

we will be meeting now at 3.10 p.m., accordingly, the Private Members business will be up to 5.40 p.m.

The House is adjourned for lunch for one hour.

The House then adjourned for lunch at twelve minutes past two of the clock.

The House re-assembled after lunch at sixteen minutes past three of the clock.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM) in the Chair.

**PRIVATE MEMBER'S RESOLUTION
DISINVESTMENT POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM) : Hon. Members, we now take up Private Members' Business. But I have a point to make. The Resolution to be moved by Shri Raghavan pertains to disinvestment. Yesterday, the Business Advisory Committee had decided to take up this very issue for discussion, at length, as a Short Duration Discussion, in the coming week. So, I think, it would be a repetition. Can I make an appeal to the hon. Member, Shri Raghavan, to give up moving his Resolution, and allow his party colleague, Shri Jibon Roy, to move his Resolution?

SHRI V.V. RAGHAVAN (Kerala) : With due respect to you, Sir, in Private Members' Business, it is the right of the Member to move his Resolution, I stick to this right.

SHRI JIBIN ROY (West Bengal) : Sir, myself and Shri Raghavan don't belong to the same party. He is from the CPI, and I am from the CPI(M). *(Interruptions)*

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, may say a few words? Sir, I agree with Mr. Raghavan; it is the right of an individual Member, and, on this issue, I think, once it is listed, we can't, possibly, take the sense of the House. Therefore, it is better to leave it to his choice.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM) : I am not challenging the right of the Member. You see, there are many issues of public importance, pending discussion. *(Interruptions)* We have been discussing many important issues of public importance in this House and, yet, there remain many other issues of public, importance. But the time left is very short. Therefore, I was making an appeal, from that point of view. I am not asking the Member to give up his right of speaking. He has the right.

Mr. Raghavan, you may move your Resolution.

SHRI V. V. RAGHAVAN: Sir, I move the following Resolution:

"That this House expresses its serious concern over the disinvestment policy being aggressively pursued by the Government of India making strategic sale of equity of profit-making public sector undertakings and that too in the core and strategic sectors like petroleum, telecom and other sectors; selling valuable natural assets at throw-away prices and getting country's assets depleted; jeopardising the capacity for self-reliant economic growth and endangering the securing of the country; and urges upon the Government to drop this programme of disinvestment and strategic sale being carried out only to fill up the budgetary deficit."

Sir, the Tenth Five Year Plan Draft approved by the Cabinet states that during the next five years Rs. 78,000 crores will be mobilised through disinvestment of public sector units. That means that the NDA Government is all set to demolish the very foundation of the country's self-reliant economy. Sir, Rs. 78,000 crores means almost all the PSUs, profit making PSUs will be demolished. So, they are demolishing the entire structure of our self-reliant economy. That is my submission. They are going to hand over the country's enormous wealth, enormous assets to a narrow set of family managed industrial groups in the name of strategic sale. Here I must point out that the Government is moving against the Directive Principles of our Constitution itself. Let me remind the hon. Disinvestment Minister that Part IV of our Constitution which is a binding Policy Directive to the State, that is, the Government. Sub-clause (c) of article 39 of Part IV says, "That the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and the means of production to the common detriment." But they are doing exactly the opposite. Sir, the Directive Principles are not binding rule but the Constitution says that when evolving a policy these Directive Principles should be carried on. So, this Part IV of the Constitution is very important. Sir, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru took this Directive Principle of the Constitution with the seriousness it deserved and built up a solid foundation in the form of public sector with the help of the friendly countries, including the then USSR. Imperialist powers particularly Britain and America were dead against our public sector units because they wanted India to be dependent on them for everything whether it is steel or heavy engineering or machinery or defence requirements, etc. It was their intention that India should not have this foundation and India must depend on them for everything. Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru requested Britain and America

to help us in building up steel plants, refineries, heavy engineering, heavy machines, etc. But they turned down every request and said, "Why should you worry about this because we are here to supply ?" That was the reply given by them. The Soviet Union liberally helped us. By accepting the help from the Soviet Union from the Second Five Year Plan onwards, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru built up this solid structure for economic progress. This economic base paved the path for development and for an independent foreign policy challenging imperialist powers who are trying to dominate the world. That was the solid base on which we stood up and followed an independent foreign policy and challenged the mighty ex-imperialist powers. Now, you are demolishing the entire public sector at the behest of the same powers! That is the tragedy. At the instance of the developed countries you are demolishing the public sector. For FDI, they say, 'You privatise every public sector unit.' They resisted our building up this base. Now, they want to demolish it and we are doing just what they want. In the name of neo-liberal economic policy and globalisation, you are committing this act which is against our national interest. I do not say anti-national. But, I say that it is against our national interest. Justifying these treacherous steps, the hon. Minister often says that our public sector units are making huge losses. Every now and then, you repeat these words. Sir, let us examine some facts. The Department of Public Sector Enterprises, Government of India, reveals that between 1991 and 2001—in a span of one decade—the net profit, after deducting tax, of the 236 Central public sector units, went up from Rs. 2,356 crores to Rs. 15,653 crores—a seven-time jump within a decade. That is the history of our PSUs. Sir, I am quoting from the authentic records of the Government of India. India, very successfully, created a broad-based, indigenous hydrocarbon capacity through exploration, production, refining and distribution industries. This was done against all the stiff resistance from the global oil cartels. They resisted every step. We fought against them and built up our own very vital industry, thanks to late Mr. K. D. Malviya, who established the oil industry, and, later, after discovering the Bombay High offshore, it helped our economy to grow. Can you forget the history of how we built all these things ? It is because of the importance for oil sector. It is a very strategic sector. In our policy, we nationalised Burma Shell, ESSO and CALTEX. Those companies were nationalised because it was very vital for our economy and our survival. Could we ever forget, Mr. Arun Shourie, what tactics these private companies adopted during the war of 1965 and 1971 ? Everybody knows what tricks they played ? It is, again, with the help from friendly countries we fought the war and won. These private companies were non-co-operative. They were resisting. That is the history. Everybody knows. And, you are, again, going to hand

over this very vital sector to private people! I warn you that history will never forgive you if you give these core sectors to the private companies.

There is an argument that the private sector is very efficient and clean. I don't need to go into the history of the private sector—the scams, the notorious acts. You just have a look at the recent experiences of how the private companies behave. Sir, we sold our prestigious institution, the VSNL, to Tatas. What are they doing now? They are diverting the very valuable reserve fund of the VSNL to the rotten companies of Tatas. Two years back, the Members of Parliament gathered, and they were glad that the VSNL was emerging as a very prestigious institution. Within two years, you sold the entire wealth for a meagre amount of Rs. 1200 crores. And, now they are diverting the reserve fund of the VSNL to their rotten companies.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY) in the Chair]

Our entrepreneurs know how Tata Telecommunication is working, what is its performance, what is its efficiency. This very valuable public money is being diverted to Tata's own companies. How can you justify that? Before your own eyes, under your nose, these things are happening. What happened to Centaur? Is it not the public money they are looting? So, please don't talk about the integrity and efficiency of the private sector. They are only for profit, only for looting the public money. Somebody was very proud that one family gathered Rs. 60,000 crores, beginning from nothing, within a short period of time since independence. Very good! But how? Have you ever thought of how they gathered this money? So many scams, including the UTI scam, are connected with it. So, please do not try to convince us that the private companies are more efficient and cleaner than the public sector units. There may be defects. There may be mismanagement. But we have to correct them. We do not kill a baby just for a simple sickness. We have to nurse the public sector units some of which have problems. This is not the way to correct the public sector units. You say that they are inefficient, and the private sector is very efficient and very clean. What certificates are you giving just to sell our assets! You and your Secretary often come to the media also that the private sector is more efficient and cleaner than the public sector units. I can quote so many reports. I do not know why your Secretary is also harping on the private sector's efficiency. I am not taking his name because he is not here.

THE MINISTER OF DISINVESTMENT, THE MINISTER OF DEVELOPMENT OF NORTH EASTERN REGION AND THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI ARUN SHOURIE): I am here. I am

responsible for whatever he says.

SHRI V. V. RAGHAVAN: You sold the very widespread food industry, the Modern Foods, to Birlas. Hindustan Liver, we call it the Birlas', because he is managing it. Hindustan Liver belongs to the Birlas. You sold it to the Birlas, and the IPCL to the Reliance. Yes, all these are being sold to the corporate houses. It is on record, nothing else. You don't issue shares to the public; the common man. In the name of strategic sales, you hand over these precious public sector units to corporate houses, one by one. And there is a queue to get hold of Hindustan Petroleum, Bharat Petroleum, Indian Oil, and, in fact, ONGC itself. There is a queue of these corporate sectors. That is why I read part 4 of clause (c). Whatever you are doing is against this constitutional clause. You are giving the assets to the family-managed industrial houses. You cannot deny that.

Now, I come to our fertilizer companies and chemical companies. Independent India was thankful to Rashtriya Chemicals, and the FACT in Kerala, for helping our Agricultural sector, and in the Green Revolution. How can you sell them to the private companies? They are doing a very good service to the nation. In the name of globalisation, in the name of privatisation, how can you take these things away from the public sector and give them to the private sector? The private sector has only profit motive in its mind, it does not think about service motive. Mr. Shourie, I need not lecture on that. You know it very well. You are a learned man. The private sector has only one motive, profit, again profit and more profit. This is the criterion, now-a-days, for assessing our growth rate also. It is based on how much profit we earn. They may adopt any method, but their only motive is to earn profit. And they are making profit by adopting any means. So, before selling these fertilizer, chemical companies, the Rashtriya Chemicals and the FACT, please think again, Mr. Shourie. You are a young man. You have to serve the nation for many years. But, don't take such steps which will, I repeat, are against the interest of the people. Sir, you may say many things about the neo liberal economic policy. It is not going to help the Indian economy; the Indian masses. Our population is 106 crores, and most of them live in the villages. Do you know about the situation in villages? Have you ever thought about it? The neo-liberal economic policy, globalisation may help 20 to 25 crore Indians, they may gladly receive it. But out of 106 crores of Indian population, 70 to 80 crore are suffering like anything in villages. Shri Ajit Singh is sitting here. He knows very well what the status of agriculture, today, is. The agriculture sector has been hit hard by the neo-liberal Economic Policy. You have opened up our entire market by lifting the

Quantitative Restrictions, and by reducing the tariff. What about our goods? There is no market access to our goods. There is no market access to the very fine cotton products, which the European people like to buy. The developed countries like European Union, America and Britain are resisting our products just for silly reasons. But you have widely opened up our market by lifting the Quantitative Restrictions, by reducing the tariff, as a result of which, we have been greatly affected. The condition of our farmers is very pathetic. Don't you think about the welfare of the agricultural workers? More than 26–30 crores people are engaged in this sector. They have no work, no food. Our people are starving. Starvation deaths have become a daily feature. People are committing suicides. Is it not an appropriate time for us to review our Economic Policy? This neo-liberal Economic Policy—which is being instigated by the erstwhile imperialist forces through the WTO, the IMF and the World Bank and other agencies. It is not suitable for us. In India, we need to adopt an Economic Policy which would help the villagers. Sir, 2,49,000 small industries have been closed down. These are your figures that I am quoting. What will be the fate of Khadi Board and other village industries? A large number of people are suffering because of the neo-liberal Economic Policy which is being aggressively followed. Some people say that China has adopted this Policy. Is it an argument? China has stabilised its villages, its agriculture. It has decentralised even steel industry. Even now, 80 per cent of Chinese industries and means of production are in public sector.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: There are no unions also...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JIBON ROY (West Bengal): Please, don't make a comment on what you don't know. Have you gone through the Report of the Second Labour Commission?...*(Interruptions)*.... You have misled the House once. I am thinking of bringing of privilege motion on this...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Mr. Jibon Roy, please, don't interrupt...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JIBON ROY: Sir, he had misled the House last time...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Mr. Jibon Roy, please, don't interrupt...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JIBON ROY: Sir, please ask the Minister not to mislead the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Mr. Jibon Roy, please, don't interrupt...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JIBON ROY: He does not know what is happening in China. There is detailed report about this in the second Report of the Labour Commission. It has answered your question...(Interruptions)...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I think, we should have a debate on China...(Interruptions)...

