

[Shri Chandra Shekhar] of Parliament, if one single individual can dictate terms not only to Parliament Members individually but to the nation as a whole; and if we do not accede to his demand, he goes to America, he goes to London, to all countries and tries to scuttle our Plan and tries to cut at the very root of our industrial development. With these words, I conclude.

ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR GOVERNMENT AND OTHER BUSINESS

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the Business Advisory Committee at its meeting held today has recommended allocation of time for Government and other business as follows:—

1. Discussion on the Interim Report on Industrial Planning and Licensing Policy . . . 2 days
2. General Discussion on the Railway Budget for 1967-68 . . . 3 days
3. Appropriation Bill relating to Demands for Grants (Railways) for 1967-68 . . . 1 days
4. General Discussion on the General Budget for 1967-68 . . . 6 days
5. The Passports Bill, 1967 . . . 1 day
6. The Central Industrial Security Force Bill, 1966 . . . 1 day
7. The Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Bill, 1966 . . . 1 day
8. The Anti-Corruption Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1967 . . . 2 hours
9. The Special Marriage (Amendment) Bill, 1966 . . . 1 hour
10. Motion regarding recent developments in West Asia . . . 2 hours

SHRI LOKA NATH MISRA (Orissa): Madam, one clarification on this announcement. We have only 12 more working days. If we go according to the schedule, we have only 12 more working days, while the announcement that you made allows for 16 working days. Do we take it for granted that

the House is going to be extended? If that is so, it must be announced earlier because unless that is announced, it would very much inconvenience our programme, if according to schedule the session is not over. That is all.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is very simple arithmetic. I am conveying it to the Government to look into it and tell us for how many more days we will sit.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): I have to say something about it. I feel that the two days that have been allotted to this discussion are inadequate. Moreover I feel that two hours allotted to some Anti-Corruption Bill are also inadequate because that Bill will require some more time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will consider the suggestions.

MOTION RE INTERIM REPORT ON INDUSTRIAL PLANNING AND LICENSING POLICY—continued

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I have not much to add to what has been so ably put forward by my friends, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, and Mr. Chandra Shekhar. They have made my task easier. I would draw your attention to article 39 of the Directive Principles of the Constitution. I would not stop there. The Central Government in 1951 passed an Act known as the Industries Development and Regulation Act, 1951. After the passing of the Act it is imperative for the Central Government to see that the regulation of industrial development and the canalising of resources according to Plan priorities and targets is done. That is number one. Number two is avoidance of monopoly and prevention, of concentration of wealth. It is no longer, Madam, an article of Directive Principle which it may not be possible for the Central Government to act upon. But it is an Act of the Government itself in accordance with the Constitution, and one has to see whether the provisions of the Industries Act had been faithfully carried

out or not. I regret to say. Madam, that even a cursory reading of the Hazari Report goes to show that the provisions of the Industries Act were not acted upon.

It has been said in that report, Madam, that sometimes—I would not name any firm; I know Mr. Birla more than most of the hon. Members present over here; I have known him and known him as a pucca anti-Congressman. I recall those days when the Congress for the first time decided in 1925 to put up candidates for the Legislative Assembly, and it was given to Mr. G. D. Birla, who was a pucca anti-Congressman at the time, to oppose the Congress candidate, Shri Sri Prakash, from Gorakhpur and Banaras constituency. He was not only a non-Congressman but so long as the late Pandit Motilal Nehru lived, Mr. Birla would not be seen near the Congress circles. You might remember, Madam, after his death, there was the Gandhi-Irwin Pact, and Mr. Birla, shrewd businessman as he is and also an astute politician, at that time came to know that very soon there was going to be a transference of power from the British hands to Indian hands, that is to Congress hands—Congress was the only organised party in the country worth the name which could take over power. Mr. Birla created a lobby, went to the Second Round Table Conference uninvited and was all the time dancing attendance upon Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Nation. He was a great favourite of the late Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, and some of the hon. friends opposite who were in the Congress might know that at one time when the discussions between Gandhiji and the British Government in England over the minorities question failed, Mr. Birla leaked out the news and gained several lakhs of rupees by manipulation in the share market. When the late Pandit Malaviya came to know of it, he fell from his grace too. Malaviyaji was very much annoyed and said, "Listen, what is this you have done?" Then came the Congress Ministries in the Provinces in 1937. Mr. Birla became

all in all. What position he occupies in the Congress, I do not know because I left the Congress in December, 1949. But before that I knew that Mr. Birla had a great lobby, a powerful lobby and an influential lobby, in the Congress circles upto 1949. My friend, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, has said that he has a great lobby in the Government and in Parliament. I am not concerned with it but what I am concerned with is the fact that the provisions of the Industrial Policy Resolution as enunciated and adopted by the Central Government were not acted upon in the matter of granting licences to the various firms of the Birlas or to any other party. Mr. Birla might have been the biggest gainer. But what was the Government doing all the time? It is not one year or two years or three years; they have had no time to review. There have been three General Elections. There have been a large number of Ministers, Commerce Ministers, Finance Ministers, and all that. My charge is against the Congress Government which is in power today and which has been in power since the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act was passed in 1951. What were they doing? And what do they propose to do even now? All that I am told by an hon. friend here is this. I suffer from certain weaknesses. I take my lunch between 1.00 and 1.30 p.m. If you do away with the lunch hour, for a man with a weak constitution like mine, it is very difficult to forego lunch whether there is food problem or not. So I told the Vice-Chairman presiding at that time that I wished to take part in this debate. But unfortunately I had to go for some time and have a bite. I was told—and I am subject to correction—that the hon. Minister said that this Report was made in December, 1966. It is more than five months and the Government is considering the Report. How long will they take? It has taken them fifteen years to find out their own mistakes, to find out that they were going against the policy adopted by themselves and it has taken them

[Shri Trinloki Singh]

another six months only to decide that they would consider the matter. That is why . . .

SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED: I did not say that we would consider.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: What did he say?

SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED: I said about our reviewing the position and the Government having taken other decisions.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: I would like you, Madam, to help me. My English is faulty and it is foreign to me. I do not want to know whether there is any attempt to review it or whether they have taken any decision upon it. All that I was saying is that it has taken them six months to decide to review it; it is still worse. If I may refer to the Report itself, it is no; that Mr. Birla could get some advantage. What was the Planning Commission doing? What was the Ministry for Industry doing? They did not care to see, if anybody was given any licence to start any particular industry or to set up a plant, whether he had actually done it or not. They were not concerned with the follow-up. Not in one case, not in two cases, but in a whole series of cases during the last 15 years, their history has been, their performance has been, that they have granted licences upon licences but have not cared to see whether those licences were fully utilised or not. Not only that. The Planning Commission also failed to fix up priorities and lay down time within which the work has to be completed. Dr. Hazari has definitely said in his Report that not only no priorities were fixed but also there was no time-limit fixed. The Government give the licence to a particular individual or a firm and say, "Do this thing or do that thing." How long will they take to do it is not their concern. In the industrial development of a big country like India, a country which has a backward economy, where the targets

fixed by the Planning Commission have to be fulfilled, why the Government themselves, the very persons who are in charge of running the Government or in framing the policies are so oblivious of their responsibilities, at least I have not been able to find an answer for that. Naturally, there has been concentration of wealth; naturally, the distribution of industrial development on a more widespread basis in different regions is not there.

I am not one who blames Mr. Namboodripad or the Chief Minister of UP. But it fell to my lot to draw the attention of the U.P. Government that the agreement that they had entered into with the Birlas for the supply of power was at a rate which was less than the cost of production. Mr. Sampurnanand, who was the Chief Minister in those days, said that it could not be and I told him that my arithmetic was never weak and that he should look into it. How was I able to get that information? It was not from any non-official. It was from the Chief Engineer who came to me after this agreement had been arrived at and said, "Look here! They are going to supply power to Birlas at less than the cost of production." If the Government of India failed in its primary duty to see that the distribution of the industrial development on a more widespread basis was carried on, then it naturally fell to the lot of the State Governments to see that they got some benefit as a result of their own efforts. And I am not surprised, if the Government of Kerala made approaches to Birlas. Here I find that the leader of the Communist Party and a prominent Member in the Secretariat of the Congress Parliamentary Party speaking in the same voice and giving expression to the same feelings. One is out of the Government; but he has the same feeling as the one who belongs to the Government's party. So, it should not surprise anybody that the wish or desire to have industrial development in a particular area compels or impels a particular Chief Minister to seek the

help of a capitalist, whether he is Mr. Birla or he is Mr. Tata or he is some one else. Therefore, the matter does not end there. Birlas are only one example.

I do not know how will the Industry Minister justify that they were given licences without the formality of the applications being processed through the Licensing Committee. Why were these formalities dispensed with? The answer might be that they were dispensed with in other cases also. It is all the worse. As I submitted at the very beginning, I am not concerned with the Birlas. I have known Mr. Birla for a very long time and I am friendly with some of the people working with the Birlas. But the point is this. Where was the Industrial Policy of the Government? They did not know that the applications were sanctioned without being properly processed through the formality of going through the Licensing Committee.

Much has been said and rightly that the Birlas are one of the richest people living in India today, and therefore in the interests of industrial development, instead of waiting till someone else came forward, it was necessary for the Government of India to give licences to the Birlas because they were men of resources, they could raise the capital, they could borrow money, they had contacts with people outside, they could have some collaborators in England or France or America and other places. But Dr. Hazari has pointed out that there are cases in which companies without adequate resources were given licences. Without the necessary capital they were given licences. A company with a small capital was given licence to deal with iron and steel because it was Birla's company. Wow, how can Birla manage it? He manages it because he has control over the banking system in India. We cannot stop the concentration of economic power if we do not nationalise the banking system in India.

Madam, the other day it was discussed in this House when my friend, Mr. Banka Behary Das, moved a resolution for the nationalisation of the banking system in India. There was an amendment that it should be socialised. Socialised or nationalised, I want public control, control of the Central Government as they have the control over the Life Insurance Corporation of India. Where is the difficulty? The nationalisation of life insurance has placed in the hands of the Government of India millions of rupees which they were otherwise deprived of. If the Government were to have a similar control upon the banking system in India, it would not be possible for them to get overdrafts, the Birlas or the Singhanias or the Morarkas—Is he a businessman or what?

AN HON. MEMBER: He is a small businessman.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: I know for a man like myself it would be difficult to get overdraft because all my life I have lived on overdrafts. I know it. But in the larger interests of the country, for the industrial development, for the economic development and for achieving the objectives—not the objectives of the Praja-Socialist Party—set forth by the Congress in its various resolutions and the Constitution of India, Madam, the banking should be nationalised. It is through the banks that businessmen are able to lay their hands on tons of money. Why was the licence given to Birlas without any capital? It is because they could raise money from banks. I would not get that opportunity. That facility would be denied to me. It was because of this that Manjushri Bikaner which had no funds in their profit and loss account were given licences. Why because they had control over the banking system. They have at their disposal crores of rupees and thereby take advantage of their position. That applies not only to Birlas but to other business houses as well.

[Shri Triloki Singh]

Now, Madam, let us have an idea of the power of Birlas. The first general elections were held in January 1952. Preparations for elections were going on. One of the Birlas, I would not take his name, but if somebody wants me to take his name, I can certainly give it out . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Then do it

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: If you are anxious to know, then I am prepared to give it. It was Shri K. K. Birla—I would give out his genealogy—tion of Shri Ghanshyam Das Birla. He was the Secretary of the Indian Sugar Mills Association. Now what was the deal struck between the Suga, Mills Association led by K. K. Birla and the Congress in U.P. led by n> less a person than the late Govind Ballabh Pant of reverd memory? It was decided that the sugar mills will give one rupee per maund on the production of sugar . . .

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA (West Bengal): To whom?

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: To the Congress Party. I never thought that you would require a repetition of the word—

One rupee per maund of sugar produced to the U.P. Congress Party in return for the release of sugar to be sold in the open market. Sugar was under control then. It was a question of release of lakhs of tonnes of sugar to be sold in the open market on whatever rate the manufacturers might fix. I took it up on the floor of the U.P. Assembly. A controversy was raised here also. I am in possession of the original letter. They went through this deal in spite of this exposure. But they kept quiet.

Now, Madam, the responsibility for encouraging Birlas or Tatas or Dalmias primarily lies upon the Congress Party which has been in power these 20 years in this country both in most of the States and at the Centre.

So, Madam, I have got nothing more, as I said in the very beginning, to add to what has been already so ably said by Mr! Bhupesh Gupta and Mr. Chandra Shekhar. But I would like to draw, through you, the attention of the Minister of Industries and the Central Government to this point. It will not be given to them for long to play with the life of the nation as they have been doing during the last 15 Or 20 years. They are in power today. I do not grudge it. They are in power because the majority has voted for them. But I would submit. Do not wield this power in the interest of a few. Do not forget what has been said in the Constitution or in the Industrial Policy Resolution. Do not forget what has been laid down in the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. Do not forget the pledge that the Congress has given to the people." And, therefore, I would most humbly request the Central Government, through the Minister in charge of Industries, who is present here today, to reconsider their policy; it is not a question of review. That is why, Madam, the matter needs a deeper probe.

It is very difficult for one to enquire into one's own failings. After all, it is the Government which has erred and if they are to enquire into what they have done, how they have deviated from the chosen path, it would be very difficult for them to come to a decision. Therefore, I would support the amendment moved by my friend, Shri Banka Behary Das, that a Committee of this House, or for that matter of both the Houses of Parliament, should be formed to go into this matter, not only the matter of Birlas—I am not concerned with Birlas alone—but the whole question. My submission, therefore, is let there be a deeper probe and let that probe be by Members of Parliament. Of course, the Government will be represented there by Members of the

majority party and they are likely to be in a majority. Let them find out what was it that led this Government to give licences to these concerns. Then alone the Government will be able to act in accordance with their own Resolution and with their own commitments. I am not asking them to follow the P.S.P path although a Government consisting of good people, people not only good but honest and intelligent, wedded to the welfare of the nation, would not mind the adoption of any suggestion made by this side of the House provided it is in the public interest and in the interest of the nation.

Thank you.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I find myself in a difficult position and feel diffident in taking the floor after the brilliant speeches of Shri Bhupesh Gupta, my friend Shri Chandra Shekhar, and Shri Triloki Singh. It is my lot to disagree, in most cases with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta in this House. But today I am in that happy position that I agree with most of what Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said. During the last session of Parliament, when my friend, Shri Chandra Shekhar, told me about an article in the *Mainstream* about the Hazari Report, I told him that it is a matter which should be brought to the immediate notice of the Parliament and, therefore, I, along with some other friends, gave a Call-Attention Notice and it came up for discussion during the last session of Parliament. At the time the Calling Attention Motion was being discussed, it was agreed that a fuller debate would be held in this House in the first week of the coming session.

At the time I gave the Call-Attention Notice, I had three objectives in view. First, I wanted to bring to light the Hazari Report especially, vis-a-vis the activities of the Birlas. Secondly, I wanted to impress upon the Government the need for a fuller enquiry into the growth of economic

power in the hands of a few persons. And thirdly, I wanted ways and means to be adopted to see that future concentration of power is checked and prevented. I am happy to see that I have more or less achieved the three objectives that I had in view. The publicity the Hazari Report has got is something which I never dreamt of when I move the Calling Attention Notice. Overnight, Prof. Hazari has become a national figure almost. The second objective has also been achieved when the hon. Minister in his opening remarks conceded that the Government of India is considering a fuller enquiry into the whole matter. And, I am sure the third point will be achieved when the recommendations of the Monopolies Commission are implemented and a commission as suggested by the Monopolies Commission is appointed to have a constant and regular eye on the economic growth of the country, especially, vis-a-vis the private sector. Shri Bhupesh Gupta and Shri Chandra Shekhar have placed a lot of statistics before the House and I shall not repeat the statistics. But I wish to invite the attention of the House to certain parts of the Hazari Report. First, I will read out Para 10.3 which says:

"The Pace of Birla advance was moderate in 1957 and 1958, considering that it was the second largest group in size and already had the largest number of companies, more than 833. The build-up of momentum started in 1959 and the breakthrough came in 1960. There has been no looking back since then. Over these 9½ years, the Birlas applied for 228 new articles, 267 substantial expansions and 443 new undertakings (all gross of some multiple counting) and received approvals for 102, 149 and 124, respectively."

Then in para 10.5 it is stated:

"During the 2½ years, 1964—June 1966, they put in 325 applications

[Shri M. P. Bhargava.]

for industrial licences, of which 132 proposed an investment of Rs. 180 crores. Approval was received for 130, of which 85 accounted for an investment of Rs. 102 crores, with an import component of Rs. 57 crores."

Then para 10.6 says:

"The large number of Birla proposals and the amount of investment contemplated therein are diffused over the entire industrial structure. Except basic steel and power generation, almost every kind of industrial product capable of domestic manufacture is covered in the Birla perspective plan. There is evidence of interest in new and rapidly growing industries, particularly, aluminium, electrical goods, chemicals cement, man-made, fibres and yarn, heavy engineering, alloy steel, pig iron, tools, timber products, newsprint and pipes and tubes but traditional industries like cotton, sugar, vanaspati and paper are by no means ignored."

If we examine geographically as to what is the position, we find that the Birlas have their industries in all the provinces. Shri Bhupesh Gupta made a remark that the Birla empire will flourish so long as the Congress regime is there . . .

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan): Congress empire.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I beg to differ there. Even assuming for a moment that the Congress regime goes, I have my doubts if Birlas' influence will lessen and that is evident from the fact of the Birla's adventures in Kerala. My friend, Shri Chandra Shekhar, gave half the story about the bamboo contract. I would give the other half. All though the file, right up to the Chief Minister's stage, the terms were that Rs. 2.80 per ton of royalty will be realised from Birlas for the supply of bamboo made to them. Then a represen-

tative of the Birlas goes and meets the then Chief Minister of Kerala, Shri Namboodiripad. After this magic meeting, no official who appeared before the Public Accounts Committee, could explain what happened. And the only thing which was told to us was that there was a nothing that the contract be given to the Birlas on a royalty at the rate of Re. 1 per ton. It was reduced from Rs. 2.80 per ton to Re. 1 per ton, only by a meeting of the representative of Birlas with the Chief Minister. The officers of Kerala were unable to explain it. I am sure Shri Bhupesh Gupta, who has the insight about the entire party, may be able to give some comments and probably after giving the comments, he will be in a position to modify his remark that the Birla empire will prosper so long as the Congress regime lasts. I am in a position to say that the Birla empire is going to prosper under the regime of the party to which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta belongs. If hon. Members have read the newspapers since the Namboodiripad Ministry has been formed this time, they would find that what I say is clearly borne out because quite a number of times a news item has appeared that the Birlas are being invited to open this industry or that they are being given licence for that industry. And it will be surprising if I tell Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that in spite of the almost unanimous demand in this House that till an enquiry is made, no further licence should be given to the Birlas, Rs. 4 crores worth of licence has been given to Mr. Birla at the request of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's Chief Minister, Shri Namboodiripad, and if he is in a position to deny it, I will request him to say so.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I stand by what I said. The Birlas, I said, should not have been given any licence without a Parliamentary Committee going into this matter . . . Birla is horror to me. (*Interruption*).

