

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Whatever he has said should be expunged from the proceedings.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Otherwise, the other side should be given a chance to reply to Mr. Dahyabhai Patel on the point he made. I insist on Mr. Dahyabhai Patel that he should deny what Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said yesterday . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chandra Shekhar, this is no point of order. The business will go on.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): On a point of order, Madam. You asked them to sit down but even then they have been speaking. What I am urging before you, Madam, is that it is very right that you should direct that all these statements made after you ordered them to sit down be expunged.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. It is not there in the Rules.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: May I say that it is left to the consideration of the Chair?

I would also like to request every hon. Member of this House not to raise points of order when there is no point of order. Mr. T. N. Singh.

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, the Foreign Minister is here in the House. Let him contradict what Mr. Dahyabhai Patel has said.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have already called the next item on the Order Paper.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: It is a question of privilege.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): Lest a wrong impression should be created, I would like to say that this is a very peculiar way of just saying something and then saying that the Govern-

ment should either contradict or confirm what has been said. We do not really carry on the Government in that form, somebody produces a piece of paper and then says we should either confirm it or contradict it. The entire thesis upon which Mr. Patel has built up his argument has been repudiated by the Prime Minister and by the Finance Minister.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: When did he deny it? He never said anything like that. He has not repudiated it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order, Madam. You closed the discussion and all of us sat down. Those two hon. Members raised points of order and you allowed them. I have no quarrel with it but now I find that the Foreign Minister is embarking on the subject which we have closed. We would like it to be discussed but you did not allow us to discuss. Now . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The Foreign Minister can reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If he is prepared to say something, then we should be allowed to ask questions. Therefore, either he chooses silence for the moment or, if he wants to explain in this way, we should also get the right to ask him questions.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): Yes, Madam.

THE INDUSTRIES (DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION) AMENDMENT BILL, 1965

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND SUPPLY (SHRI T. N. SINGH): Madam, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951, be taken into consideration."

This is a very small Bill. It seeks to modify section 18A of the Act. Section 18A of the Act empowers the Government to assume management and control of any scheduled industry. Now, it has been noticed Madam, that it is very difficult to anticipate the period for which control by the Government should continue on a particular industry after its take over. While it would not be proper to have an unlimited period, it has been thought proper to have extension after the first take-over of five years for a period of two years at a time. Every time before extension, the position will be reviewed as to whether the Government will continue its management and control or not. To safeguard the interests of the share holders it has also been laid down in the amending Bill that the total period of such extensions shall not exceed ten years in any case. Thus we have taken care to see that the management and control is for a period which does not exceed a day more than is necessary. For that reason, this provision has been made in the amending Bill.

I have nothing else to say Madam. The Act did not limit the period for control which was not proper and now we have provided for two yearly extensions from time to time after review by the Government.

The question was proposed

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh)
Madam, this Bill is quite non-controversial. It is true that it is difficult to envisage the entire period for which extension would be required and also it is correct that longer than necessary period should not be availed of. In view of both these considerations, this amending Bill deserves our support.

On this occasion, I should like to put forth a few suggestions. In the first place, there should be some Standing Committee to decide which particular industrial establishment deserves to be taken over by the Government because there have been cases when decisions are taken arbitrarily and the

demand of the workers that the establishment should be taken over is ignored. I should like to suggest that a Standing Committee consisting of representatives of the Central Labour Organisations should be constituted and that Committee should be empowered to take decisions regarding the taking over of industrial establishments. Further, whenever there is a demand by the workers it should be taken proper note of. For example, both the textile mills at Sholapur are not functioning for the last so many months and the workers of those mills have been demanding such a step from the Government but their demand has been completely ignored. There are a number of examples and there have been a number of examples of this type where the workers have been demanding but their voice is quite ignored.

One more suggestion which I would like to put forth is that before the Government takes over any particular industrial establishment an opportunity should be given to the workers of that particular establishment to run that establishment themselves because I am confident that, even as the Government has to avail of the services of the technicians when the mills or establishments are taken over and also have to divert some of its funds for running them, if the same aid that is in the form of services of technicians and in the form of funds is given to the workers it is very likely—rather I am sure—that the workers would be able to conduct their own industrial establishments. Aided by the Government if the workers are given this opportunity, we will have started a new experiment of labourising the industry which would be more beneficial as compared to the governmentalisation of the industry.

There are some other complaints regarding the functioning of the industries or establishments taken over by the Government. I would only like to suggest that there should be no discrimination in the treatment given to the workers in other private establishments and in those taken over by the Government.

Thank you

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) Madam Deputy Chairman, generally we support this measure. But the point that I would like to make in this connection is that the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, in the first instance needs to be improved upon by a comprehensive amendment in the light of the experience we have gained because it has been found that in some cases it is not effective to deal with the situation that arises in the corporate sector in the private sector of our industries. Secondly, we would also like to make the point that this Industries (Development and Regulation) Act is not being properly administered and applied effectively in order to bring the industries under the control of the Government where the situation so demands.

I will deal with the last point first. Here we have got the example of a number of concerns belonging to Sahu Jain. As you know, the Government itself under the Companies Act appointed an investigation. Well the task was given to a Special Inspector and I think it was Mr Chopra. Anyhow the Government Resolution said that there were certain *prima facie* allegations against them which had been revealed in the Vivian Bose Enquiry Commission Report and it was on the basis of that that they acted in this matter. There were also similar other allegations about these companies being mismanaged, their funds being defalcated and the shareholders' interests being compromised and so on. We brought it to the notice of the Government and they appointed a special investigation under the Companies Act but what exactly was needed in that situation was to take over those ten concerns—I think it was five concerns to begin with that were mentioned in their Resolution appointing the investigation—under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. I do not see why the Asoka Services Ltd. should not be taken over. It is an instrument of monopoly capital and the machinery is being utilised to indulge in all kinds of malpractices. Bennett Coleman is another concern against which serious allegations had been made and it has also been pointed

out in this House and the other House that the Bennett Coleman & Co were not only not co-operating with the Special Inspector but were actually obstructing his work and various steps were taken by proceedings in the High Court and so on apart from withholding material papers and documents for inspection so much so that even this Government which is very very pro monopolistic had to carry out some raids on the Alipore residence of Mr S P Jain in order to seize certain papers. And one of the concerns in this category is the New Central Jute Mill in Budge Budge. The New Central Jute Mill was raided and a number of documents were seized and among the seized documents were found some of the documents which they did not produce before the Vivian Bose Commission. I am saying this because the Government knows all about it and they should think about this matter. It is quite clear from the operations of these concerns that have been revealed in the Report of the Vivian Bose Commission that these concerns need to be taken over in the interests of public economy and of the shareholders under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. Not only the Government did not take them over under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act but when the Government appointed a Special Inspector in respect of some of them even those were not taken over although there was public demand for it that they should be taken over under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. The Government should have full control of these concerns they should look into them and protect the interests of the shareholders the workers and others. So this is an example of how even after very startling revelations have been made by a proper enquiry the Government did not apply this particular Act.

Then Madam as you know the Sholapur Mills were taken over some time back because of certain mismanagement. If the Sholapur Mills can be taken over under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, I do not see as to why the Sahu Jain concerns, more especially those which are under cloud of all kinds

of suspicious dealing and malpractices should be allowed to go scot-free without being subjected to control by Government. What comes in their way I do not know except that some powerful influences are at work which do not allow such companies being taken over. There are many other similar cases but this is a concrete case.

I can give you another example that of Jessop & Co. After the Mundhra deal or the Mundhra scandal—whatever you call it—the Government entered the Jessop & Co. in Calcutta. It is really a gold mine from the point of view of earning and it does very useful work from the point of view of the national economy as a whole. It is an important engineering concern in the country and yet this is not being taken over under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. In fact Jessop & Co. should be nationalised, it should not be allowed to remain in the hands of private elements directly or indirectly. This is another example I can give you.

Madam, I repeat here that the Sahu Jain concerns, especially those which have been named in the Vivian Bose Enquiry Commission Report—all the ten of them I think—should have been taken over under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, and if they have not done it they should do it now. Therefore I say that the Government is failing in the administration of this Act. The intention of the Act was not merely to allow the Government to come into the picture when the situation went beyond control and when the concern is about to go into liquidation. The purpose of the Act was to arm the Government with the necessary power to regulate the development and expansion of our industry in the interest of the economy and the public. That the Sahu Jain concerns are not behaving in this manner has been revealed in the various Reports and even in the Government statements. And still why is not Government acting promptly and vigorously when they have been armed with such powers?