SHRI JIBON ROY: Sir, it is a friendly nation. He is insinuating a neighbour country. It is against our Foreign Policy.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Please take your seats...(Interruptions)...

SHRI JIBON ROY: Every year, I visit China...(Interruptions)...

SHRI BALBIR K. PUNJ (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I will have no hesitation in saying that though they visit China, they take inspiration from China, they do not know what is happening there.....(Interruptions)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Please, don't interrupt...(Interruptions)...

SHRI BALBIR K. PUNJ: They only take inspiration from China. They do not know what is happening there.

SHRI JIBON ROY: Your Second Labour Commission has given a detailed appreciation of what is happening so far as the labour policies are concerned...(Interruptions)...

SHRI BALBIR K. PUNJ: No; Sir, what is happening to the labour laws?...(Interruptions)...

SHRI JIBON ROY: It is the reply to your comment...(Interruptions).... You have unnecessarily raked up this issue in the House. You insinuate against a neighbouring country. Don't do it...(Interruptions)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Please sit down. I will not allow any interruptions in the Private Members' Business...(Interruptions).... Please sit down. I do not allow.

SHRI BALBIR K. PUNJ: Sir, I want to only clarify.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Not now. Please take your seat. And, I will also ask Shri Jibon Roy to take his seat...(Interruptions)...

SHRI JIBON ROY: No; no; our inspiration is people.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Mr. Jibon Roy, kindly take your seat. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JIBON ROY: You go and see what is happening in Brazil. You go to other countries... *(Interruptions)*... The thing is that your Minister should not insinuate against a neighbouring country by giving false information.

SHRI BALBIR K. PUNJ: I understand, Sir, the... *(Interruptions)*... country which inspire you... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JIBON ROY:because it helps him to bring here slavery. He is the advocate of slavery. Wrong information helps him to propose for slavery ... *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Mr. Raghavan, please proceed. I do not want any interruptions. ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JIBON ROY: He is giving the wrong information..... *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Mr. Jibon Roy, please take your seat.

SHRI V. V. RAGHAVAN: Please do not interrupt me. Let me continue.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Mr. Raghavan, please continue and address the Chair.

SHRI V. V. RAGHAVAN: Sir, I am addressing you.

The hon. Minister was referring to the collective bargaining system in China. In China, every lively issue, including the children's education, games, etc., is addressed by the Government; all facilities are provided. If the demands of the working masses, both agricultural and industrial workers, are sufficiently met, then there will not be any trouble. Whereas, in our country, these things are not looked into. So, what I want to say is, do not compare China with India. That is my point. People compare India with China. Eighty per cent of their industries are in public sector and the remaining 20 per cent industries are in other areas like Hong Kong, etc. One thing that I must mention here again is that we talk much about the FDI. We are ready to do anything and everything for attracting foreign direct investment. In China, eighty per cent of FDI is of NRCs, of those Chinese who are in Malaysia, Singapore, America, or elsewhere... *(Time bell)*... Those Chinese patriotically bring their wealth to their country and invest it there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Mr. Raghavan, please address the Chair.

SHRI V. V. RAGHAVAN : But, Sir, what do we do? We take the money to Switzerland and safely deposit there. But those Chinese who are in foreign countries invest their money in China only. Eighty per cent of the Chinese FDI belongs to the Chinese themselves. That is their patriotism. That is where we miss. Please think about it. Don't say things for arguments' sake. This is the fact. Our NRIs safety deposit elsewhere whereas the Chinese who are in foreign countries bring all the assets that they have to their motherland and invest there. You examine it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Mr. Raghavan, please address the Chair. I think, you have already taken 30 minutes, and it is time for you to conclude.

SHRI V. V. RAGHAVAN: Sir, I am concluding. Since Mr. Vice-Chairman has asked me to conclude, and as I always obey the Chair, I have to conclude now. And, many other hon. Members have also to speak on this Resolution. I only plead with you, Sir, that keeping in view of the pathetic conditions of our masses in India, it is high time that we changed the whole economic policy. We have to change the disinvestment policy. My request is, please for Heaven's sake, do not hand over these assets to the private parties. Thank you.

SHRI RAMACHANDRA KHUNTIA (Orissa): Sir, I support the Resolution moved by the hon. Member, Shri V. V. Raghavan; and oppose the disinvestment policy which has been adopted by this Government.

At the outset, I must say that the Government has neither succeeded in achieving the target of disinvestment about which it has been taking credit, nor has it achieved the target of investment. Above all, this Government could not achieve the target of giving facilities to the general public. This Government's policy has created more unemployment problem in the whole of the country. As we all know, the total workers' strength in the country is around 403 million. Only 10 per cent of it are the organised workers, to whom the labour laws apply. But, within this period 2.5 per cent organised workers have been reduced. The unemployment rate, which in 1987, was 6.9 and in 1993 was 6.3, and it went up to 7.29 in 1999-2000. My point is that this disinvestment policy of the Government has not been able to create employment. It has rather increased unemployment. Is it good for the country? Sir, this is a 'Government of disinvestments'. If you look at it closely, you will find that it has led to disinvestments, destabilisation, disintegration, disruption, corruption, devaluation, diversions, detractions and destructions. You can safely add up all these to find out the net result of its policies.

Kindly look at the targets of investments in industry, about which the Deputy Prime Minister spoke in this House just one day before. Justifying the law and order situation in Gujarat, he said there was an investment in Gujarat. What was the amount? It was a little higher than a thousand rupees. He justified by saying that in an area, Gujarat, which is 14 per cent of the country, only a few thousand rupees were being invested. (*Interruptions*) Kindly listen to me. That means virtually no investment has been made there this year.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY) : Kindly don't interrupt. You can speak when your turn comes.

SHRI RAMACHANDRA KHUNTIA : If the total investment in the country is only a few thousand rupees, means there has been no investment in this country this year.

Sir, they are talking of China and India. If you look to the FDI investments, which the Government is hankering after, up to the year 2001, the approval of FDIs was \$ 2,58,707.29 crores and the FDI investment was only 94,882.14 crores. This is the target which they have achieved in the case of FDI investments in the country. That means they could not achieve the target of FDIs.

The Hon. Minister was accusing the unions. I am sorry to say that instead of finding a fault with the management policies in the Government, you are only raising accusing fingers at the unions. Kindly see what the BIFR and the Vigilance Commissioners have said about the policies of this Government. Whom have they accused for the sickness of 6 lakh industries? They said the corrupt and inefficient management of the Government was responsible for the loss and sickness of the industries. The Hon. Minister should know all this. I do not know whether the Hon. Minister has got the capacity, to take action against them, but the Minister is only pointing fingers towards the unions. Does the Hon. Minister know that India has ratified only 39 ILO conventions, while Japan has ratified 43 ILO conventions. If you look to the European countries—Sweden, Denmark, Austria, Germany and France, they have ratified 76, 78, 80, 90 ILO conventions. I know, what the ILO Convention is. The ILO Convention was converted into a law. It was enacted by the Parliament. If a country is converting one hundred ILO conventions, seventy-six conventions, forty-six conventions into laws, could it industrially develop? Could the law be made more stringent? In our country, to say that because of the labour law, because of the labour problem and union problem, the country is not progressing, is absolutely not correct. The ILO has fixed eight core labour standards to which our country has assented. India has rectified

only three conventions whereas Bangladesh has ratified five conventions, Nepal has ratified five conventions, and even our arch enemy Pakistan, has ratified five conventions. India has ratified only three conventions. So, in no way, we can say, our labour law is more stringent which is also creating problem for the development of industries or investment. For the development of industries and investment—what is required? This requires, infrastructure development, but this Government is not able to do that. This requires lowering the rate of interest, but this Government is not able to do that. This requires officials clearance. In this House, the hon. Finance Minister has said, we are not able to bring the enough FDI and investment, because a proposal requires more than two hundred step to pass through for getting clearance and for setting up a company. Please, try to do that within two, three or four steps. That is the business of the Government. If the steps could be reduced, if the infrastructure could be developed, if the rate of interest could be lowered, if the work culture could be changed, if the bureaucratic system could be expedited, I think investment can come in. Without doing that, only pointing accusing finger towards the workers and unions has created a very, very bad situation, like a confrontation in this country. Sir, here I want to give one example about, somebody also said, the Modern Food Industries, about Centaur Hotel in Mumbai, about BALCO. Well, in this House, you had the debate. So, what could this Government have done? Some people say that during the Congress regime also this started. Yes. But, one thing we had to also judge. After disinvestment, take the case of the Modern Food Industries. Take the case of the BALCO. What did the Comptroller and Auditor General of India say? This BALCO has been under-valued.

4.00 p.m.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: There is no report. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM CHANDRA KHUNTIA: Yes, it has been published in the newspaper. You can clarify. It was published in the newspaper. All over the country, people know that it is under-valued. The Centaur Hotel, you said, was sold at Rs. 280 crores. What has happened? The Batra Company sold all utensils, *chadar*, bed sheets, everything. That is some crores. After that, again he sold it at Rs. 32 crores more. I am not saying. Your partner the Shiva Sena people are saying. That has come in the newspaper. I am not saying; Congress is not saying. What is the explanation? What is the transparency? I am not saying anything to the Minister, Mr. Arun Shourie. We know that he is a very, very good capable man, honest man and this Government is utilising the image of Mr. Arun Shourie for getting the whole work done. I think, Hon'ble

Minister Mr. Arun Shourie should realise and be cautious about that. If you want to privatise anything, first, you must analyse, what is the cause of sickness, what is the cause of this bad situation; and after privatising also, you assess the situation in BALCO. They said, "the workers will not be retrenched." In BALCO, 300 people have gone without VRS. They were compulsorily retired. Some people have been retrenched, and this thing is going on. The question is: Should we disinvest the profit making public sector industries? Should we disinvest all industries at the cost of the country? For whom? I want to put on record one thing very clear. This is a case of the NALCO. I know, the Minister also knows that now a very hot discussion is going on. Take the case of NALCO. Why should the NALCO be privatised? The National Aluminium Company Limited was set up in 1981 with Euro-dollar loan of 980 million dollars and French Franc credit of 1050 million, totalling Rs. 2408 crores. The company paid back the entire loan in the year 1998, much before the due date. The net profit earned by this company till march 2002 was Rs. 4325.97 crores. Last year, the net profit earned by this company after tax was Rs. 409 crores; foreign exchange earned by this company till March, 2002 was 8,810 crores, and last year, it earned foreign exchange of Rs. 1205 crores. About 50 per cent of its revenue is generated through exports. It has been paying high dividend since last few years. In 2001-02, it paid 40 per cent dividend amounting to Rs. 257 crores, which is 63 per cent of profit after tax. Every year, it is paying approximately Rs. 250 crores towards sales tax and excise duty to the Government of India. (*Time-bell*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Mr. Khuntia, please conclude now. You have already taken eleven minutes. There are two more speakers from your party.

