

come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1981, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second

column thereof against Demand Nos. 47 to 57 relating to the Ministry of Home Affairs."

The motion was adopted.

Demands for Grants, 1980-81 in respect of the Ministry of Home Affairs voted by Lok Sabha

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account voted by the House on 14-3-1980	Amount of Demand for Grant voted by the House
1	2	3	4
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS			
47.	Ministry of Home Affairs	1,06,37,000	.. 2,20,19,000 ..
48.	Cabinet	41,71,000	.. 90,32,000 ..
49.	Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms	3,37,68,000	5,51,64,000 ..
50.	Police	87,18,87,000	3,29,67,000 178,41,28,000 6,59,33,000
51.	Census	6,47,40,000	.. 13,20,28,000
52.	Other Expenditure of the Ministry of Home Affairs	76,63,60,000	37,83,54,000 245,75,34,000 62,74,77,000
53.	Delhi	56,61,64,000	32,94,83,000 115,25,78,000 65,89,67,000
54.	Chandigarh	9,41,77,000	5,25,68,000 19,31,60,000 10,51,35,000
55.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	10,20,68,000	6,39,25,000 20,61,20,000 12,78,49,000
56.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	1,01,22,000	1,20,91,000 2,04,79,000 2,41,81,000
57.	Lakshadweep	2,18,47,000	59,78,000 5,37,41,000 1,19,59,000

15.45 hrs.

Motion moved

DEMANDS* FOR GRANTS
(GENERAL), 1980-81—*Contd.*

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand Nos. 58 to 60 relating to the Ministry of Industry for which 6 hours have been allotted.

Honourable Members whose cut motions to the Demands for Grant have been circulated, may, if they desire to move their cut motions, send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating the serial numbers of the cut motions they would like to move.

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1981, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 58 to 60 relating to the Ministry of Industry.

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

Demands for Grants, 1980-81, in respect of the Ministry of Industry submitted to the vote of Lok Sabha

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account voted by the House on 14-3-1980		Amount of Demand for Grant submitted to the vote of the House	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.	Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
1	2	3		4	
MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY					
58.	Ministry of Industry	1,27,91,000	.	2,00,92,000	..
59.	Industries	14,43,48,000	89,31,64,000	14,94,12,000	190,77,29,000
60.	Village and Small Industries	9,84,39,000	71,33,000	10,17,05,000	1,42,67,000

15.46 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, personally I would have been happy if the Minister had made some statement regarding the Industrial policy of the Government to enable an adequate enough discussion on the subject, because as of now, we really do not have a policy of this Government on which we can have meaningful debate. We have these Demands for Grants, but in terms of a policy discussion I really do not know where one could start because there is not anything called a comprehensive or an integrated or a studied policy which this Government in its seventh month now has yet been able to present to the House and to the country. Of course, we have a lot of statements which the Minister has made and there he has been very prolific indeed. But the trouble is that all his statements and the very considered leaks or inspired reports that very often come out of his Ministry were contradicted the next day and sometimes within moments those statements are made. I think the most significant statement made by the Minister of Industry about the policy that he is

going to pursue was made by him in Calcutta some time late in April or early May within weeks of his taking over his Department. But from the report that one must read in a Calcutta paper itself, it is clear that the Minister within minutes of making his statement having distributed it in a press conference, then asked the pressmen not to publish it because he was again having second thoughts on all things that he had said.

This is an extract from the *Business Standard* of 15th May. It says:

“During his maiden visit to Calcutta some time back, Dr. Charanjit Chanana made many a *faux pas*. A copy of his speech to local newsmen was circulated before he arrived at the Press Information Bureau to address them. The newsmen found Dr. Chanana's speech a big surprise as it contained many statements which were a total reversal of the hitherto declared policy of the Government. Some examples are, Dr. Chanana visualised the public sector industries providing the infrastructure facilities in spite of the commanding heights which had been attributed to it on earlier occasions even by the Prime Minister herself.”

"(2) Dr. Chanana said that Government would take over sick industries, but not the dead ones. Many newsmen were of the opinion that when the Government took over the industries, they were already dead. What would happen to the workers then?"

"The statement which caused the biggest surprise was that he would seek the expertise of the private sector to cure the ills of the public sector as he regarded the private industry owners as good economists."

And then the report concludes:

"But immediately after arriving at the press conference, Dr. Chanana set himself to the task of correcting the printed statement. He asked the newsmen to delete all the lines which had given an indication that a drastic change in the industrial policy was under way."

This is just one part of the kind of changes the Minister brings about in the industrial policy between lunch and tea time because I presume the statement must have been drafted during lunch and he changed it during tea time.

And then there have been a number of statements which have been appearing in the last few days. For instance, one said that the MRTP regulations are to be modified and the Rs. 20 crore ceiling is to be raised to Rs. 45 crores. Then, of course, the next day a further statement is put out, perhaps when the Minister gets pulled up or perhaps when he finds that the statement does not find the approval of his own party. I do not know, that the Cabinet has shutdown the proposal which the Minister has made. And a third paper says that such a proposal was not under consideration at all. So one really does not know what the policy is.

Then there have been reports in the last few days, in fact some of them are rather frightening reports, which suggest that the entire industrial policy is being scuttled. It seems that there have been exercises,—I am quoting the Minister about exercises—that he has been engaged in a number of exercises and the Planning Commission has also been engaged in exercises—someone has called its "Operation Sabotage", I do not know what it is because I have not seen the paper—and I am told there is a document prepared by the Planning Commission which is to be discussed with the Ministry of Industry and apparently there have been discussions between the Ministry of Industry on the one side and the Planning Commission on the other in which Members of the Planning Commission conferred with industry, have participated, and there have been very clever leaks on the kind of changes that are sought to be made in the industrial policy, particularly the Policy Resolution that this House adopted in 1956 and the Industrial Policy Statement that was presented to this House by the predecessor Government in December, 1977.

I hope the Minister is aware at least in so far as the 1956 Policy is concerned that it is not something which he can through press statements or through off-the-cuff remarks try to do away with. This is a Resolution of Parliament and I hope the Minister has seen this Resolution. This Resolution refers to the Preamble of the Constitution, social and economic justice, and then it refers to the Directive Principles of the Constitution. When it speaks of the Directive Principles of the Constitution I hope the Minister will particularly note two of them. One is that "the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as

best to subserve the common good and more importantly that "the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and the means of production to the common detriment."

I also want him to know that this Policy Resolution of 1956 has two Schedules. They are an integral part of this Resolution, and I do not think that Ministers, junior or senior, are entitled to bring about changes in these Schedules which are an integral part of the Resolution without coming to Parliament.

It is necessary to make this point here today because there has been a lot of irresponsible talk at one level and a lot of inspired opinion-making at another level, to bring about changes, drastic changes in the Industrial Policy of this country. As far as the 1977 Statement is concerned and the Industrial Policy of the previous Governments, the Janata and the Lok Dal Governments is concerned, they have come in for a lot of adverse criticisms, on the floor of this House and particularly in the manifestoes and public speeches, more there than here, that is not only ill-founded and uninformed, but that is deliberately perverse. I will deal with that separately.

But I would like the Government to realise that there are different people looking at industry in different ways and to those who are today occupying the dominant position in the industrial world viz., the private sector of our industry, the monopoly houses, as they are generally called, industry is merely investments and profits, and nothing beyond that. I hope that is not going to be the attitude of this Government. I hope the Government will overcome such attitudes which prevailed till 1977, where the industry was allowed to go away with this idea that industry was, what they thought, namely, investment and profits. Industry should not be looked at from that angle. Industry is one of the areas where you are going to find out answers to the problems

facing us and particularly the problem of unemployment. Let us not forget that there are 50 million unemployed today. Let us also not forget that this month, from the Universities, Colleges and high Schools, at least three million boys and girls have come out in the streets and they are in search of jobs and there will be another three million boys and girls who are seeking jobs this year, from this month onwards, who have not gone to school, they are the children of cobblers, potters and weavers, people who are engaged in village and cottage industries, whom thirty three years of freedom and all that you and we together did has still not touched. When we discuss industry, therefore, let us not be carried away by what FICCI says. The FICCI's concept of industry is so much of investment and so much of profit. Please do not get lost in that kind of thinking.

What are the issues that have been debated in the last few days? One is the MRTP houses question. I would like the Minister to be categorical on this, to tell this House whether Cabinet is considering such a proposal, whether it has really shot down such a proposal, if it has not done that, as the Press and very responsible sections of the press have reported, then, why is it that the Minister or the Government has not clarified that these are inspired stories and that there is no substance in them. I would like the Government to tell us, in keeping with their own manifesto—I hope, they read their manifesto, many of them do not care to read it, —I hope, they read their manifesto, then—how they are going to bring about effective control on the monopoly houses, as they themselves have promised in their manifesto.

The second issue which is being debated is the role of the public sector. Apart from the Minister wanting the private sector expertise to be made available to the public sector, there are certain points that are being made in these papers that are now making

[Shri George Fernandes]

the corridors of the Planning Commission building and Udhog Bhavan.

There are three points that are generally made:

(i) The public sector is inefficient and therefore, you need experts from the private sector.

(ii) The managerial competence is available in the private sector. The public sector does not have it and so we need to bring it.

(iii) We need the private sector now to move into new sectors, particularly, sectors which were reserved for the public sector because they are the ones who have the money for investment.

16.00 hrs.