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: To what extent it actually blocks the entry of others and thereby shuts up competition is an open question which cannot be answered straightway. But this is what is mentioned in this report in paragraph 10.9:

3 P.M.

"It is to some extent legitimate to infer, therefore, that Birla enterprise, justifiable or not in terms of ultimate performance, does tend to pre-empt licensable capacity in many industries."*

The report further says in paragraph 10.10:

"* * * Enterprise plus imaginative understanding of licensing formalities, thus, enable the Birlas to foreclose the market. Astute management turns this process into high and quick returns, on investment, which earns foreclosure of economic resources generally, and helps magnify the halo round the House of Birlas." . Now I will not take the House through what has been stated in paragraph 10.11 of the report where they have cited instances, where without almost any money Birlas have been doing business in lakhs and crores of rupees. How this is done is a jugglery; it is beyond my imagination, and I would expect that the hon. Minister for Industry would throw some light on paragraph 10.11 where all these cases have been mentioned, and similar cases mentioned in the Monopoly Commission's report. If this is the result of a sample check—that which is mentioned in paragraph 10.11—a detailed scrutiny is bound to reveal a startling state of affairs *vis-a-vis* the provisions of Company Law.

Now I come to the next question whether there is a case for further investigation of, and fuller details about the Birla empire. The Monopolies Commission went into the working of a number of concerns and they gave their studied remarks, and only in one case they have said that a fuller inquiry is necessary. That is

what I would read out and that finds a place at page 47 of the Monopolies Commission's report. It says:

"(We think it proper to mention that a large number of companies in which parties who are close relations or business associates or employees of Birlas, appear to have financial and management interests, have not been included in the group, because of the absence of adequate evidence of Birlas having controlling interests therein. As in the case of certain others groups also this can only be finally decided after detailed investigation of the beneficial ownership of the shares in these companies.)"

This is what the Monopolies Inquiry Commission have said in their report.

And what does the Hazari Committee report say in paragraph 0.3? It is this:

"The data suffer from severe limitations, as set out later in paragraph 11. Briefly, the data are partial, incomplete and in some cases not fully reliable. They should be taken as rough indicators of magnitudes, not precise amounts."

Now if we have a look at what has been said about the licences given to Birlas, one gets the impression that at cent, per cent applications of Birlas were approved. And that raises the question that forces and pressures were working behind these approvals, and whether these licences were granted at the cost of others whose applications were rejected. An inquiry is also necessary to find out whether some political forces were behind the whole racket. If so, the doings of these forces have got to be exposed irrespective of their status and standing. It has to be further inquired into if the bureaucracy has had a hand in this stinking affair of Birla licences, what methods of liaison were employed for getting this cent, per cent approval, what temptations were offered, what baits were thrown. All these need to be investigated.

[Shri M. P. Bhargava.]

Then another question which should engage the attention of the Government is employment of high officials after retirement in industrial concerns, to find out whether they misused their official position in showing favours to Birlas in the hope of getting appointments with them after their retirement. In this connection, it has to be looked into whether the recommendations of these high officers are being received in large numbers by Birlas, and whether they are being acceded to, and how many near relatives of the high officials working in the Government of India—senior officials—have their relatives in the Birlas at their own recommendations.

Then we come to the next question, and the next question is whether Birlas have utilised all the licences granted to them and whether there have been any activities by Birlas to malign or crush other rising industrialists. We find from the report that quite a number of licences have not been utilised.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: One half.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: After reading the report the impression is created that they believe in cornering everything for themselves, and shut out others. It seems that the ambitions of the Birlas know no scruples, that they would do anything to preempt licensable capacity, to foreclose the market and to exclude and exterminate the present as well as the future competitors. But what about the Government machinery? The Industries Act does provide for a follow-up and a check on the licences issued. How is it that about half of the licences issued to the Birlas were allowed to lie idle with them? In this connection I would say that even now immediate action must be taken. All those licences that stand in the name of Birlas and have not been utilised by them must immediately be withdrawn. Further investigations should

be conducted into the monopoly practices of the Birlas to find out what smaller firms are sought to be devoured by this mighty empire so that legitimate protection may be granted to those smaller entrepreneurs. The industrial policy as embodied in the Industries Act is (1) to regulate industrial development; (2) to canalise resources according to plan priorities and targets; (3) to avoid monopoly and concentration of wealth; (4) to encourage new entrepreneurs; (5) to distribute industrial development in different regions and (6) to foster technology and economic improvements. Licensing was meant to be the principal instrument for implementing the above Industrial Policy. It is nothing short of a miracle to employ this very weapon of licensing just to reverse this policy and to defeat the very purpose for which this instrument was wielded and to sabotage the whole concept of planning. Instead of regulating industrial development, this licensing system has regulated industrial stagnation, if I may say so. Instead of avoiding monopoly and the concentration of wealth in a few hands, this licensing has helped in the growth of monopoly and the concentration of economic power. Instead of encouraging new entrepreneurs it has helped in stifling them. Instead of reducing economic disparities it has further accentuated them.

Now I come to the next question. (Time *bell rings*). I will take only two or three more minutes, Madam. The next point is about the loans advanced by the financing institutions. The Birlas have companies of the Mundra type numbering at least 73 or 74. They have companies in at least twelve important countries outside through which under-invoicing and over-invoicing—are done. These Birla companies have taken loans from governmental financing institutions at least to a minimum of Rs. 85 crores in 1965-66 and 1966-67. From private banks under their own control and by way of internal accommodation

Interim Report on

they have utilised public deposits to the extent of not less than Rs. 125 crores during the three years, 1964-65, 1965-66 and 1966-67. In this connection I would request the Government to find out what loans have been given to the Birla Companies by the Reserve Bank of India, by the State Bank of India, by the Industrial Development Corporation, by the Unit Trust of India, the Industrial Finance Corporation, the Re-finance Corporation and by the Rehabilitation Corporation of India especially for rehabilitation of cotton and jute industrial units. According to my information these institutions have underwritten debentures, preference shares and equity shares in a very large way for the Birla companies and when the market was very dull and it was not possible for others to place their debentures in the market. This was done in collaboration with each other. Similarly, they bought shares and debentures and they advanced large sums of long, medium and short term loans.

Before sitting down I would like to touch on two small points. The first is about the cost structure of the various industries running in the country in the private as well as in the public sectors. I would like to know from the Government what steps have been taken by them to find out exactly what is the cost of any article produced by these industries, and whether there is any section in the whole Government of India which keeps statistics about the cost of production, whether cost accountants have been appointed from time to time for the various industries to find out the cost of production. Or are we entirely at the mercy of the industrialists and whatever prices they say we have to agree to and whatever increases they want we have to accede? Is that the position? Is there any control by the Government over the price structure of the industries? This is a basic point which needs looking into and unless we know the cost of production it will not be possible for us to stop the exploitation of the consumers by the "big industries. That is precisely what

is needed. I would, therefore, plead with the Government to agree to the appointment of a Parliamentary Committee to look into the whole affair and to submit their report after a thorough and complete study of the question. That is exactly what my amendment seeks to do and I hope that amendment will be accepted.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I beg to move my amendment, namely.

4. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely: —

'and having considered the same, this House recommends to Government to appoint a committee consisting of nine members to be elected by the two Houses of Parliament to study the concentration of wealth by the House of Birlas and connected matters'."

The question was proposed.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: May I make a submission? Since the Prime Minister is here now and there is a report in the press that Shri Arjun Arora, a Member of this House, has alleged, as far as I can understand that two or three Ministers are in the pay-roll of the Birlas, and since he had also seen the Prime Minister, I submit that the Prime Minister should get up and tell the House what the position is. It should be stated on the floor of the House. After all, this is not a private matter between the Prime Minister and the hon. Member. It cannot be a private matter between them and so I want a statement to be made on the floor of the House.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Why?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is very necessary because the matter concerns

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: May I make one submission. Madam, ©» this matter? Normally I would not have intervened, but this matter has been published in the newspapers and therefore it would be very dignified for the Prime Minister, since she is

[Shri Lokanath Misra.]

present here and listening to all this and since this matter has been raised now, to give a clarification to the country. It is a very serious matter, that a member of the Prime Minister's Own party should have made this allegation in the party meeting and that it should have leaked out to the press, that there are some Ministers in the pay-roll of the Birlas or somebody in the pay roll of the Birlas had been chosen and taken by the Prime Minister into her Cabinet. This is a very serious allegation. If any Opposition Member had done it then it would have been looked upon as frivolous.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why should it be?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: You know it is so, unless it is proved. I have always proved it whenever I made any allegation against any Minister. I have proved it in the case of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari. In the case of Shri Biju Patnaik also I have proved it. But whenever an allegation is made by Members of the Opposition in this House, unless it is proved, it is open to the Prime Minister to say that it is a frivolous charge.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: • You have made yourself clear.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, it is a very serious charge and since the Prime Minister is present here and she is listening, let us get a clarification from the Prime Minister. Let her say categorically that there is nobody on the pay roll of the Birlas who is in her Cabinet or she does not know if anybody was on the pay roll of Birlas who is in the Cabinet. She can say that and then the matter will be clarified.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now that will do.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: Madam, kindly listen to me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, it is Very important. Some naughty people may be trying to persuade

Shri Arjun Arora not to divulge the names. I am not a naughty man.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down, Mr. Gupta. Let the business of the House go ahead.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Madam, on a point of order. The motion moved by the hon. Minister is under discussion and when that is so, we cannot expect or demand any explanation from the Prime Minister. (*Interruptions*) I am on my point of order and . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Let the Prime Minister say it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: This issue could be raised as a Calling Attention notice or through some other motion and this matter could be brought before the House. But when this present motion is being discussed, how can the hon. Member get up and demand an explanation? It is not according to procedure.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, yes. That will do. You please sit down. Please do not side-track the debate in this way.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Let the Prime Minister say.

(*Interruptions.*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Please sit down. .

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: Madam, please listen to me. It is important. There are some 50 Ministers, Cabinet Ministers, Ministers of State Deputy Ministers and so on.

AN HON. MEMBER: There are fifty two of them.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: Two more? Very well.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But what is your point?

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: In one minute I shall finish. Shri Arjun Arora, it is said, made a statement

that some are on the pay roll of the Birlas. So unless their names are given we will start suspecting all the 52 of them. So at least to clear up all the others, let the Prime Minister say who these are.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the Prime Minister wants to say anything she may do so.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Madam Deputy Chairman, the hon. Member said just now that if the Opposition Members make an allegation they should prove it; is it not equally important for our own party members also to prove any allegation they make? Some general remarks were made by Shri Arjun Arora but he has not said anything specific to me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. He was prepared to give the names. Did she ask for the names?

(Interruptions.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you must take your seat.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The point is, did the Prime Minister ask for the names?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: After the reply of the Prime Minister the whole matter is closed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: No; how do you say that? Under what rule?

(Interruptions.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I want everyone to take their seats.

Mr. Dhar'ia raised a point of order. Other Members wanted to get some information from the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has replied for the present. She may or may not be able to give further information; that

has to be seen later but today that matter is closed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Did she ask for any names? That is what we want to know.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : The Prime Minister has categorically said that Mr. Arjun Arora has said nothing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: She can look after herself. It has been shown very clearly. Did she ask for the names from Mr. Arjun Arora?

AN HON. MEMBER: Why should she?

"SHBT NIREN GHOSH: And did Mr. Arjun Arora give the names to her?"

श्री राजनारायण: मैं आपके द्वारा प्रधान मंत्री के विरुद्ध विशेषाधिकार की अवहेलना का प्रश्न प्रस्तुत करता हूँ। श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा मेरे साथ कानपुर से आये और हम ट्रेन में एक ही कम्पार्टमेंट में थे। अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने चार एम०पी० के सामने इस बात को कबूल किया है कि मैंने प्राइम मिनिस्टर को नाम बतला दिया है और प्राइम मिनिस्टर इस सदन को कहती है कि उनको अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने नाम नहीं बतलाया है। (Interruption.) हल्ला मत करिये और हल्ला करने से किसी समस्या का समाधान नहीं होता है, अगर होता तो मैं उनसे भी ज्यादा हल्ला कर सकता हूँ। (Interruption.) यदि हम डीसेन्ट, सुसभ्य प्रथा की बात कहते हैं, मगर सही मानों में सभ्य, संसदीय प्रथा होती तो अर्जुन अरोड़ा इस बात को जानते थे कि आज राज्य सभा में हजारों रिपोर्ट पर बहस होने वाली है और सारा कैबिनेट जानता था कि राज्य सभा के लिए इस चीज के लिए दो दिन एलाट हैं। चूंकि हम इस सवाल को सबेरे ही उठाना चाहते थे. . . .

Interim Report on

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I Will not allow you to make a speech «ow. That will do.

श्री राजनारायण : मेरा आप से इतना ही निवेदन है कि हम चूँकि खुद नाम जानते हैं, इसलिए जब हमारी बारी आयेगी तो, हम नाम डिस्कलोज करेगे, इसलिए हमको कोई परेशानी नहीं है। और अगर प्राइम मिनिस्टर कह भी दें कि उनको नाम पता नहीं है, प्रूफ नहीं है, तो मैं इसको कबूल करने को तैयार नहीं हूँ। अनेकों प्रकार के प्रूफ किताबों में हैं कि यहां के मंत्रियों को बिरला ने कई प्रकार से खरीदा है. . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister has heard what Mr. Rajnarain has said. Mr. Bhandari.

श्री राजनारायण : आप ऐसे सुसभ्य तरीके से पार्लियामेंट को ले जा रही हैं ?

(Interruptions.) THE

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Have you anything to say?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: No; nothing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You listen to me. Don't ask me in an angry mood. The point of order is confused if you are angry.

The point of order is this. An hon. Member of this House says that in front of four hon. Members Shri Arjun Arora had said that he had given the name, to the Prime Minister. And the Prime Minister pleads innocence about it. Somebody must be correct; all cannot be.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What can you do about it?

SHRI NHIEN GHOSH: Let the Prime Minister give us the names.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: "Why don't you tell the names? You need not believe it.

SHRI NIREN" GHOSH: We know you have got Birlamen in your Cabinet. You tell us who they are.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: On a point of order. The difficulty is many of the hon. Members have not understood what the Prime Minister said. The Prime Minister has now thrown a challenge to Mr. Arjun Arora to substantiate what he says as she expects me and other Members of the Opposition to substantiate if we allege something. I thought Mr. Arjun Arora had fled away but now I find he has come back.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I never run away.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: He can give a personal explanation if he wants. But the point is, he has come back to the House when we are in a state of confusion. Now after the Prime Minister has thrown a challenge to Mr. Arjun Arora either to substantiate or to withdraw—it amounts to withdrawal if he would not substantiate it—it is up to Mr Arjun Arora either to substantiate it and publicly give the name* here or else he has to withdraw it-

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: First of all I want to say that I never run away. I never withdraw a thing which I say ' because I generally speak with a sense of responsibility. My name is Arjun and if hon. Members have read Mahabharata they will remember:

अर्जुनस्य प्रतिज्ञा वदे न दैन्यम न पलायनम्

as happened is, within my party I have said certain things. Within their party hon. Members of the Opposition say so many things. Their parties are unimportant.

SHRI BHTJPESH GUPTA: Your party is important because it is financed by the Birlas?

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I know something about the financing of other political parties also including Comrade Bhupesh Gupta's. So let him not provoke me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right; come to the point.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I have said something in my party. It is an internal party matter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But you spoke internally within the party over a matter which is a public matter.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: May be; what of that?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I think all responsible parties discuss matters of public importance, and not frivolous things. When I used to be a member of the Communist Party 25 years back we discussed political matters. Now that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is its leader, probably they discuss frivolous things. Anyhow, because our party is important, what we had said inside the party . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are not concerned with our party. The only thing is this, whether it is true that he said that there were Birla-men in the Cabinet and whether it is a fact that he gave the names to the Prime Minister and/or the Prime Minister asked for the names. It is a simple question; just say you did or did not.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I do not give Mr. Bhupesh Gupta the right to cross-examine me.

(Interruptions.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Whatever happened inside your party or outside your party we are not concerned. Before you came into the House they from the Opposition side raised an issue and the Prime Minister gave a particular answer. Now, what have you to say in regard to that answer? That is all. I do not want to hear more than that.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Madam Deputy Chairman, I have a submission to make. The Opposition rightly raised the question. It is given in the Press and I agree that it is a matter of public importance. And the hon. Prime Minister has said that Mr. Arjun Arora made some general remarks and that it is equally important for him to substantiate those charges. I shall request you to give the Prime Minister and Shri Arjun Arora time when they will discuss matters between themselves. (Interruptions).

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: It is not a personal matter between them.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Niren Ghosh, suppose a Member in the Opposition makes an allegation. Will it be open to us to ask you at the same time to prove it? Cannot he take time? If any Member raises it as an issue, he will require time.

(Interruptions.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, एक निवेदन मुझे करना है।

उपसभापति : नहीं, नहीं, आप बोल चुके हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : आप सबको निवेदन करने देती हैं, लेकिन जहाँ मैं खड़ा हो जाता हूँ, आप मुझे रोक देती हैं। मैं आपके द्वारा एक उदाहरण जानना चाहता हूँ। यहाँ बहुत से पुराने सदस्य हैं, दीवान चमन लाल जी हैं।

[श्री राजनारायण]

ब्रिटिश पार्लियामेंट की कोई हमें ऐसी नजरी बता दे, जब रूलिंग पार्टी के किसी मेम्बर ने पार्टी मीटिंग में यह कहा हो कि दो हमारी कैबिनेट में ऐसे मिनिस्टर हैं, जो कि बिरला से पैसा लेते हैं और फिर भी उन्होंने सरकार में बैठने की हिम्मत की हो। यह बिल्कुल असंसदीय और सरकार पर कलंक है और बिना इस कलंक को धोये दूये सरकार को एक मिनट भी यहां नहीं बैठना चाहिये। यह पब्लिक क्वेश्चन है। यह किसी के घर का क्वेश्चन नहीं है। ब्रिटिश पार्लियामेंट का कोई एक उदाहरण दें कि कैबिनेट के दो मेम्बरों के सम्बन्ध में रूलिंग पार्टी के एक सदस्य ने कहा हो कि वे बिरला से पाते हैं, उनकी पे लिस्ट में उनका नाम है और फिर भी वे सरकार में मौजूद हों। मैं उनकी बात की तारीफ करता हूँ। (Interruption) मैं अर्जुन अरोड़ा जी को इस बहाने के लिये दाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने यह कहा कि मैं अर्जुन हूँ और मैंने जो कुछ कहा है, ठीक कहा है और उसको सब्सर्टीशिएट करने को तैयार हूँ। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आपके द्वारा कि जो उन्होंने यह कहा कि कैबिनेट में ऐसे मिनिस्टर हैं, जो बिरला से पैसा लेते हैं, यह अर्जुन अरोड़ा जी ने कहा।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये, इस सदन से कोई चीज छिपाई नहीं जा सकती। He will have to say it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Arora, have you got to say anything? Please do it in the shortest possible time.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Yes, Madam, If there are no interruptions, I will be very brief, but if there are interruptions, as a humble parliamentarian, I should meet every interruption, whether from this side or that side. Whatever I have done, Madam, is an

internal matter of our Party. When I talked to Mrs. Indira Gandhi on Friday, I did not talk to her as Prime Minister. I talked to her as the leader of my Party and I am not prepared to tell Messrs. Rajnarain Singh and Bhupesh Gupta the internal affairs of my Party.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is the point.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should not try to interrupt. Only last night Mr. Rajnarain Singh and I travelled in the same compartment. We talked many things, discussed many things, in a friendly manner. Now, I do not want all of them to go on the records of this House. So, there is no occasion for anybody to get nervous. My Party is a great Party. My Party stands on principles of non-violence and truth.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: You have made it greater.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I am sure my Party will justly examine the statement which I made in my Party and the decision of my Party will please Members from both sides of this House and the country. Apart from that I do not want to say anything.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You rule on it. We will take it. The issue is not whether we would like them to divulge any Party secrets at all. All that we are concerned with is a matter, which you will agree, which is of very great public importance. Now, Mr. Arjun Arora is a member of the ruling party. He said or is reported to have said that there are some Birla men in the Cabinet. He has not withdrawn that. Neither he has said it. Therefore that statement stands. We are faced with a statement by an hon. Member of this House that there are some people of the Birlas planted in the Cabinet. This is the issue. Therefore, the Prime Minister was good enough to ; <<t up and say that he mentioned cer-

tain things. I can understand her saying that. AH that remains to be done or known is whether names were suggested either at her instance or directly by her. If not, since Mr. Arjun Arora still maintains that statement. May I request you, on behalf of the House, to direct the Prime Minister to ask Mr. Arjun Arora to submit the names and then the Prime Minister should come and make a statement here.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, no more on this.

