।

श्री राजनारायण : 1951 से लेकर 3 जून, 1958 तक जब कि केन्द्र की सरकार ने कहा है कि अब चीनी 36 रुपये मन गेट पर बिकेगी । 6, 7 साल तक इस सरकार ने खूब खिलवाया है चीनी मिल मालिकों को । उस समय के यही मन्त्री महोदय हैं और आज तक मौजूद हैं । वह चले गये हैं, हम डटे खड़े हैं । हम ने कहा था कि किसानों के गन्ने की कीमत नहीं बढ़ेगी तो मिल नहीं चलेगी । और एक प्रश्न मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि आप समाजवादी सरकार के अंग हैं, क्या वह सरकार समाजवादी कहलाने वाली है जिसने 30 प्रतिशत चीनी की छूट दी चीनी मिल मालिकों को कि वे जिस कीमत पर चाहें बेचे, केवल 70 प्रतिशत पर कंट्रोल है यह क्यों ? यह किसानों के हित के लिये है ? यह पूंजीपतियों की गोदी में सोनेवाली इन्दिरा रानी की सरकार जब आज किसानों का नाम लेती है तो हम को बहुत गुस्सा आता है । आज यह किसानों और मजदूरों के नाम पर पूंजीपतियों का हित साधन करने जा रही है । इस लिये श्रीमन्, मैं आज कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह केन्द्र की सरकार के नाम से ही आज उत्तर प्रदेश का किसान ऊबा हुआ है । उस ने मांग की है कि 13 रुपये क्विंटल से कम किसानों को गन्ने की कीमत हरजिज नहीं मिलनी चाहिये और 15 दिसम्बर से पूर्वी जिलों के किसान चीनी के कारखानों में गन्ना देने से मना करने वाले हैं । वहां हड़ताल होगी । इसलिये आज इस अवसर पर आप के द्वारा मैं सरकार से और शिन्दे साहब से और श्री जगजीवन राम जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि क्यों तुम ने सात रुपये क्विंटल दाम दे दिया ? यह किस के हक में है ? चीनी के मिल मालिकों के गद्दे पर बैठ कर रस पियोगे और बाद में कहोगे कि किसानों हम तुम्हारे हिन्दी हैं, शाबास, बढ़े चलो । यह क्या है ? यह ढोंग है, यह हिपोक्रेसी है, यह विडम्बना है । इस से समाजवाद नहीं आयेगा ।

इसलिये श्रीमन्, आखिर मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि चीनी की मिलों का समाजीकरण हो, अभी हो, फौरन । इन को निजी उद्योगपतियों के हाथ से निकाला जाय और जब यह निजी उद्योगपति रूपी आकाश से गिरे तो सरकार रूपी हाथ के खजूर में न अटक जाय इस लिये इसको जनता तक जाने दो । वर्ना वह सरकारी हाथ रूपी खजूर आज जनता के खून को पी जायगा । श्रीमन्, कंट्रोल आफ प्राइज सब से बड़ा सवाल है । श्रीमन्, मैं ज्यादा नहीं कह सकूंगा, समय नहीं है लेकिन एक डा० लोहिया की लिखी हुई सौ पेज की पुस्तक है, “एकानामिक्स आफ्टर मार्क्स” उसको पढ़ा जाय । श्रीमन्, जिसके पास कीमत को कंट्रोल करने की ताकद है उसके हाथ में सब है । अगर आज सरकार के हाथ में सारी इंडस्ट्रीज आ जाय, सारे उद्योग आ जाय और सरकार चीनी के दाम को बढ़ा दे, गन्ने के दाम को घटा दे तो इससे क्या किसानों का हित होगा ! क्या हित होगा !

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी): राजनारायण जी, अब आप खत्म कीजिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : इसलिये केवल राष्ट्रीयकरण, राष्ट्रीयकरण शब्द ही प्रमुख हो गया है । श्रीमन्, हम भी पहले राष्ट्रीयकरण शब्द का ही प्रयोग करते थे ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : अब आपको खत्म करना है ।

श्री राजनारायण : आपने तो हमें दो मिनट दिया था । अच्छा एक मिनट ही दे दीजिये ।

तो श्रीमन्, राष्ट्रीयकरण, राष्ट्रीयकरण शब्द का प्रयोग बहुत होता है लेकिन मैं फिर आज श्री जेड० ए० अहमद से कहना चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्रीयकरण शब्द के साथ बलात्कार नहीं होना चाहिये । यह टेक-ओवर है, अधिग्रहण है । जैसे कि 14 बैंक लिये गये तो वह अधिग्रहण है । बैंकिंग अधिग्रहण अधिनियम है । राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं है । अगर हमारे कुछ इन्दिरा गांधी के भांडू जो कि ढोल बजाते हैं, राष्ट्रीयकरण की बारात में वह आगे हो गये

[श्री राजनारायण]

हैं, वह अगर ढोल पीट रहे हैं कि राष्ट्रीयकरण हो गया, राष्ट्रीयकरण हो गया तो ऐसा नहीं है। राष्ट्र का मतलब क्या है। राष्ट्र का मतलब है, नेशनलैटीज़ प्लस पीपुल इज़ ईक्वल टु नेशन। जनसमूह और जनता बराबर है राष्ट्र। नेशन और गवर्नमेंट में फर्क है। नेशन और गवर्नमेंट का फर्क करना हर जनतंत्री, और हर समाजवाद के विद्यार्थी और प्रोफेसर को सीखना है . . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : अच्छा, अब आप बैठिये।

श्री राजनारायण : . . . इसलिये केवल राष्ट्रीयकरण शब्द कह कर के भ्रम न पैदा किया जाय, समाजीकरण के अर्थ पर हमारे मित्र श्री चन्द्रशेखर जी आ जाय।

श्रीमन्, मैं आपका बड़ा अनुग्रहीत हूँ कि आपने मुझे कुछ थोड़ा सा समय दिया। मैं अपनी सारी बातों को कहने का समय तो नहीं पा सका किन्तु फिर भी मैं आपके प्रति आभार प्रकट करता हूँ और बैठता हूँ।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, दार्शनिक विवाद में न जा कर मैं केवल आज का जो प्रश्न है उसके बारे में अपने विचार रखना चाहूंगा। सब से पहले मैं यह बता देना चाहता हूँ कि माननीय त्रिभुवन नारायण सिंह जी ने इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी रेजोल्यूशन का जिक्र किया तो मुझे ऐसा लगा कि वह हमें यह बताना चाहते हैं कि, उस प्रस्ताव में कोई कमी नहीं थी और वह प्रस्ताव शायद अनन्त अनादि काल तक के लिये इस देश के लिये एक मानदंड बन गया है हमारे यह निर्णय करने के लिये की हम किस दिशा में जाय . . .

श्री राजनारायण : यह बिल्कुल गलत है।

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : . . . लेकिन, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब उस प्रस्ताव को हमने पारित किया था तब उसमें बहुत कमियां रह गई थीं और उन कमियों का नतीजा और परिणाम हमें आज

भुगतना पड़ता है। उन्होंने शेड्यूल ए और शेड्यूल बी की बात की। शेड्यूल ए में जितने उद्योग हैं जो कि सरकारी क्षेत्र में लिये जायेंगे उसमें कौन से उद्योग हैं! महोदय, ऐसे उद्योग जिनमें अधिक पूंजी लगे, ऐसे उद्योग जिनमें लाभ बहुत दिनों के बाद हो और ऐसे उद्योग जो कि निजी पूंजीपतियों के उद्योगों को सहारा देने के लिये, उनको मदद देने के लिये, उत्पादन का काम करें। जितनी उपभोग्य की वस्तुयें थीं उन वस्तुओं को उत्पादित करने का काम निजी क्षेत्रों में छोड़ दिया गया और नतीजा यह हुआ कि निजी उद्योग बराबर लाभ करते रहे और जो सार्वजनिक उद्योग थे वह अधिक पूंजी लगा कर के, अधिक मेहनत कर के, इन निजी उद्योगों के लिये साधन उपलब्ध करते रहो। एक विडम्बना हमारे समाज में चलती रही। कोई आज ही यह बात नहीं सोची जा रही है। हमारे मित्र राजनारायण जी मार्क्स, ट्राटेस्की और लेनिन का, बहुत बातों का, जिक्र करते हैं लेकिन वह भूल जाते हैं कि यह ज्ञान कोई आज नहीं हुआ बल्कि जब भुवनेश्वर में कांग्रेस का अधिवेशन हुआ था तो कांग्रेस ने इन गलतियों को महसूस किया था और कांग्रेस ने कहा था कि उपभोग्य की जो वस्तुयें हैं उनका भी उत्पादन सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में होना चाहिये। उसी समय हमने यह भी कहा था कि खेत में जो चीजें पैदा होती हैं और उनसे जो उद्योग चलते हैं जिसमें कि चावल की मिलों का और दूसरी बातों का जिक्र किया गया था उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिये। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि यह निर्णय देर से किया गया। मैं माननीय अजित प्रसाद जी जैन से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि 15 वर्षों में परिस्थिति बदल गई, उस समय राष्ट्रीयकरण होना जरूरी नहीं था और आज राष्ट्रीयकरण होना जरूरी है।

श्री राजनारायण : परिस्थिति तो बदली है।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : जो माननीय राजनारायण जी ने कहा उसमें सत्य है कि वर्षों तक, कम से कम एक दशक तक, हमारी सरकार ने शुगर मिलमालिकों को, चीनी मिल मालिकों को,

खुली लूट करने का छूट दी और उन्होंने जनता का अपार धन अपने धनकोषों में संगृहीत किया और उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि गन्ना के उत्पादक जो हैं उनकी गति हुई, खास तौर से उत्तर प्रदेश में जहाँ कि लाखों परिवार गन्ना की खेती करते हैं, बार बार उनका संघर्ष चला लेकिन उन संघर्षों को नजरअंदाज किया गया। आज परिस्थिति उद्योग के क्षेत्र में नहीं बदली हुई है, माननीय अजित प्रसाद जी जैन से मैं कहना चाहूंगा, आज सामाजिक शक्तियां बदल गई हैं, आज सामाजिक शक्तियों का क्षेत्र बदल गया है, 1948, 1949 में उन लोगों को कांग्रेस छोड़नी पड़ी थी जो लोग कि समाजवाद का नाम लेते थे और 1969 में जिसको कांग्रेसी रहना है उसको अपने को समाजवादी कहना पड़ता है, यह मजबूरी है, यह ज़माना बदला हुआ है, यह समाज की शक्तियां बदली हुई हैं, अन्यथा, महोदय, कोई परिवर्तन नहीं आया। 1930 में, 1932 में, 1935 में चीनी मिलें बनने लगीं, उत्तर प्रदेश में करीब 65 या 67 मिलें लगीं, उन्होंने कितना धन कमाया। हमारे मित्र सीताराम जयपुरिया यहां नहीं हैं, उन्होंने कोई एक उद्धरण पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू का दिया...