Earlier there was an attack made on the Janata/Lok Dal Governments, particularly on the question of public sector. We were told that we were trying to ruin the public sector and that, in fact, we have succeeded in ruining it. This is the charge that was made against us, by this party in its manifesto. Frankly, is that the position? I have got with me here the Public Enterprises Survey, 1978-79, which was presented by the Ministry of Finance—I am glad, the Finance Minister is here. What does it say? On p. 9, it says:

“In the year 1978-79, the second year of the Janata rule....

—you laid it on the Table of the House and, I hope, you stand by what you have written here—

“...the total investment comprising of paid-up capital and long-term loans in the 176 enterprises inclusive of textile group of companies, insurance companies, Delhi Transport Corporation, amounted to Rs. 15,602 crores at the end of March, 1979 compared to Rs. 13,389 crores in 174 enterprises by the end of 1978, that is, a net addition of

Rs. 2213 crores, a record figure for any year so far, showing a growth rate of 16.53 per cent.”

This is your statement. Yet, we were under a slanderous attack of having destroyed the public sector in this country when in the second year of the Janata rule you had a record investment in the public sector. You are now trying to find fault with the public sector.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a continuous process?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: These are continuing processes. I am glad, you understand it.

Now, you say, the public sector is really inefficient. Why not go to your own Annual Report that you have submitted? Take only the Department of Heavy Industry. What was the growth rate for the last three years? In 1977-78, it was 4 per cent, in 1978-79 it was 5 per cent and in 1979-80, it was 10 per cent and you have projected a growth of 13 per cent for 1980-81, for the current year, when you are holding the charge. This is for the Department of Heavy Industry alone. This is a public sector. Yet you denigrate the public sector and say that it is the private sector that is efficient.

What is the gross growth in the industrial sector in this country in the last year? It is negative, I presume. Here is the Department of Heavy Industry which is a public sector giving you a growth rate of 10 per cent last year when the gross growth was negative. And yet you denigrate it. You call it inefficient. Where is the inefficiency?

Where is the competence and the managerial capability of the private sector *vis-a-vis* or in comparison with the private sector? What about the NTC? When FICCI goes on lecturing you, you go in search of private sector executives to find the answers to the problems. Why do you forget the National Textile Corporation, 111

textile mills made sick by the private sector, which was taken over by your Government, and which are giving you a profit or they are on the verge of giving you a profit. It is their efficiency and competence that made these 111 textile mills sick.

What about jute mills, including the largest jute mill in the country for whose nationalisation you came here the other day, the National Company, employing 12,000 or 15,000 workmen, made sick by the private sector, very efficient private sector? And now you have it in the public sector to set right.

What about the largest cement company in the country, the Jaipur Udyog, owned by one of the notorious industrial houses in this country, made sick by the private sector? Your public sector executives today are trying to put it in order. Yet, you go on talking so glibly about the competence and efficiency of the FICCI-owned industrial houses and the incompetence and inefficiency of the public sector undertakings. When do we stop this? At what point of time do we stop this?

Then, Sir, I come to the question of money. They are now supposed to have the resources. That is what one of the papers says—the Planning Commission's paper. I do not know who the authors are. I would like to know whether the Member (Industries) is the author of it—about whom, more later.

What is the contribution of industrial houses to their own capital base—3 per cent, 5 per cent or, at any time, anything more than that? Almost every paise that the private sector today has in its industry comes from your financial institutions, come from the public—either in terms of equity or in terms of loans which the public financial institutions are giving. And yet you talk about the private sector having money and therefore being given greater scope even by intruding upon Schedule A of the Resolution of 1956.

I am sure the Industries Minister would like to go into these questions and not be unfair to the public sector—as he has been in the last few weeks. I know there are problems. I am not saying there are no problems. But the problems are not of the making of the Managers alone. Who selects the Managers? There is a Public Enterprise Selection Board. Why not find out what is it that goes wrong at the selection point that we do not get the right Managers? Why not find out whether something is wrong with the selectors themselves, whether they are competent to select the kind of Managers that you need? Why not put your finger on the right spot?

At the same time, you have recently set up a Committee which is now supposed to go into the entire functioning of public sector enterprises. Sir, I know that the public sector enterprises need to be reformed to the extent that reform is necessary. But I am not sure whether the Finance Minister and the Government are right in having the kind of Committee they have, because the man they have appointed to chair that Committee is a man who made the biggest mess of the public sector undertaking that was given to him. On one project alone he lost Rs. 40 crores—and he is to find the answer to the ills of the public sector in this country! Somewhere, we must try at least to identify the right type of people for the right type of jobs. These jobs need to be done, but are monopolised by the wrong people.

So, I would make a suggestion in so far as public sector Managers are concerned. In order to get the right type of people, don't have a PSB which has private sector executives on it. The private sector in this country is not the supporter of the public sector. They want to destroy it, they want to denigrate it. They have umpteen ways of denigrating it: they control the media and they use that media. And yet I am told that

[Shri George Fernandes]

you have on your new PSB Mr. Modi from one of the largest industrial houses to select executives for the public sector. Is he going to identify talent to run the public sector for you? The whole culture of this country is the culture of the large which wants to denigrate the small at one level and wants to denigrate the public sector at another level! How can you have such people? And therefore my suggestion. My suggestion is, identify Managers who have made a success of the public sector. Make them the Board of Selection and do away with the rest of the selection body. Don't have such Chairman. I think you have a Chairman who made a mess of his own undertaking, who made one company lose Rs. 40 crores, as I have said. He is now going to be a selector of Managers for public sector enterprises in this country? Whom are you trying to fool and why; for what purpose?

Then, Sir, how is this Ministry functioning? There is a debate which is going on about the functioning of this Ministry also. I would like to know from the Minister what it is that his Ministry has achieved in the last six months. I know what appears in the press—that you are having a dispute as to whether textiles should be with the Commerce Ministry or with the Industries Ministry, that you have a dispute as to whether BHEL should be with the Industries Ministry or the Energy Ministry, etc. These things are known. I know there are disputes about officers—who should be where. These are routine. But in terms of solid achievement, what has been done?

Of course, your visit to Indonesia would be a land-mark—a high-water-mark, perhaps—which, according to one newspaper, was a disaster. They said that the doctors was at sea, some one else said that Chanana was in blunder-land. Because you went and made deals, you signed a protocol to sell pellets from a unit that has not

yet been set up, but you have promised to send it from this year. That is what your Press Note, which you yourself put out, says with great eloquence. It is a very interesting document which the Minister had put out immediately after his coming back from Indonesia. And, in this, the Minister had this to say:

16.10 hrs.

[SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL in the Chair]

“We shall now be selling to Indonesia iron pellets from a project that is being put up in Kudremukh and which is getting into production in the next few months.”

Apart from the *faux pas* that that is involved, look at the kind of exposure which the Government of India gets. After all, it is not Mr. Chanana who is making the commitment; it is the Government of India that is making the commitment. And signing a protocol, distributing it with great fanfare in the country and saying that we are having iron pellets that will be coming out from the factory in the next couple of months, when even the whole concept of pelletisation plant at Kudremukh is still on paper! It has not proceeded beyond paper, but the Minister has made a commitment on producing alumina, on the buy-back arrangement on alumina. I am told that the Steel Ministry was not happy with the whole idea even before the Minister went. And yet, you go and do this, and this is, perhaps, one of the high watermarks, I do not know. I would certainly like the Minister to tell us about this.

But there is another question which Indonesia raises. And I intend raising it today because I would like the Minister to tell us what is it that provoked him or prompted him to make his first trip abroad, within four weeks of his taking charge of the Ministry of Industry, to Indonesia.

(Interruption) I am talking of his visit to Indonesia which was the first. The proposal itself originated from the Minister that he should go immediately to Indonesia because it was important that high level talks were held. I am raising this question because it seems that, when the Minister was there, an industrialist, an Indian industrialist, who has very large industrial interest in Indonesia, was also accompanying the Minister. In fact, I am even told that the trip was made because the industrialist wanted to impress on the Government of Indonesia that he has the Minister of Industry of this country accompanying him wherever he wanted. I do not know. I hope it is not true. But was Lalit Thapar not there? And what are the Minister's associations or old time affiliations with Mr. Lalit Thapar? This question is significant not only because of Indonesia but also because of this. Even the decision of the Finance Minister, which he had taken when he was looking after the Industry portfolio, was set aside in favour of this industrial house, J.J. Glass people, for capacity expansion. It had been rejected for the last donkey's years, but it was granted the other day. Toplone synthetic, import of second hand machinery; if I am not mistaken, the hon. Finance Minister was also to reject when he was looking after that portfolio. But it was conceded the other day. I do not think you even know about it. So, Sir we want to know all these. I hope the Minister would tell us what are the affiliations, old, new, past, present, so that the House and the country knows about it.

Then, of course, there is some other achievement, and that is, the whole tilt towards multi-nationals. I held charge of this Industry portfolio for two years. One of the specific proposals that came to me was Hindustan Lever wanting to dilute their capital or not to dilute their capital. I ruled that they shall not be given exemption and they should be compelled to bring their equity capital

down to 40 per cent but you have allowed them 51 per cent. . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: But what about Siemens?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Siemens are not holding any foreign equity here. You can discuss Siemens. What is this? Siemens, Siemens, Siemens. What is the Siemens business? You can discuss it. . .

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur): There is something behind it. We do not know.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: The Siemens was initiated—the hon. Member does not know—in 1976 when I was in prison. Why talk about Siemens? Educate yourself first and then ask questions.