Here I give another example from Calcutta. In this House I raised it. I brought to the notice of the House the question of the Rivers Steam Navigation Company Limited, which is under the management of McNeill and Barry Limited, a British concern of Lord Inchcape and so on. Now, what happened? When it was pointed out by the employees and the officers of this particular concern, Indian nationals that the Company was being mismanaged, the Government did not take any action. On the contrary, I pointed out in this House—and materials had been sent to the Ministry—how the funds advanced by the Government were being mismanaged or being defalcated and misused by the management on account of overhead charges and so on. The Government did not even audit their accounts for a long time. In the meanwhile, huge grants from the Government in the name of expansion and of running the shipping concern, inland shipping, were being diverted to all kinds of purposes for which the money was not given. Now, here the other day I asked the hon. Minister a question as to how much he had advanced to the Rivers Steam Navigation Company Limited. He did not disclose it, although he was in possession of all relevant facts. He should have known that I was also in possession of all relevant facts because these are known facts in Calcutta and we have got many people in that there are strong unions there and so on. He did not divulge it. Now, naturally people were shocked in Calcutta as to why the hon. Minister did not even reveal it. Now, I tell you this is the advance made by the Government. Instead of using the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, what the Government was doing was to advance lavishly funds to the Company without looking into their accounts, without ensuring that the funds would be properly utilised. The figures are—

Ways and means advance

1958		Rs 18 lakhs
1964	do	Rs 60 lakhs
1965	do	Rs 30 lakhs

Bill, 1965

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

Between 1962 and 1965 for fleet rehabilitation they advanced Rs 48 lakhs. Taking these four items together, the Central Government have advanced Rs 156 lakhs to the Rivers Steam Navigation Company. I may inform you again that the Government of India has been very charitable because no sooner the taking over was signed than the Indian Government gave them a further loan of Rs 30 lakhs. Now, when they took it over, what they have done is this. They have bought certain shares at a nominal price. When the hon. Minister said that he had bought these shares for one pound nominal price. I asked him how much money he had advanced. He did not reveal it, but then the game would be out, because the Company had a minus, debit account. Its liabilities are big. Even so, after taking it over, they had advanced Rs 30 lakhs. The Government should have acted much earlier. As you know, the Company has been making huge trading losses since 1959 as follows—

1959	Rs 4 96 lakhs loss
1960	Rs 39 63 lakhs loss
1961	Rs 5 71 lakhs loss
1962	Rs 88 86 lakhs loss
1963	Rs 107 44 lakhs loss
1964	Rs 140 00 lakhs loss
1965 (Budget)	Rs 135 lakhs loss

This is the catalogue of losses suffered by this particular Company. The allegations against them were that the moneys taken for building ships were being utilised for certain other things and here the Government did not do anything at all. The British owners (Lord Inchcape's family) and the Managers in Calcutta, Macneil and Barry Ltd have just ruined the Company by their policy of extravagance, misappropriation, mismanagement and all sorts of malpractices. If the books of this Company are ever audited and scrutinised by independent auditors, the truth will come out. This has been stated in a memorandum and also I believe in a letter to the Government but

the point is this. Even then the Government did not act and they allowed time to pass and allowed these people to remove the money.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How long will you speak?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: A few minutes more. This catalogue is big, but anyway I will cut it short. When you say acquisition of shares by the Government, that does not meet the requirements of the situation. Purchase of 80 per cent or even 100 per cent shares of this Company need not mean any asset. On the other hand, what the Government has purchased is nothing but 80% of the net liabilities—excess of liabilities over assets, as on 31-12-1964 and thus it has become directly liable to meet 80 per cent of the Company's liabilities to the extent of Rs 116 lakhs—the net liabilities of the Company is Rs 145 lakhs—plus the immediate prospect of meeting recurring liabilities. Now, if I had time I would have given you much more details because we have studied this concern, the working of this concern and we are armed with absolutely reliable materials. Indeed on the basis of that we make it possible for the Government to act, but here was a case where the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act should have been applied much earlier in order to ensure that public moneys were not wasted in order to ensure that the Company was well run, in order to ensure that overhead charges did not become a contrivance for misusing the funds advanced even from the Government and running the Company to ruin in this manner.

I mention this again and again because the Rivers Steam Navigation Company is a concern which runs inland shipping from Bengal to Assam and so on up to that part. Now, here it was in the interests of the nation that it should have been better looked after and Government had power under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, but they did not do so.

They completely connived at it. I demand therefore an enquiry now by the Ministry of Finance by the SPE and if I may say so by the CBI as to the manner in which the Company had been functioning ever since 1959 and I demand that this Company be taken over by the Government and nationalised. As far as what compensation should be paid is concerned it will be determined later on if you pay at all any compensation because what you are getting really are liabilities. That is the situation.

Another case. Let me come to Kanpur. Here Madam there are certain concerns in Kanpur which should be taken over under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act but that is not being done. They belong to the Ram Ratan Gupta group of industries. What happens? Though many things had been revealed about these concerns and the matter had been debated they did not take over any of these concerns. On the contrary they would not recover Rs. 17 lakhs due from Mr. Ram Ratan Gupta to the LIC. When we brought it to the notice of the House—I think in 1958 and 1959—the hon. Minister gave an assurance that steps would be taken. It was disclosed in this House that certain properties would be auctioned. That was six years ago. I believe, but uptill now I shall inform hon. Members of this House none of this property had been auctioned at all. Meanwhile the Government allowed him to shift to transfer the properties in the names of others. Even when the Government went to auction the property and realise the debt it could not be auctioned and the money had not been recovered. I would like to ask. Is this how you are going to regulate the industries in our country? You should have applied the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. What prevented the Government from applying the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act in the case of this particular concern belonging to the Ram Ratan Gupta group which had given such an account of itself by an action of it and which owed so much money to the public in the form of LIC loans advanced?

Madam Deputy Chairman I may inform you that when a civil warrant of arrest

was issued against Mr. Ram Ratan Gupta, he went abroad and the warrant lapsed. The Government went to the court of law to have the warrant cancelled. Imagine the LIC filing a petition to have the warrant cancelled. Later on under the pressure of public opinion and questions in this House and the other House the warrant had been issued. But Mr. Gupta knows how to get a passport when a warrant comes and he leaves abroad. This is the position. Up to now many of us perhaps had been arrested but Mr. Ram Ratan Gupta had never been even subjected to a civil arrest for which he has eminently qualified himself.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Mr. Bhupesh Gupta there are other speakers too.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA What is the time allotted for this?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN One hour.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Therefore, Madam, I just mention this particular case. I can mention very many cases.

What I would like to say in the end is, you have by all means this particular amendment. Take them over. I am surprised that they are talking about negotiations with the son of Mr. Pratap Singh Kairon. You take over his concern. After the report, the first thing Government should do is to take over under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act all the concerns which have been mentioned in this report accused of shady transactions and so on. That is how the matter should be handled. The Industries (Development and Regulation) Act should be a weapon for fighting corruption, mismanagement and other evils and also for controlling the monopolist elements. That is how it should be administered. Today we are facing a situation where bold action is needed, and the weapon you have got in your hand. Use it, strengthen it, as indeed you are strengthening it a little today. It is not a question of four or five years. Many many concerns need to be taken over under the Industries (Develop-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta] ment and Regulation) Act I need not name them But in every industrial city you go, workers will tell you in Bombay, in Kanpur in Calcutta, in Madras and so on which are the concerns which are being mismanaged and whose funds are being misused and run against the interests of the country and the national economy If you take over these concerns it would be advantageous to the economy as a whole and also bring you certain resources With this also is involved the question of employment and so on I am not going into that aspect of the matter I have no hesitation in extending to him the powers he demands, but I would only appeal to him to have courage If you are a Minister of Industry have courage to act against these people have courage to take over, if necessary, the Birla concern, the Hindustan Motors, and other things under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, because the cost accounting is very bad there Therefore, have the courage to act against the monopolist elements I think the measure should get our support, and I think the whole country will support the Government if the Government knows how effectively and wisely to use this particular measure to put these people in their right place and save the industries and the commercial undertakings in our country from being ruined and mismanaged and run in the manner in which I have mentioned in the case of some

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab)
Madam I do not know anything at all about the cases mentioned by Mr Bhupesh Gupta, but unfortunately, Mr Bhupesh Gupta has not drawn the right conclusion as he should have done from the provisions of this particular measure According to the old measure, there was an unlimited time for the Government to function in taking over any particular industry With this amendment my hon friend limits that time It is said in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that no further extension appears to be permissible under the proviso, I do not know where my hon friend gets this particular view from If he

would only look at the proviso under the old Act, it says

Provided that the Central Government if it is of opinion that it is expedient in public interest so to do, may direct that any such notified order shall continue to have effect after the expiry of the period of five years aforesaid for such period as may be specified in the direction, etc

It may be an unlimited period It may be easily an unlimited period How can it be otherwise than an unlimited period? For such period may be one hundred years But now my hon friend says, no, after the expiry of five years it shall be only ten years and no more and these next ten years should be with five lapses of two years each that is to say, an extension of the original period of five years for two years, for another two years, and so on until ten years But there is no limit as far as the original measure is concerned and it is going to be done in the public interest What is the public interest? Does the public interest cease after the five years or cease after the fifteen years? It does not The public interest is a continuous thing, and if it is to continue then why does the hon Minister limit himself to this particular period as he is limiting himself to this period? I suggest that in the original measure there was no limit to the period for which an extension could be taken, but in this particular amendment the hon Minister is limiting himself to a period of fifteen years altogether whereas in the original measure there was no limit whatsoever

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Is that so? I want the Minister to clarify that point It is a very important point We would like to have it clarified

SHRI T N SINGH I will do it

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL I think my hon friend when he gets up will probably explain the position Therefore it is not necessary at this particular stage for

my hon. friend here to interrupt me in regard to this particular matter.