श्री राजनारायण : यह प्रिविलेज का प्वाइन्ट है। अर्जुन अरोड़ा जी इस सदन से कैंसिल नहीं कर सकते।

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: I stand on a point of privilege.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What privilege?

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: The Prime Minister has said that Mr. Arjun Arora has not given her any name, whereas Mr. Arjun Arora has himself said that he has given the names; not to the Prime Minister but as the leader of his Party. It is a split personality. The Prime Minister as leader does not appeal to *xa*. I submit that the Prime Minister while making her statement has suppressed the truth and she should make a statement here and now what names she has got from Mr. Arjun Arora.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I do not think there is anything of privilege in this. There were certain questions raised and the Prime Minister gave a certain answer. If you want to speak . . .

{Interruptions'}

SHRI RAJNARAIN: We also know the rules.

जो चीजें सदन के आंखों के सामने हो रही हैं, उस पर आप के निर्देश की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। इस समय प्रधान मंत्री यहां पर यह

कह रही हैं कि अर्जुन अरोड़ा जी ने उनके सामने तथ्यों को नहीं रखा और अर्जुन अरोड़ा साहब ने कहा कि मैंने तथ्यों को रखा है और मैं उनको चेज करने नहीं जा रहा हूँ। अब आप इस सदन को तब भी चलाना चाह रही हैं जब कि दो मिनिस्टर बिरला से पैसे लेकर के सारे समाज को गड़बड़ कर रहे हैं।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I would request hon. Members to read the records as to what exactly I have said just now in the House and also what Shri Arjun Arora has said. I did not mention the word 'name*' in my statement.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do. Mr. Bhandari.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : मैडम डिप्टी चैयरमैन, श्री हजारी ने इंडस्ट्रियल लाइसेंसिंग पालिसी के बारे में जो एक अंतरिम रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने रखी है, उस पर हम लोग चर्चा कर रहे हैं। साधारणतया इंटरिम रिपोर्ट जब तक सरकार के द्वारा नहीं रखी जाती, तब तक उसका पता नहीं चलता। यह रिपोर्ट इकोनामिक रेव्यू में छपी है। मंत्री महोदय ने अपने वक्तव्य में इस बात को कह कर अपनी जिम्मेदारी को कम करने की कोशिश की है कि उन के मंत्रालय द्वारा इसका प्रकाशन नहीं हुआ। परन्तु इतने से यह बात पूरी नहीं होनी चाहिये। यह इंटरिम रिपोर्ट अगर एक डाक्युमेंट है और यह नहीं छपनी चाहिये तो इसका अगर लोकेज हुआ है तो इस बात का जांच होना आवश्यक है और मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि सबसे पहले कि इस चीज का प्रकाशन किस तरह से हुआ। जब यहां पर कालिंग अटेंशन नोटिस आया था तब भी कुछ माननीय सदस्यों के पास इसकी प्रतियां थीं और वे प्रतियां किस तरह से उनके पास पहुंचीं, यह एक साधारण बात नहीं जिस को हम यूं ही नज़र अन्दाज़ करें। इस बात की जांच होना चाहिए। यह सारी चीजें जो इस डिबेट में सारी लाइसेंसिंग की रिपोर्ट के सम्बन्ध में कही गई और इंडस्ट्रियल

Interim Report on

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

लाइसेंसिंग पालिसी के नियमों की अवहेलना करने के सम्बन्ध में भी जो अनेकों उदाहरण दिए गए और सरकार के द्वारा प्रतिपादित नीतियों को खत्म कर के उनका नाजायज फायदा उठाने की जो कोशिशें बताई गई हैं अगर ये उस रिपोर्ट को उठाकर यहां लाना उसी चलते चले आए सिलसिले का एक भाग है तो फिर इस सारी चीज पर गम्भीरता से विचार होकर इसकी जांच करनी चाहिए।

इस रिपोर्ट के सम्बन्ध में बारबार हमारे दिमाग में एक विचार खड़ा होता है कि हम अपने देश में में नीतियां तय करते हैं और उन नीतियों के आधार पर कार्यान्वयन होता है, उन नियमों का कहीं पालन न हो, उन नियमों में से किसी तरह की गलतियां सामने आए और उन गलतियों को आप पकड़ सकें, उन गलतियों के आधार पर किसी व्यक्ति को नाजायज फायदा मिले—उन गलतियों पर जाय तब तो कुछ बात समझ में आ सकती है। मुझे दुख है इस बात का कि इस रिपोर्ट को पढ़ लेने के बाद भी वाइलेशन आफ रूलस के सम्बन्ध में इस रिपोर्ट में कहां पर दर्ज है। यहां पर उदाहरण के तौर पर बिड़ला फैमिली का नाम लिया गया है।

यहां पर श्री हजारी ने अपने वक्तव्य में उद्योगपतियों के कुछ वर्गीकरण किए हैं। उस वर्गीकरण के क्या आधार हैं, उस वर्गीकरण के पीछे उनकी क्या अर्थारटी है, उस वर्गीकरण को किन उद्देश्यों पर सर्वस्टेंडिंग किया है ? आज भी यह विवादस्पद है। मोनोपोली कमीशन की रिपोर्ट में और इनके आंकड़ों में अन्तर है। स्वयं श्री हजारी ने स्वीकार किया है कि जिन आंकड़ों के आधार पर उन्होंने अपनी कुछ बातें बयान करने की कोशिश की वे आंकड़े पूरे नहीं हैं, जो डाटा उनको मिला वह पूर्ण रूप से विश्वसनीय नहीं हैं। इस के बावजूद उन्होंने कुछ बातें सामने रखने की कोशिश की। मैं इस बात को मान

and Licensing Policy

सकता हूँ कि श्री हजारी ने अपनी अन्तरिम रिपोर्ट में दूसरे औद्योगिक संस्थानों के बारे में जानकारी होते हुए भी उनके सम्बन्ध में उल्लेख नहीं किया। ज्यादा अच्छा होता अगर जितने भी औद्योगिक संस्थान हैं, जो धीरे-धीरे अधिक अधिकार प्राप्त करते जा रहे हैं, औद्योगीकरण के क्षेत्र में धीरे-धीरे मोनोपोलिस्टिक कन्डीशन्स का निर्माण करते जा रहे हैं उन सब के सम्बन्ध में एक तुलनात्मक विवेचन यहां पर रखते। साथ ही यह भी बताते कि हमारी आर्थिक नीति किस प्रकार के ट्रेंड्स ले रही है, हमारी इंडस्ट्रियल लाइसेंसिंग पालिसी में कुछ बेसिक खामियां हैं क्या, हम किसी भी प्रकार के केन्द्रीयकरण को नहीं रोक पाते या हम किसी फेविरिज्म के शिकार बन कर काम करते हैं। कुछ चीजें बताई गई, ऐसे माननीय सदस्यों ने रिपोर्ट के सम्बन्ध में अपने विचार प्रगट किए हैं, जो बिड़ला को और कन्सन्स को उसका पिछले से जानते हैं। जब से वे कांग्रेस को जानते हैं, आज भी जानते हैं। इन पिछले दिनों में, उन्होंने कई उदाहरण दिए, उनको सोना बाहर भेजने की इजाजत दी गई, टैक्स की चोरी के सम्बन्ध में कुछ समझौते कर लिए गए और जितना बसूल होना चाहिए था उतना बसूल नहीं हुआ और सरकार में बैठे हुए कुछ लोगों ने उनको कन्सेशन दे दिए। बहुत लम्बे सालों से, बहुत लम्बे अरसे से, यह सम्बन्ध चल रहा है। इस समय मैं इसके साथ किसी तरह का डाइरेक्ट लिंक जोड़ने का मेरा इरादा नहीं, लेकिन मैं इस संयोग का उल्लेख करने से नहीं चूकूंगा जिस सन्दर्भ में हम रिपोर्ट पर विचार कर रहे हैं। अनेक कांग्रेस के माननीय सदस्यों ने पिछले दिनों की बहुत सी घटनाओं का वर्णन किया, स्वर्गीय श्री गान्धी का भी उल्लेख किया कि उन्होंने बिड़ला जी के एक कन्सन्स के सम्बन्ध में पिछले दिनों में एक मामला उठाया था। उनकी मृत्यु हो गई, उनका यह कहना है कि मामला दबाया गया। म

Interim Report on

नहीं जानता कि वह व्यक्तिगत तौर पर उन्होंने उठाया था या उन्होंने एक लेक्यूना की तरफ, किसी चीज की तरफ, हमारी नीतियों में सुधार करने के लिए और मोनो-पोलिस्टिक टेडेंसीज को रोकने के प्रति उन्होंने सरकार का ध्यान आकृष्ट किया था। मुझे दुःख है कि उनकी अकाल मृत्यु हो गई लेकिन बाकी के कांग्रेस के सदस्य उस समय भी थे आज भी चल रहे हैं। उन्होंने उस चीज को आगे क्यों नहीं बढ़ाया, आगे क्यों नहीं चलाया, इतने वर्षों तक अपने मन में सब प्रकार की असुविधाओं के रहते हुए वे चुप रहे और और इस समय बड़े जोर-शोर से अपने भाव प्रगट कर रहे हैं। क्या इसका कारण पिछले दिनों की वह घटना नहीं है जिसके कारण राजनीतिक परिस्थितियों में बदल हुआ है। जैसा यहां पर एक उल्लेख किया गया, श्री मोरारका जी के विरुद्ध श्री बिड़ला जी खड़े हुए। क्या इसकी एक वजह यह भी है कि आज हम अपनी औद्योगिक नीतियों पर ईमानदारी से सोचना चाहते हैं और उस में कुछ कन्सेन्ट्रेशन आफ बैलथ न हो, मोनोपोलिस्टिक टेडेंसीज पैदा न हों या कहीं हमारे किसी तार को छू दिया गया है या हम राजनीतिक कन्सीडरेशन्स के आधार पर नाजायज फायदा उठाने में मोनोपोली नहीं कर पा रहे हैं, इस विषय में कुछ दिल जल गए हैं, आज इस विषय में कुछ भाषाएं बोली जाने लगी हैं। आज इतने दिनों तक मजबूरी में दबो हुई बातें प्रगट होती दिखाई देने लगी हैं। इन दोनों चीजों पर स्पष्ट रूप से विचार होना चाहिए।

मैं स्पष्ट रूप से बता देना चाहता हूं कि मैं भी उन लोगों के साथ हूं जो इस देश में कन्सेन्ट्रेशन आफ बैलथ देखना नहीं चाहते। मैं भी उन का समर्थन करूंगा कि यहां पर इंडस्ट्रीज के क्षेत्र में मोनोपोलिस्टिक टेडेंसीज न बढ़ पाएं। इसी उद्देश्य को लेकर हमने अपनी इंडस्ट्रियल लाइसेंसिंग पालिसी बनाई

and Licensing Policy

और उस में इसलिए ये मुद्दे रखे कि लाइसेंस देते समय हमें सारे क्षेत्र का विचार करना चाहिए और कुछ हाथों में चीजें केन्द्रित न हों इस बात को ध्यान में रख कर लाइसेंस देने की परिपाटी अपनानी चाहिए। अगर यह विचार न होता तो इस इंडस्ट्रियल लाइसेंसिंग नीति को निर्धारित करने या लाइसेंस की पद्धतियों को लागू करवाने की मोटे तौर पर कोई जरूरत नहीं थी।

श्री हजारी ने भी स्वयं माना है कि एक समय था अपने देश में जब औद्योगीकरण के लिए हमें लोगों को प्रोत्साहन देने की आवश्यकता थी, हम लोगों के अन्दर एक अर्ज पैदा करना चाहते थे कि वे औद्योगीकरण के क्षेत्र में आगे बढ़ें। उन्होंने अपने स्वयं के रिमार्क में भी यह बात कही है। श्री हजारी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट के पैराग्राफ 15 के पांचवें भाग में जो कहा है वह मैं यहां पर उद्धृत करना चाहता हूं :

"Licensing has been one of the successful instruments of the policy during the Second Plan period to create the urge to industrialise."

और उसी के साथ उन्होंने नीचे कहा है :-

"Now the urge is there In spite of the foreign exchange crisis and so is a much greater degree Of familiarity with new technology, and, in a way, things are simplified in so far as additional output comes from existing rather than new units."

मैं समझता हूं कि जिन परिस्थितियों में हमने औद्योगीकरण की नीति लागू की थी उस समय उसकी आवश्यकता थी। अगर हम ठीक प्रकार से चलें होते और पार्टी इन पावर स्वयं ब्लेकमेल का शिकार न बनी होती तो आज जो वह सारी शिकायतें पैदा हो रही हैं और आज जो सारा शिकवा किया जा रहा है कि क्यों हिन्दुस्तान में एक व्यक्ति को इतना अधिकार

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

मिल गया — यह न होता । क्या फारेन कोलेबोरेशन हमारे यहां जूम करार दे दिया गया है, पहले हम इस को तय कर दें । अगर जूम करार नहीं दिया गया है और हम यहां की इंडस्ट्रियल ग्रोथ के लिए फारेन कोलेबोरेशन को स्वीकार करते हैं कि उसके सहारे पर इंडस्ट्रियलाइजेशन की पैस बढ़े ।

इस चीज के लिये अगर हमारे पास गुवाइस है तो अगर किसी ने फारेन कोलेबोरेशन किया तो हिन्दुस्तान की इज्जत कहां निक गई, हिन्दुस्तान के प्रति गद्दारी कहां हो गई यह मैं अभी समझने में समर्थ नहीं हो पाया हूं । अगर यहां पर किसी कॉर्न को लाइसेंस दिया गया, हमारी लाइसेंसिंग पॉलिसी में कुछ गलतियों के अनुसार, तो उसमें हमें जरूर जाना चाहिये लेकिन अगर किसी क्षेत्र के लिये कोई लाइसेंस मांगता है और दूसरा नहीं मांगता तो फिर क्या करें? यहां पर इस बात का उल्लेख है कि और भी कुछ बड़े बड़े हाउसेज हैं जिन्होंने कि लाइसेंस मांगा ही नहीं, उन्होंने लाइसेंस प्राप्त करने के लिये कोई उत्साह प्रकट नहीं किया और इसलिये बिड़लाज ने जब लाइसेंस मांगा तो दिया । और लोगों को भी लाइसेंस मिले हैं । मैं समझता हूं कि मुखे मंत्री महोदय सुधारने की कोशिश करेंगे कि यह जो गीरियड अंडर रिव्यू है इसमें मेरी जानकारी के अनुसार लगभग 9 हजार लाइसेंस ईश्यू किये गये, मेरी जो जानकारी है वह विवादस्पद हो सकती है क्योंकि श्री हजारों के सारे इकट्ठे किये गये फिगरस भी डिसप्यूटेड हैं, उन्होंने लैटर आफ इंटेंस और लाइसेंस दोनों को जाड़ा है और मंत्री महोदय ने माना है कि लैटर आफ इंटेंस तो बड़ी लिबरली दिये जाते हैं, उसकी कुछ कंडीशंस होती है, उसकी कुछ फारमैलिटीज पूरी करनी होती हैं और जब वे फारमैलिटीज पूरी हो जाती हैं तब लाइसेंस ईश्यू किये जाते हैं, तो बड़ा न्याय होगा अगर मंत्री महोदय इन फिगरस

को सिप्लेंट अप कर के रखने की कोशिश करेंगे, उससे परिस्थिति को समझने में सुगमता होगी कि लैटर आफ इंटेंस कितने दिये गये और उसमें से लाइसेंस कितने दिये गये, और मेरी जानकारी के अनुसार 9 हजार में से 161 लाइसेंस जिसको कि बिड़ला ग्रुप कहा जाता है उसको दिये गये । वह ज्यादा भी दिया जा सकता है, वह कम भी दिया जा सकता है, मैं यहां पर किसी को क्यो 161 दिया गया, क्यो 200 नहीं दिया गया या क्यो केवल 61 नहीं दिया गया इस पर विवाद करना नहीं चाहता । हम अगर एक पद्धति से चले और हमको लगता है कि वह हमारी पद्धति कारगर साबित नहीं होती है, वह बढ़ते हुये कंसंट्रेशन के क्षेत्र को रोक नहीं पाई तो फिर हम उस पर पुनर्विचार करें कि उसमें क्या बदल करना चाहिये ।

जैसा कि श्री हजारों ने संकेत करने की कोशिश की है, आज जब कि 60 परसेंट क्षेत्र पर पब्लिक इंटरप्राइज आता जा रहा है, जब राज्य का क्षेत्र बढ़ता जा रहा है उस हालत में और बड़ी बड़ी कंसर्नेस के बारे में लाइसेंसिंग की कुछ अलग पद्धति हमने स्वीकार करने की कोशिश की है, इंडस्ट्रियल लाइसेंसिंग के यह चले आये हुये पैटर्न की अब हमको कोई जरूरत नहीं है । उन्होंने इस बात को भी साबित करने की कोशिश की है कि बिना उद्देश्यों को ले कर हमने यह पद्धति शुरू की थी उसमें किसी प्रकार से हमको सफलता नहीं मिली । स्वामिनाथन कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में भी बार बार इस बात को लोगों के सामने लाने की कोशिश की गई है और उसी आधार पर अब हम धीरे धीरे डिस्लाइसेंसिंग की नीति को अपनाकर बहुत से क्षेत्रों में चलने वाले उद्योगों को लाइसेंस की पाबन्दियों से मुक्त किया है । आज हमको इस आधार पर सारा विचार करना चाहिये । अगर इन सारी चीजों पर विचार करने पर हम इस नतीजे पर

पहुँचते हैं कि जो भी क्षेत्र हमने निजी उद्योग की दृष्टि से निर्धारित किया है उसका केन्द्रीयकरण न हो, वह विकेंद्रित हो तो उस नीति को हम अपनायें, हम एक ही हाउस में ज्यादा लाइसेंस न दें, हम अपनी यह नीति निर्धारित करें कि किसी दूसरे हाउस को लाइसेंस देने में उद्योग को बनाने या बढ़ाने में हमको किसी तरह की कठिनाई नहीं होगी तो हम एक ही कुटुम्ब को, एक ही फेमिली को, एक ही ग्रुप को लाइसेंस देने की पद्धति की बदलने की कोशिश करें। आज बहुत सी चीजें ऐसी हैं जिसको स्वयं सरकारी तौर पर अपनी एजेंसीज की मार्फत निर्धारण करते हैं, उन पर हमें ज्यादा विचार करना पड़ेगा।