SHRI RAMACHANDRA KHUNTIA: Sir, I need some more time to give some data. Sir, out of 6,600 employees in NALCO, 2,500 are the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes; 1,750 are the land displaced persons, out of total employees of 6,600 who have got permanent jobs. The State Government of Orissa has earned Rs. 1,730 crores till March, 2002 from tax and royalty. In such a situation, when the company has already been modernized by spending Rs. 4002 crores, and after modernization, the company can produce 50 per cent of its installed capacity, that means, the profit, which was Rs. 650 crores, would go up to Rs. 1,000 crores. The Bauxite mines are situated in Koraput, the tribal-dominated area. The bauxite mines situated in that area is one of the biggest mines in the world, and it has rich Bauxite reserves of 300 million tonnes, which are sufficient to meet its requirement for 100 years, without any

problem. So, my question is, when the factory is earning profit, when the factory is giving enough dividends to the Government, when it has already been modernized, and by its modernization, 50 per cent more production is expected of it, why are you thinking to privatise it? The State Government of Orissa, all the Central Trade Unions and the general public are opposing the privatisation of NALCO. I would like to make one point. I want to put the record straight. After Rourkela Steel Plant, this is the only big public sector company situated in Orissa. So, the people of Orissa have a sentimental attachment with this company. The Central Government, perhaps, consider Orissa a weak State. Probably, considering that the people of Orissa cannot create any hurdle in the way of privatisation in the manner in which it has been done in other States, the Central Government is putting pressure to privatise NALCO. They are blaming everybody. They are saying that the labour unions are creating problems, the Opposition parties are creating problems. But, if you go through the record, you will find that the contradiction lies inside. Some one was referring to the HPCL. Who is investing in this company and who is objecting to investing in this company?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Mr. Khuntia, you have to conclude now. I have given you fourteen minutes. ...*(Interruptions)*... We have to complete this discussion within two hours, and there are three more speakers.

SHRI JIBON ROY: No, no. It may continue. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): No, no. There is a time-limit *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI N. K. PREMACHANDRAN (Kerala): Time may not be a constraint on the basis of the strength of the party. If that is so, there is no meaning of the Private Members' Resolution. At least, in the Private Members' Business, Members should be given adequate time to speak. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): But, this is what has been decided. *(Interruptions)* Mr. Khuntia, please conclude.

SHRI RAMACHANDRA KHUNTIA: The discussion on a Private Member's Resolution or a Bill can continue for the next date. I am trying to conclude. But, there have been instances when the Resolution or the Bill had continued for the next date.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): I have two more speakers from your party. Then, there are 3 speakers from the BJP; and then

the Minister has to reply. So, kindly conclude.

SHRI RAMACHANDRA KHUNTIA: Sir, it has come in the newspaper also. We are very happy to know that many Ministers in the Cabinet are opposing the privatisation of the public sector. So, the Government, before taking a decision, should first decide for itself what it wants to do. Now, without deciding it, you are coming out, blaming others that the unions and other people are coming in the way. That is not correct. And, I warn this Government. This Government, which has not set up even one industry all over the country, nor is getting investment, whether FDI or any other investment, has no moral right to disinvest any industry in this country. They are blaming the Congress Government. Yes, the Congress Government might have done something wrong. But, today, if there are 6 lakh industries in this country, it is the Congress Government which has brought those industries: not this Government. This Government, which is not able to put up even one industry, not able to bring any FDI, not able to bring any investment, has no moral right to disinvest or sell the property, without assessing, without doing a proper evaluation. If they do, I think, all the workers and the general public will get united and work against this Government. They will give a befitting reply to the Government. So, through you, Sir, I would like to put before the Government, especially the case of NALCO, and all other profit making public sector undertakings. They should not be privatised; rather the workers should be trained; they should be motivated to do the work well. I believe, if the Ministry takes steps to develop the public sector, it will do more work than private sector. With these words, I support the Resolution.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: could I ask one question for clarification?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Your turn is going to come, hon. Minister.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, if you are so kind, I will ask just one question. I would like to know whether he stands by this fact? I am just reading, "The disinvestment Commission will be given a wider and more purposive role in the disinvestment and restructuring of the public sector. The recommendations made by the Commission on different public enterprises, particularly, those relating to strategic sales, will be implemented professionally, without delay" (Congress party manifesto-1999 elections). Do you stand by it?

SHRI RAMACHANDRA KHUNTIA: You must know that the Congress Party had also amended its economic policy in Bangalore. You have joined the BJP only two years back, but I have been in the Congress Party for 30 years. I know better what the Congress Party is and what it stands for. First

set up some industries, then you have the right to sell it. When you have set up no industry at all, how can you sell anything.

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम (उत्तरांचल): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, खूंटीआ साहब के भाषण के बाद मैं धर्मसंकट में पड़ गया हूँ, इसलिए कि आर्थिक उदारीकरण, व्यापारिक भूमंडलीकरण, सेवाओं का निजीकरण, जो देश की आर्थिक नीति के स्तंभ हैं, इस नीति को कांग्रेस पार्टी और कांग्रेस सरकार इस देश में लाई थी और खूंटीआ साहब उस पार्टी के एक सम्मानित सदस्य हैं और हम उस नीति को परस्यू कर रहे हैं, चला रहे हैं। मुझे एक शेर याद आ रहा है:-

चुप खड़े हैं दरम्याने काबा-ओ-बुतखाना हम

किसको कह दें, कैसे कह दें, क्यों कह दें अफसाना हम।

मान्यवर, विनिवेश इस आर्थिक नीति का एक अंग है और यह आर्थिक नीति किसी पार्टी की या किसी सरकार की नहीं है, यह राष्ट्र की आर्थिक नीति है। जब कांग्रेस पार्टी का राज था, उस समय यह आर्थिक नीति आई। उसके बाद संयुक्त मोर्चा की सरकार आई, उसने इस आर्थिक नीति को स्वीकार किया और आगे बढ़ाया, उस सरकार का समर्थन बाहर से कांग्रेस पार्टी कर रही थी और देश की अनेक पार्टियां उसमें सम्मिलित थीं। उसके बाद भारतीय जनता पार्टी के नेतृत्व वाली वर्तमान सरकार आई, इसमें भी देश की अनेक क्षेत्रीय पार्टियां शामिल हैं, जो इसका समर्थन कर रही हैं। पूरे देश के क्षेत्रीय और राजनीतिक दलों ने, जो देश की जनता का प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं, इस नीति को स्वीकार कर लिया है। इसलिए यह राष्ट्र की स्वीकृत नीति है, इसे छोड़ने, बदलने और लौटने का आज प्रश्न नहीं उठता जब तक कि कोई बहुत बड़ा ... (व्यवधान) ... पहले आप सुन लीजिए, आई एम कमिंग टू दि प्वाइंट।

मान्यवर, यहां पर बड़े आंकड़े दिए गए, खूंटीआ जी बड़े विद्वान हैं, मैं इनका बड़ा सम्मान करता हूँ और हमारे साम्यवादी भाई तो बहुत तैयारी करके आते हैं, बड़ा अच्छा बोलते हैं, बड़ी ज्ञानवर्द्धक बातें कहते हैं और बड़ा मसाला इनके पास होता है। पिछले वर्ष हमारे देश ने कबीर जयंती मनाई। कबीर बिल्कुल अनपढ़, बगैर पढ़े-लिखे आदमी थे लेकिन भारत के उच्चतम लोगों में से एक थे। बनारस के ब्राह्मणों से कबीर की बहस हो गई और उन्होंने कबीर के सामने बड़े आंकड़े पेश किए, जैसे कि हमारे साम्यवादी भाई और खूंटीआ साहब पेश कर रहे हैं। कबीर ने एक बात कही कि "तू कहता कागज़ की लेखी और मैं कहता आंखन की देखी"। बोलो कौन सी बात सही है? इस आंकड़ों की लफ्फाजी में जाने की बजाय तथ्यों पर जाना चाहिए ... (व्यवधान) ... मैंने आपकी बात को बहुत ध्यान से और शांतिपूर्वक सुना है, कृपया मेरी बात को भी सुनिए। हमें आंखों से क्या दिखाई दे रहा है। विश्व ने आर्थिक क्रांति में नए युग में प्रवेश किया, उसमें हम भी शामिल हैं, हमारा देश भी शामिल है। अब प्राथमिकता क्या होनी चाहिए, क्या करना चाहिए और कहां पर हमें सावधानी बरतनी चाहिए, इस बात

को देखने की जरूरत है। पिछले दिनों हमारे देश की अर्थव्यवस्था में कितना फर्क आया है, मैं कुछ आंखों देखे आंकड़े आपके सामने पेश कर रहा हूँ। हमारे देश में अंधाधुंध विदेशों का कर्जा था, हमारी सरकार ने उस कर्जे को लेना बंद कर दिया। कर्जे को हम घटा रहे हैं। देश में विकास और कल्याण के कार्यों के लिए पैसा चाहिए। देश की सारी राज्य सरकारें करीब-करीब घाटे में चल रही हैं। केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा पोषित जितनी योजनाएं हैं, ज्यादातर राज्य सरकारें उनका क्रियान्वयन नहीं कर रही हैं, कहती हैं कि हमारे पास पैसा नहीं है कहां से पैसा आए? पांचवें वेतन आयोग की सिफारिशें हमने ऐसे ही लागू कर दीं, जैसे विनिवेश को राजधानी एक्सप्रेस की तरह लागू कर रहे हैं, फलस्वरूप जजों की तनखाह कई गुणा बढ़ गई, नौकरशाही की तनखाह कई गुणा बढ़ गई, सांसदों की तनखाह कई गुणा बढ़ गई, कर्मचारियों की तनखाह कई गुणा बढ़ गई। हमारा जो रोजाना भत्ता था 50 से 200, 200 से 400, 400 से 500 हो गया और कल मैंने पढ़ा कि मंत्रियों के आवास पर और ज्यादा खर्च किया जाएगा। जब हमारे सामने तनखाह बढ़ाने का सवाल आता है, तब यह विनिवेश कहां चला जाता है? जब हमारे सामने सुविधाएं बढ़ाने का सवाल आता है, तब यह विनिवेश कहां चला जाता है? फिर हमारे देश के अंदर बड़ी प्राकृतिक आपदाएं आईं। चक्रवात आया, भूकंप आया, बाढ़ आई, सूखा पड़ा और हर आदमी राहत मांग रहा है, किसान राहत मांग रहा है। आप बराबर समर्थन मूल्य बढ़ाते जा रहे हैं। समर्थन मूल्य बढ़े, इसके लिए आंदोलन हो रहा है। हम बराबर तनखाहें बढ़ाते चले जाएं, समर्थन मूल्य बढ़ाते चले जाएं, आपदाएं देश के ऊपर आती रहें, आर्थिक बोझ में देश डूबता चला जाएं, हम गरीब लोगों की मदद न करें, प्रदेश सरकारें घाटे में चलें और केन्द्र द्वारा पोषित योजनाओं का कार्यान्वयन न करें, फिर देश का विकास और कल्याण कैसे होगा? पैसा कहां से आएगा? क्या हम कर्जा लें? कर्जे का हाल आपने देखा है। क्या हम कर्जा लेते रहें? पिछले दिनों में कर्जे में डूबे अनेक व्यक्तियों के परिवारों ने आत्महत्या कर ली। तो क्या हम इस देश को कर्जे में डुबोकर देश की आत्महत्या करा दें? तब विनिवेश कहां चला जाता है?