श्री राजनारायण : बिल्कुल गलत दिया है।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : ...मैं एक दूसरा उद्धरण उनकी सेवा में देना चाहता हूं।

श्री राजनारायण : अपना उद्धरण दो, जवाहरलाल नेहरू का उद्धरण न दो।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : जवाहरलाल जी ने यह भी कहा था कि हिंदुस्तान के गांवों की झोपड़ियों से आंधी उठ रही है और हो सकता है कि यह आंधी बवंडर का रूप धारण कर ले और अगर इन झोपड़ियों से सुख की, राहत की, सांस नहीं आयेगी तो हमारा समाज नष्ट-भ्रष्ट हो जायगा। अभी माननीय जयपुरिया जी ने कहा कि दंड का प्राविण है लेकिन दंड नहीं दिया गया, उत्तर प्रदेश में बंगाल जैसा दंड नहीं दिया जायगा, तो मैं उनको कोई धमकी तो नहीं

देता लेकिन जयपुरिया जी और उनकी तरह सोचने वाले लोगों को एक चेतावनी जरूर देना चाहता हूं कि आखिरकार यह बंगाल में क्यों हो रहा है, क्या कभी आपने इसको सोचा है। बीस बाईस वर्षों के अन्दर कानून का सहारा ले कर शान्ति अमन की बातें कह कर के आपने मजदूरों को पीसा, 20-22 वर्षों से उनको कहा, जूट मिल नेशनलाइज हो जायगी, कपास की मिलें नेशनलाइज हो जायगी, उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण हो जायगा और मैं आज कहता हूं कि जयपुरिया जी उसको नहीं रोक सकते, हमारे मित्र श्री सी० डी० पांडे नहीं रोक सकते और भाई महावीर भी नहीं रोक सकते।

श्री राजनारायण : ज्योति बसु भी नहीं रोक सकते।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : जमाना जिस तेजी से जिस दिशा में बढ़ रहा है कि ये सरकारी गदियों में आयेंगे और जो इस मार्ग में अवरोध डालेगा वह समाप्त हो जायगा। इसलिये मैं माननीय राजनारायण जी से कहूंगा कि दार्शनिक बातें करते रहिये लेकिन ज्योति बसु को गाली दीजिये, आप जानते हैं कि मैं उनका समर्थक नहीं हूं, लेकिन माननीय राजनारायण जी समाजीकरण की बात करें, उच्च सिद्धांतों की बात करें और कार्यक्रमों के ऊपर जनसंघ और श्री चन्द्रभान गुप्त से मिलकर हुकूमत बनाने की बात करे, यह समाजवाद उनको मुबारक हो और ऐसे समाजवाद की परिभाषा...

श्री राजनारायण : और बिड़ला से मिल कर के, शान्तिप्रसाद जैन से मिल कर के, मिक कोट को पहन कर के, साउदीअरेबिया का डाइमंड ले कर के चन्द्रशेखर इन्दिरा रानी के साथ समाजवाद मनाये यह भी शोभा की बात नहीं है।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : कम से कम इसमें मैं कोई सफाई नहीं देना चाहता।

श्री राजनारायण : मत दीजिये।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : मैं जानता हूं कि यह सरकार बहुत से गलत काम करती है और मैंने उन गलतियों का बराबर विरोध किया है...

श्री राजनारायण : इसके लिये तारीफ है ।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : ... लेकिन मैंने किसी निजी स्वार्थ में आकर के या किसी क्षणिक भावावेश में आकर के या अपने दिल व दिमाग के पागलपन की वजह से किसी व्यक्ति के विरोध में समाज के साथ विश्वासघात नहीं किया जो काम श्री राजनारायण जी का दिल आज कर रहा है । यह दोनों में परिवर्तन है ।

श्री राजनारायण : बिल्कुल गलत । चन्द्रभानु गुप्ता से सहयोग करने का हमारे दिल का कोई प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता । जब चन्द्रभानु गुप्ता की गर्ज पड़ेगी हमारे कार्यक्रम से सहयोग करेंगे, जब इन्दिरा गांधी की गर्ज पड़ेगी हमारे कार्यक्रम से सहयोग करेंगी । हमारे कार्यक्रम से कौन नहीं बंधा है । समाजवादी होकर ऐसा न कहो । ऐसे अनावश्यक ब्रैवडे की जरूरत नहीं है । हमें पापी से घृणा नहीं, हम पाप से घृणा करते हैं । और अगर चन्द्रभानु गुप्ता की इन्दिरा से तुलना करनी है तो यह सदन उसके लिये जगह नहीं है, इसको बाहर करो । क्या इन्दिरा रानी हों, क्या चन्द्रभानु गुप्त हों, क्या मोरारजी भाई हों, क्या कामराज हों, क्या पाटिल हों, क्या घोष हों, क्या दिनेश सिंह हों, क्या कर्ण सिंह हों, क्या भानु प्रकाश सिंह हों और क्या सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह हों, यह सब अलग चीज है । इसकी बहस यहां नहीं है । बन्धु, यह सदन है, सदन का जो विषय है वह लीजिये ।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : आप बैठिये ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : राजनारायण जी, आप बैठिये, आप बोल चुके हैं ।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : दूसरों को समझाइये । मैं जानता हूं ।

श्री राजनारायण : मगर आप हमारे नाम पर कहेंगे तो जवाब देंगे ।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : अभिनय में एक पात्र होता है, उसकी कभी कभी उत्तेजना सुखदायी होती है । मैं राजनारायण जी को उसी रूप में लेता हूं ।

श्री राजनारायण : उसी रूप में मैं चन्द्रशेखर को लेता हूं, जोकरी का पार्ट अदा करते हैं ।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : महोदय, मैं कह रहा था कि आज प्रश्न सीमित है और वह प्रश्न यह है कि यह जो शुगर मिलें हैं वे किस तरह से समाज का और गन्ना उत्पादकों का शोषण करती रही हैं । एक बार नहीं अनेक बार यह सवाल इस सदन में भी उठा है और दूसरी जगहों में भी उठा है । सन् 1956-57 की बात राजनारायणजी ने कही । श्री खुशबक्त राय ने प्रस्ताव रखा था, उस समय गलती किया सरकार ने कि उसको स्वीकार किया था । 1955 में उत्तर प्रदेश की विधान सभा में माननीय गेंदा सिंह ने इस सवाल को जब उठाया उस समय श्रीमन्, चन्द्रभानु गुप्ता जो उद्योग मंत्री थे उन्होंने कहा था कि हमारी सरकार की नीति यह है कि सहकारिता के क्षेत्र में चीनी उद्योग को लाया जाये । 1955 के बाद 14 वर्ष तो बीत गये अब तक कुछ हुआ नहीं । अब एक काम के लिये, जिसका जिक्र हमारे माननीय मित्र श्री चन्द्र दत्त पांडे जी कर रहे थे, उत्तर प्रदेश की हुकूमत ने या वहां के मंत्रिमंडल ने एक प्रस्ताव किया है कि ये चीनी मिलें सरकारी कब्जे में ली जायें लेकिन केन्द्रीय सरकार इस मामले में एक सार्वदेशिक नीति निर्धारित करे । एक चतुराई की बात है लेकिन उस चतुराई से मुझे मालूम नहीं होता माननीय शिन्दे जी को क्यों कठिनाई होती है । माननीय शिन्दे जी और माननीय जगजीवनराम जी से मैं कहूंगा आप कभी कभी पहल करना भी सीखिये । इतिहास आपको किसी बात के लिये मजबूर कर दे और उस समय आप करें तो यह नेतृत्व का काम नहीं है । नेतृत्व का काम यह है कि यह देखे कि इतिहास किस दिशा में बढ़ रहा है, हमें किस दिशा में जाने का संकेत मिल रहा है और उस दिशा में हम कदम उठाये और अगर उस दिशा में कदम नहीं उठता है तो उसका नतीजा, उसका परिणाम यह होता है कि समाज में और देश की राजनीति में अवांछनीय तत्व पैदा हो जाते हैं और अवांछनीय

तत्व समाजवाद के नाम पर कहें, या स्थिरता के नाम पर कहें या क्रांतिकारिता के नाम पर कहें, वह अवांछनीय तत्व हमारे सामाजिक मूल्यों को और राजनैतिक आधारशिला को हमेशा सीमित कर रहे हैं। मेरा केवल यह कहना है कि 1955 में बी० एम० बिड़ला साहब की सदारत में एक कमेटी बनी, और एक बात उन्होंने कहा कि यू० पी० की मिलों में 9 करोड़ रु० की एसेट लगी हुई है। अगर मैं कहूं 9 करोड़ से अधिक की सम्पत्ति ले ली जाये तो उसमें हमारे कुछ दोस्त संविधान की बात लाते हैं। महोदय, आज नहीं तो कल हमें भी मजबूर होकर कहना पड़ेगा कि आज का संविधान अगर समाज की गति के अनुरूप चलने में हमें बाधा होता है, या आज के संविधान के कारण हमारा जन आकांक्षाएं पूरी नहीं होती, तो संविधान में जो संपत्ति के अधिकार के बारे में कहा गया है, उसको संविधान से हमको हटाना पड़ेगा। इस संसद् को और इस देश को सोचना पड़ेगा कि आखिरकार करोड़ों लोगों की च्छाओं को संविधान की एक धारा के कारण हमें नहीं रोकना होगा। संविधान की एक धारा के बारे में मुख्य न्यायाधीश माननीय हिदायत उल्ला जी ने कहा है कि प्रापर्टी राइट्स फंडामेंटल राइट्स में नहीं होने चाहियें। आज अगर हम देखें तो दस, बारह लाख धो पूंजी लगा कर करोड़ों रुपये इन पूंजीपतियों ने कमाये हैं और हमारे माननीय मित्र श्री संताराम जयपुरिया कहते हैं कि पिछले साल हमारे करोड़ों रुपये किसानों को गन्ने की कीमत के दे दिये। मैं उनसे जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या यह सही नहीं है कि खांडसारी और गुड़ इन्स्ट्री ने मिलमालिकों से अधिक रुपया गन्ने की कीमत का किसानों को दिया और उस समय सरकार की ओर से आपको सुरक्षा दी गई...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : The U.P. factories got the highest rates.

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : जिन इलाकों में मिलें लगी हुई हैं महोदय, वहां किसान कोल्हू नहीं चला सकता है, वह खांडसारी नहीं बन सकती,

यह नीति क्यों है ? क्या यह नीति उनको सुरक्षा देने के लिये नहीं है। किसने उससे फायदा उठाया ? महोदय, मैं दूसरी बात कहना चाहता हूं, सीरा जो बनता है, मोलेसेज जो बनता है, कितनी कीमत गवर्नमेंट की ओर से तय की गई ?

श्री राजनारायण : चन्द्रशेखरजी, देखिये आप कहें तो मैं सफाई कह दूँ। चन्द्रशेखर जी बिल्कुल ठीक कह रहे हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश में जब प्रभुनारायण उद्योग मंत्री थे उन्होंने खांडसारी वाला मामला खोल दिया। उन्होंने कहा यह उत्पादन बढ़ा सकते हैं। क्रशर को लगाने की छूट दी सोलह रु०, सत्रह रुपया क्विंटल दाम मिलने लग गया। अगर आज क्रशर को राज्य सरकार खोल दे तो 13 रु० क्विंटल एकाएक मालिक को देना पड़ेगा, क्योंकि मालिक तो इसलिये दे रहा है वह जानता है यह क्रशर को नहीं दे सकता, यह हमको झख मार कर देगा। अगर सोसलिस्ट पार्टी के मंत्री ने जो नियम बनाया था वही कांग्रेस बना दे तो मामला बन जाये।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : महोदय, सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के मंत्री ने बहुत काम किये जो मैं चाहता हूं कोई कांग्रेसी न करे। इसलिये महोदय, मैं उसमें नहीं जाऊंगा। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि काफी संरक्षण दिया गया है। एक दूसरी बात कही हमारे मित्र लोकनाथ मिश्र ने कि इन मिलों को बंद नहीं करने दिया जाता। आखिरकार एक ही तो उद्योग है जो उत्तर प्रदेश की आर्थिक व्यवस्था का आधार है। इसलिये आवश्यक है कि सरकार इसको कब्जे में ले और इसके लिये एटार्नी जनरल की रिपोर्ट कोई जरूरी नहीं है। महोदय, मैं यह चाहूंगा—माननीय शिन्दे साहब से करवद्ध निवेदन करूंगा—उस पक्ष की बहस में न जायें कि राज्य सरकार करेगी, केन्द्रीय सरकार करेगी। अगर उत्तर प्रदेश की अर्थ नीति को बनाए रखना है, अगर वहां के 22 लाख परिवारों को बर्बादी से, विनाश से बचाना है तो केन्द्रीय सरकार जरूरत पड़ने पर सारे देश की मिलों को ले और

[श्री चन्द्रशेखर]

उनको ले कर सहकारिता के क्षेत्र में चलाये। कोई जरूरी नहीं है कि राष्ट्रीयकरण ही हो। सारी मिलों को लेकर सवाल चल रहा है तो सहकारित क्षेत्र में मिलें चल सकती हैं। और सहकारिता के क्षेत्र का विरोध अब एक नया दर्शन बन गया है राजनारायण जी का...