So it is important because it is not only Hindustan Lever. The other day, the Prime Minister was to intervene when the Minister found himself at sea or some-one holding the file for him found himself at sea on the Gillette Blade collaboration. The Prime Minister had to say that these things some-times slip by—just slipped by. But what about Coca-cola? Is it also a slip-by? Because there the Prime Minister herself feels that Coca Cola is all right. . . (Interruptions) These are questions and these are matters which are within the purview of the Ministry of Industry and I hope the Minister will tell us what his Ministry is doing about these foreign companies, the multi-nationals and the growing tilt which the Minister has obviously today demonstrated towards them.

The other point is: what kind of work is being done to-day in the Ministry of Industry. I am told that there are 200 applications pending before the Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs. What are you doing there? There was a statement that within 7 days these applications will be disposed off unlike in the past when it took 15 days or 45 days—I

do not know. But is it or is it not a fact, Mr. Industry Minister, that there are 200 applications pending before the Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs? All that we have been seeing are a few gimmicks here and there. Gimmicks are not going to solve the problem of industrialisation of this country nor are they a substitute for solid and hard work which the Minister of Industry has to put in.

Then, Sir, Mr. Chanana was to make an announcement about the special survey made of Sultanpur district. I might mention it because not only is it a gimmick but because it raises one or two other questions which I hope the Minister will find time to answer in the course of his reply. Firstly, why was Sultanpur chosen?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Backward district.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Was that the reason? Are there no other backward districts, more backward districts? Have you seen North Bihar? Have you seen Orissa? Have you seen Eastern UP? Have you seen Madhya Pradesh? Have you seen Konkan? Have you seen Rajasthan, more particularly, the Western districts? Why was Sultanpur chosen? We want to know so that we may know the mind and the way of working of this Minister and of the government which he represents. Why was Sultanpur chosen? And then more important—this great report—who prepared it? I have got your statement—the statement of the Press Information Bureau, Government of India:

“In a major move to identify the industrial potential of backward areas, the Union Minister for Industrial Development has done..

this, that and what not? Now,—

“The Survey has been conducted by a team of highlevel experts associated with the State Government and district officials with a view to serving as a model in the industrially backward districts.”

This is your press statement of 15th May.

Then only the other day in June—how soon you change—there was a question in the Consultative Committee of the Ministry of Industry and this question was raised by a member from the other House but the minutes are the same because it is a consultative committee of Parliament. I am quoting from the minutes which your Ministry has circulated. It is signed by a Section Officer of the Department of Industrial Development, Ministry of Industry. . .

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN): On a point of order, Sir. The minutes of the Consultative Committees are not quoted in the House. In fact, they are confidential and they should not be quoted. He can use the information but he cannot quote from the minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point of order is upheld. The minutes are not to be quoted.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: There is nothing in the minutes which says that they are confidential.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The proceedings of legislature committees..

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: It is not a committee of legislature. I think you are making a mistake. On the proceedings of the Consultative Committee the Press is briefed every evening. What are we talking here? I think the hon. Minister is a little confused.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: You may reserve this point. We will look into it. But it is well-settled. In the very constitution of the Consultative Committee it is stated that the discussions in the Consultative Committee are confidential and they cannot be used on the floor of the House. I am quoting it with some authority.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am sorry, I will not accept the position. I

would agree that the ruling may be reserved on this point. But, it may be discussed. Let me mention that point I wanted to make.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. When the Members of this House are called by a Minister in his office for consultation and, when the Minister consults the Members of this House, it is in the nature of informal consultation. In the Consultative Committee, as far as I understand, the Members of the House who are members of that committee, and none else are called excepting, of course, the officers of the Minister.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Then they brief the Press.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is altogether a different thing. I have given my ruling. But, I leave the doors open and, if the hon. Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker feels that it is not in consonance with the rules well established, it may be changed.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Of course, I will accept your position on that. But, let me make my point. My point is that when the hon. Members in the Consultative Committee asked a question as to who produced the report and how the report was prepared, the Minister was to say that this techno-economic survey report was produced by experts from different industrial houses who wanted to set up industries. I hope the Minister will agree that in June in his statement, he said that a study was conducted by the Centre for Research and Development—CRD—for the Minister of State for Industry. Now, what is the Centre for Research and Development for? Is this the body which has the Minister in association because, I am told, this body has been asked to produce another 100 reports? So, what is the Centre for? Who are the people who run this Centre? Was the Minister associated with this Centre as a director, as a sponsor or as a patron at any point of time, in the last three, four or five years? I would like the Minister to tell us something about this

because this is all that the Minister of Industry, as far as I can see, has done in the last six months. Now there is this Demands for Grants Report. I am a little worried. Why? Because the report, the performance budget and the Demands for Grants are at variance with each other. I will not be able to cite every item because you have already rung the bell and there is no time and you will have to put up with me because some of the points will have to be made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How much time will you need?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You know I am always very brief. You also know I am always to the point. Only I will refer to industries. One is cement and the other is paper because both are very critical industries to-day in terms of their production, in terms of their ownership and also in terms of the kind of problems that we are currently facing. Cement is available in the black market at Rs. 80 or 90. Now that too is not available. (*Interruptions*)

आपको मालूम नहीं है। आप काहे के लिए बहस करते हैं? जिन चीजों की जानकारी आपको नहीं है, उन पर न बोलिए।

Sir, on cement, I would like to know the role that is now assigned to the Cement Corporation of India. What is the role assigned to it to-day? To day from the budget, the total demand for cement is worth Rs. 17.69 crores. That is all. I do not find a pie more. If you go through the performance budget, you will find that the demands made by the cement industries run into something like Rs. 30 and odd crores.

I find that the money is not there. That is not the point really because maybe, you may have financial constraints. But, your Performance Budget says that you are going to commission three plants in the course of the current year in Neemuch, Akaltara and Erraguntla. These three plants you are going to commission by the end of the financial year. You will need for

these the money not less than Rs. 30 crores given the cost escalation and so on.

Your demand is for Rs. 17 crores. What is going to be the fate of the Cement Corporation of India in the current year. That is point number one. Point number two is: What is going to happen to the two plants of Adilabad and Tendur for which your total requirements are in the vicinity of Rs. 100 crores? I would like to know something on this because the total licensed capacity as existed three years ago was 22 million tonnes. It was the Janata Government that licensed another 27 million tonnes of cement capacity and one of the decisions which we took very deliberately was to give to the Cement Corporation of India a major role in the cement industry in this country. I find that policy perspective has been scuttled because the Private Sector will get its money. After all the money comes from the institutions and they will get their money but the Cement Corporation of India will starve for the money. I would like to know what is going to happen or what is your perspective about the Cement Corporation of India?

Now, I come to the paper industry. Again a very critical sector. I do not know what the premium on paper today is. We are not producing enough paper. There has not been adequate investment in this industry for a long time and we are now running into problems. I have gone through the budget proposals, the performance budget and also the report.

Firstly, if the Government is to be believed the statements that you have made in your performance budget and the Minister of Industry has laid this performance budget on the Table of the House either you deliberately are trying to mislead or you do not know what you are talking about. You have said in this performance budget that Nagaland paper project will be ready for commissioning in

July 1982, the Nowgong paper project will be ready for commissioning in March 1982 and Cachar paper project will be ready for commissioning in August, 1982. But apart from saying as to when you will be commissioning the outlay for 1980-81 in respect of Nagaland is Rs. 12.83 crores, the outlay in respect of Nowgong is Rs. 41.27 crores and in respect of Cachar it is Rs. 38.86 crores. For the Kerala newsprint project, which I think you are going to commission in this month, you need another Rs. 13.01 crores. According to your budget demands, the total amount of money that you have sought is only Rs. 38 crores as against the performance budget commitment to the Parliament, to the country and to these units comes to Rs. 123 crores. Who is trying to fool whom? Someone has to answer this and it is not only in terms of investment but it is in terms of commissioning also. I would like the Finance Minister to go through these reports. In one report you say you are going to commission in July this year while in another report you say that it is July next year. You have been postponing their commissioning. But then at least the House should know how long it is going to take? Why take the House for a ride with every performance budget report and every report of the Ministry?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, I will mention one or two points. This great shift which is taking to the private sector is worrying us and when I am saying a shift to the private sector I am particularly concerned with the amount of budget, viz., the demands for grants that the Government has come forward with. There was a charge against the Janata Government and the charge was that we were making a shift away from the public to the private. Here are the figures. In the current year's budget what is your total demand for industry? It is Rs. 309 crores. What was it last year? It was Rs. 275 crores. What was it year

before? It was Rs. 280 crores. Taking into account the inflationary situation in the country what you have given today, demands for the Department of Industry and all your Grants, are not equal to what the Janata and Lok Dal had invested last year or the year before last. They have not even come to that. And if the point is that there is shift to the rural, Sir, I find that against Rs. 70 crores that was made to the village and small scale industries last year this year the budgetary commitment has come down to Rs. 40 crores.