Now what is the public interest? The public interest is not only in regard to mismanagement, as pointed out by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, of certain concerns. The public interest may be much wider than this particular mismanagement of a concern. It may be that it is in the interest of the State or interest of the public that a particular concern should be taken over and run by the Government. But when you are limiting the period of your occupation of this particular concern, then obviously the public interest ceases after a certain period, namely, 15 years. After that, even if it is in the public interest for my hon. friend to control this particular firm, he cannot do so under the law; whereas I hold that under the original measure he could do so. Now we are trying to introduce socialism. One of the weapons in introducing socialism is this particular power that the Government has in taking over a particular concern. Naturally, under the Constitution, you have to pay them a reasonable amount of compensation. You have the power to take it over, but you are limiting yourself under this amendment and you are not going to give yourself that particular authority to take over a particular concern even if it is in the public interest, and you can do so only for fifteen years. My hon. friend will probably explain this particular position.

My hon. friend talks about nationalisation. This is a weapon that certainly my hon. friend has for this particular purpose. It is said in the statement of Objects and Reasons that no further extension appears to be permissible under the proviso. I do not agree personally. But that is a minor point. The main point is that to which I have referred, namely, the divesting of authority which vests in the Government today to take over a concern and run it in the national and in the public interest. I hope that my hon. friend will be able to explain this particular point.

While supporting the Bill, I want to draw the attention of the learned Minister to one aspect of the management of industries taken over under this Act. When the management begins to mismanage the industry so grossly that this Act is invoked, one of the first victims is the workers. In almost every case in which the Government has been compelled to take over the managements of industrial units, it has been found that the workers' contributions to Provident Fund and their contribution to the Employees' State Insurance have not been deposited with the proper authorities by those responsible for the mismanagement of the units. When the Government takes over these units, the Government acts in a different way. Government does deposit the workers' contribution and the management's contribution to the Provident Fund authorities and the Employees' State Insurance authorities. But the Government is so illadvised as to treat the arrears of contributions of the workers to the Provident Fund and the Employees' State Insurance as other arrears which the concern has to pay, and these sums are paid out of the profits which the concern makes under the Government-appointed management, under the authorised Controller's management. That acts harshly on the workers because there are certain benefits of the Employees' State Insurance and the Provident Fund Scheme which are available to the workers only if their contributions have been deposited with the proper authorities. The workers are denied all those benefits if the contributions which have been deducted from the workers' wages are not deposited with the proper authorities. When the Government takes over a concern, it makes certain investments in order to run the unit. If a cotton mill is taken over, the Government has to make investments, or make guarantees to the banks for procuring cotton, stores and other requisites for running the mill. The arrears which are due to workers or which are due in payment of the workers' contributions to the Employees' State Insurance and the Provident Fund should also be treated in the same manner as the immediate requirements of running the unit, because if the human force which is employed in the industry suffers and does not get the benefit for

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh):
Madam I rise to support the Bill.

[Shri Arjun Arora.]
which it has already paid by way of deduction from its wages, the running of the concern will not be smooth

With these words, Madam, I support the Bill

SHRI M M DHARIA (Maharashtra):
Madam, I am here to support the contention of Diwan Chaman Lall, because I feel that by this particular amendment which is brought before the House by the hon. Minister, we are going to restrict the period to ten years. If we go through the previous Section, I mean the Section in the Act as it stands, Section 18A, it says—

“Provided that the Central Government, if it is of opinion that it is expedient in public interest so to do, may direct that any such notified order shall continue to have effect after the expiry of the period of five years aforesaid for such further period as may be specified in the direction and where any such direction is issued, a copy thereof shall be laid, as soon as may be, before both Houses of Parliament”

According to that, after five years, for any period as the Government would deem fit and proper, the Government could issue the direction, and it would have been possible to have the management for a number of years. By this amendment what we are doing is, we are going to fix the time limit for ten years, five or five years and then afterwards it could be increased by margins of two years, by placing a copy of the direction before both Houses of Parliament

So, what I feel is that instead of having an amendment of this sort, if we have here an amendment like this—

for a further period as may be specified in the direction or directions issued from time to time, and where any such

direction or directions are issued, a copy thereof shall be laid on the Tables of both Houses of Parliament”,

it is possible to overcome the difficulty that is in the mind of the hon. Minister. The Bill is fortunately introduced here in the Rajya Sabha and if we do not want to restrict that time for ten years, then this sort of amendment should not be inserted and we should not make any hurry in having this amendment. I think that proper care will be taken by the hon. Minister

My second point is regarding the public interest to be safeguarded. I entirely agree with the feelings of the hon. Minister, and if these public interests are to be safeguarded, then I think the two important aspects would be the stoppage of production and unemployment. If there is any stoppage of production or if there is any unemployment then naturally we shall have to resort to the provisions as are envisaged in the Bill. As Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has rightly referred to in Maharashtra State the Sholapur Mill is closed for several years. There are several legal difficulties of which I am aware. The Mill used to employ nearly 15,000 people and they are jobless. Similarly, there are mills at Akola, there is one mill at Buldhana and there is another mill at Aurangabad, which are also closed and there are so many mills likely to be closed in the years to come.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Under Section 18A it restricts it to five years and here the extension is for two years. You will see, therefore, that it is not unlimited there. If this is so it is a progress. What you say is a general thing. Actually, if you have in mind Section 18A of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act there the power is restricted to five years, it is not unlimited and when you have got five years you have the additional period of two years. Am I right?

SHRI T N SINGH: Yes

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA What they are trying to do is to have a little more power in order to extend the period of renewal of the order

SHRI M M DHARIA In that case, as I have suggested, it is possible to have an amendment in the upper part. So far as the present amendment is concerned, we shall have to make it clear that it will not be restricted to ten years. We are restricting it to ten years.

SHRI T N SINGH Fifteen years

SHRI M M DHARIA I am sorry, five years and ten years, we are restricting it to fifteen years. If we have to take over an industry, perhaps we will have to take it over for a few years together. What I would submit is that the Government shall have to think in these terms. This Bill is meant for those who are trying to evade the various responsibilities cast under the various Acts. There are various industrialists who say as we have read the news today from Punjab that it is not possible for those people to pay the minimum wage of Rs 125 per month and nearly 15,000 employees are likely to be unemployed and thrown out of job. How are we going to protect these industries and these employees? For these things, my submission to the hon Minister would be that safeguarding the public interest means preventing the stoppage of production and also safeguarding the interests of the unemployed and from this point of view, there should be no restriction whatsoever on the orders of taking over the management. And that is the only submission that I have to make. Thank you very much.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, the **VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M P BHARGAVA)** in the Chair

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालाल जोरडिया:
(मध्य प्रवेश) उप सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, उद्योगों के विकास की दृष्टि में जो संशोधन विधेयक प्रस्तुत किया गया है उसका इरादा तो बहुत नेक है मगर नेक इरादे भी अगर गलत आदमियों के हाथों में पहुँच जायें—अगर उत्तरा बन्दर के हाथ में दे दिया जाय तो हजामत बनाने की बजाय अपनी खुद की नाक काट लेगा या किसी दूसरे की नाक काट लेगा—वैसे ही इरादा तो हमारे शासन का बहुत अच्छा है कि हमारे देश में उद्योगों का विकास हो, परन्तु हमारे इस मन्त्रालय के मंत्री महोदय—आज के नहीं उनके पहले के—जैसे भी रहे कि समद सदस्यों के पत्रों का जवाब देना भी वे उपयुक्त नहीं समझते थे, इतना ही नहीं उसको एकनालेज करने में भी उनको शर्म लगती थी। ऐसी स्थिति थी। किसी समद सदस्य की कोई व्यक्तिगत फैक्टरी नहीं चलती और जिसकी चलती होगी वे इधर उधर जाने लगे और कुछ करते लगे, उनमें मेरा मतलब नहीं है, मगर जिस क्षेत्र में जो समद सदस्य हो कर आते हैं उनका एक फर्ज होता है कि इस बात के लिये काशिश करे कि उनके क्षेत्र में औद्योगिकरण हो, उनके यहाँ उद्योग चले। तो बजाय इसके कि मंत्री महोदय उनकी मांग पर विचार करते, “ग्रान मैग्निटुड” उमरे ऊपर निर्णय करते कि अमुक उद्योग का चलाना चाहिये या नहीं चलाना चाहिये, उन्होंने उसको एकनालेज करना, उनके पत्र का जवाब देना तक, ठीक नहीं समझा। यह स्थिति आज तक विद्यमान थी, अभी क्या स्थिति है मैं नहीं कह सकता। तो इस स्थिति को देखना होगा।