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये, हम जो कह रहे हैं वही शुद्ध सहकारिता होगी, वही कामयाब होगा। कमलापति त्रिपाठी की तरह नहीं कि 6,000 रु० ले लिया सहकारिता के नाम पर। वह नहीं चलेगा।

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : इसलिये मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार को अविलम्ब इन सारी चीनी मिलों को निजी उद्योग से लेकर, जहाँ आवश्यक हो और जहाँ उपयुक्त वातावरण हो, वहाँ सहकारिता के क्षेत्र में अन्यथा सरकारी क्षेत्र में उनको चलाया जाय। यह एकमात्र उपाय है और मुझे विशेष रूप से यह निवेदन करना है कि उत्तर प्रदेश और भारत सरकार के विवाद को विलम्ब करने का रास्ता न अपनाया जाय। तुरन्त केन्द्रीय सरकार इस मामले में पहल करे और अधिक विलम्ब होने से पहले कोई कदम उठाये।

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is a pleasure that most of the Members who have participated in this debate have supported the cause of nationalisation of the sugar mills in this country. I may remind my friend that the three biggest agro-industries in this country which employ a huge amount of labour, prospered before the Second World War. And out of these three agro-industries, textiles, jute and sugar, sugar was one of the biggest industries in this country which enjoyed protection for a pretty long time. That is why before the War also, the sugar industry to a certain extent changed the economies of a few States in a bigger way. But I am very sorry to say that the protection that was granted to the sugar industry, though it was primarily to benefit the agriculturists, helped these industrialists who started the sugar industry and the cane-grower at that time did not get justice which the protection meant because protection was given only to the produce of

the sugar industry, not to the agriculturist. After the War the sugar matter was discussed everywhere, the sugar industry started suffering because even before and after the War, all the profits that the sugar industry gained due to the protection, were not utilised for modernising or expanding the industry. That is why the malady in the sugar industry started after the Second World War. Before that period, all the profits of the sugar industry gained due to the protection, were given to the industrialists and the honest agriculturist did not get anything. It was the industrialists and to some extent the middlemen and the traders who got the maximum benefit. So, it was a protection given not to the entire industry or the country as such but to the industrialists who owned these industries.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, after the War the Government also did not give proper attention to the sugar industry. They were interested only in the matter of excise duty. The Government's policy regarding control and decontrol has been vacillating throughout this period. I may remind Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain that after the planning was started in this country from 1952 to 1957 there was absolutely no control on sugar and the ruling price per quintal was Rs. 82 or Rs. 83. After 5 years of decontrol, in the year 1958 there was control for hardly three years and the price went up during the control period and the average price was between Rs. 84 and Rs. 94 per quintal. Then in 1961 for two years decontrol came and the price again went up to Rs. 101 to Rs. 105. In 1963 again control was re-imposed for two years and the ruling price at that time was Rs. 108 to Rs. 112. So if you see the history of control and decontrol of sugar, you will find that when there was no control and when control came, the price was fixed at a higher rate and when again decontrol came, the price went up. Again when control came, the price was fixed at Rs. 111 which was much higher than the decontrol price in the market. Mr. Vice-Chairman, throughout this period the sugar industry has not been treated properly because the Government was more interested in two aspects, one to get more of excise duty and the other to give benefit to the industrialists. Here I may quote certain figures. In 1950-51 when the rate of excise duty was Rs. 7.37 the total revenue on account of excise duty was hardly Rs. 6 crores and in 1960-61 when the rate was Rs. 28.65 the excise revenue went up to Rs. 54 crores. Now the rate is

the same and the excise duty has gone beyond Rs. 70 crores. So it is clear that after the War the Government neglected the industry by not forcing modernisation of the mills; they did not compel them to modernise their mills. This is the only reason why the sugar industry is suffering now.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, in this connection may I remind you that when the Sen Committee was set up to look into the malady of the sugar industry, it recommended that unless the sugar mills in India are completely rationalised and modernised, the sugar industry will not be able to stand the test of time. They even went to the extent of saying that those mills which have got the capacity of less than 1250 tons should be upgraded and expanded and if they refuse to expand, then the Government should take over these mills. Though the Sen Committee were not interested to discuss about nationalisation, they came to the conclusion that unless their installed capacity is raised, nationalisation should take place. Even after the Sen Committee Report in 1965, I am very sorry to say that the Government were only interested in control and decontrol and in getting more of excise duty. They also went in for partial decontrol. Now what is the purpose of this partial decontrol? In the name of partial decontrol the consumers in this country were fleeced in the market and the industrialists were allowed to make much more profits at the cost of the consumers. Mr. Vice-Chairman, my complaint against the Government is not that they have not nationalised the mills. But my complaint is that throughout this period, the post-War period, they gave importance only to two aspects—one to have control and decontrol so that the industrialists get the benefit and the second aspect was to enhance the excise duty so that they get much revenue at the cost of the consumers in this country. But nothing was done to modernise those mills. Mr. Vice-Chairman, now such a situation has developed in the country that this industry can never stand on its own legs unless there is rationalisation of the industry. It is no use saying that in U.P. or in Bihar the mills are sick. I am not going to quote from the Sen Committee's Report. They have also given some compliment to the co-operative sugar industries of Maharashtra but they also have said that the workers working in the co-operative factories in Maharashtra are not getting enough of justice. That aspect we should not forget. I am not

going into the question whether the mills in U.P. are better or those in Maharashtra are better. But we have to take into a consideration the entire industry as it is in the country.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, my contention is that this debate has given us scope to discuss about the policy of nationalisation also. Of course, I do not agree with anybody if he says that nationalisation should be equated with State capitalism. I want the producers, i.e., the agriculturists, and also the workers to participate in the ownership and control of the industry. If we want to see that the Fourth Plan also succeeds, then I will advocate here that the Industrial Policy Resolution should be reviewed. I am very thankful to Mr. T. N. Singh who drew our attention to the lacunae in the Resolution and also how in its implementation, we have departed from it. Here again if you want to change the structure of the country's economy, the first emphasis should be that not only the key industries in this country should be nationalised but all these sectors which go into mass consumption goods should also be brought under State control. As the Reserve Bank Governor, Mr. Jha, has said, control only at the stage of production will punish the producer whereas it will give enough of scope to the middlemen and to the industrialists. The honest producers will be at a disadvantage whereas the middlemen and others will get the advantage of the whole economy. So I would suggest that not only in this context we should think of the sugar industry but we should think of all those industries which go into mass production. All of them should be under State control. I do not say that it should be done just now but I want to say that the Industrial Policy Resolution should be completely revised so that not only the key industries, not only the key sectors but all those sectors which deal with essential mass consumption goods are brought under State control. Otherwise in this planned economy it will not be possible at all to check the inflationary tendencies in the country because we cannot completely depend upon the present control machinery of the Government. In spite of the drawbacks that the public sector is suffering from, which I want should be remedied, there should be a constant effort to change the character of the public sector industries. We should not only bring key industries but other industries also which go into mass consumption, e.g., sugar, textiles and other consumer industries under the public sector.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : All co-operative sugar factories had to implement the Central Wage Board Award on sugar. There is no favouritism.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Sir, I am not contesting him.

Then, Sir, there is another wrong notion in this country that whenever a mill is sick, whether it is a textile mill or a sugar mill, it should be taken over. I do not understand why the taxpayer's money should be paid by way of compensation for such sick mills which have become sick on account of negligence on the part of the industrialists. So the attitude of the Government towards nationalisation under the present conditions should also be changed. I was against it when the Sick Mill Bill came here. Those mills were deliberately made sick to fleece the consumers and hence the industrialists should not be allowed to benefit and the taxpayer's money should not be allowed to be wasted in taking over such sick mills.

So it is a wrong approach. That is why I will say we should judge it from the sector-wise angle, judge it from sector to sector, and if we think that a particular sector ought to be nationalised in the interests of the economy, we should not bother whether the mill is prosperous or not, because we are not going to give the benefit to the person who, because of his inefficiency or because of his cheating the taxpayer, has made this country sick or that industry sick. So our approach should be not on the basis of one sick mill, or one very strong mill or a healthy mill. Our basis should be from sector to sector, and we feel that the mass consumption goods sector should be brought into the public sector, and that is why it is absolutely necessary for the sugar industry to be brought under public control.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I shall try to be very brief. I am thankful to you for giving me this opportunity to express my views broadly on this issue of nationalisation. My involvement with the sugar industry is not very great though I come from an area where two sugar mills are located. My knowledge is not adequate, however, to give me the confidence to pronounce one way or other on the merits of the issue of nationalisation. But, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have set before this country the goal of achieving a socialist society.

Unfortunately, so far we have been talking in very general terms, talking of eradicating poverty, carrying the torch of education to every hut in this wide country. We have not yet spelt out what exactly we mean by the conception of socialism. We have not categorised or itemised the steps that we propose to take to achieve a socialist order. Unfortunately, I find that our conception of socialism is based on the Fabian conception, a conception that prevails in the Western countries, a conception which leaves the apparatus of free enterprise untouched but at the same time tries to dole out some benefits to the large mass of people or the large mass of workers. Unfortunately, I feel that that conception of socialism is not suitable for this country. I know of only one socialism, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the socialism that was propagated and preached by Karl Marx and Lenin. I know of no other conception of socialism which can suit the development of this country or, for the matter of that, any backward country. Mr. Vice-Chairman, the sore point of capitalism is not maldistribution. The sore point of capitalism is its fetters on production. Unless we have a new socialist order as Dr. Z. A. Ahmad pointed out, a new system of production relations on which the industrial structure is based, we would not be achieving socialism and we would not be progressing at the pace at which progress is needed to extricate this country from poverty and ignorance. Mr. Vice-Chairman, there are people who point to us the example of Japan or West Germany and tell us that it is possible to build on that basis even in this country. But they were very advanced countries. The know-how was there. The surveys were there. The designs were there. The workers were there. The technicians were there. And only a part of, say, the real apparatus or the material machinery, which goes into production of goods, had been destroyed. Therefore it was easy for them, with the help of the large sums of money that the richer Western countries doled out to them, to rebuild their economy rapidly in the shortest possible time. But for a poor country, which has for thousands of years lived in a state of oppression and suppression, for that country it is not possible to proceed and develop on the path on which these advanced countries have developed. The example of the various undeveloped countries is before us. Those undeveloped countries, which have taken a fully socialist path, have achieved progress in the shortest possible time. Those, which have taken to

some other path. their economy is stagnating today. Mr. Vice-Chairman, therefore, I feel that, if we really want to achieve a socialist society, then we must get out of the Conception that the so-called ten-point programme provides the panacea for development. The ten-point programme, in my opinion, is a very colourless programme. It is a programme which any welfare State today adopts for its citizens. We need to go further if we really want to achieve a socialist society in the shortest possible time. The character of an economy is determined by its production apparatus. Unless that production apparatus is socialised, nationalised—I do not quarrel with these words—unless that apparatus is nationalised quickly and extensively, it is futile for us to think that we are on the way to achieve a socialist society.

श्री राजनारायण : जरा इस बात को समझा दीजिये ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : नही राजनारायण जी, समय नहीं है ।

श्री राजनारायण : इनके कहन का मतलब क्या मैं यह समझू कि उत्पादन के सम्बन्ध भी बदले और उत्पादों के तरीके और संगठन भी बदले ?

