

[Shri G. S. Pathak.]

So far as the contribution of political parties is concerned, we know that there was an amendment to the Companies Act and the amount which can be contributed by a company has been limited. Now, I do not accept the proposition that the actions of the Election Commission should be justiciable in these things and that an appeal should lie with the Supreme Court. Now that is not possible because the work of the Election Commission is of a special type and to the best of my recollection, I do not find any provision of that type in any other Constitution—I speak subject to correction.

Madam, I do not want to detain the House longer.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1950, and the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and resolves that the following members of the Rajya Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee : ____

1. Shri Chandra Shekhar.
2. Shri R. S. Khandekar.
3. Shri Chitta Basu.
4. Shri S. S. Mariswamy.
5. Shri Jagnannath Prasad Pahadia.
6. Shri T. R. Parthasarathy.
7. Shri K. V. Raghunatha Reddy.
8. Shri Biren Roy.
9. Shri A. K. A. Abdul Samad.
10. Shri Shraddhakar Supakar.
11. Shrimati Tara Ramachandra Sathe.
12. Shri G. S. Pathak (the Mover). *The motion was adopted.*

**SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION RE
THE GOVERNMENT'S APPROVAL OF
A PROPOSAL FOR FOREIGN
COLLABORATION BETWEEN AN
INDIAN COMPANY IN MADRAS AND
AN AMERICAN COMPANY FOR
MANUFACTURE OF BISCUITS**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we come to the discussion that was fixed for 4.30. Mr. Babubhai Chinai is not here. Yes, Mr. Bhargava.

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN (Madras) : Madam, on a point of order. I would like to raise a point of order as to how this matter becomes a matter of public importance. If four per cent, biscuit production in our country out of the total output becomes a matter of public importance, what else in this country of ours cannot be termed as a matter of public importance? Another point is that this matter of public importance was raised through questions in this House and some points were discussed on the 22nd August under half-an-hour discussion. And the same subject again comes up today for discussion under short-duration discussion under rule 176.

Madam, I would like to draw your attention to the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States (Rajya Sabha). Under rule 176, the Chairman has admitted this as a matter of public importance for discussion this evening. At the same time, may I bring to your kind notice rule 177-Chairman to decide admissibility? I am not questioning the discretion of the Chairman. With due regard, respect and honour . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The point of order should be brief.

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN: ... to him, there is a proviso under rule 177 which reads—

"Provided that if an early opportunity is otherwise available for the discussion of the matter, the Chairman may refuse to admit the notice."

May I appeal to you. Why not this proviso be enforced on this matter of public importance which has already formed part of discussion in this House twice ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, this point should have been taken up when the Chairman was here because the Chairman has ruled that this is a matter of public importance and therefore it is on the Order Paper. Therefore, your point is of no use just now.

Mr. Bharagava.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman I raise a discussion on the Government's approval of a proposal for foreign collaboration between an Indian company in Madras and an American company for the manufacture of biscuits in the country. It is a point about which there has been mention in this august House twice before, once in the shape of a Starred Question and again in the shape of a half-an-hour discussion. And I am constrained to say that the Minister in both the cases has failed to convince quite a number of Members about this foreign collaboration for manufacturing biscuits with an American firm. And this is very evident that as many as 32 Members have signed this requisition for this short-duration discussion under rule 176.

Now, I am one of those who believe that foreign collaboration should be gone into only when it must. It is not a thing which should be practised on a large scale or in places where we can do it without foreign collaboration. What is the object of foreign collaboration? The object of foreign collaboration in most cases is that Indian technical know-how is not available on a particular subject and that is the reason why it is considered necessary that in the interests of the development of the industry in the country foreign experts who know about the subject may be invited and asked to train Indian personnel to take up the industry in times to come. It is a sad commentary that after twenty years of independence we are still depending on foreign collaboration in season and out of season. Our National Laboratories under the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research have been doing good work in finding out how the various processes which could be utilised on a commercial basis later on could be developed. The grouse of the C.S.I.R. is that during all these years their research has not been utilised fully as far as application of that fundamental research is concerned, *vis-a-vis*

the commercial manufacture of various things and for development of the industry. We come across cases after cases where foreign collaboration is entering. I may tell the House that the Institute of Pilani wanted release of a little foreign exchange to buy some machinery from abroad so that they could manufacture television sets. Now what happens? That Institute is not given all the foreign exchange or even a major portion of the foreign exchange which they should have been given to develop and bring out Indian television sets. On the other hand, what happens? Foreign collaboration for the import of television sets is entered into and that way a lot of foreign exchange of the country in bringing actual television sets, for which one has to pay a much higher price than would have been necessary in manufacturing Indian television sets, has to be incurred.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How long will you take? There are so many speakers.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: It is a two-hour discussion.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But there are 33 names.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Most of the Members are not here. I will take fifteen minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are 12 of them and three more names have come in.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Whenever you ask me to wind up I will wind up. I will take ten minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hesse finish in ten minutes. You are nearing tea minutes.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I am dealing with the basic issue before I come to the particulars. I might tell here an interesting story. In Japan they got one steel plant from some other country. After that all other plants they fabricated themselves and they could increase their steel industry by themselves. Now what is happening here? We have had steel plants repeatedly, once, two, three and so on; yet we look to foreign countries for foreign collaboration. There is an Indian firm which was prepared to prepare a whole-project report of how a steel plant could be set up at Bokaro. But

[Shri M. P. Bhargava.] our Government did not agree to that, and we again went to the Russians for the technical know-how. I would like to know from the Government how long do they want to depend on foreign technical know-how for the development of our industry. When will that stage come when our Indian technical know-how will be progressively used and give the benefit of their services to the country?

That is as far as the general question is concerned. Now I come to this particular question. Was it at all necessary to enter into foreign collaboration for the manufacture of biscuits? Was it such a thing that without entering into collaboration and without manufacturing biscuits the Indian economy was suffering, Indian people were suffering?

May I have a specific reply from the hon'ble Minister about this question? May I know for whose benefit are you going to have foreign collaboration for the manufacture of biscuits?

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR (Madras): To enable the common man to have two more biscuits.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Just have patience with me and I will tell you. There are 26 firms which are manufacturing biscuits in India which were prepared to manufacture more if there was need for them. For whose benefit is it being done? The hon'ble Minister was pleased to say that these biscuits which are being manufactured are special varieties. And what are the special varieties? They are :>—

- Low calorie biscuits
- Diabetic biscuits
- Nutro (Nutrition) biscuits
- Vitaminised biscuits
- Special biscuits for Army rations
- Slimming biscuits
- Dietary biscuits.

Here my friend, Mr. Arjun Arora, put a very pertinent question . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): As he always does.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I may not agree with that 100 per cent, which he rarely does. He put a very pertinent ques-

tion to which no reply was coming from the hon'ble Minister. And what was the question?

"I want to know whether the Government has ascertained that the technical know-how needed for manufacturing the special varieties of biscuits is available in the country."

Then he goes on:

"My information is that the know-how for all types of biscuits is available. If such know-how was available, why was foreign collaboration permitted?"

I would request Mr. Sanjivayya to convince this House on this point that Indian technical know-how for these special varieties of biscuits was not available, and then only he will be justified in entering into this kind of agreement.

The second argument which I do not share at all is that there were no biscuit factories in the South and, therefore, this is being done. Well, I am one of those who believe that every industry cannot be established in every State. We did not raise a word when so many industries were established in various parts of the country. My State is said to be the biggest State but it is, if I may say so, the most backward State. So I do not want to go into the reasons of it. If every industry is to be established in every State . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): You have to compensate for retaining the leadership of the country.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: We can talk it out. That is a different issue. If every industry has to be established in every State, I would have conceded that there is force in what Mr. Mariswamy raised and which the hon'ble Minister was very quick to concede. There is no question of regionalism. India is one and the development of industry has to be on an integrated basis.

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR. There is also the regional consideration.

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN) (Madras): When the State Government itself is willing where does this question of regionalism come in?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I would have supported Mrs. Rajagopalan hundred per cent, if an indigenous factory was to be established in Madras. Not one, if five were to be established I would not have raised a voice. What I am objecting to is the establishment of a biscuit factory with foreign collaboration. This is what I object "to.

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN): Do you not have biscuit factories here with foreign collaboration?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: If you will bear with me, I am coming to that.

Then the third argument given by Mr. Sanjivayya was that there is already foreign collaboration as far as the Britania Biscuit Company is concerned and so what is the harm if another foreign collaboration is allowed. May I ask him when the Britania Biscuit Company was established? It was in the pre-Independence days by the British rulers who wanted to take out as much of the Indian money to their country as was possible. It was established not in the interests of the country. It was established for their own sake and if one wrong had been done in the past, is it any justification that the same wrong should be repeated? If foreign collaboration for biscuit manufacturing was allowed 30 years back, should we allow that kind of foreign collaboration in Independent India?

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY (Madras): Is it not a fact that only last week the Government of India has given a permit to the British Britania Company to open a factory in Madras?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: That is the point I am coming to. I am not supporting that either. That was the third argument and the most essential argument to which Mr. Parthasarathy has invited my attention just now and which I wanted to mention is the fact that the Britania Biscuit Company is being allowed to have another company with foreign collaboration for the manufacture of biscuits. I would like to know how many collaborations the Government of India will allow for the manufacture of biscuits which in my opinion is not an essential thing, for which the country should go and waste its foreign exchange in these hard days of foreign ex-

change where for every dollar and every pound which we spend, we have to pay through our nose. When this is the condition, why should we go into collaboration which can be avoided, without which India will not lose anything and which, in my humble opinion, is a wasteful expenditure? That is all that I have to say.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL (Delhi): Madam, it is rather unfortunate that I should have to speak on an issue which, for very unknown reasons

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): What about Mr. Arora?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hav* called Mr. Gujral. I am not going to adhere to this list.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You are not following the list.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Can you question that?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: But we should know the rules which are being followed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are no rules. A number of names are here and the Chair is not forced to follow this. There is no rule. Mr. Gujral.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: As I was bearing Mr. Bhaigava just now, I wa* considerably unhappy that an issue which should be discussed purely from the national interest point of view has unfortunately been led to assume the colour as if it is a decision on a regional basis. I think it will be a very unfortunate day for India when on the ^cation of industries, on the economy and on the national issues particularly, we start having a regional attitude. I would like to submit therefore that in whatever I say, I would like to be excused of this thing. I have no regional preferences or criteria before me. I would be as happy if Madras gets twenty more factories as I would be if Punjab gets even one. Therefore I am not at all, motivated in my views from this point of view as to the fact that a particular factory was going to be located in a particular region. The main point before us is, when devaluation came, and when we all examined it, we were made to believe—and I think they were right— that the two main reasons have been the

IShri I. K. Gujral.] culprits for our bad economic situation so far as foreign exchange goes and the two main culprits have been, one, indiscriminate collaboration, and two, the export incentive scheme. These two factors particularly have contributed to a very Sad state of affairs where we have arrived and I hope that the Government of India, particularly the Ministry of Industry, does have some policy before itself when it decides on collaboration. If collaborations are wasteful, if incentives are given again, then our way will be unhappy again. Therefore whenever you decide about collaboration you have to keep in mind one thing that we are all talking very loud about import substitution. The import substitution should have a bearing, it should have a content. Import substitution does not mean this that if a factory suits me personally or my brother or my nephew or a relative, then import substitution should be overlooked but when it does not suit me, then I would impress on that point. Purely from the national angle we should examine whether foreign exchange can or cannot be saved. Have biscuit factories in every town, it is welcome. Set up biscuit factories in every region, it is most welcome. Set up biscuit factories in every home, it is welcome but please do not look at it from this point of view. Then while setting up the factory, let us remember that biscuits have been manufactured in this country for a number of years now and I think even in the heydays of the British Empire when we used to import everything, even then the first of the factories that started coming up in this country was the biscuit manufacturing factory. Not only that, in the cottage industry sector, we also know that in every nook and corner in the bazaar there is a small bakery manufacturing biscuits.