महोदय, हमें अपनी आंखों से व्यावहारिक दृष्टि से यह देखना है कि देश की अर्थव्यवस्था को हम कैसे पटरी पर लाएं और विदेशों से कर्जा कैसे बंद करें और देश का विकास कैसे करें हां, एक बात आपको जरूर देखनी चाहिए कि अगर आप कुछ विनिवेश कर रहे हैं तो यह पैसा कहां जाना चाहिए। यह पैसा देश के विकास में जाना चाहिए, कल्याणकारी योजनाओं में, रोजी-रोटी, कपड़ा और मकान की योजनाओं में यह पैसा जाना चाहिए। एक करोड़ मकान बनाने की बात पिछली पंचवर्षीय योजना में कही गई थी। मकान बनने चाहिए, स्कूल खुलने चाहिए, दवाखाने खुलने चाहिए, सड़कें बननी चाहिए, पुल बनने चाहिए, बिजलीघर बनने चाहिए और यह पैसा देश के विकास में खर्च होना चाहिए, न कि सांसदों और मंत्रियों की तनखाहें बढ़ाने में और उनके आवासों की साज-सज्जा पर खर्च होना चाहिए। यह चिंता की

बात है (व्यवधान) Please listen to me, I always talk sense. मैं आंकड़ेबाजी नहीं करता, हालांकि मेरे पास बहुत आंकड़े हैं। हमें इस धन के दुरुपयोग को चैक करना चाहिए। स्कैम्स और धोखे नहीं होने चाहिए, भ्रष्टाचार नहीं होना चाहिए।

श्री रामचन्द्र खूंटिया: इस सरकार के समय में भ्रष्टाचार नहीं होना चाहिए? इतना भ्रष्टाचार हो रहा है।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम: मैं आपसे यही कह रहा हूँ कि नहीं होना चाहिए। देखिए, एम.एन. वोहरा ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में सब लिख दिया है कि बाड़ी में सारे बैंगन काने हैं, कोई नहीं बचा है, न न्यायपालिका बची है, न विधायिका बची है, न नौकरशाही बची है, कोई नहीं बचा, बाड़ी में सब बैंगन काने हैं, केवल difference of degrees है, कोई कम है, कोई ज्यादा है।

मान्यवर, मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि हम इस नीति के विरोध में नहीं हैं लेकिन इस नीति के क्रियान्वयन में क्या खामियां हैं, इस ओर हमें ध्यान देना चाहिए यह कहा गया कि ये उपक्रम उद्योगपतियों को नहीं जाने चाहिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आज़ादी से पहले बिड़ला जी ने इस देश का औद्योगीकरण नहीं किया होता तो इस देश में उद्योग स्थापित नहीं होते। इसके लिए हमने उनको राष्ट्रीय पुरस्कार से पुरस्कृत भी किया है। क्या हर उद्योगपति बेईमान है? अगर वह धन संचय करता है तो इस बारे में कहावत है कि—“पूत कपूत तो क्यों धन संचय, पूत सपूत तो क्यों धन संचय?” उसे धन संचय नहीं करना चाहिए लेकिन अगर वह करता है तो उसके लिए उपाय हैं—इनकम टैक्स लगाओ और वसूल करो, प्रॉपर्टी टैक्स लगाओ और वसूल करो, देश की योजनाओं के लिए उससे चंदा लो, उससे ज्यादा से ज्यादा कंट्रीब्यूशन लो। इसके लिए ये सब उपाय हैं जो सरकार को करने चाहिए। लेकिन हम इनकम टैक्स की वसूलियां न करें, हम सेल्स टैक्स की वसूलियां भी न करें तो फिर ये योजनाएं कैसे चलेंगी?

मान्यवर, मुझे मालूम है कि आपको जाना है और मुझे वहां बैठना है और समय भी कम है, मैं दो-चार मिनट में अपनी बात खत्म कर दूंगा। अब एक चीज के लिए विनिवेश क्यों हो रहा है। नई तकनीक और विज्ञान आज बराबर बढ़ता चला जा रहा है। हमारे लोग—हम सांसद पहले बस में बैठते थे। मैं बुलन्दशहर बस से जाता था तथा प्राइवेट बसें थी जिसमें आम आदमी बैठते हैं। अब हमारा कोई सांसद बस में सफर नहीं करता। अब जो हम पहले कार में बैठते आए हैं उसमें एंसी० नहीं होता था और अब हम सांसद बगैर एंसी० की कार में नहीं बैठते हैं। एंसी० मकान में रहते हैं, एंसी० दफ्तर में बैठते हैं, एंसी० संसद में रहते हैं, एंसी० हवाई जहाज में बैठते हैं, एंसी० रेलगाड़ी में बैठते हैं और अब जबकि हम कह रहे हैं कि पुरानी तकनीक और पुरानी साईंस बराबर जारी रहे, तो फिर आप नई का क्यों इस्तेमाल कर रहे हैं।

हर सांसद के घर पर कम्प्यूटर है और आप कम्प्यूटर से लिख रहे हैं। जब नई तकनीक, नई साईंस और नए आविष्कार आएंगे तो फिर पुराने फेल होंगे तथा पुरानी चीजें स्पर्द्धा में देश में तथा दुनिया के सामने रुक नहीं सकेंगी। एक काम करो कि हमारे देश की जो उपभोक्ता नीति थी कि हम अपने देश की बनी हुई चीजों और अपने देश के कारीगरों द्वारा बनी हुई चीजों का ही इस्तेमाल करेंगे, हम मोची का बना हुआ जूता पहनेंगे, हम एक्शन का जूता नहीं पहनेंगे या तो यह तय करो। हम खादी पहनेंगे, हम टेरीकोट, टेरोलीन नहीं पहनेंगे या तो आप यह तय करो। हम हिन्द साइकिल पर चलेंगे या तो फिर आप यह तय करो। हमारे देश के पुराने कारीगर, पुश्तैनी निर्माता द्वारा बनाया गया बंगाल का 22 गज का मलमल का थान एक अंगूठी से निकल जाता था। जो हाथ का बना हुआ होता था। तो कहां चली गई मलमल। चलाओं उस मलमल को। 1920 में इंग्लैंड की पार्लियामेंट में कश्मीर के शॉल पर चर्चा हुई थी कि विश्व में कहीं भी ऐसा पशमीने का शॉल नहीं बनता है या तो फिर हमारी वह इंजीनियरिंग या जो टेक्नॉलोजी हमारी इंडोजिनियस इण्डस्ट्री में थी, आज हम उसका पुनरुद्धार करें। लेकिन वह तब होगा जब हम उसका सही इस्तेमाल करें। हम उसका इस्तेमाल करना छोड़ दें, बाहर की चीजों का इस्तेमाल करें और वह चीजें हमें सस्ती मिलें तो फिर इनको कौन खरीदेगा? इसलिए दुनिया की स्पर्द्धा में आगे बराबर खड़ा होने के लिए हमें आज उस स्तर पर आना पड़ेगा। अब कुछ इस बात की जरूरत है कि, मैं आपसे माफी चाहूंगा, हमारी प्राथमिकताएं क्या होनी चाहिए। इसमें मेरे शब्द को मत देखना मेरा भाव समझना। आपने इस विनिवेश की नीति में इतनी जल्दबाजी की है जैसे नया मुसल्ला करे अल्लाह ही अल्लाह। आपके पास कोई और काम नहीं है। आपको धीरे चलना चाहिए। कौन मना करता है। आपकी गति और आपको प्राथमिकताएं सुनिश्चित करनी चाहिए। अभी परसों-परले दिन वर्ल्ड की एक रिपोर्ट छपी है कि खेती में रोजगार कम हुआ है। भारत तो कृषि प्रधान देश है। यहां पर असंगठित मजदूर खेती में काम करते हैं। तो हमारी प्राथमिकताएं वह हों जहां पर ज्यादा लोगों को काम मिलता है, जहां मुनाफा मिलता है। उनको प्राथमिकता के आधार पर सेल नहीं करना चाहिए। हमें कोशिश यह करनी चाहिए। लेकिन सरकार जो तर्क देती है वह सही मालूम होता है कि आज जिस चीज के दाम हमें सौ रुपए मिल रहे हैं तो दो-तीन साल के बाद, वह अंग्रेजी में क्या शब्द है ... (व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पी० प्रभाकर रेड्डी): खत्म कीजिए।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम: आखिरी बात कह रहा हूं हम पहले फिएट कार में बैठते थे फिर अम्बेडकर कार आई और फिर आई मारुति कार और उसके बाद फिर अनेक एंसी० कार आई और अब तो शहर में चारों तरफ क्वालिस दिखाई दे रही हैं। यह पहले गंभीरता से सोचो। मेरे पास फिएट गाड़ी है, जब मैं वकालत करता था तब की है। अब उसका सामान कहीं नहीं मिल रहा है तो मुझे तो फिएट बेचनी पड़ेगी। फिएट के दाम नहीं मिल रहे हैं जब कि मैंने उसे दुल्हन की तरह नई जैसी मेनटन करके रखा है। लेकिन अब उसका बाजार में सामान नहीं

मिलता है। सरकार का तर्क यह है कि आज तो इसका दाम मिल रहा है, दो-चार साल के बाद इसका इतना दाम भी नहीं मिलेगा, क्योंकि यह टेक्नालॉजी पुरानी हो जायेगी। इसलिए मैं राघवन जी के इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

SHRI JIBON ROY: Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. We are discussing this matter after a couple of days. Therefore, I am dealing mostly with the philosophical part of the issue now and the other parts will be discussed two days later. I may take some time because in a Private Members Resolution, one has to get the right to express his views. One thing is to communicate his view and the other is to consolidate the ideas within himself. It has two aspects. A Private Members Resolution gives an opportunity to Members to consolidate the ideas among themselves. A talk is going around that standard of Parliament is going down, and had people are entering into Parliament.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM) in the Chair] Now, I do not subscribe to that idea. I do feel that for the first time, real representation of the grass-root level is taking place in the Parliament. In the earlier period, it was being represented by the elites. Since grass-root participation is taking place, people from all corners are coming to the Parliament and entering the Ministry. Persons who are workers, peasants, can enter because of the changed scenario. Film artists are entering, journalists are entering and entrepreneurs are entering the Parliament; peasants are entering Parliament. It is a good development. (*Interruptions*) Businessmen? It is their House. Persons from the grass-root level are coming. Now, what is lacking, I must say, is the statemanship. Statemanship is going out. One may be a worker, one may be a film star, one may be a journalist, like you, but the sense of statesmanship should be there. That is lacking, Sir. That is injuring my mind to a great extent. What does statesmanship mean? Statesmanship means the ability to see the future through the prism of past and the present. Present is not the final thing. Past is not the final thing. When you will be formulating a policy, you should be able to see the future also. Secondly, all of your actions, all of the decisions of a Government should be directed towards the goal behind a policy. The policy should be there and the Government should be able enough, courageous enough, to carry the masses also with that policy. Thirdly, a Government should be able to review its policy from time to time. And, you have pursued these three lines, that is, you see the future through the prism of present and the past, you go by a policy and evaluate the policy after some time, and you carry the masses with your policy. These are the fundamental premises through which a statesman develops. Sir, my point is about the policy concerning

