

**MOTION RE. INTERIM REPORT ON
INDUSTRIAL PLANNING AND
LICENSING POLICY—*dontd.***

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we go back to the discussion on the motion regarding the Interim Report on Industrial Planning and Licensing Policy and Shri Dahyabhai Patel will speak. Shri Dahyabhai Patel.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN *in the Chair*]

श्री रामकुमार भुवालका (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : मैडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन, कल जब मैं बोल रहा था तो उस समय श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने एक सवाल किया जो इस प्रकार था :

"But can you deny that Ram Kumar Bhuwalka is connected in Calcutta with the Birlas and that Mr. Birla took him to Moscow?"

तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि वे कैसे जान गये कि बिरला जी मुझे मास्को ले गये जबकि सच्चाई यह है कि मैं मास्को स्वयं ही गया था । मैं जितनी भी दफा गया स्वयं ही गया और बिरला जी के साथ नहीं गया । वे कैसे कहते हैं कि मैं बिरला जी के साथ गया ? I want to know.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right. I want to say that I have got 35 names from the Congress Party. You will all have to sit until you are called but even then all will not get a chance.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Madam, we have been discussing what is called the Interim Report to the planning Commission on Industrial Planning and Licensing Policy. We have been no admirers of the Government planning policy. In fact, my party has been criticising the manner in which planning and licensing has been carried on by the Government. But yet I am rather surprised at the manner in which this question was sought to be brought before 635 RSD—4.

the House. Madam, we had a Report not very long ago, the Monopolies Commission Report, on which, I do not know how much attention our Government has paid but I believe that document has given enough material for thought to the Government before another Report was called for. I do not know how and why this new Report has suddenly come upon us I do not know whether the study as it is called by Dr. Hazari was entrusted to him by the Planning Commission or by the new Minister for Planning. Does it indicate a new policy, a departure from the old policy, as I seem to think from the trend of the debate that I listened to all day long yesterday? We have understood in this House, whether we like it or not, that this Government, according to its avowed policy, has recognised that two sectors are going to be developed. 'Of course, I have added my own rejoinder to it but for the present I will not refer to it. We have recognised the role of the public sector as well as the private sector and the Government has the avowed object of allowing the private sector to develop with a view to developing industries in this country to avoid unemployment and to raise the standard of living of our people.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): But the dominant role is that of the public sector.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I do not say dominant or otherwise. What is dominant? I will presently come to what is dominating the mind of the hon. Member. I will presently come to it and I hope it will dominate the minds of people who have a rational mind and it will make them exercise their brain, their intelligence, a little more than they have been doing so far. The Monopolies Commission Report was before us Only two years ago. The Monopolies Commission on page 136 and 137 of their Report have said:

"We have already indicated the view that the concentration of economic power has helped the econo-

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

mic betterment of the country. Even today our industrial development is far behind that in the western world or in Japan. But 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" thus concentrating in their hands a great portion of the economic power controlling and directing the production and distribution of national wealth and income. It is fair also to state that after concentrating power in their hands these men have gone on often to push forward development of further industries, which has been to the advantage of the country. It is also generally agreed that concentrated economic power has been responsible for the greater part of the not very high Capital formation in the country. Huge profits were often earned so that even after the distribution of high rates of dividends good surpluses were left. Those were utilised to add to the industrial capital, whether by way of issue of bonus shares or in the shape of reserves, or by investment in fresh ventures.

It is important to note that big business has been able to attract and obtain foreign collaboration and such collaboration has helped the starting of many industries specially by supplying the essential machinery and technical know-how. As we have already stated when discussing the factors responsible for concentration of economic power, foreign business concerns are not likely to extend similar collaboration to small units."

There is much more in this Report. I do not know why it has escaped the attention of the Government. Besides, some investigation of concentration of wealth and income has already been made by the Mahalano-

bis Committee and we do not think that with the limited time at our disposal we will be able to make any further addition to the results of their labours. It was spread over four years. The terms of reference read in their entirety also appeared to us to exclude any study of concentration in the hands of big trade unions and the power of labour over the process of production. How very relevant this study would be in the present context of ghraos undertaken by some of the labour unions? Is this helping production?

Madam, as regards this Report itself, I do not know how it came before this House. I was surprised. When on the last occasion a calling attention motion was moved I felt that a document like this which was in the consideration of the Planning Commission and which was not complete in itself should have been studied fully and come to us in that manner. I also tried to point out that the calling attention motion was not the correct method of bringing this matter before this House. My objection was overruled but, Madam, what was the reason urged in the Chairman's room? I do not know whether you were present or not. One reason urged very strongly was, it is this Birla who has helped the Opposition; he has defeated us in Rajasthan and therefore this matter must be brought up. If this is the driving force behind all this . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: (Andhra Pradesh): Who said it?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:
Mr. Chandra Shekhar said it.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): It is totally wrong, false and a total lie. I repudiate this charge. I never said this and I am not accustomed to say things and then say I have not said. Whatever I say, I say frankly and forthrightly! I do not play stooges behind the curtain.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I have repeated what I have heard. The other person who heard it is there. It can be verified from him. Also what has been said in this House? It has been said that a person like Mr. Morarka has been defeated.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKAR: Of course I have said that and I still say that.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Is it not the right of any citizen of this country to stand from any constituency that he likes? Is it the monopoly of anyone to stand from a certain constituency? A person may be doing good service as a parliamentarian but it is for the voters or the electorate to decide. It is for the voters of the constituency to choose whom they should send and there should be no vested interests developed in the electorate.

Mr. Morarka may have done many good things. I have no quarrel with him. I admire the way in which he did some of the things in the Public Accounts Committee and Members of this House will remember that I have supported some of the matters to which attention was drawn in the last few years. But that does not preclude my saying that in a parliamentary democracy any person, any son of the Soil, has a right to stand from wherever he likes and to put an interpretation . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): Nobody disputes his right. But what was the purpose behind it?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: But that was shown as a reason for this.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: His role in that was disputed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please come to the Report now.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : चन्द्र
शेखर जी के कहने का मतलब यह है कि
पैसा न होता तो बिड़ला उनको हरा नहीं
सकते थे ।

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam, that is entirely a different question. The cost of elections is entirely a different question. That is a matter to which our party has drawn the attention of the House more than once. The manner in which licences have been given has been criticised by our Party more than anybody else in this House and the method of giving licences. It is our Party which has said that there should be a better system of licensing, a quasi judicial system of licensing should be set up, not the method of licensing today, which has many defects. Whatever be the present system is it not uniformly applicable to all business houses? If certain officers, certain Ministers, if you please, of the Congress Government, of your Party, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, have been such that they have not done their duty properly, why do you not deal with them in your Party? Why do you bring these matters before us? Why do you not clean your Augean stables? Why do you bring this stink and mud before this House.

Dr. Hazari says:—

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

Now, this is the first admission by Dr. Hazari, who has prepared the report as to why this Report is not perfect. There are many good things in the Report. I am not shutting my eyes to them. Some of his assumptions and conclusions are understandable. Others are too sweeping generalisations. For instance, few will dispute his finding that industrial planning is faulty and outdated and could no longer be relied upon to deliver the goods. More so the Planning Commission has not been able to evolve a well-ordered list of priorities and flexibility of inter-related programmes for performance at various levels. Besides, there is no clear dis-

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

the relation between targets which are compulsive and must be adhered to at all costs and others which are merely indicative. Matching of priorities and relative profitability, of planning objectives and techniques with market criteria and tests, should be the main instruments of industrial planning and policy. Social canalisation of investment cannot be achieved by reliance upon one instrument alone, be it industrial licensing, taxation, market mechanism or any other.

I think some of the conclusions that are in the Report deserve consideration. On the basis of studies he has made suggestions which are expected to achieve the broad objectives of industrial policy, viz., the regulation of industrial development and canalising of resources according to plan priorities and targets, prevention of concentration of wealth, protection of small scale industries against undue competition from large scale industries, encouragement of new entrepreneurs to establish industries, distribution of industrial development on a more widespread basis in different regions and fostering of technology and economic improvements in industries by ensuring units of economic sizes and adopting modern processes.

Some of his suggestions also need consideration, e.g., delicensing of industries on a large scale and freedom to expand and diversify. He is talking sometimes as if he were a Member of the Swatantra Party. This, however, should be preceded by selection of a few top priority areas for planning in depth with pre-emption of foreign exchange and provision of complementary domestic resources. If licensing is retained, the exemption limit for new undertakings should be raised from Rs. 25 lakhs to Rs. 1 crore, that for substantial expansion should be 25 per cent of existing licensed capacity or Rs. 25 lakhs, whichever is more, and that for new articles should be fixed at Rs. 25 lakhs. The entrepreneur must, in return for package

licence, undertake to commission the project within an agreed period of time. Licensees may be selected where possible after inviting something like tenders, and after appraising the costs as compared with international costs. Parties which fail to make progress in implementation of licences should be penalised by transferring their licences to any alternative agency for completion of the project and its management. As a rule, not more than one licence and/or CGC—capital goods clearance—for a single firm or business group. An application to Capital Goods Clearance should be deemed to have lapsed automatically if it is not approved within two years. All unimplemented licences issued before December 31, 1964 should be revoked. Steps should also be taken to revoke unimplemented CGC approvals/licences, if the applicants fail to make adequate rapid progress. It would be neither necessary nor logical to retain the present distinction between the free, merit and banned lists for licensing.

While these are some of the recommendations, I would point out certain remarks that he has made, which he himself points out, should be followed. He says at page 1:—

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

Then, at page 3 he says:—

"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."

"The growth of investment intentions has, on the other hand, clearly filtered in the last 25 years as compared with the eve of the Third Plan."

Then, he says:—

"Delicensing and freedom to expand and diversify imply that regulation through the Industries Act of the level and pace of investment in specified industries, balancing of demand for and supply of individual products, location and size of plants is now being left to the market mechanism, regulated by fiscal and credit policies, in so far as there is no direct foreign exchange burden. The liberalisation of policy on expansion and diversification is a move in the right direction, provided the preliminary essential of industrial planning, referred to earlier, have been firmly grasped."

While Dr. Hazari has made a study of some of the projects, I do not know why Dr. Hazari did not go further, why he confined his study only to the private sector. Perhaps it will be more profitable for him, for the Planning Commission, for the Finance Minister and for this country if he had not limited his study to this. I do not know whether he was precluded from going further by the time limit of six months that was set. I do not know whether he set it himself. It is not clear from the reading of the report because after all initially it was a sort of a private document that came into the hands of a Member and he raised the matter in the House. The matter was raised I think in April. We are at the end of May. Perhaps in these two months some of the defects from which this report suffers admittedly could have been rectified and Government could have given us a version which was clearer and more accurate to help Members to decide what to do.

Madam, there is a section, I know, and my friends who sit here, have openly advocated a policy of State ownership. We understand it but has this section also crept into the report? There is one there. That is all known. But has it become so powerful that it wants to suppress private enterprise completely? We

heard the tale of what the private enterprise has done, the misdeeds of the private enterprise. Unfortunately the other side of the picture has not been placed. Whatever industrial progress has been made in this country, as pointed out by the Monopolies Commission, has been made at the initiative of the private sector. Why not Dr. Hazari and the Planning Commission consider what would be the state of our economy if the industry was controlled in that way? After all the objective study as promised in the findings and in the general observations was not undertaken for jumping to conclusions that would suit the convenience of anyone. It is very essential at the outset to remember that Dr. Hazari himself admits that the data at his disposal was inadequate to enable him to come to decisive conclusions. Why was proper data not placed before him? Therefore, on his own admission the findings of the report may at best be imperfect based on imperfect and inadequate data, after which to put interpretations on his findings or to insist that his findings are sacrosanct and should be implemented forthwith would be entirely misleading public opinion. At best the report is an interim report. His conclusions *ipso facto* are no less imperfect.

It is unfortunate that this report admittedly defective and imperfect is being utilised for political purposes which was not the intention. These political purposes have been the encouragement of the public sector more and more, the diminution of the role of the private sector and the enlargement of the role of the public sector which has unfortunately not been able to play its role properly. I will come to that presently.

The *prima facie* view of the report does lead an objective observer to the irresistible conclusion that besides the data being inadequate, Dr. Hazari's thinking seems to have been vitiated by what he thinks the strident progress made by one of the leading industrial houses. The interim report

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

reveals a deplorable lack of judicial balance in the evaluation of the little data available to him and temptation to be influenced by extraneous political considerations, likes and prejudices. The rationalist in Hazari has compelled him to be all praise for the impressive growth of the Birla industrial houses, especially under conditions hardly congenial to industrial development. But his perverted notions of social order about which there is unmistakable evidence in his report lead him to deplore what he erroneously thinks the growing concentration of economic power in the hands of a few.

Therefore, when the data is inadequate and the study is not objective and impartial it is of urgent importance to consider the whole report as a piece of too many sweeping generalisations and political views which should not merit the serious attention of the economists, the Parliament and the Government, and it should be either revised completely giving Dr. Hazari or anyone you like time to do it or consigned to the archives to which many other reports have been so far.

Undoubtedly we are passing through a crisis in thinking. We have solely chosen to adopt mixed economy but there is of late an increasing tendency to develop the public sector at the expense of the private sector and talk loosely in terms of nationalisation in spite of the deplorable performance of the public sector undertakings which I will soon come.

It is to cover up the deplorable performance of the public sector undertakings that the occasion is being used on the basis of what is called a report but which is admittedly imperfect and needs more detailed study and looking into, and this occasion is also being used to push the country further into statism, even though the experience of statism not only in our country but elsewhere has been not» 1

too good. It is the feeling of frustration that is prevailing all over that *u* being utilised to misguide people aim to make those who have agreed *a* give up the present policy of mixed economy to push them further and further into state ownership.

This type of crisis in thinking *u* crystallises clear in Dr. Hazari's report. It is high time that either we go ahead towards unbridled nationalisation or statism even though our whole economic destiny would be at stake through this road, *or* once and for all we decide to perpetuate the balance between the private sector and the public sector. There is no other middle of the road policy which could be fruitfully adopted if our economic progress is to be ensured.

It is certainly unfortunate that the Government should have been called upon to stop issuing licences to one of the leading industrial houses on the basis of imperfect findings of an illconceived report. If information in this regard is incorrect, I stand corrected.

This is what our party has been pointing out from the beginning. The system of licensing needs to be taken out of the hands of the bureaucratic official machinery and if regulation is necessary as it will be for sometime, this regulation should be entrusted to a quasi-judicial body. The root of the trouble is perhaps that this failure of the Government to respond to this appeal has led it from one mistake to another.

There are other conclusions of Dr. Hazari which are not altogether sound. Take for instance his view that industrial licensing has become a convenient instrument in the hands of big business to foreclose licensable capacity by putting in multiple applications for the same product and getting hold of several licences. Further, most of the licences are not followed. In this behalf he has made

a case study of the Birla group of enterprises. He points out that this Group had succeeded in getting a sizeable share of licences in the past few years. At the same time, nearly half of the licences had not been followed up. The result, according to him, had been the prevention of new entrepreneurs from entering the field. Nevertheless, he admits that this group had shown considerable entrepreneurial and managerial ability and therefore had been able to expand fast, even during circumstances when conditions were generally unfavourable for industrial advancement.

He has also suggested that as a matter of policy, the Planning Commission and Government should declare that certain traditional industrial activities shall be closed in future to the specified ten or fifteen largest business groups and their associates. This would imply that the large groups already established in these activities shall not be permitted to expand in these areas, which would henceforth be reserved for small groups and independent businessmen. In the event of a change in the coverage of industrial licensing or its practical abolition, the large group should not, according to the Report, receive any capital goods clearance or assistance from financial institutions for expansion within the traditional industries. However, large groups would be welcome in areas of new technology and where there are economic possibilities of large exports.

His recommendations relating to delicensing of industries, exemption limits for new undertakings and expansion, the obligation on the part of entrepreneur to commission the project in time and doing away with free, merit and banned lists are, generally welcome.

Madam, I would like to draw the attention of the Members to the Explanatory Memorandum circulated

along with the General Budget of the Government of India, particularly to the statements at pages 164, 165 and 166 where the performance of the public sector undertakings is dealt with. There are, I believe, 60 public sector undertakings. I do not know whether the Government have made a study of some of these or not. But the Government—and I believe the Members of Parliament also—who are interested in the subject—would be well advised to take into account this matter, obtain copies of publications on economic research by bodies like the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry and others. They should look at this purely from the commercial point of view, that is from the view of the economic progress of the country. I would draw your attention to only two or three paragraphs from the performance of Government Undertakings, 1958—1965, issued by the Economic and Scientific Research Foundation of the Federation. The first paragraph is at page 33.

"The performance of the public sector undertakings, in terms of returns on invested capital, i.e., from the investors' point of view, is even less satisfactory. While private industry earns about 11 per cent (net profits) on the invested capital (net worth) the earnings of government undertakings in this respect are of the order of 2 per cent, i.e., less than a fifth of the former. This large difference is naturally reflected in the relative volume of dividends distributed by the two sectors. Dividends as percentage of net worth have averaged around 6 per cent in the case of private industry during the period under review. The government undertakings, on the other hand, have only once exceeded 0.9 per cent and have yielded about 0.5 per cent, that is, nearly one-twelfth of the general level" in the private sector.'

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What we are emphasising is the licensing policy.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam, is it not natural to note what this licensing has resulted in? It may not be good to some. But what we should look into in terms of the Report is the performance of the private sector. And certain Houses have been mentioned. So, I think I am in order in making some general remarks. I am reading the whole thing. On page 27, it is pointed out:

"The marginal return on capital for all public sector was estimated at R per cent in the case of public sector undertakings and at 19 per cent in respect of private sector enterprises. On this basis, it is possible to say that the private sector is able to obtain 3 times the return on capital obtained by the government undertakings in similar activities. Steel in the public sector accounts for more than 40 per cent of total capital employed in all the government activities. If steel is included, the public sector's marginal return turns out to be much lower, about a sixth of the normal figure in the private sector."

Then on page 39:

"If we average the income yields over the seven-year period under review, we find that the 'income differential' is Rs. 22 per Rs. 100 of employed capital (Rs. 31 and Rs. 9 in the private and public sectors respectively)."

If we take the case of Rs. 100 employed in these, the difference is 80 glaring; in the case of the private sector the yield is Rs. 31 and it is Rs. 9 in the public sector—

"There is thus a notional loss of Rs. 22 for every Rs. 100 of capital used in the public sector in preference to the private sector. On this basis the yearly national loss in

industrial output at the end of the Second and Third Plans would therefore be Rs. 206 crores in the Second Plan and Rs. 382 crores in the Third Plan.

"In the course of the last 15 years, therefore, the loss incurred by the industrial sector has reached a level of Rs. 588 crores per year."

What a difference would this make to the economy of the country if this was not so. Would it not be much more worth while for persons like Dr. Hazari and the Planning Commission to concentrate their studies more on the reasons why we are losing all this money, why we have lost all this money, why we go out in this manner after the private sector. Do we wish to have a sort of witch-hunt in the case of people who are able to do things better? There were references to income-tax arrears and all those sorts of things. Madam, I am not pleading for anybody who evades the law or anyone who does not pay his income-tax. My friends will bear me out, those who have cared to listen to me properly that I have no objection to the Government dealing with those people who do not behave themselves, I do believe in a private sector. But I believe in a clean private sector. And if the machinery of the Government is such that the private sector does not remain clean, the Government must take proper steps. If you feel that there are some people in the private sector who do not behave themselves, deal with them according to the process of law. But do not brand the whole private sector as corrupt or incompetent. Incompetence is entirely in the public sector.

Madam, the other point that I would like to urge particularly upon my friends who go abroad and see things is this. When they talk of concentration of wealths, where is the wealth? Some people talk that Mr. Birla is a big man. What is Mr. Birki in comparison of the wealth that is

there outside in the world? Do we not want to raise the standard of wealth in the country? I was very glad when somebody said that we want 20 people like him. But are you going to get 20 people like him? All this sort of witch-hunting is not right. What we want is to, encourage people to make money, to provide employment and to pay their taxes regularly — Does the public sector undertakings pay any income-tax? Do they feive any returns? Do the tax-payers get anything in return for his contribution? The private sector pays dividends, pays taxes and yet contributes so much to the growth ~>I industry, to employment. Therefore, this negative attitude of my friends here which is creeping into the Congress Party needs to be amended and clear; other wise there is on hope for this country ever rising.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Reddy. I am afraid I will not be able to pick and choose names and I will request Members on this side of the House to keep to the time-limit of ten minutes.

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN) (Madras): Why restrict to ten' minutes in our case when others have been getting twenty minutes

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Unless I strictly follow this you may not even get a chance to speak.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): I would like to draw your attention to one point. Those who have given the notice of the motion, at least they should be given a chance to speak. And those who have given their amendments, at least they should also get a chance to speak.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Those who have given their amendments will get a chance.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): What about those who have given notice of the motion?

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : I have given notice of the motion.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have not got the motion before me. I do not know how many there are. Anyway, carry on. Mrs. Yashoda Reddy.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Madam, at the very outset let me thank you for breaking the monopoly of men's domination since yesterday. There have been many things said which were relevant and irrelevant. The whole of yesterday I have been listening to them. I want to confine* myself to the Hazari Report on the working of the Industrial Planning and Licensing Policy *vis-u-vis* the present economic situation of India today. But before that, Madam. I would like to say one word in deference to what Shri Chandra Shekhar and some other friends on this side and the other side pointed out about the misuse of licences and malpractices as given in the Report.

Whether it is Birlas or Tatas or anyone else, I just do not care. Whether it is a private person or a Government officer or a Minister, whosoever has misused the law, whosoever has done anything against the nation, let him be brought to book. If an officer is wrong, if any businessman is wrong or a Minister is wrong, I think nobody in this House will object to it. Let the law go ahead.

Madam, I would like to say one thing. I did not want to touch this point but, Madam, yesterday every body concentrated on these Birlas. I do not know why we have this Birla-phobia. Yesterday the speeches were either or against Birla. Let me submit the hon. Members that after all we are not children. We are Members of Parliament. Here is a report which Dr. Hazari has written.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Many of us have children.

Interim Report on and Licensing

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: The whole of yesterday they were talking. I did not interrupt. I listened to the speeches. I expect the same courtesy from them.

Madam, the gentleman, Mr. Hazari, himself says that the facts are limited. He says that it is an interim report. He says that the data was not available completely and he says most of time that it was unreliable. Madam, if that is the case, do you not think that at least the benefit of doubt has to be given to a house which has been so much criticised.

I do agree there is some concentration. I do agree that in the private sector some houses specially have concentration of wealth. But, Madam, how far is it correct to say that these people are menace to the country, that these people are nothing but evildoers, that these people have done everything bad; they have done no good? Madam, as was very correctly pointed out by my friend, Mr. Bhanilal, yesterday, there is room for genuine doubt. I am not here to plead for anybody. Madam, let me make it clear that I have neither business connections either for myself or for anybody in my family nor have I ever seen the face of Birla. I do not even know the shadow of Birla.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Their shadow is too long. It may fall on you without your noticing it.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I may tell you this much maybe you can come under their shadow but I can always escape from it.

Madam, there is the Monopolies Commission report. It says that the Birla companies are 151 in number whereas Hazari gives a higher number. Maybe it is correct. About the licences Dr. Hazari says that many licences have been given. But he also says that multiple accounting is there; some licences have been accounted many times. Then he does not differentiate between the letter of intent and actual licences approved. In the matter of LIC, Madam, the House

Policy

knows that every letter of intent is not a licence, and every licence which has been given may or may not be utilised. And licences may not always have new units. It may be for an extension. It may be for a new article. It may be for a change of location. If a licence is given automatically it does not mean for a new unit.

Again, over this question of extension, what about the Tatas? The Tatas have increased, I think, ten times more than Birlas have increased in these ten years.

HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On that you may collect more information.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: That is what I am saying. Let us not waste our breath on Tatas or Birlas. Let us not condemn anybody. Let us wait for the report which the hon. Minister said is coming in August. If there is anything wrong if anybody has unscrupulously got any licences, certainly we should have to look into them.

But, Madam, I want this House to focus their attention to the peculiar Indian economic system today. Madam, you know and every one of us knows what was the economic condition of India about 20 years back. Rightly or wrongly, some of these houses who had become rich after the war were asked to put their resources for quick and rapid industrialisation. Madam, our planners wanted and we wanted a quick and rapid industrialisation for clearing away our mass poverty, for clearing away unemployment, if possible, completely. Now the very forces which were used to help industrialisation also help concentration I want to ask my friends, were we not aware of this? Did not the planners know it? They did that why clauses (b) and (c) of article 39 were introduced in the constitution saying, "let there not be concentration, 'especially concentration against the common good.'" Let it be clear it is not concentration as such but concentration-

tion against common good that was opposed. Madam, this House wanted a certain amount of planning. We wanted a planning system. And for that planning system we formulated the Industrial Policy Resolution. We wanted the country to develop on that pattern. Now with our limited resources we knew that we could not bring about rapid economic development. My friend, Mr. Patel, says that the licensing system was not good. / can you doubt the bona fides of the Government? I agree that in the issue of licences there have been some malpractices. There have been certain shortcomings. But we cannot doubt the licensing system itself and say that the licensing system has "been put with a bad motive.

Madam, everybody has been quoting from the Monopolies Commission's Report. On page 6 the Report says:

"The actual needs of the situation proved too strong and not much could be done to counteract the various forces which made more and more concentration inevitable. On the contrary, the planned economy which the Government decided to accept for the country as the quickest way, to achieve industrialisation on the right lines has proved to be a potent factor for further concentration"

Again, what does the Industrial Policy Resolution and the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act say? The licensing system itself is good. Madam whatever may be the results the motives cannot be do You may now question the results. You may now want a better way of doing things. But you cannot doubt the motive for licensing. The licensing authorities wanted to give licences where the capital goods were available, Where the machinery was available or where the raw materials or foreign collaboration could come from. And, Madam, what, happened with tk*

break-down of agriculture with the balance of payments position beint upset? The Government could not come in and we had to stop imports and necessarily we had to allow the few houses to concentrate, Madam. And then when you gave these licences, it is not because the licensing system was favouring one particular house or that any house influenced it. The very planning system, the very licensing system allowed this sort of concentration.

Then, Madam, what does Dr. Hazari himself say on concentration. He says, on page 356 of his own book on the Corporate

"If directives and value judgments are set aside and attention is focussed on the urgent needs of the economic situation, there is room for honest difference of opinion on whether the increase in concentration that took place between 1951 and 1958 was undesirable and excessive. An increase in concentration has its economic and technical advantages and can do some good."

(Time bell rings)

Madam, I will just finish In another five minutes. I am the only lady member to speak so far. Please excuse me." They had the whole of yesterday.

Again the Monopolies Commission itself says, on page 136:

"... What little development there is much to the advantage and skill of a few men who have in the process succeeded also in becoming "big business" thus concentrating in their hands a great portion of the economic power .It is fair also to state that after concentrating power in their hands, these men have gone on often to push forward development of further industries, which has been to the advantage of the country. It is , ' also generally agreed* that &*-

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy]

centrated economic power has been responsible for the greater part of the not very high capital formation in the country."