मैं इस बात से इंकार नहीं करता कि नाजायज तरीका अपनाया गया, जैसा कि यहां पर एक बहुत बड़ा रेवेजेशन इन्होंने किया है कि बहुत सी जगहों पर जो हुकम दिया गया वह हुकम 'ग्रान फाइल' दिया गया, लाइसेंसिंग कमेटी के प्रोसीजर में वह चीजें नहीं आई और ग्रान फाइल कई चीजों के लाइसेंस की इजाजत दे दी गई। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि ग्रान फाइल हुकम देने वाले कौन थे, सारे प्रोसीजर को छोड़ कर केवल फाइल पर सीधे हुकम देने की पद्धति कितने केसेज में अपनाई गई, किन लोगों ने अपनाई उसके लिये ब्युरोक्रैसी जिम्मेदार है या मिनिस्टिरियल लेवेल के लोग जिम्मेदार हैं। ईमानदारी से इस बात की जांच होनी चाहिये और यह जांच केवल एक हाउस तक ही सीमित न रहे। यह तो एक ऐसी अन-हेल्थी प्रैक्टिस है कि अगर इस प्रैक्टिस को रोकने की कोशिश नहीं की गई तो हमारा सब प्रकार का यहां पर किया गया विचार या हम जो कोई भी पद्धति यहां पर लागू करना चाहते हैं, जो भी बंधन बांधना चाहते हैं, जो कोई भी पद्धति एवाल्स करना चाहते हैं जिससे कि सेंट्रलाइजेशन न हो सके, वह सब बेकार हों जायेगा। अगर

614 RS-7.

सारी पद्धतियों की उपेक्षा कर के सीधे सीधे पर्सनल कंसीडरेशन पर केवल फाइलों पर ही मनमाने तौर पर आज्ञायें जारी करने की पद्धति जारी रहेगी। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि जांच हो। अभी तक सारी पद्धतियों को जिस तरह से लागू किया गया है उसकी जांच हो और अगर किसी विशेष फेमिलीज और किसी ग्रुप के साथ कोई पक्षपात किया गया है तो उसकी बराबर जांच होनी चाहिये। सेंट्रलाइजेशन या कंसेंट्रेशन आफ वैल्यू एक ही केस में तो नहीं है, औरों के केस में हुआ है। यह बात अलग है कि कुछ लोगों ने अपनी थोड़ी इंडस्ट्रीज के अन्दर ही पूंजी का बहुत बड़ा विस्तार कर के एक बहुत बड़ी पूंजी पर अधिकार किया है। आज टाटाज के बारे में भी अपनी पूंजी बढ़ाने के आंकड़े अपने पास हैं, टाटाज ने भी अपनी पूंजी बढ़ाई। टाटाज के 30 असेट्स के बारे में जो रिप्यू 1956-57 में किया गया उससे उस समय टाटा की टोटल असेट्स 157 करोड़ की थी और आज 1965-66 में उसकी 396 करोड़ रुपये की असेट्स बनी है। कितनी वृद्धि हुई है। 239 करोड़ की। हम किसी की रक्षा नहीं करना चाहते लेकिन बिड़ला का 1965 में असेट्स कुल 266 करोड़ रुपये का था। तो ये दोनों प्रकार के सेंट्रलाइजेशन को मैं ठीक नहीं समझता। लेकिन यह कुछ पद्धति सी बन गई है पिछले कुछ वर्षों से कि हम एक एक हाउस को अपनी कनवीनियंस के अनुसार छांटते हैं और उसको शिकार बनाने की कोशिश करते हैं। इस प्रकार से उनको अवसर मिल जाता है कि पार्टी इन पावर, कांग्रेस, उनको बुलिग टैक्टिक्स के आधार पर दबा कर उनका, रस निचोड़ कर, अपने पार्टी के फंड्स को इकट्ठा करती चली जाय। यह पद्धति बना कर रखी गई है। यह प्रैक्टिस किसी भी प्रकार से स्वस्थ प्रैक्टिस नहीं मानी

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह मंडारी]

जायेगी। अगर केन्द्रीयकरण को रोकना है तो केन्द्रीयकरण के सिद्धान्तों पर जाइये। केन्द्रीयकरण कैसे रक सकता है उन सारी चीजों की तह में जा कर उसका विचार कीजिये।

आज मैं यह अपील करना चाहूंगा, मंत्री महोदय को, कांग्रेस सरकार को, कि इस सारी की सारी रिपोर्ट के सब आसपेक्ट्स पर विचार करने के बाद इस प्रश्न पर जल्दी से जल्दी निर्णय लेना चाहिये कि अब जो कुछ भी हमने प्राइवेट सेक्टर के लिये क्षेत्र रखा है उसके लिये लाइसेंसिंग आवश्यक है या नहीं। अब लाइसेंसिंग की जरूरत बची है कि नहीं ताकि आज जो छोटे छोटे लोग लाइसेंसिंग फारमेलिटीज की पूरा नहीं कर पाते, जो पूंजीपतियों की चाल से नहीं चल सकते, उनको लाइसेंस मिले। आज यह कहा गया कि बिड़ला थोड़े चतुर हैं जानते हैं लाइसेंस कैसे प्राप्त हो जाता है, सब तरकीबें जानते हैं। तो क्या उन्होंने सारी गवर्नमेंट को 'आउटविट' करने की कोशिश की है? तब तो फिर सरकार को अपनी बुद्धि की जांच करानी चाहिये। अगर बिड़ला का कन्सर्न सारी एक सरकार को आउटविट कर सकता है, अपनी सारी तरकीबों से, कलाबाजियों से सरकार और सरकार की सारी मशीनरी को, इतने बड़े बड़े एक्सपर्ट्स को जो कि इन्डस्ट्रियल लाइसेंसिंग पालिसी के सारे सिद्धान्तों को लागू करके सेन्ट्रलाइजेशन को रोकना चाहते थे उनको भी आउटविट कर दिया तब तो भाई इस सरकार के ऊपर आरोप लगने के बाद इस सरकार को आत्म निरीक्षण करना चाहिये कि वह इस देश का उद्योगीकरण करने में समर्थ है कि नहीं और फिर उसका दोष किसी एक आघ को 'स्कैपगोट' बना कर, अपनी सारी कमजोरियों को छिपाने की कोशिश नहीं होनी चाहिये।

मैं जानता हूँ, इस उद्योगीकरण के क्षेत्र में उत गलत नीतियों के कारण और असावधानियाँ बरते जाने के कारण, राजनैतिक पक्षपात के कारण, जो ब्रीटलनेक की स्थिति पैदा हो रही है उससे सरकार की दृष्टि आलोचनायें हो रही हैं। अपनी आलोचनाओं से बचने के लिये किसी को स्कैपगोट बनाने का प्रयत्न न करिये, उसमें किसी का भला न होगा। मैं किसी अपराधी की रक्षा करना नहीं चाहूंगा, मैंने पहले यह मांग की है कि जहाँ भी गलती पायी जाय उसके लिये एक फुलफलेज्ड अथॉरिटी सुझाव देगी। इस संबंध में मुझे श्री धाका बिहारी दास के सुझाव का समर्थन करने में गर्व होता है। आप उसके संबंध में जांच बैठाएं कि कितने इन्डस्ट्रियल कन्सर्न्स हैं जिन्होंने इस तरह से फायदा उठाया है। सबकी जांच करिये लेकिन किसी एक को स्कैपगोट बनाकर जो बीस वर्ष का कूड़ा है उसको उसके माथे पर मत डालिये। जो आज शेर बनना चाहते हैं मैं उन से निवेदन करूंगा : यह सब आपके किये का परिणाम है, ये आपने भीके दिये हैं सब लोगों को पनपने के, इस तरह के इन्डस्ट्रियल हाउसेज बनाने के। आप उसको बदल कर अपनी सारी नीतियों को जनहित की दृष्टि से ढालने की कोशिश करिये।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि देश का औद्योगीकरण हो, देश का औद्योगीकरण रुकना नहीं चाहिये, और इस बात को सामने रखकर इस औद्योगिक को हम जितना ब्राडबेसड बना सकें, जितना अधिक से अधिक क्षेत्रों में विकसित कर सकें, उतना अच्छा है। आज शायद कुछ लोगों को यह शिकायत हो सकती है कि पहले बिड़लाजी या कुछ और उद्योगपतियों के कारखाने किसी एक प्रान्त में सीमित थे और आज अगर सब प्रान्तों में उनका उद्योगीकरण होने लगा है तो आज उसमें से एम्पायर की भावना का निर्माण होता है।

में समझता हूँ अगर बाकी जगहों पर दोष नहीं और विकेन्द्रित अवस्था में लायें और ज्यादा है, अगर बाकी जगहों पर दोष बूढ़ कर उनको से ज्यादा इन्डस्ट्रियल हाउसिंग को उसमें निकालने में समर्थ नहीं होते तो महज इस वजह मौका मिले । इसलिये अब श्री हजारे के से कि एक समूह ने अलग अलग प्रांतों में उद्योग सुझाव के अनुसार भी, जिस लाइसेंसिंग स्थापित किये हैं-इसमें से एम्पायर की कल्पना की अब आवश्यकता नहीं रही है उस लाइसेंस-पैदा नहीं होनी चाहिये । यह फिर सारी सिंग को समाप्त करके हर प्रकार के उद्योग-चीज को गलत दृष्टि से देखने की बात होती पति को सरकार की दया पर न छोड़ कर है । अगर कहीं एक प्रांत में भी मोनो- अपनी सामर्थ्य के आधार पर औद्योगिकरण पोलिस्टिक ट्रेड निर्माण होता है और एक प्रांत के क्षेत्र में आगे बढ़ने का मौका दें । अगर में ही औद्योगिकरण का जाल पैदा करके सारे अभी तक इन सारी नीतियों में जो आरोप देश की आर्थिक पूंजी को, आर्थिक तंत्र को लगायें गये हैं वे आरोप सही हैं तो फिर अपनी मुट्ठी में बंद करने की कोशिश चालू पार्लियामेंट की कमेटी को स्थापित करें । हो, तो भी वह दोषपूर्ण है । लेकिन अगर उसमें सभी प्रकार के उद्योगों की जांच करने विस्तार के आधार पर एक एक प्रांत में इस में हमें किसी प्रकार की कोताही नहीं करनी चीज को पौइन्ट आऊट करने की कोशिश चाहिये । धन्यावाद ।

चलेगी तो आज इस प्रांत में नम्बर आ गया तो कल उस प्रांत में नम्बर आ जायेगा । मैं इस दृष्टि से इसको देखना नहीं चाहूंगा । सेंट्रलाइजेशन एक प्रांत में भी अगर हो मोनोपोलिस्टिक ट्रेड अगर एक प्रांत में भी हो, तो वह हमारे आज के आर्थिक नियोजन के क्षेत्र में बाधा पैदा करेंगे । उनको रोकने के लिये कदम उठाने चाहिये ।

केवल एक और निवेदन मैं करना चाहूंगा । मैं चाहता हूँ कि आज हम औद्योगिकरण के विषय पर जब विचार कर रहे हैं तो हम देखते हैं कि अपने देश में पंजाब ने औद्योगिकरण को एक मिसाल पेश की है, औद्योगिकरण के क्षेत्र में पंजाब ने अपने ढंग की विस्तृत क्षेत्रों में छोटे पैमाने पर उद्योग धंधों की एक श्रृंखला निर्माण करके पंजाब के उद्योगपतियों ने औद्योगिकरण का एक नक्शा हमारे सामने बनाया है । क्या हम उस नक्शे को अपने देश के दूसरे प्रदेशों में लागू नहीं कर सकते क्या बाधा है ? आज पंजाब का पैदा किया हुआ माल एक्सपोर्ट भी होता है, आज उन्होंने इस प्रकार की अपनी क्षमता प्रकट करने की कोशिश की है । आज हम सारे औद्योगिकरण के क्षेत्र को इन दोनों दृष्टियों से विचार करें

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I may inform the House that the House will sit till 6 P.M. as there are very many speakers.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, we can have an additional day.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: From the announcement of the business, there is no additional day. If more Members have to speak we must sit for longer time. We will sit till 9 P.M. Mr. Chinai.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair]

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am of the opinion that Dr. Hazari's report is a very valuable document. Also, I think, Dr. Hazari has done well in spelling out the principal shortcomings of the present system of industrial licensing and has come to the worthwhile conclusion that the deficiencies cannot be remedied by procedure or administrative changes. The recommendations ought to be looked at from socio-economic perspective.

*Interim Report on**and Licensinn Policin*

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai.]

Sir, I for one feel that the suggestion for achieving industrial targets through adjustment of broad policies of taxation, credit, prices and allocation of foreign exchange should be welcome.

Dr. Hazari has not faced the problem of retaining the licensing system and also bringing about delicensing sparsely. In this connection I would like to draw the attention of the Study Team of the Administrative Reforms which has said that the licensing system has not led to the achievement of the socio-economic objective for which it was designed. Dr. Hazari has also suggested that if licences cannot be given up completely, then there should be an exemption limit of a crore of rupees. He has also suggested to draw up a list of priority industries and that the Government should see that all the pre-requisite of implementing these schemes under those licences, namely, foreign exchange, collaboration, know-how, Indian resources etc. should, first of all, be assured to the parties concerned. I personally feel that this is a very welcome suggestion of Dr. Hazari.

There are certain controversial suggestions also. It says that certain traditional industrial activities should be closed in future to the specified ten or fifteen largest business groups and their associates. Another suggestion is one licence should be given to one group of industries. The third one is that a project of Rs. 1 crore and above should be considered only if the whole project is fully before the Government with all the necessary paraphernalia like foreign collaboration, foreign investment, rupee resources, raw material availability, etc. Just like when one wants to build a house, he prepares the plan in advance. This simile, according to me, is not befitting to the present industrial licensing system. And fourthly, he has suggested a system of package licence which is something like the tender system.

Now if we look to these suggestions, I personally feel that these are the suggestions which would retard the industrial progress of this country. Take, for example, the last one which says that you should give licences by the tender system, if the tender system is going to be adopted in this country, then all the objections which I heard here this morning are going to be perpetuated and still more strongly perpetuated than they are at present. Therefore, we will have to think in terms of other measures to bring about the socio-economic policy into function and operation, as, for example, our taxation policy, our price fixation policy, our foreign exchange availability—these are the things by which you can screw the industrialists who come for permission to have industries in this country.

Then, Sir, we have also to consider it from a larger perspective and in the light of what has been said by the Monopolies Inquiry Commission. Here I would like to draw the attention of my friends here in this House to what the Monopolies Inquiry Commission has said. Number one, "Big business has done much for the country's economic betterment and as a consequence, for the alleviation of the poor man's misery." Number two, "What little development there is owes much to the adventure and skill of a few men who have in the process succeeded also in becoming 'big business'. It is also fair to state that these men have gone on often to push forward development of further industries, which has been to the advantage of the country." Thirdly, "Big business has generally been able to supply over years considerable amount of managerial skill of high quality, so that production has been high, profits have been good and failures comparatively few in number." And number four, "Big business has been able to attract and obtain foreign collaboration and such collaboration has helped the starting of many new industries specially by supplying the essential machinery and technical know-how."

Now, Sir, much has been said in connection with the Hazari Report, in connection with the house of Birlas. I must frankly at the very outset say that I hold no brief for the house of Birlas. I only look to this question from the point of view of industrial development in this country. Therefore, whether the Birlas got more licences or not, whether the Birlas monopolised licences by some methods or not, I am not concerned. What I am concerned with is whether Messrs. Birlas implemented the licences they got or not or they produced wealth in this country or not. If they have produced wealth in this country, by all means we will have to congratulate them. And what is the position about the licences also? I personally know that some of the licences mentioned in Statement A of the Hazari Report are not Birla concerns at all. The Birlas have only a little financial interest in them. They have no voice in the management or decision-making. After all what is the definition of a corporate group? A corporate group is denned as "consisting of units which are subject to the decision-making power of a common authority." And I know for a fact that in certain ceases, there is no decision which the Birlas can take in those industries and, therefore, it would be wrong to say that those industries fall under the Birla Group of industries.

Now, Sir, I want to draw your attention to another point. Dr. Hazari, in his own report, has very grudgingly given a compliment at one place. He has said "Birla appears to have reduced the import component substantially." Is this not in the interest of the country and if they have done so, as Dr. Hazari himself has said, why should we grudge it? I think, Sir, this requires a closer attention of the hon. Members.

Then, Sir, the Birla group of industries, we are told, have got licences by cornering them and not allowed others to compete. This, I think, is an exaggerated picture. In

9\$ years of Industrial Licensing Policy, they have got 28 per cent of the licences no doubt. But they have, by and large, implemented this 28 per cent and have created wealth in this country.

Now, so far as the licensing system is concerned, it is not that it is in the hands of one man or two men or three men. The Licensing Committee consists of a representative of the Finance Ministry, a representative of the Industry Ministry, a representative of the Planning Commission, a representative of the Commerce Ministry and it also includes the Director of Industry of every State. . .

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: That is the danger. They are in their pocket

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: One of these days, I will not be surprised if I see you in their pocket. Therefore, to say that the Industry representative, the Commerce representative, the Finance representative, the Planning Commission representative and every Director of Industry of the States are in their pocket is rather an exaggeration and I think nobody would believe that. I can quite understand if one or two persons are their friends, but to say that everybody is in their pocket is, I think, very irrelevant and very uncharitable both to the House of Birlas and to those officers who have been functioning very honestly and sincerely and have put in hard work. Therefore, I would submit that it is not a fact.

Much has been said in connection with the bamboo supplied for the rayon julp factory in Kerala. As one who is in that line, I would like to throw some light on this. No doubt, the Birlas did offer Rs. 2.80 to the Kerala Government. But there is competition between State and State. No sooner the other States—especially the Chief Minister and the Industries Minister of other States—came to know that the Birlas wanted to put up a pulp factory, then they all

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai.]

rushed at Mr. Birla. They started offering all sorts of concessions to them. Any businessman in the place of Mr. Birla—even I, if I was there— would have asked for further concessions from the Kerala Government and it is in the fitness of things that Mr. Birla bargained and got it for Re. 1.

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU (Uttar Pradesh): All the States are at his feet?

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: It is not a question of all the States being at his feet . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Having agreed in letter that Rs. 2.80 would be the rate, is it bargain to ask for Re. 1?

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: Of course, why not? If the deal was not closed and negotiations were going on, Babubhai Chinai has every right to bargain with other States, especially the Kerala Government and get as low a price as possible. In our own case, I may tell you, we wanted to put up a pulp factory in Mysore, on behalf of the National Rayons. All the arrangements were made. We were then approached by two other States. And will you believe me, when we were going to Mysore, the then Minister of Industry thought we were foreigners in this country. In spite of that, in fairness to the Chief Minister of Mysore, he came to our help and ironed out everything. In the meanwhile, the capital market became stuck down. Another State came and offered us better terms. And we are planning to have an agreement with that State. Why should we not have it? Are we bound to go to Mysore even though we get better terms from another State? Certainly not. And therefore, Sir, what I would like to say is this. Please do not read too much into this; it is a fact that they got the rayon pulp at one rupee in place of Rs. 2.80.

Then, Sir, it has been said . . . (Time bell rings)

Sir, I have taken only ten minutes, and five minutes more remain.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): No, you have taken 14½ minutes so far. You started at 4.5.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: Well, Sir, it has been said that Rs. 42 crores worth of synthetic yarn was imported and that most of it went to Birlas. The latter—the reference to Birla's share of it—is far away from truth. Out of 2 lacs of looms in the country Birlas have about 300—400 looms only. Birlas do not use Rayon because indigenous Rayon is available.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: How do you know?