The Finance Minister was very eloquent in his budget speech. Lot of people admired that speech; so many articles were written till they discovered that they had been taken for a ride. This is what you have done. From Rs 70 crores you have brought it down to Rs. 40 crores this year. If you tell me, Mr. Minister, that there is a new Ministry of Rural Development that is looking into it that also is not true because Demands for the Rural Development Ministry last year were Rs. 647 crores. They have come down to Rs. 638 crores in the current year. Khadi and Village industries from Rs. 38 crores to Rs. 41 crores—an increase of only Rs. 3 crores. Add the inflation, where is the Khadi and Village industries? Where are the rural and the cottage industries? Now, Sir, the point is that our party Government has been accused of having abandoned science and technology. The Minister has stated this. The President has perhaps mentioned it in his Address, I do not exactly remember. A number of members of the Government have been very eloquent about it. I am mentioning this because science and technology invariably relates to industry. So, what are you doing so far as science and technology is concerned? I am amazed to see how the members of the ruling party sometimes indulge in talks which are never related to realities, never related to truth. I find that in 1978-79 Rs 25 crores was spent by the department of Science and Technology. In 1979-80 this was Rs. 33 crores and in 1980-81 all that you put in is Rs. 31 crores. And the Council of

Scientific and Industrial Research had in 1978-79 Rs. 44 crores; in 1979-80, Rs. 51 crores and all that you now put in is Rs. 51 crores. And yet we were accused of putting the clock back and moving away from science and technology. So many words, so many words; Here are the Institutions. These are your budgetary provisions—it comes to the same amount which the Janata and Lok Dal Government made available and if you add the rate of inflation in the country, it would be lesser money than what we have put in, in those 2 years or 3 years when we had the occasion to take decisions in regard to these matters. Sir, there is one final point and this is very important because they have been very glibly making accusations and charges. The Economic Survey presented by our good friend the Finance Minister says this. I am reading from the Chapter on Industry. This is from page 16 of the English version of this report on Industries. While accusations and charges are made in this House and outside against the Janata and Lok Dal Governments, this is what we see in the Economic Survey. I quote:

‘Perhaps the most important constraints upon industrial production in 1978-79 were those arising such as power, coal and transport (especially the railways and ports). . .’

And then you say:

‘In fact, total consumption of coal by power houses during 1979-80 amounted to 33.58 million tonnes which was 14.2 per cent. higher than the consumption of 29.4 million tonnes in the previous year. However, the increase in power generation is not commensurate with the increased consumption of coal. This is because there has been a significant decline in coal quality. The calorific quality of coal supplied to power houses has declined and the ash content has increased. The decline in quality of coal reduced the thermal efficiency, and the increased quantity of coal supplied, therefore, turned out to be insufficient.’

Kindly tell us what you are doing about it. But all the time you go on

accusing the Janata and the Lok Dal in regard to this, because it is very easy to do so. We are no more in power and yet you go on pointing your accusing finger at us and you do not go into the root of the problem. Most of our elders would never understand; they would never understand this, and this is where I want the Minister of Industry to tell us what is being done so far as the power sector is concerned, because, without that, nothing can happen. You have called that 'one of the greatest constraints' that you have to face in 1979-80 and in the previous year. And as far as the transport requirement is concerned, I know, how the railwaymen are under attack. Not a day passes when the railwaymen are not under attack. Not a day passes when there is not a question on transport; somebody there gets up and says, how bad we are in regard to transport. Let me state what the Finance Minister has to say on this. He said:

'To an extent, the problems of the railways have been compounded by inadequate investment in the Railways over time. . .'

Mind you, not in 3 years:—

..The share of the Railways in gross domestic capital formation declined from about 9.6 per cent during the period 1960-61 to 1964-65 to only 2.3 per cent in 1975-76 to 1977-78. This has been reflected in a much slower rate of additions to rolling stock and track mileage, since 1965-66.

You have again quoted the wagon building industry but the point is, what are you doing about it. Are the Railways going to get more money? Are you doing anything to strengthen this infrastructure to a point where, from the 9.6 per cent of a decade ago, you get the 2.3 per cent of a decade later,—that you brought about, not we, we inherited it, we tried to correct it to the extent possible—and here my colleague Mr. Dandavate will bear me out on this. What are you now going to do about it? If your entire tilt is to the private sector and if moneys from the

financial institutions, from the Government, are now going to be made available to build the FICCI sponsored institutions and not provide budgetary support to industry, to energy, to transportation, then, Sir, I am afraid we are going to be in for a very major trouble. The 1977 policy plan is under attack. Very offensive language has also been used. The manifesto talked about primitiveness for asking the cobbler to produce shoes, the potter to produce earthen vessels, the weaver to produce cloth, we have been accused of primitiveness. That is what the manifesto said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: From where you got this.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: The hon. Minister for Home Affairs just now told us that the mandate has once again proved that Emergency is acceptable to the people. But that, we will question elsewhere. But that manifesto speaks about primitiveness. Is the potter primitive to Indian Society, to Indian culture, to the Indian economy? Is the weaver, the cobbler, the village artisan primitive today? So, when we discussed our 1977 policy, what we talked was about taking the large to the small, from the urban to the rural, from the cancerous growth of these cities where crime, where water, where housing problems are there name it anything, to the rural areas. We talked of taking the industry from the urban to the rural, of taking it away from the large and giving it to the small. That is where we have got reservation for the small scale sector and we said wherever possible take the industry away from the machine to the hand. That is what we always said. What is primitive about it? We have brought the D.I.Cs into existence. I know that the Minister is not happy and his only anger is that somewhere in the coining of the phrase a man called George Fernandes also figured in it, this he does not like. Then call it any other name because you are on a naming spree. Have any name. I do not care for what name you call it. But please do not dismantle the District Industries Centres. They are

doing a magnificent job. This is your own admission. I am quoting your own report. What you have said is this:

"...that during 1978-79, 96,013 entrepreneurs were identified to choose appropriate industrial opportunities. . . . A total of approximately 2.75 lakh persons are expected to have been provided with additional employment. . . . In respect of reporting DICs a total credit assistance of Rs. 86.58 crores has flowed."

In 1979-80, a year that has just gone by, with all the industrial depression, with all the shortages in production, what is the DIC's performance? According to your report, Mr. Minister, the number of entrepreneurs identified are 1.37 lakhs, about 5.42 lakhs new jobs are expected to be created and the total credit given to the rural sector through the D.I.Cs is to the tune of Rs. 360.00 crores. Therefore, when you discuss the Janata or the Lok Dal Industrial Policy, please understand not merely nuances, not merely the personalities but also understand that it was meant to take the industry from the large to the small, from the urban to the rural, from the machine to the hand, in order to put man in the centre of all things as Mahatma Gandhi wanted. Don't push the man to the periphery, don't push the man away from the centre again and put** in the Centre. Put 50 people in the Centre, put such people in the Centre. . . . (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you referring to the persons who are not here in this House?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am referring to** who signifies industry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would be unfair on your part because you are referring to a person who is not present here.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: But let us not put FICCI in the Centre, let us not put big businessmen in the Centre. That is what I would say.

Finally, I would like the Minister to tell us when he replies to the debate

on the Demands for Grants of his Ministry firstly, that the small and village industries will get higher priorities in the Government's Industrial Policy, not in terms of words because his budget proved contrary, that he will change the emphasis, that he will come with the new proposals and that he will come with new demands for grants to see that the village and the small scale sectors get priority.

Secondly, that the District Industries Centres will not be weakened but they will be strengthened further and all the assistance that they need will be made available to them.

Thirdly, that the reservation policy in regard to the small scale sectors will not only be continued but will be expanded. There will be no dilution of that. There will be no dilution on that: (4) The textile policy where the emphasis was on handloom and on cheap cloth for the masses with the National Textile Corporation playing a dominant part. There will be no change brought about in that; and if there is going to be any change, it will provide more opportunities to the handloom and not to the sulzerloom, big industry, the big textile mill sector; (5) that the MRTP and the FERA will be directly enforced and the Sachar Committee's recommendations will be implemented. When I talk about the Sachar Committee's recommendations and when I talk about MRTP and FERA, I am also once again reminding you about the Coca Cola talk that is going on, about the Gillette talk that had been raised in this very House and about the Hindustan Lever getting 51 per cent as against 40 per cent that we have recommended for it; (6) that the public sector will be strengthened and whatever internal difficulties it has, those difficulties will be overcome by means of policies that you are going to adopt which will give to the public sector better Managers and do away with all the incompetency that may be lurking around at other level. With these words, I oppose the Demands raised by the Ministry. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All the objectionable references to Mr. Lalit Thaper will not form part of the record.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I have made a very specific point about this.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: The names of Tatas, Birlas are used in this House very often. I do not know what exclusive privilege you attach to it. In this House, you can say that he should have sought the permission. You could have told at the appropriate occasion. Now you cannot say that the name of Lalit Thaper is something sacrosanct and should not find place in the record. (*Interrptions*) I am sorry, this is not the way. (*Interrptions*)

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA (Bombay North): Mr. Chairman, he made no allegation. He asked the Minister whether he was accompanied by that person.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: That was figuratively used. There was no serious allegation. You must understand the spirit in which....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am giving my ruling here in this House. If there are any objectionable references to Lalit Thaper, they will not form part of the record or any other persons, because those people who are not capable of countering the allegations made here.... (*Interrptions*)

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA (Calcutta North East): It is a question of the House. Therefore, if you say it from the class point of view, then you cannot rule it out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not concerned here with the stand and stances you take here, but from the Chair's point of view, it would be necessary for me to protect the interest of those people who are not capable of protecting themselves in this House, because they are not present here. (*Interrptions*) Let me finish it. I am giving my ruling. If you want to say anything you can say afterwards. I am ready to hear you. But let us go by procedure. Now this can cut this side;

now that can cut that side. This is a double edged weapon. So, what I am saying is that if you are referring to somebody's name and if he is not able to defend himself in this House, it would be unfair; and if you are leveling any allegation against any member or any Minister in this House, the procedure is that you give him a notice; you tell him that you are going to level some objections against him. If you do that.... (*Interrptions*)

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: It is important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have said that all those things which will be objectionable and which would require defending them in the House would not form part of the record.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: My submission is that I have asked the Minister whether he was accompanied by a certain person. It does not.... (*Interrptions*) That is not a charge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If anything of this nature you want to ask, it would have been fair on the part of any member to give notice to that effect. (*Interrptions*)

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: Mr. Chairman, Your words come from the Chair. Your words are invested with the authority of a ruling. Therefore, as it is necessary for us to understand....