Then a question arose that some specialised biscuits are needed, some extra vita-minised biscuits are needed, some slimming biscuits are needed, some fattening biscuits are needed and therefore we would like to have some collaboration. I do not know what can be a stronger argument for more wasteful expenditure of our foreign exchange. Tomorrow we will be told that the housewife who has been making *chapa-ti* would like to have some collaboration

because in the South they have never made *chapalis* and so let us go to America or Mexico because they can eat the American variety in a vitaminised fashion. What the North knows should be taught to the South and what the South knows should be learnt in the North and this is a mutual dependence we should have. That is how our nationalism should assert itself. I would ask the Minister, when the Licensing Committee sat to approve the scheme, was there a representative of the C.S.I.R. and did he approve that collaboration was necessary in this field? Did he advise the Committee that the C.S.I.R. has come to the conclusion that without collaboration such factories cannot be set up? I would say two or three more sentences, and sit down and that is this. I am aware and conscious of the fact that particularly in the last 10 or 12 years in this country collaborations have become fashionable, collaborations have become respectable and collaborations have become more profitable because it is the easiest thing to collaborate with foreign manufacturers, get their name, know their know-how, get their machinery and then fleece the consumer public. You would be interested to know that although we have been manufacturing biscuits everywhere, the prices have not been within the reach of the common man. Even to-day in our set-up of society, biscuits are consumed by those who are better-off, who can afford the luxuries of life. It is neither the common man's necessity nor the common man's requirement nor can the common man ever get it. I am happy that the Prime Minister is also here to hear the views of the House. Therefore I would ask that this criteria on collaboration must be finalised and for all times established and also a *very* serious and stern warning should be given to the Ministry of Industry that collaboration shall be permitted only if it is necessary, if it is a must and when without that collaboration the country cannot survive.

It has been said that the collaboration was entered into for the import of the plant and not for the know-how. I think a biscuit plant is some such thing which we should be able to make by now ourselves. If we have not done it, we should do it because after all even to a layman like myself, it is very obvious that biscuit manufacturing does not require much of a

technical growth or that stage of technical growth where a plant cannot be copied. I would therefore submit, Madam, that under no circumstances
5 P.M.

should collaborations of this type, which are wasteful, which are anti-national, which defeat our entire approach to import substitution, be permitted.

Think you.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरदिया
(मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदया, जो प्रस्ताव विचारार्थ है वह बिस्कुट बनाने के लिए मद्रास की कम्पनी ने अमेरिका की कम्पनी से जो सहयोग किया है उसके बारे में है। यहां जो चर्चा चली और जो कुछ सदस्यों का रुख देखा तो उससे ऐसा लगता है कि प्रस्ताव की युक्ति पर विचार करने की अपेक्षा अपनी क्षेत्रीय भावनाओं से ज्यादा प्रेरित हो कर और उस दृष्टिकोण से आपस में चर्चा करने का भाव रहा।

उपसभापति महोदया, मुझे दुख होता है कि एक ओर तो हम विदेशी मुद्रा के लिये इतने परेशान हो रहे हैं कि हर बात में उसकी कटौती करना चाहते हैं, उसकी परेशानी इतनी बढ़ती जा रही है कि जो हमारी सुरक्षा के लिये भी आवश्यक है और जो हमारी दैनंदिन की आवश्यकताएँ हैं जो हमारी कंट्री की नैसिस्टीज हैं उनके लिये भी विदेशी मुद्रा उपलब्ध नहीं कर सकते, यदि कोई बीमार है तो उसके लिये भी विदेशी मुद्रा उपलब्ध नहीं कर सकते और दूसरी ओर हम बिस्कुट बनाने के लिये कालोबोरेशन करें, कुछ समझ में नहीं आता कि हम किस दिशा में सोच रहे हैं। वैसे हमारी प्रधान मंत्री महोदया के खुद के विचार बड़े अच्छे हैं जैसा कि अखबार में प्रकाशित हुआ, उसमें उन्होंने बताया था :

"But there are other collaboration agreements to which I am opposed. It sometimes happens that individual Ministries go through such deals, and by the time you catch up with them, it is too late to do anything."

आगे फिर इसी में उन्होंने बताया :

"I think this kind of a thing has been happening in the Government before and" they continue to happen today."

और आगे इसी में बताया है

"I therefore want to order a thorough investigation made of all such collaboration agreements."

तो यह सारी बात क्या प्रकाशित करती है। हमारे मंत्रियों के द्वारा किसी भी चीज की उपयोगिता के बारे में ऐसा चित्रण कर दिया जाता है कि जब तक प्रधान मंत्री महोदया उसमें विचार करती हैं तब तक मामला बहुत आगे बढ़ जाता है। यह आरोप इस शासन पर ही है, हमारी प्रधान मंत्री ही हमारे विभिन्न मंत्रालयों पर यह आरोप लगा रही हैं कि आप विदेशी कालोबोरेशन को इतना आगे बढ़ा देते हैं कि उसको रोक पाना कठिन हो जाता है।

इसके लिये सेंचुरी फ्लोर मिल्स, मद्रास, ने 1962 ई० में इंडस्ट्रियल लाइसेंस के लिये एप्लाइ किया और 10 लाख के लिये किया लेकिन उस समय इंकार कर दिया गया इसी आधार पर कि विदेशी मुद्रा की आवश्यकता है परन्तु फिर उसी ने 1965 में एप्लाइ किया और उसे 10 लाख के बजाय 20 लाख रु० की स्वीकृति दे दी, यह आश्चर्यजनक मालूम पड़ता है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHAR-GAVA) in the chair.]

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज सवेरे ही मद्रास की सेंचुरी मशीन टूल्स मैन्युफैक्चरर्स लिमिटेड की चर्चा की गई थी और अब मद्रास की सेंचुरी फ्लोर मिल्स की चर्चा है। मैं यह कुछ समझ नहीं पाता। जब किसी हिस्से की बात होती है तो उस क्षेत्र के लोग समझते हैं कि यह तो हमारी क्षेत्रीय भावना को उभार रहे हैं और हमारी क्षेत्रीय भावना के विपरीत बात कर रहे हैं। मैं नम्रता से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि आप कृपा कर के क्षेत्रीय भावना की कुछ भी चर्चा न करें और चूंकि इसमें दक्षिण

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया] के एक मंत्री जी हैं उन पर भी कहीं आरोप न लग जाय, तो यह जो कोलोबोरोशन का मामला है वह बिस्कुट बनाने का है जो कि हमारे घर की महिला भी आसानी से बना सकती है, बनाती हैं और बना रही हैं, यह केवल कोई विदेशी फैक्ट्री का काम नहीं है, हमारे घर में बिस्कुट बनता है। शायद ही कोई ऐसी पिछड़े क्षेत्र की महिला होगी जिसने कि बिस्कुट न बनाया होया बिस्कुट न खाया हो और कम से कम ज्वार और मकई के बड़े-बड़े बिस्कुट तो जरूर ही बना कर खाती हैं। तो क्या हम इतने विवेकहीन और बुद्धिहीन हो गये कि हमें बिस्कुट के लिये भी विदेशों का मुंह ताकना पड़े। शिक्षा के लिये हम विदेशों की राय लेते हैं, हमारे यहां गऊ का पालन करना है तो विदेशों का सहयोग चाहिये। हमने अपने आप के स्व को पहिचानना बिल्कुल छोड़ दिया। गांधीजी का नाम लेते हैं लेकिन गांधी जी हमेशा स्वावलम्बी जीवन का प्रतिपादन करते रहे और उसी वजह से आप लोग चाहे अपने घर में टेरिलीन और नायलन की चीजों का उपयोग करते हैं मगर यहां बिल्कुल खादी को उपयोग में ला कर आते हैं। तो उनका मूलमंत्र यह था कि हम स्वावलम्बन के आधार को अपनायें। लेकिन आप कहते कुछ हैं और करते कुछ हैं। एक बिस्कुट बनाने के लिये भी अगर आप स्वावलम्बी नहीं बनेंगे तो क्या है। बिस्कुट बनाने के लिये भी 20 लाख की विदेशी मुद्रा देना चाहते हैं और उसकी दलील देते हैं कि एक्सपोर्ट ओरियेंटेड बिस्कुट बनाने वाले हैं। हजारों टन बिस्कुट आज भी बाहर भेजा जा रहा है, 25 लाख रुपये का इसका एक्सपोर्ट हम करते हैं तो क्या वह एक्सपोर्ट ओरियेंटेड नहीं है। अगर उनकी ही कैपेसिटी बढ़ायेंगे तो क्या वह और नहीं कर सकेंगे। परन्तु यह कुछ ऐसी बायस वाली बात है। जो बिस्कुट बनाने वाली एसोसियेशन है उन्होंने इसी आधार पर चिट्ठी लिखी तो एक सितम्बर तक उसका एकनालेजमेंट भी नहीं पहुंचता है कि उनकी चिट्ठी आई

हम विचार कर रहे हैं या नहीं कर रहे हैं। उनको सुनना चाहिये था, सब पक्षों को देखना चाहिये था। लेकिन यहां दक्षिण भारत के सदस्यों का जो रुख देखा, बीच-बीच में उनके टोकने की प्रवृत्ति देखी तो उससे कुछ ऐसा लगता है कि राष्ट्रीय भावना की अपेक्षा क्षेत्रीय भावना इनमें ज्यादा पनपती है। मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि दक्षिण भारत को कोई भी और दूसरा कोले-बोरोशन कर के राष्ट्रीय हित की कोई इंडस्ट्री दें।

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this is an accusation which, I think, he has to withdraw. We never view things from a regional angle only. When you, Sir, were making your speech, I just said that if it was in the interests of the State, I mean, if the State Government was willing to take it on considering that it was in the interests of the State and the country as a whole, then it should be taken into account. We never said anything regionally. He is himself saying so, that southern people talk in regional terms which, I think, he should withdraw.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे अपने भाव व्यक्त करने का पूरा अधिकार है और मैं अभी भी दुहराता हूँ कि यहां पर जिस तरह का रुख कुछ सदस्यों ने जो कि मुख्यतः दक्षिण क्षेत्र से आ रहे हैं अपनाया उससे यह स्पष्ट प्रतीत होता है कि उनके मन में वह क्षेत्रीय भावना जो आती है उसके आधार पर वह सदस्यों को बोलने से मना कर रहे हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : You have stressed your point once. What is the use of repeating it?

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA: Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mrs¹. Rajagopalan, I think you have your right of reply:

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया : मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि अगर हम चाहते

हैं कि यह मामला निष्पक्षता से निपटे, निष्पक्षता से इसका निर्णय हो तो प्रधान मंत्री महोदय के हाथ में इसे सौंप दिया जाय और दोनों पक्ष अच्छी तरह से उनके सामने रखे जायें। मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि यह शिक्षा दी जाती है कि विदेशी मुद्रा की बचत की जाय और दूसरी ओर बिस्कुट बनाने के लिये भी जो कि एक मामूली सा काम है विदेशों की सहायता ली जाय यह हमारे लिये बहुत शर्म की बात है और यह, स्वावलम्बन का आचरण करने की अपेक्षा परावलम्बन की ओर जाना है जो कि हमारे देश के लिये बहुत घातक होगा और हमारे देश को गर्त में ले जायगा अगर इस दिशा में आप चलते रहे तो।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : I have got a large number of hon. Members who want to take part in this debate. Therefore I would request them to be brief. Dr. Chandrasekhar.