दूसरे, उद्योगों का चलाने के लिये खास तौर पर विदेशी मुद्रा, कच्चा माल, और

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया]
परमिट, इन तीन चीजों का झगड़ा रहता है और ये सारी हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यहां पर अपने हाथ में केन्द्रित कर रखी है और इस केन्द्रीयकरण के परिणामस्वरूप यह होता है कि यहां पर अगर मंत्री महोदय स्वयं भी प्रयत्न करें और स्वीकार करें कि यह जस्टीफाइड केम है तो भी मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि वे उस मामले को पूरा करने में समर्थ नहीं हो सकते हैं। मुझे मध्य प्रदेश के एक दो केम मालूम है। बेचारे कोई संसद सदस्य थे, वे अपने क्षेत्र में उद्योग खुलवाने के लिये इधर उधर जाकर मंत्री महोदय के पास पहुंचे, सब के पास पहुंचे। उत्तर मिल गया कि यह कारखाना नहीं खल सकता क्योंकि इसमें बड़ी कठिनाई है, फारेन एक्सचेंज की कमी है। मगर एक कंपनी जो यहां पर लिएजोन का काम करती है उसने उनसे कहा, हमको तीन परमेन्ट कमीशन दे दो, हम दफ्तर से दो महीने के अन्दर सारा दिलवा देंगे, फारेन एक्सचेंज की दिक्कत मिट जायेगी, सारा कच्चा माल मिल जायेगा। पहले भी इस पर जब जब चर्चा हुई थी तब मैंने कहा था कि हमारे यहां दिल्ली में ऐसे लोग काम करते हैं और जब तक हम इन प्राइवेट चैनल्स में काम नहीं करवाते तब तक हमारे काम पूरे होते नहीं और उद्योग का विकास नहीं होता और अगर बीच में दलालों से मिल कर उनको कमीशन देकर काम करवाए ता हो जाता है। इस दृष्टि से यह अत्यन्त आवश्यक है कि मंत्री जी इस बात का प्रयत्न करें और देखें कि ये कौन लोग ऐसे हैं जो इस तरह से हमारे यहां ठीक व्यवस्था में गड़बड़ फैलाने हैं। दूसरे, अगर उद्योगों का विकास करना है तो प्रत्येक प्रान्त को इस बात की छूट दे दी जाये कि जिससे उनके यहां जो उद्योग व चाहते हैं उनका एक कोटा बांध दीजिए किन्तु अविकसित क्षेत्र हों तो उनको ज्यादा, विकसित हों तो कम, दीजिये। उनके लिये यह भी व्यवस्था आप कर दीजिये कि जिसको चाहे वह लाइसेंस

दे सकेंगे, और जो विदेशी मुद्रा चाहिये वे दे सकेंगे। अगर आप ऐसा करेंगे तो यह जो आरोप इस प्रकार के लगाये जाते हैं वह भी कम हो जायेंगे।

आप यह कानून बना रहे हैं कि दस साल की अवधि बढ़ा सकें, दो दो साल करके पीरियड बढ़ा सके। यह ठीक ही है। मध्य प्रदेश में राजनन्द गांव में एक मिल थी, वह मिल ठीक तरह से नहीं चलती थी तो सरकार ने टेकओवर कर लिया। इसका उल्टा परिणाम यह हुआ कि थोड़े दिनों वह मिल चल सकी फिर वह फेल हो गयी और जो मूल झगड़े की जड़ थी वह थी मजदूरों की आपसी खीचातानी, और उसमें भी कुछ ही लोग थे, जिसके परिणामस्वरूप समस्त मजदूरों को तकलीफ उठानी पड़ी और वह उद्योग भी काम नहीं कर सका। इसलिये यह अत्यन्त आवश्यक है कि सरकार को उसमें सक्रिय भाग लेकर ऐसे तत्व जो कारखाने को चलाने में बाधक होते हैं और अगर स्पष्टतः मालूम पड़ता है कि ये मुख्य दो चार आदमी ऐसे हैं जो लोगों को भ्रम में डाल कर हमारे कारखाने को उत्पादन करने नहीं देते तो उन लोगों को हटा कर कारखाने को चलाया जा सके या तो हमें बिल्कुल स्पष्ट कर देना चाहिये इसको कि ये ये खराबियां हैं और अगर सरकार पूर्णरूपेण टेकओवर करना चाहे तो उसका कम्पेनमेंशन तय करें और सरकार उसको अपने हाथ में लेकर उसको ठीक तरह से चलाने की व्यवस्था करें। जो कारखाना कच्चे माल का उप-लब्धि के आधार पर और अन्य सभी आधार के कारण लाभ में चल सकते हैं वही मशीनरी खराब होने से या आपसी झगड़ों के कारण असफल भी हो सकते हैं। तो यह जो चीज राजनन्द गांव में चली तो इस राजनन्द गांव के झगड़े को देख कर के उस कारखाने को जल्दी से जल्दी सुचारू रूप से चलाने की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये।

एक बड़ी विचित्र व्यवस्था हमारे देश में चलती है कि होना तो यह चाहिये कि जो पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्र हैं उनको विशेष अनुज्ञा पत्र दीजिए, विदेशी मुद्रा भी दीजिए, लेकिन हमारे व्यापारी लोग भी इतने तेज हो गये कि पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्रों के नाम पर विदेशी मुद्रा पर्मिट ले लेते हैं, जैसा कि मैं मिसाल के तौर पर बताऊँ कि अभी मध्य प्रदेश के नाम पर देवास में एक कारखाना खोले जाने की बात थी और वह जाकर गुजरात के नदियात नामक स्थान पर खोला गया। तो किसी क्षेत्र के विकास करने की दृष्टि से योजना बनाई जाय और उसके लिये दूसरी जगह में खर्चा हो जाय तो यह न्यायसंगत प्रतीत नहीं होता। इस दृष्टि से मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से प्रार्थना करूँगा कि इस दिशा में भी कुछ करेंगे तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा और जो तीन बातें मैंने कहीं, उनको ध्यान में रख कर हमारी सरकार कारखाने स्थापित करेगी तो ठीक होगा।

राजस्थान के एक मित्र कह रहे थे कि हमारे यहाँ पर घड़ी का कारखाना खोलने के लिये विदेशी भी सहयोग देने के लिये तैयार हैं मगर एक साल हो गया उनकी अर्जी एक टेबल से दूसरी टेबल पर ही जा रही है—एप्लाइ एप्लाइ नो रिप्लाइ। कुछ लोगों में ऐसी धारणा हो गई है—और वह सही धारणा है—कि अगर उसमें थोड़ा बजन पड़ जाय और चाहे जो एजसी यहाँ पर काम करती है उसी के माध्यम से बजन पड़ जाय तो काम बन सकता है।

तो मेरा कहना है कि जो एक सत्ता आपने अपने हाथ में केन्द्रित कर रखी है उसको प्रान्तों में विकेंद्रित कीजिएगा और जो बेईमानी चलती है उसको रोकने का प्रयत्न करेंगे तो बहुत अच्छी बात होगी।

श्री عبدالغनी (पंजाब) : वृत्त

चेयरमैन صاحب - मेरे खुशी है

156 RSD.—4.

के सरकार रजम और दिया चाहती है -
 खोब लें - चूं के सरकार की मन्शा ये
 है के जहाँ के हैं भी इन्डस्ट्रियल इन्वैस्टि-
 में ये के के जस ने समझा लिया हो वे
 अपने किसी इन्डस्ट्री के तहत इस काम को न
 जलाने या केमिनी में जेकरा हो और न
 काम चलें और इस में इन्डस्ट्री को भी
 देहा लें और मजदूरों को भी जो वहाँ
 काम करते हैं, तो इस में आप ये
 चाहते हैं के पाने साल की बचत
 मेहनत और जेहा दी जाँ - दो दो साल
 कर के दस साल और कर दिया जाँ - मेरे
 कौनो اعتراض नहीं लेकिन मैंने, वॉन्स
 चेर में साब - عرض करना चाहता
 हों के के सरकार واقعی इस नेत से चल
 रही है के मजदूरों को زیاده काम -
 इन्डस्ट्री को देहा न लें, मैंने इसा
 मेकसुस नहीं करना - जस बचत को
 जे सोशलस्टिक बचत कहा है और
 जस की تعریف करते हमारी ऑडिशेल
 पार्टी तेकनी नहीं इस ने लाकहों
 मजदूरों को یریشان कर दिया है एक ही
 चोट में के अन पर ۲۵ की बचत
 एक سو पचेस कर दिया है, पार लूम
 वालों पर - वे जानते हैं के मेहनत
 में जलने भी लूक हैं अन के एक
 एक दो दो पार लूम हों, زیاده को
 के दिया पचेस पर हम دعاوی कर دیں
 گے - اس سے اوپر امید ہے اور زیاده
 دامت کر دیں گے تو اس پر آدمی کے لئے

[عمری عبدالغنی]