श्री ब्रजकिशोर प्रसाद सिंह : जी हां ।

Therefore, the new production apparatus must be based on production relations, which are essential to achieve socialism. One of the ironies of free enterprise is that, while maintaining the apparatus if you try to introduce greater and greater equality by doling out money, say, to the workers or to other sectors of the economy, then there is less and less saving, and if there is less saving, there is less investment and if there is less investment, there is no progress. But in the modern world it is not possible to sustain a system in which there are large inequalities. Therefore it is necessary to think of a system where inequality would be eliminated but at the same time savings would be of such an order that with those savings we can quickly rebuild our economy. Therefore there is no way out of a socialist society. For the establishment of a socialist society it is necessary to have a socialised sector of production or a nationalised sector of production.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will be very brief now. I find that our Constitution, incorporating property rights and the political machinery that we have in this country, stands in the way of rapid advance. I am not prepared to go as far as Prudhon and declare that all property is theft. But at least I feel that I would cease to be modern, I would become anti-diluvian, if I do not take the view that the right to life must take primacy over the right to property, and if property rights and the constitutional structure embodying them came in the way of rapid advance, they must be subjected to rapid change. But then, with the Constitution as it is, it is not possible for us to brush aside property; compensation and the other elements that are there. Therefore I feel it is necessary for the Government today to establish a scheme of priorities, a scheme of priorities with the aim of coming to a decision as to which sectors of the economy it is necessary to nationalise and by nationalising which sectors it would be possible to control and operate the economy in such a way that rapid advance would be possible. At this stage I cannot say whether in that scheme of priorities this sugar industry will find a high place. But then, in nationalisation we have not to consider only the economic aspects. We have to consider the political aspects also and, therefore, if in the scheme of priorities that is drawn this industry finds a high place, I see no reason why this industry should not be nationalised. But then, I also feel that this is an issue which cannot be decided in the House in a discussion of this nature. This is a matter which should receive cool and mature consideration after an analysis of all the facts from all angles and then, if this step really helps the economy of this country, then nationalisation, in my opinion, should be a must.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the most painful aspect of this debate was the pathetic speech of Mr. T. N. Singh. It was a sight for the God to see Mr. T. N. Singh disowning the Planning Commission and blaming Jawaharlal Nehru.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN : And he is in charge of administrative reforms. You have put him incharge of administrative reforms.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : It is awfully bad that he is a Member of the Administrative Reforms Commission. Mr. T. N. Singh was a Member of the Planning Commission for a very long time and if

[Shri Arjun Arora]

there were mistakes in the Plans Mr. T. N. Singh cannot escape the responsibility for them. His could have been an honest speech if he had today made a clean breast of his own shortcomings as a Member of the Planning Commission. Sir, if there were any mistakes in the Plans, Mr. T. N. Singh is the person in this House who is responsible for them.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, श्री टी० एन० सिंह को तो जवाहरलाल जी न उसी जगह बैठाया था डाक्टर लोहिया को हराने के लिये ।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : उस पर भी मैं अभी आ रहा हूँ । Mr. T. N. Singh blamed Jawaharlal Nehru of gigantism. He said Jawaharlal Nehru wanted everything to be gigantic and he blamed him for it. Sir, ours is a gigantic country and if our problems, which are also gigantic, have to be solved—and the most gigantic of the problems of this country is the problem of poverty—this country will have to go in for gigantic schemes and Jawaharlal Nehru did the correct thing when he went in for gigantic schemes. He of course made some gigantic mistakes also and today I am convinced that one of Jawaharlal Nehru's gigantic mistakes was the elevation of Mr. T. N. Singh from an insignificant, Sub-editor in a Lucknow newspaper to a Member of the Planning Commission. He made this mistake. The correct place for Mr. T. N. Singh was where he was at Lucknow.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, इस को यह भी बता दीजिये कि टी० एन० सिंह की वजह से नेशनल हेराल्ड भी चला था । जब नेशनल हेराल्ड पर कुर्की हुई थी तो टी० एन० सिंह ने ही बनारस से रुपया ला कर दिया था ।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : हम ने कानपुर से चन्दा कर के भेजा था ।

श्री राजनारायण : तब जवाहरलाल जी की पोलिटिकल हिस्ट्री बनी । उस के कारण रहे हैं टी० एन० सिंह और रहे हैं ठाकुर दास वकील ।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : If after every sentence of mine Mr. Rajnarain gets up, Sir, you will at least please give me that

much time extra which is taken up by Mr. Rajnarain.

श्री राजनारायण : चूँकि टी० एन० सिंह नहीं है इसलिये मैं सफाई कर रहा हूँ ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तो पंत ठेंगड़ी) : आप इंटरप्ट कर रहे हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : यह इंटरप्शन नहीं है । यह तो प्वाइंट दे रहा हूँ श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा को ।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : मेरे पास जितने प्वाइंट हैं उतने हमारे समय के लिये काफी हैं । आप को जितना समय मिलता है उस का चौथाई समय मुझे मिलता है ।

Mr. T. N. Singh said that the Centre will have to nationalise the sugar industry. He was very keen to absolve the U.P. Government and its Chief Minister, Mr. C. B. Gupta, of any responsibility for nationalising the sugar industry. There was till 1951 a scheme in U.P. under which sugar mills could start crushing only if they obtained a licence every year from the Government of U.P. It was true of the Governments of U.P. and Bihar. This licence system was in vogue in U.P. and it is open to the U.P. Government to restore that annual licensing system which was in force in U.P. till 1951. Once that system is restored the U.P. Government can easily refuse licence to any mill that it likes and easily take it over. It is not that the Centre alone can do it. If the U.P. Government is sincere about its resolutions, it can take over the industry. Of course I want the Centre to take over the sugar industry. I want the Centre to get the credit for it but I must point out that the U.P. Government is not so helpless in this matter as Mr. T. N. Singh and Mr. C. B. Gupta pretend, Sir, it was surprising that Mr. T. N. Singh who was Member in charge of Industry in the Planning Commission blamed the Plans and said that the Plans were industry-oriented. He said that that meant neglect of agriculture. There is no conflict between industry and agriculture in the world of today. Agriculture itself needs the products of industry as much as industry needs the products of agriculture Sir, how can we have fertilisers, for example...

SHRI RAJNARAIN : Even today in Russia agriculture is treated like a colony

for Industry. To develop industry agriculture has been exploited. There is conflict between industry and agriculture. This is why in India too you are not going to establish parity between the prices of industrial produce and agricultural produce.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Please do not interrupt.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : We are not discussing Russia.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : You said no. where is the word; so I want to point this out to you and correct you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Mr. Rajnarain, after every sentence there cannot be interruptions like this. You were not interrupted.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Sir, this running commentary should be stopped.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, समझ गया । आप की आज्ञा शिरोधार्य कर रहा हूँ । जब मैं पार्टी कहता हूँ तो अशोक मेहता साहब जो प्लानिंग कमिशन में थे, हमारी पार्टी में लगते थे । उन्होंने कहा कि कैपिटल फार्मेशन कहां से होगा ? यह फंडामेंटल प्वाइंट है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपल्ल ठेंगड़ी) : अब आप बैठिये ।

All the fundamental points are not to be dragged in just now.

श्री राजनारायण : आप की आज्ञा शिरोधार्य है ।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Sir, Mr. Rajnarain occasionally waxes eloquent over parliamentary procedure. The correct parliamentary procedure is to listen to speeches and then speak only when one's turn comes. Unfortunately his turn came earlier. So he should please stop his running commentary.

Sir, there is no conflict between industry and agriculture in the 20th century.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, जब यह गलत बुनियाद पर खड़े होंगे तो कहना ही पड़ेगा ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : No, you will not interruption. You listen patiently. You please consider the time.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन् उन को सात बजे तक का समय दिया जाय ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : No; you will not interrupt him. You listen patiently. You please consider the time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : You now finish your speech.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : My speech will begin when Mr. Rajnarain stops his interruptions; my speech has not yet begun.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Don't punish us.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Sir, Sitaram Jaipuria was another interesting speaker in this debate. He claimed that the private sector has done well in the sugar industry. Now if the private sector has done well in the sugar industry, then why this cry about lack of modernisation in sugar industry? The Sen Report and the Gundu Rao Report are two big volumes which condemn the private sector. Mr. Sen is a person whom I do not know but I know that he is not a politician. I know Mr. Gundu Rao. He is a life-long sugar technologist. These two technical people have condemned the private sector in the sugar industry for lack of modernisation. Lack of modernisation is a big problem of the sugar industry, particularly in U.P. and Bihar where the sugar industry was the first to be started. It is a big condemnation of the private sector in the sugar industry.

Then, Sir, more than one speaker referred to the failure of the co-operative movement in U.P. U.P.'s peasantry was one of the worst exploited during the British rule. The British did not only exploit them, but they also created the peculiar system of Zamindari in U.P. This was their act of vindictiveness for the participation of the peasantry of U.P. in the freedom struggle of 1857. Sir, U.P.'s peasantry has been one of the worst exploited in the country and, therefore, one of the poorest. It does not have the resources to raise money for the co-operative movement. When the Congress Government of Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant did a good thing and abolished the Zamindari, the agriculturists in U.P. had to pay ten times the land revenue for acquiring the proprietary rights. This continued in the fifties. So whatever money the agriculturist in U.P. could

[Shri Arjun Arora]

save was given to acquire proprietary rights. The peasantry in no other State had to do this. The peasantry in U.P. remains the poorest and the most resourceless. The Co-operative movement does require some resources on the part of the co-operators.

Workers not only in U.P. but all over the country, workers engaged in the sugar industry want its nationalisation. There is the organisation called the Indian National Sugar Mill Workers Federation, which was formed in 1946. One of its objectives is to work for the nationalisation of the sugar industry. Early in November this year the General Council of that organisation called for the early nationalisation of the sugar industry. This was done unanimously. Mr. Kashinath Pandey, who has changed his mind and changed his party, was a party to that decision. I urge upon the Government on behalf of them...

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA : He has not at all changed his party. He is in the original Congress.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : No, let us not enter into that controversy. Kindly wind up.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : You are wrong, Mr. Chavda. He has gone to Congo.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA : He is the original Congress.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : The workers wanted it, whether Mr. Kashinath Pandey wanted it or not. The organisation to which he belongs wants it.