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is unfortunate that a feeling of regionalism has been injected into this matter giving rise to the question of North and South where it should not be so. At the very outset I would like to answer Shri Chordia. What I said was this in an elaborate form. I said that it was a question of not only national development but also represented certain grievances in some parts of the country, where the people, rightly or wrongly, feel that that part of the country has not been adequately fostered in terms of rapid industrialisation, and exactly this was the point that I made when I interrupted you when you were speaking. Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it necessary to go in for foreign collaboration for getting a foster-mother?

DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR: Sir, I am much obliged to you for the opportunity you have given. Now I want to present some facts which nobody has so far given. The first thing is: Are we against collaboration at all? Have we made a national policy that under no circumstances we shall go in for foreign collaboration, either with the Soviet Union or with the United States of America or with any country which

might have a better technical know-how? This is my first question. Then this practical debate on this particular issue does not arise.

The second question is that the Planning Commission's Draft Outline of the Fourth Five-Year Plan talks about redressing the imbalances in regional economic development. If some part of the country, whether it is Madras or Bengal or Punjab, feels that in some ways they have not been brought up to the level in terms of giving employment to more people, or importing more machinery, or producing more food or goods or services, then I think we ought to make an endeavour to do something about it.

Thirdly, I must say, as far as the facts about this case are concerned, that this particular Indo-American or Madras-American venture is limited, as far as collaboration is concerned, to obtaining the machinery. So there is no question of asking whether Madras grows wheat or millets, or is producing enough sugar, or anything of the kind.

The next point is repatriation of capital will take place only after twenty years. I think this fact should be a sufficient guarantee to see that there is no drain of the foreign exchange or foreign currency that we shall be earning as a result of this set-up. The other thing is that dividends will be only against the foreign exchange earned by this company. *Ipso facto* and conversely, if this collaboration with this company does not earn any foreign exchange, the question of any payment would not arise at all till such an amount has been earned by this company.

It is not a question of just manufacturing the biscuits as my hon. friend Mr. Chordia and others said. We are not taking it up as the manufacture of biscuits only. It is a question of the importation of modern up-to-date scientific machinery which will render the production of biscuits very easy and there will be tremendous mass production and the prices are likely to go down and biscuits which are not within the reach of the average consumer in this country will be within their easy reach.

The last point that want to mention is this. It is not a question of anybody trying

Dr. S. Chandrasekhar.] to set up a particular company or helping a particular individual. The State Government and the people concerned would like to have this set-up in that part of the country. So long as the Government gives careful consideration to it and licences are not granted just like that, and all the pros and cons are fully gone into, there is no reason whatsoever why this question should be reopened again and be discussed again. There is no question of north and south or east and west. There is nothing of that kind at all. Certain people in certain areas feel that they are a little backward or not so advanced as those in some parts of the country in the matter of capital machinery or foreign exchange investments and so on. These things have to be corrected. And also there is no question of payment in this case for some years. The question of payment does not arise for two decades. Moreover, this will be adding to the food resources of the country. There is no reason why we should go back on the decision we have already made and I trust and hope that this will not be examined in any short-sighted manner and of suddenly trying to effect a little savings of foreign exchange or anything like it. That question does not arise. It is also a question of fulfilling the demands and aspirations of the people. As far as the all-India patriotism and the feeling of oneness as citizens of India is concerned, I yield to none in that matter.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI A. K. A. ABDUL SAMAD (Madras): Sir, the matter before the House is very clear and there can be no doubt about the fact that the proposition put forward by the Century Mills of Madras is to the best advantage of the country from many points of view. The Century Mills have been able to convince foreign investors of the desirability and the soundness of investing money in the country on an industry and on terms which are more advantageous and beneficial to the country than the terms which the existing companies have been able to secure. The new venture sponsored by the Century Mills has got U.S. interest only to an extent of 40 per cent of the capital, while the Britannia Biscuit Company which is opposed to this venture has a U.K. interest to an extent of 60

percent. The Century Mills do not require any foreign exchange to be released by the Government of India. While the Britannia Biscuit Company have had a large amount of foreign exchange in importing some rebuilt and reconditioned machinery, that is to say, old machinery, the new company is being supplied with brand new modern and up-to-date machinery by their collaborators. The Government and the country have not incurred the expenditure of foreign exchange of even a single rupee for all these machineries or for the know-how to be provided by the foreign collaborators of the Madras factory.

The old company which is opposed to the proposal of the Century Mills has been asking for its own purposes a foreign exchange commitment of Rs. 30 lakhs per annum, that is to say, Rs. 150 lakhs for the Fourth Plan period.

I am sure the Government of India went through all these and other aspects of this venture of the Century Mills and have rightly and wisely shown the green flag to this venture. Now at this stage if the Government comes to have any hesitation in the matter because of the interested agitation of the old companies, they will be doing a great disservice to the interest of the country from more than one point of view. It would not only mean the throwing away of a large portion of the much-needed foreign exchange but also it would queer the pitch for socialism at the behest of established monopolists. What is more, it will be resurrecting in a more forceful and vigorous manner the feeling of North *versus* South which seems to have received a quietus for some time now. If they want to give a vigorous life to these feelings, there can be no other and surer way than to show hesitancy in going ahead with the sanction that they have given to the Century Mills of Madras.

Thank you.

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have heard the views expressed by many hon. Members on the collaboration arrangement that this particular company has entered into. I entirely agree with you Sir, and other hon. Members who have said that collaboration of this nature for this purpose is something ridiculous. At the

same time if the Government agrees to collaboration for developing the biscuit industry, I don't find anything wrong in this particular case. They have had collaboration in the case of the Britannia Biscuit Company for so many years. I also learn from certain sources that recently the Government has issued licence for new units of that company in Madras. If that is the intention of the Government then I do not know why this company also should not go in for collaboration especially when it will cater to the needs of the people of Madras State and also result in exporting biscuits to Japan and other places.

If we look at the terms for this collaboration we find that they are far better than those of the Britannia Biscuit Company. For instance for the technical know-how we do not incur any expenditure because the installation is by the foreign experts and we are not spending anything for them. And then of the 40 per cent dividend repartition is to be paid only after 20 years and that too only if the concern earned foreign exchange. The terms are far better than those of the Britannia Biscuit Company. For the Britannia Company the foreign exchange is to be made available for the payment of proportionate profit on the investment made by the foreign company, for the service charges on the loan, for payment of royalties, and for remuneration to the foreign managerial and other technical personnel. I think if we compare the conditions of both the concerns, the collaboration with the Century Flour Mills will be found to be more favourable to the country.

There is another point which should be mentioned about this Century Flour Mills collaboration. The marketing facilities are to be provided by the foreign people themselves and the brand and trade mark will remain Indian. Our intention is to earn more foreign exchange and popularise Indian goods and I think this collaboration helps us to earn more foreign exchange and thus to strengthen our foreign exchange position. At the same time it helps us to popularise our biscuits in foreign countries and so, this is definitely far better than the Britannia Biscuit Company which, as I said, has been recently issued a licence to have another unit in Madras.

There is another thing I want to refer to. Some hon. Members said that we are taking it on a regional basis. We are not taking anything on a regional basis. We are considering only the terms of both the companies. If such collaboration is allowed by the Government of India and if we are pursuing such a policy, then I think this company also should be given facilities for this collaboration.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do not know why any speech is called for here. Yet we have to make speeches, I suppose. This is a simple thing. A biscuit company wants foreign collaboration and when they want to bring in Americans, we know they will produce some arguments or the other. But this should be viewed from the point of view of principle. Are we going to have this kind of an arrangement that even for running a biscuit industry we should need American equity collaboration? It is a plain thing. I am sure the biscuits will be sweeter and our sweet people high up will take them also especially of the ruling Party. There is no doubt about that. But then is it such a vital thing for the nation that you should go in for this kind of an arrangement? Is it the position that until and unless we go in for this kind of a foreign collaboration we will not be able to meet all our requirements in the matter of biscuits? Nobody has said that this is a vital essential proposition. Nobody has said that it is a *sine qua non* for the development of our biscuit industry. Yet our friends from Tamilnad are just demanding it. I do not know why. Tamilnad is a great State. We have a President of the Congress from Tamilnad. I do not know what he has to say about it. I thought in Tamilnad they preferred *Iddily* to biscuits. But now I find they would not like even biscuits unless it has 40 per cent American collaboration. They want 40 per cent American collaboration to produce biscuits for them. I would rather have *dosas* and *iddilis* even though I come from the North than biscuits produced by American collaboration.

I, a man of the north, am making you this offer; I would rather live on *tidily* than this kind of biscuits.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you know how to make *iddily*?

Saw BHUPESH GUPTA: Here it is a question of principle. Now I would like to hear Mr. Kamaraj on this subject. I hear that he is making very great speeches; good, but I should like to hear, if my voice reaches him, as to what he thinks about this particular collaboration with an American private concern.

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN: What ha» Mr. Kamaraj got to do with this collaboration? Why do you bring in his name here ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know if he knows with whom we are collaborating. If Tamil Nad wants industries, if you like to industrialise your State, come here with proposals with indigenous capital in the public sector; we shall support them and we shall give Mrs. Rajagopalan more than what she needs in this respect but for Heaven's sake don't run after the Americans. *(Laughter)* I know my language; don't try to laugh at it. Then you spoil the whole thing. You must know where not to laugh.

Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is entirely wrong; it is repugnant to our policy and my attack against this is that it is contrary to what we consider to be the right approach in the matter of industrialisation. Neither is any technical know-how involved in it, nor is it a vital strategic industry. Even so you want *to* go in for private foreign participation? *(Interruptions)*. When Mr. Kamaraj went to the Soviet Union he could have tried to find out whether some Soviet Biscuit concerns would be in a position to help Tamil Nad. I tell you I went on a parliamentary delegation with Mr. Jagan Nath Kolay, Cabinet Minister of the West Bengal Government. He owns a biscuit factory; you know the Kolay biscuits and all that. The only thing is, nobody gives me good biscuits except what you give me in the Central Hall. Together we went to see some Soviet Biscuit factories and he seemed to have been very much impressed by the development of biscuit factories there.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Are they sweeter ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know how they will taste in the Swatantra mouth.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : If the non-Communist biscuits are not sweet for the

Communist mouth, naturally the Soviet biscuits will not be sweet for us.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There you ara; quite right but I must say that they will not taste bitter in the Congress mouth at all because that mouth is yet a little normal mouth; yours is completely abnormal.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you hav* taken five minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He asked ma a question and I have to reply.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Sir, I did not think of speaking on this but now I must be given an opportunity.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes; he must be given an opportunity.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHAROAVA) : You continue your speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am finishini.

Therefore I say no case has been mada out so far except that the Century Flour Mills happens to be situated in Madras and our Madras friends are behaving as if they have no industries at all, as if they ore almost industrially destitute and whatever comes along they should take. Well, I put this to the Prime Minister. I will ask her not to make these election speeches; good speeches she makes about foreign collaboration. The newspaper headlines say that she has said that everything will b» reviewed about foreign collaboration but Mr. Sanjivayya after having settled hia quarrel with Mr. Sanjiva Reddy is now producing this kind of thing.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA): This happened before.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You can celebrate the occasion otherwise than by doing this kind of thing. Therefore I appeal *to* you; I appeal to the Congress Members here, that this is not a party issue at all; 3on't bring in foreign collaboration, equity participation, in the matter of biscuits. If you need better machinery, negotiate with Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, Britain, France or even America and try to get it I have no quarrel over it but don't intro-iuce foreign equity participation here. As t said, it is repugnant and therefore I will

ask Mr. Sanjivayya to retrace his step, cancel this deal, in the same way as they cancelled the V.O.A. deal. That is my appeal to them.