رعایت کرنا—اور اس طرح سے مزدوروں کو لہذا میں زیادہ جاگرتی تھی انہوں نے کہہ دیا ہم ایسا کریں گے۔ ایجنٹیشن کریں گے۔ لیکن مہاراشٹر میں کہیں زیادہ ہے پنجاب سے اور صوبوں سے۔ تو کھا سرکار واقعی یہ سمجھتی ہے کہ اس سے دھکا نہیں لگے گا انڈسٹری کو۔

دوسری بات، وائس چیرمین صاحب۔ میں عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ کمپنیوں میں خرابیاں ہیں شری بھوپیش کہتا جی نے آج نہایت دستار کے ساتھ تفصیل کے ساتھ کئی کمپنیوں کا ذکر کیا ہے۔

میری کچھ بد نصیبی ہوئی اور میں متحسوس کرتا ہوں جس آکس ہاؤس کے ممبر ہونے کا حق مجھے نصیب ہوا ہے کہ یہاں کمپنیوں کمپنیوں کے درمیان رعایت کی جاتی ہے ایک ہی گناہ کے لئے اور ایک کمپنی کو جو ڈالیا جمن گروپ کے ساتھ تعلق رکھتی تھی اس کو رکھ دیا گیا اچھا کہ، لیکن جس کا تعلق بڑا ہے اور بڑا کے ساتھ ہیں سے تھا ان پر سرکار چلی سادہ بیٹھی ہے اور نندا جی کہتے ہیں کہ ۶۰ ایم۔ پیہز ان کی جیب میں ہیں۔ اگر کوئی اسی چلڈ پیارے چلڈ کے بارے میں شکایات کرتا

ہے اس کے باوجود کہ ان کا نام بلیک لسٹ میں آگیا ہے۔ ان کی تمام کمپنیوں کو آنا چاہئے۔ ان کو یہ درجہ لائسنس دینے گئے۔ اسٹیشنل سارٹیفیکٹ دے گئے اور اس سے بھی کوئی کام بنا نہیں۔ تو ہم سمجھتے ہیں کہ کہ سرکار کا مدعا یہ ہے کہ پارڈ گئے ہاتھ میں رکھ جس کا سر چاہے سچل دے۔ سرکار کے جب دل میں آتی ہے تو جس کو چاہے بخش دیتی ہے۔ اور جس کو نہ چاہے اس کو نہیں بخشتی۔ اس کے معنی یہ نہیں کہ وہ لیبر کو پناہ دینا چاہتی ہے یا انڈسٹریز کو اتھارنا چاہتی ہے۔ اگر ہے تو میں پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ آخر یہ جو پیار اور کے بارے میں یہ سچ سمجھے ایسا کیا گیا کہ ان پر زیادہ بڑھا دیا گیا تو اس میں کس کا دوش ہے؟

دوسری بات جو میں آپ کے نوٹس میں لانا چاہتا ہوں وہ یہ ہے کہ ہمارے ساتھ صاحب ایک شریف اور اچھی طبیعت کے منسٹر ہیں۔ ایک طرف تو ہم یہ چرچا کرتے ہیں کہ جتنا روپیہ ہے وہ ہمارے دیس میں رہے۔ یہ تو اچھی بات ہے لیکن ہم نے کیا کیا؟ ۱۹۶۲ میں جب ایمرجنسی لگی چرچا ہوئی۔ تو سارے دیس میں وائس چیرمین صاحب۔ یہ متحسوس کیا گیا کہ اس وقت جو

ہمارا رویہ ہے اس کو بچایا جائے - بلکہ دیش والوں کو جو صنعت کار ہیں ان کو زیادہ سے زیادہ مدد ملے - لیکن ہوا کیا - ہم نے فارن کنٹریز کو بڑا آرڈر اولین ٹاپس اور دا اول کے لئے دیا اور اس سے ہم نے کروڑوں روپیہ اپنے ملک سے اس کام کے لئے باہر بھجوا جب کہ ہماری بھلیں اپنے زیورں اور چھوٹے چھوٹے کانٹوں اور چوڑیوں کو جو سونے کی ہوتی تھیں دے دیں تھیں اس لئے کہ ہمارا فارن ایکسچینج بڑھ جائے - تو اس کے معنی کیا ہوئے - کہ بجائے دیسی اون کے اس وقت ہم نے اپنی دوجوں کو فوراً سامان دینا تھا اس لئے اس اول کو فوراً باہر سے ملگایا - لیکن ہم نے اس فارن ایکسچینج کو ضائع کیا اور وہ ضائع ہوا - میں اس بارے میں دعویٰ کرتا ہوں اور سہری کوئی تردید نہیں کر پائے گا کہ بڑا جھسے چنڈ موٹہ آدمیوں کو بلک اول دیا گیا اس کے بارے میں کس نے اس بات کی بھی چلتا نہیں کی کہ اس اول کا کچھ سامان فوراً فوج کے آدمیوں کو بھی بھجوا گیا یا نہیں - تو میں کہتا ہوں آپ چننا اختیار چاہتے ہیں لے لیجئے - چننا دے چاہے لے لیجئے کیوں کہ بغیر اختیار کے حکومت نہیں چلتی اور اگر کوئی انتہائی قس آگے کرنا چاہے تو جتنی جلدی قابو کر پائیں گے چننی دیر لے لیں کہ ہائیڈرین ادا اچھا ہے - میں کہتا چاہتا ہوں کہ جو - وچاروں کو چلا رہی ہے تو اس سرکار کی حالت یہ ہے کہ یہ تھپک ہے کہ

اندستہ سے اس کا واسطہ نہیں ہے لیکن لیڈر سے تعلق ہے - پی - ڈبلیو - قی - میں تمہیں برس سے جو لوگ کام کرتے چلے آ رہے ہیں وہ ابھی تک کچھ ہی ہیں یکے نہیں ہوئے ہیں - وہ ابھی نہ ڈیموگری ہیں سرکار انہیں پرمائیٹ نہیں کر رہی ہے اس طرح بھلائی اور روز کیلا کے کارخانے میں یا دوسرے کارخانے میں جہاں سرکار کام کرتی ہے - اور اسی طرح سے دیلوے میں اور دوسری جگہ کیا وہاں وہ یہ دیکھتی ہے کہ جہاں کام رک جاتا ہے یا کام اس ہمت کے ساتھ نہیں کر پاتے کیا یہ اپنی صنعت کو چاہے لڑے کی صنعت ہو دیکھتی ہے ؟ اس لئے کیا جواب ہے ان کے پاس اور انہوں نے اب تک کیا کچھ کہا ہے ؟ کتنی ترقی کی ہے - تو دوسرے کارخانے جسے لے لیتے ہیں جیسا کہ ابھی جوڑیا جی نے کہا کہ ' ایڈا اور اپنے کسی بہت (Pet) کو دے دیا اور اس طرح سے وہ سرکار کے تحت ہو گیا - ہار دن چلا کر اپنا مرزا لے کر قہر سے بیٹھ گئے - تو میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس سے کوئی زیادہ لاپہ ہونے والا نہیں ہے اگر آپ لاپہ دینے والے ہیں - میں مانتا ہوں کہ سرکار نے بعض ایسی کمپنیوں کو اپنی ادھار میں لیا ہے جنہوں نے بہت اچھا کام کیا ہے -

[شری عبدالغلی]

جس طرح سے کہ اسمال اسکول انڈسٹری اور ہائر پریچیزینگ کا ڈیپارٹمنٹ ہے - اس میں کھچو کھچو گڑی چلتی ہے ۱۹۶۲ تک ہم صرف چھ کروڑ روپیئے کا کام کر پائے ہیں لیکن ۱۹۶۴ تک ۱۹۶۳ تک ۱۹۶۲ تک اگر ایک ڈیپارٹمنٹ اس سے دوگنا کرتا ہے ۱ چھ کروڑ سے بارہ کروڑ تک کا کام کر سکتا ہے ۱ اس کی پیداوار بارہ کروڑ سے زیادہ ہو سکتی ہے تو اگر سرکار چاہے تو باقی سب جگہ پر کمپلیوں کے ذریعہ سے ان کی ترٹھوں کو پکڑے اور ان کو سزا دے - لیکن یہ سزا دے کی کیا - ؟ حالت یہ ہے کہ اگر ہائر پریچیزینگ ڈیپارٹمنٹ دو سال میں اتنی ترقی کر سکتا ہے تو گورنمنٹ کے ڈائریکٹ کنٹرول میں جو اپنے ادارے ہیں وہ اتنی ترقی کیوں نہیں کر سکتے ؟ اگر وہ اس طرح سے ترقی نہیں کر سکتے تو اس میں ضرور کہیں خامیاں ہیں -

میں مانتا ہوں کہ ٹی - این - سائیک صاحب جہاں یہ اختیارات لیتے ہیں وہاں پر ہائر پریچیزینگ ڈیپارٹمنٹ کے جو ڈائریکٹر صاحب شری ناچھا ہیں اس طرح کے قابل آدمی پیدا نہیں ہو سکتے جو دو سال میں آٹھ سال سے بھی زیادہ کام