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: I am in the line; you do not know that. I am in the rayon line and Birlas have not got to use it, the rayon yarn. I am in the line and so I know it. I do not hold any brief for Birlas. If you so like, you may hang them; I am not going to come into your way. But let not anything wrong go on record, and let it not be said that what others have said is correct.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: What Mr. Babubhai Chinai says should be taken as hundred per cent correct.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: That is not the point. If Mr. Dharia thinks that whatever he says is correct on all occasions, we are not gullible enough to take it as always correct. Please bear this in mind. (Interruptions). If I am to be interrupted like this ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Order please.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: if I lose my time in this manner, you will have to make good the loss by giving me more time, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You have finished your time.

Interim Report on

and Licensing Policy

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: This is a matter, Sir, on which you should allow me to have my say. What I say, Sir, is . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Chinai, my difficulty is that if I allow extra time to everybody, we cannot finish the debate . . .

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: I agree; I only crave your indulgence for a few minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Two minutes at the most.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: Another point which I wanted to make was: After all what is our desire? After twenty years of independence are we really on our legs? Have you produced enough? Is there enough for everybody? Are we in a position to distribute our wealth? Are we in a position to distribute all that we are producing, to everybody? If not, and if you want to raise the standard of our people, we will have to depend upon many more industrialists. We will have to encourage them to produce more. After all power is with us and we can take away any big slice we like from them, by way of other means. Income-tax is at our disposal. All fiscal measures can be used. Price fixation is at our disposal. I do not know why we are worried. Let them produce as much as we need a thing and we will see that we take away from them any gains which we think are in excess of what they should legitimately have.

A point more and I have done. It is this. The Estimates Committee of Parliament is sitting over the Monopolies Commission report on industrial policy. They have had full discussion, they have discussed it; their report is in the drafting stage and I am told that their report will be ready in a couple of days. When that report is ready and comes before us, that will be the proper time when we can discuss

whether really there is any monopoly in this country. When that is so, why should we be in a hurry to appoint a committee of Parliament Members, I do not know. I do not think, Sir, that it will serve any purpose. If you want to make a scape-goat of anybody, I have nothing to say, But I am totally opposed to the appointment of any commission; I am totally opposed to the appointment of any committee, as suggested by your good-self, consisting of Members of Parliament. It is not because I want to protect anybody, but it is because I feel that since the Estimates Committee's report is going to come up before Parliament, why not wait and see whether there is any truth in what has been said on the floor of this House. And then we will have ample opportunity to examine the issues threadbare.

What I want finally to say, Sir, is this. There are industrialists, several of them, in this country, big and small. There are certain, ten or fifteen, big industrialists who have done immense good to the country. There are three or four people, biggest industrialists, in the country. They have done also very good, in their own way, to this country. Please for God's sake do not make a scape-goat of them, do not accuse them alone and say that you have done something wrong. Thereby you will be accusing somebody to the exclusion of the rest. That is not the way for the matter to be treated. Don't pick up one man and say after twenty years that you have done something wrong. Where were you all these twenty years? Were you asleep for twenty years? When they have done such nice things for the country, please for God's sake allow them to do what is good for the country, and do not fall a victim to the impression of jealousy against them which seems to be the case with some people. Please see that justice is done to everybody in the interests of the country. I appeal to you and through you to all Members to consider that, in order to have better conditions in the country, industrial development is a must. And

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai.]

who will be able to advance the industrial development of the country? It is those who have got the resources, those who have got collaboration arrangements with foreign countries, those collaborators who have established a name and who can bring foreign exchange, and also those who have got the know-how. It is not I or you who will be able to effect the necessary industrial development of the country in different fields. Therefore, my submission is that I do not agree with the suggestion for the appointment of a committee or commission, and I therefore submit that it should not be accepted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): May I request hon. Members again to stick to their time so that it does not increase the length of the debate unnecessarily? Mr. Rajnarain. Twenty minutes.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, हमारे बाद ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : आपके बाद नहीं । आप से ही ।

श्री राजनारायण : पहले हमको बाबुभाई चिनाईजी की बात कहनी पड़ रही है । मैं उनकी तारीफ कर दूँ कि इस समय एक कुशल मगर उलटे दिमाग के वकील की हैसियत से बिड़ला साहब की जितनी वकालत की जा सकती है उतनी वकालत बाबुभाई चिनाई जी ने की । मैं श्रीमन्, आप के द्वारा श्री बाबुभाई चिनाई या उनके समकक्ष विचारधारा रखने वाले लोगों से केवल इतना ही विनम्रतापूर्वक जानना चाहता हूँ कि जिस संविधान की उन्होंने शपथ ली है, क्या वह संविधान ग्रंथ मात्र भी पूरा हुआ है । जिस संविधान की शपथ ली है बाबुभाई चिनाई जी ने, उसमें साफ लिखा हुआ है :

"That the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment."

बिलकुल साफ लिखा है कि आर्थिक व्यवस्था का सृजन इस प्रकार होगा कि एकाधिपत्य सम्पत्ति का किसी एक के हाथ में नहीं होगा और उत्पादन के साधनों पर किसी का एकाधिपत्य नहीं होगा । बाबुभाई चिनाईजी ने कहा कि बिड़ला जी ने राष्ट्रीय सम्पत्ति में बढ़ावा दिया । राष्ट्र की सम्पत्ति में बढ़ावा हो जाय और बाबुभाई चिनाईजी सब को हड़प लें और यहां जितने 249 बंटे हैं, सब बेकार हो जायें, इनकी अंतर्द्वियों तक तिलमिलती रहें, तो क्या मैं यह समझूँ कि यह उचित है । हम भी जानते हैं बिड़ला साहब ने सम्पत्ति बढ़ाई है मगर अपने लिये ज्यादा बढ़ाई है और उसका डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन नहीं हुआ है जब कि यहां पर बिलकुल साफ लिखा है कि उचित डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन भी करना हमारा लक्ष्य है ।

बिड़ला की हैसियत अंग्रेजी राज्य में केवल 25 करोड़ की थी । इस समय बिड़ला की हैसियत जो मानोपली कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है उसके अनुसार 292 करोड़ 72 लाख की है । उसमें बहुत सी चीजें छूटी हुई हैं । अगर सब को जोड़ा जाय तो मैं समझता हूँ कि शायद इस समय वह टाटा को टाप करेगा ।

इस हजारों रिपोर्ट में बहुत सी बातें कही गई हैं । हम उन आंकड़ों में इस समय जाना नहीं चाहेंगे । भूपेश जी ने जो आंकड़े पेश किये, चन्द्रशेखर जी ने जो आंकड़े पेश किये और श्रीमन्, जो आप ने पार्लियामेंट के एक सदस्य की हैसियत से आंकड़े पेश किये और त्रिलोकी सिंह जी ने जो आंकड़े पेश किये, मैं उन सब के साथ हूँ । जो आंकड़े लिखे हुये हैं हजारों कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में, उनको हम आखिर में पढ़ दंगे, हमको दो मिनट का समय और दे दीजियेगा ।

मैं माननीय चन्द्रशेखर जी की भावनाओं की कद्र करते हुये उनसे कहना चाहूंगा कि चन्द्रशेखर जी जरा इस पर धीरज से सोचें कि आखिर यह हुआ क्यों ? यह बाबुभाई चिनाई जी ने बहुत सही बात कही कि बीस वर्ष

तक क्या सोते थे, क्या सारी आर्थिक स्थिति पर पलथी मार कर के यह कांग्रेस सरकार बैठ गई थी। अगर सही प्रब्लम को किसी ने टच किया, तो माननीय त्रिलोकी सिंह साहब ने टच किया। उन्होंने बिलकुल सही प्रब्लम को टच किया जब कि उनर प्रदेश की एक घटना का उन्होंने वर्णन किया कि जब वहां की शुगर फेडरेशन के चेयरमैन बिड़ला साहब थे तब 1952 में 3 करोड़ रुपया कांग्रेस कमेटी को चुनाव लड़ने के लिये चन्दा चीनी के मिल मालिकान ने दिया था। 25 करोड़ मन गन्ना पेला गया था और उससे जितनी चीनी बनी, उस पर एक रुपया फी मन चीनी के हिसाब से तीन करोड़ रुपया आता है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि उस समय माननीय चन्द्रशेखर जी कहाँ थे।

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : आप के साथ थे।

श्री राजनारायण : सही बात है। उस समय हमारे साथ थे, धारिया साहब भी थे। मैं उनसे यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि बन्धुओं, गलत जगह बैठे हों, फिर हमारे साथ आ जाओ। क्योंकि जब से तुमने हमारा साथ छोड़ दिया तब से बुद्धि-विभ्रमजन्य भ्रान्ति में विवरण करने लगे हो, सत्य को पकड़ नहीं पा रहे हो सत्य को पकड़ने के लिए . . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : सत्य को ही तो पकड़ रहे हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : उस सत्य को पकड़ने के लिए एक किताब है मॉन्ट्रियो की 'कम्पेन', उसके 249 पेज पर कुछ लिखा है, उसको पढ़ें देता हूँ :

It was agreed that Mr. Justice Das's verdict would be final and binding, but Mr. Deshmukh reserved to himself the right to refuse to submit any further cases to him for informal scrutiny if he was dissatisfied with the initial finding. This option Mr. Deshmukh is now reported to have exercised. He is belie-

vea to have communicated to Mr. Nehru the reasons for his dissatisfaction with Mr. Justice Das's finding, as well as his decision not to submit any more cases to the former Chief Justice. According to usually reliable sources, the instance of political inpropriety referred to Mr. Justice Das related to the employment by a leading industrialist of a senior Central Minister's son."

"

I सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेन्ट के एक मिनस्टर का एक लड़का है, उसको एक बड़े पूंजीपति ने अपने रोजगार में कहीं लगा रखा है। उतने यहाँ तक लिखा है कि उसकी अवस्था 30 बरस है, उसमें इतनी योग्यता नहीं थी कि मैनेजिंग डाइरेक्टर का पद सम्भाल सके। शिवहरा शुगर मिल किसकी है, उसका मैनेजिंग डाइरेक्टर कौन एपॉइन्ट हुआ इसका पता लगाइए। मैं नाम नहीं कहना चाहता। शायद उसमें भूतपूर्व गृह मंत्री पंडित गोविन्द वल्लभ पंत का नाम आया और उनका लड़का आया जो अब कैबिनेट में है। मैं एक वाक्य पढ़े देता हूँ, उसको सुन लें। इस सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य चले गए हैं। जब मैं डा० लोहिया का नाम बता हूँ तो उनके सीने पर साँप लोटने लगता है कि सब चीज के आरीजिनेटर डा० लोहिया हैं। यह 'जन' है मासिक पत्रिका, डा० लोहिया इसके प्रधान सम्पादक हैं, इसके सम्पादक मण्डल में मेरा भी नाम है, एकलव्य—यह 1958 है, 'बिड़ला रहस्य'—एक लेख छापा 'जन' ने तो बिड़ला के काले कारनामों का पर्दा खुला। दूसरे तमाम आंकड़े हमारे दफ्तर में मौजूद थे और सारे कारनामों का पर्दा खुलने जा रहा था। 'जन' ने 'बिड़ला रहस्य' लेख छापा तो बिड़ला जी के परम मित्र माननीय गोविन्द वल्लभ पंत, भारत सरकार के गृह मंत्री गुस्सा हो गए और दिल्ली में पुलिस को आर्डर मिला कि वह 'जन' पत्रिका की जांच पड़ताल करे और पता लगाए 'एकलव्य' कौन है—“भारत में आज जो भी धीमी आवाज अफसरशाही कांग्रेसी कुशासन के दुःशासनों के खिलाफ उठ रही है उसे दबाने की

[श्री राजना रायण]

हर तरह की कोशिशें सरकार और औद्योगिक प्रतिष्ठानों के शिखर स्थित सज्जन करते हैं। श्रीमन् यह डाकूमेंट है जिसे मैं सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों की सेवा में उपस्थित कर रहा हूँ। जांच करें हमारे जन के कार्यालय को किस तरह से गृह मंत्री के आदेश पर कागजों को उठा ले जाया गया, किस तरह से घुस कर हमारे दरवाजे तोड़ गए। इसकी जांच पड़ताल करा-इए। मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या हमारे 'हिन्डलको' हिन्दुस्तान एल्युमिनियम कार्पोरेशन में 25 दिसम्बर 1965 को जो वहाँ का कोठारी है, बिड़ला का दुलारा लाड़ला है उसने डंडा नहीं चलवाया। उसने हमारे ऊपर डंडा चलवाया था—मेरे ऊपर जिसको आज आपके साथ बैठने का अवसर प्राप्त है। वहाँ के मजदूरों को जितना शोषण कैसर से मिलकर बिड़ला कर रहा है उतना शोषण दुनिया के मजदूर आन्दोलन के इतिहास में कहीं नहीं हो रहा है। जब मिर्जापुर में पानी की कमी है, बिजली का होना बन्द हो रहा है, बिहार के डी० पी० सी०, दामोदर वैली प्रांटी से बिजली बिड़ला के कारखाने को मिलती है 2 पैसे यूनिट और वही दूसरों को दी जाती है 30 से 32 पैसे यूनिट। बाबुभाई चिनाई की इस बात की मैं तारीफ करता हूँ कि उन्होंने एक बात की तारीफ कि कि बिड़ला के अकल है। कांग्रेस सरकार को बेवकूफ बना कर अपना निज हित साधन करने में माहिरत हासिल की है तो बिड़ला ने। मैं कैसे कहूँ कांग्रेसी सरकार बेवकूफ थी। कांग्रेस सरकार का ऐसा कौन मंत्री है जो एक न एक तरीके से कहीं न कहीं किसी न किसी पूँजीपति से लगा रहता है। कोई एक बता तो दो। इसलिए मैं भाई चन्द्रशेखर और धारिया जी से और अर्जुन अरोड़ा से भी कहता हूँ कि भाई साहब जांच इसकी भी होनी चाहिए। इसीलिए हमने अपने संशोधन में लिखा है कि जो कमीशन इस सदन के सदस्यों का बने वह जिस मंत्री को चाहे, जिस अफसर को चाहे,

जिस कागज को चाहे उसे साक्षी के लिए उसके सामने आना पड़ेगा। अगर आप नाम गिनाने के लिए कहेंगे तो मैं बहुत से नाम गिना दूंगा। चाहे वह शान्ति प्रसाद जैन हों, चाहे बिड़ला हों, चाहे टाटा हों, चाहे और कोई कन्सर्न हो, एक न एक प्रकार से मंत्री के रिश्तेदार, उनके बेटे, उनके नाती, उनके पोते कहीं न कहीं किसी न किसी कम्पनी में खपाए जा रहे हैं और इसी खपाए जाने की बजह से आज सारी बंगलिंग हो रही है। सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि श्री नेहरू की जानकारी में क्या यह बात नहीं थी, क्या कैरों का मामला नहीं था, क्या बिजू पटनायक का मामला नहीं था ? सारे मामलों भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री की जानकारी में थे, कांग्रेस के बड़े बड़े लोगों की जानकारी में थे। मोरारजी भाई बैठे हैं। क्या तेजा के बारे में जब बम्बई के एक मित्र ने पत्र लिखा था तो उसे मोरारजी ने प्रधान मंत्री को नहीं दिया था, जिसमें उसने लिखा था कि डा० तेजा बेईमान है, धूर्त है। हमने वह चिट्ठी मोरारजी को भेजी, जब वह फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर थे और मोरारजी भाई ने प्राइम मिनिस्टर को दी। इस सदन में हमने उसे पढ़ दिया था।

SHRI S. S. MATRISWAMY: I am afraid Shri Morarji Desai has not understood you. Please tell him again.

श्री राजना रायण : मैं समझता हूँ कि मोरारजी हमको खूब समझते हैं। इस सदन में मैं वह चिट्ठी पढ़ चुका हूँ, चाहेंगे तो फिर कापी भेज दूंगा। डा० तेजा के बारे में बम्बई के एक सज्जन ने लिखा था कि वह मेरे साथ 1946 से रहता रहा है, वह धूर्त है, उसने डाक्टरेट नहीं की है, इस पर यकीन मत करना और पैसा न देना। यह चिट्ठी उन्होंने जवाहरलाल जी के हाथ में दी और यह जानते हुए डा० तेजा को 20 करोड़ कई लाख रुपए का ऋण दिया गया जब डा० तेजा के पास पेड-अप कैपिटल 200 रुपए थी।

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI) May I say that I have no knowledge of all this?

श्री राजनारायण : यह मोरारजी कह रहे हैं। वह चिट्ठी हमारे पास रखी है। जब हमने उसे इस सदन में पढ़ा था, आप उस समय मंत्रिमंडल में नहीं थे, दूसरी स्थिति में थे। श्रीमन्, मैं बहुत ही सफाई से कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस की सरकार इतनी भ्रष्ट हो चुकी है, इतनी पतित हो चुकी है, इतनी सभी मान्यताओं, सीमाओं को तोड़ चुकी है कि त्रिलोकी सिंह का यह कहना बहुत सही है कि जब तक कांग्रेस की सरकार केन्द्र में कायम रहती है तब तक इस देश की किसी भी समुचित तरक्की की कल्पना इन्सान को अपने दिमाग में नहीं लानी चाहिए।

हमारे यहां बड़े बड़े तर्क दिए जाते हैं कि बिड़ला ने धन को बढ़ा दिया। धन को बढ़ाया तो कहा गया। हजारी कमेटी की रपट में लिखा हुआ है कि लाइसेंस प्रदान करने के लिए जितनी मान्यताएं हैं बिड़ला को लाइसेंस देने में उन सब को तोड़ा गया है। फाइनेंस कारपोरेशन ने आउट आफ वे जाकर बिड़ला को धन दिया है, सरकार के मंत्रियों, बड़े बड़े उद्योगपतियों और बड़े-बड़े अफसरों की साठ-गांठ से बिड़ला को धन कमवाने की सारी साजिश हुई है। यह क्या हजारी कमेटी की रपट में नहीं है ?

हम उन को सुना दे, हमको थोड़ा समय चेयर दे दे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महाबीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : 15 मिनट आपके हो चुके हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : दो मिनट जब रह जायें तब आप बता दें। जब बतायेंगे तो हम पढ़ना शुरू करेंगे आगे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महाबीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : पांच मिनट पहले ही बता दे रहा हूँ।

श्री राजनारायण : इसमें यह है :

"The data suffer from severe limitations, as set out later in para 11.

Briefly the data are partial, incomplete and in some cases not fully reliable. They should be taken as rough indicators of magnitudes, not precise amounts."