Thank you.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I do not know whether we have one Government of India with Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, as its head Or we have a number of Governments of India and whether each Ministry is an empire in itself.

The *Blitz*, news weekly of Bombay, on August 27 featured on the front page an interview with the Prime Minister. The heading is:

"Indira for probe into all Foreign Collaboration"

And in that interview the Prime Minister is reported to have said that she does not want and will not tolerate collaboration agreements which damage national interests. And she is further reported to have said:

"It is something that I do not want. They are unnecessary and avoidable. I want a thorough investigation made of such collaboration arrangements. I find there are a number of them made since and even before the Chinese aggression with which I do not agree. We must see to it that they are not extended or repeated."

Then she is further reported to have emphasised the *swadeshi* spirit—the effort to build everything *swadeshi* and she said :

"In any case the main thing is to depend upon our own effort."

But here, as somebody correctly pointed out, the Ministry of Industries has somehow become guilty of granting a licence for foreign collaboration in the preparation of biscuits as a preliminary step to foreign collaboration in the cooking of *chapatis*. Sir, I am sorry for Mr. Sanjivayya. I hope the ex-President of the Indian National Congress is not personally responsible for this big blunder. Some bureaucrat or somebody has landed him in a soup and he should know how to get out of it. We will welcome if he, at the end of this discussion, rises and says

that this collaboration agreement will go the V.O.A. way. Jawaharlal Nehru, also an ex-President of the Indian National Congress, was strong enough, was bold enough to cancel a deal which one of his Ministers or Secretaries of the Government of India had entered into. The Industries Minister should also have that courage.

As far as regional considerations are concerned, I request that any number of licences for South India may be given. My own reports are that since independence, South India has developed industrially much more than it had developed during the two hundred years of British rule.

(Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : You have once more minute, Mr. Arora.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I must meet the interruptions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You can meet anybody in one minute.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA; As far as Tamil Nad is concerned, the cotton textile industry in Tamil Nad today is better equipped than the cotton textile industry in any other part of the country, mainly because since 1952 any number of licences have been given to South India. Give them many more licences. Give them one more refinery. They do not have oil but a refinery is being erected at Madras. Let them have another at Madurai or somewhere; do not mind. And give them a steel plant to be made of lignite, for which they can get collaboration from the G.D.R. which will be less exacting and less humiliating. As far as regional considerations are concerned, I am all for Tamil Nad I suggest to my friends from Tamil Nad that rather than having the know-how of making biscuits from Americans, export some beautiful ladies from Tamil Nad to teach Americans how to make '*Idli*' and '*Dosa*'. They have the I know-how which the Americans can borrow from us.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : It is time to wind up^ Mr. ' Arora.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: One more minute and I have finished. I find that biscuits are . . .

(Interruptions.)

SMU R. T. PARTHASARATHY: The hon. Member was using . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): He is objecting to something.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY: 'Ex port ladies'—is it permissible in parliamentary etiquette?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): It should be avoided. Please wind up.

SHRI KOTA PUNNAIAH (Andhra Pradesh): Those who are well versed in preparing *ldlies* should be sent to any other country, not beautiful ladies. What is the idea? I do not understand it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : I have already said that this expression should have been avoided.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI KOTA PUNNAIAH: It is none of his business to mention North and South a hundred times.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA (Andhra Pradesh): That business he can take up if he likes.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : I withdraw it *(Interruption.)* Do not get hysterical. I have withdrawn it. I was so far trained and educated to believe that women dislike being called ugly. Now I find there are some women who resent my calling them beautiful. *(Interruptions)* Now, coming back to biscuits, I find biscuits are not end. I am told that the Ministry of Industry is preparing to grant the Ovaltine manufacturers a licence to set up an industry.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Arora, there are a number of speakers. Please wind up.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: They are going to make the same mistake and grant a licence for the manufacture of Ovaltine, when, during the last few years a number

of small units have been set up in th* country to manufacture delicious drink* and beverages which are not worse than Ovaltine. So, I request the Minister to cancel this collaboration agreement and desist from granting this intended licence for manufacturing Ovaltine. And before I sit down I again withdraw the remark about the beautiful women of Tamil Nad. Let them export men and let the women of Tamil Nad stay at home.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): We sit up to 6.30 P.M.

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): Why?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : There are a number of speakers.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Sir, the way the debate has developed in this House, there might be definitely a misconception outside that there is a combat between the North and the South. I want to dispel it from the beginning. I belong to the North. All the same I am in favour of the Collaboration. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is laughing. Anything from Russia is sweet, magnificent and beautiful to him and anything from any other country is repugnant to him. Therefore, I understand his sentiment. He is against collaboration with any American firm, any British firm or any other firm, but Russia.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Private Col-
laboration.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Whether it is private or public, it does not matter. Here it is a first venture in the South so far as biscuit manufacturing is concerned. The only other one is owned by a firm which is sixty per cent British. Do you prefer that to this ? *(Interruption.)* You must realise that this would be in Indian hands. Even with forty per cent, collaboration, this would be primarily in Indian hands and do you prefer a company which is definitely and primarily in British hands? Would you like to have a British company rather than an Indian firm ?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: It is not a question of preference . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Please do not take my time. Kindly give me more time. He wanted to know something.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): He has finished.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Sir, in this particular case there is some confusion.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Because of so much discussion on beautiful ladies.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: From beautiful ladies we have come to handsome men.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Now, collaboration in this particular case has become essential. In other cases my hon. friends do not have any objection to the replacement of obsolete machinery by modern machinery. The same machinery may be offered from America or from the UK, because the original source is probably either America or England. They have no objection to that. But in the case of a fresh venture, which goes to the South, they have objection. This is very wrong in principle. You may have your objection so far as collaboration is concerned, but since Madras has remained a backward area so far as industries are concerned and it is having its first venture, why should there be any objection? You grant concessions in the case of so many States where they are backward, and in this particular case why should you object to it? That might appear ridiculous and it would also not be properly represented outside the House. You have to take people's goodwill into consideration when you discuss something of this sensitive type. We are definitely discussing a sensitive matter. That might create some dissatisfaction among a particular section in the country. The entire debate has been based on it. Till now somebody from Tamil Nad says that this should be done and every Member from outside Tamil Nad is against it. Naturally I want to dispel that misconception in the country and when I am trying to do it there is an interruption from one of our anti-collaborators, Mr. Kumaran, and he is speaking against me. Now, Sir, even at this stage, in spite of whatever might be said in this House, I would urge upon the Minister not to budge an inch from the decision that he has taken. He should not do it and it would be in the interests of the entire country as a whole if he does not do it. If he does it, the idea in the country would be that if some people can combine in Parliament, to whatever regions

L122RS/66

they may belong, then orders already passed may be set aside against the particular State.

Thank you.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the question that has been raised is important, but the answer is very simple. Should collaboration be permitted in lines of production like biscuit manu* facture or not? There has been an accepted policy of Government for a long time, a policy reiterated by our present Prime Minister recently to which attention was drawn by the hon. Member, Shri Arjun Arora, from Kanpur. It is clear that this collaboration agreement is in violation of that policy. I am not against foreign collaboration as a matter of principle. But then let us realise that even the fund of American capital is not unlimited. For the last three or four years America has been facing a problem of imbalance of payment. Their gold and capital reserves every year are registering a decline and there is a movement in America, in the USA, to restrict the export of capital. In that situation, there is another aspect which I would like to emphasise. Should we permit them to collaborate in lines which are in a sense not so important and not so sophisticated and thereby decrease the funds, that is the total of the funds that are available for investment in India. Because if they invest in biscuit line then it is clear that some other important, sophisticated and necessary lines shall be deprived of foreign exchange and foreign capital. Indian biscuit industry has been doing very well. & can understand collaboration in an industry like electronics or the transistorised industries. But where is the point in having collaboration in the manufacture of biscuits? I am not happy about the references to regional imbalances. Regional imbalances have to go but then at what stage? Soviet Russia after 45 years of industrial development thought of spreading its industries throughout all the regions. Any way, even assuming that at this stage of our industrial development, it is necessary to remove regional disparities, then the disparities could be removed in a better manner. Let Tamil Nad and other regions of this country have industries which are necessary to build up the economic apparatus of this country so that it be-

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha.] comes viable and strong, so, that our economy becomes a self-generating economy. And there is a vast field for expansion, there is a vast field for investment, expansion and investment which would really gear up our economy and strengthen our economy. And I am sure that it will be recognised by every impartial person that biscuit industry is not one of those industries which are basic, whose building up is necessary at this stage. Whether the collaboration is located in one region or another is, in my opinion, immaterial. The whole issue is: should we at this stage of our economic development allow collaboration in such industries?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: In respect of worn-out and obsolete machinery you are allowing foreign exchange to replace them. Why do you object to this collaboration? In other industries, you allow it.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Exactly. The reply was given by one hon. Member here. Mistakes were committed in the past. Our economy assumed a particular pattern because of foreign domination. We cannot brush that aside. We have to live with them. Does it mean that we go on repeating the same mistakes voluntarily, of our own free will and volition, the mistakes or unbalances created in our economy by foreign domination? That is the reply. That was inevitable because we were under foreign domination. What we are doing today is the very thing and that makes a world of difference. Let us henceforth decide that in these lines there shall be no foreign collaboration whether the benefit of collaboration goes to region A, region B, region C, or region D. I would be very happy. I feel happy when I go to Madras. When I was there I saw chimneys smoking, spread out 20 or 30 miles this way or that way of Madras. I feel happy because one of the important regions of India is getting industrially stronger and stronger and thereby India as a whole is getting stronger. But then remove the imbalance by building up essential industries and not these non-essential industries which really cater to the rich few in this country and which are not catering to the masses. I

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): I do not want to make a long speech on this subject. But I want to register my sincerest protest against this attitude of the Government in granting such collaboration especially when we are in a difficult situation. Time and again, our leaders have been proclaiming to the whole nation that we should revive the spirit of *swadeshi*. Mr. Arora rightly emphasised that point. It is not only an economic question, it is not only a question of foreign collaboration, it is a psychological question. But what is the idea of the biscuit manufacturers who are very much in favour of this collaboration? They say that while in Europe the *per capita* consumption is 20 pounds, in India the consumption is half a pound *per capita*. You can well understand what is the necessity for this, what is the consumption, and what sections of the society are going to consume these biscuits. And moreover, biscuits which are consumed by the common man in this country are not manufactured by this refined machinery. You can see here in Delhi bakeries manufacturing biscuits. I do not know what is the taste of the Swatantra mouth or the Communist mouth, but the Indian mouth very much relishes the biscuit that is prepared in any bakery in Delhi . . .

(Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): In fact, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, the best are those prepared at home.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR. I agree with you.