public sector. What policy does guide it? Under what policy, are you pursuing the line of disinvestment, line of strategic sale and line of privatisation? What is the basic policy? Earlier, I have heard talks, some time from your Secretaries, some of the speeches, teaching classes by Secretaries in the Tripartite Labour Conference and some of the Standing Committees. Their argument is that after the World War II, most of the Third World nations did not have that much fund and they were not in a position to establish industries. They were required to take public fund because of that reason. You might vouch on the minutes of the Standing Committee, on the minutes of the National Labour Conference. But since there was no money, the Government collected funds through tax and established public sector to safeguard the private companies. And, when the world situation changed, it was necessary to transfer all the assets to them because they are the owners. I would request the Minister to vouch on the minutes. Is it fair? It may be fair but the geographical position was something different. In 1959, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said in the National Development Council meeting that socialism or the socialistic pattern was the direction of the economy. And, then, he said that it is not any dogma; probably, he was referring to the Soviet Union and other countries. Socialism or socialistic pattern, according to Panditji, was not a dogma but it is an understanding related to equity. And, what was the economic pattern that emanated during that period? Your Secretariat might have learnt something else; but the record says that the public sector philosophy emanated from basics to principle. One principle was social equity and another principle was to develop national industries and to protect them in the interests of the nation. These were the two basic directions. And, during Smt. Indira Gandhi's period, that socialism concept was taken in the Constitution itself. Now, you were not correct when you cited the Congress policies. In their 1991 statement concerning disinvestment and privatisation, they made a declaration. And what does it say? The 1991 Declaration, a copy of which I could get from the library, says, "The portfolio of public sector investments will be reviewed with a view to focus the public sector on strategic, hi-tech and essential infrastructure." One can clarify what 'strategic' is; what a 'hi-tech' is and what an 'essential' is. It further states: "Whereas some reservation for the public sector is being retained, there would be no bar for areas of exclusivity to be opened up to the private sector selectively. Similarly, the private sector also will be allowed an entry in the areas not reserved for it." No doubt, there is some shift from the original 1948 Industrial Policy Resolution, the 1966 Industrial Policy Resolution; no doubt, there is some deviation but the socialistic pattern does exist. It was open for the private sector a little bit. And, there was no bar on any public sector company to bid for another public sector company.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Look at the Chair, not at the Minister. आप बहुत अच्छी बात कह रहे हैं लेकिन चेयर को भी तो सुनने को मिले इसलिए कह रहा हूँ। ... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI JIBON ROY: His Secretary had taken our class. I had attended that class ten times. I am taking the class of his minister now. Sir, the 1991 statement had not talked about strategic sale. It had talked about partial opening up. Socialism is not compromised. General equity is not compromised. Nowhere it is compromised. Social equity is not compromised. There can be no compromise with imperialism. Yes, the objective reality was there. I was saying that a statesman has to review and to understand. There is a sea-change in the world scenario. One must understand the perspective of the 1991 Resolution. The entire industrialisation of our nation was built up, basically, by the Soviet Union, and others joined later. The basic inputs were given by the Soviet Union. But the Soviet Union collapsed. The socialist system in many parts of the world made a retreat. The problem was there with India. The problem was there with China. The problem was there with many other countries. American imperialism was taking revenge against the third World nations, because of the past history. Yes, there was a change. But I am for adjustment. And, that adjustment was made through the 1991 Resolution. I had not supported it at that moment also. I said that once you compromised your position, you would be dragged into further compromises, as it is happening today. Now, you do whatever you like. After all, whatever you may have stand on the economy, you can change your position from time to time; you can reverse it from time to time; but the basic direction is—whether it is anti-imperialism or whatever—our economic safeguards should be maintained and the principle of equity has got to be maintained. That is my basic concern. The Government is not addressing this. That is my grievance. I understand, it is a very difficult situation. You have adopted that policy. Now, the situation has changed; ten years have passed; the world is getting changed; why should you not review your position? (*Time-bell*) Sir, I will take some time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Mr. Jibon Roy, normally, we have the discussion on a Resolution for two hours only. I wish that the discussion on this Resolution is finished today.

SHRI JIBON ROY: Sir, it can be carried over. My Resolution, in the past,

was also carried over to the next day. A very important thing is being discussed here. Justice has to be done to that, and to me also. And, I am appealing to the government. I am not fighting with the government. I want a review. that is all. While I demand a review, I request you, you bring whatever changes you want to, but do not forget the basic direction of the nation, the basic understanding. It is there in the Constitution. Socialism is still there. If you have the guts, you come forward with an amendment to change the Constitution. Equity must be maintained. Sir, he was quoting from the Resolution on disinvestment. You know that I do not support that Resolution. Still, in that Resolution, the matter of disinvestment is there; not strategic sale. The difference between disinvestment and strategic sale is to be understood. Disinvestment means, you have a company, and because you require some money, you may dispose of some of the equity or some of the shares, and collect some money. When you talk about strategic sale, you are liquidating. That is the difference. *(Interruptions)*. I am not trying to become a statesman. But the Government should be courageous enough; it should not be a hypocrite. I was reading a book in the library. It was a book of essays, written by very eminent economists, including Mr. Montek Singh Ahluwalia. In one part, the editor of the book says that the unfortunate thing in India is that the reform process is undertaken, but, in no electoral process, it is taken to the masses. He says that they have not changed their concept of socialism in the Constitution; they have not changed their Resolution pertaining to the socialistic pattern of society, and they have not changed over to their economy being handed over to the top bureaucratic class. I agree, that is right. But they have not...

SHRI BALBIR K. PUNJ: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir,...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Mr. Punj, please sit down.

SHRI JIBON ROY: Have patience. *(Interruptions)* Please, have patience.

So far as people are concerned, you have to pass it to the people. You have to pass it through the prism of the people. In no election, has this issue of reform been taken to the masses, and their vote sought for that. At no time, it has been said that socialism is being compromised, and that the Constitution is being compromised. Then, would I not say that you have...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Please conclude.

SHRI JIBON ROY: Sir, if, on Private Members' Resolution also... *(Interruptions)* All right, I am not concluding, but...

SHRI BALBIR K. PUNJ: Your are against privatisation, but...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Please.

SHRI JIBON ROY: The thing is that it is a Private Member's Resolution. So far as I remember, on this topic, a philosophical discussion has never taken place.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Mr. Jibon Roy, you have already taken 17 minutes.

SHRI JIBON ROY: I may take 17 more minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): No. There is a specific provision that a Member cannot take more than 15 minutes on a Resolution. It is in the rules. You can see the rules.

SHRI JIBON ROY : Then, I will keep quiet. All right.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): No, you please conclude.

SHRI JIBON ROY: No, no. Why should I go against the law? I am talking about law, and I am talking about the Constitution. I do not wish to go against the law.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Mr. Jibon Roy, if you want, you can take one or two minutes.

SHRI JIBON ROY: No, no. I go by the law, and the rule. This is an issue...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Mr. Jibon Roy, thank you then. You have spoken very well.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA (WEST BENGAL): Sir, let him conclude.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Haven't you heard me? I told him that he could take one or two minutes.

SHRI JIBON ROY: The thing is that you make a review. Keep the matter

of equity and imperialist offensive in your mind. You have to save the nation. Just look at America. America is waging a war against Iraq, for what? For petrol. And we have some national companies in our petroleum sector. Without waging any war, we are, ourselves, resolving the problems. Is it patriotic? Is there any social dimension? You have changed the direction. From the 1991 Resolution, you have gone to disinvestment. From disinvestment, you have gone to strategic sales. Now, you are saying that the Government will not do any business. That means, the Government will withdraw its control over the country's economy. You are going to hand over the entire nation to a group of people who are important. The entire economy is being managed by the industry. Not one thing is being given to the agriculture. You do not have the courage to fight with the private sector and see to it that agriculture also contributes. You are transferring every thing to the private sector, and they are transferring the entire nation to the foreign companies. You look into the papers prepared by the Second National commission on Labour. They have said that most of the money, which is coming from outside, is being spent for acquisitions. Sir, it is an international affair. Here, I would like to quote from the book titled 'Globalisation Unmasked' by James Petras and Henry Veltmeyer. It says that countries after countries are being taken over by the foreigners. They come only to indulge in speculation and not to set up any industries. I quote, "The 'wave of the future' ideology is tied to a specific group of capitalists operating at the centre of the globalisation project: the investment bankers and brokerage firms that have moved to the forefront of the richest U.S. companies. Goldman Sachs, Wall Street's biggest private partnership, will probably earn close to \$ 3 billion in 1997. In 1975 brokerage and investment banking firms earned \$ 4.8 billion; by 1994 annual profits had grown to \$ 69.5 billion. In comparison, Microsoft, the biggest and most successful high-tech firm, had after-tax profits of only \$ 2.2 billion."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Thank you very much (*Interruptions*) Please conclude.

SHRI JIBON ROY: Sir, one more minute. Take note of what is happening in Brazil; take note of what is happening in Guatemala; take note of Venezuela. Thank you very much, Sir.

डा० रमेन्द्र कुमार यादव "रवि" (बिहार): इसमें भी आपने पान्दी लगा दी है।

श्री मनोज भट्टाचार्य: प्राइवेट मैम्बर्स के रेजोल्यूशन में ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए।

DR. M.N. DAS (ORISSA): Mr. Vice-Chairman, sir, kindly don't take me amiss, and with due apology, let me speak to my hon. friend. Shri Sangh

Priya Gautam, sitting on that side, that he is in the habit of generating heat on the floor of the House, but most of us are interested in finding light out of this great economic issue facing the country. You asked as to where from we can get money for development of the country. Well, the windows of the World Bank are open for you; the windows of the IMF are open for you. Borrow thousands of crores of astronomical figures and spend that money all over the country, but don't check corruption at any stage of implementation of the programme. I have written to the hon. Minister for Disinvestment, Shri Arun Shouriji. Out of my own experience, I have found, you are giving to each M.P. Rs. 2 crores to spend for local development, but you don't control the district administration, the implementing agencies and a lot of money goes down the drain, in the form of corruption before your own eyes. We are shocked to see that. That is a different matter.

Now, I come to the subject matter. Sir, kindly excuse me to say that all over India today, either among the conscious section of the population or among the common people, three words, namely, liberalisation, privatisation and disinvestment are being discussed. These topics are being discussed everywhere, but surprisingly enough and peculiarly enough, the word 'disinvestment' also is associated with the name of hon. Arun Shourieji. Kindly excuse me to speak the facts. As if Mr. Arun Shourie is disinvestment or disinvestment is Arun Shourie. Both happen to be the two sides of the same coin. The other day, I was discussing with some people who know the subject. One of them told me that this very Arun Shourie, not long ago, was an opponent of the policy of disinvestment, liberalisation and privatisation. But, today he is the strongest advocate of the same policy of disinvestment. I told him we analyse historical personalities.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: That person is completely wrong mid-90s, I am supporting it.

Dr. M. N. Das: You are supporting! Very good. You are quite right. But I thought that there are some kind of metamorphosis of the personality, under compelling or imperative situations or factors. But that apart, whatever it may be. Whatever it be. My friend, Shri Gautam, as also my esteemed colleague, Shri Jibon Roy, referred to the Congress regime. Now, I have tried to understand a bit of what the policy of liberalisation was, which was taken up during the Congress regime, when Dr. Manmohan Singh thought of liberalisation, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, etc. His liberalisation stood on a solid principle—dividing the Indian Public sector into two categories—profit-making and loss-making. He took a decision to patronise

the public sector units, and to never close down any public sector unit which was making profits. But where an industry is sick and the Government had been incurring loss year after year, they thought it was better to adopt a different attitude towards those defaulting loss-making industries.

So, the policy was never to privatise those industries which are making profit, adding to the resources of Government of the time. Rather, they thought that such industries should be encouraged and money invested in them so that they earned more and more. But, today, a nightmarish scene is seen all over the country, as if a huge bulldozer is directed towards all the public sector units, whether profit-making or loss-making. Whether it is a right concept or a wrong concept, only the future will tell.

My esteemed friend, Shri Ramachandra Khuntia, gave an example. During the last few months, my home State of Orissa is in a total turmoil, a type of upheaval, popular resistance, popular movement, popular restlessness; because, somehow, they have come to know that the Government is going to privatise NALCO, the only industry in Orissa, today, that earns huge profits; it is regarded as a pride of the State.

I would give a few figures. The Government invested only Rs. 1200 crores in it, but the company has paid back to the Government, till date, Rs. 4000 crores. Annually, on an average, NALCO is making a profit of Rs. 500 crores. This year, as Mr. Khuntia pointed out, the profit was Rs. 623 crores, and the company is trying to modernise itself spending Rs. 3700 crores, from its own resources. In the future, the profit will not be Rs. 600 crores, annually, but Rs. 1000 crores! Out of this Rs. 1000 crores the Government of India would get Rs. 400 crores. Is it a company to be handed over to a private corporation? That is the question of questions, problem of problems. Don't play with the pride of a State of 4 crore people.

When we are giving you Rs. 400 crores, annually, out of the profit of Rs. 1000 crores, on what logic, on what basis, on what principle are you going to privatise it? That is the question of questions. What about the human aspect? (*Time-bell*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Just one second. Apart from you, there are seven more Members to speak and the hon. Mover of the Resolution has to reply. But we have got only 45 minutes at our disposal.