The cane-growers in U.P. are a pitiable lot, but they also want nationalisation of the sugar mills in U.P. The sugar-cane in U.P. is considered bad because the recovery is less than in other parts of the country. How has it come about ? The U.P. Government collects a cane cess. The U.P. Government collects a purchase tax on the purchase of sugarcane by the mills. These two taxes are supposed to be spent on the development of sugar-cane. The yield must increase and the quality must improve. Though every year crores of rupees are collected for the development of sugar-cane, nothing is done to improve the quality. The sugar-cane grower in U. P. a serf. He is not free to sell his

produce where he wants. Mr. Jain defended the system under which the sugar-cane grower is tied to a particular sugar mill. He has to sell his produce to that sugar mill. How does that sugar mill treat him ? While all over the country cash payments are made for purchases made by the factory, sugar mills in U.P. do not pay the price to the sugar-cane grower. They hold it back and every year crores and crores are due from the sugar mills. The demand for the nationalisation of the sugar mills in U.P. is now more than ten years old. In 1959 the then Chief Minister of U.P., Dr. Sampurnanand, wanted the appointment of a high power committee to examine the implications of nationalisation of the sugar industry, but Mr. S. K. Patil, the great friend of Mr. Chavda, who now sits in the Opposition, was then the Food Minister. He turned it down.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA : We also stand for nationalisation.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Mr. S. K. Patil, your leader, does not. Please repudiate him.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY : He is not the leader.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : One of the leaders of your party.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY : I say again, my good friend, I do not want to say things. He is not our leader.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Is he your follower ? He is your financier. He is your party's financier.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY : Why do you jump from one thing to another ?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : He is one of the leaders of Congress (O).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Kindly close.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY : Of the country.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Not of the country, but of Bombay where he lost the election.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA : He has won from Banaskantha.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : He is the leader of Ban skantha, but today Mr. Chavda does not accept him as leader. Sir, thanks to Mr. S. K. Patil this again was delayed. After ten years now that the Government party has got rid of Mr. S. K. Patil it is time that the Government nationalised the sugar industry.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, so far as the sugar industry in this country is concerned, there are about two hundred district all over the country and of these about 29 are in UP. Whatever may be the importance of the sugar industry in different parts of the country, I think you will agree with me that the sugar industry in UP and Bihar occupies a very important position in the economy of the State concerned. So far as UP is concerned about 29 districts of the whole State more or less depend upon the cultivation of sugar-cane and naturally the economy of these 29 districts is largely dependent upon the sugar industry itself. About 22 lakhs of people who cultivate sugar-cane are directly involved in this industry. Therefore, this industry has been developed, as we have known earlier, under a state of protection from the Government. As has been stated earlier, it had tariff protections it had a protected market for sale, it had protected and fixed price, and as a result of these variety of protections -- since I have not much time to discuss -- with this much I think you would agree with me that this industry enjoyed a variety of protections, and under the shelter of variety of statutory protections this industry earned, if not fabulous, but convertible profits. Even today I find from the Report of 1967-68. I also refer to my friend, Mr. Kulkarni--that 116 private sector sugar factories earned Rs. 11.50 crores as profit and 30 co-operatives earned Rs. 1.23 crores as profit. That means that even after such a plight as is said by the sugar industrialists they earned a profit of Rs. 11.59 crores. We have to see things in the proper background. As our friend, Mr. Dikshit, was very much pleased to refer, the capital which was invested in the earlier stage of the industry in Uttar Pradesh was not more than Rs. 9 crores. If you add the profit the Uttar Pradesh sugar industries have so far earned, I think it will be more than Rs. 200 crores up to now.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Just one clarification I would give you.

The **VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) :** Will you refrain from saying anything ? You had your say.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Have I said anything wrong ?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : I want to give him a clarification...

SHRI CHITTA BASU : You are having profit. I have not no grudge that you should not earn profit. But it should be nationalised along with your profit or loss, if you incur.

It is alleged that although the sugar Industry had been earning profit after profit under a variety of statutory protections, as I have stated earlier, they have not ploughed back their profits in reserves for the modernisation and rehabilitation of the industry. Not only that, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the depreciation funds which these industries are bound to feed have also been converted in various other ways various very questionable ways, if I am not to use a stronger language. Not only that, whatever may be their profit and loss accounts, I think you will agree with me that there are manipulations of accounts to a large extent. After all these things the sugar industrialists have earned covetable profit during these years, and the industries have not been nurtured, they have not been rehabilitated, they have not been properly nourished, as a result of which the workers in the factories are suffering a lot. The cane growers are not even being paid the legitimate sale price. I was looking into the old files wherein I found that our hon. Minister, Mr. Shinde, in the Lok Sabha sometime ago, about three or four months ago—I have forgotten the date—had to admit that an amount of Rs. 25 crores were due to the growers to the country. The industrialists purchase the sugarcane but the cultivators are not being properly paid, not paid in time also, they are being paid unremunerative price. Therefore, this industry is now in the deepest of doldrums. Now I think everybody will agree that for the nation's interest the industry is to be modernised, it is to be rehabilitated, and for that purpose something is to be done.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the report of the Sen Commission and the report of the Gundu Rao Committee have been referred to here. They have said in unmistakable terms that the industry was not being modernised by these industrialists, and in the interests of the country,

[Shri Chitta Basu]

in the interests of the industry, in the interests of the cultivators, in the interests of the consumers the industry is to be modernised. I hear a suggestion which is very much put forth as to why those sick mills are not being taken over by the Government by way of forming a Sick Sugar Mills Corporation. There are also suggestions that the Industries Development and Regulation Act may be applied in the matter of takeover of these sick mills. I am very much opposed to this very idea. I am very much opposed to this idea because it is with the State exchequer's money that the sick mills are being renovated, are being rehabilitated, are being modernised, and after being modernised and rehabilitated they are again to be given back to the old proprietors or factory-owners who were really responsible for the present plight or the unhappy state of affairs of those mills. Therefore, if the industry is to be at all modernised, it is to be under the State sector. The Government will give money, Government will supervise, and only after the supervision and after the patronage or financial assistance by the Government this industry can be modernised and rehabilitated in the interests of the consumers, cultivators and the country as a whole. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, at the present stage there is no other alternative than to go straight for the nationalisation of the sugar industry. That alone will ensure the survival of the industry in the interests of the cane growers, in the interests of the consumers, in the interests of our accepted policy.

श्री नन्द किशोर भट्ट : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय चीनी उद्योग के राष्ट्रीयकरण की मांग को लेकर आज इस माननीय सदन में बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण चर्चा हुई है। इस सबध में हमारे कुछ मित्रों ने इस मांग को लेकर इसके दार्शनिक और विभिन्न पहलुओं पर भी चर्चा की है। मैं उन सबका बड़ा आदर करता हूँ और मान करता हूँ। जिस प्रकार अधिकांश सदस्यों ने चीनी उद्योग के राष्ट्रीयकरण की मांग के संबंध में विचार रखे हैं, उसी कड़ी में मैं अपने संक्षिप्त विचार आपके समक्ष रखूंगा।

श्रीमन्, बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण का निर्णय लेने के पश्चात् इस देश में चीनी उद्योग के राष्ट्रीयकरण की जो मांग हो रही है वह यह

बतलाती है कि इस समय देश में कितनी जागृति है, सर्वसाधारण आज कितना जागरूक हो चुका है, अपने अधिकारों के प्रति और इस सदन के जरिये और जो भी जनतन्त्रात्मक तरीके उसके सामने हैं, उनके जरिये वह अपनी न्यायोचित मांग को जोरदार तरीके से देश की सरकार के समक्ष रख रहा है।

श्रीमन्, हमारे देश की अर्थ व्यवस्था मूलतः कृषि पर आधारित है। हम और आप सभी जानते हैं कि जिस देश की आधारभूत अर्थ-व्यवस्था कृषि है, उस देश में भी कृषकों का कितना शोषण हुआ है और जो शोषण हुआ है, उसके संबंध में मैं अधिक कहना नहीं चाहता हूँ। लेकिन इसी सिलसिले में चीनी उद्योग में काम करने वाले जो गन्ना उत्पादक हैं, उनका भी शोषण बहुत अधिक हुआ है। आज मे 30 साल पहले जब यू० पी० और बिहार की सरकारों ने इस उद्योग को संरक्षण दिया था, तो इसी आशय से दिया था कि अन्ततः श्रमिकों को और जो गन्ना उत्पादन करते हैं, उन लोगों को राहत मिलेगी। चीनी उद्योगपतियों ने इसका नाजायज फायदा उठाया। उन्होंने अनाप शनाप रुपया कमाया और इसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि सरकार को मजबूरन इस उद्योग पर कंट्रोल करना पड़ा। परन्तु कंट्रोल करने के बाद सरकार की नीति कमजोर थी। जितने भी गन्ना उत्पादन करने वाले थे और जो श्रमिक लोग थे, उन्हें कठिनाइयों का सामना करना पड़ा। साथ ही साथ उपभोक्ताओं को भी कठिनाई का सामना करना पड़ा और इस तरह से उद्योगपतियों ने इस नीति की आड़ में काफी लाभ उठाया। गन्ना उपज करने वाले और खास कर के इस उद्योग में काम करने वालों ने जब इस स्थिति को देखा, तो उन्होंने मांग की इस उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिये। इस संबंध में राष्ट्रीय मजदूर कांग्रेस ने इस उद्योग के राष्ट्रीयकरण की मांग की और संगठित यही पहली मजदूरों की संस्था थी, जिसने इस तरह की मांग की थी, परन्तु दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि सरकार ने इस ओर ध्यान न देकर दूसरी दिशा में इस संबंध में विचार किया।

माननीय मित्र श्री टी० एन० सिंह जी ने इस संबंध में नेशनलाइजेशन की बात की और कहा कि राष्ट्रीयकरण से कोई लाभ होने वाला नहीं है, क्योंकि-जिना जिन उद्योगों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया गया, उनमें घाटा हुआ। उन्होंने पब्लिक सेक्टर के उद्योगों की काफी आलोचना की और कहा कि अगर किसी बात की कठिनाई है, तो किसी नीति को कार्यान्वित करने के बारे में है। मैं बड़े नम्र शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह की बातें कह कर आज लोगों को गलत रास्ते पर नहीं ले जाया जा सकता है। आज हमारे देश में जनता, श्रमिक, कृषक और सभी जागरूक हैं और इस तरह की दलीलों से उन पर प्रभाव डड़ने वाला नहीं है। आज पब्लिक सेक्टर में अगर कोई कमी है, तो कमी उन लोगों की वजह से है, जो नौकरशाही के लोग हैं। आज यह नौकरशाही पूज्यपतियों से प्रभावित होकर तरह तरह की अड़चनें डालती हैं। इसलिये हमें उन अड़चनों को पहले दूर करना चाहिये और जिस तरह से देश के प्रमुख उद्योगों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जा चुका है, उसी तरह से चीनी उद्योग का भी राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाना चाहिये।

श्रीमन्, मैं आपका ध्यान एक बात की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि इस उद्योग के बारे में सरकार ने जो निर्णय लिये उसका उद्योगपतियों ने नाजायज फायदा उठाया। मगर आज मजदूर, कृषक और जनता काफी जागृत हो चुकी है और उसी चेतना के परिणामस्वरूप सरकार ने उद्योगों के लिए वेज बोर्ड बनाये। चीनी उद्योग के लिये एक वेतन बोर्ड 1957 में बनाया गया था और दूसरा वेतन बोर्ड 1967 में बनाया गया था। गजेन्द्रगडकर कमिशन ने इस संबंध में यह बात कही थी कि यह ठीक है कि तनख्वाह बढ़ाने के लिए वेतन बोर्ड स्थापित किये गये हैं, परन्तु इस उद्योग में काम करने वाले जिनने भी मजदूर हैं, उनका भला तब ही हो सकता है जब कि इस उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर लिया जाय।

श्रीमन्, इस संबंध में मुझे यह निवेदन करना है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में सबसे अधिक चीनी मिलें

हैं और वहां की सरकार जो कई मामलों में अप्रगतिशील है, उसने इस मांग का समर्थन नहीं किया। फिर भी उसी सरकार ने अभी दो महीने हुए यह मांग की है कि चीनी उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाय। इस संबंध में उसने अपनी जिम्मेदारी केन्द्रीय सरकार पर डाल दी है। मैं जानता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार की अपनी कठिनाई हो सकती है, परन्तु उनकी कठिनाई का यह मतलब नहीं है कि जिस उद्योग से देश की जनता का, 50 करोड़ जनता का, सवेरे से शाम तक संबंध है, उस संबंध में किसी तरह से आनाकानी या हील हवाल कर सकती है। इस उद्योग में सबसे बड़ी कठिनाई यह है कि इसमें काम करने वाले लोगों को कठिनाई का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। गन्ने की कीमत तय की जानी चाहिये। इस संबंध में सरकार की जो नीति है वह सही नहीं है। आज गन्ना उत्पादन करने वालों को जिस सबसे बड़ी कठिनाई का सामना करना पड़ रहा है, वह यह है कि उसको जो कीमत मिलनी चाहिये, अपने श्रम का जो फल मिलना चाहिये, वह आज नहीं मिल रहा है। यह स्थिति तब ही बदली जा सकती है, जब सरकार इस संबंध में आगे आये और उसके सामने जो प्रगतिशील सुझाव रखे गये हैं, उन सुझावों पर वह आचरण करे।