You may ask, now are you going to accept concentration? Are you going to allow the private sector to have its way? No. We have accepted the mixed economy which includes both private and public sector. I would like to agree, for once, with Mr. Dahyabhai Patel. The biggest monopolist to-day is the Government itself. And when the Government is not able to take up all the industries and it should not, when there are no resources, when foreign collaboration is not coming, when the foreign exchange and even the capital of the country itself are limited, if there is a group of people which is going to do something, then we should not be prejudiced and we should not condemn them unnecessarily. And Dr. Hazari himself says in his book that there are two ways of counteracting concentration. One is the negative, quickest way; the other is a positive, long drawn out way. The negative way is what most of my friends have been saying, *i.e.*, doing away with the private sector and concentration. I do not accept or propose to have this negative system of breaking up the groups. He says a break-up of the large groups is legally impossible. The other method is nationalisation of large groups. He says you can nationalise an industry, but not a group. Even if you overcome it legally, what is the economic position? What he says is very interesting. He says: "The economic case against the break-up of groups is even stronger. The country lacks organisation even more than it lacks capital. This break-up of the few existing large organisations would entail the loss of the useful experience and skill that have been built up in and by these organisations." He also says—this is very important—"A complete embargo on the growth of the large groups would be suicidal

in the present context." I have no time, otherwise I would read more of this. He says "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 of large groups if one were reasonably confident"—please mark the words—"that others, *i.e.* small and medium groups, independent and new industries, 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 such grounds for such confidence." After all, we are not viewing it from the point of view of the public sector or the private sector, or from the point of view of Tatas or Birlas. We have to view this from the economic point of view. After all, the economic policies and the Directive Principles are not rigid things. Industrialisation is a long-drawn process and we cannot by one stroke wipe out the things of yesterday. So, we come to 2nd and positive way of doing away with concentration. We should realise that it is not once for all process and it takes time. In this connection the Government will take some time. I would like to say, Madam, that in the licensing system, the Government should be more careful to encourage small industries. They must reserve certain fields for the minor and medium groups where the big groups cannot come, see that credit is issued to them, see that the market is given to them and also arrange to provide foreign collaboration to them. The corporate sector also should be developed. As long as the State does not take it completely and small industries come in, we should allow the big houses. There is no monopoly in this country in the correct sense of the word and as long as concentration does not work to the common detriment, we should allow it. We should not be guided by public or Private sector. We should be guided by only what is judicious in the present case—

test of things. What is socialism? It is wiping out every thing before other things are developed, just like the demand of the Hindi people that English should be removed before Hindi can come in. Can we do it? I am only giving you an example. So the private sector also should be there. It is a necessary evil. But do not wipe it out till the other things are developed. We have accepted its "so-existence with the public sector. So with these things in view, I want the House to proceed. Thank you very much. I am sorry I have exceeded my limits.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI (Gujarat): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am very thankful to you for giving me this chance to speak. After the brilliant speech of my hon. friend, Shrimati Yashoda Reddy, I have not much to say about this matter. I will only say that Dr. Hazari's Report has to be considered from a dispassionate and objective view-point. On the one hand we have to keep our objective clear in view, i.e. prevention of concentration of economic power in the country. On the other hand, we have to steer clear of exaggerations which we have heard in this House yesterday such as that the economic policy of India is being dictated by Birlas. If that is so, it means that the whole of the Industries Ministry, the whole of the Planning Commission with its illustrious Chairman, the Prime Minister of India, and its Deputy Chairman, Mr. Asoka Mehta, a veteran socialist, are all under the influence of the Birlas. This is not a fact. And we have also to keep clear of exaggerations such as that Mr. Nambudiripad is a stooge of the Birlas or that the whole Kennedy Administration in America was under the influence of the Birlas. There is no limit to the exaggerations, irresponsible exaggerations, we have heard in this House the whole of yesterday. I refute these exaggerations and I say that we have to keep clear of them.

Now, Dr. Hazari's Report has to be considered from four angles: firstly, whether so many licences have been issued to this business house or not; secondly, whether these licences have resulted in a foreclosure or not; thirdly, whether there is excessive economic growth of this particular business house; and fourthly, the question of concentration of economic power and how to stop it.

Now coming to the question of the number of licences issued to this business house, the Industries Minister said yesterday that he would enquire into whether there has been any discrimination in favour of any business house and whether there has been any foreclosure. So I will not go into it in detail. But one thing strikes me, Madam, and it is that when this matter came up under a Calling-Attention Motion in the last session, certain figures were given about licences, about the investment component and about the import component also. Why have not any of the sponsors referred to those figures this time also? I think presumably after a more careful study of the Report, they have found them to be incorrect. And I may say, Madam, if you refer to para. 10.2 of Dr. Hazari's report, you will find that they are not licences but just 375 approvals—he says. Approvals can be for letters of intent also, and a letter of intent is only a permission, to negotiate for capital issues, to negotiate for machinery, to negotiate for raw materials or to negotiate for foreign collaboration, if any. It is only a permission to negotiate and may or may not materialise. Dr. Hazari uses the word very carefully as 375 approvals only. He has never mentioned 375 licences. And most of the Members do not know the difference between a letter of intent and a licence. That is why a misunderstanding is sought to be created, as if so many licences have been given to this particular business house. Now that is in reference to para. 10.2. but if we come to para 10.4 there, Dr. Hazari himself

[Shri Suresh J. Desai.]

says that the number of licences was only 80 plus 51, that 80 applications went to the Capital Goods Committee and 51 did not go to the Capital Goods Committee because they had no import component. So it comes to a total of 131 in all out of those 375 applications approved. Now if you analyse para. 10.8 of the report, you come to a very absurd conclusion. Para. 10.8 of the report says that 240 of the approvals given have an import component of Rs. 159 crores. But applying the same rule of arithmetic which Dr. Hazari follows we come to the conclusion that 209 out of them have an import component of Rs. 168 crores; that is, a part is bigger than the whole. It is an absurd conclusion. This is nothing else but a jugglery of statistics. I can understand that most of the Members have neither time nor the aptitude to look into these statistics, and that is why a sort of misunderstanding has been tried to be created in this House that so many licences have been given with such a huge import component and such a huge investment programme.

I come to the second point, Madam, to the question of foreclosure, whether there has been any foreclosure or not. I understand that in these 15 years which have been under review by Dr. Hazari, more than 9,000 licences have been issued by the Government of India. Now, if 9,000 licences have been issued, and even if you take the whole figure of 375—even take the whole figure—not just the 131 I have mentioned—it comes to about 4 per cent only, and 4 per cent of licences issued to one firm cannot shut out, cannot pre-empt others from getting licences. It is such an obvious fact that I should not elaborate on this idea further.

Let us come to the third point, about the excessive growth of this particular business house. Let us take the whole picture in proper perspective. We have got a large public sector and there we have got an in-

vestment of Rs. 1900 crores and if you take the block capital, it will come to something like, at the present valuation, Rs. 3000 crores. The question whether the public sector is efficiently run or not is a different matter but we are proud that the Government of India has been able to set up such a large public sector. It is an achievement of the Government of India and we are proud of it. Now, if you take only one unit of the public sector alone, if you take, say, the Hindustan Steel, the total block capital there is three times that of the Birlas, and twice that of the Tatas. It is this public sector that is dominating and rightly dominating the economy of the country today. So it is infantile, I should say, for anyone to say that this business house or that business house has been dominating the economy of the country. It is the huge public sector which has the basic industries, the vital industries, the key industries, a sector which is fast developing, that is controlling and rightly controlling the economy of the country, because it is the right of the Government to control the economy of the country. Why this nervousness then that this or that particular business house is controlling the economy of the country? This nervousness is being experienced by people who are fifteen years behind time. They do not know what transformation has come about in this country. With the huge public sector now, where is the private sector? The private sector is dwindling as more and more expansion is taking place in the public sector. It is rightly so and I fully support it. The only way in which we can stop concentration of economic power is by further expanding the public sector and making it more efficient, and automatically the private sector will dwindle. And it will do so in course of time. There is no need to compare the growth of this particular business house with the others. We have just now mentioned the figures about Tatas and all that; I need not go in**

them. I only want to say something about the Tatas. I am a humble share holder of a few Tata companies and I can just say this about two Tata companies, the TELCO and the TISCO. In these eight years their block capital has increased by Rs. 147 crores. I am a shareholder and I go through the reports of the different companies. The block capital of these two Tata companies has increased by as much as 147 crores.

Then let us come to the question which has been often posed about the proliferation of this business house into various branches of industry. Dr. Hazari himself says in his book "The Corporate Private Sector" that purely on economic grounds it is advisable that the traditional industries should expand into some other industries because the traditional industries like jute, cotton, tea and sugar have become less profitable now. So people in these traditional industries take to and expand industries like cement, chemicals, engineering, rayon, paper, etc. It is purely on economic grounds that Dr. Hazari himself has endorsed the idea, and that is the pattern which is followed in all the Western countries also; those industries which become less profitable go into other industries. The industrial development in most of other countries has taken place in that way. And there is also the question. Madam, often raised that this particular industrial house has spread into various States of the country, right from Kashmir to Kanyakumari. And to this I would say why it is so. It is the Chief Ministers. Congress and non-Congress, both, who have been inviting them. It is not that this business house has got the Chief Ministers in their pocket. It is the Chief Ministers who are running after them and pressing them to set up industries. It is the Chief Ministers, I should say, who are competing among themselves to have this business house into their States. Mr. Chandra Shekhar referred to Hindustan Aluminium yesterday. I know about Hindustan Aluminium. Bauxite ore for aluminium comes from Madhya Pradesh. Now Madhya

Pradesh Chief Minister says; 'Bauxite ore is in my State. So you should start the Rs. 20 crores factory in my State.' The U.P. Chief Minister says: "I will give you cheap electric power from the Rihand dam. Come to my State." Again the Madhya Pradesh Chief Minister says: "I have got Pench Valley coal and I will set up thermal power station, and will give you cheaper electric power. Come to my State." Again the U.P. Chief Minister says: "I will give you electric power below cost price come to my State." So it is the Chief Ministers who are competing amongst themselves, and giving this business house favourable terms, giving them facilities. (Interruptions) I do not tolerate interruptions because I do not interrupt any. So I do not want to be interrupted.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Your name is registered.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: It is the Chief Ministers who are competing amongst themselves.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौर-
हिंसा : - तत वही है कि गया
गया गया। तत् जम्मा गये जम्मा-
दास। आप जब यहाँ थे तो यहाँ का भारत
बोलते थे और अब वहाँ है तो वहाँ का
भारत बोलते हैं।

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Your name is registered there, but I am speaking the same voice wherever I am. I have not changed that way.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: Please do not take my time. I have got very limited time. As I said, it is the Chief Ministers who are competing amongst themselves and giving this business house facilities. And why do they compete? It is because they want to develop their resources. They want to have expanding avenues of employment. They want to raise the standard of living of their people.

[Shri Suresh J. Desai,] They want to do good to their people. That is why they invite them. Mr. Chandra Shekhar gave the example of Mysore Cement. The Mysore Government had a share in it. The International Finance Corporation had a share in it. The Agency for International Development had a share in it. Mysore Cement had gone phut. The value of its share had gone down to Rs. 5 from Rs. 10. Then this business house was invited to take it up, and today the value of the share is Rs. 12. Similarly, our Saurashtra Government we are having 42 per cent share in the Digvijay Woollen Mills, which also went phut and the share price had gone down from Rs. 10 to zero, it had a capital of Rs. 46 lakhs zero. It had a capital of Rs. 46 lakhs. So the share price went to zero. Now it was the Saurashtra Government which asked this business house to take it up. And during these nine years when they have been running the mill, Rs. 4 crores have been paid to the Government in income-tax, super-tax, corporation tax and excise duty. Also bonus has been paid to the workers, and dividend has been paid to the shareholders and the share price of it, from zero has gone up to Rs. 18. So it is the Chief Ministers who are inviting this business house. It is not only the Chief Ministers in India; I should say it is also the foreign countries, Malaysia, Singapore, Burma, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Cyprus, Greece, Kenya, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Morocco, Libya, Ireland, Yugoslavia, Ghana and some South American countries. All these countries have invited them.

TSTT % I SHRI SURESH J. DESAI:
All these countries have invited them. Why have they invited this firm. They have invited this firm not because of any capital they might invest. No capital is allowed to be exported out of the country. The largest industrial complex in Africa was offered to them for nothing. They said: "Take it and

manage it. We do not want a pie." They are invited because of their expertise managerial talents and efficiency. And now I come to my last point and that is about concentration of economic power. Certainly we want to stop such concentration of economic power because we are aware that such concentration of economic power has social, political and economic implications. As Members of Parliament, we are all aware of it. The Monopolies Inquiry Commission has also referred to the dangers of concentration of economic power. Certainly we are all aware of them and we want to stop the growth of such concentration. But the question before us and before the Government of India is whether in the limited sphere which we have allotted to private individuals, which we call the private sector, we want economic growth or we want social considerations to prevail. That is the dilemma before us. There are four agencies which can bring about economic growth and this is the case in any part of the world. They are firstly, the Government itself. They can start industries. Secondly, the small and medium entrepreneurs can assist this progress. Thirdly, there are the large entrepreneurs and fourthly, we can invite foreigners to participate in certain sectors. And we have as a matter of fact, invited some foreign firms as for instance in the case of oil refineries and the fertiliser plants. In these fields we have foreigners working with us. We have a large public sector in this country started by the Government and it is expanding and growing. Moreover, it has been the policy of the Government of India to encourage the smaller entrepreneurs. But Dr. Hazari himself writes in his book that this policy of spreading out licences to a large number of small entrepreneurs has resulted in the legacy of a large number of small sized uneconomic units with a huge wastage of foreign exchange. Still the Government should encourage these small and medium entrepreneurs and there are three ways of doing it. Firstly, the Government should give

them institutional finance. Secondly, there should be an assured market for the sale of their products. Thirdly, the Government should guarantee foreign collaboration agreements to the smaller units because the large collaborators do not go to the smaller entrepreneurs. Therefore the Government should give them this guarantee. In these three ways you can encourage the smaller and medium entrepreneurs. So On the one hand we have to help these small people and on the other, we have to make the public sector large and efficient. Then automatically the importance of these big business houses will dwindle. Till this is done, there is a dilemma before the Government. I do not blame the Government of India in any way. This has been the policy of the Government. To depend on the large business houses in only an expeditious measure.

I do not have time to quote from the Monopolies Commission's Report or from the other books that I have here. I have got here the Mahalanobis Report also. But I will not take up the time of the House by quoting from them. I shall conclude by saying that the Government Of India is examining the whole question and they are bringing forward legislation based on the recommendations of the Monopolies Commission's Report and we shall certainly be happy to support that legislation.

Madam, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to make my observations on this motion.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri D. L. Sen Gupta is the next speaker. But if you will allow Mr. Pandey to speak now, you can follow him afterwards.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA (West Bengal): Very well, Madam.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Madam, before Mr. Pandey starts his speech I would like to bring one thing to your notice. I gave my name for speaking during this discussion on Ni RSD—S

the first day of this session of Parliament.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am not supposed to be aware of all that. I am not really aware, because this is done by the Whip and the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. Here I have got a list of some 30 names. I am not concerned with what you gave or when you gave it.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौर-
डिया : यह काम बिड़ला जी हाँ नहीं करते
यहाँ भी होता है कुछ ऊँचा नीचा ।

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I know you are not concerned, Madam, but please let me submit one thing. I am a Member of this Parliament and I gave my name one week before and I have been under the impression that I will get an opportunity to speak. What transpired behind the scene and what talks I had with the Presiding Officer, all that I am not going to disclose here.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Which Presiding Officer?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Not the present Presiding Officer, Madam. But I have a fear that some people have taken upon themselves the responsibility of conducting the affairs of this House and they have . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That complaint has to be made somewhere else, not here now.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौर-
डिया : यह सदन का मामला है । माननीय
सदस्य ने एक सप्ताह पहले नाम दिया । समझ
में नहीं आता. क्या माया है प्रेम की ।

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: This concerns Government and Parliament. I do not want Parliament to avoid its responsibility of going into this matter. Every Member has the right to speak, subject to the desire or the will of the Presiding Officer. We are told that some persons go and give, certain names to suit themselves or their friends and those who gave their

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha] names earlier are deprived of their chance of exercising their right to speak.

Another thing that I want to bring to your notice, Madam, is that it is stated that those who have moved amendments will get the chance and the time to speak. Let me tell you that henceforth I will give critical amendments to all Government motions and thus exercise my right because if somebody gets the right by sending in critical amendments then I would also exercise 'this right.

I do not want to participate in this debate because I feel that things are not being conducted in a proper manner in this House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I want to say that Mr. Sinha has brought certain points to my notice which strictly speaking, I need not deal with. The parliamentary practice wherever parliamentary democracy is functioning is that the Chair's eyes have to be caught by the hon. Minister. But we have departed from that and the Whip is giving a long list of names. I do not mind if the lists are reasonably long so that everybody could be accommodated. But the list is ever so long. Here I want to bring to your notice that the Chair's eye may not be caught. That is also parliamentary practice. You may stand up a hundred times from your seat and yet you may never catch my eye.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Most unfortunate.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That has been the practice in the House of Commons, which is the mother of parliaments. Unfortunately if this continue here and if endless lists come, then I shall follow my own practice when I am in the Chair and say that the Member has to catch my eye if he is to speak.

Now Mr. Sen Gupta has agreed that Mr. Pande will speak first and then himself.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, I submit that Mr. Sinha should be given an opportunity.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinha should be given an opportunity today.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: On a point of order.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Let me make one thing clear, Madam. If you had said that I did not catch your eye, then I would not raise any objection. But if you say that there is a long list, then naturally I shall have to object and I shall always object.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: I have a fundamental point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have no time.

श्री राजनारायण : बहुत फंडामेंटल प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर उठ गया । महोदया, मैं आप के द्वारा यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि काउंटिंग टु रूल इस सदन में जिस तरीके से श्री सिन्हा जो ने धनको दी है कि अब आइन्दा मैं क्रिटिकल हूँगा और सरकार के हर मोशन पर क्रिटिकल होकर अपने अमेंडमेंट सूब करूँगा तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या श्री सिन्हा जो इसके पहले अपनी पार्लियामेंट्री इयूटी को पूरा नहीं करते थे और आज वे समझे हैं कि उनकी पार्लियामेंटरी इयूटी क्या है ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do, that will do.

श्री राजनारायण : गवर्नमेंट का क्रिटिकल होना सही है या न होना सही है ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. There is no point of order. Yes, Mr. Pande.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Madam Deputy Chairman, I feel that it is rather incongruous and anomalous that we should be discussing this Interim Report of Dr. Hazari when the correct order of things should have been

that we should be discussing the Monopolies Commission's Report. The Report was received two years back and we have had before us the Maha-lanobis Report also. We have not discussed or debated them or taken any steps on those Reports. Now this Interim Report leaks out in the Press and it is brought to the House by the Government on account of certain circumstances . . .

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY): The Report of the Monopolies Commission has been discussed in this House.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: But no steps like this have been taken about that. There is a bigger ground covered and in a more authentic manner by the Monopolies Commission. This Report here covers only a part of the whole thing and that part is concentrated on a certain house. It is only a part and in the whole Report it is possible that other houses may be involved. Here there are some 75 concerns mentioned. But there may be other houses involved. Do you think that we should have for every business house one debate? It is no use. It is better if we discuss the Monopolies Commission's Report and work according to the recommendations made. I really support and admire the line taken by the Government in this connection.

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

But that line should have been taken with regard to the Monopolies Commission which is the main body, which is the more authentic body and which covers the largest number of companies which are under review.

Now, I will deal with licensing. Licensing is a legal process. It is governed by the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. There are certain business houses, many of them capable of doing things, capable of effectively utilising the licences.

They apply, and if everything is O.K. they get the licence. But there is a tortuous process involved in getting licences. First, an application for a licence goes to the Development Wing of the Planning Commission. Then it goes to the Technical Adviser to the Government of India and finally it goes to the Central Licensing Advisory Committee. And the Licensing Committee is an independent organisation which has not been presided over by Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar for a long time and there are so many rival interests in that Committee. So it is not possible for Birlas to control their rivals in that Committee. Therefore anything has to be done through the Planning Commission, through the Technical Directorate of the Government of India, through the Central Advisory Licensing Committee and finally by the Ministry. What pains us is this. Day in and day out accusations are made. I do not care what you say about Mr. Birla. But no single Minister in this Government of India is spared by these people, by the Opposition parties. They have not spared anybody. Do you think this is a happy thing for the country that you can go on accusing people without substantiating . . .

श्री राजनारायण : कौन सी चीज सब्स-
टैंसियेट नहीं हुई, कोई ऐसी बात है जो कि
सत्य साबित नहीं हुई ।

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Then there are accusations against the entire bureaucracy. On the one hand we in this House stand for public sector but who is going to manage that public sector if you condemn everybody in the bureaucracy? You want everything to go to the public sector and who is to manage those things? We have no other cadre in the country except this cadre whom you are condemning day in and day out that this man is corrupt, that that man's son is working there. It is really a very bad thing if you were to give the impression that there are no honest people in the country, that the bureaucracy is dishonest, that the

Interim Report on

and Licensing Policy

[Shri C. D. Pande] Ministers are dishonest and that the business houses are all criminals. Even Members of Parliament are supposed to be in the pay of this house or in the pay of that house. There are so many contending houses and those houses are fighting and it is quite possible if there are certain persons here. But then you have not spared public men, you have not spared the bureaucracy, you have not spared any of the important Ministers of the Government and you have not spared any prominent businessman. If this is the impression created what happens when we go to the foreign countries? Our Government is committed to invite foreign collaboration. Is this a good and decent thing? Your papers go to those countries and if someone wanted to come in collaboration here he will be told: "Where are you going? It is a den of dacoits and looters. Every businessman in India is dishonest, every Minister is dishonest, every public man is dishonest." This is not the way to serve the country; this is not national service. You are not doing any service either to the public sector or to the private sector or to your own national interests. It is absolutely shameful that people should go on talking of corruption here, corruption there, corruption everywhere, as if only Mr. Rajnarain and a few other persons are honest in this country and everybody else is dishonest. If it is your contention I welcome you to have that opinion but all I say is, do not try to misrepresent things, do not smear the image of India which is being watched by the whole world. Of course people know better and they would not rely on your statement. Anyhow, if you go on slinging mud, the mud sticks some time or other. But the main thing is, the Government should not pay any attention to these smearing campaigns either from that side or from this side against the bureaucracy or the business front. Of course, our friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, has a certain goal. He wants to discredit the entire democratic system and the private sector, this policy

of having both the public and the private sector, is part of the process of democracy. And if he says that all these people are dishonest it hurts the entire concept of democracy and he welcomes it. But we do not know how to make a difference between the motives of . . .

श्री राजनारायण : डेमोक्रेसी में जो डिस्अननेस्ट गवर्नमेंट होती है वह हटा दी जाती है।

श्री सी० डी० पांडे : जब आपको मौका लगेगा तब आप हटा दीजियेगा, लेकिन मैं कह सकता हूँ, I can tell you that there are many States where you have done that.

श्री राजनारायण : कैरों का मामला आप देखिये।

SHRI C. D. PANDE: And do you think that the industrial process will, come to a stop there and they will take your advice? I will tell you that those people have got greater sense than you have got. They are inviting competent people from all sectors, and all business houses to come to their States. It was disputed by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta who said that Mr. Namboodiripad did not invite Mr. Birla. Of course, Mr. Birla was invited many years ago and he is there with a flourishing and a very novel business of producing what is called rayon in this country. Rayon used to be imported always.

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON (Kerala):

He is producing only pulp.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: You just allow him and he will set up a factory. So the Chief Ministers today are competing; they are inviting the big business houses, not only Birlas but many others, and asking them whether they will come to their States and establish industries. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is not here now. Even Mr. Khrushchev of the USSR once invited Mr. Birla to Russia and seriously proposed to him

if he would establish some industry which was not there in that country. That is the situation. He is highly respected. But here it has become a fashion to pull down every reputation whether in the Government or in the business world. This type of campaign is a very bad thing for the country.

(interruptions) Sir, this is not the way. He is ridiculing. Sir, please ask Mr. Raj-narain not to mimic and not to make a buffoon of himself.

श्री राजनारायण : क्या हुआ पांडेजी, क्या कह रहे हैं। इनको कहिये गर्म नहीं। मैं आपको पर्सनल एक्सप्लेनेशन देना चाहता हूँ।

SHRI C. D. PANDE: No; you cannot do that. I will not allow it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Rajnarain, let him finish. Please sit down. Mr. Pande, only two minutes more.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: If my time is taken away like this, what can be done?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You should not allow yourself to be diverted.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: I will not go into the details of all the things that have been discussed in this House yesterday. My hon. friend, Mr. Triloki Singh, referred to something about an industry in Mirzapur District, an aluminium factory. It has been said that the electricity supplied to the Birla Brothers is at a very cheap rate. Of course I am not in a position to say whether it is below cost or above cost but I can say one thing. To an American firm in Hirakud electricity is supplied at a much cheaper rate by our Government. It is supplied at Rs. 1201- per kwt. per year whereas Birlas pay Rs. 175- per kwt. per year. More than that; there are other projects in the country, Sherrawati and Koyna, where the charge for electric supply will be almost two-thirds of these rates.

श्री राजनारायण : पांडे जी, माइक टूट जायेगा, उसको आप छोड़ दीजिये।

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Therefore to say that electricity has been supplied to them below cost price or at a throwaway price is not correct. There is one thing more. When the Rihand dam was ready there was not a single consumer in view. The Railways who were supposed to be the main consumers were not ready and they wanted four years time. And the transmission lines were not ready for power to be taken to the eastern districts of U.P. The real question before the authorities then was what to do with the electricity which they had produced and for which they had no consumers. Birlas were given an assurance: "You put up your industry and we will give you power." And yet they were asked to pay more than the Hirakud rate. And they came in at a time when there was no consumer.

Therefore, to say that the whole district is starving, that the whole thing is a farce because the people are not given electricity is all wrong. I say Mr. Rajnarain, who comes from that district, should know the real facts. The whole of U.P. did not have a single big industry. This was the first time when he came there and it is the last time he will be there, I tell you. There has been a cluster of business around Mirzapur, Rihand and Chopan. It is a big industrial centre and except for Kanpur it is a big industrial area in U.P.

Thank you.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, मैं एक आवश्यक बात आपकी खिदमत में पेश करना चाहता हूँ, एक मिनट में।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): What is this about?

श्री राजनारायण : यह प्रॉसीडिंग है 1-9-66 की . . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : अब इसको खत्म हो जाने दीजिये।

श्री राजनारायण : ... इलिये भी कह रहा हूँ आप खबर कर दें कि यह 1-9-66 तारीख का है, इसमें श्री रामस्वामी ने 26 अगस्त, 1966 का चिट्ठा लिखा है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Has it anything to do with the Hazari Report?

श्री राजनारायण : येत। कल जब मैं इस सदन में बोल रहा था तब श्री मोरारजी बड़े थे और मैंने कहा रामस्वामी ने एक चिट्ठा लिखी है जिसमें उन्होंने डा० तेजा के बारे में कहा है और उन्होंने—श्री मोरारजी ने—प्रधान मंत्री जी को प्रेषित किया। लेकिन मोरारजी ने यहां सफाई दी : “आई हव नो नल्लिज आफ दिस”। तो मैं आपके जरिये इस सदन को यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि 29 नवम्बर, 1961 को डा० डॉ० रामस्वामी ने एक चिट्ठा लिखी है जिसमें उन्होंने डा० तेजा के बारे में मोरारजी को बतलाया है। उस चिट्ठी की कापी उन्होंने 26 अगस्त, 1966 को डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया को भेजी जिसमें उन्होंने लिखा था :

“On Jayanti Shipping Company scandal you were the only one who presented the quintessence by asking whether the Government will arrest and prosecute Dr. Teja. Dr. Teja played series of confidence tricks on gullible people like Nehru . . .”

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You may just refer to it.

श्री राजनारायण : लास्ट में मैं पढ़ देता हूँ :

“By way of background I send herewith a copy of a letter I wrote to Shri Morarji Desai who passed it on to Shri Nehru. Sd. D. Ramaswamy.”

तो मैं आपसे यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि मोरारजी भाई को, मैं चाहता हूँ, आप हिदायत करें कि जो 29 नवम्बर, 1961 को रामस्वामी ने डा० तेजा के बारे में मोरारजी भाई को चिट्ठी लिख कर भेजी थी उस चिट्ठी को व खोजें, उस चिट्ठी की कापी

टेबल पर रखें और उस चिट्ठी में जो रामस्वामी ने डा० लोहिया को 26 अगस्त 1966 में लिखा उसमें लिख किया है कि उन्होंने मोरारजी देसाई को चिट्ठी लिखी है और वह चिट्ठी उन्होंने नेहरू जी को भेजा।

अब मैं एक पर्सनल एक्सप्लेनेशन दे रहा हूँ आपको . . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अब्दुल अली खान) : मैं समझ गया।
I will ask the Minister concerned to take note of it and to pass it on to Mr. Morarji Desai.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन् मैं आपको पर्सनल एक्सप्लेनेशन यह दे रहा था कि श्री पांडे जी ने हमारे बारे में यहां पर एक तैश में आकर कुछ कहा। मैं पांडे जी को कोई बच्चा नहीं समझता। मैं सदन के सदस्यों को . . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अब्दुल अली खान) : आपने क्या कर्माया है ?