The other point is that it is for foreign export. Are we in a position or do we think that we shall be able to export food material to other countries? And moreover what do we want to inculcate among [the people of this country? Here in this House time and again the Food Minister has come and said that we must change our food habit, and that instead of taking rice we must take wheat or we must take coarse grains. But what we are saying is that in order to refine our habits we must inculcate the habit of taking biscuits manufactured by the most modern and refined machinery that will be imported from the U.S.A. or the U.K. Here is a British

company. For me it is immaterial that it is a British company. I would suggest to the hon. Minister, and I hope that the Government will take courage, not today, but tomorrow, to nationalise all these foreign concerns whose existence is a burden upon the economy of our country. No self-respecting nation will go in for collaboration for manufacturing biscuits. Outside this country, our heads will hang in shame if you go and say that you went in for foreign collaboration. I will not be out of place, I hope, if I can give you an example. Last year in January I was in Cuba. Or. Fidel Castro—we may not agree with him on many issues—was addressing an Independence Day Rally. One lakh of people or more were attending it. There was the controversy between Cuba and China. China at that time had refused to give rice to Cuba. He asked them one question. He said, "We were exporting two tons of sugar for one ton of rice. China is not prepared to give rice. You, citizens of Cuba, have to decide here and now whether you want rice or you want national honour." And more than one hundred thousand people with one voice said, "We will live without rice, we want national honour." This is the feeling that we want to inculcate in our own country. And Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will say that there must not be any illusion. Rice is the staple food of Cuba. Nearly 95 per cent of the people there eat rice and nothing else. But they say, "We will live on vegetables, we will live on potatoes but we shall not like to have rice from China on any term which is humiliating to us." I shall appeal to the hon. Minister that we have to inculcate this feeling, howsoever this fact might be pleasant to you that you are getting collaboration. God forbid—if something untoward happens in this country, I do not know what will be the attitude of these collaborators. An individual's memory is short, but the nation's memory should not be so short. Only last September we were knocking at every door but we were not getting even a single pie for defending our nation. I wonder how my friend, Mr. Lokanath Misra, who has got independent views rises and says that we should go in for foreign collaboration with the United States for manufacturing biscuits. If collaboration is essential, if it is imperative.

it must be there. But we must enter into these collaboration agreements in a guarded way.

With these words, Sir, I shall request the Government to take a policy decision that in all superficial fields of our economic life, whatever the cost, whatever the felling of certain individuals, this collaboration will not be allowed, and if they have been entered into they will be scrapped.

شری عبدالغنی (پنجاب) : وائس

چیرمین صاحب—

"اتنی سی بات تھی جسے افسانہ کر دیا، کبھی میں نے آپ سے اختلاف نہیں کیا لیکن یہ پہلا موقع ہے جب مسٹر چندر شیکھر سے بھی اختلاف کر رہا ہوں۔ میں تو اپنے انٹسٹری منسٹر کو کانگریچولٹ کرتا ہوں کہ انہوں نے ایک ایسی فیلیٹنگ کو جو کہ ساؤتھ کو ہو رہی تھی اس کو سمجھا۔ ساری دنیا جانتی ہے اگر آنکھوں سے کوئی دیکھتے ہوئے بھی اور آنکھیں دکھتے ہوئے بھی کوئی اپنے کو اندھا کرے تو اس کا کوئی علاج نہیں۔ لیکن دنیا جانتی ہے کہ ساؤتھ وائے کافی دکھی تھی کہ نارتھ ترقی کر رہا ہے اور ساؤتھ اتنی ترقی نہیں کر رہا ہے۔ تو انہوں نے آخر کونسا جرم کیا۔ اگر آپ ہزاروں کروڑوں کا مال باہر سے ایسا منگواتے ہیں جس کی ضرورت نہیں ہے۔ کون نہیں جانتا کہ ہمارے یہاں بھی دیسی اون ہوتی ہے۔ لیکن فوج کے لئے دیسی اون کی جرسیاں کام نہیں آ سکتی تھیں اور

[شری عبدالغنی]

آپ نے ودیسی اون کی اجازت دی اور کروڑوں روپے کی اون یہاں آنے کی اجازت دی۔ آپ طے کریں کہ کولوریشن نہیں ہونا چاہئے تو میں مبارکباد دوں گا کہ صحیح ہے اور اگر آپ نہیں چاہتے نہ کیجئے کوئی ہرج کی بات نہیں لیکن انہوں نے ایسی کونسی بات کی اور اس میں آپ کا کونسا فارن ایکسچینج اٹک گیا ہے۔ اور جذبات میں آ کر یہ کہنا کہ قوم کی توہین ہے کچھ جچتا نہیں۔ اس وقت آپ کی توہین نہیں ہوتی جب کہ آپ کروڑوں روپے کا فارن ایکسچینج ضائع کرتے ہیں اور اسے ضائع کر کے پھر فارن ایکسچینج کے لئے بہنوں اور ماؤں سے سونا مانگتے ہیں۔ اس وقت لجا نہیں آتی۔ اس وقت لجا نہیں آتی جب کہ آپ فارن ایکسچینج کے لئے اپیل کرتے ہیں کہ دوسرے دیش آپ کی مدد کریں میں حیران ہوتا ہوں کہ انہوں نے کیا کیا؟ انہوں نے آپ کا فارن ایکسچینج ضائع نہیں کیا بلکہ فارن ایکسچینج لانے کے لئے ہی سادھن کیا ہے۔ ابھی آپ کی پارٹی اور گورنمنٹ کی پوزیشن ایسی نہیں ہوئی کہ آپ کہہ سکیں کہ کسی سے کالوریشن کرنا نہیں ہے۔ جب تک یہ نہیں ہو تو پھر موری سبجہ میں نہیں آتا کہ اس طرح جذبات سے کیوں کہتے ہیں۔

وائس چیر مین صاحب—

کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس وقت جو کچھ ہو رہا ہے وہ ہستدیدہ نہیں۔ آپ دیکھیں کہ اپنے ڈولپمنٹ کمشنر لسٹل اسکیل انٹسٹریز میں وہ جگہ جو ہے وہ دو ہزار پچھتر روپے کی ہے وہاں جو آدمی ہے وہ اڑھائی ہزار روپے تنخواہ لے رہا ہے۔ اس پر فائنٹس نے اعتراض کیا کہ اس کو نہیں رکھنا چاہئے اس کی تنخواہ زیادہ ہے اور اس جگہ کے لئے ضرورت کم تنخواہ والے کی ہے فائنٹس منسٹر نے کہا انٹسٹری منسٹر نے کہا کہ ہم اتنی تنخواہ نہیں دے سکتے لیکن گلزاری لال نندہ نے جو کہ گاندھی جی کا نام لیتے ہیں اور اپنے آپ کو گاندھی جی کا جانشین کہتے ہیں انہوں نے کہا کہ پھر ایک سال کے لئے اس کی معیاد بڑھا دیتے ہیں اور یہی ڈولپمنٹ کمشنر یہاں رہے گا۔ جس کے خلاف اسٹیٹ کمیٹی نے ۴۰ پیج لکھے ہیں اس کو رکھا ہوا ہے جو آنے والا ہے اس کو نہیں لیا اور اس کا جرم صرف یہ ہے کہ وہ ساؤتھ انڈین ہے اور اس نے اپنے محکمہ میں وہ کام کیا جو پہلے ۱۰ سال میں کوئی نہیں کر سکا۔ تو یہ بھی کوئی بات ہے کہ اب ساؤتھ اور نارتھ کی چیز اس کو بناتے ہیں اور کولوریشن کا نام لے کر جذبات ابھارنے کی کوشش کرتے ہیں۔ وہاں سودیشی کی بات نہیں جب کہ آپ کروڑوں روپے کی

مشین امپورٹ کرتے ہیں - اسپینڈل بدلنے کی اجازت دیتے ہیں - اس طرح سے انہوں نے ایک منسٹر پر اور دوسرے منسٹر پر حملہ کرنے کی کوشش کی اسکو بدنام کرنے کی چال چلی ہے - میں حیران ہوتا ہوں - کیونکہ اس طرح سے کانگریس پارٹی ڈوب جائے گی تو پھر دیش کا کیا ہوگا ؟ کانگریس کے بنا کوئی پارٹی ابھی دیش کو سنبھالنے والی نہیں ہے اور اگر کانگریس پارٹی کو دھکا لگتا ہے تو آپ کو جاننا چاہئے کہ اس طرح چیپ لیڈر شپ حاصل کرنا یا جذبات سے کھیلنا فائدہ مند نہیں ہوگا - آپ منسٹر صاحب سے یہ کہئے کہ وہ اور جگہ بھی دیں لیکن اگر کوئی چیز یہاں ہو گئی تو آپ کیوں ان کو مجرم ٹھہراتے ہیں اور کہتے ہیں کہ انہوں نے دیش کے ہت کے خلاف کر دیا ہے - دیش دروہی بن گئے ہیں - میں ادب سے کہتا ہوں کہ کانگریس کو آپ بچائیں - آئے دن کی ان باتوں سے ، اور ایک دوسرے پر طعن تشنیع نہ کیجئے اور سوجھ بوجھ سے کام لیجئے -

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : आप किसकी आवाज में ऐसा बोल रहे हैं। क्या बात है।

श्री عبدالغنی : میں جانتا ہوں - میں کیا ہوں - آپ کے پہلے سے میرا کانگریس سے ساتھ رہا ہے - میں جانتا ہوں میں ڈیزرو کرتا ہوں کیوں کہ میں نے آپ سے زیادہ قربانی کی ہے

اس دیش کے لئے اس کانگریس کو اٹھانے کے لئے اس کانگریس کے وقار کو بڑھانے کے لئے - اس لئے آپ کی کوئی ایسی بات کہنے سے مجھ پر کوئی اثر نہیں ہوتا - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اب تک آپ کی پالیسی نہ بدے آپ سب کو نیشنلائز نہ کر لیں تب تک اس میں کیا ہرج ہے - میں آپ کے ساتھ ہوں اور ڈنکے کی چوٹ کہتا ہوں جتنے کنسرن ہیں خواہ وہ ٹاٹا کے ہوں یا برلا کے ہوں، اسی چند پیارے لال کے ہوں، ڈالیمیا کے ہوں سب کو نیشنلائز کر لیا جائے - مجھے اس میں کوئی اعتراض نہیں میں آپ کے ساتھ ہوں لیکن ایک بہانہ لے کر منسٹر سنجیویا پر حملہ کرنا بالکل بے سود ہے اس کا کوئی فائدہ نہیں - اور اس طرح اس پر وار نہیں کرنا چاہئے - بلکہ اصل بات کو سمجھنا چاہئے اور صحیح بات کوئی چاہئے - حیلوں بہانوں سے دوسروں کو بدنام کرنا اچھا کام نہیں ہے - لہذا ایسا نہیں ہونا چاہئے -

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी (पंजाब) : वाइस चैयरमैन साहब —

“इतनी सी बात थी जिसे अफसाना कर दिया ”

कभी मैंने आप से इत्तलाफ नहीं किया लेकिन यह पहला मौका है जब मिस्टर चन्द्र शेखर

†[] Hindi transliteration.