MR. CHAIRMAN: You were probably there in the House yesterday when I had to expunge certain things, that is, protecting both the members from both the sides.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA (Bombay North): Since words from the Chair are invested with the authority of the Chair and take on the nature of a ruling, it is open to us, Members, to seek your guidance. If an hon. Member makes an allegation about someone who is not present in the House or makes derogatory references to somebody who is not present in the House or refers to an official or refers to a Minister, and does not give notice to the Minister to come prepared with the material necessary to deal with any

such allegation that the Speaker may permit him to make in the House after due notice, then what you said applies.

Now the hon. Member says that the Minister was accompanied by a certain gentleman, and asks the Minister whether he was accompanied by that gentleman. There is no allegation; there is no innuendo in it. He is wanting to verify the fact... (*Interruptions*). I am speaking to you, and not making my submission to you, and not to the hon. Member who is interrupting me. These things form part of the proceeding of the House. They lay down guidelines for us. Members who sit there as well as here, today as well as tomorrow. Therefore, I will appeal to you to consider not only this particular instance but also whether in the past references have been made to individuals without imputing any motives. According to your ruling we can refer to nobody who is not present in the House....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have not said that.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: That creates a peculiar situation. I only want to point out to you that my hon. friend only asks the hon. Minister whether it is a fact that he was accompanied by X.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You put the matter in a very nice manner before the House. Let me have my say on that point. As far as reference to somebody accompanying the hon. Minister is concerned, what was necessary is to give notice to the Minister and to the Speaker also and obtain permission from him.

SHRI K. P. UMNKRISHNAN: That has not been the practice in this House. For allegations you give notice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am giving the ruling. Only some days back I referred to the decisions given in this House. I referred to the commentary on the practice and procedure in this House and then I gave my ruling. Here also the same thing applies.

What I am saying is this. I am not saying whether that reference is correct or not. What I am saying is, if you are alleging against any person who is not a Member of this House... (*Interruptions*). I say objectionable thing, if a man is not able to defend himself and you allege anything against him, will it be fair?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Have I said anything about any person who is not capable of defending himself?

MR. CHAIRMAN: On that point you are to give notice.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: If I have said anything which imputes anything against anybody. But on the limited point, to ask the Minister whether he was accompanied by a certain individual, if I need to give him notice, no debate will be possible in this House. We have here a former Speaker in this House, here; let us ask him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us not confuse. If you have said that somebody accompanied the hon. Minister, there is nothing objectionable to that; if there is anything objectionable which relates to the Minister and the Members here and not to that person, it is not objectionable. But if you have said anything against any person who is not a Member of this House, if you have said that, that would not form part of the record.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: That is fair enough. But I would like the Minister to reply to my question... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary to give an exposition on this point in detail. You are all learned Members, hon. Members, and know what is the position. When a point arises, I give the exposition. Suppose you are saying something against some House relating to some policy, we do not object. Suppose you make certain allegations against certain person, it is objectionable. That is not to go on the records.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI CHARANJIT CHANANA): While I shall reply to the hon. Member's other gimmickry later on, I would like only to inform the House that such allegations are wrong. Nobody of this name accompanied me at all and the hon. Member should go and see the flight number and see the names of people also. It is absolutely wrong. I would like only to say this to the hon. Member. I would like to advise him that he should not try to enter into scandal-mongering. I have not referred to his connections at all. He should not do this. He should withdraw it.

SHRI R. L. BHATIA (Amritsar): Now he should withdraw.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I have raised specific questions to the Minister. I want the Minister to give specific replies when he answers the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just to make the point a little clear I shall let the House know—

“Allegations may not be made normally against outsiders as they are not in a position to defend themselves.

Allegations may not also be normally made against officials by name as the constitutional responsibility lies with the Minister.

Where, however, a Member is convinced after making enquiries that there is basis for the allegation and he is prepared to accept the responsibility for the same, he should give the details of the allegations in writing sufficiently in advance to the Speaker and the Minister concerned and in no case later than 10 a.m. on the date on which these are sought to be made. The details of the charges should be spelt out in precise terms and should be duly supported by the requisite documents which should be authenticated by the Member. Where a Member sends mere intimation of intention to make allegations without

furnishing precise details and documentary evidence he may not be allowed.

Where a Member persists in making serious allegations in the House without giving previous notice and without complying with the well established procedure in this behalf or without the permission of the Chair, these may not form part of the proceedings of Lok Sabha.”

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You have held that I have made allegations. I have only asked a question—when the Minister was in Indonesia, whether Shri Lalit Thapar was with him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not the question; we are discussing something else.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Since the whole thing has come in the context of what I said, it gives an impression that I have made allegation. I have made no allegations against the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fernandes, every day something crops up here and we are here to protect the interests of all the Members.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You must be fair to me. You have conveyed that I have made an allegation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. It is an explanation given to the queries made by the Member. Did I, at any time, refer to your name?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: This is an impression that is going on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry about that. It has nothing to do with you.

Discussion is on record. I have given my ruling. I have read out the ruling. I have read out the agreement which was arrived at between the Members.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

The hon. Member has said something. The hon. Minister replied to that and he may explain afterwards if there is anything to be explained. There is no question of expunging everything from the record. Only the objectionable things will be expunged.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO:

(*Intermittent*)

SHRI ANANDA GOPAL MUKHOPADHYAY (Asansol): Will the hon. Minister tell the House who accompanied him during his recent tour to Nagaland?

60 SHRI JAGANNATH RAO (Berhampur): I was surprised to hear from Shri Fernandes that this Government has no industrial policy and it has not come forward with any statement. As far as industrial policy of the Government is concerned, it is enshrined in the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956 along with the Industrial (Development and Regulation) Act of 1951, the M.R.T.P. Act, the Companies Act, FERN and all other Acts. Therefore, it is not necessary to reiterate time and again what the industrial policy is. This Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956 forms the sheet-anchor of the industrial development of the country. It consists of two scheduled—Schedule A exclusively reserved for the public sector and Schedule B for the private sector, but the State also can enter that sector. This policy resolution is being followed by all the Governments, including the previous Government. There can be no doubt that there is any shift in this policy. We have got a planned economic development of the country after independence, the main objective being to achieve social justice and the social objectives enshrined in the Constitution. That being the case, there can be no question of any shift in the policy. This Government especially has no idea of making any shift. The public sector has to reach the commanding heights of the economy and the private sector has to play the limited role

assigned to it in the industrial policy resolution.

Sir, I am not very happy about the way the private sector is expanding, spreading its tentacles far and wide. Its assets are growing by leaps and bounds from year to year. Therefore, it has to be checked. Take any large house. Its expansion is horizontal. Each house has a conglomeration of industries not connected with each other. For instance, a house owing a sugar industry deals in cement, automobiles, heavy machinery and also newspaper industry. Therefore, the private sector is expanding in menacing proportion, which has to be checked. The MRTP Act has no teeth in it as it stands today. I have been mentioning this repeatedly whenever I spoke on the demands of this Ministry. It has to be amended suitably so that the activities of the monopoly houses can be curbed and they may not be a menace to the society by acting as a deterrent to the social development of the country.

The public sector has been doing well in some units, not so well in other units and perhaps bad in some other units. But that does not mean that we should condemn the public sector. We have to improve its performance, so that its profits may increase because the profits made by the public sector are meant for social gain and not private profit. On the other hand, the private sector functions entirely for private profit. It is not bothered about society or the development of the people. Therefore, there is no question of allowing the private sector to enter larger areas of industries. It should be confined to the industries mentioned in Schedule B. I do not see any reason why the public sector should not expand. In every industry, the public sector is more or less a corporation as in the cement industry, paper industry, etc. Therefore, the public sector should expand. It can find resources. The private sector is making profits at the

expense of the public financial institutions. The invested capital is very small whereas the capital borrowed from public financial institutions is very large. Therefore, I do not agree with the proposition that the private sector is more successful or more competent. It should be the endeavour of the Government to see that the public sector operates well. Of course, there were difficulties last year because of shortages of steel, power, cement, etc. But all this can be made up this year and the Finance Minister has made the optimistic statement that the economic growth will be 7 per cent this year, so that it can make up for the loss of last year.

The main purpose of our economic development is self-reliance and self-generated economy. Our economy has become self-reliant in the field of industry and agriculture. The researches made so far have been spectacular. The results themselves prove that the researches made by our scientists are responsible for the growth of agriculture and industry. We have achieved nuclear capability. We have put a satellite in space only the other day. We should be proud of our scientists who are capable of doing all these things. They are second to none in the world.

17.00 hrs.

The public sector is very vital to our economy. The Government should try to expand it. It should not allow the private sector to come forward into these areas. Let it be reserved only for the public sector so that it reaches the commanding heights of the economy. The objectives for which we stand, cannot be achieved if the private sector is allowed to have its own say or have its own way of doing things. It is Panditji who used to say that we should create a scientific temper in the country to make our economy and country strong. With this objective and also on the advice of Dr. Shanti Swaroop Bhatnagar, a chain of laboratories and research institutions were

established in the country. The result achieved by this step was very nicely put forward by our Prime Minister in her speech while inaugurating the Indian Science Congress in January, 1976 where she said that it had produced the 'Nehru-Bhatnagar effect'.