श्री राजनारायण : मैं केवल एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। जब पांडे जी खड़े होते हैं तो बिल्कुल असंजदीय तरीके से ये भाषण करते हैं। अगर सही तरीके से इनके भाषण का सार देखा जाय तो सिवाय बिड़ला जी की दलाली के इन्होंने और कुछ नहीं किया। अगर पांडे जी गरम होते हैं तो मैं आइन्दा बताऊंगा। पांडे जी के बारे में बहुत सी चीजें जानता हूँ। क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि पांडे जी के रिश्तेदारों को वहां लगाया गया है और उसके डाइरेक्ट पे में हैं ? (Interruptions) इस तरह की गरमी न दिखाया करें, जरा यह पालिया-मेंटरी प्रोसेस को समझें। बिड़ला की कमाई खा खा कर इस सदन में गरम नहीं।

कुमारी मनिबेन बल्लभभाई पटेल : (गुजरात) : मैं एक बात पूछना चाहती हूँ कि क्या कोई एक सदस्य के ऊपर कोई कानून, कोई नियम लागू नहीं होता है ? यह ठीक बात है क्या ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Sometimes we have to tolerate Mr. Rajnarain.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Sometimes we have to tolerate Mr. Pande.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Otherwise time will be wasted.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: This is the parliamentary practice.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am sorry that an important matter like the Hazari Report is being allowed to be misdirected and miscarried. It is an unfortunate episode that if somebody starts with a Biila debate it also ends with Birlas. I think the Hazari Report contains something much more serious than that. Birla is an instance. That is not the conclusion. We have got to see from the Report how the Planning Commission and how the Government of India were violating the Directive Principles in relation to our national economy, how the cardinal directives in the Constitution of India have been violated, how our national economy was allowed to be concentrated in the hands of a particular group or family of industrialists. That is the point and that is the danger. We have got to decide how that danger can be obviated, how we can come out of the situation, how best we can turn the corner. My friends supporting obviously the case of Birlas there were suggesting how many men Birlas have employed. Had there been no Birla, there would have been a void in the country. I do not understand this. It is a vicious circle. Who knows that but for these Birlas, but for this corrupt and ill-advised policy of our Government, the national economy would have prospered more? Here is a point in this Report which says that Birla gets licences not to carry them through, but to block the others. This is a serious charge. Birla has been allowed monopoly of a particular group of industries or a major share in an industry to the serious prejudice of our national growth, because the people feel diffident in entering

into the area of competition of Birlas, who have already the control. That is the difficulty. That is the aanger.

Now, I would like to indicate from this Report itself and that will serve as a reply to my friend, one-time socialist, Mr. Suresh Desai. He says there are three types of business houses which require licences. Yes, Dr. Hazari knew that and he has indicated it in paragraph 10.2 of his Report:—

"The licensing Committee granted approval for 375 applications, of which investment data available for 240. These 240 applications involved an investment (in capital equipment) of Rs. 246 crores with an import component of Rs. 159 crores. If, on a rough and crude basis these investment data are boosted *pro rata* for all the 375 applications approved, the total investment (in capital equipment) and its import component would be Rs. 384 crores and Rs. 248 crores, respectively."

Then comes para 10.3 and I see these things so far as this Chapter is concerned.

"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 300. The build-up of momentum started in 1959 and the break-through came in 1960. There has been no looking back since then. Over these 9J 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."

All these things were known to Dr. Hazari. He knew it. But the point is not that. The point is, Birla has shown how our Government has failed in this vital aspect in granting indiscriminate licences to one firm, and has indicated how the Planning Commission should behave. I am referring to the recommendations and I believe that Dr. Hazari has played the host

[Shri D. L. Sen Gupta]

for the Planning Commission all right. Dr. Hazari was appointed in the Planning Commission in July 1966 to conduct a study of licensing under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. The study had two objectives—I am not reading that. What have been his recommendations? The recommendations are very very important. I shall read only 1, 2, 6, 9 and 10 and I shall indicate therefrom that he has given a caution to the Planning Commission because of its sleeping attitude. It may not be connivance. I do not go so far as to say that all the Ministers are conniving, it might be or it might not be. There was a commonsense knowledge, I should say, and people knew that Mr. Birla has in his pocket 60 or 70 M.Ps. It is very disgraceful. I do not know whether the number has increased or decreased. Now Mr. Birla has some Ministers in his pocket. It is disgraceful. Nobody is coming out with the whole truth. We are left guessing. We have no choice for Birla or Tata or Dalmia or anybody. We want clean industry, we want a clean economy. How can that clean economy be made possible? Here are the recommendations:

"1. The Planning Commission should not confine itself to the laying down of end-Plan targets but should also indicate which targets are compulsive and which are merely indicative. It should specify the major priority areas and suggest from time to time the broad policies on taxation, credit prices and allocation of foreign exchange required to fulfil the targets set for these areas.

2. Estimates for priority and inter-dependent areas should be worked out for various alternative levels of realisable or expected performance. The industrial aggregations which find expression in the plan have to be continuously reconciled with developments at the level of individual firms or groups of interrelated projects.

6. Regional allocations, small industry --servations and >> ies re-

garding concentration of economic power should be built into the industrial plan and programmes, and not left to be determined on an ad hoc basis.

9. As compared with industrial planning, modification of the scope and mechanism of licensing is a relatively secondary matter."

Why Mr. Birla was given so many licences is a secondary matter. Planning is more important,

"10. Matching of priorities and relative profitability, of planning objectives and techniques with market criteria and tests, should be the main instruments of industrial planning and policy. Social channellisation of investment cannot be achieved by reliance upon the one instrument alone, be it industrial licensing, taxation, 'market mechanism or any other."

My point therefore is this. What should be our attitude towards these industrial houses? I do not say that they must be scrapped. I only say that we should be conscious of their limitations, we should be conscious of the mischief they are capable of doing if they go on in the manner we are allowing them to go on. Why are the other industrial houses not developing? Why not there be 800 industrial houses even in the private sector? I know that the public sector cannot undertake everything. So why are not 500 industrial houses growing? Why the heavy concentration of wealth should be in one particular house? Some good friend in this House on behalf of the Birlas, I take it, was saying, "No, no, Tata has increased many times more." But how? There is no comparison between Tata and Birlas so far as Dr. Hazari is concerned. If Dr. Hazari has said about Tatas, our comments would have been the same. My comment is not about Birla or Tata. My point is, where are the figures? Up to 1959 Birla had no dominant position. After 1959 he has suddenly jumped up. It means a boost. Who

has given this boost? Is the Birla empire an ideal one? Certainly not. They are tax-dodgers. There is a book "T.T.K. and Birla House" by one Mr. Debajyoti Burman, and you will find there how these Birlas have defrauded this Government of India. You will find in it how they are cheating the railways. I am giving only one passage just to make my submission complete—the book is available in the market, of course it is not in the Library:

"It has been proved before the Sixth Industrial Tribunal, West Bengal, that a Birla manufacturing concern maintains a number of apparently independent companies with the object of escaping tax liabilities. Mr. Sailesh Sengupta, Judge, Six Industrial Tribunal, in his judgment delivered on January 22, 1957 said: 'The case supported by the Union is that the Paper Distributors Ltd. and a bunch of other companies were floated by the same group of persons to carry on the same type of business as agents of. Orient Paper Mills Ltd which was a paper manufacturing concern. To all appearances these several companies were independent units but in fact they were all chips of the same block. They were so split up with the ulterior object of escaping liability for income and super tax and keeping the employ-yees under the heels of the Maliks. Nominally attached to one company, the employees were made to work for the other companies as well. The company strongly repudiated the union allegation that the Paper Distributors and the other companies were parts of the same concern kept in isolation out of fraudulent intentions. They were in fact independent and separate concerns. I have evidence before me that employees of one company were transferred to other companies. It is hence clear that the transfers were made in the interests of the companies and not out of consideration for the employees. Unless there was

a common denominator or connecting link behind the facade of absolute independence no such transfers could be arranged.'

In this case, Mr. B. P. Khaitan, Solicitor for Birla concerns appeared on behalf of the Paper Distributors and Mr. D. L. Sen Gupta, Advocate, High Court, for the employees. The same old story of hiding vital books of accounts was repeated in this case as well. The Judge remarked, "The Union called for the godown books amongst others. The company was directed by the Tribunal to produce books and documents which might be in their possession. The godown books were in their possession but were not produced. The Tribunal is free to make the presumption that if they were produced, they would have been found to be unfavourable to the company's case."

A cash book written in Marwari script which none of the witnesses could read was produced but it was useless. The case of closure of paper business must hence be discredited. On the collapse of this plea, the company has no case at all."

Mr. Bhuwarka asked: when there are different companies, how could Dr. Hazari come to the conclusion that they are of Birlas? Though they are separate entities they can be Birla concerns because the controlling authorities are the Birlas. These are all subterfuges.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Sir, since two days we have been discussing the Report of Dr. Hazari and also the Birla Empire is on fire. When we have been discussing this Report, I am really concerned that the admirers of the Birlas are under the feeling that it is being done by some responsible or irresponsible Members because of their bias against the Birlas. I would like to make it very clear that this discussion is not out of any bias towards any individual or any group. There is no doubt that for the Industrial development of this country we

[Shri M. M. Dharia]

have accepted the principle of a mixed economy and therefore that principle stands. Along with the public sector the private sector is bound to remain. But at the same time we have also accepted some other principles. In this country of ours we have decided that a socialistic structure shall be our aim. It will be the democratic socialism that we want to establish in this country. And when we say that we want to establish democratic socialism, then naturally some curbs and restraints on the private sector are followed.

Many have said many things. Some of the admirers like Mr. Chinai and others have said that for the industrial growth of this country, why one Birla, one hundred Birlas are necessary. There is the industrial growth of the country at one end and there is the socialistic objective of the country at the other end. If that conflict takes place in between these two, Sir, I would like to submit that social objectives are more important for this country than industrial progress which is sought by my friends. I feel, when I speak of social objectives, that industries are a part of social objectives. But industries cannot dominate our social objectives, and that is the real trouble. "When several comments come against Birlas, I can appreciate the irritation of the admirers of the Birlas for several reasons behind that. Without exposing those reasons, because everybody is aware of them, I would like to say that today there is a feeling in this country that this growth of the Birla Empire is not only not limited to industrial purposes, it has also crossed the limits and the bounds. It was said that the Chief Ministers are competing amongst themselves—if the Birlas are taking advantage of the position, what can we do? Sir, the Chief Ministers of States are competing in inviting Birlas. Such a power has grown of the Birla Empire and that is nothing new about a monopoly. We are against the build-up of all these

monopolies in this country, against a power of this type which makes the Chief Ministers to compete amongst themselves. The very reason why I have come forward against the admirers of Birlas is enough cause for me to see that this monopoly does not grow. The Chief Ministers compete with one another against the interests of the people. What is the Chief Minister? The Chief Minister is not only an individual, he represents four or five crores of the people from his State and he has to do it at the cost of the people. When Birlas who have got at Rs. 2.80 per tonne get the contract from the Kerala Government at Rs. 1 per tonne, at what cost it has happened? That is, Rs. 1.80 would have gone to the people of Kerala. They had to forego it. It is because of their growing empire. There is nobody else to look after that. There is a feeling in this country and it is on this ground that I am here to oppose this growing monopoly. I am here to congratulate my friend, Shri Chandra Shekhar, who took a very bold step and lead in this matter. He has brought this matter before this House. I am also proud of this House because this House can appreciate to the feelings of the Members and the people at large. We know how these Birlas have grown up. In the year 1942, the total assets of the Birlas were not even to the tune of Rs. 30 crores. These Birlas have crossed Rs. 300 crores and all this is white money. I do not know about the black money. Somebody may ask, "How do you say it?" They may say that this man is making an irresponsible allegation. I have here the report about the election of Mr. Morarka. In that parliamentary constituency, nearly 500 jeep cars and vehicles were moving. (Interruptions) Let me have my say. AN HON. MEMBER: Why not?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Every day nearly Rs. 1 lakh were spent on the vehicles and such other articles. As

per my information, nearly Rs. 60 lakhs have been spent by the Birla group in that constituency. As per the election regulations, not more than Rs. 25,000 could be shown as expenses. Wherefrom did this amount come? It has come from blackmarketing by Birlas. Otherwise, they could not have spent this much amount.

Sir, these Birlas were in the company of Gandhiji. I am really sorry. If Gandhiji had been alive today, what he would have felt, I do not know. One of the able representatives of Birlas . . .

^m SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: (Uttar Pradesh): He was never in the company of Gandhiji. Let me correct you.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: That is very good. I thank you very much. I thought the impression was otherwise in the whole of the country. I am thankful to Mr. Triloki Singh for giving me this information. As per my information, he was in his company.

Anyway, Sir, the point is that one of the able representatives of Birlas had been to me after this Report was sought to be brought before this House. Of course, I had to give him some time; I am a representative of the people. He came and was with me for one hour. He could not convince me on one single point. Before going, he asked me, "Mr. Dharia, will you accept one fact about these Birlas? They are the most patriotic industrialists in this country. Will you also accept that the Birlas are not at all now in need of industries? They do not want money. They have earned much. Why should they be in that way discussed in the House? Why should their name be defamed in the House?" I told him, "I ask you, gentleman. If you are so much conscious of that, if the Birlas are not in need of industries or in need of money, if the Birlas were definitely nearer to Gandhiji, do they at least remember the advice given by

Gandhiji? The idea of Gandhiji was of trusteeship. Birlas who are not now in need of money or in need of industries, are they prepared to declare their whole property or their whole industries as trusts? I am prepared to work on that trust and see that in this country a new era is opened." But that gentleman had no reply. These are the Birlas.

Sir, two years back I was in America. When I was there, I was fortunately in one hotel where there was a conference of industrialists. And one Mr. Vogan happened to be at my table where I was having my meals. I just discussed with him about India. I came to know that that gentleman had travelled in our country too. He said, "Mr. Dharia, We are proud that your country is going ahead." I asked him, "What about the industrialists? Whom do you appreciate?" He said, "We appreciate your Tatas and Mafatlals." I asked him, "What about our Birlas?" He said, "About Birlas? Mr. Dharia, I have travelled the whole of your country. May I say one thing in the language of your country?" I said, "Yes." And that gentleman said, "The Birlas are banias first and then industrialists. They are not a reliable people. I am not prepared to trust the Birlas." So that is the image of the Birlas outside.

Sir, in this country, the Tatas are also having their products; the Mafatlals are also having their products. About quality at least we can say; I am not entering into other aspects as to how they have secured their licences. But so far as the quality is concerned, we can believe the Tatas and the Mafatlals. But so far as the quality of Birla products is concerned, what is that quality? What are these Ambassador cars? I have said once in this House that in the Ambassador car, except the horn every other part gives noise.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Madras): The horn also.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: The horn does not give noise.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): 'Except the horn' he says.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Of course, in this Birla Empire, I am now happy that at least those horns may not be giving noise. But there are some horns somewhere including in this House which are making noise. Anyway, it is how the Birlas manage. Sir, the point is: Where do we want to go? What does this country intend to stand for? What is our pledge to the people or our obligation to the people. Let us be absolutely clear. In this country we shall not allow these monopolies to grow. We shall not allow a danger to be created to our democracy and , socialism. Today these growing monopolies of Birla are a danger to the democracy, to our socialism and that is the reason why we demand from the Government curbs against these monopolies. We say that an enquiry should be held.

Now what are the ways and means adopted by these concerns? The Hazari Report is not a complete report. I am aware of that position. But at the same time it is not an interim report also. If I may refer to Mr. Hazari's introduction to this Report, he says:

"The aggregate statistical data on licensing relate to the calendar years 1959, 1960, 1964, 1965 and January-June 1966. The data on the Birla Groups cover the period 1957—June 1966. The coverage of capital goods data is indicated in appropriate places. The rlnaT report will include aggregate licensing data for 1961 to 1963 also, and the entire data will be analysed in greater detail by industries, States and groups."

That is, whatever is contained in this report is not incomplete. It is absolutely complete and, besides, further more data is to be collected. The data which have been made available to the Hazari Committee today cannot be conclusive but it is indicative. And what does it indicate? How did these Birlas amass wealth? Mr. Suresh

Desai says that what they have secured are not licences but approvals. It is true that approvals are not licences. We know the difference between approval and a licence. No sooner you secure an approval you block the way for others. These people without making any investment block the road for new industrialists to enter into this field.

Sir, in this context I have to say something about the ways and means adopted. In Delhi, Sir, there are three types of Embassies: (1) Foreign Embassies, (2) Embassies of our States, and (3) the more powerful and effective embassies of the empires of these- industrialists. They are having their contacts. Even today I find them sitting in the Galleries. These Embassies are most effective. They are having first class accommodation in hotels. They are having their rooms reserved in the Asoka Hotel and the Oberoi International Hotel. In these hotels they entertain everybody with whom they are related and from whom they have to extract something. They are having first class contacts with the officers. I am sorry to say that the I.C.S. officers, who have no future after their retirement, are the best friends of such industrialists. They get promotions. They get more pay. If they are getting Rs. 4-5 thousand here per month, they get Rs. 10,900 per month with these industrial concerns, and that too, without taxes. General Kaul, who had to retire from Army, was appointed by Mr. Teja on a monthly salary of Rs. 20,000. If such a bright future is offered to these I.C.S. Officers who control these empires, who control these executive rights, they are bound to be in favour of such capitalists (Time bell rings") Since I have no time at my disposal I may make my submission in very short. I would like to say that the ways and means which are being adopted by these industrialists, have created the real danger to our democracy. I am not against anybody being defeated. But the ways and means adopted, an

amount of Rs. 50 lakhs of blackmarket money being used to defeat a particular individual is a matter of serious concern for me. This democracy is not going to allow this sort of thing. If these gheraos come about, and if there is anybody to be blamed for these gheraos, it is this functioning of these industrial houses that shall have to be blamed. In this context we shall have to look at all these problems. Therefore, on my amendment I have to make the following submissions. Firstly, the Monopolies Inquiry Commission report has been received by the Government in the month of October 1965. That report contains a draft legislation. From my point of view that draft legislation is not complete. It is evasive. So it should be properly drafted and a legislative measure should be immediately introduced by the Government by the end of this session. A Monopolies Commission on a permanent basis should be immediately appointed after that legislation is passed here to watch the monopolies.

My second submission is regarding the enquiry into all the affairs regarding the ways and means adopted by these industrialists, particularly by the Birlas. That data is available. Somebody might say that he is not the only thief. But instead of waiting for all the thieves to be apprehended, why not start prosecution against the one who has already been caught? The ways and means adopted should be enquired into so that the road is not blocked for other industrialists, to see that preferences are not given to such people who are having their contacts, to see that social objectives are properly implemented, to see that these monopolies do not grow, to see that there is a balanced regional development throughout the whole country, to see that our scions are not compelled to go to these industrialists at any cost. Now in their contract with the Birlas the Kerala Government had to say that labour legislations would not be made applicable to the employees. Is it not detrimental to the interests of the

poor employees? We shall not allow it to be done. And you say, "What can we do?" What does this Parliament stand for? It stands to protect the interests of the people, and anything going against the interest of the people shall not be tolerated by this Parliament.

To enquire into all these affairs a Committee is absolutely necessary. That committee should be a committee of not only experts but some non-official Members of this Parliament should also be attached to it. This Committee should be asked to submit its report within three months after its appointment.

Sir, it was said that if Birlas were not here we could not advance industrially. It is not correct. It is not the Birlas who are running the industries. It is our workmen, our technicians, our experts in these industries, a patriotic lot, who have to be taken into confidence. They will run these industries.

Then my third submission is . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Last submission.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: These are my submissions. On my amendment I will not speak. Then pending enquiry these Birla group of industries should not be given any further licences. I am happy that the hon. Minister has made the position very clear. I would congratulate him and the Minister of State also for taking this very reasonable attitude in the matter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Now you must finish.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: I am finishing. Finally, I would request the hon. Minister that it is in this light that he should make a categorical statement in the House. Then alone this debate should come to a conclusion. Sir, I have done. Thank you. very much.

SHRI RAMACHANDRA MENON: Sir, we are now at the cross-roads. We are not sure how our country should advance. I am glad there are people, there are friends on both sides of the House who very seriously take up this issue, who want to know what our social objective should be. There was the old resolution which definitely laid greater emphasis on the State sector. From Ram Rajya to democratic socialism we have slowly passed through various stages without a clear social objective. We have not been able to really build up our economy on a sound basis, on an independent basis. Why is it that it was not possible? Because this country when it got independence was not very clear about its social objectives. We were very much interested in the freedom of the country, but we did not know how we should take the country forward industrially. The result was the Tata and the Birla plan was already there. They had planned how they should develop this country in their own way. They tried their best to see that the Government's policy turned out to be a policy which helped their own way of approach. This is what has happened. Now we talk about mixed economy. But actually what has happened? Thanks to Pandit Nehru—we must admit it and we are proud of it—we thought about heavy industries, we thought about these industries being developed in the State sector and that they should take a commanding position. But what has happened? During these years we have been slowly going away from that. I know how in the case of fertilizers, we have given up our old stand, how in the case of oil we are giving up our stand, how some of the basic industries themselves are being handed over to the very people whom we are now attacking. This is what has happened. The policy of the Government is not very clear. They are not definite and this indefinite stand of theirs has helped all monopolists to grow as much and as quick as possible, with the result that the entire structure which was sought to

be built up, has now almost collapsed? The Industries Act laid down clearly how monopolies should be prevented, how medium and small-scale industries should be encouraged, how new entrepreneurs should come, how development on a widespread basis should take place in different regions and how to boost up technology and economic improvements. 'Nothing has happened. Every promise has been given up. What do we see? Monopolies have been created. Big industrial houses have become monopolists. We speak so much about socialism. We have unashamedly gone and secured foreign collaboration for almost every industry, industries for which we do not require collaboration, which can be set up here without the help of anybody. There are 3,000-odd collaborations with foreign concerns. What for, I do not know. From lipstick to anything, from baby food to anything, we have gone to the extent of opening the gates for foreign capital and asking for assistance. This is what has happened. We must seriously consider what the Government policies have done to the economy of the country. By your policies you have encouraged monopolies both foreign and Indian. By your wrong policies, you have allowed the imperialists' capital to come back. And it must be remembered that at no period in our history has there been so much of foreign capital investment in even small and traditional industries. For example, if you allow Lever Brothers to come in, you can certainly understand that Mysore soap or Kerala soap has no future. But this is what has happened. The monopolists are allowed to penetrate into every section. Even in the traditional industries they come in. Foreign capital also comes in and they come together. The result is the entire attempt of our small people to industrialise, every attempt of theirs, has been completely throttled such activities. The report is a very restrained one. The language is very carefully chosen and a good deal is left to our inference. Dr. Hazari has pointed out that it is not merely a question of

licensing but the wrong policy of the Government that has helped the monopolists to grow. What more is required than this? This document points out that the policies of the Government have been wrong. For example, take page 25 where he says: "I hold this view because most of the defects of licensing policy appear to have arisen from planning deficiencies though administrative complications too, have made their contribution." This is the fact. The strategy of industrialisation has not been properly worked out and all the steps that we have been taking are to blow up that strategy we set out in the Industrial Policy Resolution. The result is we have got monopoly capital and this capital thrives at the expense of every backward section.

Now there has been a complaint that various State Governments are inviting the Birlas. The licence is not given by the State Government. Licensing is done here. For example, take Titanium steel in Kerala. To day it is to be taken up by the Birlas. But why not the State take it up? It is a very important project and the Birlas want to start this Rs. 30 crore project. This can very well be taken up by the Centre in the State sector. You won't do it. For long, from the British period up to now, we have been the raw material reserve. Even now we continue to be in this unfortunate situation. Small industries, cashew industries, beedi industries and such other industries are there in Kerala. But you will not in any way lift your helping hand to set up new and advanced industries in Kerala. This unfortunately is responsible for all these big industrialists coming there. Licences are given by you and if they come there with licences, we don't say "Don't start your industries here." We require industries. But what has happened? When Birla starts his Rayon's industry there, he will have only pulp there and the yam will be produced somewhere else. He does not want to industrialise that place. New subsidiary industries cannot come up. It

should be the policy of the Government to see that regional disparity is avoided. That you do not do. And for us, we feel there has been no difference between the Birlas and the Government or the Britisher in this sense that we continue to be the most undeveloped area, in spite of the fact that our people are hard-working, in spite of the fact that there are 1,200 people per sq. mile and there is great unemployment, in spite of the fact that our's is the most educated area with an intelligent labour force. It is the wrong policies of the Government which have helped the Birlas. You have sown the wind and so you are reaping the whirlwind. All this shadow-boxing now will not help you in any way. You have helped the growth of monopolies. You are responsible for it and you reap the consequences. The capitalist has been allowed full freedom. He has developed into a monopolist.

شہری اے - ایم - طاق (چمیں اینڈ
کشمیر) : مسٹر وائس چیرمین - کل
سے اس ایوان میں ہزاری رپورٹ کے
بارے میں تمام ممبر حضرات تقریر
کر رہے ہیں - جہاں تک ہزاری رپورٹ
کا تعلق ہے میں اس کے دوسرے پہلو
پر جو سیاسی پہلو ہے اپنے خیالات کا
اظہار کرنا چاہتا ہوں - جہاں تک
لائسنسز کا تعلق ہے بہت سے ممبروں
نے اپنی واقفیت کی بنا پر معلومات
کی بنا پر متوجہ سے اچھی تقریریں
اس مسئلہ پر کی ہیں - اس میں
کوئی شک نہیں ہے کہ کسی اندو
قولید کٹوری کے لئے یہ نہایت ضروری
ہے کہ ملک میں کافی بڑے بڑے
کارخانے ہوں، مشینیں ہوں، دولت

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) On a point of order. In the morning, the Chairman has ruled that he should speak from his seat. When he was asking a question, he was asked to sit from his seat. Is it his seat or he sits somewhere else? I am sorry, Sir, he has to speak from his seat.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I think so.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: Excuse me h.s time. I have got a lot of papers here.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Under the Rules of Procedure, this is an absolute necessity.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I agree with you.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Under the Rules of Procedure, there is only one procedure, that is, you have to speak from your own seat; you cannot speak from anywhere else.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You speak from your seat.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: I have got a lot of papers here. Please excuse me for this time.

श्री राजनारायण : जब शुरू कर दिया
है तो वहीं से बोलने दीजिये ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): All right; next time you must speak from your seat.

شہزی اے - ایم - طارق : اندر دولہا
کڑھری نے لئے یہ بے حد ضروری ہے
کہ ملک میں کافی بڑے بڑے گارخانے
ہوں ، مشینیں ہوں ، دولت ہو
لیکن سرکار کا اور ایوان کا بھی یہ
فرض ہے کہ وہ دیکھ کہ جب وہی
دولت ملک کے لئے عذاب ہو جائے ،
زھر ہو جائے تو اس دولت کی روک

تمام بے حد ضروری ہے - جہاں تک بولا
برادرس کی بزنس کا تعلق ہے اس
ملک میں اور بھی بزنس ہاؤسز ہیں
جن کی دیکھ بھال اور روک تھام
بے حد ضروری ہے لیکن ان بزنس
ہاؤسز کا ہماری سیاسی زندگی پر اتنا
اثر نہیں ہے جتنا بولا ہاؤس کا ہے -
دیکھنا یہ ہے کہ اپنے کاروبار کے ساتھ
ساتھ یہ ہاؤس کہیں اس ملک کی
سیاسی زندگی پر ہماری بلتی ہوئی
سوسائٹی پر اثر انداز ہونا تو نہیں
چاہتا ہے - جذبات والا - آپ کی
اجازت سے میں اس ایوان کی توجہ
آج سے چالیس سال قبل کے ایک
خط کی طرف جو اس وقت ایک
بہت بڑے آدمی نے جو بولا کی
دولت سے کھرا گئے تھے اپنے بیٹے کو
لکھا - باپ کا نام ہے موتی لعل نہرو
اور بیٹے کا نام جواہر لال نہرو -

"Communal hatred and heavy bribing of the voters was the order of the day. I am thoroughly disgusted and am now 'seriously thinking of retiring from political life. What is worrying me *» how to occupy my time. I am waiting for the Congress Session at Gauhati and keeping mum in the meanwhile. The Malaviya-Lala gang, aided by Birlas money, are making frantic efforts to capture the Congress." This letter is dated December 2, 1926. Now this is the political aspect of Birla House.