کر سکتے ہیں - جو تدریجاً بارہ کروڑ کی پیداوار کر رہے ہیں - لیکن حالت یہ ہے کہ سرکار مشینری کے لئے امپورٹ لائسنس دیتی ہے لیکن اس کے پوزوں کے لئے امپورٹ کی اجازت نہیں دیتی ہے - جب مشین والے امپورٹ کرنے کے لئے درخواست کرتے ہیں بلکہ بنیہ پوزوں کے ہماری لیب بے کار ہو جائے گی جو ہم سرکار کو فارن ایکسچینج دینا چاہتے ہیں وہ بے کار ہو جائے گی تو وہاں پر ہمارے ٹیکسٹائل کمشنر صاحب بیٹھے بیٹھے حکم دیتے ہیں کہ تم دیسی پرزے خریدو لیکن یہ مشینری ایسی ہے کہ ہندوستان میں اس کے پرزے نہیں ملتے - جب ان سے کہا جاتا ہے کہ تم بتاؤ کہ کہاں پر پرزے ملتے ہیں ہم وہاں سے خرید لینگے تو اس کے بارے میں کوئی توجہ نہیں دی جاتی - ہائر پریچیزینگ ڈیپارٹمنٹ والے جب ان کو لکھتے ہیں کہ ان کی دقتیں ہیں اور وہ اس قسم کی ہیں اور ان کی دقتوں کو دور درو تو وہ منکھمہ جو ٹیکسٹائل کمشنر کے ماتحت ہے ۱ جس کے ذریعہ ساری انڈسٹری چلتی ہے وہ خامیوں کا غلط بیانی کرتا ہے - یہ ڈیپارٹمنٹ اتنا بے پروا ہے کہ منسٹری کے خدو تک کا معقول جواب نہیں دیتا - (Time bell rings.)

میں آپ کا حکم بجا لاتا ہوں - ہمارے منسٹر سنگھ صاحب جنہوں نے یہ نیا بوجھ اٹھایا ہے وہ یہ دیکھیں کہ انہوں نے ملک کی ایک بڑی ذمہ داری اٹھائی ہوئی ہے کہ جو اس طرح کی بے ایمانی ہوتی ہے اس کو روکیں - اگر کوئی بے ایمانی کرتا ہو جیسا کہ ابھی ہمارے شری بھوپندھ گپتا جی نے توجہ دلائی ہے کہ لوگ کس طرح کی بے ایمانی کرتے ہیں تو آپ کا کام ہے کہ آپ ان کو پکڑیں - اگر آپ نہیں پکڑتے اور جیسا کہ ۱۹۵۸ کے واقعہ میں آپ نے کہا اور مجھے یاد ہے کہ جذاب نے کئی بار جہاز رانی کی کمپنیوں کی طرف توجہ دلائی کہ کمپنیوں کمپنیوں میں امتیاز نہ ہو - اگر ایک ہاتھ سے سزا دیتے ہیں شولا پور مل والوں کو یا کسی دوسرے کو تو وہاں پر آپ اپنا مضبوط قندار سرمایہ دار پر نہیں بلکہ آفیشل پر پھینکیں جو سرکار کی طرف سے خراب کام کرتا ہے - جو مزدوروں کو تکلیف دیتا ہے اور جو مزدوروں کا سہارا نہیں لیتا -

میں آخری ایک عرض یہ کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ بھاکڑہ قلم جو ہم نے بنایا ہے وہ دنیا میں ایک بڑی طاقت رکھتا ہے وہ انڈسٹریز کے لئے کھیتی باڑی کے لئے بہت اچھا

کام ہے گا - لیکن وہاں کے مزدوروں نے جنہوں نے اس میں کام کیا کام ختم ہونے کے بعد ان کو دوسری جگہ کام دینا آپ کی ذمہ داری ہے - اگر مزدوروں کو لیبر ملے گا تو انڈسٹریز کو ترقی ملے گی کیوں کہ وہ انڈسٹریز کو بھائی نہیں لے اور کافی تعداد میں دیلے - لیکن اس کا پھل آپ کو ملے گا یا نہیں ملے گا یہ دیکھنا سرکار کا کام ہے - مہرا عرض کرنے کا مطالبہ ہے کہ سرکار اگر ادھیکار لینا چاہتی ہے تو لے لیکن ادھیکاروں کا استعمال ایسا نہ کرے جس سے کہ بدنامی ہو جائے - جس طرح کہ سرکار فوڈ کے معاملہ میں بدنام ہوئی ہے اور اس نے سارے دیہی کو اس کام کو اپنے ہاتھ میں لے کر بھوکا مار دیا ہے - جب اس کے بزرگوں نے اس کا بزنس نہیں کیا تو وہ اس طرح کے کام کو کیوں اپنے ہاتھ میں لینے کی ہمت کر رہی ہے - میں ان سے عرض کروں گا کہ وہ ڈیموکریسی کا نام نہ لیں - جمہوریت کا نام نہ لیں - اس کو ڈکٹیٹرشپ کا نام لینا چاہئے - جہاں سے ان کا کچھ بننے والا ہے - لیکن جیسا کہ جذاب نے فرمایا میں اسے پوری طرح مانتا ہوں لیکن میں یہ جانتا ہوں کہ کمپنیز جو منسٹروں کو یا منسٹروں کے عزیزوں کو یا عزیزوں کے عزیزوں کو

[شری عبدالغنی]

اپنے یہاں اکسویٹ کرتے ہیں - میں
ایک نہیں دس نام لے سکتا ہوں - وہ
جو چاہیں کرتے چلے جائیں ان ۱۴
کوئی ہاتھ نہیں پڑتا ہے -

میں امید کرتا ہوں کہ مسٹر
سنگھ ان باتوں سے بے نیاز ہو کر اگر
اپنے محکمے میں یہ ادھیکار لیتے ہیں
تو وہ پورا پورا اس کا صحیح استعمال
کریں گے - شکریہ -

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी (पंजाब) वाइम
चेयरमैन साहिब, मुझे खुशी है कि सरकार
रहम और दया चाहती है। खूब लें, चूंकि
सरकार की मनशा यह है कि जहां कहीं भी
इण्डस्ट्रीलाइजेशन है या वह कि जिस ने
संस्थाया लगात हो वह अपने किसी इन्वेस्ट
के तहत इस काम को न चलाए या कम्पनी
में अगडा हो और न काम चले और उसमें
इण्डस्ट्री हो भी धक्का लगे और मजदूरों
को भी जो वहां काम करते हैं, तो उसमें
आप यह चाहते हैं कि पांच साल की बजाए
मियाद और बढ़ा दी जाए—दो दो साल
करके दस साल और कर दिया जाए। मुझे
कोई एतराज नहीं लेकिन मैं, वाइम चेयरमैन
साहिब, अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि क्या सरकार
वाकई इस नीयत से चल रही है कि मजदूरों
को ज्यादा काम मिले। इण्डस्ट्री को धक्का
न लगे, मैं ऐसा महसूस नहीं करता। जिस
बजट को बड़ा सोशललिस्टिक बजट कहा गया है
और जिसकी तारीफ करते हमारी आफिशियल
पार्टी थकती नहीं उस ने लाखों मजदूरों को

परेशान कर दिया है, एक ही चोट में, कि
इन पर 25 की बजाए एक मी पच्चीस कर
दिया है, पावर लूम वालों पर। वह जानते
हैं कि महाराष्ट्र में जितने भी लॉग है उनके
एक एक, दो दो पावर लूम्स है। ज्यादा को
कह दिया पच्चीस पर हम रियायत कर देंगे।
इस से ऊपर उम्मीद है और ज्यादा रियायत
कर देंगे, तो अमीर आदमी के लिए रियायत
करना — और इस तरह से मजदूरों को
लुधियाता में ज्यादा जागृति थी उन्होंने कह
दिया हम ऐसा करेंगे, एजिटेशन करेंगे।
लेकिन महाराष्ट्र में कहीं ज्यादा है पंजाब से,
और सूबों से तो क्या सरकार वाकई यह
पमझंसी है कि इस से धक्का नहीं लगेगा
इण्डस्ट्री को ?

दूसरी बात, वाईस चेयरमैन साहब, मैं
अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि कम्पनियों में
खराबिया है। श्री भूपेश गुप्ता जी ने आज
निहायत विस्तार के साथ, तफसाल के साथ,
कई कम्पनियों का जिक्र किया।

मेरी कुछ बदनसीबी हुई और मैं महसूस
करता हूँ जिस आगस्ट हाउस के सम्बर होने
का हक मुझे नहीं मिला है कि यहाँ कम्पनियों
कम्पनियों के दरनियान रियायत की जाती है,
एक ही गुनाह के लिए और एक कम्पनी को
जो डालमिया-जैन ग्रुप के साथ ताल्लुक
रखती थी उस को रादा गया, अच्छा किया,
लेकिन जिस का ताल्लुक बिडला से, बिडला
के साथियों से था, उन पर सरकार
चुप्पी माथे बैठा है और नन्दा जी कहते हैं कि
60 एम० पीज उनकी जेब में है। अगर
कोई अमी चन्द प्यारे चन्द के बारे में शिकायत
करता है इस के बावजूद कि उनका नाम
ब्लैक लिस्ट में आ गया है, इनकी तमाम
कम्पनियों को आना चाहिए। उन कं
पै-दर-पै लाइसेंस दिए गये। अमेरिशियल
मर्टिफिकेट दिए गये और उस से भी को
काम बना नहीं। तो हम समझते हैं कि

सरकार को मुद्दा यह है कि पावर अपने हाथ में रखे जिस का सर चाहे कुचल दे। सरकार के जब दिल में आती है तो जिसको चाहे बखश देती है, और जिस को न चाहे उस को नहीं बखशती। इस के मायने यह नहीं कि वह लेबर को पनाह देना चाहती है या इण्डस्ट्रीज को उठाना चाहती है। अगर है, तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि आखिर यह जो पावर लूम के बारे में वगैर सोचे समझे ऐसा किया गया कि उन पर ज्यादा बढ़ा दिया गया, तो इस में किस का दोष है ?