132 [श्री अब्दुल गनी]

से भी इच्छावाक्य कर रहा हूँ। मैं तो अपने इण्डस्ट्री मिनिस्टर को कांग्रेसुलेट करता हूँ कि उन्होंने एक ऐसी फॉलिंग को जो कि साउथ को हो रही थी उसको समझा। सारी दुनिया जानती है अगर आंखों में कोई देखते हुए भी और आंखें रखते हुए भी कोई अपने को अंधा कर ले तो उसका कोई इलाज नहीं। लेकिन दुनिया जानती है कि साउथ वाले कार्फो दुखी हैं कि नार्थ तरक्की कर रहा है और साउथ उतनी तरक्की नहीं कर रहा है। तो उन्होंने अखिर कौन-सा जुर्म किया। अगर आप हज़ारों करोड़ों का माल बाहर से ऐसा मंगवाते हैं जिस की जरूरत नहीं है। कौन नहीं जानता कि हमारे यहां भी देसी ऊन होती है। लेकिन फौज के लिए देसी ऊन की जरूरतें काम नहीं आ सकतीं थीं और आपने विदेशी ऊन की इजाजत दी और करोड़ों रुपये की ऊन यहां आने की इजाजत दी। अगर आप तय करें कि कोलांबोरेशन नहीं होना चाहिए तो मैं मुबारिकबाद दूंगा कि सही है और अगर आप नहीं चाहते न कांजिए। कोई हर्ष की बात नहीं। लेकिन उन्होंने ऐसी कौनसी बात की और इसमें आपका कौन सा फारेन एक्सचेंज अटक गया है और जजबात में आकर यह कहना कि काम की तोहीन है कुछ जंचता नहीं। उस वक्त आपकी तोहीन नहीं हुई जब कि आप करोड़ों रुपये का फारेन एक्सचेंज जाया करते हैं और इसे जाया करके फिर फारेन एक्सचेंज के लिए बहनों और भावों से सोना मांगते हैं। इस वक्त सज्जा नहीं आती। इस वक्त सज्जा नहीं आती जब कि आप फारेन एक्सचेंज के लिए अपील करते हैं कि दूसरे देश आपकी मदद करें। मैं हैरान होता हूँ कि उन्होंने क्या किया? उन्होंने आप का फारेन एक्सचेंज जाया नहीं किया बल्कि फारेन एक्सचेंज लाने के लिए ही साधन किया है। अर्थात् आपकी पार्टी और गवर्नमेंट की पोजिशन ऐसी नहीं हुई कि आप कह सकें कि किसी से कोलांबोरेशन करना नहीं है। जब तक यह नहीं हो तो फिर मेरी

समझ में नहीं आता कि इस तरह जजबात से क्यों खेलते हैं।

वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, मैं साफ कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस वक्त जो हो रहा है वह पसन्दीदा नहीं। आप देखें कि अपने डिवलपमेंट कमिश्नर स्माल स्केल इण्डस्ट्रीज है वह जगह जो है दो हजार पिछतर रुपये की है वहां जो आदर्श है वह अठ्ठाई हजार रुपये तंखाह ले रहा है इस पर फाइनांस ने एतराज किया कि उसको नहीं रखना चाहिए इसकी तंखाह ज्यादा है और इस जगह के लिए जरूरत कम तंखाह वाले की है। फाइनांस मिनिस्टर ने कहा, इण्डस्ट्री मिनिस्टर ने कहा कि हम इतनी तनखाह नहीं दे सकते लेकिन गुलजारी लाल नन्दा ने जो कि गांधी जी का नाम लेते हैं और अपने आप को गांधी जी का जानशन करते हैं उन्होंने कहा कि फिर एक साल के लिए उसकी मियाद बढ़ा देते हैं और यहीं डिवलपमेंट कमिश्नर रहेंगे। जिस के खिलाफ एस्टिमेट पार्लियमेंट ने 45 पेज लिखे हैं उसका रखा हुआ है जो आने वाला है उसको नहीं लिया और उसका जुर्म रिफ यह है कि साउथ इंडियन हैं और उसने अपने महकमे में वह काम किया जो पहले 10 साल में कोई नहीं कर सका। तो यह भी कोई बात है कि अब साउथ और नार्थ की चीज उसको बनाते हैं और कोलांबोरेशन का नाम लेकर जजबात उभारने की कोशिश करते हैं। वहां स्वदेशी की बात नहीं जबकि आप करोड़ों रुपये की मशीन इम्पोर्ट करते हैं। स्पिडिल बदलने की इजाजत देते हैं। इस तरह से उन्होंने एक मिनिस्टर पर और दूसरे मिनिस्टर पर हमला करने की कोशिश की। उसको बदनाम करने की चाल चली है। मैं हैरान होता हूँ क्योंकि इस तरह से कांग्रेस पार्टी डूब जाएगी तो फिर देश का क्या होगा? कांग्रेस के बिना कोई पार्टी अर्थात् देश को संभालने वाली नहीं है और अगर कांग्रेस पार्टी को धक्का लगाता है तो आदमी जानना चाहिये कि इस तरह चीप लीबरशिप हासिल करना या

अज्ञात से खेलना फायदा मन्द नहीं होगा। आप मिनिस्टर साहब से यह कहिए कि वह और जगह भी दें लेकिन अगर कोई चीज यहां होगी तो आप क्यों उन को मुजरिम ठहराते हैं और कहते हैं कि उन्होंने देश के हित के खिलाफ कर दिया है। देश बर्बाद बन गये हैं। मैं अदब से कहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस को आप बचाइये। आप दिन की ऐसी बातों से और एक दूसरे पर ताना तिकने न खेंचें और सूझ बूझ से काम लीजिए।

श्री श्रीलक्ष्मण याजी : आप किस की आवाज में ऐसा बोल रहे हैं। क्या बात है।

श्री श्रीलक्ष्मण याजी : मैं जानता हूँ मैं क्या हूँ। आपके पहले से मेरा कांग्रेस से साथ रहा है। मैं जानता हूँ मैं डिबेट करता हूँ क्योंकि मैंने आप से ज्यादा कुर्बानियाँ की हैं इस देश के लिए, इस कांग्रेस को उठाने के लिए, इस कांग्रेस के बकार को बढ़ाने के लिए। इस लिए आप की कोई ऐसी बात कहने से मुझ पर कोई असर नहीं होता। मैं समझता हूँ कि अब तक आपकी पालिसी न बदले आप सब को नेमनेजाइज न कर लें तब तक इसमें क्या हर्ज है। मैं आपके साथ हूँ और आपके साथ से कहता हूँ कि ये जितने कनसर्न हैं सत्राह वे टाटा के हों या बिरला के हों अथवा चन्द प्यारे लाल के हों डालमिया के हों तब को नेमनेजाइज कर लिया जाए। मुझे इसमें कोई एतराज नहीं, मैं आपके साथ हूँ लेकिन एक बहाना ले कर मिस्टर संजीविया पर हमला करना बिल्कुल बेसूद है। इसका कोई फायदा नहीं और इसी तरह इस पर बार नहीं करना चाहिए बल्कि असल बात को समझना चाहिए और सही बात करनी चाहिए। होली बहानों से दूसरों को बदनाम करना अच्छा काम नहीं है लेकिन ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए।]

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I agree with the view expressed by Mr. Gujral that wherever indigenous know-how is available, there is no justification for foreign

collaboration. I also agree with the point raised by some hon'ble Members that we must have certain criteria where we should permit foreign collaboration and where we should not permit foreign collaboration. That has not been laid down by the Government. But that is not the end of it, Mr. Vice-Chairman. There are other considerations also where we have got to permit foreign collaboration.

Now, Sir, we are in a great difficulty with regard to foreign exchange. One of the criteria which the Government has been consistently following is to permit foreign collaboration where there is a need for importation of foreign machinery and equipment for which foreign currency is required for importing. In such cases and in many other cases foreign collaboration is allowed. Now I would like to ask the Minister to tell us the requirements of foreign currency for the expansion of the biscuit industry in the Fourth Five Year Plan.

I understand from the leaderette of Economic Times that Mr. A. C. Khanna, President of the Federation of Biscuit Manufacturers of India, has stated that the Fourth Plan has a target of 75,000 tonnes for the manufacture of biscuits, and that can be achieved only if the Government releases foreign exchange to the tune of Rs. 30 lakhs per year for the period of the Fourth Plan. This was the estimate before devaluation. Now this value will go up. I would like to know from the Minister whether that is the target for the expansion of the biscuit industry and whether any foreign exchange is necessary to achieve that target. If so, what is that? Now if we are going to release foreign exchange for the expansion of capacity, then we can discuss the collaboration agreement in that perspective. If we are told by the Minister that there is no necessity for the release of foreign exchange for the expansion of the industry to 75 thousand tonnes, the whole discussion will be on a different basis. Now if there is need for foreign currency for the expansion of this industry, and if we look at it from that angle, then this collaboration is quite profitable from the point of view of India. If it is necessary to release foreign exchange for the expansion of capacity—as stated by many hon. friends that the terms of the

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.] collaboration for obtaining the plant and equipment are quite satisfactory—it is better to give them foreign exchange on that basis rather than on free foreign exchange basis because we have not got enough foreign exchange for the expansion of very many important industries. So if the Minister makes it absolutely clear whether we can expand further the Fourth Plan target without the assistance of foreign exchange, then there is no justification for sanctioning this collaboration. But if he says that it is necessary to have foreign equipment, foreign machinery which it is not possible to manufacture in India during the Fourth Plan and for that purpose free foreign currency will be released, then, after my impartial study of it, I can say that it appears to be quite profitable.

6 P.M.

DIWAN CHAM AN LALL (Punjab): Mr. Vice-Chairman, in a very able speech you led the debate on this particular question. I congratulate you on the speech that you made. Maulvi Abdul Ghani, my old friend from Punjab, asked: "What is wrong in regard to this particular policy of seeking collaboration? On the last occasion, that is, on 22nd August, we discussed this matter and three days later, the Prime Minister made a statement which I am going to read out for the benefit of my old friend Maulvi Abdul Ghani:

"The Prime Minister favours a thorough probe into foreign collaboration agreements which go against national interest to ensure that they are not extended or repeated."

On foreign collaboration agreements, she said:

"When I went into this matter of collaboration agreements which we have been making for a long time—even before the Chinese aggression—I found that I did not agree with most of them. The only thing we can do about them now is to see that they are not extended or repeated. The fertilizer deal was necessitated by the food crisis. It does not in any way signify that we have changed our policy. But there are other collaboration agreements to which I am opposed. It sometimes happens that in-

dividual Ministries go through such deal* and, by the time you catch up with them, it is too late to do anything. On such collaboration was brought to my notice at a party meeting last week. After that there was a meeting of the planning Commission. I sent a query to Mr. Asoka Mehta. He said that the news was unfortunately true, but it was too late to reverse it. It was only a minor thing, but on principle it was not the sort of collaboration I like. It is not right to call this a deviation or policy adjustment or anything of the sort, but it is unnecessary and avoidable."

The question that I am going to put to my hon. friend, the Minister of Industry is this. Is this collaboration unnecessary? Is this collaboration avoidable? Mrs. Gandhi continued:

"I think this kind of a thing has been happening in the Government before and they continue to happen to-day. Somehow individual Ministers get the idea that they are necessary, that they will bring foreign exchange and, therefore, they go in for them. By the time it comes to your notice, the deal is done and you cannot help it. You cannot tear up agreements already signed.

I, therefore, want to order a thorough investigation made of all such collaboration agreements in order to ensure that they are not extended or repeated. Some of these transactions are quite old. If I remember aright, one goes back to 1959."