اور میں اس خط کی بنا پر تمام
ممبران کی توجہ دلاؤں گا - بغیر اس
کو سوچے کہ ہم کسی جماعت کے
ہیں دیکھنا یہ ہے کہ ہمارے سامنے

بہت سے ایسے واقعات آئے ہیں جن میں یہ کہا جاتا ہے صاحب - یہ ایسا ہے وہ ایسا ہے ؟ وہ یہ ہے یہ وہ ہے - لیکن اگر ہم خود ان باتوں کی اجازت دیتے ہیں جیسا کہ مسٹر وائس چیمبرلین آپ کو یاد ہوگا ابھی قیصر سال پہلے امریکن سلیٹ میں اسی طرح کا ایک کہس ہوا تھا - ایک معمولی آدمی رابرٹ بیکر کا جو کہ لندن جانسن کا خاص آدمی تھا ایک وہ پیج بوائے (page-boy) تھا لیکن دولت کے کرپشن کی وجہ سے دولتمند کی امداد سے ؟ وہ اس سینٹ کا ایک نہایت بااثر آدمی ہو گیا - ہم نے اس ملک میں بھی ایسے بااثر آدمی دیکھے ہیں - میں اس ایوان کی توجہ ایک معمولی واقعہ کی طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں - وہ ہے ایم - او - متھائی کا کہس - ایم - او - متھائی بھی ایک آدمی تھا اس ملک میں پلڈت جواہر لال نہرو کا ایک معمولی پی - اے - اور اس معمولی پی - اے - کی ماں کے لئے بولا ہاؤس نے لاکھوں روپے دئے ؟ ان کی ماں کے لئے ٹرسٹ بنانے کے لئے - کیوں ؟ اس لئے کہ اس وقت اس کے ہاتھ میں کافی طاقت تھی اور وہ اس طاقت سے ان ہاؤسیز کو فائدہ پہنچا سکتا تھا - تین تین لاکھ روپے کے مکان ۳۰ جلوری مارک پر خرید کر دے دئے گئے ان کی ماں کو - جب کہ ان کی ماں کا ہماری مدد سے

زندگی ، ہماری سماجی زندگی ، میں کوئی اثر نہیں تھا لیکن آج وہی ایم - آر - مٹھائی پچھلے ایک مہینے سے بڑا بوائرس سے انٹرویو چاہتا ہے جو نہیں مل رہا ہے - میں یہ سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ ایک خطرناک چیز ہو رہی ہے ہمارے ملک میں اس کی روک تھام کرنا ہم سب کا - مسبران پارلیمنٹ کا ایک فرض ہے - ہم جس طرح سے اپنے ملک کی سرحدوں کی حفاظت کرتے ہیں - جس طرح سے ہم یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ اس ملک کے لئے اندرونی امن ضروری ہے - انٹرنل سیکیوریتی ضروری ہے تو ہم نے یہ بھی دیکھا ہے جو لوگ ہمارے ملک کی سیاست سے ہمارے کلچر ، ہماری تہذیب اور ہمارے اخلاق کو متحضر اس دولت کے بل بوتے پر خرید رہے ہیں تو ان کی بھی دیکھ بھال پوری ہونی چاہئے ورنہ یہ ملک ایک ایسے آزار میں گرفتار ہو جائیگا جس سے نکالنا مشکل ہے - میں کسی کا نام لھنا نہیں چاہتا ہوں - کیا یہ حقیقت نہیں ہے کہ ہمارے ملک کے بہت سے بڑے بڑے افسروں کی سیکوریتی کے لئے ، ریٹائر ہونے سے پہلے ہی ان ہاؤسز میں جگہ کریمت کی جاتی ہے - اگر آج کی حکومت ایسے اعداد و شمار جمع کر لے تو آپ دیکھئے کتنے انکم ٹیکس کمشنر ریٹائر ہوتے ہی سیدھے بڑا ہاؤس پہنچتے ہیں - اب نوپت

[شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق]

یہاں تک آئی ہے کہ ہماری فوج کے بڑے بڑے جنرل سیدھے بولا ہاؤس میں جاتے ہیں یہ اس ملک کی سیاست کے لئے نہایت خطرناک چھوڑ ہے۔ اسکی روک تھام بے حد ضروری چھوڑ ہے۔ ہم سمبران پارلیمنٹ یہ دیکھیں کہ یہ سرکار پر حملہ نہیں ہے، ہم خود سرکار میں، ہم اس ملک کے رہنے والے ہیں، باقاعدہ نمائندگی کرتے ہیں۔ اگر ہم ہی نہیں رہے تو سرکار بھی نہیں رہے گی۔ ملک بھی نہیں رہے گا۔ تو اس بات کو چھوڑ دیجئے کہ یہ کس پارٹی کی حکومت ہے، کس پارٹی کے لوگ اس ریپوزیشن کو لائے ہیں۔ اصل ہماری کی روک تھام بے حد ضروری ہے ورنہ یہ لوگ آپ کی سیاست پر قابض ہو جائیں گے۔ چھوڑنا ترنگا رہیگا، شہر کے تین مہلے ضرور دھونگے لیکن اس منہ کے پیچھے اصلی شکل میں کبھی بولا ہونگے، کبھی تھاپڑ ہونگے، کبھی گونگا ہونگے۔ آپ ان چہروں کو سمجھ جائیں گے ان کا علاج کھجئے۔ ان کا علاج دھونڈ نکالنے کا کام سرکار بخوبی جانتی ہے۔ ان لائسنسہز کے بارے میں ہمارے پاس کافی اطلاعات ہیں، ان کے بارے میں کافی کچھ کہا جا سکتا ہے لیکن بدیہی بات یہ سوچنی ہے۔ ہمیں اس سے کوئی انکار نہیں ہے کہ ہم اس میں بڑا جی کے تمام ہاؤسہز کی مدد کرنا

چاہتے ہیں اور دولت اس ملک میں بلے، کارخانے بلیں لیکن ساری دولت کا استعمال سرکار کے خلاف نہیں ہونا چاہئے اس دولت کا استعمال زیادہ اے۔ احمد کے خلاف نہیں ہونا چاہئے، قہیا بھائی پتیل کے خلاف نہیں ہونا چاہئے۔ ہریھر چندر ماتھر کے خلاف نہیں ہونا چاہئے، اگر آپ ہم نے یہ برداشت کیا کہ وہ دولت کسی کے خلاف استعمال ہو رہی ہے تو وہ سماج کے خلاف استعمال ہوتی ہے اور ہم سب جلیہوں نے آزادی کے لئے ہر قسم کی مصہبتیں اور تکلیفیں برداشت کی ہیں۔ زندہ رہتے ہوئے بھی ہم پریشان دھونگے اور اپنے ملک کی خدمات نہیں کر پائیں گے اس لئے اس بات کی بھحد ضرورت ہے کہ ہم اپنی توجہ اس طرف کریں۔

میں آپکی اجازت سے صرف دو ملت کے لئے مینسٹر صاحب کی توجہ دو تین باتوں کی طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں صرف وہی چیزیں نہیں تھیں جو بہت سے ممبروں نے کہی ہیں ایک رول ٹاپس کا کہس بہت آتا ہے چائلا کے حملہ سے پیدا ہوئی ایمرجنسی کے زمانہ میں جب سرکار کو رول ٹاپس کی ضرورت پڑی اس میں بڑا ہاؤسہز کو بہت بڑا لائسنس ملا اور جب وہ رول ٹاپس لگائے گئے ان سے اون بدلا۔ اون سے کہو

ہلنا اس کے بارے میں اس سر نو
تصفیقات کی جائے کہا وہ کیوں ایسا
تھا جو پہلے لائق تھا - اس میں
کوئی شک نہیں کہ ہلدیستان موٹر
کا جہاں تک سوال ہے وہاں سرکار نے
چھاپا والا پورا کس مکمل ہے
پچھلے کئی مہینوں سے لیکھی کوئی
فیصلہ نہیں ہوتا ہے - جب فیصلہ
سرکار خود نہیں کر سکتی ہے تو یہ
سرکار اپنے آفیسروں کے بارے میں
عوام میں ایک شک پیدا کرتی ہے
اس شک کو دور کرنے کے لئے بہت
ضروری ہے کہ ان کا فیصلہ کیا جائے -

روبی انڈورنس کے بارے میں میرے
دوست چندر شیکھر نے ہنگال کے
چیف منسٹر صاحب کو خط لکھا
ہے - ایک صاحب ہیں بہت شریف
آدمی مسٹر بی - کے - تھانو جو
شیگر ہولڈر نوے چھپوں نے خود
سرکار سے کہا مجھے اجازت دیجئے
میں آپکے سامنے واقعات رکوں
لیکن اس کے لئے ضروری ہے کہ جس
رہاست کے آئیہ دھلے والے ہوں وہاں
کا ایڈوکیت جنرل آپکو اجازت دے -
ہنگال کا ایڈوکیت جنرل اجازت نہیں
دیتا - سہماجنل گورنمنٹ کو مداخلت
کرنی چاہئے اور پوچھا جائے اس
ایڈوکیت جنرل سے کہ اگر ایک آدمی
یہ کہتا ہے کہ میرے پاس ثبوت ہے
اور میں ثابت کر سکتا ہوں کہ کچھ
سرکاری دولت کی خورد برد ہوئی

ہے - کچھ سرکار کے ایسے لوگوں کی
عوامہ افزائی کرنا چاہئے بھارت دین
ان کو ملنا چاہئے جو سرکار کو جان
کاری فراہم کرے - مصیبت تو یہ ہے
کہ ملتا ان کو ہے جو سرکار کی دولت
پر ناجائز قبضہ ڈالتے ہیں - ناجائز
استعمال کرتے ہیں -

میں آخر میں منسٹر صاحب
کے سامنے دو تہی تجویزیں رکھنا
چاہتا ہوں - جب تک یہ معاملہ
سرکار کے زیر غور ہے تب تک بولا
ہاؤس کو بلک لست قرار دیا
جائے - ایک بات تو یہ ہے -

دوسری بات یہ ہے کہ بولا ہاؤس
سے سرکار کہے کہ وہ دو دن کے اندر یہ
اعلان کر دے کہ ان کے پاس کتنی
دولت ہے اور ان کے نوکروں کے نام پر
کتنا کاروبار ہے - بہار میں چھوٹے
چھوٹے کام چار چار لاکھ روپیہ کے
ہیں اور میسور میں اسی طرح کے
انگوروں کے باغوں کے چھوٹے چھوٹے کام
ہیں پنجاب میں بڑے بڑے فارم
تین تین اور چار چار لاکھ کے ہیں
جو ان کے نوکروں کے نام پر ہیں -
اگر یہ ساری فہرست سرکار کے پاس
نہیں آتی ہے تو وہ ان کو مزید کام
نہ دیں -

ایک اور تجویز میری ہے جو
نہایت مناسب ہے دوسرے وہ صنعت
لگے گی مگر اس ماحول میں جس
ماحول سے ہم گذر رہے ہیں جس
ماحول میں ہم پس رہے ہیں ایک

I want the hon. Minister to give me a little hearing. I want the hon. Minister of State to listen to me for a minute. Is it not a fact that the Birlas had a licence for fertiliser factory in this country and yet they were trying to obtain another one? And they were told that nobody could have two such factories. Meanwhile, the World Bank Chairman, Mr. Woods who is a personal friend of Shri G. D. Birla, made a recommendation and on the recommendations of Mr. Woods the Government of India have asked the Birlas to apply for another licence?

میں یہ کہتا ہوں کہ اگر یہ حقیقت ہے تو اس ملک کے لئے یہ نہایت شرم ناک بات ہے۔ آپ بولا کہ + لائسنس اپنی مرضی سے دینا چاہتے مگر امریکہ نے دباؤ کے تحت آدھا بھی دیتے ہیں تو اس ملک کی جمہوریت کے لئے ڈیموکریسی کے لئے یہ ایک مذاق ہے۔ امید ہے کہ کل جب مسٹر صاحب اپنا جواب دیں گے تو اس بارے میں بھی جواب دیں گے۔

† श्री ए० एन तारिक (जम्मू और काश्मीर) : मिस्टर वाइस चैयरमैन, कल से इस एवान में हजारी रिपोर्ट के बारे में तमाम मेम्बर हजारात तक़ारर कर रहे हैं। जहाँ तक हजारी रिपोर्ट का ताल्लुक है, मैं इसके दूसरे पहलू पर जो सियासो पहलू है अपने खयालात का इजहार करना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ तक लाइसेंसिज का ताल्लुक है बहुत से मेम्बरों ने अपनी वाकफियत की गिना पर, मालूमत की गिना पर मुझ से अच्छी तकरीरें इस मसले पर की हैं।

† [] Hindi transliteration.

इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि किसी अनडेवलपड कंट्री के लिए यह निहायत जरूरी है कि मुल्क में काफी बड़े बड़े कारखाने हों, मशीनें हों, दौलत हो . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISHRA (Orissa): On a point of order. In the morning, the Chairman has ruled that he should speak from his seat. When he was asking a question, he was asked to put it from his seat. Is it his seat or he sits somewhere else? I am sorry, Sir, he has to speak from his seat.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I think so.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: Excuse me this time. I have got a lot of papers here.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Under the Rules of Procedure, this is an absolute necessity.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I agree with you.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Under the Rules of Procedure, there is only one procedure, that is, you have to speak from your own seat; you cannot speak from anywhere else.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You speak from your seat.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: I have got a lot of papers here. Please excuse me for this time

श्री राज नारायण : जब शुरू कर दिया है, तो वहीं से बोलने दीजिये।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): All right; next time you must speak from your seat.

श्री ए० एन० तारिक : अनडेवलपड कंट्री के लिए यह बेहद जरूरी है कि मुल्क में काफी बड़े बड़े कारखाने हों, मशीनें हों, दौलत हो, लेकिन सरकार का और एवान का भी यह फर्ज है कि वह देखे कि जब वही दौलत मुल्क के लिए अदाव हो जाए, बहर हो जाए, तो उस दौलत की रोक थाम बेहद जरूरी है।

जहां तक बिड़ला ब्रादर्स को बिज़नेस का ताल्लुक है, इस मुल्क में और भी बिज़नेस हाऊसिज़ हैं जिनकी देख भाल और रोक थाम बेहद जरूरी है, लेकिन इन बिज़नेस हाऊसिज़ का हमारा सियासी जिन्दगी पर इतना असर नहीं है जितना बिड़ला हाउस का है। देखना यह है कि अपने कारोबार के साथ साथ यह हाउस कहीं इस मुल्क की सियासी जिन्दगी पर, हमारी बनती हुई सोसायटी पर असर अन्दाज होना तो नहीं चाहता है। जनावे वाली आपकी इजाजत से मैं इस एवान को तबज्जो आज से चालीस साल कबल के एक रत्त की तरफ, जो उस वक्त एक बड़े आदमी ने, जो बिड़ला की दौलत से बचरा गए थे अपने बेटे को लिखा — बाप का नाम है मोती लाल नेहरू और बेटे का नाम जवाहर लाल नेहरू :—

"*C^nonanaal hatred and heavy bribing of the voters was the order of the day. I am thoroughly disgusted fiwt am now seriously thinking of retiring from political life. What is worrying me is how to Occupy my time. I am waiting for the Congress Session at Gauhati and keeping mum in the meanwhile. The Malaviya-Lala gang, aided by Birlas' money, are making frantic efforts to capture the Congress.*"

This letter is dated December 2, 1926. Now this is the political aspect of Birla House.

और मैं इसी खत की बिना पर तमाम मैम्बरान की तबज्जो दिलाऊंगा। बगैर इसकी सोचे कि हम किस जमायत के हैं देखना यह है कि हमारे सामने बहुत से ऐसे वाक्यात आए हैं, जिनमें यह कहा जाता है साहब यह ऐसा है, वह ऐसा है, वह यह है, यह वह है। लेकिन अगर हम खुद इन बातों की इजाजत देते हों जैसा कि मिस्टर वाइस चेयरमैन आपको याद होगा अभी डेढ़ साल पहले अमेरिकन सिनेट में इसी तरह का एक केस हुआ था, एक मामूली आदमी राबर्ट बेकर का जो कि लन्दन जांस का खास आदमी था, एक पेज बुधाय था, लेकिन दौलत के करप्शन

का वजह से, दौलतमन्द को इमदाद से वह इस सेनिट का एक निहायत बा-असर आदमी हो गया। हमने इस मुल्क में भी ऐसे बा-असर आदमी देखे हैं। मैं इस एवान की तबज्जो एक मामूली वाक्या की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ। वह है एम० ओ० मचाई का केस। एम० ओ० मचाई भी एक आदमी था इस मुल्क में पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू का एक मामूली पी० ए० और इस मामूली पी० ए० की मां के लिए बिड़ला हाउस ने लाखों रुपये दिए, उनकी मां के लिये ट्रस्ट बनाने के लिये— क्यों? इसलिये कि उस वक्त इसके हाथ में काफी ताकत थी और वह इस ताकत से इन हाउसिज़ को फायदा पहुंचा सकता था। तीनतीन लाख रुपये के भूकान 30 जनवरी मार्ग पर खरीद कर दे दिए गये उनकी मां को। जबकि उनकी मां का हमारी सियासी जिन्दगी, हमारी समाजी जिन्दगी में कोई असर नहीं था। लेकिन आज वही एम० ओ० मचाई पिछले एक महीने से बिड़ला ब्रादर्स से इन्टर व्यू चाहता है, जो नहीं मिल रहा है। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि यह एक खतरनाक चीज हो रही है हमारे मुल्क में, उसकी रोकथाम करना हम सबका, मैम्बरान पार्लियामेंट का फर्ज है। हम जिस तरह से अपने मुल्क की सरहदों की हिफाजत करते हैं, जिस तरह से हम यह चाहते हैं कि इस मुल्क के लिए अन्दरूनी अमन जरूरी है, इन्टर्नल सिक्योरिटी जरूरी है तो हमने यह देखा है कि जो लोग हमारे मुल्क की सियासत से हमारे कल्चर, हमारी तहजीब और हमारे इखलाक को महज इसी दौलत के बल-बूते पर खरीद रहे हैं, तो उनकी भीदेख भाल पूरी होनी चाहिए वरना यह मुल्क एक ऐसे आजार में गिरफ्तार हो जाएगा, जिससे निकलना मुश्किल है। मैं किसी का नाम लेना नहीं चाहता हूँ। क्या यह हकीकत नहीं है कि हमारे मुल्क के बहुत से बड़े बड़े अफसर की सिक्योरिटी के लिए रिटायर होने से पहले ही उन हाऊसिज़ में जगह क्रीएट की जाती है। अगर आज की हुकूमत ऐसे अ दाद व

[श्री ए० एम० तारिक]

जुमार जमा कर ले, तो आप देखिए कितने इन्कम टैक्स कमिश्नर रिटायर होते हो सोचे बिड़ला हाऊस पहुँचते हैं। अब नौबत यहाँ तक आई है कि हमारी फौज के बड़े बड़े जनरल सोचे बिड़ला हाऊस में जाते हैं। यह इस मुल्क को विवास्त के लिए निहायत खतरनाक चीज है। इसकी रोक थाम बेहद जरूरी चीज है। हम मेम्बरान पार्लियामेंट यह देखें कि यह सरकार पर हमला नहीं है, हम खुद सरकार हैं, हम इस मुल्क के रहने वाले हैं, बाक्यदा नुमाइन्दगी करते हैं, अगर हम हो नहीं रहे तो सरकार भी नहीं रहेगी। मुल्क भी नहीं रहेगा। तो इस बात को छोड़ दीजिए कि यह किस पार्टी की हकूमत है। किस पार्टी के लोग इस रेजलूशन को लाये हैं। असल बामारो की रोक थाम बेहद जरूरी है वरना यह लोग आपको विवास्त पर काबिज हो जाएंगे। जंडा तिरंगा रहेगा, शेर के तीन मुँह जरूर रहेंगे। लेकिन इस मुँह के पीछे असल शकल में कभी बिड़ला होंगे, कभी थापड़ होंगे, कभी गोलनग होंगे। आप इन चेहरों को समझ जाइये, इनका इलाज कीजिए। इनका इलाज इंडू निकालने का काम सरकार बखूबी जानती है, इन लाइसेंसिज के बारे में हमारे पास काफी इनलियात है, उनके बारे में काफी कुछ कहा जा सकता है, लेकिन जिनवादी बात यह सोचनी है कि हमें इससे कोई इन्कार नहीं है कि हम इसमें बिड़ला जो के तमाम हाऊसिज की मदद करना चाहते हैं और दोलत इस मुल्क में बने, कारखाने बनें, लेकिन सारो दोलत का इस्तेमाल सूरारका के खिलाफ नहीं होना चाहिए, इस दोलत का इस्तेमाल जेड० ए० अहमद के खिलाफ नहीं होना चाहिए, डाह्याभाई पटेल के खिलाफ नहीं होना चाहिए, हरिश्चन्द्र माथुर के खिलाफ नहीं होना चाहिए, अगर आज हम ने यह बरदाश्त किया या वह दोलत किसी के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल हो रही है, तो वह समाज के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल होता है और हम सब, जिन्होंने

आजादी के लिए हर किस्म को मुसीबतें और तकलीफें बरदाश्त की हैं—जिन्दा रहते हुए भी हम परेशान रहेंगे और अपने मुल्क की बिदमात नहीं कर पाएँगे, इसलिए इस बात को बेहद जरूरत है कि हम अपनी तबज्जो इस तरफ करें।

मैं आपकी इजाजत से बिक्रं दो निनट के लिये मिनिस्टर साहब की तबज्जो दो तीन बातों को तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ। बिक्रं वही चीज नहीं थी, जो बहुत से मेम्बरों ने कही है। एक वूल टाप्स का केस बहुत आता है। चायना के हमले से पैदा हुई एमरजेंसी के जमाने में जब सरकार को वूल टाप्स को जरूरत पड़ी, इस में बिड़ला हाऊसिज को बहुत बड़ा लाइसेंस मिला और जब वह वूल टाप्स लगाए गए उनसे ऊन बना, उन से कपड़ा बना, इसके बारे में अजसरेनो तहकाकात का जाए, क्या वह कपड़ा ऐसा था, जो पहनने लायक था? इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि हिन्दुस्तान मोटर का जहाँ तक सवाल है, वहाँ सरकार ने छपा डाला, पूरा केस मुकम्मल है पिछले कई महानों से लेकिन कोई फ़ैसला नहीं होता है। जब फैसला सरकार खुद नहीं कर सकती है, तो यह सरकार अपने आफिसरों के बारे में आबाम में एक शक पैदा करती है, इस शक को दूर करने के लिए बहुत जरूरी है कि उनका फ़ैसला किया जाए।

रुबी इन्वॉरेंस के बारे में मेरे दोस्त चन्द्र-शेखर ने बंगाल के चांफ मिनिस्टर साहब को खत लिखा है। एक साहब हैं बहुत शरीफ आदमी मिस्टर बी० के० थानी, जो शेपर होल्डर थे, जिन्होंने खुद सरकार से कहा मुझे इजाजत दीजिए, मैं आपके सामने वाक्यात रखूँ। लेकिन इसके लिए जरूरी है कि जिस रिवास्त के आप रहने वाले हों, वहाँ का एड-वोकेट जनरल आपको इजाजत दे—बंगाल का एडवोकेट जनरल इजाजत नहीं देता। सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को मददखलत करनी चाहिए और पूछा जाए उस एडवोकेट जनरल से कि अगर एक आदमी यह कहता है कि

मेरे पास सबूत है और मैं साबित कर सकता हूँ कि कुछ सरकारी दौलत की खुद बूढ़ हुई है, कुछ सरकार के ऐसे लोगों का हीसला अफजाई करता चाहिए, भारत रत्न उनको मिलना चाहिए, जो सरकार को जानकारी फराहम करे। मुसीबत तो यह है कि मिलता उनको है, जो सरकार की दौलत पर नाजाइज कब्जा डालते हैं, नाजाइज इस्तेमाल करते हैं।

मैं आखिर में मिनिस्टर साहब के सामने दोतीन तजवीजें रखना चाहता हूँ। जब तक यह मामला सरकार के जरेगौर है तब तक बिड़ला हाऊस को ब्लैक लिस्ट करार दिया जाए। एक बात तो यह है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि बिड़ला हाऊस से सरकार कहे कि वह दो दिन के अन्दर यह एलान कर दे कि उनके पास कितनी दौलत है और उनके नौकरों के नाम पर कितना कारोबार है। बिहार में छोटे छोटे काम चार-चार लाख रुपये के हैं और मैसूर में इसी तरह अंगूरों के बागों के छोटे छोटे काम हैं, पंजाब में बड़े बड़े फार्म तीन-तीन और चार-चार लाख के हैं, जो उनके नौकरों के नाम पर हैं। अगर यह सारी फरिहस्त सरकार के पास नहीं आती है, तो वह उनको मजबूद काम न दें।

एक और तजवीज मेरी है, जो निहायत मुनासिब है वैसे वह सख्त लगेगी मगर इस माहोल में जिस माहोल से हम गुजर रहे हैं जिस माहोल से हम पिस रहे हैं एक तरफ तो पाकिस्तान है, चीन है और अमेरिका है और फिर हमारी हुकूमत के ऊपर असर

डाला जाए वल्ड बैंक के जरिए। इसलिए मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ और मेरे पास यह इत-लाह है :

I want the hon. Minister to give me a little hearing. I want the hon. Minister of State to listen to me for a minute. Is it not a fact that the Birlas had a licence for fertiliser factory in this country and yet they were trying to obtain another one? And they were told that nobody could have two such factories. Meanwhile, the World Bank Chairman, Mr. Woods who is a personal friend of Shri G. D. Birla, made a recommendation and on the recommendation of Mr. Woods the Government Of India have asked the Birlas to apply for another licence?

मैं यह कहता हूँ कि अगर यह हकीकत है, तो इस मुल्क के लिए यह निहायत शर्मनाक बात है। आप बिड़ला को 10 लाइसेंस अपनी मर्जी से दे दीजिए। मगर अमेरिका के दबाव के तहत आधा भी देते हैं, तो इस मुल्क की जम्हूरियत के लिए, डेमोक्रेसी के लिए, यह एक मजाक है। मुझे उम्मीद है कि कल जब मिनिस्टर साहब अपना जवाब देंगे तो इस बारे में भी जवाब देंगे।

SHRI T. N. SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we have had quite a long debate and I have listened to many of the speeches with great attention. I would like the House to understand the implications of the mixed economy and the licensing system that we have adopted and then come to a final conclusion in the light of that. I feel that it has been held in certain quarters that the concepts of mixed economy and this licensing system are bound to lead to the result that we see today. I remember sometime in 1960 sitting at a meeting of the

[Shri T. N. Singh]

National Development Council. Shri Jawaharlalji was in the chair, when Pandit Nehru expressed grave concern at the fact that the rich were getting richer and comparatively the poor were getting poorer. Now this is what is worrying me today. We have not to worry so much about this or that individual. I am not concerned with that. I think that the Administration should take care of it and I know it will take care of it. But what is worrying me today is that these things that are happening today should have happened. Now, India has taken great strides in the industrial sector. We have marched ahead in many sectors of industry. There is no doubt about that. But the rich are getting richer and the poor, comparatively are growing poorer. There is a lot of erosion in the wages earned by the poor people. The agricultural labourer today, I am sorry to say, is worse off than before. This is a serious situation and there must be something wrong somewhere which we should consider, understand and see what can be done to remedy the position.

Sir, I had occasion, for a brief period of some fifteen or sixteen months, to look after the affairs of the Industries Ministry and being a great believer in diffusion of ownership and dispersal of ownership, I tried to see what could be done to ensure that there is no concentration of economic power in a few hands. What is the difficulty? If one tried to look at the licensing procedure and the process of dealing with the various applications, One would see that it so happens that there are certain applications which do not fulfil the conditions and requirements laid down by the rules and that these conditions are being fulfilled only by a few applicants from a few firms. Naturally these few firms get the licences. That is how things happen.

If you do not give licences to those firms what happens? The industries do not get started and the Government and this House get worried. Then it is suggested that since the private sector is not coming, we should ask the

public sector to do the job. And the public sector comes and takes up the job. Then what happens? Naturally being new to the line, it makes mistakes and then this House, every section of the House I am sorry to say, pillories the public sector. The only remedy to my mind, to this concentration of wealth in a few hands is to have less rigidity in our plans. We have applications from the private sector, but they can be limited I may give you one instance. It was noticed towards the end of the Third Plan, or may be towards the middle of that Plan, that we had not developed adequate steel casting capacity. That was to be done in the private sector. There were not many people in that line and it had not come up. There was no provision in the public sector to start this industry. What was to be done? We called a meeting of all the steel casters and of the various applicants and asked them, "What are you going to do to expedite this thing?" It has to be expedited because without steel castings it is not possible to carry on and we will have to import them and that means great pressure on foreign exchange. Therefore we called them and sought their assistance. But they did not come up. They will come only in those industries which give them good profits. That is inherent in the private sector. They are attracted only to industries which make profits. That is no fault of theirs. They go only to industries where there are profits. They are not attracted to industries which though they have higher priority, do not have the profits they expect. This is one case which came in my experience. Nobody came up to make these steel castings. When I asked, "What about the public sector?" Promptly somebody said, "There is no provision in the *n* Plan and so you cannot have it in the public sector." Then how do you prevent this concentration?