श्रीमन्, उद्योग किसी व्यक्ति का नहीं है वह समाज का है। जो उद्योग के लिये काम करता है उनका और विशेषकर उपभोक्ताओं का विशेष ध्यान रखा जाना चाहिये। आज स्थिति क्या है, उसको देखा जाना चाहिये। जो गन्ना उत्पादन करता है, उसको तो फायदा नहीं मिलता है और जो बीच का आदमी है, मिडिलमैन है, उसको फायदा होता है। इसलिये, मेरा निवेदन है कि इस मिडिलमैन को पहले हटाया जाना चाहिये। मैं यह बात किस आधार पर कहना चाहता हूँ, वह मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। पहले हर जगह पर इलैक्ट्रिसिटी कंपनियां, बिजली घर हुआ करते थे और इन बिजली घरों को प्राइवेट कंपनियां चलाया करती थी। परन्तु जिस प्रकार से उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण किया गया, जिस प्रकार से

[श्री नंद किशोर भट्ट]

हर जगह पर इलैक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड बनाये गये, उनसे संबंधित लोगों को शामिल करके उन्हें चलाया गया, उसी आधार पर चीनी उद्योग का भी राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाना चाहिये। अगर सरकार ने इस तरह का कदम उठाया, तो उसे किसी प्रकार की कठिनाई नहीं होगी।

आज इस उद्योग के संबंध में जो सबसे बड़ी समस्या है वह स्वामित्व की है, जिसकी वजह से यह उद्योग कुछ ही लोगों के हाथ में सीमित है। अब काम यह करना है कि इस उद्योग को जनता के हाथ में आ जाना चाहिये, जो इस उद्योग में काम करते हैं, उनके हाथ में यह काम आ जाना चाहिये। इस संबंध में और समाजवाद के संबंध में जो बातें श्री राजनारायण जी ने कही हैं, मैं उनसे सहमत हूँ। परन्तु राष्ट्रीयकरण के नाम पर एक अधिकारी के बदले दूसरे अधिकारी को यह काम दे दिया जाय, एक पूजीपति की जगह किसी सरकारी अफसर को वहां पर बिठला दिया जाय, इस तरह से समस्या का हल नहीं होगा। इस तरह की बातों से जनता संतुष्ट नहीं होगी। जब तक जनता के, कृषकों के और मजदूरों के प्रतिनिधियों को उसके इंतजाम में शामिल नहीं किया जायेगा, तब तक वे और किसी बात से संतुष्ट नहीं होंगे। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि इस उद्योग में जो वर्कर्स हैं जबतक उनको भागीदार नहीं बनाया जायगा, जब तक मजदूरों को काम करने के लिये प्रोत्साहन नहीं मिलेगा, तब तक इस उद्योग की आगे उन्नति नहीं हो सकती है।

चीनी उद्योग एक कम्पलीट इकोनोमी है। उसका तन्त्र फैक्टरी की ओनरशिप तक ही सीमित नहीं है, बल्कि जो फैक्टरी में काम करते हैं, जो गन्ना पैदा करते हैं, उन लोगों का भी इंटिग्रेशन होना चाहिये। जब तक फैक्टरी और गन्ना पैदा करने वालों का इंटिग्रेशन नहीं होगा, तब तक यह समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती है। आज हमारे देश में प्रोप्रेसिव नीतियों की कमी नहीं है, बल्कि उनको क्रियान्वित करने की

कमी है। मैं मंत्री जी से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इन नीतियों को इम्प्लीमेंट करने का जो तरीका है, उसमें बदलाव आना चाहिये। जब तक संबंधित व्यक्तियों का इन पालिसियों को चलाने में हाथ नहीं होगा, सहयोग नहीं होगा, तब तक कोई काम नहीं हो सकता है। केवल यहां पर चर्चा करने से आगे काम नहीं बढ़ सकता है।

श्रीमन्, मैं चाहता हूँ कि चीनी उद्योग के लिये एक ऐसी स्पेशियलाइज्ड एजेन्सी बना दी जाय, जिसमें संबंधित व्यक्तियों का योग हो और उद्योग को सही माने में चलाने में मदद मिल सके।

अन्त में, श्रीमन्, आपने जो मुझे इस समय बोलने के लिये समय दिया है, उसके लिये मैं आपको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Mr. Rizaq Ram, you will be the last speaker before the Minister speaks. Kindly be brief.

श्री रिजक राम : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज चीनी मिलों के राष्ट्रीयकरण करने के बारे में बहस हो रही है। यह प्रश्न काफी जटिल है, क्योंकि इसमें एक ओर गन्ना उत्पादन करने वाले किसान हैं, श्रमिक लोग हैं जो कि अनपढ़ हैं, उनके हितों का सवाल है, उनकी अपनी मांगों का सवाल है, उनके अपने जीवन व्यवस्था का सवाल है और दूसरी तरफ उनके विरोध में, जिन लोगों का हम राष्ट्रीयकरण करने की मांग कर रहे हैं, वे लोग पूजीपति हैं, और संगठित हैं। उनके पास शक्ति है, उनके पास प्रभाव है, रुपये पैसे की ही शक्ति नहीं है, बल्कि राजनीतिक क्षेत्र में और दूसरे क्षेत्रों में भी उनका प्रभाव छाया हुआ है। इसलिये गरीब जनता के मुकाबले में एक बहुत बड़ी शक्ति है और दूसरी तरफ वेजवान और अनपढ़ लोग हैं।

यह समस्या काफी जटिल है, लेकिन मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि आज सदन में इस संबंध में बहस हो रही है और इस संबंध में माननीय सदस्य ने राष्ट्रीयकरण के संबंध में एक बड़ा

प्रस्ताव रखा है और बड़े बड़े मुझाव सदस्यों ने सदन के सामने रखे तथा हर सदस्य ने इस मांग का समर्थन किया। इस उद्योग के राष्ट्रीयकरण के संबंध में पहले से ही विरोध चला आ रहा है और इस संबंध में कई कई बातें कही गई हैं। यह भी कहा गया है कि चीनी उद्योग जो कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर में है, उसमें काफी खराबियाँ हैं, काफी उसमें घाटा है और इस तरह से तरह तरह की उममें त्रुटियाँ बतलाई गई हैं। मैं एका बात अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर का ताल्लुक है, मैं अपने तजुबे की बिना पर एक बात निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि नीजि उद्योगपति और अमली तरीके अख्तियार करने के अलावा अपने ढंग से कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर में दखल डालने के लिये अपनी पूरी शक्ति लगाए हुए हैं। मैं हरियाणा के बारे में आपके सामने एक मिसाल रखना चाहता हूँ। शुरू में वहाँ एक फैंकट्री निजी क्षेत्र में थी। जहाँ दूसरी मिल रोहतक में लगाने का प्रस्ताव सरकार ने रखा। तो जो शुगर मेगनेट्स निजी क्षेत्र में थे। वे बीच में आये, उन्होंने हेरा फेरी की और इस तरह से सारी बातों को जमाया कि उन्होंने मशीनरी के खरीदने की एजेंसी ले ली। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आप हैरान होंगे कि उन्होंने जो मशीनरी रोहतक के कोआपरेटिव शुगर मिल के लिये सप्लाई की वह इतनी निकम्मी थी कि उसके लगाने में मुश्किलें आई और जिस वक्त उस मिल को चालू किया गया, वह मशीनरी बेकार साबित हुई। कई साल तक उस मिल में लगातार घाटा चलता रहा। यह इर्सा नये किया गया क्योंकि निजी क्षेत्र में जो उनकी अपनी मिल थी, उसका वह मुकाबला न कर सके और यह सिद्ध हो जाय कि कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर में चीनी बनाने का तजुर्बा ठीक नहीं रहा। इसलिये उस क्षेत्र में उस काम को प्रोत्साहन देने के बजाय, उसे फेल करने के लिये शुगर मेगनेट्स ने ऐसे ढंग अख्तियार किये। पानीपत में जब कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर में मिल लगने को हुई, तो उन्होंने कहा कि मशीनरी उनकी मार्फत खरीदी जाय। पहले तजुर्बा हो चुका था, इसलिये चेकोस्लो-

वाकिया से उससे बहुत सस्ती मशीनरी खरीदी गई, किशतों पर खरीदी गई। लगभग 20 लाख से लेकर 30-35 लाख रुपये सालाना तक का मुनाफा उससे हुआ है, जबकि रोहतक का मिल कई साल तक घाटे में चलता रहा जब तक उसकी मशीनरी बदली नहीं गई। ऐसे हथकण्डे पूँजीपति लोग कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर या पब्लिक सैक्टर को फेल करने के लिये अख्तियार करते हैं और फिर कहते हैं कि निजी क्षेत्र के वगैर भला नहीं हो सकता। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आपको मालूम है कि हरियाणा छोटी सी स्टेट है। वहाँ तीन शुगर मिलें हैं, 1 निजी क्षेत्र में और 2 कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर में। तीन साल पहले बीमारी लगने की वजह से जितनी भी गन्ने की फसल थी ज्यादातर सूख कर खराब हो गई। लेकिन कोआपरेटिव मिल्स जितनी थीं, उन्होंने 7-8 लाख रुपये तक सूखी फसलों का मुआवजा दिया, उस हालत में जबकि उनसे बाँड्स लिये हुए थे, लेकिन निजी क्षेत्र में ऐसा नहीं होता। कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर में एक भावना रहती है, एक विचार रहता है कि यह मिल लोगों की है, यह ग्राउन्स की अपनी है, श्रमिकों की अपनी है और उनकी भला के लिये वह चलाई जाती है न कि लूटमार के लिये।

अभी आपने देखा कि सदन में एक और सवाल उठाया गया। करीब एक घन्टे से ज्यादा बहस हुई यह तय करने के लिये कि प्रान्तीय सरकारों को अधिकार है या केन्द्रीय सरकार को। मैं नहीं समझता इस वक्त क्या आवश्यकता है, इस बात का फैसला करने की।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : जल्दी खत्म कीजिये।

श्री रिजक राम : सबकी कसर मुझसे तो नहीं निकालनी चाहिये। यही काफी दंड है कि आपने मुझे आखिर में बोलने का मौका दिया। मैं तो सोचता था कि जब हम और आप अकेले रह जायेंगे, तब आप मुझे बोलने का मौका देंगे।

[श्री रिजक राम]

तो मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि राज्य सरकारों और केन्द्रीय सरकार का जो प्रश्न है, उसे इस वक्त उठाने की आवश्यकता नहीं थी। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आप जानते हैं कि भूमि सुधार का कानून बनाने का अधिकार राज्य सरकार को है। राज्य सरकार उसके सम्बन्ध में कानून बनाती है, मगर एक नीति के तहत। अभी फूड और एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्ट्री ने सब चीफ मिनिस्टर्स को बुलाया और यह सिद्धान्त तय करने के लिये बुलाया कि कृषि की उपज करने वालों के और सरकार के बीच में कोई बिचौला नहीं होना चाहिये। उन्होंने चीफ मिनिस्टर्स को बुलाया, उस कान्फ्रेंस में यह तय किया कि एक साल के अन्दर ऐसा कानून भूमि के बारे में सब स्टेट पास करें कि बिचौला भूमि की उपज के बारे में न रहे। इसमें सेंटर को कहीं आवश्यकता नहीं थी, सेंटर को कोई कानून बनाना नहीं था। जहाँ तक चीनी मिलों के राष्ट्रीयकरण का सवाल है, मुझे कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार को चीनी मिलों के राष्ट्रीयकरण का पूरा अधिकार है, दोनों सरकारों को अधिकार हो सकता है, राज्य सरकारें भी कर सकती हैं और सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट भी कर सकती है, इस बात में सन्देह नहीं। लेकिन इसके साथ ही थोड़ा अफसोस भी है और हैरानी भी है। जहाँ सरकार यह पालिसी निर्धारित कर चुकी है कि खेती की उपज को पैदा करने वाले लोगों के बीच और सरकार के बीच कोई बिचौला नहीं होगा, उसे यह भी निर्धारित करना चाहिये कि खेती की उपज, उसकी प्रोसेसिंग और उसके डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन के बीच में कोई मिडिलमैन लूटमार करने वाला नहीं होगा, चाहे निजी उद्योग वाला हो या दूसरा कोई भी हो। जो पैदा करता है, उसके और प्रोसेस करने में, तकसीम करने में किसी बीच के आदमी को मुनाफाखोरी की इजाजत नहीं हो, यह पालिसी सरकार निश्चित करे। मैं समझ नहीं पाया कि जहाँ भूमि सुधार के बारे में सरकार ने फैसला करवाया, चीफ मिनिस्टर्स की कान्फ्रेंस की, वहाँ यह फैसला भी साथ क्यों नहीं करवाया कि