DR. M. N. DAS: Sir, I know about this House, the Chairmen of various parties, I say with truthful courage—including you give indulgence to

heavyweights and the lightweight Members have no chance to speak. I am thankful to you. I am sitting down.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYAGAUTAM): Kindly conclude in the usual manner, (*Interruptions*)...

DR. M. N. DAS: I have already concluded... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): So kind of you ... (*Interruptions*)...

श्री जीवन राय: हम लोगों का भी कुछ ख्याल रखिए। कम से कम प्राइवेट मेंबरज बिल में तो बोलने की इजाजत दीजिए, नियमानुसार तो टाइम का देखना चाहिए, अन्यथा यह अवसर भी चला जाएगा।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): I am not the maker of the rules. I am merely following them ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN: Are you allowing Members to speak on the Private Member's Resolution based on the strength of each party? ... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): No, no... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI N. K. PREMACHANDRAN: Then why is this rotation? ... (*Interruptions*) ... First Congress and then the ruling party Members... (*Interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): We have adopted this practice.

SHRI N. K. PREMACHANDRAN: At least on the Private Member's day Members should be given an opportunity to speak according to the order ... (*Interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Kindly write to the hon. Chairman. ... (*Interruptions*)... This matter can be discussed ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI N. K. PREMACHANDRAN: With due respect to the Chair, now there is no Member belonging either to the BJP or Congress... (*Interruptions*) ... It is full time for the Members in the Private Members' day.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): This is the usual practice.

usual practice.

SHRI BALBIR K. PUNJ: Sir, our friends sitting on that side are opposed to privatisation, but they are so emphatic on Private Member's Resolution ... *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): It is just humour and humour is a part of discussion ... *(Interruptions)*... As you are aware we have made a practice to call the Members party-wise so that all Members could participate. Otherwise, if there are 10 Members who give their names in advance *(Interruptions)* ... from one party what will happen to others.

श्री जीवन राय: सुबह एक घंटा था। The North-Eastern Council Bill was discussed up to 2.15 P.M... *(Interruptions)* ... Generally, you are very liberal. आप बोलने दीजिए।

5.00 p.m.

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN: This is the only opportunity for the Members of belonging to smaller parties and groups to speak ...*(Interruptions)*... If this opportunity is denied, it means that is absolutely..... *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): I will bring your suggestion and grievance to the notice of the hon. Chairman.

SHRI N. JOTHI (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as far as I am concerned, I am not for total disinvestment and for fully supporting it. It should be done on a selective basis, from industry to industry basis. Only after that a decision has to be taken. It is not that you bulldoze it in wholesale. It cannot be done like this. Sir, immediately after the Independence when the Constitution was being made, the debates in this regard took place just 15 feet away from this Chamber, that is, in the Central Hall. Based on these debates, our Constitution was framed. In Part IV, in article 37, it has been very clearly mentioned that the Directive Principles of the State Policy shall be the guiding factor for the purpose of governance of the country. Articles 39(b) and 39(c) are very clear and very emphatic in stating certain principles to be followed by the State. Article 39 (b) says that the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good. And Article 39(c) says that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common

Arun Shourie. He must bear in mind that he is governed by Part IV and Articles 39(b) and 39(c) of the Constitution which prohibit concentration of wealth in certain people.

Now, I come to the point of what is going on in the Disinvestment Scheme. The core sectors like steel, fertilizer, power, etc., have been brought under the public sector by our forefathers with a laudable purpose. The purpose behind it was, self-sufficiency, sharing of foreign exchange and stopping imports. These were the main reasons. Then, came socialism, thereafter, mixed economy and democratic socialism. Like that, it was thought of. It might have failed in some sectors. It is mainly due to the selfish, corrupt managerial policy adopted by the bureaucrats. It is unfortunate. They are not being controlled by the Ministers. The bureaucrats have brought bad policies. This was coupled with the fact that Ministers could not control them. In addition to, that the workers and employees were not realising their duty to the welfare of the public. These are the contributory factors for failure of certain core sectors. And then, they started running on losses. Instead of augmenting infrastructure and looking forward with remedial measures, a policy has now blindly been undertaken to disinvest everything. Sir, father may become ill, mother may become useless after attaining certain age. But, that does not mean that they should be thrown out. Still, you must nourish them. Still you must take care of them. It is the pious duty of a son. Like that, the policy-makers of this country should have a broad-based thinking, based on the forefathers' views found in the Constitutional debates. The articles were framed on those views. Articles 39(b) and 39(c) say that wealth should not be concentrated in some people. So, you must think the ways in which the public sector undertakings could be redeemed and could be taken care of. I can understand certain irredeemable institutions being sold, but not profit-making institutions or core industries like petroleum. What for petroleum industries are sought to be sold, their equities of them sought to be sold? What is the purpose behind this? Who is behind it? Somebody wants the retail outlets because in some places private people have set up refineries. Important places are not available to them to open their outlets in cities and towns. So, they have decided to take over this sector. Sir, it is very unfortunate. It is like father-in-law taking away the son of a father who has to take care of his parents. This is exactly what is happening now. It is like a rich father marrying off his daughter to a boy and taking away that boy to his house. This is how it is happening now. This should be stopped. I appeal to the hon. Minister...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Mr. Minister,

the hon. Member is drawing your attention.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, he is not only not interested in public sector, but also in my speech.

Now, I am bringing before you an important issue which is creating a problem in the State of Tamil Nadu. There is a mild steel plant called Salem Steel Plant. Already the Jindal Group Companies has set its eyes on it. The Legislative Assembly of Tamil Nadu passed a unanimous Resolution not to disinvest it. It is our property. Our men have brought it up. It has come up with our resources. It is making profits. Sir, TATAs and Jindal competed with each other for this. I am told that, now, TATAs have backed out. Sir, that industry is very important industry for the simple reason that the steel manufactured in the Salem Steel plant is mainly used, and can be for used for making missiles. It is a peculiar, and a very fine steel. There is a condition that it shall not be sold to other foreign countries, and that it should be utilized only in India. Suppose, it is sold to Jindal, who have already set their eyes on it, can you impose a condition on them that it should not be sold to any foreign country? Sir, this is a very unfortunate situation. In such situations, you must put the national interest first. This important aspect should be looked into. There is no point in selling everything, in a wholesale manner, for some money. At times, feeding a loss-making company can also prove to be the best economic strategy. Once you sell it, you cannot restore it later; you cannot create it later.

As Shri Raghavan has said, we have nationalised four petroleum companies by an Act of Parliament. What for? The purpose is to make our country self-sufficient, which is yet to be achieved. Then, what is the fun in selling its shares? The NDA Government itself is divided on this matter. I am very happy about that. There are some very conscious people, who are educated on that matter. Sir, there are some industries; you could never think of selling them. We should stop thinking on those lines. There are certain industries which are making losses continuously, they cannot be retrieved back at all. No amount of further investment can revive them. And if they are not viable, then, you can think of selling them. But even then, you must keep the country's interest, local interest, public interest, in mind. Everything should be taken care of. The guiding factor for your Ministry should be Article 39 (b) and (c). These should be guiding factors for your Ministry.

Sir, I am not trying to canvass for anything here when I mention this:

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI* (TAMIL NADU): Mr. Vice Chairman,

Sir, it is a *sub judice* matter. It cannot be discussed here.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Mr. Virumbi, please ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, it is not a *sub judice* matter. It is a matter of policy. (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: I just want to know whether it is in the court or not...(*Interruptions*)... If the matter is *sub judice*, then, you just see to it that it is expunged... (*Interruptions*) ... Even if it is a truth ...(*Interruptions*)... even it is a fact ... (*Interruptions*) ... I don't know what you feel ... (*Interruptions*) ... You may feel it is a fact, but, I don't think so ... (*Interruptions*) ... I just want to know whether a sub Judice matter can be discussed here or not ... (*Interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): I have told you, I will look into it, ... (*Interruptions*) ... I have told you, I will look into it. ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI N. JOTHI: That is why I said, when there is a full-fledged Ministry for Disinvestment, there cannot be a different policy by the central intelligence agency against it. This is what I am saying. I am only talking about the policy matter. Maybe, you have some grudge against her ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: No; no, I don't have any grudge against her. (*Interruptions*). I am only concerned about the rules and procedures of the House. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Mr. Jothi, you address the Chair...(*Interruptions*)... He is raising objections. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: He is casting aspersions on me.... (*Interruptions*) ... I am just concerned about the rules and procedures of the House. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Mr. Jothi, the hon. Member is just saying that this matter is *sub judice*. And, if it is so, then, you try to avoid such matters ...(*Interruptions*) ... You are a very senior lawyer. (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Sir, it is all right. But, what is your ruling on the matter which has already been discussed here? You have given a ruling

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

that hereafter, he should not mention it. But, what about the *sub judice* matter which he has already referred to?

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): I have already told you, I will look into it. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: It will be removed, thank you, Sir.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): I have already told you.

SHRI N. JOTHI: The Sun rises in the East, but, there is a small section of people who think that it is not so. Moses had given Ten Commandments. If some people say that Ten Commandments were not given, it is not true. But there are people like that, and we have to put up with such people. I don't have any grievance against that. As far as disinvestment is concerned, through Chair, I appeal to the hon. Minister—I know very well that you are not anti-national, that you are a thought-provoking person, and that money alone does not matter in certain issues—to kindly think twice before selling any company. Kindly think several times before fixing the value of any company. Because, bureaucrats and rich personalities are more clever in money matters than the policy matters. Kindly rethink on all these matters and save this country. Thank you.

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for the opportunity you have given to me. Actually, the whole process of disinvestment, the entire process of rethinking about the manner in which it should be done, started because of a major lacuna in our polity. It is the 'work culture'. If we had the right kind of 'work culture', we would not have faced any of these disinvestment programmes. In fact, our industries would have been flourishing. They would not have needed any kind of disinvestment. Mr. Gautam rightly said that demands on the economy are coming from all directions. Where from the money will be raised, especially, when this Government has decided that it will not take any further foreign loans? We are already overburdened with loans. We have stopped taking loans. So, wherefrom will the money be raised? Therefore, a policy needs to be framed to generate some funds for the sake of the development as well as for running the economy, as such. The Policy of Disinvestment, therefore, covered not merely the loss-making units, it had to cover the whole gamut of industrial units which can yield money, and that too, a good amount, so that it could help the economy. Almost every Member has talked about petroleum industry. It has five different aspects—exploration, production, refining, pipeline and

storage, and the last one is retail. All the first fours are already being handled by the private sector. As far as the private sector is concerned, everything, from exploration to pipeline and storage, is fully in gear. Only the retail part has been retained by the Government. I do not know what is so strategic about retail. It has always and will always be retained under the control of any Government, because the retail outlets are there in various districts and towns. Some kind of a psychosis has been generated that petroleum industry is a strategic industry. Therefore, it should be completely retained by the Government, but that kind of psychosis does not hold water. The more important point is, since Independence, trade unions have been playing a very unfortunate role, in our country. Even as a student, I have always thought that why trade unions do not talk about increasing production, about mobilising the resources, and things like that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Hon. Members, Mr. Virumbi had raised an objection that the matter of fact which Mr. Jothi was referring to, is *sub judice*. Rule 238 (i) says, "a Member while speaking shall not refer to any matter of fact on which a judicial decision is pending." If it is so, it will be expunged.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Sir, it is so.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Then, you have to prove that it is *sub judice*.