दूसरी बात जो मैं आप के नोटिस में लाना चाहता हूं वह यह है कि हमारे सिड साहिब एक शरीफ और अच्छी तबीयत के मिनिस्टर हैं। एक तरफ तो हम यह चर्चा करते हैं कि स्थितता रुपया है वह हमारे देश में रहे। वह तो अच्छी बात है लेकिन हम ने किया क्या। 1962 में जब एमरजेंसी की चर्चा हुई तो सारे देश में वाइस चेयरमैन साहिब, यह महसूस किया गया कि इस वक्त जो हमारा रुपया है उस को बचाया जाए बल्कि देश वालों को जो सनअत-कार हैं उन को ज्यादा से ज्यादा मदद मिले। लेकिन हुआ क्या ? हम ने फारेन कन्ट्रीज को बड़ा आर्डर वूलन टाप्स और रा वूल के लिए दिया और इस से हम ने करोड़ों रुपया अपने मुल्क से इस काम के लिए बाहर भेजा जबकि हमारी बहनें अपने जेवरों और छोटे छोटे कांटों और चूड़ियों को जो सोने की होती थीं दे रही थीं। इसलिए कि हमारा फारेन एक्मचेंज बढ़ जाए। तो इसके मायने क्या हुए कि बजाए देसी ऊन के उस वक्त हम ने अपनी फौजों को फौरन सामान देना था, इसलिए इस वूल को फौरन बाहर से मंगाया। लेकिन हम ने इस फारेन एक्मचेंज को जाया किया और वह जाया हुआ। मैं इस बारे में दावा करता हूं और मरी कोई तरदीद नहीं कर पाएगा कि बिडला जैसे चन्द मोटे आदमियों को बल्क वूल दिया गया। इसके बारे में किसी ने इस बात की भी चिन्ता नहीं की कि इस वूल का कुछ सामान फौरन फौज के आदमियों को भी

भेजा गया या नहीं। तो मैं कहता हूं आप जितना अखत्यार चाहते हैं ले लीजिये, जितना दिल चाहे ले लीजिए, क्योंकि बगैर अखत्यार के हकूमत नहीं चलती। और अगर कोई इण्डस्ट्री डिस-आनेस्टी करना चाहे तो जितनी जल्दी काबू कर पाएंगे, जितनी देर के लिए कर पाएं, उतना अच्छा है। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि जो सरकार अपने विचारों को चला रही है तो उस सरकार की हालत यह है कि यह ठीक है कि इण्डस्ट्री से उसका वास्ता नहीं है, लेकिन लेबर से ताल्लुक है। पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० में तीस बरस से लोग काम करते चले आ रहे हैं, वे अभी तक कच्चे ही हैं, पक्के नहीं हुए हैं। वे अभी तक टेम्प्रेरी हैं और सरकार उन्हें परमानेंट नहीं कर रही है। इस तरह भिलाई और हरकिला के कारखाने हैं या दूसरे कारखाने हैं जहां सरकार काम करती है और इसी तरह से रेलवे में और दूसरी जगह, क्या वहां वह यह देखती है कि जहां काम रुक जाता है या काम इस हिम्मत के साथ नहीं कर पाते, क्या यह अपनी सनअत को चाहे लोहे की सनअत हो देखती है इसलिए क्या जवाब है इन के पास और उन्होंने अब तक क्या कुछ किया है? कितनी तरक्की की है? तो दूसरे कारखाने जिसे ले लेते हैं जैसा कि अभी धौरडिया जी ने कहा कि ले लिया और अपने किसी पेट (pet) को दे दिया और इस तरह से वह सरकार के तहत हो गया। चार दिन चला कर अपना मजा ले कर टप से बैठ गये। तो मैं समझता हूं कि इससे कोई ज्यादा लाभ होने वाला नहीं, अगर आप लाभ देने वाले हैं। मैं मानता हूं कि सरकार ने बाज ऐसी कम्पनियों को अपने अधिकार में लिया है जिन्होंने

[श्री अब्दुल गनी]

बहुत अच्छा काम किया है जिस तरह से कि स्माल सक्ल इण्डस्ट्री और हायर परचेजिंग का डिपार्टमेंट है। इस में खिचूखिचू गाड़ी चलती है। 1962 तक हम सिर्फ 6 करोड़ रुपये का काम कर पाए हैं लेकिन 1962 तक, 1964 तक, अगर एक डिपार्टमेंट इस से दो गुना करता है, छ करोड़ से बारह करोड़ तक का काम कर सकता है, इस की पैदावार बारह करोड़ से ज्यादा हो सकती है, तो अगर सरकार चाहे तो बाकी सब जगहों पर कम्पनियों के जरिए से उन की कृटियों को पकड़े और उन को सजा दे। लेकिन यह सजा देगी क्या? हालत यह है कि अगर हायर परचेजिंग डिपार्टमेंट दो साल में इतनी तरक्की कर सकता है तो गवर्नमेंट के डायरेक्ट कंट्रोल में जो अपने इंदारे है वह उतनी तरक्की क्यों नहीं कर सकते? अगर वह इस तरह से तरक्की नहीं कर सकते, तो इस में जरूर कही खामिया है।

मैं मानता हू कि टी० एन० सिंह साहिब जहां यह अख्तियारात लेते हैं वहां पर हायर परचेजिंग डिपार्टमेंट के जो डायरेक्टर साहिब श्री नाजपा है इस तरह के काबिल आदमी पैदा नहीं हो सकते जो दो साल में आठ साल से भी ज्यादा काम कर सकते हैं, जो तकरीबन बारह करोड़ की पैदावार कर रहे हैं, लेकिन हालत यह है कि सरकार मशीनरी के लिए इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंस देती है लेकिन इस के पुर्जों के लिए इम्पोर्ट की इजाजत नहीं देती है। जब मशीन वाले इम्पोर्ट करने के लिए दरखास्त करते हैं बल्कि अगर पुर्जों के हमारी लेबर बेकार हो जाएगी, जो हम सरकार को फारेन एक्सचेंज देना चाहते हैं वे बेकार हो जाएगी, तो वहां पर हमारे टैक्स-टाइल कमिशनर साहिब बैठे बैठे हकम देते हैं कि तुम देसी पुर्जे खरीदो, लेकिन यह मशीनरी ऐसी है कि हिन्दुस्तान में इस के पुर्जे नहीं बनते, जब इन से कहा जाता है कि तुम बताओ कि

कहा पर पुर्जे मिलते हैं हम वहां से खरीद लेते तो उस के बारे में कोई तवज्जो नहीं दी जाती। हायर परचेजिंग डिपार्टमेंट वाले जब उन को लिखते हैं कि इन की दिक्कतें हैं और वे इस किस्म की है और उन की दिक्कतों को दूर करो तो वह महकमा जो टेक्सटाइल कमिशनर के मातहत है, जिसके जरिए सारी इण्डस्ट्री चलती है वह ख्वाहमख्वाह गलत ब्यानी करता है। यह डिपार्टमेंट उतना बेपरवा है कि मिनिस्ट्रो के खतों का माकूल जवाब नहीं देता। (Time bell rings) मैं आप का हुक्म बजा लाता हू। हमारे मिनिस्टर सिंह साहिब जिन्होंने यह नया बोझ उठाया है वह यह देखे कि उन्होंने मुल्क की एक बड़ी जिम्मेदारी उठाई हुई है कि जो इस तरह की बेईमानी होती है उसको रोके। अगर कोई बेईमानी करता हो जैसा कि अभी हमारे श्री भूपेश गुप्ता जी ने तवज्जो दिलाई है कि लोग किस तरह की बेईमानी करते हैं तो आप का काम है कि आप उन को पकड़ें। अगर आप नहीं पकड़ते और जैसा कि 1958 के वाक्या में आप ने कहा और मुझे याद है कि जनाब ने कई बार जहाज रानी की कम्पनियों की तरफ तवज्जो दिलाई कि कम्पनियों में इम्तियाज न हो, अगर एक हाथ से सजा देते हैं शोला पुर मिल वालों को या किसी दूसरे को तो वहां पर आप अपना मजबूत डंडा सरमायदार पर नहीं बल्कि आफिशियल पर फेंके जो सरकार की तरफ से खराब काम करता है, जो मजदूरों को तकलीफ देता है। और मजदूरों का साहरा नहीं लेता।