In the field of science and technology, Government should devote its attention and continue to see that we are self-reliant. We are not importing any technology. There is no need to import any sophisticated technology from the world because unemployment is inherent in our economy. Our industries should be labour-intensive and not sophisticated so that labour numerically is not reduced.

As far as the small scale sector is concerned, I am glad that the small scale sector has done a good job and is doing a good job. 120 items have been reserved for the small scale sector and even in the matter of commodities produced by the large scale sector, small scale sector is in a position to compete with them. There are difficulties experienced by the small scale sector i.e. non-availability of raw material. For this, the Government should come to their aid. If it is possible, they should have a bank of raw materials and whatever essential requirements are needed by them so that the States/Small Scale Corporations can immediately look after the needs of a particular unit.

About the cottage and village industries, emphasis has been laid on the development of the rural sector. They have also to give proper encouragement and fillip to it. There is no question of abolishing the District Industries Centres which were set up in 1978. Even Mr. Fernandes read out a statement which is said to be the statement issued by the Government wherein it has been said that the DICs will be strengthened. Therefore, there is no question of abolishing the DICs which are doing a good job.

They have identified entrepreneurs and the areas but the industries have yet to come up. Therefore, it is the duty of the Ministry of Industry and the Government of India to regulate the industries in the country.

I would strongly urge upon the Government to see that the activities of the private sector are curbed. The MRTP Act should be amended suitably and given teeth so that the monopoly houses do not grow larger day by day, the public sector can hold the commanding heights and the economy goes in a particular direction to achieve our social objective. Our social objective is that the resources of the country should be utilised for the common good so that they subserve the common good of the country and not allow the private industrialists to make profit for themselves. Unfortunately, when we got Independence there was no industry as such in the country. Ours was a purely agricultural country though some individuals had started some industries of their own without any guidelines from the Government. That being so, this mixed economy has brought about this private sector and the public sector. At the same time, the public sector is to play a dominant role in the development of industries in the country so that the benefit goes to the larger section of the people and not to individuals.

Sir, much has been said about the development of backward areas. Whatever may be the incentive you give to the entrepreneurs, no one is willing to put up an industry there for three reasons. Firstly, the infrastructure is not available. Secondly, the distance from the place of the unit to the railway is very long, and thirdly, there is no readily available market. Therefore, only the Government should come forward to put up industries through the public sector wherever it is possible in backward areas and it cannot depend upon the private sector. Whatever are the incentives that will be offered to them, they may not come forward.

About the marketing of the commodities produced by the rural and cottage industries, markets should be made available readily. Government should come to their rescue to see that the articles produced are readily marketed so that they do not suffer. Though the banks are giving them loans, they cannot withhold for a long time the articles which they produce because they have no finances to their credit. (31/1/51)

17.07 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

These are some of the points which, I think, I would request the hon. Minister to bear in mind and see that the Government enforces the industrial policy of the Government strictly and that the public sector plays a dominant role. You have executives who are good. There is nothing wrong in borrowing a good executive from the private sector. We can borrow his services for a period of years. There is nothing wrong in it. Therefore, I would appeal to the Government that they should pay greater attention to see that the public sector improves its performance so that the profits earned will serve the common good. As far as the Government is concerned, there can be no question of lack of resources. When the private sector is borrowing from the commercial banks, the public sector units also can borrow from the banks. As a matter of fact, they are doing this.

Will these words, I support the Demands for Grants.

श्री छोटभाई गमित (माण्डवी): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया, उसके लिए मैं आपका आभारी हूँ। मैं उद्योग मंत्रालय की अनुदानों की मांगों का हार्दिक स्वागत करता हूँ। हमारे देश में आजादी के बाद से तीस वर्ष तक विकास के लिए कार्यक्रम चला है, उसमें औद्योगिक क्षेत्र में काफी कार्य करने का प्रयास किया

गया है। हमारे देश में कई बड़े-बड़े उद्योगों का विकास हुआ है और औद्योगिक क्षेत्र की आमदनी से हमारी इकानोमी पर बड़ा प्रभाव पड़ा है।

हमारे देश में उद्योगों का विकास होता रहा है—और भी होने वाला है, लेकिन सब प्रयत्नों के बावजूद हमारे देश में अमीर और गरीब के बीच अन्तर बढ़ता रहा है। गरीब ज्यादा गरीब होते रहे हैं और अमीर ज्यादा अमीर होते रहे हैं। इस असमानता के साथ साथ हमारे देश में बेरोजगारी भी दिन-प्रति दिन बढ़ती रही है। क्यों कि अभी तक हमारे देश में जहां उद्योगों का विकास हुआ है वह खास तौर पर शहरों में और शहरों के नजदीक ही हुआ है, वहीं उद्योग लगाए गए हैं। हमारा देश 6 लाख गांवों का बना हुआ देश है और 70 प्रतिशत से ज्यादा आबादी आज देहातों में रहती है। उद्योगों के विकास के लिए ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों को प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिए वह नहीं दिया गया इसलिए ग्रामीण लोगों में जितने उद्योग लगाने चाहिए वे उद्योग लगाए नहीं गए हैं। इसीलिए आज हमारे देश में शहरों और गांवों के बीच में काफी अंतर बढ़ता चला जा रहा है।

अभी हमारी कांग्रेस की गवर्नमेंट बनी है। हमें देश का संतुलित विकास करना है तो इस चीज को ध्यान में रख कर देश के जो ग्रामीण क्षेत्र हैं उन ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में ज्यादा उद्योग लगाने चाहिए।

साथ-साथ आज देश में बेरोजगारों की संख्या दिन प्रति दिन बढ़ती जा रही है। छठी पंच वर्षीय योजना के अन्तर्गत तीन करोड़ लोग बेकार होंगे और जो ग्रामीण क्षेत्र की प्रच्छन्न बेकारी है, वहां के जो अर्ध-बेकार हैं उनकी संख्या 5 करोड़ गिनी जाती है। इस तरह से छठी पंच वर्षीय योजना के अन्त तक करीब - सात आठ करोड़ लोग बेकार होंगे। तो यह गंभीर समस्या है। इस समस्या को सुलभाने के लिए हमारे उद्योग मंत्रालय को गंभीरता से सोचना चाहिए।

दूसरा सुझाव मैं यह देना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों के विकास के लिए लघु उद्योगों को ज्यादा प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिए और वहां लघु उद्योग लगाए जाने चाहिए।

जो हमारे देश के आदिवासी या पिछड़े क्षेत्र हैं इन क्षेत्रों का विकास करने के लिए सरकार की ओर से पब्लिक सेक्टर के उद्योग लगाए जाने चाहिए। खास तौर से जो आदिवासी क्षेत्र हैं जहां पर कि कभी भी किसी प्रकार का विकास हुआ नहीं है और जो हमारे आदिवासी और हरिजन लोग हैं जिन की गरीबी दिन प्रति दिन बढ़ती जा रही है उन लोगों को बेकारी से बचाने के लिए और उनकी आर्थिक दशा सुधारने के लिए इन क्षेत्रों में सरकार की तरफ से उद्योग लगाए जाएं, इसके लिए मैं माननीय उद्योग मंत्री से विनती करता हूँ।

इसके साथ-साथ मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में खास तौर पर मुख्य व्यवसाय लोगों का खेती है। तो खेती के विकास के साथ-साथ जो एग्री बेस्ट इंडस्ट्री है, ऐसी इंडस्ट्री वहां लगनी चाहिए। एग्री बेस्ट उद्योग जो हैं उनको वहां ज्यादा प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिए क्यों कि ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में जब एग्री बेस्ट इंडस्ट्री लगायी जायेगी तो जो आज किसानों को अपने प्रोडक्शन का उचित दाम नहीं मिलता और उसमें उनको जो और दिक्कतें आती हैं, वह दिक्कतें नहीं आएंगी और उनको अपने प्रोडक्शन की अच्छी कीमत मिलेगी। साथ ही ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में जो बेरोजगारी है उस समस्या का भी हल होगा।

जहां से मैं चुन कर आता हूँ वह सूरत डिस्ट्रिक्ट है। वह सारा सूरत डिस्ट्रिक्ट ट्राइबल एरिया का है। अभी दो तीन साल पहले जो देश में इंडीस्ट्रियली बैकवर्ड डिस्ट्रिक्ट घोषित किए गए हैं उनमें सूरत डिस्ट्रिक्ट को शामिल नहीं किया गया है। मैं उद्योग मंत्री से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह सूरत को इंडीस्ट्रियली बैकवर्ड डिस्ट्रिक्ट में शामिल करें क्यों कि सारे सूरत डिस्ट्रिक्ट की 50 प्रतिशत से ज्यादा आबादी आदिवासियों की है और बहुत विस्तृत क्षेत्र में आदिवासी वहां बसे हुए हैं। लगभग दो तिहाई हिस्सा उसका ट्राइबल एरिया है। गुजरात में जहां ट्राइबल प्रोजेक्ट है उसमें सबसे ज्यादा आबादी सूरत जिले में है और वहां पर दो ट्राइबल प्रोजेक्ट हैं। सूरत में इण्डस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट हुआ है लेकिन वह सिर्फ सूरत शहर में ही हुआ है, जो आदिवासी पिछड़ा क्षेत्र है वहां पर कोई विकास नहीं हुआ है। जहां पर ज्यादातर आदिवासी

लोग रहते हैं, जो अधिकतर हमारे भूमिहीन श्रमिह्वर मजदूर हैं, करीब 56 फीसदी आदिवासी भूमिहीन श्रमिह्वर मजदूर हैं उनको अच्छी मजदूरी दिलाने के लिए वहां पर औद्योगिक विकास किया जाना चाहिए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude. Every hon. member should take only ten minutes. There are 44 members to speak. You must all cooperate.