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL: So, all along, Sir, there has been only one aspect of the trade unions and, i.e., fighting, fighting for their rights, fighting for their wages, without any concern for what is going to happen to any industry. Sir, I have had the opportunity of examining several public sector undertakings as a Member of the Committee on Public Sector Undertakings. The biggest malaise that I found there was—common to almost everyone—that they were having the staff almost 30-40 per cent, in most cases, 70 per cent, beyond their requirement. It seemed as if the public sector undertakings became the fiefdom of the then Ministers who would just tell "इसको रख लो, उसको रख लो", and they would be employed. And, as such the staff went up. Now, that is one aspect. The other aspect is, how merrily things are stolen; thefts are committed on a very, very large scale telling on the economy of the entire undertaking itself. We have the Railways. We know what amount of thefts are taking place there. What has happened to the State Electricity Boards? They have become white elephants. At least, in my State, it is a white elephant. The transport

system was nationalised, the State bus services are going on, and it is almost like a white elephant. A man who is working there has just to sit there. I know some drivers who are not employed. The officially employed driver is working somewhere else and he has asked one of his friends to run that bus and there is nobody to check! The ease with which all these irregularities, all these thefts, are going on in public sector undertakings is the second factor which has caused a complete disaster in the public sector undertakings. Nobody is interested in whether the company is earning profit or running in loss. They will get their salaries, even if the Government have to shell out money for their salaries. Therefore, this attitude, this work culture, has been the major reason for our present day malaise. Suddenly we have got exposed to liberalisation, and here we have to compete with countries where the work culture is very different. People speak about China. More than 20 years back, China had introduced the policy of hire and fire. If a person is not working properly, if he is not prone to discipline, he is thrown out, and nobody can do anything there. But, here, we are still battling as to how we rationalise the labour laws. The VRS schemes that have been offered are offering a fortune for a person to walk out. When I saw that I said, "How is it economical to throw him out at such a high cost". If that is the cost that is going to be paid to get rid of one man who is not needed and who was recruited as a measure of gratis by a generous Minister, then where are we going to end up? So, the basis point is, we have to disinvest not the loss-making companies only. Who will buy the loss making companies? When it comes to that, they say that a particular company is making a tremendous profit. The BALCO was in the red. What happened to the BALCO since its disinvestment? The production went up several folds and it has now become an asset to the country. No matter who is running the industry. If it is generating wealth, it is generating wealth for the country. It does not matter who is running it. So, when the State is running a company, there is nobody responsible. That is because of our work culture. If it is disinvested, it starts yielding much higher returns for the investment that has been made therein.

Sir, one point would be said as to what should be done with the money that comes out of this disinvestment process. There, I would like to suggest to the Government that that money should be kept aside for developmental projects, for infrastructural development, for amelioration of the backward and the less fortunate people in the country. Those schemes should be financed from that. This money should not be utilised just for meeting the routine Government expenditure. That is not fair. When we are taking away money from a productive industry, we should invest in equally productive channels. That is the point the Government needs to address.

Sir, they go on saying that only the profit-making industries have been sold. I may point out that out of 36 companies, 75 per cent of them were loss-making.

The criticise the Government on strategic sales. They say that we just hand-over the shares. The point is when some industries are on the point of disinvestment, and if the *bazaars* go cold, the company gets collapsed. If you sell the shares at that price, what return is the Government going to have? Sir, they talked out of the Centuar Hotel. They say that he bought it for some crores of rupees and sold it at a profit of Rs. 32 crores. What about the IPCL? He bought it for Rs. 2,500 crores and today it is not even worth Rs. 250 crores. These are the vagaries of the market. We have to understand it. But, by politicising it and by trying to run down a political party, you are actually running down a policy, which was initiated by the Congress Party Government and was supported by all the Opposition parties. Since we are now in power, it does not mean that it is exclusively a policy of the NDA Government. It is a policy of the entire nation. The point that needs to be addressed is how to make it really effective.

The trouble is that the people very easily compare themselves with outside countries, without realising the extent of our capital market and the extent of their capital markets. The entire Indian capital market comprises of \$135 billion. Compare it with the US capital market which is of \$10,000 billion. The UK capital market comprises of 14 billion pounds. With this small capital market, we cannot think of very large-scale disinvestments. These points have to be kept in mind before we start comparing ourselves with other countries in respect of these things.

Besides, it is not that India alone is resorting to disinvestments. It was started by England. It has been done in Russia. That is the only way, after the end of the cold-war economy, which was between two poles. Today it is a uni-polar world. Therefore, our economy has to adjust itself to the present-day situation. As Mr. Jibon Roy has rightly said, adjustment has to be made, because there are forces which you and I cannot govern. Therefore, we have to adjust accordingly.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Kindly conclude now.

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL : I will just conclude.

Sir, they have talked about the Directive Principles of State Policy. This Government, of all the Governments, has definitely tried to take away money from those who can pay, and then invested it in channels which can do good to the underdogs, to the really poor. Antyodaya and various other programmes

launched by the Prime Minister are meant to improve the buying capacity of the poor man. It is for these schemes that the money earned through disinvestments needs to be utilised. If that is done, I am sure, this disinvestment programme, which now cannot be reversed, will achieve its target. Of course, the programme needs to be reviewed. That review is being done. After that review, it has to be followed up so that the country does not go bankrupt.

डा० रमेन्द्र कुमार यादव "रवि": माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं माननीय सदस्य वी.वी. राघवन जी के विनिवेश के संबंध में प्रस्तुत संकल्प के समर्थन में बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। अभी-अभी सदन में माननीय रामचंद्र खूंटीआ जी, माननीय एम.एन. दास जी, माननीय संघ प्रिय गौतम जी, माननीय सिंहल साहब ने अपने विचार प्रकट किए। वैचारिक विविधता हमें एक निष्कर्ष पर लाती है। सरकार की अपनी अवधारणाएं हो सकती हैं, स्थापनाएं हो सकती हैं, मान्यताएं हो सकती हैं। इसे आर्थिक उदारीकरण, वैश्वीकरण, भूमंडलीयकरण जितने भी नाम दिए जाएं, सरकार अपनी अर्थ-नीति तय करती है। अर्थ का मतलब अनर्थ नहीं होना चाहिए। अभी-अभी माननीय संघ प्रिय गौतम जी ने कहा, मैं कहता अखिशन की देखी। इस सदन में जो सदस्य इस बहस में भाग ले रहे हैं, शिरकत कर रहे हैं, इनके अलावा भी विद्वतजन देश में हैं, विभिन्न जातियां हैं, वर्ग हैं, धर्म हैं, सम्प्रदाय हैं। इस देश की तुलना अमेरिका, इंग्लैंड, फ्रांस, जापान से नहीं हो सकती है। इस देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था की रीढ़ खेती है और यह अत्यंत आबादी वाला मुल्क है। इस देश में शिक्षित लोग बेरोजगार हैं, किसान असंगठित हैं बेरोजगारी का आलम है। मैं पवित्र स्मरण करना चाहूंगा इस मौजू वक्त पर श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जी का। एक वक्त था जब उन्होंने देश की चल-अचल सम्पत्ति देश के राजाओं-महाराजाओं से लेकर देश को सौंपी थी। एक समय वह था जब राजाओं-महाराजाओं से सम्पत्ति लेकर देश को सौंपी गयी थी और आज एक ऐसी सरकार है जो मुल्क की सम्पत्ति को, पीएसयूज को चंद लोगों के हाथ में सौंप रही है। इसका दूरगामी परिणाम क्या पड़ेगा, मैं नहीं कह सकता हूँ। मैं कोई अर्थ-शास्त्री नहीं हूँ, विशेषज्ञ नहीं हूँ, लेकिन पढ़ने की आदत है समीक्षकों को, आलोचकों को, अर्थ-शास्त्रियों को और विद्वतजनों को मैं अखबारों में पढ़ता हूँ। जो आम धारणा है वह विनिवेश के पक्ष में नहीं है। यह ठीक है, बुरा ऋण है, बेडइन्वेस्टमेंट है, ऐसी सम्पत्ति, परिसम्पत्ति को अगर बेचा जाता है तो यह क्षम्य है। इनको घाटे में नहीं चलना चाहिए। मैं राज्य सरकारों की आर्थिक स्थिति की चर्चा नहीं करना चाहता हूँ, लेकिन जो यूनियन्स वायबल हैं, उनको नहीं बेचना चाहिए। माननीय गौतम जी ने, संघ प्रिय हैं यह तो बुरा लगता है, लेकिन गौतम हैं, बहुत अच्छा लगता है। आपने कहा, इतनी जल्दबाजी क्यों? इतनी हड़बड़ी क्यों? सात घोड़ा अमेरिका जा रहा है, आठवां घोड़ा, छोट घोड़ा हम भी जा रहे हैं, हमारी स्थिति अलग है। इस समय यहां राष्ट्रीय मोर्चा की सरकार और आज की सरकार विनिवेश के मामले में * दिखती है। * कोई असंसदीय शब्द नहीं है और न अपशब्द है। * दिखती है, ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए। इतनी जल्दबाजी क्यों? लोग कहते हैं जल्दी का काम शैतान का।

मैं बहुत अधिक नहीं बोलकर मंथन के बाद अपने विचार रखना चाहता हूँ। मैं आपकी तरह ऐसे भी बोल सकता हूँ, लेकिन मैं पिन-पाइंटिड होकर आदरणीय विनिवेश मंत्री श्री अरुण शौरी जी से कहना चाहता हूँ।

यह सही है कि सरकार बहुत जगह पर कारोबार नहीं कर सकती। खासकर कंपनियों के संचालन का काम हर जगह सरकार के वश का नहीं होता है। प्रबंधन को प्रभावकारी बनाने और उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए जरूरी होता है कि सरकारी नियंत्रण में कुछ कमी की जाए। इसके लिए निश्चित रूप से कुछ सार्वजनिक उपक्रमों का विनिवेश एक रास्ता था।

जिस समय विनिवेश की प्रक्रिया शुरू हुई थी। यह तय किया गया था कि विनिवेश के जरिए कंपनियों में प्रबंधन का हस्तांतरण होगा ताकि प्रतिस्पर्धा के दौर में कंपनियाँ टिकी रह सकें। लेकिन वास्तविकता यह है कि विनिवेश की मौजूदा प्रक्रिया प्रबंधन का हस्तांतरण नहीं है बल्कि सार्वजनिक सम्पत्तियों का हस्तांतरण है। यह बाजार में नयी तरह का एकाधिकार पैदा कर रही है। सरकार ने मार्डन फूड को बेचा....

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम): डा. रवि, * शब्द असंसदीय माना गया है। इसलिए इसे निकाल दिया जाए।

डा० रमेन्द्र कुमार यादव "रवि": ठीक है, * शब्द निकाल दिया जाए। * हो रही है, उतावली हो रही है। मैं साहित्य का छत्र हूँ....

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम): अगर * होगा तो उसे निकाल दिया जाए।

डा० रमेन्द्र कुमार यादव "रवि": मैं * कह रहा हूँ, अधीर होना, उतावला होना। यह असंसदीय नहीं है, यह अपशब्द नहीं है। मैं शर्त लगा सकता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम): उतावला कहना सही है लेकिन * ये सारे शब्द असंसदीय हैं।

डा० रमेन्द्र कुमार यादव "रवि": हजूर, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि शब्दों के अर्थ नहीं होते हैं, शब्द निरर्थक होते हैं, ऐसा हमारे बहुत बड़े विद्वान आचार्य देवेन्द्र नाथ शर्मा ने कहा था। मैं कहता हूँ कि अरुण शौरी साहब बहुत विद्वान हैं। मैं फिर कह रहा हूँ "अरुण शौरी साहब बहुत विद्वान हैं!" फिर मैं कहता हूँ "अरुण शौरी साहब विद्वान हैं।" तीनों के तीन अर्थ होते हैं, अगर कहने का तरीका अलग हो जाए। शब्द निरर्थक होते हैं। जो अभिप्रेत हमारा है, वह देखिए। सरकार उतावली हो रही है।

* की जगह उतावली को अंकित किया जाए और यह असंसदीय नहीं है। मैं साहित्य का छत्र हूँ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Dr. Ravi, we are not entering into discussion on this very point. The word * is unparliamentary. Please go ahead.