यह लिखा हुआ है कि लाइसेंसिंग कमेटी के पास सारी फिगरें नहीं हैं। लाइसेंसिंग कमेटी के पास इम्पोर्ट कांम्पोनेंट्स के सारे आंकड़े नहीं हैं। इम्पोर्ट कांम्पोनेंट्स के बारे में यह आंकड़े जानना चाहते हैं, मैं उनको सुना दूँ।

सन् 1957 से जून 1966 तक के समय में बिड़ला ने 938 आवेदन पत्र दिये जिसमें प्रस्तावित लागत का डाटा केवल 472 आवेदन पत्रों के लिये सुलभ है। इन आवेदन पत्रों की पूर्ण प्रस्तावित रकम 496 करोड़ रुपये की थी जिसमें 313 करोड़ रुपये का इम्पोर्ट कांम्पोनेंट था। लाइसेंसिंग कमेटी ने 375 आवेदन पत्रों पर स्वीकृति प्रदान की जब कि 240 का ही इन्वेस्टमेंट डाटा प्राप्त है।

375 में से 240 का इंडस्ट्री मिनिस्टर साहब कहां बैठे हैं। इन 240 की स्वीकृति में 159 करोड़ रुपये के इम्पोर्ट कम्पोनेंट को ले कर 246 करोड़ रुपये की लागत सम्मिलित है। अगर 375 आवेदन पत्रों की रफ फिगर का अंदाज इसी प्राप्त स्वीकृति के आधार पर लगाया जाय तो 248 करोड़ इम्पोर्ट कांम्पोनेंट और 3845 रुपया कैपिटल इन्वेस्टमेंट होगा।

यह सब कहा गया। यों ही बिना लाइसेंस प्राप्त करने के लिये पूरे कागजातों के बिड़ला को लाइसेंस दिया गया और इसमें लिखा हुआ है कि जितने डेफर कर दिये गये लाइसेंस उसको दूसरों से ज्यादा प्रिफरेंस दे करके लिस्ट में रख दिया गया, वॉटिंग लिस्ट में नम्बर वन में रख दिया गया बनिस्बत दूसरों के यह बिड़ला के साथ रियायत क्यों हुई। किसने की। त्रिलोकी सिंह, भूपेश गुप्त ने किया, चन्द्र शेखर ने किया, या राजनारायण ने किया।

[श्री राजनारायण]

किसने किया। यही जो भारत माता की छाती पर कांग्रेस दल बैठा है। मेरा निवेदन इस सम्बन्ध में केवल इतना है:

"If the applications are rejected or deferred for subsequent consideration, they remain on the waiting list against future licensing, ahead of new applications from others."

यह पेज 12 पर लिखा हुआ है, अंग्रेजी अगर जानते हों तो पढ़ लें। फिर आगे यह है:

"Application for the free list, as it stands from time to time, do not come before the Licensing Committee. Such applications and approvals are not included in the data analysed here. It is reasonable to suppose that the number of such applications and approvals might be considerable."

श्री ओम मेहता (गुजरात) : हिन्दी में मतलब समझाइये।

श्री राजनारायण : यह समझाने को हम ही रह गये हैं, समझायेंगे तो फिर सब रह जायगा। अनुवाद हो रहा है।

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : गड़िये मत, अपनी बात कहिये।

श्री राजनारायण : बात मैं अपनी यह कह रहा हूँ कि जो लोग सही तरीके से इसको जानना चाहते हैं तो हमारे "जन" में एक लेख में मथाई और बिड़ला के नाम से एक आर्टिकल छना हुआ है, उसको देखें। जिस मथाई के लेटर को यहाँ पर प्रोड्यूस किया था उस मथाई के सम्बन्ध में भी बहुत कुछ लिखा हुआ है क्योंकि समाचारपत्रों ने कुछ यहाँ के पूँजी-पतियों के खिलाफ, अफसरों के खिलाफ राज खोला। मथाई साहब उबल पड़े और कहा कि ऐसा करोगे तो हम तुमको ठोक कर देंगे, लिखा देंगे। पूरी की पूरी स्थिति यहाँ है।

अगर ईमानदारी के साथ इस सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य अपने कर्तव्यों का पालन करना चाहते हैं तो सत्य को छिपाये नहीं। मैं जानता नहीं कि हमारे भाई अरोड़ा साहब ने किन दो लोगों का नाम पेश किया है। हमने उनसे निकालने की कोशिश की लेकिन उन्होंने दोनों का नाम नहीं बताया, उन्होंने यहाँ कहा कि हमने नाम प्राइम मिनिस्टर को दे दिया है, नाम प्राइम मिनिस्टर को दे दिया है, यही बराबर कहा, हमने कोशिश बहुत की जानने की कि वह दो नाम हैं क्या। मोरारजी भाई को मैं साक्षी बनाता हूँ, पार्लियामेंटरी पद्धति का साक्षी बन कर हमें बताये कि कांग्रेस पार्टी का एक लीडिंग मेम्बर जिसने पार्लियामेंटरी पद्धति में अपना जीवन खपाया है जब वह कहता है कि कैबिनेट के दो मिनिस्टर बिड़ला से पैसा लेते हैं, उनकी तनख्वाह लिस्ट में है तो क्या वह कैबिनेट के बारे में देश की जनता का विश्वास रहेगा। क्या उस कैबिनेट को अपने चेहरे को साफ करना कर्तव्य नहीं होता है और बिना उस चेहरे का साफ किये हुये यहाँ पर लम्बी चौड़ी तकरीरें होती हैं, शर्म आनी चाहिये, डूब मरना चाहिये। अगर जनतंत्र और संसदीय परम्परा का तनिक भी ज्ञान होता तो मोरारजी भाई इस तरह यहाँ आने से पहले इस्तीफा देते। उनको कहना था। (Time bell rings) क्योंकि मोरारजी भाई अपने को गांधियन ट्रेडिशन का कहते हैं। गांधी का ट्रेडिशन क्या है। हम सत्य हैं केवल इतना ही काफी नहीं है दूसरे जाने भी कि हम सत्य हैं यह भी जरूरी है।

आपने घंटी बजा दी है। तो हजारों की रिपोर्ट पर यहाँ बहस होने से तभी कुछ फायदा हो सकता है जब हजारों की रपट से जो बात निकल रही है उसकी पूरी पूरी जांच हो और मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि उसमें इंक्यूड होना चाहिये हर मंत्री के बारे में मैं उनका नाम नहीं लेना चाहता। हमारे पुराने बिहार से आने वाले साथी है, उनको कोई पोर्टफोलियो मिला नहीं है। आम चर्चा

हे कि बिड़ला से इनके अच्छे सम्बन्ध हैं। हो सकता है कि अच्छे सम्बन्ध हों। अच्छे सम्बन्ध हैं तो उसको जरा ढूँढ़ें। मैं एक चीज और पढ़ देता हूँ। जरा इस मॉडेल को पढ़ लीजिये।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : कहां से पढ़ते हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : एक "करप्शन" की यह किताब है, मॉडेलरियों की लिखी हुई :

"Mr. Deshmukh's point was reported to be that this man, not yet 30, had been made Managing Director and given a conspicuously high salary which he would not normally have got but for his father's position. In holding that there was nothing improper in his appointment, Mr. Justice Das is believed to have based his verdict on the evidence of the industrialist concerned who testified that he had in his employ more than 125 young men drawing salaries comparable to the Minister's son."

बिड़ला साहब से यह भी कहा कि तुम दो एक की बात क्यों करते हो, हमारे पास 125 से ज्यादा आदमी हैं। और आगे श्री देशमुख के बारे में बिड़ला साहब ने कहा है, देशमुख जो बड़ी लम्बी चौड़ी हांक रहे हैं मगर आपकी बीबी दो लाख रुपया पा रही है:—

"According to another paper, the industrialist is said to have retorted that nobody could object to his exercising his rights as an employer and pointed out to the Rs. 2,000.00 ..."

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: Rs. 2,000.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: It is two lakhs.

"...salary drawn by Mrs. Durgabai Deshmukh, Mr. Deshmukh's wife as a Government employee. Mr. Deshmukh was reported to have been irritated by the tone of the industrialist's letter and the way he boasted about 127 highly connected young men and written to the Prime Minister ..."

उस समय भी प्राइम मिनिस्टर को लिखा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : अब खत्म कीजिये।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन् जरा खयाल कीजिये।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : हजारों रिपोर्ट डिसकस कर रहे हैं, यह सब नहीं डिसकस कर रहे हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : इसमें से निकलता है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : नहीं निकल रहा है।

श्री राजनारायण : हजारों को ऐसी रिपोर्ट देने की आवश्यकता क्यों पड़ी। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हजारों को कोई जरूरत ही नहीं थी अगर यह सरकार सभ्य होती, अगर यह सरकार देश की जनता के प्रति अपने कर्तव्य को जानती, अगर यह सरकार कांस्टीट्यूशन के प्रति बफादार होती, अगर यह सरकार 1951 ई० में जो इंडस्ट्रियल रेगुलेशन एक्ट पास हुआ और जिसमें यह कहा गया था कि किसी भी प्रकार से मानोपोली को बढ़ने नहीं देना चाहिये और किसी भी प्रकार से वेल्थ कंसंट्रेशन नहीं होना चाहिये उसको समझती, तो हजारों की यह रिपोर्ट नहीं होती। इसके बारे में यह भंडाफोड़ हुआ क्यों, मैं आपकी खिदमत में पेश कर रहा हूँ। सालों से यह कांग्रेस के लोग जानते थे लेकिन आज विवाद क्यों हो रहा है। (*Time bell rings*) दो मिनट का समय दे दीजिये। मेरी जानकारी है, सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य सुनें, हमें ऐसा बताया गया है कि बिड़ला साहब कैबिनेट में किसी आदमी को इनक्लूड कराना चाहते थे, कैबिनेट में उस आदमी को इनक्लूड कर देने से इंटर्नल कांर्ट्रिब्यूशन बड़ा व्यापक हो जाता, नाम मैं जानता हूँ बताऊंगा नहीं इस समय। इसलिये बिड़ला साहब मौजूदा प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी से कुछ खिलाफ हो गये

[श्री राजनारायण]

श्रीर इसलिये प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी से लगे हुये जो सभी लोग हैं उन्होंने बड़ा हल्ला मचाना शुरू कर दिया, वरना यह कोई तरीका है, यह कोई तुक है कि जब सदन में उसके लिये विवाद का समय निश्चित है, जिस पर सदन में विवाद करना है, उसको आप अखबारों में पहले ही प्रचार करने के लिये मौका दें, दो दिन पहले कांग्रेस पार्लियामेंटरी पार्टी को बैठक होती है और वहां का समय नष्ट कराया जाता है यह दिखाने के लिये कि बिड़ला के सम्बन्ध में कांग्रेस पार्टी के लोगों ने भी पहले हू एंड आई मचाई। अरे, कांग्रेस पार्टी के लोग देश के नाम पर, जनता के नाम पर, गरीबों के नाम पर, जहां कि देहात की आसत आमदनी, फी आदमी गिरती जा रही है, जहां पर 30 करोड़ लोग तीन आना रोख पर फी आदमी पल रह है, वहां बिड़ला परिवार की आमदनी 8 करोड़ रुपये रोजाना है। क्या यह समाजवाद है, जनतंत्र है? इसलिये श्रीमन्, मैं आपका ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता। बिड़ला के हाथ में जो धन का एक्कीकरण हुआ है उसके लिये सारे का सारा दोष कांग्रेस सरकार का है, सारे का सारा दोष मंत्रियों का है, सारे का सारा दोष कांग्रेस पार्टी का है जिसमें, करोड़पतियों के नोट से गरीबों के वोट को खरीदने की साजिश है। कांग्रेस पार्टी में आधे से ज्यादा सदस्य ऐसे हैं जो बिड़ला से 10,000 रु०, 20,000 या 50,000 रु० लेकर चुनाव लड़ते हैं। करोड़पतियों के वोट से गरीबों के वोट को खरीदने की साजिश और उनके वोट को खरीद कर अल्पमत को बहुमत बनाने वाली सरकार उन्हीं के नोटों की हिफाजत कर रही है : (Interruption). हजारी को क्या कहेंगे—उसने अच्छा काम किया इस देश में जो धन का एक्कीकरण हो रहा है उनके विरुद्ध आवाज बुलन्द की।

इसलिये मैं अपने प्रस्ताव श्री संशोधन के साथ माननीय मोरारजी और श्री चन्द्र-

शेखर और दूसरे लोगों से विनम्रतापूर्वक निवेदन करूंगा कि बिना किसी चूंचपड़ के, जो यह प्रस्ताव है कि संसद के दोनों सदनों के सदस्यों की एक समिति बनानी चाहिये, उस समिति को अधिकार देना चाहिये, जिस मंत्री, जिस आफिसर, जिस व्यक्ति से कागजात देखना चाहिये वह सारे का सारा उसको सुलभ हो। उस समिति का निर्माण कर दिया जाय और मैं इस बात से भी सहमत हो जाऊंगा कि केवल एक बिड़ला ही क्या सब उद्योगपतियों का मामला उसमें सम्मिलित कर दिया जाय तो मामला साफ हो जायेगा।

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are discussing today the Hazari Report and there are two terms of reference. One is the licensing procedure and the other is the number of licences granted to Birlas during the last two years. So many eminent speakers have spoken today and, while leading my support to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and Mr. Chandra Shekhar, I bring to the notice of the House that we should have so much heat generated on the political side of this problem. Let me take the House to the real, serious problem of the licensing policy and the need to change the same. The licensing policy has been evolved on the Directive Principles of the Constitution and the Industrial Policy Resolution has declared that there should be regulation of industrial development and resources, that concentration and monopoly should be avoided, that new entrepreneurs be ushered in, that small industries should be protected and that regional balance be maintained. If I go on the principles enunciated in the Industrial policy Resolution and look into the Hazari Report, I see an Uttar disappointment that the Government have not done anything and the licensing policy, by their present methods, is encouraging the big capitalists instead of being curbed. If you see the picture

of the licences issued and the quantum of licences issued, you will find that the large and medium industries have increased from 30 to 60 per cent in respect of the capital invested. What does this show? Is it going to help the small industries or other industries whatsoever? In this respect may I bring to the notice of the House the fact that all these things are being manoeuvred by the big capitalist people by opening their liaison offices in Delhi. What I object to is the opening of these offices in Delhi, whereby they corrupt the officers and influence the Government's decisions. Licences are being blocked and the capacity is shut out to other small industries. In this context, may I bring to your notice that even in regard to industrial licensing there is a clause that ancillary industries will be taken up by the licensees under the Industries Act. The House will note with surprise that these ancillary industries at present are not there in practice. Whatever ancillary industries have been opened by these big capitalists belong to their sons-in-law or other relatives, thus opening up a new avenue for getting more money.

I may say that the Hazari Report has also brought out that Birla's licences have been obtained in various fictitious firms' names, which have got no existence, whose capital will match with Teja's capital or any other hoax company. May I say that while giving licences, if the policy had been rational, if the policy had been real these malpractices could have been curbed? I, therefore, plead with this House that there should be a basic change in the industrial licensing policy to suit our underdeveloped country and the need for this country to attain the socialistic pattern of society. In this connection, may I bring it for the consideration of the House that if you are to achieve economic equality in a very short time and if you want to open opportunities to all new-comers and entrepreneurs, you will have to make a basic change and that change can be made by

rigidly controlling and not by decontrolling the licensing procedure? You should rigidly control the licensing procedure in compartments. I may say that the big industries, up till now, for the last seventeen years have been thriving on a sheltered market in this country, and the consumer has been fleeced to earn more and more profits. In this respect I may suggest that a tight compartment is made that the large and medium scale industries in this country should export 75 per cent of their production and then give them whatever concessions they want. Give them all the raw materials, at whatever international prices they demand. Make them to export so that their up-to-date machinery and all their automatic machinery will be geared to this purpose. The rest of the production, mainly consumer items, should be distributed between the small-scale industries and the agro-industries on a co-operative basis—May I again suggest that all food processing industries and all agricultural processing industries should be reserved for cooperatives and these processing industries should not be open for any other type or sector, whether private or public?

[THE DEPUTY CHAIBMAN in the Chair]

I also bring to the notice of the House that we have got certain public sector industries, but unless we could devise a public distribution system, we would again fall a prey to the same calamity wherein the traders and the capitalists take the benefit of shortages and increase prices to » great extent. In this connection, I may say that if a public distribution system is evolved and mainly co-operatives are used for distributing the daily needs of consumer items, the country will get fairplay and such types of calamities will not occur.

I also bring to the notice of the House that all these things are being done because 99 per cent of the credit institutions are in the hands of these capitalists like Birlas. If I may say

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni.]

so, the small industries, which require about Rs. 1000 to Rs. 3000 crores for their working capital, are getting barely 6 per cent of their capital needs. I may also point in regard to big capitalists, if you look into the share market and the stock market, you will see that between 5 and 10 per cent of the equity capital is raised out of the resources available from these banks and they are able to capture an industry worth crores of rupees. It has been found amply by the economics of this country that the small industries are investing 58 per cent of their equity capital in the industry. Please see the big difference. The small industry is investing 58 per cent and creating genuine interest in the industry, while these capitalists, with five to ten per cent of their investment, are capturing a very big industry. Thus they have got no stake in the industry. They have got no stake in this nation. They have got no stake in the teemunity. That is why I challenge this type of system. I do request the House to note that unless control is brought about, unless socialisation is done of these credit institutions, no such monopolies are going to be wiped out, there will be not only Birlas but others. There will be hundreds of Birlas if we are not going to control these credit institutions. That is why I say that this capital, after being brought from the credit institutions, must be socially controlled, must be controlled by the Government for the community. Otherwise, such types of things will always take place. I again

say that there is another 5 P.M. loophole. Please have a

look at the Directorate of the R.B.T., that is the Reserve Bank of India, I have seen the I.C.I.C.I. and all these things. Is there any iota of social thinking in all these directors? I have seen credit being denied to the co-operatives. Why? Because the Directors sitting on the Board have got no faith in the small man. They think he has got no credit worthiness, that the co-

operators have got no experience. I bring it to the notice of the House that it is necessary that some radical change takes place in the thinking of the Government as regards the appointment of the Directors of the Reserve Bank of India or the I.F.C. or the I.C.I.C.I. or the L.I.C. I will give you an instance. This L.I.C. has got an Investment Committee. Who is sitting on the Investment Committee? Had I seen a respectable man like Shri Chandra Shekhar sitting on the Committee, I would have thought that socialisation was coming in. (Interruption.) But such people will not find a place there.

In this regard I bring another example. When I visited Japan and America I saw how the small industries were developed, how the credit institutions were utilised for the benefit of small industries. May I point out to this House that these big capitalists here give ancillary jobs in the engineering industry to the small workshops. They run their industry on the capital borrowed by the small industries. They are not taking delivery of the goods offered by the small industries run as ancillaries. Thereby the protection is not given to the small man. But in Japan and America the Government looks after the small industries. The Small-scale Industries Board has recommended all these things. But they are not coming up because of the present faulty method of the Government in industrial licensing and in industrial policy.

I have got only one more point to say. While all these things are being done, I do say again that I am supporting another of my friend here, Mr. M. P. Bhargava when he says that Birlas are not only capable of pocketing the Congress people but they are capable of pocketing the Communists also because what does the latest example of Mr. Namboodiripad show? A red carpet is being spread for them. That means, as Shri Babubhai Chinai also said, that all the State Governments are at the feet of Birlas.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: I never said that. What I said was that all the directors are amending the Licensing Committee. Therefore, they are taking part in it. All the State Chief Ministers want to develop their States and therefore they are also requesting Mr. Birla to come in.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: The hon. Member should know that after the disclosures in the Hazari Report the Chief Minister of Kerala, Mr. Namboodiripad, has written to the Central Government that these licences need not be given. They do not want that they should operate there. That is the position.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: I want to bring this to the notice of the hon. Member on the opposite side and I am giving this warning that the hands of these capitalist people are so long that they can even catch at your throat also. I request this House to consider the Hazari Report in this fashion and I would request the Government of India and particularly the Minister of Industrial Development, who have got all love for the small man, that unless you radically change your policy in the interests of the small-scale industries and the co-operatives, no socialism is going to be attained in this country.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Madam Deputy Chairman, much has been said about the figures and all the observations in the Hazari Report. I will confine myself to a few observations at first on the anomalies, discrepancies and all those things.