This is the sort of thing that I would bring to the notice of Maulvi Abdul Ghani. This is the policy of the Government of India. Is the Minister going against the policy laid down by the Prime Minister? Is he going against that or is he not going against it? If he is going against it, I call upon him, I request him upon bended knees if he likes, to withdraw this particular collaboration that he has ordered in respect of this particular firm.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: (Uttar Pradesh): He did not order. It was ordered earlier.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: It may be correct that it is not he who ordered it. Now what are the facts? Messrs. Century Flour Mills, Madras, were granted an Industrial Licence early in 1962. After re-

cept of the licence the firm applied for foreign collaboration, which was then refused by the Government in keeping with their declared policy of not allowing foreign collaboration in well-established and non-priority industries. I want Maulvi Abdul Ghani to listen to this. This is the fact. If that is the fact, then why this policy has been changed in respect of this particular firm? Subsequently, in 1965 this firm applied for Collaboration with National Biscuit Company of New York, the world's largest Biscuit Company. Permission for this collaboration was granted—when?—in May 1966. It was only a few weeks ago that this collaboration was permitted. Now my friend spoke on the last occasion and I interrupted him: 'Is there anything in the letter of intent or in the agreement that has been signed—if it has been signed I do not know—compelling this particular company to manufacture the biscuits of that particular variety that my friend talked about? Unfortunately he failed on the last occasion to answer this particular question that I put to him. I interrupted him, which is not my ordinary habit to interrupt a speaker, but nevertheless, he did not answer that particular question. He sat down without answering that. I repeat that question now. Is there anything in the letter of intent or in the agreement entered into between the Government on the one side and the firm on the other compelling this particular firm to manufacture those special biscuits and is he not aware of the fact that the industry to-day, these 26 firms, are quite capable of manufacturing that particular variety of biscuits that he is talking about? Take the Nutro biscuits. They are being manufactured to-day in India. Take the army requirements. Thousands of tons of biscuits had been supplied during the last war by these biscuit manufacturing firms to the army. How can we now, on this specious argument particularly in view of what the Prime Minister has said in regard to this policy, allow this particular action on the part of the Ministry of Industry to go through?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): So far as the policy is concerned and so far as the Prime Minister's statement is concerned I think we all agree and we fully support. The only thing that troubles me in this matter is this. You know that I am one of the signatories of this

who wanted a debate. There are two considerations that I want to place before you and I want a specific answer from the Minister on them. One is, in this statement also the Prime Minister has said that if once the agreement had been entered into and all things had been done, then it becomes a question of national honour. If a mistake has been committed it is a different thing and those who have committed the mistake should be asked to explain but when we have entered into an agreement, then it is an agreement on behalf of the country and must be respected. I think the question of VOA does not apply here because that implied publicity, propaganda and many other international things which do not go in line with the question of a biscuit factory. The other thing that I would like to know from him, in view of our target in the Fourth Plan, is how much biscuit we will produce and how much we will export. And was it possible for the existing industry to complete that target without any further liability? Here the question of foreign exchange arises, and for this foreign exchange you will have to explain to us, compared to the other Britannia factory, what foreign exchange will be necessary to produce the same quantity and in the best possible manner in collaboration with the American company, because I feel, Sir, that it is really a competition between Britain and the United States*. I sense that, and that will have to be looked into deeper, because both of them are in the picture today. If it was purely an Indian venture, it would have received my full, cent per cent, support. But if it is a matter of choosing between the two, then my interest will be to choose the best, to choose the better of the two, which will give us the largest quantity and which will involve us in the least amount of foreign exchange and which will improve the industry. These are the only two things that I wanted to say.

SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE (Maharashtra): Sir, I like to have a specific reply from the hon. Minister to the question whether it is a fact that the Government, very recently, in the last week, has issued a licence in favour of the Britannia Company to float a new company at Madras; secondly, whether their terms are more favourable to the country than those of the Century Mill and, if so, in what

[Shrimati Tara Ramchandra Sathe.] respect. Sir, I am of the opinion that no collaboration with any foreign company to manufacture biscuits should be allowed when we are short of foreign exchange. If at all the collaboration has taken place, will the Government be bold enough to cancel the collaboration? And, if not, then I would like to know what is guaranteed for export. Is there any specific term mentioned in the contract?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): Sir, when I look at some of the foreign collaborations, my head goes down with shame. In this free country of ours, during the last fifteen years, we have allowed collaboration even to manufacture pens, ink, pencils, tooth paste and face powders. Just the other day I read an advertisement in Bombay that there would be collaboration for manufacturing ice-cream in this country.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Why did you not object then?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Just a minute. I am here to oppose all such collaborations. I feel that the dignity and prestige of our country never increases, but it goes down because of such collaborations. Now here I have to request the hon. Minister to say, having regard to our Industrial Policy Resolution, why we have been interpreting or, rather, misinterpreting that Resolution in (his way, and why these foreign collaborations are being allowed. Is it not possible for our own industry to do as per our plans and targets? The Biscuit Manufacturers' Association has come forward with their own plans and with their own targets. They are prepared to go ahead and they are prepared to do if we do not allow such collaboration. Why should we allow it? When I think of our own plans and schemes I feel that we have not cared for the design engineering industry which is in the interests of the country. Every time we have been importing some things—there have been several occasions when such things have been imported—right from lip-sticks to race-horses. We are ready to import anything into this country and drain our foreign exchange. We should not allow that at least in days to come. I would like to appeal to the hon. Minister that this collaboration, which is not at all warranted, which is not at all necessary, which is not

at all required by this country, should not be allowed. The Manufacturers' Association should be taken into confidence. Sir, I would like to say that there are engineers, there are technocrats. The talent required is in this country. If proper opportunities are given to our own technocrats, to our own engineers, to our own talented and wise people, I have no doubt that they can manufacture not only the biscuits that are necessary and required for this country, and for export, but they can also manufacture and fabricate the machinery required for such a factory. So under these circumstances I am here to record my strong protest against this policy of the Government. It is not increasing the prestige of the State; it is bringing shame to our country. Therefore, this decision should be changed under any circumstances and I hope that the hon. Minister will assure this House accordingly. The majority of the Members of this House, and also of the Lower House are net in favour of this collaboration.

Thank you very much.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pra-desh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the main point for consideration before me on this matter is as to what is essential and what is non-essential in this country. In things which are needed by the country, or which are essential for its people, in such matters there is certainly no harm in having foreign collaboration, but for non-essential things, namely, things not necessary for ordinary daily use and without which the country can exist for years, or even for centuries, there is no point in having foreign collaboration and I am sure biscuit manufacture is of this character. Now it is true that in the Industrial Policy Resolution there is no special reference as to in what matters there will not be foreign collaboration, but, all the same, from the way Pandit Nchro took the country along with him, after the passing of that Resolution, it was quite clear to every one of us that his intention was that there should be as little foreign collaboration as possible, and where it does become necessary, it should be only in things which are essential for the country, for instance in the matter of things and articles which are needed for our defence, or for the uplifting of the country as a whole. Now as for the biscuits, I do not see, and I really wonder how the idea came

into the mind of the hon. Minister, that an unessential thing like this should be started with foreign collaboration. My friend, Mr. Akbar Ali Khan has just said that, if a commitment has been made by the country, then in refusing to accept it the question of the country's prestige arises, and if it goes back upon it it gives a bad impression. But I would say that in a thing like this I would not like to tolerate even the commitment made by the hon. Minister. I am certainly of the view that if the commitment is not in the interests of the country .. .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: The commitment is of the Government of India, not of the Minister.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : Well, yes, the commitment is of the Government of India, but if it is not in the interests of the country, then such a thing should not be tolerated by anybody much less by this House. Various other matters have been put forward and I agree with the points of view which have been stressed by various Members regarding the non-implementation of this Resolution.

I am very sorry, Sir, that the question of regionalism has somehow been put forward by some sections of the hon. Members of the House. As you know, Sir, U.P. is one of those States which has most badly been treated in the matter of location of industries, and we have neither been given big industries nor small industries and we are wanting them, but I would not ask for an industry of this type to be set up there. If Madras or any other State wants greater industries to flourish there, I would be only too glad. But let us look for things which are really essential. The policy of the Government now is .. .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: YOU have the industry of industries.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: What is it?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I think your State has the most major industry, the leader of the Congress Industry.

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA: In the leadership of the country.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: Now, Sir, I am glad it has recently become the policy of the Government to substitute foreign

articles by producing them in India itself. If there are other industries which can be taken up in the country and in which it is necessary to have know-how or machinery etc. from outside and requiring foreign collaboration, then we shall have no objection to such industries being set up, but in this matter of biscuit manufacture, I do not think the Ministry should stick to its decision and I would request the hon. Minister, particularly because he happens to be an ex-Congress President, to keep that point in mind when he finally sanctions collaboration in this industry.

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in this discussion. As many as eighteen hon. Members have participated in the discussion and I am glad that you initiated this discussion. I agree with and join the hon. Member Diwan Chaman Lall, in the tribute he paid you, on the manner in which you so ably initiated this debate.

One particular and pertinent point which has got to be taken into consideration in this context is the pattern of this collaboration. Foreign collaboration can be of two types. Foreign collaboration may be for equity participation or it may be for technical know-how. In this case I must at once confess that there is not so much of "foreign technical know-how as there is equity participation. More than one hon Member pointed out that the Government of India is wasting foreign exchange when the Government is finding it difficult to get foreign exchange. I must state once that in this case we are not wasting foreign exchange at all. On the other hand we are trying to save foreign exchange this way. If instead of the Madras Century Flour Mills, some other factory had set up a biscuit factory, then that firm cannot set up a modern biscuit factory without some foreign exchange. Mention was made that licence was issued to the Britannia Biscuit Company to set up a unit in Madras State. They were issued industrial licence on 15th January, 1965 for setting up a new unit to produce 1,200 tonnes of biscuits per year and the foreign exchange allotted to them is about Rs. 7 lakhs and that is for second hand machinery which they are importing. If they were to go in for brand new machinery probably it would have cost

[Shri D. Sanjivayya.] diem much more. Here foreign exchange is allotted by the Government of India to the extent mentioned. To that extent the Government saves foreign exchange in this matter by their not going in for new machinery. But in the case of the Madras-American collaboration the equity participation is to the extent of Rs. 24 lakhs and that is for the cost of the machinery. With that amount of Rs. 24 lakhs they bring in brand new machinery-

The question might arise that they might repatriate the invested capital or even the dividend. That point has been very ably answered by one hon. Member here. It has been made a condition that within 20 years the capital should not be repatriated. Even with regard to the dividend, a condition has been laid down that it should be against the foreign exchange that this factory earns. Therefore, I think there is no question of frittering away the precious little foreign exchange that we have at our disposal. On the other hand it is a question of trying to earn foreign exchange.

In another way also this will help the Government of India to earn foreign exchange. We have been exporting biscuits to foreign countries for the last so many years. If we calculate the figures of our exports we come to the conclusion that we have not been able to improve much in the matter of export of biscuits. In the year 1962-63 we exported 397.3 tonnes for Rs. 8.58 lakhs. In 1963-64 we exported 434.9 tonnes for Rs. 10 lakhs. In 1964-65 we exported 397 tonnes for Rs. 11 lakhs but in 1965-66 we exported only 210 tonnes for earning Rs. 7 lakhs. Therefore we are really worrying about it as to why we are not able to keep up the tempo of export of our biscuits.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA (Andhra Pradesh) : What about the raw materials ?

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: I am coming to that. We have to earn foreign exchange and we have prepared a programme for earning foreign exchange to the extent of Rs. 50 lakhs per year and this unit will certainly help us to earn it and to reach that target.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: Not from this alone.

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: No, not from this alone. But this will help us because within seven years we have produced and exported and earned Rs. 20 lakhs. So we have to take into consideration the exportable varieties of biscuits and I must say that one or two firms, as Diwan Chaman Lall said, are producing some varieties of biscuits which are called special varieties of biscuits. But the question is one of quality. When we export biscuit to foreign countries they will certainly take into consideration the quality of our biscuits. If the quality is as good as or better than other varieties of biscuits that are available in the market, then they will certainly prefer our biscuits. But if our biscuits do not come up to the international standard then naturally they will go and buy biscuits from other countries and they will not be willing to purchase our biscuits. Therefore an attempt has been made here to have up-to-date sophisticated machinery which can produce quality biscuits and biscuits of a special variety.

Reference was made to the Britannia Biscuit Company and it was said that this was established several years ago. Whatever might be the historical background of this particular concern, whatever may be the date on which this factory went into production, today the fact is that this factory through its various units is producing about 40 per cent, of the total production of biscuits in our country and they are exporting only 1 per cent, of their production. Therefore it becomes necessary to break this monopoly. We should have more and more biscuit producing units in our country so that this monopoly may be broken. Therefore this unit has been licensed. Even then, as has been stated, the total production envisaged is only 40,000 tonnes whereas by the end of the Fourth Plan our production target for biscuits is as much as 75,000 tonnes per year. If we want to achieve this target, what is the foreign exchange required? After all, you cannot produce biscuits by merely having the raw materials.

SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE: What is the export that we should have.

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: We have to export as much as necessary to earn Rs. 50 lakhs per year. We can calculate that figure

because we know that for 400 tonnes we are getting Rs. 10 lakhs. Therefore, in order to achieve this production target of 73,000 tonnes a year we have to set up new units and probably expand existing ones also. We cannot produce more biscuits by merely having the raw materials. We want machinery also. Reference was made to the question of *swadeshi*, to the need to foster the spirit of *swadeshi*. I am second to none and I also believe fully that we should have everything indigenous in India, as far as possible. I want import substitutions. In fact, I have constituted a board similar to the National Inventions Promotion Board, to recognise the services rendered by scientists, technologists, technicians and craftsmen. We have also shown interest in the matter of import substitution. We are trying to do all that is possible. But the position today is that we have to import machinery and for that purpose approximately about Rs. 30 to Rs. 40 lakhs of foreign exchange we have to spend per annum.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If I may interrupt for a minute, for the import of machinery should you necessarily have this equity participation? Cannot machinery be got on loan or on credit from countries with which you have rupee-payment agreements? May I know from the Government whether any such alternative proposal was considered which would not involve equity participation by foreign private parties?

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: I quite agree with the hon. Member when he says that machinery can be imported by utilising free foreign exchange, rupee exchange or even foreign credit provided by foreign Governments, etc. If that is available, it is well and good. Suppose it is not available; suppose it is required for other relatively more important things, then probably we can go in for this equity capital.

Now coming to this question of finding foreign exchange to the extent of Rs. 30 to Rs. 40 lakhs per year it will come to more than Rs. 180 lakhs during the Fourth Five Year Plan period. Therefore instead of spending this Rs. 150 lakhs or Rs. 180 lakhs of free foreign exchange—probably it is going to be free foreign exchange unless some other rupee countries come forward to help us—if we allow equity capital

to that extent we will be saving foreign exchange.

Now, various other points have been raised by you. Sir, when you held the floor. You were quite anxious to know whether the research in the national laboratories of the C.S.I.R. is being made use of.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): HOW long are you likely to take?

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: Well, another five to ten minutes.

Now, I would like to inform you that the technical know-how provided by the Pilani Research Institute has been utilised and the two firms which have been licensed to produce television sets have been asked to utilise only the Pilani know-how and not to have foreign collaboration.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, so far the hon. Minister's defence of this transaction has been based on pragmatic or practical considerations. There was a substantial question raised by the hon. Diwan Chaman Lall and other Members as to how this transaction was in conformity with the policies laid down and pursued by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and reiterated by the present Prime Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think the hon. Minister should be fair to the debate. He may disagree with us. Our contention was not merely on technical or financial grounds. Here it is a specific case where, according to me, no technical know-how is involved.

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: Not so much, I said.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now any line which is non-essential does not come high up in the priority at all. Yet, we are permitting equity participation to the extent of 40 per cent. I remember one day what Dr. Ambedkar said in this House. I do not know if you were here, Sir, but in a comparable matter he said; some lady—don't mind it . . .

شری عبدالغنی : وائس چیرمین
صاحب-اس کا مطلب یہ ہے کہ
ہر معبر پھر وقت لینا شروع کرے

[श्री عبدالغनी]

का - हर एक अपनी बात पहर कहे सक्ता
 ६ - एक लिकचर शुरु कर दिया
 भेषिस जी ने -

†[श्री अब्दुल घनी : वाइस चेयरमैन साहब,
 इसका मतलब यह है कि हर मेम्बर फिर
 बत लेना शुरू करेगा । हर एक अपनी बात
 फिर कह सकता है । एक लेक्चर शुरू कर
 दिया भूपेश जी ने ।]

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am asking *
 question.

SHRI ABDUL GHANI: I am asking the
 Chairman.

آن اے پونٹ آف آرڈر—وائس
 چیرمین صاحب—آپ کی رائے
 جاننا چاہتا ہوں کہ جب سب نے
 تقریریں کیں - منسٹر صاحب خاموش
 بیٹھے رہے - جب منسٹر صاحب کہنا
 چاہتے ہیں تو انہیں کہنے کا موقعہ
 ۶ یا نہیں یا ہر ایک ممبر کو حق
 ۶ کہ ان کو راستہ میں ڈسٹرب
 کرے -

†[आन ए पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर । वाइस चेयर-
 मेन साहब, मैं आप का राय जानना चाहता
 हूँ कि: जब सब ने तर्कारें कीं मिनिस्टर
 साहब खामोश बँडे रहे । जब मिनिस्टर
 साहब कहना चाहते हैं तो उन्हें कहने का
 मौका है या नहीं या हर एक मेम्बर को हक
 है कि: उनको रास्ते में डिस्टर्ब करे ।]

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महाबोर प्रसाद भार्याब):
 श्रीका जरूर है Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you seek
 your clarification. That is all. Briefly.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let him speak.
 Sir. I do not mind. Afterwards I can put the
 question but it is a strange thing . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P.
 BHARGAVA): Don't comment on what has
 happened,

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: ... that
 the Minister has sat down but . . .

श्री عبدالغनी : اتنے شریف آدمی
 ہیں منسٹر بھوپیش سے ڈر گئے اس
 لئے بیٹھ گئے اور کوئی بات نہیں
 - ۶

†[श्री अब्दुल घनी : इतने शरीफ आदमी
 हैं मिस्टर भूपेश से डर गये इस लिए बैठ
 गये और कोई बात नहीं है ।]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P.
 BHARGAVA): What is your clarification, Mr.
 Gupta?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will seek it
 later. I know Mr. Ghani does not like our
 decision and therefore he is . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P.
 BHARGAVA): No comments on hon. Members.

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: Some references
 hav: been made with regard to policy and I
 would like to clarify the position. Today the
 policy in respect of allowing foreign capital
 participation in consumer industries is that such
 proposals should be examined carefully on the
 merits of each case to ensure that the outgo by
 way of dividend which is fairly high in the
 case of consumer industries because of the high
 profit margin involved does not offset the
 primary advantages of the inward remit' tance
 of foreign capital by investment. In such cases
 this policy has been kept in view while
 approving the terms of collaboration.

Now, somehow or other, whether we like it
 or not, regional imbalances have been brought
 into the picture. North and South has been
 mentioned. I would like to mention only one
 point, namely, that even in the Third Five Year
 Plan document there is a paragraph which
 makes reference to the existence of regional
 imbalances in the matter of industries, etc. I
 had the singular

privilege of participating in the discussions as a member of the National Development Council years ago and I was one of the Chief Ministers who raised this point and argued that the regional imbalances should be removed and even today people feel about it very much and it should be the duty of the national Government to see that regional imbalances are removed so that people in the various areas may feel satisfied that their areas are not neglected and . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why don't you lease the South to the Americans? Now, why don't you realise . . .

Tire VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Order, order. No comments, please.

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: I mentioned about import substitution. We have been trying our best to save foreign exchange by import substitution. It is not good for us to depend eternally on foreign countries. We have to stand on our own legs. We have to safeguard our interests and that can be done only when we are self-reliant. We are very conscious of it and we are trying to do our best in the matter.

About prices some mention was made and I must say that with more modern and sophisticated machinery it would be possible for us to produce biscuits at cheaper rates.

Mr. Arjun Arora made a reference to some other deal. I do not know; I will have to look into the papers. I cannot immediately say whether that is correct or not. The other point was whether collaboration is necessary, whether it is an avoidable one or an unavoidable one. It all depends on how we view this question. In the light of the non-availability of adequate amount of foreign exchange the Government felt that it is essential and therefore they have permitted this particular entrepreneur to enter into collaboration with the American firm.

Now, coming to the pertinent question raised by Diwan Chaman Lall, he said that in the first instance collaboration was refused and later on it was granted. I am sorry to say that it is not correct. Now, there is a Committee called the Foreign Investment Committee. It consists of the Secretary of the Economic Affairs Depart-

ment, Secretary, Industries Department, Additional Secretary, Economic Affairs Department, Secretary, Supply and Technical Development, Secretary, Defence Supplies, Adviser, Planning Commission, and the Secretary of the administrative Ministry concerned. This Committee in the first instance gave approval for equity participation only to the extent of 20 per cent but later on the entrepreneur came forward to say that his foreign collaborators were not agreeable to this, that the machinery which he wanted to import cost Rs. 24 lakhs and therefore he wanted 40 per cent participation. The total being Rs. 60 lakhs, 40 per cent of that will be Rs. 24 lakhs and that is equivalent to the cost of the machinery he wanted to import. Therefore the Foreign Investment Committee reviewed its decision on the application made by the manufacturer and they permitted this 40 per cent equity participation.

Another important point which the hon. Diwan Chaman Lall raised relates to whether all these conditions for manufacture of biscuits, etc. are contained in the letter of intent or the licence. Now, normally at the time of the issue of the licence we do not mention these conditions but only when we approve the actual agreements. In the first instance we approve the terms on which the Indian manufacturer should enter into collaboration with the foreigner. Then he goes to the foreign collaborator and if he is agreeable to the terms, the manufacturer draws up the agreement and files it before the Government. At that stage we put all these conditions. Therefore there should be no apprehension about the conditions with regard to the production of special biscuits.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: The agreement has not been signed ?

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA : That has not been signed. What we do is this. He says that he has come to this agreement with the firm. Then, we modify it this way. With our modifications we give it to him. We give him authorisation to enter into collaboration on particular terms. Then, he goes to them and signs the agreement. It is then ratified or recognised by the Government. At this stage we say, put these conditions also. Therefore, there is no apprehension that he will go back on the

[Shri D. Sanjivayya.] assurances given by him. If there is any other question which hon. Members would like to ask, they may do so.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : There is no provision in the rules.

REFERENCE TO CALLING ATTENTION NOTICE

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : I have one submission to make, not with regard to that: All that I want to know from you is this." Will you kindly convey to the hon. Minister that the House has expressed with an overwhelming majority, strong sentiments against it and that it should be respected ?

One thing I would like to say if you think you can convey it. Mr. Sachindra Chaudhuri has made a statement in the other House about identical matters we raised in our House. I also requested in the Calling Attention Notice to the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister that he should come here and make a statement with regard to the alleged letter—I say so to be on the safe side—by Mr. N. S. Hoon. Now, Mr. Sachindra Chaudhuri has not even cared to come to this House and make any statement. Yet the charges are very serious. One charge was that when he was a lawyer he was working for both the plaintiff and defendant companies . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Gupta, the Lok Sabha is adjourning today. We are sitting on Friday.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The second charge is that he has admitted—I have knowledge now from the other House—that he had asked these people to apologise to Orr, Dignam and Company, with whom he has been associated for forty years. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would request you, it is an extraordinary thing that

has happened. Searches have been made and the Finance Minister took the initiative to tender an apology to the owners of the bouse where the search took place. This has never happened. Searches have been made before, but never such a thing has happened. Therefore, Mr. Sachindra Chaudhuri should come and tell us why he was so afraid of Orr, Dignam and Company and what motivated him in taking this extraordinary step in offering an apology or an apology to be offered to them on his behalf.

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh) : Shall we expect a statement the day after tomorrow ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Well, we shall see.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : This, I think, you will agree.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : That will do. You have finished Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. There is a message. Secretary.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE PUNJAB REORGANISATION BILL, 1966

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha :—

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Punjab Reorganisation Bill, 1966, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 7th September, 1966."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

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

The House then adjourned at forty-five minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 9th September, 1964