This House, I must say, in its desire to pillory the Government Or the Minister has condemned the public sector. I have been a sorry witness,

looking helplessly at the manner in which the public sector has been run down. There is no hope for the public sector today. Such is the situation. I would appeal to all Members and say let us be a little more forgiving. Let us be a little more considerate to the public sector. After all, this is a new line, a new experiment, a new way of life this country is adopting. It was Shri Jawaharlal] i who showed us this new way, the way of the mixed economy. We are creating the public sector which should be holding a dominant position in our economy and yet we are allowing the private sector to grow. Still everyone in this House has run down the public sector. Where is the hope? I will not be surprised and here I give this warning that. ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Not all, Mr. Singh.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: I know there are a few noble exceptions, including you, Sir. But I have witnessed thi_s kind of thing going on and we think that yet we can rescue the economic process which is inevitably leading towards the dominance of the private sector. I give this warning that the day is not far off when all of us, even the great advocates of the public sector, will join together and say that the public sector has failed an_a we will say: "Transfer them to the private sector." That is where we seem to be going. I am saying this with real sorrow and sadness. I feel that the only saviour of this country where there are millions of people who are living on the verge of great poverty, people who can hardly get two meals a day, is diffusion of economic power. This country cannot tolerate concentration of economic power in a few hands. Sooner or later there is going to be a cataclysmic revolution, I am merely giving this warning. I have no hatred against anybody, no prejudices against any people, be it Birlas or anybody. This is a very small point according to me. What is more important is, we should know where we are going and where we want to go. And if tor

some reason we are not going in the direction that we want to go, it is high time that we sat up and thought as to what we should do to proceed towards our goal.

Take for instance this licensing business. You say so much is allotted for the private sector. Applications are invited and they come up and in that melee of people who are running for licences only those get licences who have got larger resources. I remember in the Planning Commission as a Member I had the misfortune to be asked to face a delegation of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce who accused me of standing in their way of getting licences and I had to explain to them why licences were not forthcoming, why we wanted dispersal. Why should a few people alone get the licences. But there was the hard fact. We had given licences to a large number of people, very small men and they could not implement the licences. Their plants were not coming up. Luckily for me I had the answer ready with me. I could also produce a number of cases where the bigger business houses—I am not talking of any individuals—had licences in their pocket, lying unimplemented for eight or nine years. Is it not a fact even today? I ask the Minister. Even today there are licences lying in the pockets of a few people for the last eight or nine years. And what has been the result? When the Third Plan was to commence by that time all the licences for almost al] the targeted capacities had been issued except in some sectors and yet there wa_s pressure for mor_e licences. Today when there is a little slump, a little recession, everybody blames the Government. Why? In those days I remember the FICCI delegations came to me pressing for expeditious issu* of licences. All these days people belonging to the industry have been pressing for quick issue of licences. And when licences are issued an* they do not set up industries the Government again is blamed for the recession that has occurred. You cannot have it both ways. How are the liccm-

[Shri T. N. Singh.] ces given? First condition is—You must have foreign collaboration. And every foreign collaboration must proceed On the basis of progressive manufacture and progressive manufacutre means 80 to 90 per cent imported components in the beginning with only 10 to 20 per cent indigenous and gradually you go up with the indigenous consent. We say in five years we should have hundred per cent indigenous content. Can any licence stand scrutiny on that ground now? Nobody has been able to keep to the schedule. And then there is pressure on foreign exchange resources. Everyone wants imports on maintenance account. We are today borrowing hundreds of crores, for maintenance imports purposes, for the purpose 01 running our factories. That is the position. And yet licences must be expedited. We cannot run our factories beause we have not got the foreign exchange and yet we must go on licensing and adding to that burden. If somebody had the impertinence like me to point out these things he is thought to be standing in the way of industrial progress. I am saying all this with a sad heart; I feel very strongly about this.

I feel there is no way out for this country except self-reliance. This "business of progressive manufacture, this high import content, this rush for collaboration, te not going to lead us to our economic salvation. We must rely on ourselves. That has been my theme all these years. And what a glorious spectacle we had when Pakistan invaded this country? These very industrialists came to me and said that they would have their manufactures on the basis of hundred per cent indigenous content. And what happened after three or four months? Everyone started pressing for imports. And today we are borrowing from the World Bank for even maintenance purposes. We are almost bankrupt. Is it not true that even for running Our factories we have to borrow? So it is time that we sat

up and reveiwed the whole position. Therefore I welcome this discussion but let us not be misled into going into individual cases. I am no advocate of any particular business house. I have my own well known views. In the time of Jawaharlal Nehru almost everyone of us was a socialist but today I do not see many. At the time of the Pakistan invasion everyone was a great patriot saying that they will manufacture without imports but today there is nobody who says he can manufacture without imports. And if somebody talks of self reliance he is supposed to be out of his mind. That is the position now. So I would suggest that there is no way out except self reliance. If this craze for industrialisation goes on as it is—and in that everybody is guilty—if this craze for attacking the public sector day in and day out goes on there is no way out. It is no use complaining, we have got to revise our attitude. It is all right that we shall get publicity; in the newspapers and our names will be in the headlines saying that so and so has attacked so and so but it is not going to solve our problems. *(Time bell rings)* I am a disciplined man, Mr. Vice-Chairman and I will not take more of your time. I am grateful to you that you have given me this opportunity. But I want to say this. We have got to have a fresh look on many of our problems. W« have come to a pass when we cannot have our industries unless foreign aid comes to us and we cannot start any new industries unless we receive som« foreign collaboration. That is what has happened. There is no use blaming the Licensing Committee. The Licensing Committee was issuing the licences or letters of intent as part of its duty. We had what is called a Foreign Agreements Committee. It is a new Committee. That Foreign Agreemen's Committee had the right to approve the agreements with foreign concerns. Not only that; it had the right to approve the right of a for°itm concern to corns .+o ?n agreement with somebody here. So

they went about searching for somebody hejre as partners so that the licence could be got but at that time I remember—it is no use blaming the Government now—every section of the House was saying that we were behind our Second and Third Plan schedules and that we must go ahead with industrialisation.

We have talked here 4oday about the provinces vying with each other. What can the poor provinces do? They have their own problems. I come from a very poor part of Uttar Pradesh, the Eastern U.P., and I know what pover.y is. if I wer_e to go to Bombay or Calcutta I see these big palaces and the huge factories belching out smoke with the average wage of the worker being Rs. 150 to Rs. 200 in these factories. I come and see things in Delhi, these big palaces and then I go to my own State. I want something like these in my own State. What is wrong in that? Then, the States compete with each other and the private sector gets the advantage. The thing that is wrong actually is in our attitude of mind. We must change that. We have forgotten Gandhiji. We have forgotten Swadeshi. We are only relying on foreign aid and foreign collaboration. If all this goes on, we cannot progress.

I say it is possible to rely On ourselves today without any further notice. We can do it. I appeal to all the sections of the House today. I think I am old enough to make that appeal. Time is not there for much of the mud slinging that is going on today in the country. We cannot afford to abuse each other. We are hard pressed for time. Things have to be done quickly. There are all kinds of problems. There are enemies hovering around us. There is also the shadow of a third world war in the firmament. Can we afford to lose time in little pleasures of abuses of each other? Whom does it benefit? Have w? cv«« thought about it? Is it not benefiting the enemies of the coun-

try? Therefore, at this hour of crisis iii the country I appeal to all sections of the House that let us remember that there is a paramount interest that has to be protected and I assure all the sections of the House that tht Congress is second to none . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Are we to put vermillion on the head of Birla or members of the Birla House?

SHRI T N. SINGH: Please, I hav* not disturbed you. Everyone wants that the case of the poor people should be fully heard and they should be protected. They have got the first priority in all our things. Daridra Narayan is the real Narayan. We have to pay obeisance to him and I want all of us to join together in this noble task. I say the sands of time are running out and there is not much time left to set our house in order. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALJ KHAN): I appreciate your appeal.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Cry of an oppressed soul.

SHRI M S. OBEROI (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, with your permission, I rise to speak oh the Hazari Report and I want to make a few observations before I make my comments. I must compliment Dr. Hazari for the trouble he has taken and for the way in which he has minutely gone into the statistics and other details. While going through the terms of reference, the main object of appointing Dr. Hazari, I find, is to streamline the licensing system and to point out the shortcomings in relation to 'the Industrial Policy. That is the main feature which I find in the terms of reference, but in his Report he has given complete details of the licences granted to all the big and small industrialists like the Birlas. Tatas, Martin-Burn, Walchand. Bango, Thapar and International Combines, etc. The Report

[Shri M. S. Oberoi] before us is an interim one, which was submitted in early August 1966 and was followed in mid-September by a supplementary note. The hon. Minister for Industrial Development has informed the House that the full report will be in our hands in the next six months' time. I am sorry that the Government was to yield to the pressure of some Members of this side and that side of the House to place this interim Report before the House. If the complete report comes in the next few months, it would be more exhaustive and we could have been given much more details than possibly this interim Report contains.

(interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No interruptions please.

SHRI M. S. OBEROI: I do not manufacture. I only do service.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): They want to take your time.

SHRI M. S. OBEROI: I get very little time. It is very seldom! that I speak and I hope the Chair will show me a little more leniency in this respect.

I have listened very carefully to both sides of the House and I am more than surprised that hardly there have been any comments or suggestions on the improvement Of the existing licensing system, which was the main object of Dr. Hazari's study. The whole force has been used against Birla undertakings. I will be all the time with Shri Bhupesh Gupta and my other friends if this Report had something to do with allegations of malpractices against the Birla undertakings or misuse of the industrial licences. If there is a case Of **tax** evasion, hoarding essential materials and corruption, I will be on my legs for hours to fight strongly, as in our society we cannot allow such abuses to continue unabated and thi* must be stopped

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Why da you say 'if'? Are you not aware of it?

SHRI M. S. OBEROI: There is no such allegation in this Report as far as this is concerned.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Everybody knows it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No interruptions please.

SHRI M. S. OBEROI: To ask for and receive licences is not a present nor a crime. All that Dr. Hazari has done is that he has given a comparative study of all the licences issued to all the undertakings in India. At no stage he has pointed out that any preferential treatment was granted to the Birla group. In his findings on page 7 of his Report, he remarks:—

"While Tatas have hardly been inactive, considering their top position and while Martin-Burn made no application whatsoever in 1959 and 1964 to June 1966 and was barely active in 1960, the pride of place is occupied by Birlas which merit special attention."

These are the remarks of Dr. Hazari and I cannot conceal them. In other words, Dr. Hazari has complimented Birlas on the initiative they have shown in increasing the country's industrial development.

Mr. Chinai has also made a reference to the Estimates Committee. Let us see what the Estimates Committee has to say about the Birla affair. They will be dealing with all the aspects of the matter. If there is need for any enquiry, I will be with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta saying that the enquiry must be instituted. It has also been pointed out that there is a well-represented Committee appointed, which goes through these licences and we have not seen any adverse reports from that Committee either. Let us be very clear as to the existing economic position of the country, which is at a low ebb. The only saving is

to develop industries, agriculture, improve our exports and cut down our imports and thus improve our foreign exchange position. In this both the public and the private sectors have to play their part.

Take the public sector. The actuals for the year 1955-56 show that the Government investments in running commercial concerns were Rs. 434.12 crores. The net profit works out to 3.8 *per cent*, while the yield by way of dividends to Government is only 0.19 *per cent*. This investment has been made out of the total public debt of over Rs. 16,000 crores on which Government is paying interest at about 6 *per cent*. This is the result of the investment of the Government undertakings.

Now, we are left with the private sector. The Report itself has revealed that a tremendous development has taken place in the private sector. The results are very assuring. Now it is only the private sector which can counter-balance the shortcomings of the public sector. The big industrialists have not grown overnight. Birlas' and Tatas' growth has been over a period of 200 years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Maybe 100 years.

SHRI M. S. OBEROI: The objec-on is that they **grow** too fast and too big, and that has happened only since independence, as before the Independence no opportunity was available during the British time. I say, let them grow big and produce, and the policy of the Government of India is well known: let them grow big and then nationalise. I think Shri Bhupesh Gupta should note this. If they go on expanding, at least this will not retard production. Why wait for new people to learn and eliminate those who have already learnt? This will in no way hurt the ideologies of the ruling party.

I have to answer Shri Bhupesh Gupta's tall objection to amassing wealth and its distribution. He has no objection to the wealth but his objection is to the inequitable distri-

bution. My answer to him and other friends of his thinking is that over 80 *per cent* of the investment in Tata and Birla group of concerns is of small investors who get good yield and return on their investment. These organisations find employment for millions and their employees are better paid than the public sector employees. Today there are more ghe-raos in West Bengal in the public sector than in the private sector. So the distribution of wealth is there. If the objection is that Birlas and Tatas have big houses to live and big cars to ride, well so have the Ministers. Why shed tears over non-existing calamities? Thank you.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman. I am extremely obliged to you for giving me this chance. The obligation is greater because I never expected that I would be called upon to speak.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, this debate has not taken an unexpected turn. We have ignored the wood for a tall cedar, the green cedar of Birlas, which has monopolised our attention. Dr. Hazari's report is in my opinion a fair report, a report behind which there is a great amount of labour. But let us not forget that Mr. Hazari has painted on a limited canvas and on that limited canvas the Birlas occupy a very very small place, and if they are mentioned, they are mentioned in an illustrative capacity and not otherwise. The few things which are said about them could with justification be said about other big houses also. There are four statements in the report about the Birlas. Firstly, there has been a progressive decrease in the import content of the Birla projects; secondly, though during the last three or four years there has been economic recession, Birlas have not been inhibited. I do not think these two statements are critical of the Birlas. The only statement which is critical of Birlas is that they foreclose certain areas in the industrial sphere. The hon. Minister has already announced corrective measures in this respect.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Even then I feel this is a matter which needs some greater consideration because it should not be open or left to any industrial enterprise to foreclose, preempt, and thereafter sit idle and block the economic growth of the country. The largest amount of criticism has been concentrated on the concentration of wealth and economic power. Now concentration of wealth, as has been rightly pointed out by one of the speakers who spoke sometime back, is a necessary feature of capitalist development. Mr. Vice-Chairman, to bargain for a society in which private property is the predominant form of ownership and at the same time to expect that there shall be no concentration of economic power and wealth, that there shall be no growth of monopolies, is in my opinion to try to live in a swamp and then to expect that the house shall be free of mosquitoes. Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have been proclaiming for the last twenty years that our economy is a mixed economy. The name may be new, but the reality is old. India even in the British times had a mixed economy. Railways were a nationalised undertaking. Telephones and telegraph were a nationalised undertaking. The big Ordinance factories were nationalised undertakings. We have added to them a few more steel fertiliser and industries of that type which require a huge amount of capital which private enterprise cannot afford. But the fact remains that our economy today is predominantly a private property economy a free enterprise economy. Then we have tried, while retaining the economic apparatus of private property and free enterprise, by some measures to disperse wealth. I am surprised when some Members take the view that this dispersal of wealth is socialism. I am more surprised when Mr. Bhupesh Gupta falls a prey to this delusion. Wealth is dispersed in primitive society, in many societies in the hill areas of India even today. That does not mean that that society is a socialist society. The

French economy, the Japanese economy, between the period of the two Wars was really an economy based on small industries, small enterprises, small property owners. (Interruption.) That is my view. But that did not make their economies socialist economies. Therefore, the reality today is that our economy is predominantly an economy based on private property. The vast agricultural sector is based on private property. The whole sphere of trade is based on private property and "a predominant portion of the industrial sector is based on private ownership. But concentration and monopoly is something which goes with this system. Capitalism or free enterprise in its initial stages is marked by small properties owned by numerous individuals. But as the free enterprise system develops, smaller fishes are swallowed by bigger fishes. This is the lesson which we learnt from that brilliant analysis of capitalism by Lenin: "Imperialism, the last stage of Capitalism." His diagnosis and his prognosis in that book are valid even today.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Now Dr. Lohia is . . .

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: And the experience of the last half a century confirms what Lenin stated in that great book, though it is of a small size. We have had a Monopolies Inquiry Commission; we have had the Swaminathan Report. Now we have the Hazari Report. And in all these Reports it is clearly indicated that in spite of all our desire, in spite of our law, there has been a development of free enterprise in India also on the same lines on which it developed in other countries. People refer to the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act and in the context of that Act, they want to judge what has been taking place in this country. I am afraid, what has happened is not unusual. Rather my own personal view is that when the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act prescribed that there should be no concentration of wealth and no growth of

iy, the Act itself and those
 monopo? responsible for it behaved in
 who are/ that the courtiers of King the
 wa;, behaved. They thought they Canute
 Aep away the waves of econo-could
 kfcncement, that the waves of mic adv;c
 growth could be subdued economitld be
 kept under control at and coihmand of
 somebody.

^PUTY CHAIRMAN IN THE CHAIR
 [THE ^
 ii«v"e already said that concentra-
 I ii of wealth or monopoly is an in-
 Writable part of capitalism. That has
 sveen the experience of the United 'Statteg
 of America. Eighty years ago, the United
 States passed an Anti-Trust Law. Their
 Federal Trade Commission was charged
 with the duty of controlling or prohibiting
 the growth of trusts and monopolies. They
 were not satisfied with that. The Senate
 appointed a Sub-Committee on Antitrust
 and Monopoly. And what has been their
 experience? That experience is recorded
 in a book by Senator Estes Kefauver,
 which was published in 1965. The book is
 titled "In a few hands—Monopolypower
 in America." After sifting and sorting cut
 the material, the Senator who was at the
 head of the Committee comes to the
 conclusion:

"The core of the economic problem
 facing us today is the concentration of
 power in a few hands."

That is the usual feature of capitalism
 when it develops. There are figures given
 in that book.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Tell us
 whether you like it or not.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I am coming to
 that.

Now, the same has been the experience
 of this country. Sevpty five groups
 control 1,536 companies with assets over
 Rs. 26 thousand million, that is Rs. 2,600
 crores. Several figures are given.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are
 now confusing the figures.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I am not
 confusing the figures.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI
 (Maharashtra): Do not confuse him.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Twenty-six
 thousand million. Since the hon. Member
 tells me that I am confusing .. .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Twenty-
 six thousand crores?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Twenty-six
 thousand million.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now you
 are right.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Million, I said,
 not crores.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Earlier you
 said.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: No, no. Rs.
 2,600 crores I said. If the hon. Member
 feels that my figures are not right, then I
 will refer him to "International Affairs"
 one of the most authoritative economic
 and poli-cal journals produced by Soviet
 Society. The latest issue contains these
 figures. I have taken these from its latest
 issue. Therefore, you need not challenge
 them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; I do not
 consult the Japanese Telephone Direc-
 tory to get you.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Now, Madam
 Deputy Chairman, that is the situation,
 that is the economic reality. We are
 operating in a system of free enterprise.
 In this situation, concentration of wealth,
 concentration of power, is inevitable. The
 question is being put: What is my
 solution? I suggest two solutions. World
 economy and national economy are at a
 stage in which it is not possible for any
 backward country to develop on the basis
 of free enterprise. That has been the
 experience of numerous countries which
 have become free during the last 20 Or 25
 or 30 years. Apart from the experience of
 history, there are sound and valid
 economic reasons behind it. Today world
 economy is one. One economy
 impinges on¹

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha]

another economy. And when one economy impinges on another economy, naturally the higher economies have a devastating effect on the weaker economies. And that is why during the last 20 years, it is only the countries which have fully controlled their economy, which have fully developed their economic apparatus and economic system on a socialist basis it is only those countries that have been able to register an economic advance. Other countries which have tried to build up on the traditional pattern have failed. Therefore, today there are two alternatives, as I said before. One, we move swiftly and with great determination towards a new economic order which only gives hope for future advancement. Second but the, this is something which will not please my friends there, if because of certain compelling factors, we do not have either the will or the desire or the courage to make a drastic change in the system, then for heaven's sake do not take measures, do not move in a direction, which will throw inside the present economic apparatus certain elements to which the present economic apparatus or economic system would not react properly but would react in an adverse manner. As I have already said, every economic system has its own laws of birth, laws of development, its laws of decay and its laws of existence. Every economic system reacts favourably to certain actions, certain norms, certain modalities and certain impulses. But a system gets paralysed if the impulses that are introduced in that system are not appropriate or suitable. Therefore, this is my note of caution to this House and to the members of the Government
(Interruptions) I have already said that

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Why not change the economic order? Have the courage to do that.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: This is my note of caution to the Government. If you are not in a position to make

a swift change in the economic order, for heaven's sake do not make steps that have been suggested here during the last two days because these steps will not improve matters. These steps concerned with the Birlas, I am not Birlas are not persons, Birlas are, in my opinion, an abstraction as are, in abstraction representing a certain social order. You may cut the head of the social order, but the social order, like the Birlas can throw out thousands of people. You can destroy one Birla but Birlas will be many others. I may take their place or even Mr. Bhupesh Gupta their

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Let him take the courage to break one Birla. Other Birlas will be taken care of.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Therefore, my suggestion is that till we do not take determined steps to establish a new social order, we should not try to throw off the present economic system, we should not take such a step as would introduce in the present economic system germs of paralysis. That is all I have to say.

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN): Madam Deputy Chairman, at the outset before I say anything about the Hazari Report I may say that I heard the speeches from all sides of this House. Different shades of opinion have been expressed. In certain cases they have said that this report is of no importance and that the main concern is about the industrial policy. But I think Prof. Hazari, who has been a professor of industrial economy, had been asked by the Planning Commission to submit a report which we are discussing, discussing what has been submitted in the context of that report and it would be unfair on our part to make some other comments. We should give due respect to his report and discuss about it.

Another Member said that the data was not reliable and that it was inadequate and all that. I would like to draw attention to the introduction portion of the Report where it is said:—

" . . . The Industry and Minerals Divisions of the Planning Commission kindly placed at my disposal all the files available with them relating to the Licensing Committee and the Capital Goods Committee and inter-government correspondence on industrial policy. These are the only sources of statistical data analysed in this report."

I want to emphasise this point that the data were not unreliable or inadequate.

Again, Mr. Suresh Desai said that those who do not know what the letter 'M' of intent is and who do not have an aptitude for business have been discussing this matter. Of course, he cannot expect everybody to be a business expert like him. But as far as the report is concerned, as far as we have found out from the report, we have also the authority to say something about it.

In the report we find that there is concentration of wealth and that smaller industries are affected by it. He makes his recommendations about the remedies.

(Interruption by Shri Suresh J. Desai)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No interruption, please. Let there be only parliamentary interruption.

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN): I am proud and happy that the ruling party Members have brought forward this Hazari Report for a discussion in this House and we, the Members of the ruling party, have now an opportunity to prove value we attach to the socialistic pattern of society and so it has been made feasible for us to show to the Opposition parties that we are going in that direction. I congratulate the Government for giving it a serious consideration and for adopting the follow-up measures with regard to that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Pattern to be seen in Mr. Babubhai Chinai.

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN): Madam, Congress, for deca-

635 RS—7

des, has been the symbol of socialism. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru stood for socialism. Shri Kamaraj, Shrimati Indira Gandhi are following up that policy. In fact, I would like to mention to this House that in the Bhubaneswar Session of the Indian National Congress . . .

(Interruption by Shri Bhupesh Gupta)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN): I do not want any interruption, Madam. In fact, I would like to point out to this House that in the Bhubaneswar Session of the Indian National Congress, Shri Kamaraj, the Congress President gave birth to the idea of socialistic pattern of society. In that session grave concern was expressed about concentration of wealth in that Resolution. The follow-up may have been a little delayed. But I am confident that our Government and our party will prove to the Opposition that they would achieve this end and the credit will go to the ruling party and not to the Opposition.

I have also to congratulate Dr. Hazari for coming out with this interim report with the data and other materials supplied to him. I also congratulate the Minister of Industry for announcing today that further licences will not be issued to the Birla group of industries.

Coming to the Hazari Report, in my opinion it deals with many of the findings of the Monopolies Commission Report like the concentration of wealth and industrial licensing etc. It has also indicated that all is not well with the Planning Commission because it does not keep an effective eye on the execution of licences given to industries in the context of the welfare of the society and the nation.

Madam, it is incorrect to say that the Report attacks only the industrial licensing policy of the Government of India as the report very clearly indi-

L Shrimati L. alnha (Kajagopalan)J

cates that the main beneficiary of this policy have been the Birla group oi industries. With limited material and data, Dr. Hazari's assessment may not be cent, per cent, correct but it is bound to be at least 50 per cent. Correct. He has pointed out that the Birla group of companies were favoured though some of them were not up to the mark; or even they were below par.

Coming to the licensing policy, I think he has very clearly stated that the three categories of lists are there-free list, merit list and rejection list. There is no hard and fast rule because the free list does not go by the licensing policy at all, and for the merit list adequate data are not provided for the Licensing Committee to decide about it.

About the rejection list he says that some of the rejection cases are decided on the file at higher level but the decision is not available to the Licensing Committee. Further he adds that the distinction between these three types of licences, including the one for substantial expansion of new undertakings, is not always very clear in the available data. He goes on to say that "larger investment proposals do not come before the Licensing Committee". It very clearly shows that the defect lies in the Licensing Committee and he has made certain recommendations regarding it.

Coming to the principal shortcomings of industrial planning, he clearly points out:

"There hava been no overall policy guidelines . . . which indicate the capacity and output to be achieved at the end of each five year period."

Then he says:

"Just because a project is, or can be made, emenable to available of foreign exchange should not qualify it for approval."

This is indirectly hinting at Birla who has control over finances.

He further observes:

"In attempting to cover almost the whole range of large scale industrial development licensing inevitably loses sight of the relative importance, of different projects and/or products."

He goes on to say that the basic change and scope in drawing up industrial programme in the Planning Commis-sion should be thoroughly overhauled. Industries which can save foreign ex-change of priority nature which can produce byproducts or industrial wastes should be considered on merit. He recommends allocations to be reviewed every two years in the light of actual development. Here I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Birla group of companies, which have been functioning all this time and which have engulfed the entire industrial structure of India, has any of these industrial companies been reviewed in the light of this recommendation given by the Hazari Committee?

In his speech yesterday Mr. Babu-fohai Chinai said, "For God's sake allow them to continue". We are **not** in any way against the continuance of larger group of industries. Th* larger group of industries should be there but, as the Hazari Committee points out, they should be there within their limits so that the smaller groups also thrives. This is his main point.

On page 24 in para 22.5 Dr. Hazari says:—

"As a matter of policy, the Planning Commission and Government should declare that certain traditional industrial activities shall b« closed in future to the specified ten or fifteen largest business groups and their associates. This would imply that the large groups already established in these activities shall not be permitted to expand in +hese areas."

He does not say that it should be closed completely. Therefore, Mr. Babubhai Chinai need not be afraid that the larger industries will not thrive.

[Shrimati Lalitha (Rajagopalan)]

Then he has also stated: "It should also be stated at the same time that the large groups would be welcome in areas of new technology and where there are economic possibilities of larger exports." So there is avenue for foreign market also for these industries. Larger industries also can come in. So the industrialists need not be frightened that they would be rooted out completely.

Scfene Of the recommendations that he /has made are very good. This rapport should be studied concurrently "with the Monopolies Commission Report and the Government should come out with a decision about the industrial licensing system and the financial institutions, in this connection, I would like to say that the Congress Working Committee Resolution about social control of banks is vague and confusing. I hope the Government will follow this up and evolve a policy regarding the financial institutions. I hope also that the Government is aware that 71 per cent of the deposits made by the public are controlled by the private banks and that 14 banks control 85 per cent of the total deposits and the big five control nearly 58 per cent of the total public deposits. This should be borne in mind. The Birlas have the control of the banks and the foreign exchange. What more do they need to obtain licences? The Government should take a serious note of this matter and it is better for them to come out with a policy decision regarding the control of financial institutions.

The Birlas are not only raiding the industrial structure of the country, but they have penetrated into the political arena also. I have not a shadow of doubt about this. In party itself is not willing to listen to the last general elections, they spent money like anything. They made their officers resign their jobs and apply for tickets and when they failed to get the Congress ticket, they helped the Opposition and independents also to fight the Congress candidates to oust them.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौर-
डिया : इसलिये बुरा लगा है। यह
पोलिटिकल ब्लैकमेल है।

श्रीमती ललिता राजगोपालन : : नहीं
यह फैक्ट है।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौर-
डिया : यह फैक्ट है कि जब तक वे कांग्रेस
के साथ थे तब तक अच्छे थे।

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : अब आप के साथ
चले गये हैं, इतना आपने मान लिया है।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौर-
डिया : वे अपनी ताकत पर लड़ रहे हैं,
हमारे भरोसे नहीं हैं।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In Calcutta, the Birlas were helping entirely the Congress.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: What about Jan Sangh and your party?