The objectives of proper industrial licensing policy are as follows:

- (a) Minimising the net aggregate foreign exchange cost of the industrial programme and making the best available use of foreign exchange.
- (b) Minimising the total cost of the industrial programme.
- (c) Maximising the total output (especially in the priority areas) in relation to given volume of investment and materials.

\$14 RS—8.

isut none of these objectives has been fulfilled by the Licensing Committee. The policy pursued by the Government has fulfilled none of these objectives. That is amply apparent from all those observations that have been detailed before the House by the different Members and which are before me. The facts brought to light by the Hazari Report clearly point this out. Licences were given for imported components worth Rs. 400 crores or Rs. 500 crores without taking into account the fact that this is not the end of the matter. When industries are set up, there is a recurrent demand for raw materials, spares and other intermediate products and this becomes a perennial drain on the foreign exchange resources of the country in order to operate these firms. This perennial drain amounts to another Rs. 500 crores or Rs. 600 crores. None of these was taken into consideration. As much as 60 per cent of the project investment is for import components.

The second point is, on the floor of the House the opposition raised the question that the licences have been cornered and the big business houses are getting the bulk of them. It was denied by the Government in 1963 and 1964. Now it seems that the Government misled the Parliament in denying that. It is fully evident from the Hazari Report. They have got the bulk. Only 20 houses have got almost 60 to 70 per cent of all the licences given and the major part of the investment proposed.

The Birlas utilising the State apparatus could strengthen their position in most of the sectors of industrial activity. The report highlights the point. Birlas spread their tentacles throughout India in all the States. That means that they are coming to have their grip on the different States of India. They are like an octopus gripping the Government of India as well as the State Governments.

The licensing authority has become a hunting ground for corrupt officials. Otherwise how can the discrepancies

[Shri Nirsan Ghosh].

arise? Licences were systematically used for clandestine profits by some business houses. The Hazari Report has only touched the fringe of the problem, not the entire problem. All the skeletons in the cupboard have not come out in the report.

Dr. Hazari noted, "the data on a number of applications and approvals analysed here are not expected to tally with those released periodically by the Ministry of Industry". So this means that the Ministry is doing something behind the back of the Licensing Committee, and it proves that there might be some Ministers on the payroll of the Birlas. Otherwise how can such things happen that the Licensing Committee Report and the report released by the Ministry do not tally. The House is entitled to know whether this is due to the tampering of the decisions of the Licensing Committee by certain officials of the Government or certain Ministers of the Government. Otherwise it is difficult to explain the discrepancy in the data on the number of applications approved by the Ministry and the Licensing Committee.

Dr. Hazari's report also observed: "The distinction between the three types of licences, new articles, substantial expansion and new undertaking, is not always clear in the available papers. Errors of recording and taking down the data are somewhat common in this area." Now, this is very serious allegation. It is clear, and anybody can understand the distinction between these. But the Ministry or the Licensing Committee does not seem to be aware of this; it seems to be unaware like a sleeping baby. Yet licensing involving hundreds of crores of rupees has been approved. It is being deliberately kept vague as to what is meant by new articles, expansion programmes, etc. It is being deliberately done. There is sufficient ground to believe that the vagueness is deliberately kept by industrialists in connivance

and Licensing Committee with the

officials to misuse the licences, even secretly selling them without changing the names of the owners.

Dr. Hazari found that the Birlas were given licences in 55 cases even without supplying the import content of the products. How the licences could be sanctioned by violating every principle that was to guide them passes one's comprehension. Birlas got more than 400 licences during the last decade, half of which were not utilised. Still new licences were issued to them in order to corner the market. This has been said. Cases of fictitious companies also obtaining import licences are there. Dr. Hazari says:

"There are as many as 119 cases with a foreign exchange allocation of Rs. 50 crores which do not figure in available Licensing Committee data."

Yet these licences were given. Who gave them, the Minister or the officials? Who are they? Dr. Hazari makes a statement of fact, but does not explain it. These things require to be known:

"... 29 were in cotton and coal for which there is a separate foreign exchange allocation procedure."

Still it is there; yet for these the Licensing Committee allocated foreign exchange. It is strange how these things could happen at all.

Then, Dr. Hazari gives an account of how Birlas entered into most of the industries and tried to corner them. That has been already narrated. There is need to study the entire problem and to find out the root cause of the scandal.

Now, I will come to certain concrete things, is it a fact that an ex-Commerce Secretary, after retirement, took up a job with the House of Birlas on a pay scale of Rs. 10,000 per month and is acting as their liaison in Delhi? It is for the Government to say.

„ Then, as regards tax evasion, let me give you certain figures. Some time ago, the Income-tax Investigation Commission found out tax evasion on the part of the House of Birlas. It is not merely a question of getting more licences, but of malpractices of Birlas, a vicious demon which is a threat to the democracy of India, the House of Birlas, and it is soaked in malpractices from beginning to end, all through:

	Rs. Cotton
Agents Ltd. . . .	1 crore 10 lakhs. Birla
Brothers Ltd. . . .	90 lakhs. Model Knitting
Ltd. . . .	15 lakhs.

These are all Birla concerns.

R. K. Kejriwal Groups,	Rs.
Binamdar of Birlas . . .	24 lakhs
Loyalka Groups	40 lakhs.
Birla Cotton Mills Ltd.	2 crores.
Orient Paper Mills Ltd.	2 crores.

These are the findings of the Income-tax Investigation Commission. And there is the question of how they cheated the public exchequer. When their Bharat Airways were nationalised, they had only an asset of something like Rs. 15 to Rs. 20 lakhs. It was inflated to Rs. 1,50,00,000 or nearabout and they cheated the public exchequer to that extent. For that purpose, they indulged in the practice of double invoicing. Here is the thing. I tell you, there is a purchasing agent in Washington. This is a set of double invoices, this is the copy.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is this?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: This is the invoice of the Birla House; it is a copy of the double invoicing that they have indulged in. Here it is.

Now, there is another thing. You will see how they indulged in malpractices. This is as regards the Orient Paper Mills. This is a letter written by Mr. P. N. Lala to the Manager of the Orient Paper Mills at their Calcutta Office:—

"My dear Kanoriaji,

I am enclosing herewith a copy of Mills' letter No. SLS/1/2471 dated 18-8-54 in connection with

the rates we revised for Calcutta Distributors.

As we have no record to show central Excise authorities regarding the changes in rates, please arrange to send me per return copies of your letters to the parties (VLT, NTC, Ashok Trading Corporation and the Distributors) stating about the revision in rates by you. The letter should be back-dated and numbered and should also be corresponding to the numbers in force then, i.e., in August, 54. We have been charging these special rates till very recently as per our letter, stated above, i.e., from August, 54 onwards. If you like, you may also send us original letters from the parties, which should also be back-dated as 16.8.54.

Please treat this as extremely urgent as we are expecting a checkup of all our bills and acceptance notes by the Excise authorities for supplies made during the period when *ad valorem* duty was enforced."

Messrs. VLT, NTC, etc. are all Birla binamidars. This is another Birla thing. About the Kejriwal Groups, I have already mentioned. Then there is the case of their mill, the Birla Textile Mill, at Bhiwani. It is a recent case.

"It is reliably understood that due to the fraudulent means adopted by this textile mill the exchequer has suffered a loss of about Rs. two lakhs in excise duty due to unauthorized changes made in production specifications of dhoties by the mill; the length of dhoties were changed from the authorised 4J- metres to an unauthorized 3J metres.

Acting upon information from undisclosed source, Central Excise men carried out a surprise inspection of the mill premises a few days ago and unearthed the fraud that was being perpetrated on the Government as well as the people of the country."

This was only a few days back. This is how they evaded the taxes by sub-standard production, this and that. This is what they have done.

Then, is it a fact—I want to know from the Government—that whenever a licence application is made before the Licensing Committee, there are highly placed officials in that Committee and if there is any error or anything on the ground of which it may be rejected, within an hour the Birlas are informed and a new application comes to the Licensing Committee as per their advice in a corrected form? Is it a fact or not? That is what I want to know from them.

Then there is another question. Is it a fact that the Cabinet Minister, Shri Satya Narayan Sinha, whenever he goes to Jaipur, stays at the Birla House, that he always stays there and that he does not go to the Congress House even? Is it a fact that he has been kept in the Cabinet at the dictates of the Birlas?

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: That is what you say.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Till recently he was an important member of the Cabinet and the Birlas used to do things through him, all those manipulations and many other things. That much is certain. And for this purpose they used to utilise the ex-Minister for Parliamentary Affairs. Mr. Birla used to sit with Pandit Nehru here as the top guide of the Congress and the Government and used to manipulate all those things. I make this charge on the floor of the House. This is nothing new. I remember one instance of long ago. Some American businessman came to interview a very senior member of the Cabinet. Mr. Birla was sitting by him. And he wrote giving his impression that Mr. Birla spoke in such a manner as if he was speaking on behalf of the Government. He came to interview a very senior Cabinet Minister.

(Interruptions). Do not provoke me. I can give the name also if you want. It was Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, the Deputy Prime Minister of India. The American businessman came to interview him. Mr. Birla was sitting by him and it was Mr. G. D. Birla who did most of the talking. That is the impression that he wrote in the American journal. It was Mr. Birla who seemed to speak on behalf of the Government. That is how they had gripped the Cabinet. But perhaps there was not such close relation between the Birlas and Pandit Nehru. That is why the "Hindustan Times" sometimes used to play down Pandit Nehru. That has happened now and then. A charge was made on the floor of this very House. That is how they are patronised.

The L.I.C. sanctioned a loan of Rs. 50 lakhs to the monopoly paper, 'Hindustan Times', for its new building as if the Birlas are short of funds. Which Minister is involved in it, may I know?

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: No Minister.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Madam Deputy Chairman, there the Ministers are busy in an assembly.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: How can it happen? It is a monopoly group.

SHRI Z. A. AHMED (Uttar Pradesh): The Minister is not listening to the debate at all.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Another thing I would like to say. There is political jockeying for power between the house of Birlas and Shanti Prasad Jain group and they penetrate into the Cabinet. Many things happen. I demand of the Government to tell us all those things and take the country and Parliament into confidence. Let us know what is actually taking place.

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU: Ask Nambodripad What has happened to him?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Do not go in for that. I have already explained it. What about the Rajasthan power? After Mr. Sukhadia could not be sworn in and the President's Rule was proclaimed, how did it happen that power was given at the cheapest rate at a terrible loss to the exchequer on advice from the Centre? May I know, Sir, which Cabinet Minister is involved in this deal and which high-placed officials are involved in it?

Madam, would they conduct a probe into the number of sons and relations of the Cabinet Ministers employed by the houses of Birlas and others? Some Members have said, take all the houses together and not the Birlas separately. I know, Madam, the monopoly groups together rule the country and the Congress executive is merely a rubber stamp. So now that it has come to light it is better to order a probe. Take the house of Birlas singly. They have escaped punishment for the last twenty years by manipulating the government machinery and this is the first time that the scandal has been exposed in a big way. Madam, two "volumes, "Mysteries of the Birla's House", were written by Dev Jyoti Burman exposing tax evasion by Birlas to the tune of crores and crores of rupees. Is it not a fact that not a single of that book can be found in the Parliament library? Though all those things may have become old, but Members of Parliament know that. It was hushed up somehow or other. It was a terrible loss to the exchequer. But they manage to do these things. The allegation never saw the light of the day. Birlas bought all those copies. So that is how the house of Birlas is functioning. Therefore, let the Government take the two Houses of Parliament into their confidence and conduct a probe.

Madam, the Hazari Report is not a very strong one. It has made some bold statement. Many important things are missing, it is true. But the important thing is that it has served to highlight all the malpractices and machinations of Birlas. Therefore, let us not say that we take all the

houses together. Therefore, I demand let this House be seized of the matter of the house of Birlas in view of the fact that the Birlas have Cabinet Ministers on their pay roll, that they have a Birla lobby inside Parliament and have several State Governments under their grip. I demand a thorough probe either by a Parliamentary committee or a Vivian Bose type of Commission. All their malpractices should be processed. The Government of India is deliberately avoiding the demand for a probe. Whatever Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed has said is a clear indication that the Government is determined to bypass the thing. Let me tell the Government that unless they order a thorough probe into the whole affair, the entire Cabinet will be under suspicion and the people of this entire country will never have confidence in the honesty and integrity of this Cabinet. Let it be understood. Unless you conduct a probe by a Parliamentary Committee or a Vivian Bose type of Commission so that they can get hold of all the connected papers, the Government will prove to the hilt that all these allegations made on the floor of the House are correct. Unless they do that the people of the country will understand that they have hushed it up. The issues are great. The issues are serious. So there should not be a denegation. It is not a question of procedural changes or the setting up of a committee in order to hush up the whole thing and throw a blanket over the whole thing. The Birlas have been exposed. I have detailed all their malpractices. I have cited specific cases precisely in order to strengthen my case that a thorough probe must be conducted in the house of Birlas by a Parliamentary Committee or a Vivian Bose type of Commission. I have not made any vague allegations. I have given some specific cases.

I would in conclusion say that the Government should accept this demand or they would stand condemned at the bar of public opinion. Madam, whatever the Government may get passed through their votes, no Member of

Parliament will have faith in them*. They may issue whip and through the sheer force of that whip may get anything done, but many Members tell us in the Lobby—I do not want to mention their names—that they are not happy. Unless this is done, the honesty and integrity of the Central Cabinet remains a big question mark. A question mark has been put about it. Beware of it. Whatever you may be able to do by voting, but voting will not clinch the issue. You will be known as being in the grip of Birlas. A thorough probe must be conducted. Till such time all the licences issued to them which have not been utilised should be frozen. No further licences should be issued to the Birlas, and if possible, the concerns that have been caught red-handed in the matter of tax-evasion should be taken over by the Government. This is the least that we can do till the enquiry is conducted; otherwise nobody would believe you, howsoever you may try to whitewash the Birlas. With these words I conclude.

श्री रामकुमार भुवालका : उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, 6 अप्रैल को यहां पर एक मोशन के द्वारा हजारी रिपोर्ट की बात हुई थी। मोशन पर एक घंटे से ज्यादा बहस हुई। उस वक्त लगा कि न मालूम बिड़ला ने क्या कर लिया है, लेकिन बिना रिपोर्ट देख कुछ पता नहीं चल सकता था कि बिड़ला ने जो कुछ किया है वह ठीक है या गलत है। आज यहां के बड़े-बड़े मेम्बरान ने, माननीय सदस्यों ने ऐसी बात कही कि लगा शायद कुछ होगा, लेकिन जब रिपोर्ट सामने आई, तो उसमें कोई ऐसी बात नहीं बताई गई है कि जो बिड़ला ने कानून के बाहर की हो। 1965 में मोनोपलीज कमीशन की रिपोर्ट निकली। उसको देखने से भी कोई ऐसी बात नहीं मालूम होती। उसके बाद डा० हजारी की रिपोर्ट है, 35 रुपए इसका दाम है, प्लानिंग कमीशन का पब्लिकेशन है। इसमें भी नहीं मालूम होती कि बिड़ला

ने कोई गलत काम किया है। इसमें 75 बड़ी-बड़ी फर्मों का वणन है। इसमें डा० हजारी ने 20 फर्मों का हवाला दिया है। इसे मैं सुबह से देख रहा हूँ। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : समझ में आएगा भी नहीं।

श्री रामकुमार भुवालका : जैसा आपने कहा, समझ में नहीं आएगा। जो आदमी तरक्की करता है, उससे कुछ लोग जलने लगते हैं। यह दुनिया की आदत है कि जिस पेड़ को फल लगता है, लोग उसको डेला मारते हैं। उससे उसका नुक्सान नहीं होता, उसकी कमियां निकलती हैं और तरक्की होती है। इस रिपोर्ट में बहुत सी बातें हैं। इसमें है कि 938 लाइसेंसों के लिए इन्होंने एप्लाइ किया है। मुझे भी कुछ जानकारी है, इसमें ऐसे लोगों के नाम हैं जिनका बिड़ला से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है—सूरजमल मेहता, एन० एस० सिंघी, के० एस० गांधी, सी० एस० नेवटिया, एक ही जैसे कितने नाम हैं, मैं नाम ज्यादा नहीं पढ़ूंगा, उसमें देर लगती है, बोलने का समय नष्ट होता है। लेकिन इसमें जो नाम दिये हैं उन पर बिड़ला का कोई कंट्रोल नहीं है, ऐसा मेरा विश्वास है। मैं जानता हूँ। कोई प्रूव कर दे कि बिड़ला से कोई कंसर्न है, तो मैं उसका चार्ज लेता हूँ।

A. G. KULKARNI: It is said in the Hazari Report.

SHRI R. K. BHUWALKA: Yes, but they are not under the Birlas.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How do you know?

श्री रामकुमार भुवालका : इसमें नाम है, पर्सनल नाम है, कम्पनी का नाम है, फर्म का नाम है।

Suppose I am Ram Kumar Bhuwalka, how can you say the Birlas control me? I am a person, not a limited company.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But can you deny that Ram Kumar Bhuwalka.

Interim Report on
on is connected in Calcutta with the
Birlas and that Mr. Birla took him to

श्री रामकुमार भुवालका : इसमें जितने
नाम दिये हैं उनमें बहुत से नाम ऐसे हैं जिन
पर बिड़ला का कोई कंट्रोल नहीं है। अपनी
पहली रिपोर्ट में डा० हजारी ने लिखा है :

"Within the limited period of six months
allotted for this study, it was not possible
to examine the extent to which
implementation of licensing policy has
subservd the objectives indicated
above."

"A complete embargo on the growth of

उन्होंने खुद ही लिख दिया है कि यह
बात सच है कि जितना टाइम था, उसमें
मैं पूरा काम नहीं कर सका। उन्होंने लिखा
है कि लाइसेंस से ज्यादा एक आदमी को नहीं
देना चाहिए। फिर, उन्होंने ही खुद लिखा
है इस पुस्तक में (page 359, The
Corporate Private Sector):

the large groups would be suicidal in the
present context. Their investment
programmes are integral to the overall
development efforts, and are
complementary to the public sector
programme. Their existing undertakings
can expand at a cost lower than that of new
undertakings, without requiring a propor-
tionate expansion in overheads and without
involving all the difficulties of starting from
scratch. There is no justification for
allowing the managerial, financial and
output capacity of the large groups to go
waste. Moreover, the public sector
programme itself would be endangered if
the suits which are part of large groups are
not allowed to expand. If Tata Steel, Indian
Iron, A.C.C. and Tata Loco, for instance,
are not allowed to expand there would be a
shortage of steel, cement and engineering
goods required for the public sector.

Risks are inherent in growth but there is
a point beyond which it is unwise to take
risks. One could think "in terms of
imposing severe restrictions on the
growth

and Licensing Policy of the large
groups if one were reasonably confident
that other, i.e., small and medium group,
independent and new industrialists, and the
State could set up and expand a wide
variety of large-scale industries with a
speed and efficiency comparable with that
expected of the large groups. There are no
grounds for such confidence."

"Government spokesmen claimed at one
time that the policy of licensing a large
number of new units in each industry was

डा० हजारी ने आगे इसी पुस्तक में
फिर लिखा है, दूसरे पेज पर
(page 361 The Corporate Private
Sector):

meant to disperse economic power. This
policy was based upon a complete mis-
understanding of the concept and origin of
economic power. It might have been
appropriate in dealing with a monopolistic
situation, but not for curbing the growth of
the kind of concentration which exists in
India. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that
the policy has failed to achieve its stated
objective.