श्री छातुभाई गामितः सुरत डिस्ट्रिक्ट को इण्डिस्ट्रियली बैकवर्ड डिक्लेयर किया जाना चाहिए।

इसके अलावा जिला उद्योग केंद्रों पर जो छोटे-छोटे उद्योग करने वाले हैं जिनको लोन की आवश्यकता होती है उनको बैंकों की ओर से लोन नहीं मिल पाता है। साथ ही बैंकों की ओर से जितना अच्छा क्रेडिटेशन होना चाहिए वह भी नहीं है। जो लोग छोटे-छोटे खादी एवं ग्रामोद्योग लगाना चाहते हैं उनको भूमि की सुविधा नहीं मिलती है। इसलिए उद्योग मंत्रालय की ओर से ऐसी समीचित व्यवस्था की जानी चाहिए जिससे उद्योगों की स्थापना हो सके।

इसके अतिरिक्त जो हमारा आदिवासी क्षेत्र है वहां पर पेपर फैक्टरी है जिसमें अधिकतर आदिवासी मजदूर काम करते हैं। इस फैक्टरी को जितनी सुविधा मिलनी चाहिए वह भी नहीं मिलती है। मेरा निवेदन है इन बातों की तरफ उद्योग मंत्रालय को ध्यान देना चाहिए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am now calling the next speaker. Mr. Ajoy Biswas.

*SHRI AJOY BISWAS (Tripura West): Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, while speaking on the demands of the Industries Ministry, I will have to deal with the total Industrial policy of the Government of India. The Congress (I) party through the General Elections have come to power but they were in power earlier too. Therefore I will have to discuss the policy pursued by them earlier and at

present. Sir, if we survey the rate of industrial growth during the last 10 years then we will find the following

Year	Rate of growth
1970-71	5.5
1971-72	4
1972-73	2.2
1973-74	2.6
1974-75	6
1976-77	3.9

Thus the average rate of industrial growth per year during the last 10 years was 4.6. During 1979-80, the rate of growth was (—) 0.4. According to the Economic Survey for 1979-80, the Gross National Product has gone down by 1/3(?). If we compare our achievements with the Socialist countries, then we will find that in those countries there has not been any fluctuation in the growth rate as is discernable in our country—sometimes it has gone up and sometimes it has gone down. China prior to independence was an under developed country. Its economy was worse than ours. But today we find that China has gone much ahead of us. In regard to coal, China is producing 650 million tonnes whereas we are producing 100 million tonnes. So far as steel is concerned, China produces 30 million tonnes while we produce 8.24 million tonnes. When China is producing 106 million barrels of oil we are able to produce only 25 million barrels. Even when we compare ourselves with Korea, we find that we are producing less steel than them. Czechoslovakia with a population of 2½ crores is producing 15 million tonnes of steel whereas we are producing only 8 million tonnes.

Therefore, we have to find out the reasons which have led to this situation. The main reason for this is the profit motive. The motivating factor of our industrial policy is to build up a nation on a capitalist pattern to

*The original speech was delivered in Bengali.

uphold the interest of the capitalists within the country and to invite the multinationals to safeguard the interests of the monopolists, Jotdars and Zamindars and the foreign monopolists. What is the result of this policy? As a result of this policy we find that the share of profit of the private producers is increasing and on the other hand the purchasing capacity of the people is dwindling fast and exploitation is increasing. If we are to strengthen the industrial policy, the first imperative that we will have to achieve is to augment the purchasing power of the people. Sir, 80 per cent of the country's population live in villages and unless we are able to increase the purchasing power of the common man we would not be able to lend strength to our industrial structure. What have the Congress Government done during all these 30 years to increase the purchasing power of the rural people. The only way to achieve it is by giving more land to the landless. Now let us see what the Congress Government had done during their rule. Sir, till date 51 lakh acres of land was declared surplus. Out of this 39 lakh acres have been taken over by Government and 16 lakh acres have been distributed. In 1969 Mahalanobis Committee's report was presented. What do we see from this report? According to this report it was estimated that 63 million acres of land would be available as surplus for distribution to the landless. Thus the Government pursued a policy which failed to increase the purchasing capacity of the people and on the other hand they have used industry to further the interest of the Jotdar, Zamindars, monopolists and capitalists. It is no wonder therefore that the industry should suffer from the inevitable consequence of stagnation for the last 10 years.

I would now like to say a few words about the multinational Companies and Government's policies towards them. The Congress(I) party in their manifesto had stated that they would contain the multinationals. But what has really happened. Far from contain-

ing the growth of the multinationals, they have been encouraged by the present Government. Sir, it was agreed that the multinationals should not be allowed to retain more than 45 per cent of the share capital but in reality we find that they have been allowed to retain 75 per cent of the share capital. I would like to cite one example to show how these multinational companies are allowed to loot the Indian market and feather their own nest under the very eyes of the Government. The Glaxo Laboratories Limited had started their business in India with only 1.50 lakh. But today they have a paid up capital of Rs. 7.20 lakhs and the foreign equity share is upto 75 per cent. During their 5 years' working in India during 1969-70 to 1973-74, the company was able to repatriate Rs. 5 crores 5 lakhs. How does this Company send the money abroad? Sir, the Company purchases machinery and goods at a price 12 to 14 times more than the local price. In the name of technical assistance huge sums are given to foreigners. The Company has further built up a reserve of Rs. 7.58 crores. Sir, it would be very pertinent to note what the Hathi Committee had to say about these multinationals. The Hathi Committee said and I quote:

"Multinational companies had an extremely favourable climate in this country when they commenced operations."

"They managed for a good length of time with meagre capital investment, pushed up the sales of their products, remitted profits to their principals abroad and built up substantial reserves. Government's policy permitted payment of royalty even on drug formulations. Whatever basic drugs they manufactured were mostly utilised for captive consumption. High prices were maintained for their drugs for several years."

It must be said that the Committee had made its recommendations when the Congress party under Shrimati Indira Gandhi was ruling the country. Nothing was done to implement the recommendations of the Committee.

Sir, let us now have a look at the import policy of the Government. It is strange that even when we have the industrial capacity to produce a thing, it is still being imported from abroad. We are using 45 to 60 per cent of the industrial capacity. Sir, the capacity in our steel mills is adequate enough to meet the country's demand but during 1978-79 we had imported steel worth Rs. 717 crores. The authorities of Durgapur Steel have complained that a very poor quality of coal is being supplied and as a result the production has gone down. During the same year we imported paper worth Re. 146 crores, custurd with Rs. 102 crores and fertilizer and chemical worth Rs. 911 crores. Then what is our policy. Whatever it is, it does not try to encourage our own industry rather it tries to help the foreign monopolist. Let us take the case of rail wheel sets. At Durgapur we have a modern plant which if utilised fully can fully meet the demand. But what are we doing? We are importing rail wheel sets for Rs. 1200 per set when those produced in Durgapur will cost only Rs. 800.

Sir, it is a very common knowledge that the private industrialists run their units in their own interest and make it sick by syphoning the profit to other industries. After one unit is declared sick loan is again given to the industrialist. I would like to suggest that all sick units should be taken over by the Government only and there are many sick units in West Bengal. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether his Ministry keeps a watch on the money which is given as loan to the owner of a sick industry. This is indeed very necessary.

Government's policy of assistance/loan to industries is heavily tilted towards heavy industries although they may say something in sympathy for the small scale industries. We find that Government's financial assistance towards big textile mills amounts to Rs. 500 crores whereas the assistance given to the handloom industries is only Rs. 100 crores. In addition to this the big textile mills have been

given a sum of Rs. 249 crores for modernisation. This amply shows the Government's tilted policy. But/strangely enough even though the big industries are getting more assistance, their production is low while the production in handloom sector is increasing despite small assistance. We would like to know from the Government whether they should give more and more assistance to big industries who do not produce more and this suppress production which helps them to create scarcity and jack up the price and make more profit. The Government will have to consider it seriously. Therefore I have no hesitation to say that the industrial policy of the Central Government during the last 30 years was aimed at tampering the monopoly houses only. The industrial policy was for the benefit of the Tatas and the Birlas. Sir in this house very often the Janata Party's Government is blamed for lack of industrial growth but I must say that this Government is also following the Janata line. As a result of this policy the assets of the monopoly houses have gone up steadily from year to year. Sir during 1972 to 1976, when Shrimati Indira Gandhi was the Prime Minister of our country, the assets of Birlas had gone up by 250 per cent Mafatlal's by 139 per cent, Singhanias by 198 per cent and Mahindra's by 215 per cent This is just to mention a few.

Before I conclude Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, I would like to say a few words about the North Eastern States. What is the state of affairs there During the last 30 years of Congress rule, nothing was done to develop industries in these States. We have the six States of Arunachal, Maniour, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, and Tripura and in addition we have Assam. During all these years no concerted effort was made to develop the infrastructure without which the industry can not thrive. During all these years the Congress Government did not do anything to link the State capitals by rail. How can those States thrive industrially without a rail link and cheap means of communication. In 1978 the Janata party had allocated some amount for rail expansion on its

this region. But during the current rail budget we find that the Congress Government has not increased the amount by even a naya paise. This is the apathy of the Centre towards these States. Sir, consumption of electricity, by and large, is taken as the yard stick to judge the development of any area. Let us now see how much electricity is being consumed by them. The figures of per capita consumption in kilowatt for these States are as follows:—Manipur 9.4, Meghalaya—55.7, Mizoram 4, Nagaland 38.6 and Tripura 82. The all India average of consumption of electricity is 108.2 kilowatt. This shows how industrially backward these States are. Sir, the whole of the North Eastern region is in a flux. There is dissatisfaction all round. Nothing has been done for these people during all these 30 years to improve their economic condition. Surely all those who are advocating for a Secessionist movement are utilising the people's anger and frustration in their own favour. In Tripura 83 per cent of the population live below poverty line and in the whole of the North Eastern region nearly 70—75 per cent of the population are under the poverty line. We are reaping the harvest of what the Government had done all during the last 30 years. Their faulty industrial policy towards these States is today leading towards a secessionist movement in this area and none but the Central Government should be held responsible for their attitude of apathy towards these States. I would request the hon. Minister to do some introspection and find out for himself how far the Central Government's industrial policy is responsible for what is happening in the North Eastern region.