मैं आखिरी एक अर्ज यह करना चाहता हू कि भाखड़ा डेम जो हम ने बनाया है वह दुनिया में एक बड़ी ताकत रखता है, वह इण्डस्ट्रीस के लिए, खेती बाड़ी के लिए, बहुत अच्छा काम देगा। लेकिन वहां के मजदूरों ने जिन्होंने इस में काम किया काम खत्म होने के बाद उन को दूसरी जगह काम देना आप की जिम्मेदारी है। अगर मजदूरों को लेबर

मिलेगा तो इण्डस्ट्रीज को तरक्की मिलेगी क्योंकि वह इण्डस्ट्रीज को बिजली देंगे और काफी तादाद में देंगे। लेकिन इस का फल आप को मिलेगा या नहीं मिलेगा, यह देखना सरकार का काम है। मेरा अर्ज करने का मतलब यह है कि सरकार अगर अधिकार लेना चाहती है तो ले लेकिन अधिकारों का इस्तेमाल ऐसा न करे जिस से कि बदनामी हो जाए। जिस तरह कि सरकार फूड के मामले में बदनाम हुई है और इस ने सारे देश को इस काम को अपने हाथ में ले कर भ्रष्टाचार दिया है। जब इस के बुजुर्गों ने इस का बिज़नेस नहीं किया तो वह इस तरह के काम को क्यों अपने हाथ में लेने की हिम्मत कर रही है। मैं इन से अर्ज करूंगा कि वह डेमोक्रेसी का नाम न लें, जम्हूरियत का नाम न लें। उनको डिक्टेटरशिप का नाम लेना चाहिए जहां से इन का कुछ बनने वाला है। लेकिन जैसा कि जनाब ने फरमाया मैं इसे पूरी तरह मानता हूं लेकिन मैं यह जानता हूं कि कम्पनीज जो मिनिस्टर्स के अजीजों को या अजीजों के अजीजों को अपने यहां अक्रोमोडेट करते हैं, मैं एक नहीं दस नाम ले सकता हूं, वह जो चाहे करते चले जाएं उन पर कोई हाथ नहीं पड़ता है।

मैं उम्मीद करता हूं कि मिनिस्टर सिंह इन बातों में ब-नियाज हो कर अगर अपने महकमे में यह अधिकार लेते हैं तो वह पूरा पूरा इस का सही इस्तेमाल करेंगे। शुक्रिया।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Krishna Dutt, Please be brief.

SHRI KRISHAN DUTT (JAMMU AND KASHMIR): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support this measure which, I think, is quite necessary, and the powers which the Government seeks by this measure are absolutely essential for the better regulation of industries in the country. But one

thing to which I like to draw pointed attention of the Government is this. The State of Jammu and Kashmir lags behind, and has been lagging behind others, for the past seventeen or eighteen years for want of a Central public undertaking, and I do not see any reason why the State of Jammu and Kashmir has been neglected in that regard. There is plenty of raw materials there; the climate is suitable for the opening of an antibiotics industry there, or for other suitable industries sponsored by the Centre; as I said, the climate is also agreeable for a Centrally-sponsored public undertaking there for the manufacture of watches. But consistently in the past the State of Jammu and Kashmir has received no attention for a big public sector undertaking being opened there. I want to know from the Government the reasons why this neglect or ignoring of the State of Jammu and Kashmir is taking place in this regard, and I would urge strongly that attention should be paid to the State of Jammu and Kashmir for industrial development on the lines I have suggested. The State of Jammu and Kashmir is industrially most backward as compared to other parts of the country. I do not know what considerations stand in the way of the industrial development of my State through the efforts of the Central Government. So far as industries run by the State Government are concerned, they are there no doubt, but I would plead strongly for the establishment of a public sector undertaking by the Centre for the industrial development of Jammu and Kashmir State.

With these words, Sir, I support the Bill which is before the House. Thank you.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am obliged to the House for the general support this measure has received. I would like to clear up one or two points. I would begin by saying that this Act, when it was passed and as it stands today on the statute book, is intended only to regulate and control industries. Its purpose is not to take over the

[Shri T. N. Singh.] ownership of industries. For that we have got other measures and other methods to follow. The limited purpose here is this. Wherever industries appear to be going wrong and wherever, because of the mismanagement or bad management, public interest is affected, or production has gone down, in such cases there is provision for Government to take them over for a period and manage them. Now it has been found in many cases that we have taken over and managed them, and managed them well. I would like to point out to Mr. Ghani, who felt that we were taking too many tasks on our shoulders, that there are many very good examples where industries, which a little while ago were going down, have prospered under Government management and control, and in this period the Government has never used its power indiscriminately. In all these years twelve undertakings were taken over and then handed back. Seven undertakings are today under the management of the Government. One of the undertakings, which is today under Government management and which has occasioned this measure, was in a rather bad way when Government took it over about seven years ago, and the Government, within the initial five-year period of management improved its finances. Its profits have gone up. Its reserves have gone up. The concern has considerably improved, but then it was again thought that it has to be continued under proper management—an extension was given—and Government are of the opinion that this management has to continue. If the existing law remains as it is today, there is no course open to the Government but to hand it back to the share holders. This is one of the reasons why this measure has been brought forward before this House, because the law as it stands today does not permit more than one extension of such management. So, I think, that clears the point which was raised by some of my friends including Mr. Diwan Chaman Lall. There is nothing like unlimited extension. This Act is not meant for Government to virtually take over industries and continue to be indefinitely in possession and control of them. It is not meant

for that purpose, and this cannot be done under this Act. Therefore this unlimited interpretation which Mr. Diwan Chaman Lall put on this Act, I think, is not justified.

I am in sympathy with some of the views expressed. It is true that we should take responsibilities which we should be able to discharge well, and I think even the most critical Members will be satisfied that we have taken such responsibilities very selectively and discharged them well. It may be that there are certain concerns which were really beyond redemption. Yet we have been making a sort of effort and that effort is well worth it. Now take the case of India Electric Works. Even as a working concern it is still in bad shape. The Government were compelled to take it over because otherwise it had to close down and a large number of workers were to be thrown out of employment. Mr. Thengari referred to the labour demands and other things. That was one of the reasons why we took it over. But then we cannot go on taking indefinitely such responsibilities at the cost of the taxpayer's money. There is a limit to it. And what is the limit to such cases? My only intention is that, to the best of its capacity, whatever is possible, the Government should try to bring about improvements, and this provision of one extension alone should not stand in the way. Therefore the amending Bill gives powers to the Government to extend control by periods of two years at a time but by not more than ten years in all after the expiry of the initial period of five years. In that period it is supposed that the concern would be set in order; that is the intention. I am sure that this amendment will be helpful both to the private industry as well as to whatever the Government does in such cases. It is desirable in every way.

The hon. Member, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, referred to various companies which were mismanaged. I know of many cases. But my own and the Government's policy is that they should take responsibility in such matters after careful scrutiny and examination. And that meets the

point raised by some other friends too. We should not take over such responsibility indiscriminately. We are careful, and once a responsibility is taken, the intention is to perform it well. That 3 P.M. is why it is not possible to take on many more concerns. Yet it may be desirable, despite the limitations of the Government, to take over the control and management of concerns in the country's interests, and where the public interest is involved the Government cannot simply plead that its hands are full. They have got to do something about it. We cannot shirk that responsibility when public interest is involved. So I can assure the House that in all such cases, wherever it is considered necessary, we shall not hesitate to serve the public interest and take over the regulation of such industries. It is true and I have heard also of complaints of provident funds being misused and so on and so forth. Wherever things come to our notice we try to take remedial measures. Remedial measures can be taken in different ways and it may be possible to rectify matters even without actually taking over any industry under this Act. We explore all possibilities and take necessary steps accordingly.

During the course of the debate, some rather extraneous matters were also raised, matters which are not relevant to this measure, if I may be permitted to say so in all humility. For instance, there was a reference to the location of certain industries under the public sector in this or that State. That is a matter which can usefully be taken up during the debate on the Budget and on the Grants and I shall be very happy, indeed, to meet those points. I do not want to say anything at this stage except that in the location of all public undertakings, we take due care of all backward regions, subject to the economics of the project. In all such cases, the practice is to appoint a location committee which goes into the merits of the various locations. I can assure the House that generally the interests of every backward region are always kept in view. As a matter of fact, every effort is made to look at all the possible

backward regions for the purpose of location of the industries.

I have nothing else to say. I believe I have covered all the points that were raised during the speeches. I commend this Bill to the House for its acceptance.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Now we take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill. There are no amendments.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

I. THE APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS) BILL, 1965

II. THE APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS) NO. 2 BILL, 1965

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI S. K. PATIL): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to authorise paymer and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1965-66 for the purposes of Railways, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

There is one request. There is another Bill that will be taken up afterwards, more or less the same kind, seeking ad-