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौर-
डिया : वह जो दूध देने वाली गाय थी,
उसकी जब लात लग गई तो आप बुरा मान
गये।

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN): In matters of public importance, the Government should take a quick policy decision. Now the trend is that the people are not willing to listen to your explanation's or excuses. Even the Government should give serious consideration to this matter. The Hazari Report is an eye-opener to the defects of the Industrial Licensing system and about the financial institutions, but also about the domain of Birlas in the map of India. To-day it may be Birlas. We are now talking about the Birlas only because the Interim Report contains information mainly about the Birlas. But the Final Report may contain information about Tatas, Jains and

[Shrimati Lalitha (Rajagopal'an)] others. It is Birlas to-day. Tomorrow it may be that the Birlas, Tatas and Jains combined, may dictate terms to the Government regarding the industrial policy of the Government. I do not say that the Birlas have not contributed to the welfare of the country. But at the same time, their personal gain out weighs the national gain.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I may inform the House that the House will sit up to 6 P.M. and we shall try to accommodate as many members as possible.

श्री निरंजन सिंह (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभा-पति महोदया, सबसे पहले तो मैं इस सम्बन्ध में इतना ही कहूँगा कि जो रिपोर्ट है वह रिपोर्ट नहीं है और भी कई रिपोर्ट आ चुकी हैं। जब गवर्नमेंट लोगों का मन केवल डाइवर्ट करना चाहती है, तब वह एक कमेटी एप्वाइन्ट कर देती है और रिपोर्ट मांगती है। उसके बाद में गवर्नमेंट क्या करना चाहती है, क्या करेगी, इसकी कमी भी न तो कोई रूप रेखा आती है और न उसको कार्य रूप में परिणत किया जाता है। दो दिन हमारे इसमें लगे हैं और हम यह जानते हैं कि कितना भी कम कहें, यह सरकार उसके ऊपर ध्यान देने वाली नहीं है। आज और कल मैंने सुना कि कांग्रेस के सदस्य भी बहुत ज्यादा कटु आलोचना कर रहे हैं, पर उनकी कटु आलोचना आखिर में ठंडी पड़ जाने वाली है। इसीलिये मैं यह कहता हूँ कि यह जो टर्म्स आफ रीफरेंस दिया है, इसको अगर ठीक तरह से पढ़ा जाय, ठीक तरह से समझा जाय, तो यही ज्ञात होगा कि सारी इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी के ऊपर यह है और इसीलिये हम यह जानना चाहते हैं कि यह जो बीस साल में इस सरकार ने काम किया है, वह किस बेसिस पर किया है। मिक्सड इकोनामी को यह बहुत अच्छा कहते हैं। लेकिन मिक्सड इकोनामी में अच्छे

कैरेक्टर की जरूरत होती है। रेजिमेंटेड इकोनामी में तो आप डंडे के बल से काम करवा सकते हैं, लेकिन मिक्सड इकोनामी में ऐसा नहीं हो सकता है। जहां पर आपके पास कोई डिमाकेशन नहीं है, जहां पर आपकी कोई क्लियर लाइन नहीं होगी, वहां पर कोई काम ठीक तरह से नहीं हो सकता है। आपने अपनी पालिसी रिपोर्ट में हमेशा यह बताया है कि हम की इंडस्ट्रीज को पब्लिक सेक्टर में लेंगे और दूसरी इंडस्ट्रीज को प्राइवेट सेक्टर में देंगे। आपकी की इंडस्ट्रीज कौन सी हैं, क्या आपने की इंडस्ट्रीज की कोई लिस्ट बनाई है और की इंडस्ट्रीज के सम्बन्ध में आप क्या करना चाहते हैं, उनको किस तरह से आप डेवलप करेंगे? इस सम्बन्ध में गवर्नमेंट की कोई रूपरेखा नहीं है। तो जब तक क्लियर अंडरस्टैंडिंग नहीं होगी तब तक आपकी मिक्सड इकोनामी इस देश में सफल नहीं होगी। आज कुछ सदस्यों ने कहा कि पब्लिक सेक्टर में इंडस्ट्रीज धीरे-धीरे जाने वाली है; क्योंकि आपका खुद माइन्ड क्लियर नहीं है, दूसरों की आप सुनना नहीं चाहते और जो एक्सपर्ट्स हैं, उनकी भी आप कुछ सुनना नहीं चाहते हैं। इतना ही नहीं कुछ मेम्बरों ने यह कहा कि जिन कंटीज में रेजीमेंटेड इकोनामी है, वही बढ़ सके हैं। मैं आपसे कहूँगा कि आप चाइना की रेजीमेंटेड इकोनामी देख लीजिए। यदि आपने केवल उन आदमियों को रखा जो कि मैनेजमेंट में रहेंगे और उनमें और इंजीनियरों में झगड़े रहेंगे, तो आपकी रेजीमेंटेड इकोनामी सफलीभूत नहीं होगी। इसलिये उन्होंने अपनी पालिसी चेंज की और आज कम से कम वहां यह नहीं है। आपका जो पेड आदमी है, उसको वहां पर अगर बिठला दिया जाय और वह मैनेजर बन कर के गवर्नमेंट की इच्छा के अनुसार काम करे, तो गवर्नमेंट की इच्छा के अनुसार काम करने वाला मैनेजर कभी भी सफलीभूत नहीं हो सकता है, इसलिये जहां तक लाइसेंसिंग की बात है, हमें पब्लिक सेक्टर और प्राइवेट सेक्टर का रिलेशन कुछ बदलना पड़ेगा।

महोदया, मैं आपको पब्लिक सेक्टर का एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। पब्लिक सेक्टर में कितना यह सरकार फेवरेटिज्म कर रही है और उनको सहायित्व दे रही है, उसके सम्बन्ध में मैं एक पेपर मिल का उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। मध्य प्रदेश में एक पेपर मिल पब्लिक सेक्टर में है। उसके लिये उन्होंने यह कंसेशन दिया कि उन्होंने 6 रु० टन के बजाय 12 रु० टन बांस की कीमत की। अब जब उन्होंने बांस की कीमत 12 रु० कर दी तो बिड़ला कंपनी जो 7 रु० टन ले रही थी, उसको एक मौका मिल गया और 12 रु० टन में वह भी लेने लगे। जब पब्लिक सेक्टर में आपने 12 रु० किये, तो उनके लिये आप 13 रुपये कर देते। इस सम्बन्ध में यदि मैं कुछ कहूँ, तो उस तरफ बैठे लोगों को बुरा लगेगा। लेकिन आप देखिये कि हुआ क्या। एलेक्शन के लिये यह कांट्रोवर्सी चल रही थी कि बिड़ला से हम को कितना रुपया लेना है। उसके लिये उन्होंने 9 लाख रुपया इलेक्शन में लिया। 9 लाख रुपए जब इलेक्शन में लगे तब क्या होने वाला है, वही होने वाला है, जो आज आप कह रहे हैं। मेरा कहना यह है कि यह आज की चीज नहीं है, बहुत समय से चली आ रही है। डालमिया ने 62 के इलेक्शन में पैसे दिए थे, बाद में 47 में सोचा कि बिना हमारे इलेक्शन नहीं जीतेंगे, जब उन्होंने बात करनी शुरू की, तो इन्क्वायरी बिठा दी। अब बिड़ला का मौका आया है। मोती लाल जी के समय की बात है, 1926 में टाटा ने तीन लाख रुपए इलेक्शन के लिए दिए थे, वह गुड बुक्स में था, बिड़ला गुड बुक्स में नहीं था। जब तक आप इन पुरानी परम्पराओं को नहीं तोड़ेंगे, तब तक आपके बड़े, बड़े भाषणों से कुछ नहीं होता। हाल ही के इलेक्शन में टाटा ने कहा था कि मैंने स्वतंत्र पार्टी को भी दिया है और कांग्रेस को भी दिया है। जिस वक्त वह अकेले स्वतंत्र पार्टी को दे देगा वह भी उसी कैटेगरी में आ जायगा। मेरा कहना है कि इन

सारी कंट्रोवर्सी के लिए कुछ बेसिक चीजें तय करनी पड़ेंगी, जैसे आप कहाँ पर कौन सी चीज करना चाहते हैं, कौन सी इंडस्ट्री की जरूरत है और कौन सी चीज को प्राइवेट सेक्टर में लेना चाहते हो। मेरा न तो बिड़ला से सम्बन्ध है, न टाटा और न गोयनका से ही सम्बन्ध है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सारे ऐक्शन के लिए जिम्मेदारी गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर है। अवश्य बिड़ला के ऊपर इन्क्वायरी हो, अगर बिड़ला का एक भी केस है गवर्नमेंट के पास। एक ने कहा बिड़ला वाले उनको भी देते हैं, दूसरी पार्टियों को भी देते हैं। इसमें प्रसन्नता यह है कि अपनी नाक कटती है, तो दूसरे की नाक कटने में खुशी होती है। हमारे नेशन का इतना करेक्टर गिर जाय कि जिसको उसके ऊपर चेक करने का राइट है, वह उसको चेक न करना चाहे। यदि दस रुपए आपको मिलते हैं, तो एक आध किसी को मिल जाता है। मैं नहीं जानता कोई आदमी या व्यापारी ऐसा है, जो मुफ्त में देता है, जिस तरफ प्राफिट होगा, उस तरफ पैसा देंगे, वहां पैसा लगाएंगे जहां प्राफिट होगा। तुमने अनाज लिया, दूसरे को भूसा मिला। आप कहते हैं कि वह भी खराब है। हम कहते हैं कि जो लेता है अपनी जगह वह और आप अपनी जगह बेईमान हैं। यदि किसी ने एक रुपया खाया है वह भी गिर गया है और जिसने सौ रुपया खाया है, वह भी गिर गया है। इस मंडिल में सेक्टर हो, मिनिस्टर हो—सबकी इन्क्वायरी होनी चाहिए। जब तक यह बेसिक चीज नहीं करते—इस तरह से एक आदमी को कभी मार दिया, कभी दूसरे को मार दिया—यह ठीक नहीं हो सकता। अगर आप इस देश के डेवलपमेंट को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, इस देश की आमदनी को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, तो आपको अपनी नीति बदलनी होगी।

गांधी जी ने भी कहा था कि काटेज

[श्री निरंजन सिंह]

इंडस्ट्रीज को बढ़ाओ और आज भी यह सही है, जापान क्यों बढ़ रहा है। जापान के बढ़ने का कारण है कि वहां काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज को बहुत प्रोत्साहन दिया गया है। आप एक कम्पनी को लाइसेंस देते हैं और उसी कम्पनी को और लाइसेंस देकर उसे प्रासपर करना चाहते हैं। आप उसको की इंडस्ट्रीज न दीजिए। हजारी ने बहुत सी रिकमेंडेशन की हैं। उनका भी एक आउटलुक है, जो वर्ल्ड इकानामिस्ट का है। उन्होंने यह कहा कि एक लाइसेंस दो। एक लाइसेंस किस बात का दो इंडस्ट्री में? कम्पिटिशन हम क्यों न करते दें। बिड़ला एक जगह है, डालमिया एक जगह है, गोयनका एक जगह है। अगर 4-5 आएंगे तो डेवलपमेंट ज्यादा अच्छा होगा और आपकी इंडीजीनस इंडस्ट्री बढ़ेगी। तभी तरक्की हो सकती है। कोलेबोरेशन में सारे पार्ट विदेशों से आ जाते हैं और आप कहते हैं कि हम इंडस्ट्री कर रहे हैं। लोगों के ऊपर टैक्स बढ़ाते जा रहे हैं। जनता के ऊपर मंहगाई होती जा रही है—यह कोई इंडस्ट्री नहीं होती। आपको यह देखना पड़ेगा कि यहां की इंडस्ट्री कितनी बढ़ रही और उसके लिए आपको दूसरे के ऊपर डिपेंड न करना पड़े। आप उसका रिव्यू नहीं करते, तो आप इंडस्ट्री को डेवलप नहीं कर सकते, इस देश को अपने पैरों पर खड़ा नहीं कर सकते। जब तक अपने पैरों पर खड़ा नहीं कर सकते, तब तक आप समझ लीजिए कि वर्ल्ड मार्केट में आगे बढ़ जाएंगे यह असम्भव है (समय की घंटी) दस मिनट हो गए, कोई बात नहीं मेरी बात पूरी हो गई। आप सेल्फ सफीशेंट हों। जब तक सेल्फ सफीशेंट नहीं होंगे तब तक आगे बढ़ना असम्भव है।

आपके सामने चाइना की चीजें हैं, वहां की खबरें भी नहीं मिलती हैं। लेकिन हमने यह देखा है, रिपोर्टें पढ़ने को मिलती है कि चाइना में भी कम्युनिस्ट कान्ट्रियों ने

जो सामान दिया वह इतना रिलायबिल नहीं था और जब उनको अपने पैरों पर खड़े होने का मौका मिला, तब उन्होंने डेवलप किया है। आज आपने रूरकेला में जर्मनी से कोलाबोरेशन किया है, दुर्गापुर में इंग्लैंड से कोलाबोरेशन किया है, वहां कितना प्रॉफिट हुआ है? 5 परसेंट प्रॉफिट नहीं कर पा रहे हैं, तो क्या होगा? मेरा यह कहना है कि आपको सारी पालिसी को रिव्यू करना पड़ेगा। हमारी पब्लिक सेक्टर और प्राइवेट सेक्टर की इंडस्ट्री कैसे अपने पांव पर खड़ी हो, यह सोचना पड़ेगा। जब तक यह नहीं करेंगे तब तक हमारा डेवलपमेंट ठीक से नहीं चल सकता।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tarkeshwar Pande; you said you would just need five minutes.

श्री टी० पांडे (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसभापति महोदय . . .

श्री राजनारायण : ये तो दो मिनट में बोल सकते हैं, सूत्र में बोलते हैं।

श्री टी० पांडे : सूत्र में बोलता हूं, भांडा भाषा में नहीं बोलता हूं। यहां जो डा० हजारी की रिपोर्ट है, उसका विश्लेषण हो रहा है। मैं सिर्फ 3-4 बातें निवेदन करना चाहता हूं। राजनारायण जो सुन लें, भारत सरकार को जो औद्योगिक और आर्थिक नाति है, वह प्रतिगामी है और प्रेरणा रहित है। उसका परिणाम यह हो रहा है कि अमीर अमीर हो रहा है और गरीब गरीब हो रहा है। उद्योग चन्द परिवारों के हाथों में नियंत्रित होता चला जा रहा है। यह बात सही है, जिसके हाथ में आर्थिक संचालन होता है, वहीं राजनीतिक, सामाजिक और सांस्कृतिक जीवन का संचालन करते हैं। इनमें व्यवस्था का दोष है, बिड़ला का दोष नहीं है, बिड़ला तो राजनीतिक संघर्ष का शिकार है।

तीसरी बात मैं अपने अनुभव की . . .

श्री राजनारायण : शिकार नहीं है, फायदा उठाने वाला है ।

श्री टी० पांडे : यह आपकी राय है । मैं सोमेट कारपोरेशन में कुछ दिनों तक डाइरेक्टर था । उसमें मैंने देखा कि जब सोमेट कारपोरेशन ने लाइसेंस चाहे—यह पब्लिक सेक्टर बाड़ी है—तो उसे यह पता लगा कि उन कंपनियों के लिये लाइसेंस पहले से ही दिये जा चुके हैं, लेकिन काम शुरू नहीं किया गया है । जो लाइसेंस देते हैं, वे अपराधी हैं, उनको दंड मिलना चाहिये, जो लाइसेंस लेते हैं, उनका या बिड़ला का कोई अपराध नहीं है । वे तो अपना फायदा चाहते हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : लेने वाला और देने वाला दोनों दोषी हैं ।

श्री टी० पांडे : यह सही है कि बिड़ला कन्सर्न को लाइसेंस देने में नियमों की जितनी पूर्ति होनी चाहिये, वह नहीं की गई है । मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि जिन सरकारी कर्मचारियों ने यह नीति अपनाई, उनको दण्ड दिया जाय । एक बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ । बाबू त्रिलोकी सिंह जो यहां पर मौजूद नहीं हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : कहिये हम लोग हैं ।

श्री टी० पांडे : लेकिन उनके साथ उस वक्त के हैं, अब के नहीं हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : अब भी हमारे साथ हैं ।

श्री टी० पांडे : कहना यह चाहता हूँ कि सन 1922 ई० में मैं उत्तर प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी का सेक्रेटरी था । उन्होंने यह तथ्य बतलाया है कि कौन सी शूगर कमेटी थी, जिसके चेयरमैन श्री आर० के० बिड़ला थे और श्री गोविन्द बल्लभ पन्त की गवर्नमेंट थी और उनको उन्होंने चीनी रिलीज कर दी और इतना रुपया चन्दा ले लिया । यह तथ्य-पूर्ण नहीं है । स्थिति यह थी कि चीनी का कंट्रोल था और चीनी का नियंत्रण भारत सर-

कार करती है, चीनी का उत्पादन अधिक था, भारत सरकार ने समूचे देश में चीनी को रिलीज किया ओपन मार्केट में और उत्तर प्रदेश में भी किया । इसमें श्री गोविन्द बल्लभ पन्त का या कांग्रेस सरकार का कोई दोष नहीं है ।

श्री राजनारायण : लेकिन वह चन्दा कांग्रेस पार्टी को मिला था, केवल उत्तर प्रदेश को नहीं ।

श्री टी० पांडे : सकल पक्षरथ यहि जग माहीं, करम होन नर पावत नाहीं, तो मैं क्या करूँ । ऊंच निवास नोच करतूती, देखि न सकहि पराय बिभूति, तो मैं क्या करूँ, मेरा तो कोई अपराध नहीं है ।

श्री राजनारायण :

जो शठ दंड करी नहि तोरा ।

अष्ट होय श्रुत मारग मोरा ॥

रे रे दुष्ट ठाड़ किन होहों ।

निर्भय चलसि न जानसि मोही ॥

श्री टी० पांडे : दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि 20 वर्ष के अन्दर भारत सरकार की कृषि की जो नीति है, उसकी उपेक्षा की गई है और औद्योगिक नीति को प्रोत्साहन दिया गया है और औद्योगिक समाज बनता चला जा रहा है, यह बात सही है ।

इसलिये मेरा सुझाव है । दो सुझाव मेरे हैं । केवल बिड़ला को दोष देना और एक ग्रुप को समिने रख कर के वाद-प्रतिवाद करना, यह मैं कोई बहुत अच्छा नहीं समझता हूँ, मैं इसको समय को बर्बादो समझता हूँ, चाहे बिड़ला ग्रुप हो, चाहे डालमिया ग्रुप हो, या कनोडिया ग्रुप हो या टाटा ग्रुप हो . . .

श्री राजनारायण : या शान्ति प्रसाद जैन हों ।

श्री टी० पांडे : . . .

या शान्ति प्रसाद जैन हों या श्री राजनारायण सिंह हों, जो भी औद्योगिक कार्यों को कर रहे हैं, वे इस बात की चेष्टा में हैं कि उनको अधिक

[श्री टी० पांडे]

से अधिक उद्योग करने का अवसर मिले। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि इसकी जांच होनी चाहिये। आपको राय से, एक सज्जन की राय से, एक एक्सपर्ट की राय से मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ; क्योंकि मैंने अपने यहां देखा है कि जो खेती के काम का एक्सपर्ट है, वह टोपी पहन कर, हेट और सूट पहन कर आते हैं, वह कभी भी खेती के काम को जानते नहीं हैं, इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि संसद के सदस्यों की, दोनों सदनों की, एक ऐसी समिति संगठित की जाय जो इसकी जांच करें।

दूसरी बात मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि केवल बिड़ला ग्रुप आफ इंडस्ट्रीज की ही नहीं बल्कि अन्य औद्योगिक संस्थानों की भी जांच की जाय और जांच करने के बाद जो विवरण हो, वह सभा पटल पर रखा जाय। थैंक यू।

SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA' (Rajasthan): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am grateful to you for permitting me to intervene in this debate and to say something on this very important subject which is under discussion today. We have been discussing a lot of things in connection with this Report and one gets the impression that the main concern of the Report was what is called the Birla episode or the Birla empire that has been built up. As a matter of fact, the Report has as its main concern the study of the licensing procedure of the Government and the Birlas have been selected as an example so that the whole operation may become understandable and the methods followed in such cases could be clearly understood. Therefore, any impression that the Birlas have been discriminated against or that there is any prejudice against the Birlas, I think, is not well founded. The Birla group was selected for study for very valid and academic reasons. The Report itself says that out of the three groups, namely, Tatas, Martin Burns and Birlas, the first groups made almost no applications during the period of

Madam, this is not the first time that a study of this nature was conducted though I feel that this study was long overdue. It was necessary for the Government to review from time to time the various procedures and the various implications of this administration in this very important field. Therefore, I feel that this Hazari investigation had not come a day too soon. As a matter of fact, these facts are in a way very elementary and these should have been collected in the normal course of the administration by the Department concerned, facts as to who were getting the licences and in what direction licences were going, what type of industries were applied for and whether any particular group was pre-empting a larger share of them than was proper and so on. As a matter of fact, those facts should have been before the Licensing Committee itself in view of what is contained in the Industrial Policy Resolution as well as in the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. Our country has a definite industrial policy tracing right from the Constitution of India to the Industrial Policy Resolution and the implications of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, as well as the Plans that have been adopted by this House. All these things gave the context in which each application should have been judged and my

this study. The Birla group was selected because of the large number of applications that it had made and because the various processes which had to be gone through in giving licences to industries could best be illustrated by a study of the Birla group. Therefore it is not out of any pre-judice, as I said, but because of very valid reasons that this group was selected and there has been a thorough study of the whole thing. The conclusions are said to be interim, but on the whole, I do not think that they could be improved upon and so far as they go, they are complete and they throw enough light on the whole procedure that is followed in this matter.

regret, Madam, is that all these Resolutions and all these policy considerations were ignored when implementing them and this is the crux of the whole Report. It does not matter whether the Birlas got a disproportionately large number of licences—it may have significance of its own—but that it has been high lighted should really warn us as to how such wrong tendencies can develop if proper check is not exercised on the matter at the policy formation level. So we have to consider how to avoid this sort of thing happening in the future and for that we are grateful to the hon. Minister of Industries for his announcement that he would order a thorough probe into the whole thing. I think the probe should embrace not only the licensing procedure—that is a very minor aspect of the whole thing—but the other aspects have to be gone into including the credit policy of the financing institutions that the Government of India have established, the Company Law Administration, and the various terms that private organisations have to fulfil when they approach the authorities for the licences and so on. And there should be a complete and thorough probe to see how and why the clear-cut policies of the Government were not implemented in practice and how this type of aberrations were made possible. I will just give an example which will illustrate how without giving considerations to the various issues involved licences were issued in a sector which in no way can be said to be a priority sector and which developed because of probably, indifference—if nothing worse—on the part of the persons who guide such matters. It is the case of the rayon industry. Everyone knows that this is a capital-intensive industry with very little or almost no employment potential and even for its day-to-day running needs foreign exchange because its raw materials have got to be imported. Therefore, it is not a type of industry which should have priority. We should enquire us to why this private industry was given the licences while others were denied and

that is how we can discover how these things happen. The growth of this industry has been encouraged by various means, by putting a series of restrictions on the expansion of the textile units in the belief that we will not be able to grow enough cotton in the country. A number of new rayon units were allowed in addition to allowing the expansion of old ones. Some of the units were included in the Plan though we do not see them in even the core of the Plan. That is why we want to know when the thing was not in the core of the Plan, when it was not even in the priority sector, why this was permitted, why all these licences were given for having rayon factories. Rayon is just one example. This can be shown to exist in almost all other sectors. Why is it that luxury industries like refrigeration, air conditioning and things like that have overshot the Plan targets whereas higher priority sectors like transport and power which are really basic to the development of the country, have always had shortfalls? There must be something basically wrong in our planning when such things are occurring and it is exactly in that direction that I want to draw the attention of the Government. I say, please have a probe into all these things so that we may see where things have gone wrong, why they have gone wrong and what remedy is available to us, so that we may know the reasons for this state of affairs. Dr. Hazari has given certain suggestions as to how these things could be improved. Personally I think Dr. Hazari is not a radical revolutionary. Today many people who are swearing by his name may later have to rethink about their own opinion about him. "When the full Report comes he might suggest many things which may not be acceptable to them. I will just quote from his earlier work to show what sort of views he holds on certain things. He says:

"A complete embargo on the growth of large groups would be suicidal in the present context.... Their existing undertakings can ex-

(Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha)

pand at a cost lower than that of new undertakings without requiring a proportionate 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."

This is Dr. Hazari whom all along we have been quoting here. Even in this Report there are certain observations about which we will have to think very seriously before accepting them and before asking the Government to implement them. The whole thing revolves round as to what type of set-up we want in this country so far as industries are concerned. We say ours is a mixed economy; some people go further and say that we have some sort of a socialism or at least we are approximating to some sort of a socialism. I think this is a completely wrong description of the situation. We, in this country, by State action, by deliberate policy on the part of the Government, are strengthening the private sector to an unheard of extent. What we have is not even a mixed economy; what we have is capitalism on a silver platter. The whole planning apparatus has been so geared as to strengthen the private sector leaving free such industries to the public sector which the private sector in any case will never touch. All profitable lines like the consumer goods industries have been pre-empted by them, have been reserved for them and that is how the whole thing is working. The capitalist system of economic organisation has some good points; for example, the market mechanism leads to competition and in certain circumstances it can reduce the per item cost of production and lead to other improvements in the technology of production. These things have been admitted even by Communist economies and they are also practising this market economy to a certain extent but we in this country do not have

a market economy at all. The private sector has a protected market; there is no competition worth the name and all imports from outside are closed through restrictions, tariffs and things like that. It is a very protected and sheltered market and the capacity that has been sanctioned is much less than the total requirements of the country. Suppose we need a hundred thousand tonnes of a certain thing and 20,000 tonnes are already available, we sanction only another 60,000 and there is thus always a gap between the demand and the supply, that has been sanctioned. We are planning not for plenty but for perpetuating scarcities of these things with the result that the private sector is completely left alone free to raise the price, to play havoc with the consumers, to give sub-standard goods and to enjoy all the protection of the sheltered market and we are left without even the little benefits that we can get from the operation of the market economy. There are certain sectors which have to be free; there should be free licensing in certain consumer goods. We should compute the requirements of the nation and give free licences to the whole extent and even a little more. If some people are prepared to come in that field they should be allowed to do so that we can at least some benefit from this private enterprise system which, so to say, we have admitted into this country.

Now, Madam, a suggestion has come that all these things are connected with finance. It is very true and a suggestion has been put forward—it has been mentioned in many of the speeches here—that unless the financial control by the private sector over the banks is removed this sort of thing cannot be stopped. To some extent that is very much true but before we can talk about the nationalisation of banking we should have a look at the existing state banks, the existing financial institutions, and the way they operate. I have to say that very much remains to be done to

improve their working. Mere State control or mere State ownership would not lead to any results. Take, for example, the Reserve Bank of India and the State Bank of India. These two banks are completely controlled and owned by the Government. They have been nationalised all right but in the operation of these banks they always favour the private sector. The co-operative sector is ignored; the small entrepreneurs are ignored and most of the money goes into private channels. The whole thing is geared to prop up the private sector in our national economy. I do not grudge it but we do it we should do it with our eyes open. If that is the Government policy let them come and say so, but it cannot be that we talk of nationalisation of the financial institutions and in practice go on conferring favours, so to say, on a silver platter, to the same set of persons who dominate the private sector to run their own industries. These nationalised institutions disburse loans according to their pleasure helping the private sector economy with the public funds and with the added prestige of their being nationalised institutions. Take even organisations like the LIC for example. They say that they are now working for the interests of the policy-holders. Well, the interest of the policy-holder is that the national economy should be strengthened which can only be done on the basis of socialist development. So whatever they say, whatever investments they make—the Finance Corporations, the Industrial Development Corporation; I do not know but there are a host of organisations that come up almost every alternate year—they are all just there to prop up the private sector in our economy and their policies are so framed that the small entrepreneurs as well as the co-operative sector are completely starved. The Land Mortgage Banks and the Co-operative Banks go to the LIC just for a pittance of a few crores of rupees for the whole country but it refuses to accommodate them even to such an

extent. Such instances can be multiplied. So what I would like to urge on the Government is, at least they should first see and improve the working of these nationalised institutions, of these Government institutions which we have already got. The Board of Directors is completely dominated by the private sector. There is no difference between the Board of Governors of the Reserve Bank and the State Bank and the Board of Directors of any other scheduled bank in the private sector. So the Government should know what directions they should give to their financial institutions and those directions should be clear-cut so that there is no confusion. It is only then, that we talk about nationalisation of banks because mere ownership of the banks would not be of much avail. There should be some social direction in the operation of these banks; they should not be operated as in the old days, as if no change has taken place. The State Bank is operating in the same way in which any private scheduled bank is operating. They were given certain limited responsibilities for the promotion of the co-operative movement, for the small entrepreneurs and things like that, but they have completely failed to do even that. Why is it so? Has the Government ever asked its Directors who sit on the Board of Directors as their representatives? Have those people ever thought of reporting back to the Government as to how they have been functioning? So what really matters is that the Government and its officers should have a clear concept of what is expected of them. These Birla licences as mentioned in the Hazari Report, would probably not have been given if the Government had given clear-cut directions to the licensing authorities. One thing is however clear that nothing illegal has happened in the granting of these licences. There is no mention in the Hazari Report that any provisions of Law have been contravened. The necessary procedures have all been gone through.

[Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha]

They are all responsible people and they have scrutinised the applications carefully and they have sanctioned them with their eyes open. No fraud has been played—if anything of this nature can be a fraud. What has been lacking, according to me, is a complete lack of directions from people in responsible places as to what is expected and what is the detailed way in which our policy should be implemented.

Therefore, in concluding my speech, I once again thank our hon. Minister for his announcement that a committee would be appointed to examine the whole thing. I would suggest that the committee, which is to be appointed, should cover a very comprehensive field of things. Mere licensing would be just tinkering with the problem. It would not be any solution to all this. The whole gamut of our industrial life, the way our financial institutions are working, the way Government subscribes or underwrites and in every possible way props up this system of private economy, has to be gone into and the rationale examined and it should be considered in the context of our declared policy decisions. I am not referring to the Congress resolutions. I am referring to the Constitution of India, to an Act passed by this House, by Parliament, to the Plans that have been approved and accepted as national goals of our economic development to our Industrial Policy Resolution, about which there have been no differences. These are the basic facts, these are the basic principles on which our economic policy should rest and it is the duty of the Government and I think it would be a grave dereliction of duty, even a contempt of the House, if these things are not properly implemented. So, very detailed instructions should be issued, so that no one, no one in authority can get away with the impression that what he is doing is completely all right. The hon. Minister said yesterday, while making his introductory re-

marks, that the method of licensing is that an application comes and if the targeted capacity has not been reached, it is granted. Very simple. But whether there are other applicants who are equally good, whether a group has pre-empted a number of licences to itself, whether its past performance is good or not, how does this group fit into the total concept of the economic development of the country and the lines in which the State wants to proceed—these apparently are not gone into. So, the fault lies in our lack of clarity of thought. We ought to know what is expected of industrial licensing. Industrial licensing is a very potent weapon for channeling the scarce resources of the country into desired channels. What are the desired channels is very apparent from our industrial policy, which is a national policy. Instead of that this Report shows how the anatomy of perversion can go forward, how aberrations can creep into the implementation and the instrument of channelling the resources into desirable ends has resulted in funnelling all our resources into channels which we now regard as undesirable. I wonder why we should feel surprised if all these things are happening. Personally I am not surprised at all. This sort of thing has been going on all these years. The way big industrialists are raising big industries is known to everyone. Only the factual data had not been collected and collated in this way and presented to us before. The way Birlas have been going about and strutting about is no secret to anyone. Therefore, the whole purpose of the new committee, which is being set up, should be to conduct a deep probe into the whole concept of our economic development, where licensing fits into our national goals so far as industrial planning is concerned, what place we want to assign to the private sector, etc. We always try to run down the private sector. In our state of economy, the private sector is also a part of our national

economic set up. They should have a distinct and definite place. They should 'know to what extent they could go. If they transgress that, they should be hauled up and brought to book. On the one hand, if you allow the private sector and on the other hand, if you put strings around it, we would fall between two stools. We will neither get the benefits of Uic ixee enterprise system nor the benefits of a planned and regimented econojmy. We will have the worst of both th_e worlds. We talk of the mijxed economy and we want the best of j both 1he worlds. We want to a??oid—the shortcomings of the two economic systems and want them to join together in our national development. So, we want to have a very clear concept of the direction in which we want to take the country and the Government should completely inform itself on these things.

This debate has served a very useful purpose. It has high-lighted certain things which were very necessary. It has high-lighted the dangers of concentration of wealth and economic power, which undoubtedly exists in this country. It has alerted us to a menac_e which, if allowed to grow, would become much worse. We are just on the threshold of vast economic development. Birlas' concentration is nothing compared to what can happen in the future when we want to double our industrial production in every Five Year Plan. The whole thing is how much of the future development should go to the private sector and the rest to the other sectors.

There have been talks about monopoly. The word 'monopoly' is used in different contexts. Mention was made about the monopolies in America and the anti-trust legislation there and things like that. What we regard as completely legitimate in the Indian context are illegal even in the context of a free enterprise economy like America. For example, fixing of common rates of interest by the banks would come under restraint of trade, if it is done in

America and it is something which they would completely abhor. Fixation of interest rates fixing of price⁹ between the various manufacturers, such things are completely legal and common in our country. No one thinks about these. This is the real monopoly and not a few individuals who have got certain economic powers. So, when we talk of monopoly we should know what it mean⁹. In America, which is a free enterprise country, even they are going to check these malpractices, so that the consumer might profit, so that the nation might profit. As I said, when we are on the threshold of a vast and accelerated programme of industrial development, this is the time when we must think about basic problems and find solutions for them.

With these few words, I thank you very much for permitting me to speak in this important debate and I hope the committee, which the Government *is* going to form, will give some solutions and some guidelines for all the problems that we are facing.

Thank you.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore):
Madam Deputy Chairman. I am very conscious that we are just discussing here the Hazari Report. Now, for the purpose of this, it may be considered under the following heads:—

- (i) What are the number of applications made during the period under consideration?
- (ii) Number of licences granted;
- (iii) Capital investment involved;
- (iv) Foreign exchange components; and
- O) Areas or States in which these industries have been developed.

During the period of nine and a ha'f years, for which these things have been considered, it is said that Birlas particularly submitted 938 applications. There is in this what is known as multiple-counting also. Dr. Hazari

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy]

hug taken into consideration multiple counting, which means they have been repeated. There may be many applications of the same party. It means, in all directions there were 938 applications. These have been classified into three types of applications. There are what are known as applications for new articles. It means the equipment remains the same and the factory remains the same. Only the manufacture is different. They are going into a new market. There is another category called substantial expansion. The same kind of factory and everything else is the same, but it is expansion. It may contain also some import components and extra investment, etc. Then, there are new undertakings. Dr. Hazari himself has divided all these applications for licences from Birla into three classes. Now, for new articles there have been 228 applications, of which only 102 have been sanctioned by the Licensing Committee. For substantial expansion there have been 267 applications and 149 applications have been sanctioned. There have been applications for 443 new undertakings of which 124 have been sanctioned. So, it is worthwhile for this House to take into consideration what is the significance of each one of these applications made and sanctioned. Now, for the manufacture of a new article, if a licence has been applied for, probably in the wisdom of the Licensing Committee they thought that for the country's economic development and rapid, accelerated growth of the industry this was necessary. So, 102 applications have been sanctioned for new articles. Similarly, substantial expansion is another thing. By expansion the country's economy was going to be helped. Does it mean to say that we must hamper the national development by not sanctioning the expansions? Should we take it as a very serious thing at all? I do not know. This expansion is a due process of growth which has been allowed. It is nothing very extraordinary. It is not showing any undue favour. If anybody says that undue favour has

been shown to Birlas, I would not agree with him. Further in the words of the distinguished Professor, in para. 11-3 he says:

"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 of data are somewhat common in this area."

That means to say that the data on which he has depended are shot correct. He is not quite sure of the data that he has collected, or it was not available, I do not know. But this is what he says. It may be there are more applications for new things, there are more applications for expansion. All that is not clear. So we cannot depend upon his own figures because he makes an observation of the kind that I have just now quoted.

Again in para II *11 he says:

"The data have no reference to follow-up action after consideration of proposals by the Licensing Committee and/or the Capital Goods Committee. To the extent licences do not fructify ultimately or there is a time lag between sanction and actual investment, or a difference between estimated cost and actual cost, there would be a wide gap between investment intentions and fulfilment."

If a licence has been sanctioned, it has not been followed up. There are no records with the Government or with anybody. There is no follow-up as to how many of them fructified and how many did not fructify. Even this aspect of the question has not been gone into and we have been asked to pronounce a judgment on such imperfect data as the ones presented by the Hazari report.

Now, 375 licence applications have been sanctioned in all even according to the report. The capital equipment is also estimated. But in the estimate of capital equipment the learned Professor takes recourse to guesses, in

his own words—it is not my word:

field, and approval of licences became inevitable.

"It is on a rough and crude basis these investment data are boosted *pro rata* for all the 375 applications approved, the total investment and its import component would be Rs. 384 crores and Rs. 248 crores respectively."

In his own statement on a *pro rata* basis he has calculated. He has put before the country that the total investment of these licences granted was Rs. 384 crores. Is this Parliament going to depend on such imperfect data and pronounce an opinion about the investments, extraordinary investments on an extraordinary number of licences to the Birla group of industries? I suppose we shall not be so hasty as to pronounce a judgment on the imperfect data. According to the author himself the whole data are

Did licensing Birlas block the entry of other entrepreneurs—what is called foreclosure? Has it been there Or has it not been there? That also has not been made clear. The learned author says: "Whether and if so to what extent this performance actually blocks the entry of the other existing or potential entrepreneurs and thereby shuts out competition is an open question which cannot be answered straightway on the basis of the data on hand." Even on the question of foreclosure he says it is an open question. He could not come to any conclusion. Speeches are made here to show as if the entire country has been shut out. This again should leave this House in doubt whether or not there were other competitors to Birlas in the licences applied for or approved. This House, therefore, is not in a position to draw conclusions one way or the other. On the other hand the benefit of doubt should be given to the whole question. It may as well have been a case of no competitors in the

Madam, yesterday Mr. Bhupesh Gupta made it look to the House that in 1959 the number of applications made by Birlas formed 55 per cent of the total and the number of applications approved were 47 per cent, so that Birlas seemed to have got almost the entire applications approved. No, the interpretation of the statistics seems to be different. Out of the approved applications, 47 per cent Birlas got away with. That means to say, out of the 9000 odd applications that have been approved, theirs were 47 per cent involving investment of capital of Rs. 105 crores and import component of Rs. 141 crores in 1959. Subsequently in 1960 of course the same is the story. The investments have also improved and the import component have also improved. Therefore, it should not be made to look as if the entire licences have been sanctioned only in favour of the Birlas.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must wind up now.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I am concluding, Madam. I am quite conscious of the time you have given me. What is the purpose of reopening the subject of licenses issued to the Birla group of industries? There are numerous Ministries and others at the subordinate level in the Government who consider the entire licensing system. After all who has done this job? Our own Government. Whom are they condemning now? We are only trying to condemn Government. Especially to my friends of the Congress Party I would point out that if we have done anything wrong, certainly we shall take the responsibility. It is a question of condemning our own Government.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: That is wrong. We are condemning the Birlas and other people.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: There are well laid-down policies of the Government and also the Directive

Interim Report on

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy] Principles of the Constitution which are within the knowledge of the licensing authority. This prevention of concentration of wealth is certainly a very important thing.

In conclusion I* would like to point out that this subject requires a very deep study. This House should not form an opinion on the basis of the imperfect study made by Dr. Hazari. I congratulate the Minister because he has promised that the whole question will be examined by the Cabinet Committee. Certainly the country will have absolute confidence in you, Sir. If the Cabinet Committee considers it and comes forward with practical proposals as to how the future economy of the country has to be built up, they should be accepted. Sir, you have been very particular to say that it is also intended to set up an enquiry to ascertain whether in the issue of the past licences there has been any discrimination in favour of the bigger groups of industries consistent with the need to ensure rapid industrial development. I am very happy that you have used these words 'consistent with the rapid development'. Therefore, by all means you will have the good wishes of the country in this.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: This Committee means Birla Committee.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Madam, the debate on Dr. Hazari's Report has been developed into a gherao at the House of Birlas.

(Interruptions) THE

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीय जब कोई हिन्दुस्तानी अंग्रेजों की तरह मुंह बनाकर अंग्रेजी बोलने लगता है तब हमें कुछ समझ नहीं पड़ता ।

SHRI A. D. MANI: It is undoubtedly true that much of the statistical material which is given by Dr. Hazari in his Report relating to the House of Birlas . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Madam, he is not in his seat.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have permitted him. Let him come before the mike.

SHRI A. D. MANI: . . . shows increasing concentration of economic power in the House of Birlas. But in all these matters, we must have a proper focus in mind. At the present time, capital formation . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Are you supporting him?

SHRI A. D. MANI: . . . is more or less non-existent. I am not supporting him, I am supporting common sense.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Which you have not got. It is very rare.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam, as a result of very heavy corporate taxation and personal taxation . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: It is as a result of heavy concentration.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mani, please come one step forward. Now, you should be able to speak into the mike, louder than those who speak.

SHRI A. D. MANI: As a result of the heavy corporate taxation and personal taxation which has eroded into the savings of the common man, there has hardly been any capital formation in the country. I am not suggesting that we should give support to the House of Birlas but we should not do anything which will frighten away capital formation. My hon. friend, Mr. Sri Rama Reddy, who is not here has pointed out a number of statistical inaccuracies in regard to the analysis made by Dr. Hazari about the Birla applications. What he says might be true; it may not be 700, it may be 400. But a large number of licences have gone over to the House of Birlas and it is for the Committee which the hon. Minister is going to

to find out how these things
 given to the House of Birlas, a
 commercial probe. (Interruptions) I
 before me a lot of material on
 have other companies also. Andrew
 the other Martin Burn and Balmer Lawrie
 Yule, years ago were top companies in
 some of India. But now they have gone down
 at the bottom of the scale. The House
 of Birlas has come up. And this is a
 matter for consternation to all of us
 because we do not want any concen-
 tration of economic power in the hands
 of any one house. But I do not see
 how we can avoid concentration at
 some stage or other. And in this con-
 nection, I would like to draw the
 attention of the House to the observa-
 tions made by Dr. Hazari in his book
 "The Corporate Private Sector". He
 says and I want to quote it briefly—

"A complete embargo on the growth of
 the large groups would be suicidal in the
 present context. Their investment
 programmes are integral to the overall
 development effort, and are complementary
 to the public sector programme. The
 existing undertakings can expand at a cost
 lower than that of new undertakings,
 without requiring a proportionate
 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 to
 waste. Moreover, the public sector
 programme itself would be endangered if
 the units which are part of large groups are
 not allowed to expand."

These are his conclusions. Dr. Hazari
 himself has said that there is some advantage
 in the concentration of economic power.
 How he has changed . . .

श्री राजनारायण : मुनि की जो
 आखिरी वाणी होती है वह सत्य मानी जाती
 है।

. SHRI A. D. MANI; But I am also quoting.
 ■ what he has written in his book.

635 RS—8.

Our capital formation has been so poor that
 we cannot think in terms of monopolies at this
 stage. Monopolies would come into existence
 perhaps when this country is highly
 industrialised and we reach the stage of
 industrialisation of the USA, Japan and the
 U.K. Unilever is a great concentration of
 economic power in the United Kingdom, and
 this has been the subject of a series of
 economic inquiries. But we have not reached
 that stage yet. The vast potential of the home
 market . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Mr. Mani, will
 you tell us whether monopolies exist in India
 or not? Let us know where you stand.

SHRI A. D. MANI: There is a tendency
 towards monopoly. I concede that point.
 And perhaps . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Only a tendency?

SHRI A. D. MANI: . . . if steps are not
 taken, monopolies of the kind which have
 emerged in the USA and the UK might come
 into existence in India also. But I do not
 believe that we should start a witch hunt of
 the big business just because they happen to
 be big. If Birlas are not in the field, if Tatas
 are not in the field, if Sahu Jains are not in the
 field, their absence is going to be made up by
 somebody else who will come forward, apply
 for licences and build up new industries.
 Unfortunately, economic power has been
 concentrated into these three Houses. And it
 speaks much for the inefficiency of the
 Income-tax Department that so much money
 has been allowed to accumulate in the hands
 of Birlas. I am told that Mr. Birla himself
 does not pay any income-tax at all. How one
 House could have amassed such a large
 fortune speaks for the vigilance of our
 Income-tax Department. But then the remedy
 should be to see that the Income-tax
 Department is brightened up and collections
 are made more vigorously. We should not
 start on a witch-hunt of big business just
 because they happen to be big, but try to see
 that the licences are spread on a under scale

[Shri A. D. Mani]

because what is going to happen is, if the licences are not spread over on a wide scale, the smaller entrepreneurs are not going to come forward. They do not have that managerial and entrepreneurial ability which Dr. Hazari says in his book 'The Corporate Private Sector' the big business houses have. I therefore feel that we should maintain a sense of balance. I feel that the licensing system has led to many abuses and has perhaps led to the creation of many private fortunes of Government servants. Reference has been made in the debate to some ICS officers being engaged by the House of Birlas. And my hon. friend, Mr. Tariff, mentioned, I believe, an Income-tax officer being taken up by the House of Birlas. I do not know whether I am right in quoting him because I had been listening to so many speeches in the debate. But it is true that many of our officials are in close touch with these big business houses and in spite of a Vigilance Cell in the Ministry of Home Affairs, a large number of Government servants, after retirement, migrate to these big business houses and strengthen their managerial ability by the inside knowledge of what goes on in the Government. Madam, I do not know how we can prevent Government servants from seeking private employment after retirement. After all, the pensions that we give to Government servants are so meagre and the real value has been so much eroded by the rising cost of living that a Government servant also has got to live. But whether he should go to the House of Birlas is a different matter. Personally any official who has had commercial dealings should not be permitted to have employment

in any commercial house after retirement. He can work in a college, he can work in a charitable institution.

श्री राज नारायण : एक मंत्री का बेटा।

SHRI A. D. MANI: He becomes a Minister. He can become a Member of the Rajya Sabha. But he can't . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He will not get any pension.

SHRI A. D. MANI: But he has Rs. 400 plus facilities plus he has travel and all that. It works out at Rs. 900.

Madam, I feel that the Home Ministry should scrutinise the records¹ of all those persons who have sought employment in the private sector after retirement. It is not with a view to seeing that they are landed in jail but to study the trends among Government Officials so that we can evolve procedures which can prevent administrative talents misusing the position that they enjoyed in Government by entering into business houses.

Madam, I want to make an observation about the recommendation made by Dr. Hazari that certain industries should not be given more than one licence if they reach a certain stage. I do not know whether that would be tenable in law if it is challenged before the Supreme Court I hope they would win the suit because after the recent amendment of the Constitution, the Seventeenth Amendment, Fundamental Rights are very important. It is not fair to limit the fundamental right of any person by saying that not more than so many applications should be granted to a concern because of the concentration of economic power.

Madam, I would also like to refer to the question of monopoly to which a reference has been made in the debate by many speakers. The idea of monopoly differs from country to country. In the United States a company having a capital of \$600,000 is regarded a small business. It means a company worth about Rs. 80 lakhs in the United States is considered a small business. Whereas in

we are accustomed to say that India was having more Rs. 5-6 lakhs a conceit to big business. Therefore, belongs it is not possible for our Madam, to industrialise itself unless country makes its ideas of monopolies. I revise it to mention to this House would be a danger to the paper industry, that in it had experience of a large we have! of persons applying for number land not pursuing the project licences / they did not have the capital because of a good paper plant in the to put it. The Minister of Industries could admit that he has had to in-allow many industrialists to take up the paper industry. But unfortunately, they have not been able to find the capital for this purpose. Therefore, since iron, steel and fertilisers are the main needs of the country, it is impossible to avoid big business. I am sorry to say that in spite of the widespread disapproval on this side of this House we cannot avoid concentration of wealth in some measure. It should not become a dangerous measure.

Madam, I agree to the setting up of the Committee which is going to be established.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : माननीया डिप्टी चयरमैन, महोदया, कल से हजारी रिपोर्ट पर बहस हो रही है और बहस के दमियान यह पता चल गया कि इस हाउस में जो सदस्यगण हैं उनका क्या ख्याल, उनका क्या दृष्टिकोण है और वह क्या है, उनका असली स्वरूप चाहे वह इधर के बैठने वाले हों या उधर के बैठने वाले हों पता चल गया। कम से कम इसके लिये मैं साथी चन्द्र शेखर जी और भार्गव जी को धन्यावाद करता हूँ कि उन्होंने इसका मौका दिया और अपनी पार्टी को भी धन्यावाद करता हूँ और इसलिये करता हूँ कि वह लोग जो कि साहू सर्विस पार्टी के सदस्य हैं, श्री राजनारायण, जिसको कि एस० एस० पी० कहा जाता है, उन्होंने ओ० बी० ई० आर्डरली आफ दि बिड़ला इम्पायर कांग्रेस को कहा।

श्री राजनारायण : माननीय, आन ए प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर, आन ए प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर . . . :

कई माननीय सदस्य : अपनी सीट पर बैठिये, वहाँ से बोलिये।

श्री राजनारायण : इस हाउस में यह प्रथा चला दी गई है इसलिये यहाँ से बोला। आप कहे तो मैं जा सकता हूँ, आपने उनको एलाओ किया था इसलिये मैं यहाँ खड़ा हुआ। मैं अपनी जगह पर आ सकता हूँ। मैं तो कायदा का पालन कराने के लिये गया था ताकि हम सब उसका पालन करें।

मेरा निवेदन यह है कि क्या सदन का कोई सदस्य किसी पार्टी के नाम को डिस्टार्ट कर सकता है और अगर संयुक्त सोसलिस्ट पार्टी के नाम को श्री शीलभद्र जी अपने शील को भंग कर के डिस्टार्ट करते हैं तो मैं कहूँगा कि कांग्रेस पार्टी का मतलब है करण्ट पार्टी, कांग्रेस पार्टी का मतलब बिड़ला पार्टी और शीलभद्र याजी अपने शील को भंग कराने वाले व्यक्ति।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मैंने इसलिये कहा कि उस रोज जब बहस हो रही थी तब इस सदन में श्री राजनारायण जी ने कांग्रेस को ओ० बी० ई० कहा था जो असलियत में ठीक नहीं।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Yajee, you have got very limited time.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : लेकिन हाँ, उस बात को कहना है, सफाई देनी है और वह यह है कि उन्होंने हमारे कांग्रेस का नाम रखा ओ० बी० ई०, आर्डरली आफ बिड़ला इम्पायर।

श्री राजनारायण : हे ही।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : तो हमने जवाब दिया कि एस० एस० पी० यानी साहू सर्विस पार्टी। क्यों जवाब दिया, इसलिये कि बीवियन

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

बोस कमिशन की रिपोर्ट पर जब बहस हो रही थी तो 750 एम० पीज० हैं लेकिन उनमें से एक सदस्य भी रोने पीटने वाला साहू जैन को नहीं मिला और लोहिया साहब को एक लाख रुपया लेना था वह ले कर साइन करवा कर लोक सभा को अर्जी दी।

श्री राजनारायण : झूठ है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मैं कहता हूँ कि साहू सर्विस पार्टी के सदस्य ने रुपये लेकर अर्जी पर हस्ताक्षर किया।

श्री राजनारायण : शीलभद्र याजी झूठ बोल रहे हैं।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मैं एकदम सही सही बोल रहा हूँ। आप बैठ जाइये, मुझे 10 मिनट में सब कहना है।

श्री राजनारायण : साहू जैन का कोई विरोध करता है तो राजनारायण ही करता है जब कि कांग्रेस में ऐसे लोग हैं...

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मैं कहता हूँ यह संयुक्त समाजवादी पार्टी साहू सर्विस पार्टी है।

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, उत्तर प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री श्री सम्पूर्णनन्द का जो लड़का था उस लड़के को एक हजार रुपया साहू जैन ने दिया। यह गलतबयानी करते हैं और कहते हैं कि कांग्रेस के सदस्य हैं। तमाम साहू जैन के पैसे पर चल रहे हैं।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : जरा सुनिये भाई, मैं इसलिये कह रहा था कि हमारी पार्टी को कहा गया। हम आठ सदस्य जो कांग्रेस पार्टी के हैं उन्होंने ही यह बताने के लिये कि बिड़ला में क्या पीप भवाद भरा हुआ है इसका मोशन दिया, यह हमने दिया और उनको यह हिमाकत हो कि वह ऐसा कहें कि ओ० बी० ई०। जो बिड़ला के बिजाफ में हैं, जो उसकी खराबी है

उसको बताने के लिये हम आठ सदस्यों ने मोशन दिया और कांग्रेस के कोई साहू सर्विस पार्टी का आदमी उनके बाद ओ० बी० ई० कहे तो हमने उनको ठीक जवाब दिया। बोवियन वास का को ठीक वक्त में क्या क्या बात हुई और मिशन के क्या बात होती है, वहाँ से क्या क्या इन्सपिरेशन मिलता है...

श्री राजनारायण : साहू जैन का बिड़ला को भी, अपने को भी खाने को तैयार है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि आज जो सही स्वरूप, आज जो नक्शा देखने को मिल रहा है उससे पता चल गया कि कितने नामधारी सोशलिस्ट हैं, गाली तो हमें बकते हैं लेकिन सही मानों में पूँजोवाद को मानते हैं। जो हमारे साथी सूपेश गुप्ता जो हैं और साथी राजनारायण जो हैं, मैं उनको भी साथी कहता हूँ, वह सोशलिज्म को बोलते तो हैं, हो सकता है कि इनके लोडर पब्लिश्ट हो गये हैं लेकिन यह अच्छे आदमी हैं, इसलिये मैं इनको कहता हूँ कि आप बोवियन बोस कमिशन के टाईप का जो कमिशन चाहते हैं वह ठीक नहीं, उस पर 36 लाख रुपया गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया का खर्च हुआ...