खेती से जो उपज होती है, उसमें निजी क्षेत्र वाले लोग चाहे चावल की मिल वाले हों, चाहे तेल की मिल वाले हों, चाहे आटा की मिल वाले हों, जो लूटमार करते रहते हैं, उनको खत्म करने के लिये स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स या केन्द्रीय सरकार एक साल के अन्दर ऐसा कानून बनाए ताकि वह लूटमार से किसान बच सके। केन्द्रीय सरकार इस बारे में खुद समर्थ हो तो खुद कानून बनाये और अगर खुद समर्थ नहीं तो चीफ मिनिस्टर्स की कान्फ्रेंस बुला कर जल्दी से जल्दी यह फैसला ले कि वे इसके बारे में कानून बना कर इस एक्सप्लायेशन को बन्द करवाये।

एक बात और कह कर बैठता हूँ। पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स के बारे में कहा गया कि पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स में वह मुनाफा नहीं है, जितना निजी क्षेत्र में है। मैं उम बहस में नहीं पड़ता। जो उत्पादन पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स कर रही है, उसके बारे में निजी क्षेत्र के बड़े से बड़े उद्योगपति जे० आर० डी० टाटा ने भी इस बात को माना है कि यदि प्राइवेट सेक्टर भी वह उत्पादन करता तो घाटा होता लाजिमी था। सवाल यह है कि जो ऐमे क्षेत्र हैं उनमें लोगों का कितना हाथ हो, पैदा करने वालों और मजदूरों का कितना हाथ हो। हमने यह देखा है कि निजी क्षेत्र वाले गरीब किसानों के अनजानपने का कितना नाजायज़ फायदा उठाते हैं। निजी क्षेत्र में हमने देखा है कि कितना अन्याय किसानों के साथ होता है। उनसे बाइस लिखवा लिये जाते हैं कि दस मील के इलाके में सब गन्ना उनको दिया जायगा, मिल वाले लेगे। लेकिन मिल वालों की कोई जिम्मेदारी नहीं और जो लोग थोड़ी आवाज उठाने वाले होते हैं — मैंने देखा है जमना नगर में और दूसरे इलाकों में — उनको विक्रि-माइज़ किया जाता है, उनकी फसल खड़ी रहती और दूसरे लोगों की खरीद ली जाती है। और उस की गोदी में इतनी बेईमानियाँ होती हैं। दूसरी बात जो सेस वे वसूल करते हैं, उसको वे डेवलपमेंट के लिये नहीं लगाते और तरह तरह से उन लोगों को लूट मार में

फंसाया जाता है। तो मैं यह अर्थ करना चाहता हूँ कि कोऑपरेटिव सेक्टर से, पब्लिक सेक्टर से निजी क्षेत्र की इस तरह से तुलना का जाय यह बिल्कुल गलत है। सिद्धांत रूप से गलत है। कभी पब्लिक सेक्टर में या कोऑपरेटिव सेक्टर में काम करने वाले या उद्योग चलाने वाले यह नहीं सोचेंगे कि हम को किसानों के साथ या श्रमिकों के साथ कोई धोखा या लूटमार करनी है। वह ऐसी बात नहीं सोचेंगे कि मोलेसज को बेईमानी से बचा कर लाखों रुपया कमायें। वह ऐसी बात नहीं सोचेंगे कि सस या रुपया बचा बचा कर दूसरे कामों में लगाये। वह उन लोगों, की भलाई के लिये कुछ काम करेंगे और उसके लिये अपना रुपया भी लगा देंगे। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूँ।

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Sir, the House has been pleased to discuss the demand for nationalisation of the sugar industry. While discussing this demand, hon. Members have covered a very wide ground. Some of the hon. Members criticised the policy of the Government. Many times public memory is very short. I would like to recall the years 1966 and 1967 when the major parts of our country where sugarcane is grown were affected by drought and there was a very drastic reduction in the acreage of sugarcane. As a result, sugar shortage developed. But I think as a result of very appropriate policies formulated by Government, Government was in a position to overcome the difficult situation. And the policy of partial decontrol was adopted under those circumstances. I must submit that the policy has paid rich dividends. Though there is some misunderstanding about the policy, I may submit that the cane growers in this country benefited as never before as a result of this policy, and production has also gone up. For the year which was just over, we had a production of 35.5 lakh tonnes. In the current year, the trends of production are so encouraging that we expect a production of more than 40 lakh tonnes. The sugar prices have also come down, and availability is very easy. So, it would not be correct to say that the Government has been wrong in adopting this policy. May I submit, Sir, that recently when this year's policy was to be formulated, we consulted the Chief Ministers and to our surprise, and personally to my surprise, we found that

many of the Chief Ministers who were critical of this policy of partial decontrol themselves came forward and said that the partial decontrol policy is the only right policy and it should be adopted. There was near-unanimity in the Chief Ministers' conference about this policy. I do not want to take up the time of the House in explaining Government's approach in regard to this.

श्री राजनारायण : वह मिनिस्टर जो पहले अपोजीशन में थे, अब ऐसा कहने लगे ? वह कौन कौन थे ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : You may continue, Mr. Shinde.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : I am making a factual statement.

श्री राजनारायण : बिहार के, उत्तर प्रदेश के या कहां के हैं ? यह इंटरप्शन नहीं है। यह तो जानने की चीज है।

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Now, when this problem of sugar industry was being discussed, naturally some references were made to certain regions and some hon. Members stated that the element of regionalism should not be introduced into this. I quite agree with this proposition and I think that though the problems of sugar industry may be different in different regions, we must consider them from the point of view of national importance of the sugar industry and no element of regionalism or provincialism should be brought into it. But I must say that the sugar industry in U.P. has attracted considerable criticism both in this House and outside, and I must say most reluctantly that the health of sugar industry in U.P. and Bihar is really not very good, or rather it is not good at all.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : It is bad.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : You can say that.

श्री रिजक राम : हरियाणा में भी ऐसा ही है।

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : I quite see that. So, the main reason is that a large number of sugarcane growers in the country are mainly concentrating in U.P. and Bihar. From the figures available with me, the total number of sugarcane growers supplying sugarcane to the sugar industry is about 26 lakhs in the country.

[Shri Annashaheb Shinde]

Out of that, 20 lakhs are from U.P. and Bihar. So you can imagine the magnitude of the problem as far as U.P. and Bihar are concerned, from the point of view of the cane growers' interests.

SHRI JAGDISH CHANDRA DIKSHIT : It is 23 lakhs.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : You have your own figures, I have my own figures.

Therefore, from the point of view of the economy of sugarcane and sugarcane growers, U.P. and Bihar are continuing to occupy a very important position. Moreover, Sir, the industry in U.P. has a very peculiar history. For instance, most of the sugar factories in U.P. are mostly outmoded and old. Out of a total of 71 factories in U.P. only 5 are less than 20 years old. Fifty are of the age-group 30-39; that means they are more than 30 years old. And 10 are over 40 years old. Most of the factories have very old plants. Naturally their efficiency is not very satisfactory. And when the efficiency of the plants is not satisfactory, naturally it has many other implications.

Then, Sir, even from the point of view of capacity we find that a very large number of factories in U.P. and Bihar are very small units. They are uneconomic units and this factor also has got other implications. In U.P. it has been a habit with the factory owners that they always keep on some arrears to the cane growers. Since I have come into Parliament, i.e. from 1962, I have been connected in one form or another with this Ministry and I have not seen a single year when this problem of arrears to the cane growers was not raised in either House of Parliament. There have been complaints from cane growers. We have always been advising the State Governments that they must adopt most coercive measures to recover the arrears. Despite all this—and the State Governments have been taking some steps to recover the arrears—the arrears of the cane growers have been continuing. Even according to the figures with me, in 1968-69, out of the total prices of sugarcane, i.e. Rs. 329 crores, Rs. 12.34 crores were in arrears throughout the country. Of 1967-68, it was Rs. 16.7 lakhs. Even from earlier years there were arrears of Rs. 36 lakhs. So this problem of arrears has been one of the very irritating points. Once the

sugarcane grower sells his sugarcane, the sale is complete and in fact, the sugarcane grower is entitled to the full price of the cane. But in this sugarcane industry, a system has developed whereby the cane growers have always been put into difficulties, and especially in U.P. and Bihar, this problem has been very acute because I find that the average cane grower in U.P. is very small. The average cane grower in Eastern U.P. for instance, has been supplying four to five tonnes of sugar cane. So, we can well imagine the position. While in Maharashtra it is 82 tons per cane-grower, in U.P. and Bihar it is 4 to 5 tons. In Western U.P. it is slightly higher, 12 to 13 tons. In Eastern U.P. and Bihar where poverty is extreme, cane-growers are very few and even out of the 4 to 5 tons which they grow, they are in arrears in their supplies. I entirely share the views of Shri Ahmad when he referred to the extreme poverty of the cane-growers in U.P. Their resources are very limited. There is no growth there. There is no good seed. There are no irrigation facilities in Bihar. For instance more than 65 per cent of the cane-growing area is unirrigated. In U.P. also more than 35 per cent is broadly unirrigated. And because of all these difficulties, the arrears of cane-growers, the inefficiency of factories, the outmoded plants, the cane-growers are very much pressed and they are always in difficulty. That is why this problem has become very sharp in U.P. and therefore, we have to sympathetically understand this problem. I would not like to go into the legal aspects of the problem. But as I have already said, legal advice has been given to us that the State Government as well is competent to take over the sugar industry, and if that be the only point of some Members, I do not think it should really form a point of controversy . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN : On a point of information.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Let me finish. I am not yielding.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, आन ए प्वाइंट ऑफ इन्फॉर्मेशन ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Is it seeking information or giving information ?