The implementation of this policy has
actually left a legacy of uneconomical,
small-sized plants, to say nothing of the
high foreign exchange cost it has entailed.
To avoid repetition of this experience,
Government must insist upon economic
size of plants and the attainment of certain
minimum levels of efficiency while giving
licences and assistance to medium groups.
If monopoly or near monopoly, in the
traditional sense of the term, is thereby
promoted or tolerated, it should be clearly
recognised that this is the necessary price
which has to be paid for modern techno-
logy, till such time as the size of the market
for individual products expands sufficiently
to permit economic working of a large
number of each product."

इसी में उन्होंने लिखा है कि जो ज्यादा प्रोड-
क्शन करते हैं, उनको लाइसेंस देना चाहिए।

[श्री रामकुमार भुवालका]

इसमें और भी बहुत सी बातें हैं। एक कम्पनी को एक ही आदमी कंट्रोल कर सकता है। लेकिन एक कम्पनी का नाम दो जगह लिखा है, बिड़ला के अंदर भी लिखा है और एन्ड्रयू यूल के अंदर भी लिखा है और साहू जैन के अंदर भी लिखा है। एक ही कम्पनी को दो आदमी कैसे कंट्रोल कर सकता है। कितने नाम इसमें दिये हुये हैं, जो नाम मैं जानता हूँ, मुझको पता है, मैंने इन्क्वायरी की है, जैसे हिम्मतसिंहका एंड संस, के० एन० हिम्मतसिंहका, हिम्मतसिंहका मिल्स, हिम्मतसिंहका टिम्बर, जोरहाट एलेक्ट्रिक, मैं जानता हूँ ये बिड़ला के अंदर नहीं हैं। अब जैसे कि रिलायंस फायरविक एंड पाटरी कम्पनी है, यह कम्पनी एन्ड्रयू यूल की पहले थी, एन्ड्रयू यूल उनको कंट्रोल करते थे, उसके मेजरिटी शेयर जब परचेज कर लिया श्री रामकुमार अग्रवाल ने श्री यह उनके हाथ में चली गई, यह मानोशोशी इन्क्वायरी कमिशन को रिपोर्ट में है। लेकिन डा० हजारी ने इसको बिड़ला के अंदर भी दिवाया है, एन्ड्रयू यूल के अंदर भी दिवाया है। मालूम नहीं उनको यह गजब रिपोर्ट कहां से मिली।

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: He must be in doubt. So he has put both the things.

श्री रामकुमार भुवालका : यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आया कि डा० हजारी जैसे बुद्धिमान आदमी ने यह क्यों किया। इस किताब का दाम 35 रु० रखा गया है, यह किसी मेम्बर को न दो गई, मुझ को मालूम हुआ, तो मैंने 35 रु० खर्च करके देखने के लिये खरीदी और इन 35 रु० का क्या लाभ हुआ, मझे मालूम नहीं।

श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्रू : हमको तो मुफ्त में मिली है।

श्री रामकुमार भुवालका : आपको मुफ्त में मिली होगी, मुझे तो ख़याल देना पड़ा है। इसमें लिखा है :

1966, published by Planning Commission, Government of India.

The entire cost of the project including publication has been borne by the Research Programme Committee, Planning Commission, Government of India. The Directors, did not, however, receive any remuneration.

अब वहाँ 938 लाइसेंस देने की बात है, उसके बारे में मैं आपको बताऊंगा। उन्होंने लिखा है कि बिड़ला समूह ने पिछले साढ़े 9 वर्षों में 938 लाइसेंस के आवेदन दिये। इसी रिपोर्ट में यह बताया गया है कि बिड़लाओं के 661 लाइसेंस आवेदनों में से 375 आवेदन लाइसेंस एग्रेसि ने मंजूर कर दिये। डा० हजारी इन 375 आवेदनों में से 277 आवेदनों के बारे में कुछ भी नहीं बता सके हैं। दूसरी बात यह है कि जब 661 आवेदनों में से केवल 48 आवेदन ही वास्तव में एकाधिकार आयोग की सूची के अनुसार बिड़ला उद्योगों से सम्बन्धित हैं। अतः, डा० हजारी ने 938 आवेदनों की संख्या का जो उल्लेख किया है, वह भ्रामक और गलत है। इन 48 आवेदनों में से केवल 175 आवेदन ऐसे हैं, जिन्हें लाइसेंस समिति से मंजूर हो चुके हैं। यहां यह उल्लेखनीय है कि डा० हजारी ने लाइसेंस और स्वीकृति-पत्र में कोई अंतर नहीं माना है और यही नहीं, बल्कि यदि एक ही कार्य के लिये बार बार दो या अधिक आवेदन की गणना बार बार की है। अतः डा० हजारी ने स्वीकृत आवेदनों की संख्या गिनना कर बिलकुल सन्देहजनक चित्र प्रस्तुत किया है।

डा० हजारी की रिपोर्ट से तो यह भी स्पष्ट हो जाता कि इन 175 स्वीकृत आवेदनों में से कितने नये उत्पादनों से संबंधित हैं, कितने केवल वर्तमान उद्योगों के विस्तार के लिये हैं, कितने नये उद्योगों की स्थापना के लिये हैं, कितने मात्र स्वीकृति-पत्र हैं और कितने नए आवेदन ऐसे हैं, जिनकी गणना एकाधिकार में नहीं आती। रिपोर्ट में बताया

क्या है कि 375 स्वीकृत आवेदनों में से 28 प्रतिशत आवेदन नये उत्पादनों के लिये, 39 प्रतिशत औद्योगिक विस्तार के लिये और 33 प्रतिशत आवेदन नये उद्योगों की स्थापना के लिये हैं। इस प्राप्त नये उद्योगों की स्थापना के लिये बिड़लाओं के केवल 33 प्रतिशत आवेदन स्वीकृत हुये हैं।

डा० हजारो ने लिखा है कि 375 स्वीकृत आवेदनों में से 209 आवेदन पूंजीगत माल की मंजूरी के लिये पूंजीगत माल समिति के समक्ष पेश ही नहीं हुये। कारण स्पष्ट है। केवल ऐसे आवेदन ही पूंजीगत माल समिति के समक्ष पेश होते हैं, जिनमें पूंजीगत माल की मंजूरी के लिये प्रार्थना की गयी होती है। इसके अलावा, एक ही आवेदन लाइसेंस समिति के सामने कई बार पेश किया जा सकता है, पर पूंजीगत माल समिति के समक्ष केवल एक बार ही पेश होता है। अतः, स्पष्ट है, कि केवल 166 स्वीकृत आवेदन ही पूंजीगत माल समिति के समक्ष पेश हुये, जिनमें से समिति ने केवल 80 को मंजूरी दी। क्योंकि 51 आवेदनों में आयात अंश नहीं था और इसीलिये पूंजीगत माल समिति की मंजूरी जरूरी नहीं थी जबकि 29 आवेदन सूत तथा कोयला के लिये थे, जिनके लिये विदेशी मुद्रा की पृथक प्रक्रिया है। शेष 6 आवेदन पूंजीगत माल समिति के विचाराधीन प्रतीत होते हैं। यदि इन 166 स्वीकृत आवेदनों में से उन आवेदनों को निकाल दिया जाए, जो एकाधिकार जांच आयोग द्वारा गिनाए गए बिड़ला उद्योगों से सम्बन्धित नहीं हैं, तो बिड़ला उद्योगों के स्वीकृत आवेदनों की संख्या 166 से काफी कम रह जाती है। पिछले 10 वर्षों में भारत सरकार ने 9,000 लाइसेंस तथा हजारों स्वीकृत पत्र जारी किए हैं। प्रधान मंत्री ने 23 अप्रैल, 1963 को लोक सभा में यह कहा था कि 31 मार्च, 1963 को समाप्त होने वाले पिछले 3 वर्षों में कुल 4,211 औद्योगिक लाइसेंस

जारी किए गए और इनमें से कुल 182 लाइसेंस देश के 10 प्रमुख औद्योगिक परिवारों को दिये गये। ये 182 लाइसेंस भी केवल नये उद्योगों की स्थापना के लिये नहीं थे, बल्कि इनमें वर्तमान उद्योगों के विस्तार के लिये नए लाइसेंस भी शामिल थे। यहां यह भी उल्लेखनीय है कि लाइसेंस एक दो सरकार अधिकारी से मिलकर अपनी इच्छा से मंजूर करते हैं, ऐसी बात नहीं है। अधिकारी विशेषज्ञों की एक लम्बी शृंखला कई बार आवेदनों की जांच परख करके लाइसेंस की स्वीकृति देतो है। उसमें कई बातों पर ध्यान दिया जाता है, जैसे विदेशी मुद्रा की मात्रा, अपेक्षित पूंजी जुटा पाने की क्षमता, अच्छा तकनीकी सहयोग प्राप्त करने की योग्यता, कार्य कुशलता और सरकारी लक्ष्यों की परिधी में लाइसेंस क्रियान्वित करने की अपेक्षित उत्पादन क्षमता उत्पन्न करने की सामर्थ्य आदि आदि। सभी उद्योगपति आवेदन देने को स्वतंत्र हैं और लाइसेंस के लिये आवेदन देने पर कोई कानूनी रोक नहीं है। मंजूरी देना न देना सरकार का काम है।

अभी आपको मालूम है कि लाइसेंस कितने ही चीजों से हटा दिये गये हैं, जैसे पेपर, सीमेन्ट, काटन मिल आदि हैं। उनके लिये अब लाइसेंस की जरूरत नहीं है। लेकिन जनता की क्रय शक्ति गिर गई है, आदमियों में खरीदने की क्षमता नहीं है। इसका कारण इस समय देश की आर्थिक अवस्था खराब है। उसमें कोई आदमी, नया आदमी, क्या काम कर सकता है, मैं नहीं समझता।

इसके बाद मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूं कि बिड़ला के यहां करीब करीब, जहां तक मेरी जानकारी है और मैं जानता हूं, अंदाजन 20 या 25 हजार तो स्टाफ के आदमी हैं और उनकी सारी मिलों में, कारखानों में 2 लाख से ज्यादा उनके वर्कर्स हैं। जो उनके

[श्री रामकुमार भुवालका]

बीस, पच्चीस हजार आदमी काम करते हैं, उनके बारे में अपनी जानकारी से मैं कह सकता हूँ, यारी जानकारी तो नहीं है। लेकिन जो मुझे मालूम है, उससे कह सकता हूँ कि उनको किसी तरह की शिकायत करते हुए मैंने नहीं देखा, बल्कि यह देखा है कि हमारे पास बहुत आदमी आते हैं, जो कहते हैं कि हमको बिड़ला के यहाँ काम दिलवाइये। बिड़ला के यहाँ काम करने जाने में वे इच्छा समझते हैं, पैसा ज्यादा मिलता है, उनका स्टैण्डर्ड बढ़ जाता है। मेरा भी थोड़ा सा उनके मिलों से संबंध है, एक बत्ती का डिस्ट्रिक्टर हूँ, उनकी मिलों में मजदूरों की हालत भी अच्छी है। जैसा भूपेश गुप्ता ने कुछ बात कही केशवराम के बारे में। मैं केशवराम मिल्स की जितनी बात जाता हूँ, वे नहीं जानते। केशवराम काटन मिल्स में 12,000 आदमी काम करते हैं। किसी को ऐसी शिकायत नहीं है कि हमको पैसा कम मिलता है, बल्कि ऐसा कहा जा सकता है कि यहाँ पर लोग ज्यादा खुश हैं, उनको तनखाह अच्छी मिलती है, यह पक्की बात है। आज जो सदन में चर्चा हो रही है, उसको मैं नहीं कहता कि असंगत है; क्योंकि हर एक अपनी दृष्टि से परख करता है और उस परख में अगर बिड़ला का नाम ठीक आता है, तो उनको आगे बढ़ना चाहिए। जैसे और लोग लाइसेंस लिया करते हैं, वैसे ही वे भी लेते हैं, कोई फर्क नहीं है।

(सत्र की घंटी)

इसलिये मैं माननीय सदस्यों से निवेदन करता हूँ कि वे लोगों को उपसाएं कि इन्डस्ट्री लगाएं, काम करें। मैं जानता हूँ बिड़ला वाले हर आदमी को उवसाते हैं, तुम इन्डस्ट्री करो। वे कोशिश करते हैं, उनको समझाते सिखाते भी हैं। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि जानकारी आदमी भी कभी कभी बिना सोचे समझे बोल जाते हैं। मैं मानता हूँ, जो समझते नहीं हैं, उनके लिये वह बाजब है। लेकिन जो सच्चाई जानते हैं, उनको ऐसा नहीं

करना चाहिये। इतना कहकर मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Govinda Reddy.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Madam Deputy Chairman

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Madam Deputy Chairman, we have not had a chance to speak. It has been a men's day.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They are doing a manly job.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I guess ladies should be allowed to speak.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Tomorrow will be ladies' day.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: May I continue?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please also finish your speech at 6 O'clock.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Madam Deputy Chairman, we are discussing the Interim Report; it would have been better if the full report had come before us; then the discussion would have been more fruitful.

The author of this report has been* under a handicap admittedly; he did not get the relevant facts; he did not get the full data, and he had to work on incomplete statistics and incomplete information. So to base conclusions on incomplete data and insufficient material is not quite correct. But all the same he has drawn* some conclusions, and from his report and for want of time, Madam, I am just listing some of the important conclusions, which he has come to, without developing them. (1) No attempt to appraise the role and purpose of the changing industrial environment has been made but evaluation has been confined only to production and allied matters. (2) Deficiencies in follow-up action after issue of licences are many and varied. In (a) to (e) of paragraph 1.*>

"(a) projects of larger size have become more frequent,

(b) the import component has declined slightly,

(c) 'new articles' account for a relatively larger proportion, one-third against one-tenth of applications, made as well as approved, and their share in total investment has also increased,

(d) the share of the two top industrial states, namely Maharashtra and West Bengal, in proposed investment has visibly declined, though this is more true of West Bengal, than of Maharashtra, and

(e) the share of large sized groups in the number of applications and investment applied for has increased and their share in approvals has risen slightly to about 30 per cent of the number of applications and 50 per cent of the proposed investment."

He has drawn other conclusions, that most of the applications are for small amounts of investment, that more than two-thirds of the investment is in projects above one crore of rupees, which works out to only 14 per cent of the applications that cases pending with the Capital Goods Committee are more than one year old, that procedure for considering applications is not uniform, that the procedure in approving projects amounting to two-thirds or more of the proposed total investment is different from that of the normal procedure for licences; that, is the procedure adopted in the case of more than two-thirds is different from what is prescribed for issuing licences; that the Planning Commission has laid no guidelines and there has been no official insistence on feasibility reports, that there is absence of well-ordered priorities.

These and other deficiencies, he says, cannot be overcome by procedural or administrative changes. He further says that applications for the free list *ia* not come at all before the Licensee Committee, that only rejection* do

come but that it is not obligatory on the Licensing Committee to decide OR the rejections and that only those industries which come under the merit list come before the Licensing Committee. But the author of the report finds that the data are incomplete even as far as this merit list is concerned. Then the author of the report finds that the private sector accounts for the bulk of output, income and savings, and that the public sector accounts for an investment of 15 per cent of the national income but an output of only less than 2 per cent of the total output of the industry in the country, and that in large projects, two-thirds or more of investment are subject to other than the normal procedure for licences.

I cannot develop my argument on these points because they are self-evident, and also for want of time.

Now the other point I come to is about the Birlas. I think that the author of this Report has not been fair in taking only one of the big business houses or industrial houses. It has been done so much so that today our discussion appears to be a debate on the Birla House and not on the Report. This is not fair. The author has mentioned the house of the Birlas as second in order among the business houses. The first one is some other concern. I do not name it. He lists this one as the second in the order. Why he has chosen the Birlas for this Report is perhaps due to the large number of licences that the Birlas have secured. While referring to the Birlas the author has given them some compliments also. He has been very positive about their astute management and he has paid them compliments for not having any import-components. In the beginning there were some import-components, but later they did not have any import-components. And then he compliments on their diversification of industries and their managing them in such a manner as to get quick returns. This* has built up a halo round the name of the Birlas. These are positive compliments-

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] -merits which the author has mentioned. He has also pointed out the de-facts. He has said tht during the year 1965-66, out of 938 applications 376 of the Birlas have been approved. He also says that on some of these applications data is not available. Some 51 of them had no import-components and 209 did not reach the Capital Goods Committee. I am not going into all these details. When we judge the performance of any business house we have to do it against the background of our country and our industrial policy. Ours is a mixed oconomy and in a mixed economy, according to the Government's Policy Resolution, a sphere of industries is assigned for the public sector and the rest of the sphere is left for the private sector. And as far as the private sector is concerned the Government can only prescribe the procedures for issuing licences etc. They can only regulate them by procedures. They cannot say how many of the industries should take their licences, and put a limit on the number of licences. I can understand the demand and I am a socialist myself. If we want a Socialist State then we should have the industries, at least those of them which are related to the welfare of the nation, in the public sector. If we allow a sphere of industries to the private sector then how can you say that certain industrial firms should have only so many licences? Why should they not have more licences? Why should not have the Tatas have more licences? If I am an industrialist, I can ask why I should not have more licences? One argument against the Birlas is that they have used influence. I do not know, but it is a well-known fact that nobody can get a licence without using either the influence of men or money. Let alone business licences. If you, Mr. Vice-Chairman go not as a Member Of Parliament but as an ordinary person to the railway station and to the booking office there, you cannot get a berth booked. You will be told that one month ahead seats are booked. You have to use the influence

i of either men or of money. If you want your boy or girl to be admitted into an engineering college or to a medical college, then you will have to bribe somebody or bring in influence. It is not called a bribe but it is called by the dignified name of donation. If you want a bed in a hospital you cannot get it without the influence of somebody. Even for these ordinary things the influence of men or money comese in. How much more will -this be the case in the matter or licences ?

AN HON. MEMBER: They are the norms of your Congress rule.

SHRI M. "GOVINDA REDDY: They say the Birlas use influence to get licences. I do not deny that for a fact. But that is the case with every industrial concern or industrial house. It is not something peculiar to the Birlas. I am not concerned about the allegations made against the Birlas outside the report. I do not know. They may not be relevant. I am not for condemning them for what is happening in the case of all generally. I am not one of those who approve irregularities like the evision of income tax or the using of political influence for getting all these things. But this is a fact which we have to face that thesftl» things are happening. Can anybody point out that even one licence can be secured without the use of some sort of influence or the other? So this is the position, 'if the family of Brilas or if the Birla concerns have secured a number of licences, I do not think that we should condemn them on that ground alone.

AN HON. MEMBER: He justifies it.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: If they use wrong methods, if they shut out others by unlawful methods, if they offer bribes for getting these licences, then I can understand our condemning them or disapproving them or castigating them. But unless it is

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy,]

industries in the private sector, then these business houses must run these industries in the private sector.

AN HON. MEMBER: Just as they like?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Not just as they like. You regulate them. You tax their products, control the labour conditions. Control the prices. You have your price control. Do everything you like. If they evade income-tax then punish them. But nobody can be accused simply because he is rich or simply because he has

the capacity to run the industries or « simply because a group of people have ^- industries all over the country. I d< not think it would be reasonable. It •would be unfair to these business houses.

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

The House then adjourned at ^{one} minute past six of the circle till eleven of the'clock on Tuesdaa(the 30th May, 1967. /