श्री राजनारायण : मैं तो हाउस की कमेटी को बात कहता हूँ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : उसको छः वर्ष लगे लेकिन नतीजा क्या निकला। जैसे ही बोवियन बोस कमिशन की रिपोर्ट हुई वैसे ही यदि मिनिस्टर ने एक्शन लेना चाहा तो उधर बैठने वाले लाख 50 हजार रुपया ले कर के ओ० बी० ई० का विरोध करना शुरू कर दिया। तो एता खतरा मुझको है और मैं आगाह किये देता हूँ कि बिड़लान बोस कमिशन के टाईप के कमिशन के फेर में मत पड़िये। आपको जो नीति है उस पर चलिए। हम समाजवाद की बात करते हैं, हमने बिड़ला की कटु आलोचना का है, हमने

शांति प्रसाद को आलोचना की है, क्योंकि पूँजीवाद तो बड़ी गली चोज़ है, बुरी चोज़ है। और जब तक इस देश में पूँजीवाद रहेगा हमारा सरकार के कुछ लोगों को भ्रष्ट करेगा, कर्मचारियों को भ्रष्ट करेगा, प्रशासन को भ्रष्ट करेगा, सब को करेगा। इसका कारण यह है कि भ्रष्टाचार की जो जननी है वह यह पूँजीवाद है। यह जब तक हिन्दुस्तान में रहेगा और वह जो सरकार को गंगा जमुना की नीति जिसको मिकसड इकानामी कहते हैं चल रही है, वही सारी खुराफात की जड़ें हैं। हजारों हजार रिपोर्ट और विवियन बोस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट बनती रहेंगी लेकिन उसके रहते वह भ्रष्टाचार खत्म होने वाला नहीं है। यदि सबमूव हमारी सरकार समाजवाद के रास्ते पर चलना चाहती है तो दूसरा रास्ता अपनाना होगा। हमारे कुछ साथियों ने कहा, बिड़ला ने यह किया वह किया, आजादी को लड़ाई का हवाला किया है। सभी जगह जब आजादी की लड़ाई होती है तो पूँजीपति लोग मदद कर सकते हैं, और सब मदद करते हैं। लेकिन बिड़ला जो और डालमिया जो इसलिये करते थे कि लंकाबायर का कपड़ा नहीं आयेगा तो हमारा कपड़ा बिकेगा इधर भी दान करते थे उभर भी दान करते थे, वार फ्रंट में भी चंदा देते थे। यह कोई देशभक्ति नहीं है। बिड़ला जो का गुणगान हुआ, डालमिया जो का गुणगान हुआ। तो पूँजीपतियों ने इधर कुछ चटाया वहाँ कुछ चटाया और अपना काम चलाया, इसलिये नहीं दिया कि देशभक्ति थी। पूँजीवाद को खत्म करने को जिस रफ्तार से सरकार चल रही है उसको मैं मानता हूँ बहुत सुस्त है, लेकिन सही मानों में यही सरकार समाजवाद लायेगी। सही मानों में सोशलिस्ट आप विरोधी दल के लोग नहीं हैं इसलिये कहते हैं कि सरकार ने अभी तक 20 वर्ष में सोशलिज्म क्या नहीं किया। लेकिन सरकार चलती कैसे है कछुवा गति से। हमारी सरकार विश्वास करती है 'स्लो एन्ड स्टडी विन्स द रेस' में। ताज्जुद्दीन के जमाने की जो यह कहावत थी वह आज एक मूलत

नीति है। आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम अपनी सरकार को कोसे कि हमारी सरकार की नीति की वजह से, चाहे बिड़ला के प्रति हो, किसी के लिये हो, उनकी पालिसी की वजह से मोनोपोलिस्ट लोग बढ़ भी रहे हैं। पूँजीवाद बढ़ रहा है, ठीक है, आंकड़ा देख लें। हमारे मुरेश देसाई बहुत बड़े सोशलिस्ट हैं, पहले सोशलिस्ट थे, उन्होंने दिखला कर साबित करने की कोशिश की कि पब्लिक सेक्टर में यह हो रहा है वह हो रहा है मालूम पड़ता था बिड़लाशाही घट रही है, जैनशाही घट रही है। सब लोग कम्प्यूज्ड हैं, हमारे साथी जो बैठे हैं चन्द्रशेखर जी वे भी कम्प्यूज्ड हो गये। इस मायावी पूँजीवाद का हाथ सब को करप्ट करता है, हमको भी करता है, सब को करता है। जब भी कोई बात हो गई विवियन बोस का हवाला दे दिया जाता है। सही बात की मौजूदा नीति, जो मिकसड इकानामी की नीति है, जो प्रो कैपिटलिस्ट नीति है, इस नीति को परित्याग करना पड़ना और इस नीति का जब तक परित्याग नहीं होगा, इस तरह की हजारों कमेटी रिपोर्ट होती रहे उनसे कोई नतीजा निकलने वाला नहीं है। असली और मूल चीज यह है इसके लिये मैं साथी चन्द्रशेखर जी को और भार्गव जी को और अपने आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ, आपको नहीं देता हूँ कि आपने मौका दिया, हाँ आपको भी बोलने का, गुवार निकालने का मौका मिला, सरकार के ऊपर गुवार निकालने का मौका मिला और सही मानों में जो हमारे इन्डस्ट्री डवलपमेंट मिनिस्टर हैं वे एक समाजवादी हैं और हम सब लोग हैं लेकिन आज उसके लिये जरूरत इस बात की है कि यह सब जो पुरानी नीति है उसको छोड़ अन्यथा कभी करप्शन बंद नहीं होगा, किसी भी गवर्नमेंट से वह नहीं हो सकता है जब तक सारे पूँजीवाद पर कुठाराघात नहीं होगा। एक बिड़ला नहीं कितने बिड़ला हैं हिन्दुस्तान में। तो जब तक इस पूँजीवाद को जड़ से नहीं काटा जायेगा

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

तब तक न भ्रष्टाचार बंद होगा, न समाजवाद होगा। यदि समाजवाद नहीं होगा तो ठीक है, हमारे चिन्ताई साहब मानते हैं कि 100 बिड़ला हैं हिन्दुस्तान में, लेकिन उन बिड़लाओं से काम नहीं चलेगा। सरकार के नेता कहते हैं, पार्लियामेंट भी कहती है, कांग्रेस भी कहती है लेकिन उस नीति की रफ्तार को तेज करना पड़ेगा और जब तेज करेंगे तभी लांछन भी नहीं सुनना पड़ेगा। लेकिन आप जल्दी भी करेंगे तो भी लांछन सुनने पड़ेंगे और लांछन सुनते सुनते हम इतने वाटरप्रूफ हो गये कि उसमें घबड़ाने की बात नहीं है। लेकिन सही मानी में समाजवाद लाने की दिशा में, आपको खतरा दूसरी बात का है और वह खतरा है कि जो आप अपोजीशन में बैठे हैं आप भी नहीं बैठने पायेंगे, हम भी नहीं बैठने पायेंगे, दूसरी जगह आपकी जगह होगी और दूसरी जगह जेल होगा। जनता जनार्दन से रिएक्शन होगा। आपने देखा गाय के नाम पर 8 लाख आदमी आ गए थे। तो राइट रिएक्शन बड़ेगा। गलती से कम्युनिस्ट, सोसलिस्ट, जनसंघ एस० एस० पी० सब मिलकर चू चू का मुरब्बा बना, सब आइडियलाजी को आपने ताक में रख कर जहन्नम में जाने का रास्ता लिया वह हिन्दुस्तान में नमूना बन सकता है। इस लिये सब लोग, सोशलिज्म पसन्द जो लोग हैं, खासकर कांग्रेस सरकार उनकी जो मिक्सड इकानामी की नीति है, जब तक उसका परित्याग नहीं होगा तब तक बिड़ला शाही बड़ेगी, कान्सन्ट्रेशन आफ वेल्थ चलेगी, साहू जैन शाही चलेगी, सब शाही चलेगी। जनता की गरीबी नहीं जायेगी, बेकारी नहीं जायेगी और असंतोष होगा और हिन्दुस्तान का इससे नुकसान होगा। इसलिये हमारी सरकार को चेतावनी है कि इस बहस से उनको सबक लेना चाहिये।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Madam Deputy Chairman, the Planning Commission has done well in appointing Dr. Hazari to produce this re-

port. Such an enquiry was long overdue. I must mention ? in this House that a left-wing weekly of Delhi, *Mainstream* was the first to publish parts of this report/ and it was the publication of extracts from this report in the *Mainstream* which created conditions in which the report had to be laid on the Table of the House. I, of course, thank the Industries Minister for responding to this suggestion of the Congress Member of Parliament Mr. Chandra Shekhar, that the report be laid on the Table of the House. The report has made many things so clear that this sort of mistake cannot be repeated in the future. And whatever may have happened in the past as far as licensing is concerned, no new empires will come into being. In this respect, this report is a historical document in spite of certain minor inaccuracies and minor and insignificant contradictions which some Members have chosen to magnify.

Licensing is one of the most crucial instruments of regulation of industries which was evolved after the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956-Licensing was meant to serve a social purpose in accordance with the Industrial Policy Resolution. The Hazari Report indicates serious fault in the manner in which licensing was done. It has made it obvious that the procedure which was adopted was such that it led to the defeat of the main objective and the social purpose which the licensing was supposed to serve has not been served. As a matter of fact, something contrary to that social purpose has developed. The report has made it obvious that the Birlas have expanded beyond proportion. Other monopolies have also grown while the economy of the country has been stagnant and the standard of living of the people has not improved. In this connection, it is pertinent to refer to the Preamble of the Constitution and certain Directive Principles which led to the acceptance of the socialist pattern of society by the Parliament in 1954.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) *in the Chair*.] The j report has pointed out that not tfcnly the Industrial Policy Re-solutilon has been violated and ignored byj those responsible for licensing, but taie Directive Principles of the Constitution, and the Resolution re-gardirjig the socialistic pattern of societfr, accepted by Parliament in 1954,, have also been ignored. The personal growth of the Birlas, and the growth of their industrial empire isj'not the enrichment of the country. Tthe advocates of the Birlas empire, s» omo oi whom could be compared to the devil's advocate, yesterday and today tried to argue that Birlas have done wonderg which have led to the enrichment of the country. In this connection, the most significant was the speech of Mr. Babubhai Chinai who, unfortunately, happens to be a member of my party. The speech was a brazen-faced, if not unashamed, admission of the profit motive.

SHRI BABUBHAI M CHINAI: Russia has also accepted prolit motive.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: It was th© brazen-faced acceptance of the principles of capitalist growth which reacted on the people. Mr. Babubai Chinai and others of his way of thinking should know that this country and the Parliament have rejected those policies which he advocates. He should go back to 1954, to the 1954 Resolution of the Parliament of India, which Mr. Babubhai Chinai of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, and many of his type have not been able to get reversed.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: I, have been in parliament since 1957 and I know . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA * * * *

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: Sir, I take strong objection to such remarks.

****Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Arju» Arora, you should not be personal in making remarks.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I am not yielding to interruptions.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: He will hare to withdraw it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Sapru, yom please sit down.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: The word* "in an unscrupulous manner" should be withdrawn.

(Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I think the word 'unscrupulous' is unparliamentary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; No, no.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: No.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: No.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN (Andhra Pradesh): No.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Order, order; please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: "Why did you say so, Sir? We would like to understand from you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Dr. Sapru, please sit down. If you allow me, I shall say a few words. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, please sit down. My own view is that it was said with -e-ference to a Member of this House. In that connection I consider the word 'unscrupulous' unparliamentary.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: No, no.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member, while making his observations, said something about me, that I have mad, money . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: No, no.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: The record will show what he actually said. I object to his remarks against me, Sir.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: May I make a submission, Sir? If I have heard correctly, Mr. Arjun Arora said Mr. Babubhai Chinai * * * * If Mr. Arjun Arora has said that Mr. Babubhai Chinai has earned money by unscrupulous means, it is unparliamentary, but if Mr. Arjun Arora says that he knows nothing but the way to earn money unscrupulously, it is not unparliamentary, because I assert that the capitalist way of earning money is an unscrupulous way, and a member who knows that way knows nothing but the way to earn money by unscrupulous means.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, apart frdtn . . .

श्री सज्जनारक्षण: श्रीमान्, मेरा एक प्वाइंट आफ़ आर्डर है मैं आप से अदब के साथ अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ और सभी संसदीय परम्परा की जानकारी के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि कोई भी सम्मानित सदस्य इस सदन का यह कहने का कतई हक़ रखता है और यह संसदीय प्रणाली के अनुसार है कि कोई भी सदस्य अनुचित तरीके से, असाध्य तरीके से धन कमाता है। ऐसा कहने में कोई गलती नहीं है, कोई असंसदीय बात नहीं है, अनपार्लियामेंटरी भी नहीं है। श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने बिल्कुल सही बात कही है और उन्हें बोलने दिया जाना चाहिये। श्री बाबुभाई चिनाई ने जो प्वाइंट आफ़ आर्डर उठाया है वह बिल्कुल निराधार है, बेसलेस है, उसे आप कतई स्वीकृति न दें।

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, apart from the point of order raised, and its ultimate outcome, may I say this? Mr. Arjun Arora or any Member of

•Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

this House is entitled to have his or her own way of thinking but, either directly or by implication, if any Member of Parliament is suggested to have done something unscrupulous, or if any one gives the impression, the appearance, that some hon. Member is doing something unscrupulous, you know by your experience in the past, Sir, . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Sir, . . .

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Let me finish.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): She has not finished.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I have nothing against you, Mr. Arjun Arora. Sir, what I am saying is on grounds of ordinary decency. Rules and procedures apart—he may or may not agree with me—it has been the convention of the House, 'on grounds of ordinary decency, that you cannot name a particular Member and say such things against him, and I think the remark made by Mr. Arjun Arora should be withdrawn.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I should also be heard on the point of order.

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated): May I suggest that when you have declared this expression unparliamentary, It may be withdrawn by the hon. Member?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: You must give your ruling on this.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The record will show.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Let the record be read.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: It may be read after I have made my submissions to you, Sir. The lady is getting very impatient. I have only said that Mr. Babubhai Chinai knows the unscrupulous way of making money. I have not said that he has made money unscrupulously; I do not

[Shri Arjun Arora]
know if he has made money that way. Anyway, Sir, the record may be consulted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The records are there and you can easily verify what exactly Mr. Arjun Arora said. He has repeated it again, I mean what he said and now we have to believe him because the words fell from his lips. I submit that it is not unparliamentary. He only said that Mr. Babubhai Chinai knows the unscrupulous ways of the big business houses. (Interruptions.) Just one minute.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I have heard you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, you have not. If you see the Monopolist Commission's Report you will find there that they have mentioned these 75 families and among them Shri Babubhai Chinai's name is mentioned, I take it. They refer to so many crores of paid-up capital and the number of companies and their assets. Therefore, the Monopolies Commission has made certain observations which point to the fact that the honourable members of these 75 families are very well conversant with the unscrupulous ways of how the big business houses are built up. And since Shri Chinai belongs to that holy crowd, therefore Shri Arjun Arora was entitled in the course of the debate to remind Mr. Chinai that he knew the unscrupulous ways. What was wrong in it?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I will further study the records and then come to my decision.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHAINAI: No, no, Sir.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Obey the Chair.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: With due respect to the House, hon. Members

should not abuse each other and whether any Member is justified in describing a respected Member of this House as a person who knows the art of making unscrupulous money is a question on which you should give your decision.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Can Shri P. N. Sapru, an old Member of this House, challenge your ruling, Sir? You have said that you will give your ruling after studying the record. Can he challenge it?

SHRI RAJNARAIN: On a point of order, Sir. आपकी रूलिंग के बाद अभी सदन की कोई कार्यवाही आगे नहीं चली है, इसलिये और प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर उठ नहीं सकता है। (Interruption:) आपकी रूलिंग के बाद सदन की कोई कार्यवाही आगे नहीं बढ़ी है, इसलिये मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर है कि आप इस मौके पर किसी को कोई प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर उठाने का मौका नहीं दे सकते हैं। यह आपकी कैपेसिटी के विषांड है। आप अर्जुन अरोड़ा जी को बोलने दीजिये। अगर उनके बोलने में कोई अड़चन आयेगी तब प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर उठाया जा सकता है, बट नाट ऐट दिस स्टेज। यह आपकी कैपेसिटी के विषांड है कि आप किसी को प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर रोज करने का मौका दें। मैं आपकी इस पावर को चैलेंज करता हूँ।

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Has he given his ruling?

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Yes, he has given his ruling.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): If only you will listen to me. When I heard this expression, the impression that I had was that it was a personal reference to Shri Babubhai Chinai and that is why I said that I considered the word "unscrupulous" unparliamentary. But now when the other Members drew

[The Vice-chairman]

any attention and wanted me to consider and a different interpretation of what Mr. Arju Arora had said came for discussion, I gave further consideration and I said that I would look into the records and come to my own conclusion. I have not said anything against it. My first impression, *i* here-fore, continues, unless I look into the matter and change my decision.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: That stands.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Arjun Arora.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: In clarification of your ruling, Sir, अगर मैं यह कहूँ कि बाबूभाई चिनाई या अन्य दूसरे पूँजीपति जिन्होंने करोड़ों करोड़ की सम्पत्ति जाम कर रखी है, उन्होंने पापपूर्ण तरीके से धन कमाया है क्योंकि वैसे किसी के पास इतना धन हो ही नहीं सकता है, अगर वह ठीक तरीके से कमाये, तो क्या आप इसको अन-पार्लियामेंटरी करेंगे।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): If it is your conviction, it is a different matter. Yes. Mr. Sinha.

श्री राजनारायण : हाँ, मैं यह कहता हूँ कि सब पूँजीपतियों ने पाप के तरीके से धन कमाया है।

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: Have I understood you correctly, Sir, . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I have called Mr. Sinha.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, after this long discussion I would not have liked to intervene. But then the issue is a very important one. The issue is how should Parliament conduct itself or how hon. Members should conduct themselves. You have rightly said, Sir, that you will look into the record. I am not bothered about that one word "unscrupulous". The statement has to be read

as a whole and even if you omit that word "unscrupulous" the statement is objectionable in my opinion . . .

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: . . . because a general impression is created by this that one of the hon. Members of this House knows nothing, is busy with nothing except with the making of money which, in my opinion, is an unjustified aspersion on a Member. And Mr. Vice-Chairman, looking into the question from another and practical point of view . . .

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

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I am just finishing, Sir. From a practical point of view, if such a thing is permitted then this House will almost cease to be a dignified forum in which the affairs of the country are conducted and controlled.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, yes, that will do.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: It is for the Chairman to call me to order and not for you. You are not sitting in the Chair.

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

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Again I object. When I am speaking I do not want to be lectured to by Member* who have been here only for two years or so. I do not want to be lectured to by them. I have been in this House from the very beginning and I have had some experience of political life outside Parliament also and if such men start lecturing to me I cannot tolerate it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): That will do.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Coming now to my point, Mr. Vice-Chairman. if Members start casting aspersions on each other, then this House will lose its dignity and its effectiveness.

Nobodyj should cast aspersions on other Members.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No, no. please sit down.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: I am the man who has been hurt most. Sir, I would like to know, when you said that you will look into the records, do I understand that suppose after looking into the record you come to the conclusion that the word that the hon. Member used was a wrong one and not parliamentary, then you will remove that word and that you will give your ruling tomorrow?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I will. You please sit down.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: Thank you.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: How will you come to that conclusion. He can repudiate the allegation. He can deny it, but you cannot expunge it. It would be very wrong.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, मेरा एक निवेदन है कि अगर आप एकसपंज करने का फैसला करें तो सदन के सामने करें ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I have heard you.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: But you have given a promise. Why do you give a promise? This is a serious matter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You please sit down. Yes, Mr. Aijun Arora.

KUMARI MANIBEN VALLABHBHAI PATEL: I want to say one word, please. आपने कहा कि देखूंगा और कल रूलिंग दूंगा । कल आप कैसे इसको रिमूव करेंगे । आज यह सब अखबार में आ जायेगा तो कल रिमूव करने से फायदा क्या है ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Arjun Arora.

SHRI M. N. KAUL: Sir, the point raised by the lady Member, Kumari Maniben Patel, is a very valid one. It should be considered now. Normally when an expression is declared to be unparliamentary, then the press is not entitled to publish it. When you have given the decision, then the matter will not be published (Inter-

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I have got the record with me and I . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I hope we will not be faced with a situation when from the quarters of the Chair we will have the experience of blowing hot and cold. You had said you would look into it and then you go to give a ruling. *(Interruptions.)* Everything that has been uttered will be there. Nothing is to be expunged.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: The Chair has said. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What you have said will also go in. Everything that has been uttered shall be reported tomorrow in the Press if the Press likes it. The freedom of the Press should not be interfered with.

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

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, kindly listen.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I have heard you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How can you hear me even before I have spoken? The position is this. In a comparable situation, as you know, both the things, the utterance as well as the objection, go into the Press and the next day if you say something on this that will also be reported by the Press because today we have got two

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

sets of statements. Mr. Arjun Arora had been accused of saying something which he himself says he had not said. Is it not a more reliable proof than what you and I may want? Therefore the Press would be entitled to report whatever he has said and if you think tomorrow after examination that what is recorded is at variance with what he has said even so the question remains whether it is unparliamentary. To mention the word 'unscrupulous' in connection with the big business is a lot of courtesy shown to the big business according to me.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, एक प्वाइंट बड़ा इम्पोर्टेंट है जिसकी ओर भूपेश गुप्त ने इशारा किया है, आप समझे या नहीं मैं नहीं जानता। मैं इस रिपोर्ट को सही नहीं मानूँगा। जो आपका लेखक है, शार्टहेन्ड का वह यह लिखकर दे कि नहीं अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने यह कहा था तो मैं उसको सही नहीं मान सकता। यह मान्य संसदीय परम्परा है कि जब अर्जुन अरोड़ा कहते हैं कि मैंने यह कहा था तो अर्जुन अरोड़ा के स्टेटमेंट को सही माना जायेगा और एक रिपोर्टर के स्टेटमेंट को मैं सही मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ, अगर आपसे अनुरोध करता हूँ कि आप इस वक्त कोई क्लिग नहीं दे सकते इसका मतलब यह हो जायेगा कि किसी रिपोर्टर ने कुछ भी अनाप-शनाप रिपोर्ट कर दिया उसको आप ज्यादा अहमियत दे रहे हो बनिस्वत एक सदस्य के एक्सप्लेनेशन, स्पष्टीकरण सुनने के बाद भी। यह सदन के एक सदस्य के सम्मान का प्रश्न है, सदन का प्रश्न है। इसलिये सदन का कोई सदस्य जब यह कह दे कि हमने यह नहीं कहा, यह कहा तो उसी को माना जाता है संसदीय प्रथा में। हम समझते हैं कि अगर आप सेक्रेटरी से पूछेंगे तो अनेक एग्जाम्पल दे सकते हैं इस बात की।

SHRI HAYATULLA ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh): I want to bring to your notice a certain shade of mean-

ing in the sentence which Mr. Arjun Arora has said. If I say "You know nothing but the ways of crime" to a criminal lawyer I do not think it will be something bad. Or if I say the same thing to a detective "You know nothing but the ways of crime" I do not think it will be wrong. So you have to take into consideration in this shade of meaning before you give the ruling.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I agree with him. It is a very reasonable approach he has made.

SHRI M. N. KAUL: What is the decision on the Press report in it? ^

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Sir, I have to make one submission with your permission. I did not say that Mr. Babubhai Chinai has made money in an unscrupulous way. I only said that he knows the unscrupulous way of making money (Interruptions.)

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: Mr. Arjun Arora may be clever but that is another way of saying the same thing.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: There is a difference between knowing a thing and practising it. I also know how to make money but I have made no money. I also know the unscrupulous way of making money but I have made no money in a scrupulous way or in an unscrupulous way. So when I said that he knows * * * I have cast no aspersion on him. I have only mentioned his knowledge of a particular method.

SHRI K. P. MALLIKARJUNUDU (Andhra Pradesh): May I draw the attention of the Chair to Rule 338, Sub-rule (vii) where it is said that a member while speaking shall not utter treasonable, seditious or defamatory words? Is this not defamation? Even if the interpretation of Mr. Arjun Arora is accepted it is defamation. It comes within the meaning of section 499 I.P.C. and therefore it is unparliamentary.

*^*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: What Mr. Arjun Arora has said is that Mr. Babubhai Chinai has the knowledge of an art. Whether he has exercised that art or put that art into practice, he has not said. If Mr. Arjun Arora had said that he knows this art and he practises this art, then it would have been different and one could then say that an aspersion has been cast. But to say that you know this art does not mean that you practise this art. That is very clear.

شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق: میں آپ کی وساطت سے انتہائی ادب اور نیازمندی سے اپنے بزرگ دوست ارجن اروڑا سے یہ درخواست کروں گا کہ جو ان کا مقصد نہیں تھا اور جو بابو بھائی چلٹی نے سنا۔ ...

شری ارجن اروڑا: یہ ان کی گلتی ہے۔

شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق: وہ وہ ان اسکرپٹس کے دکھائی میں یا پارلیامینٹری زبان میں ان پارلیامینٹری نہیں ہے لیکن دونوں ممبر اس ہاؤس کے بزرگ ممبر ہیں اور ارجن اروڑا عمر میں بھی زیادہ ہیں، بزرگ بھی ہیں اگر بابو بھائی چلٹی کو ان کی بات سے چوت لگی ہے، دل کو تکلیف ہوئی ہے ...

شری ارجن اروڑا: اگر دھڑ ہے تو گلتا دھڑ ہے۔

شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق: تو آپ یہ کہیں کہ اس لفظ کو خارج کیا جائے کیوں کہ ہم ایک گھنٹہ کے قریب ضائع کر چکے ہیں۔ ایک گھنٹہ بہت قیمتی ہے۔ خاص کر جب کچھ ممبر چاہتے ہیں کہ

نہ ہونے پائے؟ ہاؤس کا ٹائم خراب ہو مہربانی آپ سے درخواست ہے۔ . . . میں ان کو ذاتی طور پر بھی جاننا ہوں کہ یہ کہیں کہ اس لفظ کو خارج کیا جائے۔ اس سے کوئی فرق نہیں پڑتا۔

†[شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق: میں آپ کی ویساٹ سے انتہائی ادب اور نیازمندی سے اپنے بزرگ دوست ارجن اروڑا سے یہ درخواست کروں گا کہ جو ان کا مقصد نہیں تھا اور جو بابو بھائی چلٹی نے سنا۔ . . .

شری ارجن اروڑا: یہ ان کی گلتی ہے۔

شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق: وہ وہ ان اسکرپٹس کے دکھائی میں یا پارلیامینٹری زبان میں ان پارلیامینٹری نہیں ہیں۔ لیکن دونوں ممبر اس ہاؤس کے بزرگ ممبر ہیں اور ارجن اروڑا عمر میں بھی زیادہ ہیں، بزرگ بھی ہیں اگر بابو بھائی چلٹی کو ان کی بات سے چوت لگی ہے، دل کو تکلیف ہوئی ہے۔ . . .

شری ارجن اروڑا: اگر دھڑ ہے تو گلتا دھڑ ہے۔

شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق: . . . تو آپ یہ کہیں کہ اس لفظ کو خارج کیا جائے کیوں کہ ہم ایک گھنٹہ کے قریب ضائع کر چکے ہیں۔ ایک گھنٹہ بہت قیمتی ہے۔ خاص کر جب کچھ ممبر چاہتے ہیں کہ

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Arora, have you got anything to say about Mr. Tariq's request?

† [] Hindi transliteration.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I have not heard what Mr. Tariq has said.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir, I want to draw your attention to a point of order that I want to raise. I am not referring to the affair between Mr. Arjun Arora and Mr. Babu-bhai Chinai. But my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, just now said: "I have the experience of the Chair blowing hot and cold at - the same time" I object to this. It is derogatory to the dignity of the Chair, and the whole House and he must be asked to withdraw it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have not said that. The hon. Member does not know.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: You can ask for the record.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am a little more adept in the game than Mr. Dahyabhai Patel. I would not say such a thing that is patently insulting to the Chair. I said, I hope from the quarters of the Chair we would not have the experience of blowing hot and cold. Fortunately after your ruling I say that we did not have that experience. It is a tribute to you. (Interruptions).

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Do you take it as a tribute to be told that you are blowing hot and cold at the same time?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): That is another question. The first question is about what Mr. Arjun Arora said. I know therefore these two hon. Members of this House. One genuinely thinks that what he has said is right.

The other thing is he has hurt and what he has said is not right. Therefore, in such circumstances when I have to see to the different statements of the two hon. Members of this House, it is my duty to examine the position. What I have got from the record is that Mr. Arjun. Arora used those words.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: No, no.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Please. I am glad Mr. Arjun Arora repudiates this. As he also repudiates it, I direct that if it is in the record, this should be expunged.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I submit, I would request you to check this up. Before I come to my speech, I request you to consult the tape-record also, before you give your ruling. You please consult the tape-record also and whatever ruling you give as Chairman of the house is acceptable to the House and I am part of the House. Dr. Z. A. Ahmed rose.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Dr. Ahmad, he has finished his speech. I have got two more speakers" Have you finished your speech?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I am on my legs. I have just started . . .

कुमारी मनिबेन वल्लभभाई पटेल :
मेरा एक प्वाइंट आफ़ ऑर्डर है । मैं एक
प्वाइंट आफ़ ऑर्डर कहना चाहती हूँ ।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Lady Member also.

कुमारी मनिबेन वल्लभभाई पटेल :
क्यों नहीं, आप ही जैसे मेम्बर हैं, यह क्या
बात है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :
नहीं, आप फर्माइये ।

कुमारी मनिबेन वल्लभ भाई पटेल :
मेरा यह कहना है कि इस बारे में जो आपकी
रूलिंग हो वह आज ही मिलनी चाहिये,
अगर इसके बारे में यह रूलिंग हो तो उनको
एक्सपेंज करना चाहिये, लेकिन सबके सामने
एक्सपेंज करना चाहिये, आज ही होना
चाहिये ।

कई माननीय सदस्य : एक्सपेंज तो
गया ।

श्री राजनारायण: अर्जुन अरोड़ा साहब
आपने जो कहा था उसको फिर रिपीट करते
हुये रहिये ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Rajnarain,
Mr. Arjun Arora is a sufficiently
senior Member. He does not need
your advice.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: I am also a
senior Member. I know parliamen-
tary practice. I shall repeat the same
sentence again and again.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN): Why are you
saying this?

SHRI RAJNARAIN: You say that he
is a senior Member.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN): You please
listen.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: I am listening to
you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN): Why do you
advise him?

SHRI RAJNARAIN: I have got every
right to advise him.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN): Yes, Mr. Arjun
Arora.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: If you like, I
will continue my speech tomorrow
morning.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN): No. Tomorrow
the Minister will reply.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Before the
Minister replies you give me ten
minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN): You at least
finish it, Mr. Arjun Arora.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-
Chairman, he has been disturbed and we
sympathise with him. We must have
some human feelings. Therefore,
tomorrow he should collect his thoughts
and make his speech.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN): There is a lot of
work.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know
that we have got a lot of work, but we
shall arrange it to your satisfaction. We
are also workers. Mr. Arjun Arora
should not be disturbed any more. Let
him go home, collect his thoughts and
resume his speech tomorrow morning.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN): Is it the sense of
the House that this should be BO? (After
a pause) The House stands adjourned till
11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at
five minutes past six of the
clock till eleven of the clock on
Wednesday, the 31st May, 1967.