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, यह पार्लियामेंटरी पद्धति है। प्वाइंट आफ इफार्मेशन होता है। उनका इफार्मेशन देनी चाहिये। श्रीमन्, मेरी यह इफार्मेशन है, मुझको कुछ समय पहले बताया गया कि एटार्नी जनरल की ओपीनियन इस सरकार ने ली और एटार्नी जनरल ने अपनी राय कुछ डिफरेंट दी, उसने यह कहा कि नहीं स्टेट ऐसा नहीं कर सकती, सेंटर को करना चाहिये और अगर सेंटर चाहे तो सब स्टेट से करवा सकती है। एक बात। दूसरी बात यह कि श्री जगजीवन राम जो एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्टर हैं, उस एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्टर के सेक्रेटरी ने अपनी ओपीनियन दी कि नहीं इसको स्टेट नहीं कर सकती, इसको सेंटर कर सकता है और फिर किसी एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्टर ने कहा कि जब ऐसे बात है तो इसमें ला डिपार्टमेंट की ओपीनियन भी ले लो। तो ला डिपार्टमेंट के एक सेक्रेटरी ने यह राय दे दी कि यह ठीक है, इसको सेंटर ही कर सकता है, स्टेट नहीं कर सकता है। ला डिपार्टमेंट के सेक्रेटरी की यह ओपीनियन है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : अच्छा आप बैठिये।

श्री राजनारायण : तो यह मेरी इफार्मेशन है। मैं आन प्वाइंट आफ इफार्मेशन यह पूछा है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारी इफार्मेशन है वह सही है या गलत है। इसमें एग्रीकल्चर डिपार्टमेंट, इसमें ला डिपार्टमेंट, इसमें एटार्नी जनरल का डिपार्टमेंट, सब कंसटेड है और बाद में ड्यु टु सम पोलिटिकल गोजस अब ला डिपार्टमेंट का मिनिस्टर कहता है कि ऐसा भी हो सकता है। हम इस लीगल क्विलिग्स में नहीं जाना चाहते, हमारा अपना डाइरेक्ट कंसर्न है, अगर हमें मालूम जाय कि एटार्नी जनरल की ओपीनियन है कि स्टेट भी कर सकता है तो हमारे लिये बड़ी आसानी होगी, हम बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश में इसको करवा ही देंगे। इसका यह जवाब देंगे कि क्या है।

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Sir, I can only say—the honourable Member may say from his own knowledge—as far as my Ministry is concerned, we are not concerned with the legal aspect of the problem and we have to depend entirely on the legal advice and there is no reason whatsoever as to why my Ministry or the Secretary of my Department should go into the legal aspect of the problem because whatever the Law Ministry advises . . .

श्री राजनारायण : लीगल आसपेक्ट में नहीं जानता, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि एग्रीकल्चर डिपार्टमेंट के किसी सेक्रेटरी ने किसी स्तर पर कोई ओपीनियन दी है !

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : अभी आप बैठिये। And he will proceed uninterrupted.

श्री राजनारायण : आप हमारा प्वाइंट समझे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) : समझने की बात नहीं है, आप हमारा प्वाइंट समझ लीजिये, आप बैठिये।

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Sir, if my Ministry or my Secretary has any difficulty, naturally we will consult the Law Ministry. Sir, I was explaining the point as to what has been the approach of my Ministry in regard to the sugar industry. I must very humbly say and tell the honourable Members here that I am one of the workers in India who is very closely associated with the working of the cooperative movement in this country and I have worked as a very humble and ordinary worker in the fields in the villages. To my mind, especially for an industry like the sugar-cane, the only solution that appears to be there is that the sugar industry should be owned by the cane-growers. That seems to be the ultimate objective with which we must proceed. I myself have organised sugar factories with cane-growers and though in some States the experience may be contrary or may be not too satisfactory, I can submit with some authority that wherever the cane-growers have organised these co-operatives, they are managed well and wherever the State Governments are also very helpful to the cooperative movement, there these cooperative factories are going on very well and the cane-growers have benefited most and the cane-growers of

[Shri Annashaheb Shinde]

the cooperative sugar factories have been getting, by and large, higher prices than what the joint stock factories have been paying to the cane-growers. Even the efficiency and other things of the factories managed by the cane-growers are much better than many other factories. I do not agree at all with the assessment of Shri Jaipuria. He may have his own experience in U.P. and some other States. But by and large, the country's picture as far as the cooperative movement is concerned, is very encouraging, and that is why the Government of India's approach has been to encourage the cooperative movement. And honourable Members will be satisfied to know that when we began the First Plan there were only three cooperative sugar factories in the country. But now out of the 210 existing working factories, the number of cooperative sugar factories is 62 and if we take into consideration the total number of factories which are licensed, the House will be pleased to know that out of the total number of 267, the total number of cooperatives is around 109. So, the position of production in the cooperative sector by the end of the Fourth Five Year Plan would be almost 40 to 45 per cent out of the total production. So, progressively, as far as the sugar industry is concerned, it is being cooperativised and the cane-growers are getting a more and more predominant position, and I think the Government of India's approach will be progressively in this direction so that the cooperatives have a dominant position as far as the sugar industry is concerned. I must also submit that this is one of the outstanding achievements of the Government of India during the last two or three Plans though many a time because of some setbacks in some other sectors of economy we failed to realise what we achieved in certain other sectors and this is really a very outstanding achievement made as a result of the efforts of the cooperatives, the State Governments, and the Government of India's policy of encouraging the cooperatives.

As far as the nationalisation in U.P. is concerned or even the nationalisation of the sugar industry is concerned, naturally if the Government of India has to take certain steps, all its implications, its economics, etc. will have to be closely gone into and the Government of India is giving some thought to this problem and all the pros and cons will have to be considered and the Government of India will no doubt arrive at some decision on

the basis of the merits of the industry and the merits of the case. That is the only thing that I have to submit at this stage. I have nothing more to add.

SHRI JAGDISH CHANDRA DIKSHIT : Sir, just one point. The question is, of course, as pointed out by the honourable Minister, whether the Government has been trying to encourage the co-operatives. I have my doubts for the simple reason that although in the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956, it had been stated that 'the principle of cooperation shall be applied wherever possible and a steadily increasing proportion of the activities of the private sector developed along cooperative lines' and 'special assistance will be given to enterprises organised on cooperative lines for industrial and agricultural purposes, and in the Third Plan it had been categorically stated that the aim of the Government was to promote a pattern of industrial organisation which will lead to high levels of productivity and give full scope to cooperative organisations and that in licensing new industrial units the cooperative organisations were to be encouraged, yet the policy decision taken by the Licensing Committee in 1963 took a contrary view and said, "other things being equal preference was to be given to the establishment of cooperative factories". Now, my point is that does the term 'preference' mean the same thing as the terms 'encouragement' or 'development'? My argument is that 'preference' which always succeeds development cannot proceed it. So I have my doubt about the intention of the Government to develop cooperatives of cane-growers to install or operate Sugar factories.

SHRI ANNASHAHEB SHINDE : I think, Sir, the honourable Member has not properly understood the Government of India's policy. We say we give preference to the cooperatives. That means if there are two applications, including one from the cooperatives, we do not at all consider the joint stock factory's application. For instance, during the last year and a half we have licensed about 56 factories and out of this number 49 are cooperative factories. Joint stock proposals have been accepted where the State Governments have supported their proposals and where there are no proposals from the cooperative sector.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : There is one thing which I am not able to understand from the reply of the hon. Minister.

Much of what he has said does not seem to have relevance to the immediate context of the discussion. The discussion came in the wake of the demand made by the U.P. Government, which on the balance of considerations, social and economic, came to the conclusion that the sugar industry should be nationalised in the State. The Government of India is now confronted with the demand that the sugar industry should be nationalised. That matter has been pending before the Government. When we wanted to raise the discussion, we wanted to understand the constitutional and legal implications of the matter so that we could come to the right judgment about this. Therefore, the question was raised whether this was legally sustainable. We have had absolutely no light from the hon. Minister on what the U.P. Government has said. We wanted to know in this very context what they have to say about it because what we are considering is the demand for nationalisation. The Minister said something very useful, very important and I attach great value to it but it does not carry us far in the direction of the demand with which they are confronted by the U.P. Government.

SHRI A. C. KULKARNI : There are two or three points which I would like to make, Sir, for clarification. Is it not a fact that the private sector sugar factories, when they say they have got profits and they have earned more than the co-operatives, it is due to the sugarcane price paid at Government rate and the price realised for sugar was the highest, above the other price by Rs. 10 per quintal? The co-operatives have given Rs. 17 to Rs. 20 per quintal as a remunerative price and that is why they could not show profits. Then 92 per cent. of the agriculturists are below 1 acre or $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres in the co-operative sector. Secondly is it not a fact that the co-operative sector has along with the private sector implemented the Second Wage Board Award? I do not know whether Mr. T. N. Singh is an agriculturist or not but I want to know from the Minister whether it is a fact that the current crop is of 11 months whether it is in U.P. or Maharashtra or Gujarat or Mysore and the arsalis is of 16 months and that crop produces four times the crop which is current crop. Is this also not a fact that thereby the agriculturists earn more? May I also know whether it is not a fact that in Maharashtra the majority of the members of the sugarcane co-operative societies are below three acres?

श्री राजनारायण : मैंने अपने भाषण के दौरान में सरकार को यह बताया था कि 15 दिसम्बर से उत्तर प्रदेश में गन्ना उत्पादक मिलों को गन्ना देना बन्द करने जा रहे हैं। उनको मांग है कि 13 रु० क्विन्टल गन्ने की कीमत मिल मालिकों से सरकार दिलवाये, तो क्या इस मांग पर सरकार किसी स्तर पर विचार कर रही है और जो एक विपत्ति 15 दिसम्बर से आने वाली है कि मिल का चक्का चलना बंद हो जायेगा, उसके संबंध में सरकार क्या कोई उचित कदम उठा रही है।

दूसरा स्पष्टीकरण मैं चाहूंगा कि आज जो चर्चा का विषय है, उसको ठीक से पढ़ा जाये— देश में चीनी उद्योग के राष्ट्रीयकरण की मांग के संबंध में चर्चा को जाय। “देश के चीनी उद्योगों की” राष्ट्रीयकरण की चर्चा नहीं है। “देश के” होता तो सब जगह होता। “देश में” है, यानी देश के अंदर जहाँ जहाँ चीनी उद्योग के राष्ट्रीयकरण की मांग है, उस पर हम चर्चा कर रहे हैं। अनावश्यक ढंग पर लोग “देश के” कहे जा रहे हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ जैसा कि उत्तर प्रदेश में है, फिर उत्तर प्रदेश की संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी ने मांग की कि 25 नवम्बर को करीब 2 लाख जनता आई, जिसने कि सरकार को कहा कि चीनी उद्योग का समाजीकरण हो, उस संबंध में सरकार को स्पष्ट उत्तर देना चाहिये कि उत्तर प्रदेश के चीनी उद्योग के बारे में केन्द्र सरकार क्या करने जा रही है; क्योंकि वहाँ की संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी ने मांग किया और जैसा कि मिश्र जी ने बताया शायद वहाँ की सरकार ने भी कोई प्रस्ताव किया है। और दूसरे लोगों के दल के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहता हूँ जो आज कुछ कहते हैं कल कुछ कहते हैं, वे गिरगिट की तरह रंग बदला करते हैं।

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN : Sir, this discussion pinpoints the need for nationalisation. The word ‘nationalisation’ can be treated as taking over by the State Government or taking over by the State-sponsored public undertakings or even in the co-operative sector. With this end in view may I know from the Government whether the Government have got at present any definite policy in regard to

[Shri K. Chandra Sekharan]

natioanalisation or is it that since the matter is possible for decision at the State level from the legal point of view, the policy of the Government of India is to leave the matter to the State Governments concerned and not to have a national policy in regard to this crucial matter ?

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Sir, Shri Kulkarni raised three points. The first one is a simple point which should not take any time. About the implementation of the Wage Board recommendations, I must say that by and large the sugar industry in the country, whether in the private sector or in the co-operative sector has been implementing the recommendations of the Wage Board. Then as far as the balance sheets of joint stock companies and co-operatives are concerned, there is no comparison because the balance-sheets of co-operative factories are drawn up on a different principle altogether; they show the profit and loss only after the cane price is paid and the cane price depends upon certain factors. But generally speaking, as I have said, the cane price paid by the co-operative societies is much more than that paid by the joint stock companies. In Maha-

rashtira there are only two districts where the adsali cane is grown. In the rest of the places it is of the same type as elsewhere—the districts of Adsali cane are Poona and Ahmednagar.

Shri Rajnarain raised some point about the cane price. The Government has announced its policy of cane price and the price policy is known to the hon. Member.

श्री राजनारायण : दिसम्बर 15 तारीख से वहां हड़ताल होने जा रही है ।

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : Then Shri Chandrasekharan referred to the point whether the Government of India has a policy. As I have said, the Government of India is considering this issue and naturally when it comes to some conclusions, those conclusions will be known to the House and to the hon. Member, and that will be the policy of the Government of India.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at eight of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 10th December, 1969.