डा रमेन्द्र कुमार यादव "रवि": विनिवेश का उद्देश्य कई सेवाओं में से एकाधिकार खत्म किया जाना था परन्तु सरकार सार्वजनिक सम्पत्तियों का हस्तांतरण कर बाजार में नयी तरह का एकाधिकार पैदा कर रही है। सरकार ने मॉडर्न फूड को बेचा। निश्चित रूप से इससे, खरीददार का एकाधिकार बहाल हुआ। ऐसे ही सरकार ने आई.पी.सी.एल. को रिलायंस के हाथों बेच दिया। इससे भी एकाधिकारी प्रवृत्ति को बढ़ावा मिला। मेरा चौथा प्वाइंट है कि विनिवेश नीति की सबसे बड़ी गड़बड़ी यह है कि यह सरकार मुनाफा वाली कम्पनियों को बेच रही है जबकि तब यह किया गया था कि जो कम्पनी घाटे में चल रही है, उसका ही विनिवेश किया जाएगा। एक और घोर आपत्ति की बात यह है कि सरकारी कम्पनियों की सभी चल-अचल सम्पत्तियों को औने-पौने दामों पर बेचा जा रहा है। मैं संतूर होटल व नाल्को वगैरह की बात नहीं करूंगा, बाल्को की बात नहीं कर सकता या ऐनरॉन की बात नहीं कर सकता, स्मरण है लेकिन चर्चा का वक्त नहीं है। बाल्को के विनिवेश मामले में सी.ए.जी. ने भी कह दिया है कि इसकी कीमत लगाते हुए 300 करोड़ रुपये के करीब तक का आकलन हुआ है। सरकार ने रिलायंस और एस्सार जैसी कम्पनियों को खुले बाजार में आने की इजाजत दे दी। ये दोनों कम्पनियां अपनी खुदरा बिक्री केन्द्र खोल सकती हैं, इसमें हम लोगों को कोई आपत्ति नहीं है लेकिन सरकार अपनी कम्पनियों के मार्किट शेयर तो नहीं बेचे। ऐसे में सरकार की मंशा पर भला उंगली कैसे न उठे?

अंत में, क्या सरकार यह स्पष्ट कर सकेगी कि जब वह कोई कम्पनी बेचती है तो उसे आमदनी होती है लेकिन वह आमदनी कहां खर्च होती है, यह शायद सरकार को भी पता न हो। सरकारी खर्च में कटौती के बदले लगातार बढ़ोत्तरी हो रही है। उसे पूरा करने के लिए कहीं से तो धन जुटाना है। कहीं विनिवेश को ही तो सरकार ने अपना खर्च पूरा करने का जरिया नहीं बना लिया है? धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Dr. Ravi, you have taken very less time. Thank you very much. Now, Shri Mool Chand Meena.

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा (राजस्थान): माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सदन के सदस्य श्री बी.बी. राघवन जी के संकल्प पर जो चर्चा हो रही, वह विषय बहुत गंभीर है। इसकी गंभीरता का ध्यान रखते हुए मैं सदन का ध्यान 1947-48 की ओर ले जाना चाहता हूं। देश 1947-48 में औद्योगिक दृष्टि से बहुत नगण्य था केवल 1951 के अंदर सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र की कुल पांच इकाइयां प्रारम्भ हुई थीं। जिसमें 29 करोड़ पूंजी लगी। 1990 में यह बढ़कर 99.315 करोड़

*Not recorded.

हो गई। 1989-90 में इस पूंजी पर 4.48 प्रतिशत का लाभ हुआ था। आज सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में कुल 235 उद्यम हैं और इनमें 8 लाख 12 हजार लोग कार्यरत हैं। इन उद्यमों पर 23 लाख अरब रुपया लगा हुआ है। एक तरफ देश में उदारीकरण लागू हुआ, विनिवेश नीति को अपनाया गया। यह एक ऐसा विषय है जिस पर पार्टियों को पार्टी से ऊपर उठकर राष्ट्र के हित में सोचना चाहिए और मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि सरकार द्वारा उदारीकरण का जो फार्मूला अपनाया गया, इस उदारीकरण के संबंध में 1996 में जो प्रक्रिया शुरू हुई, निश्चित रूप से उससे देश आज एक खतरनाक मोड़ पर पहुंच गया है। चाहे शब्दों के जाल से हम कितना भी लॉजिक दें कि यह सही प्रक्रिया है, तो भी हम समझते हैं कि आप जिस तरह से चीजों का कौड़ियों के भाव बेच रहे हैं, यह एक खतरनाक संकेत है। खासकर मैं चर्चा करना चाहूंगा कि हम जब गांव में किसी परिसम्पत्ति को बेचते हैं, गाय-भैंस को बेचते हैं तो मार्केट की स्थिति देखते हैं। कोशिश करते हैं कि हमें इसके अच्छे दाम मिल जाएं जिससे हम इसको बेच सकें, मूल्यांकन भी करते रहते हैं। एक छोट सा उदाहरण मैं मंत्री महोदय को देना चाहूंगा। आई.टी.डी.सी. के कई होटलों को आपने बेचा है। बिहार में गया में एक होटल था आई.टी.डी.सी. का, आपने उसे दो करोड़ में बेच दिया। दो करोड़ की तो उसमें लकड़ी लगी हुई थी। ऐसे ही जयपुर में भी आपने कई होटलों को बेचा। जयपुर में रामबाग पैलेस 6 करोड़ में बेचा, 6 करोड़ की तो ज़मीन ही है उसकी, बल्कि ज्यादा की होगी। तो यह तरीका आपका हमारी समझ में नहीं आता है कि किस प्रकार से इस नीति को आप आगे बढ़ा रहे हैं? मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि सरकार का काम होटल चलाना नहीं है, यह बात हमारी समझ में आती है। यह सम्पत्ति पिछले 53 वर्षों से अर्जित की गई, दूसरी सरकार चाहकर भी इसको बेचकर सौ गुना सम्पत्ति लगाकर धन अर्जित नहीं कर सकती, इसलिए इस पर चिंता करनी चाहिए और हमें सोचना भी चाहिए कि आखिर हम किस होड़ में इस काम को कर रहे हैं? एक तरफ बड़े कैपिटलिस्टों द्वारा सरकारी सम्पत्ति संस्थाओं को 1 लाख 25 हजार करोड़ रुपए में बेचने की साजिश है, हमारे पास सरकारी आंकड़े हैं। 85 हजार करोड़ रुपया इन वित्तीय संस्थाओं द्वारा दबाया गया है। इस पर हम कोई कार्यवाही नहीं कर रहे हैं। दूसरी तरफ हम परिसम्पत्तियों को कौड़ियों के भाव बेचकर कोई साधन बना रहे हैं। यह किसी भी रूप में तर्कसंगत नहीं लगता है। महोदय, 45वें संविधान संशोधन के माध्यम से संविधान में सोशलिस्ट शब्द सम्मिलित किया गया। श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने संविधान संशोधन लाकर इस शब्द को जोड़ा। जो बड़े पूंजीपति, सेठ और राजा थे, उनसे सम्पत्तियां ले लीं, उनका दुरुपयोग हो रहा था, इंदिरा जी उनको सरकार के अंडर में लाई। आज उसका उल्टा हो रहा है जैसा अभी यादव साहब कह रहे थे। आप फिर वापस उन पूंजीपतियों के हाथ में दे रहे हैं। यह एक सौ करोड़ की आबादी वाला देश है यह। यहां आर्थिक विषमता है, सामाजिक विषमता है। इस सरकार के ऊपर बहुत सारे दायित्व हैं और ये सारे दायित्व अनुत्तरित हैं। ऐसी परिस्थितियों में निश्चित तौर पर इकनोमिकमी प्रचलन हुआ है। हमने जो

एसैट खड़ा किया है उसको इस तरीके बेचना उचित नहीं लगता। इस पर रिव्यू होना चाहिए। इस बारे में मैं आपको एक छोटा सा उदाहरण देना चाहूंगा, सरकार की पॉलिसी की ओर ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहूंगा। एक तरफ आई.टी.डी.सी. के होटल बेच रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ ट्रेवल एंड टुवर कैटरिंग कापोरेशन खोल रहे हैं। यह कैसी विडम्बना है, निश्चित तौर पर हमें लगता है कि हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय दबाव में हैं। इस पर हमें सोचना चाहिए। मैं आई.पी.सी.एल. के संदर्भ में कहना चाहता हूँ और मंत्री महोदय मैं आपका ध्यान भी इस ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम): मिस्टर मीणा, क्या आप दो-तीन मिनट में समाप्त कर सकते हैं?

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: नहीं होना तो मुश्किल लगता है। हो नहीं सकेगा, साहब।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम): करिए, कोशिश कीजिए। You can finish it. There are many more speakers.

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: आईपीसीएल एक प्रोफिट मेकिंग कम्पनी है। इस कम्पनी को रिलायंस को बेचना था, लेकिन इंडियन ऑयल खरीदने के लिए तैयार था। उसको डिसक्रज करने के लिए वातावरण तैयार किया गया। आपको जानकर आश्चर्य होगा कि आईपीसीएल को बिकना है, लेकिन गैस गारन्टी नहीं मिली। पिछली जितनी भी सरकारें आई और यह सरकार भी आई, लेकिन गैस गारन्टी नहीं मिली। लेकिन रिलायंस के हाथों बेचने के लिए उसको गैस गारंटी दे दी गई। किसको लाभ पहुंचने के लिए दी गई है ? मैं संक्षेप में अपनी बातों को रखते हुए यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ऑयल कम्पनी लाभ दे रही है। जिनसे सरकार को आत्मबल मिलता है, रोजगार सृजन का एक लम्बा सिलसिला उसके माध्यम से है, उनको रखना चाहिए। यह प्राइवेट कंपनी आती है तो किस तरह से रोजगार के क्षेत्र को सैट्राइज करेगी। आपको समझ में नहीं आता है कि आप इस ओर क्यों जा रहे हैं ? आज भारत 100 करोड़ की आबादी वाला देश हो गया है। देश के अंदर रोजगार के साधन कम होते जा रहे हैं। जहां तक ऑयल कंपनी लाभ दे रही है उन कंपनियों को बेचने का विचार सरकार को छोड़ना चाहिए। ... (व्यवधान) ..

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA : Sir, it is already 5.45 p.m.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM) : The House will sit up to 5.46 p.m. Shri Meena, you please finish.

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: सर, मैं यह कह रहा था कि जो ऑयल कंपनियां लाभ दे रही हैं, उनके स्ट्रैटेजिक पार्टनर खोजे जा रहे हैं। पार्टनर तो उसका तब खोजा जाता है जब मैनेजमेंट नहीं हो, तकनीकी न हो। लेकिन जब ये कंपनियां दुनिया में अपनी पहचान बना रही हैं तब क्यों नहीं हम उनके इक्विटी शेयर पब्लिक को दे दें। कंपनी अपना हिस्सा सरकार को वापस करना

चाहती है। सरकार को इसके ऊपर विचार करना चाहिए। एनर्जी सैक्टर सिक्योरिटी प्वाइंट से भी महत्वपूर्ण सैक्टर है। इसका डिसेइन्वेस्टमेंट करने से पहले सरकार को सोचना चाहिए।

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM) : Mr. Meena, please sit down. Hon. Members, further discussion on this Private Members' Resolution will continue on Friday, the 13th December, 2002. Shri Meena may continue his speech on that day. The House is adjourned till 11 a.m. on Monday, the 2nd December, 2002.

The House then adjourned at forty six minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 2nd December, 2002.