Sir, the Government of Tripura wanted to set up a paper mill and the Government of Soviet Union has assured help. There is shortage of paper in the country. The mill when installed will produce 300 tonnes per day of paper and give employment to 20,000 people. We take loans from the capitalist countries on stiff terms and conditions but we have not taken any decision about the Soviet offer. A letter of intent was issued in 1975 but

although, the papers are with the Central Government, no decision has been taken in this regard. Sir, on behalf of the six States of the Eastern zone I would like to request the hon. Minister to tell us if the Central Cabinet has considered anything positive for the expansion of infrastructure and industrial development of this area. We urge that something positive has to be done by the Central Government in this regard.

I would now like to say something about the coir industries in Kerala. The State wanted to enact a law on the lines of the Essential Commodities Act. The draft legislation sought to be enacted by the State Government is with the Central Government and it is pending their consideration. Even though the Law Department has passed the draft legislation, the Ministry of Industrial Development and the Central Government have yet to take a decision in this regard. Sir, this legislation is very essential for ensuring a proper growth of the coir industry in Kerala and delay on the part of the Central Government would only cause set back to the industry in the State. I would also like to urge upon the hon. Minister that he should consider all the suggestions that have been sent by the Government of Kerala for the development of industry in the State expeditiously and give all possible assistance to them and with this I conclude my speech.

डा. राजेन्द्र कुमारी बाजपेयी (सीतापुर):
अभी जार्ज साहब ने बड़े जोरदार शब्दों में जनता पार्टी की औद्योगिक नीति की बकालत की। मुझे अफसोस है कि इस समय वह हमारी बात सुनने के लिए यहां सदन में मौजूद नहीं हैं नहीं तो मैं उनको बताती कि किस तरह वह अपने को निर्दोष साबित करने की कोशिश कर रहे थे। जितना वह एका कर रहे थे उतना ही वह स्वयं अपनी पार्टी में फंसते जा रहे थे।

जनता पार्टी के समय इंडस्ट्रियल पॉलिसी को जिस की बात वह बार-बार कर रहे हैं, 1977 की पॉलिसी स्टेटमेंट की बात, उस संदर्भ में मैं उनको बताना चाहती हूँ कि 1956 में पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के नेतृत्व में कांग्रेस ने औद्योगिक नीति निर्धारित की

थी। उस समय यह भगड़ा नहीं उठाया गया था कि बड़े उद्योगों को हमें ज्यादा प्रोत्साहन देना है या ग्रामीण या छोटे उद्योगों को। उस वक्त देखा यह गया था कि कैसे और किस तरह से इस देश की गरीबी से हम लड़ सकते हैं और किस तरह अपने पैरों पर खड़े हो सकते हैं। आज भी जो नई सरकार है, श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी की सरकार उसके सामने भी एक ही लक्ष्य है कि कैसे हम इस देश की गरीबी से लड़ सकते हैं, कैसे अपने पैरों पर खड़े हो सकते हैं। बार-बार कहा जाता है कि मल्टी-नेशनल्ज को बुलाया जा रहा है। लेकिन मुझे याद है 1977 में जब जनता पार्टी की बात घोषित की गई थी उस में पहली बार इन्होंने बड़े स्पष्ट शब्दों में और खुल कर यह कहा था कि हम ऐसे लोगों को बुलाते हैं, दावत देते हैं और उन्होंने यह दावत दी भी। इसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि हमारे उद्योग जिनको हम कंज्यूमर कर्मांडिटोज कहते हैं या हमारे वे उद्योग जो कि हमारे देश के लिए आगे के आधुनिकीकरण के लिए इन्फ्रस्ट्रक्चर तैयार कर रहे थे उस में रुकावट आई।

उन्होंने सिमेंट की बात कही है, पेंपर की बात कही है। मैं जार्ज साहब से पूछना चाहती हूँ कि क्या सिमेंट का आयात जनता पार्टी के राज में आरम्भ नहीं हुआ था? क्या सिमेंट के आयात में वृद्धि जनता राज्य में नहीं की गई थी? मेरे पास आंकड़ा है। 1977-78 में इन्होंने 3.12 लाख टन सिमेंट बाहर से मंगाया। 1978-79 में 16.55 लाख टन मंगाया। 1979-80 यानी अभी के लिए भी जो हालत ये हमारे लिए छोड़ कर गए हैं, हमारे सामने कोई दूसरा चारा नहीं है सिवाय इसके कि हम इसके आयात को जारी रखें। मुझे खुशी है कि सरकार ने जो अपनी पुस्तिका हमारे सामने प्रस्तुत की है उस में सिमेंट उद्योग के विस्तार की बात कही है। हम जब अपने देश में उद्योगों के विस्तार की बात करते हैं तो इसके माने यह होते हैं कि हम नए एम्प्लायमेंट के जरिये अपने देश की जनता के वास्तो खोलते हैं। बार-बार यह कहा जा रहा है कि मल्टीनेशनल्ज को और प्राइवेट जो पार्टनर हैं उनकी तरफ नई सरकार झुक रही है। बाहर के लोगों को बुलाकर और उनके साथ मिलकर तो काम करने में इन्होंने तय्यारी नहीं की थी या संकोच नहीं हुआ

था, जिसके कारण हमारे उद्योगों के बढ़ते हुए काम उन दिनों रुकें थे। उसी का नतीजा हुआ कि देश के अंदर तमाम कंज्यूमर्स कर्मांडिटोज, जिनको हम पब्लिक सेक्टर और प्राइवेट सेक्टर में बना रहे थे, उनमें कमी आई थी।

आज हमारी सरकार की पालिसी यह होनी चाहिए कि देश में जो भी पूंजी है और खासकर जनता राज्य में जो नम्बर 2, ब्लॉक का पैसा इक्ठठा हुआ है पूंजीपतियों के पास, उस को किस तरह से निकाला जाये और किस तरह से उसका इन्वेस्टमेंट हो। मैं यह इंडस्ट्री मिनिस्टर और सरकार के ऊपर छोड़ती हूँ कि वह यह नीति अपनाये कि जो इतना बड़ा इन्फ्लेशन है, मुद्रास्फीति है, जिसके कारण कीमतें बढ़ रही हैं, जिन्दगी में लोगों को आज इतनी परेशानी उठानी पड़ रही है, एक तरफ तो हम उसका मुकाबला करने के लिये जो बहुत ज्यादा नम्बर 2 का पैसा इधर-उधर पड़ा हुआ है, उसे नई इन्वेस्टमेंट के जरिये निकालें और उद्योगों में लगाने के लिये मौका दें। हमें इस बहस में नहीं पड़ना चाहिये कि हम कितनी सीमा बढ़ा रहे हैं या कम कर रहे हैं। सवाल इस बात का है कि हम कितनी एम्प्लायमेंट अपने देश के लोगों को दे सकते हैं। अगर हम एम्प्लायमेंट देते हैं तो लोगों की पर्चेजिंग पावर बढ़ती है और इससे हमारे देश का आलराउंड विकास भी हो सकता है।

सबसे बड़ा सवाल हमारे लिये यही है कि देश में लाखों-लाखों युवा लोगों की अन-एम्प्लायमेंट की वजह से जो संख्या बढ़ती जा रही है, उनको किस काम में लगाते हैं।

जहां हमने 5 पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं में अपने ऐसे स्ट्रक्चर्स तैयार किये हैं उद्योग के, जिनमें बुनियादी तौर पर वह उद्योग कायम किये गये चाहे एन्जी को फील्ड में हो, इस्पात, हवी-मशीनरी के फील्ड में हो, जिनके द्वारा इन्फ्रा-स्ट्रक्चर तैयार करने के लिये आज भारतवर्ष के पास काफी शक्ति है, मैं चाहूंगी कि हम उस ओर फिर जायें जिससे कि वह कंज्यूमर्स कर्मांडिटोज जिनको हम छोड़ देते हैं कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर चाहे कितना काम बढ़ाये या घटाये, वह पूरी कर सकें। आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन सिस्टम, वितरण प्रणाली को कैसे ठीक कर सकते हैं। उसी तरह जो बाजार

ऐसी व्यवस्था चाहिए जो प्रतिदिन व्यवहार में आने वाली चीजें हैं, उनके उद्योग और उत्पादन पर भी सरकार का कंट्रोल होना चाहिये।

इस दिशा में को-आपरेटिव बहुत काम कर सकती हैं और मुझे ख़ुशी है कि को-आपरेटिव सैक्टर को बढ़ाने के लिये, हमें जो यह रिपोर्ट की पुस्तिका दी गई है, उसमें यह लिखा गया है—

"The Industrial cooperatives are expected to play a very important role in the successful implementation of the new Industrial Policy."

पूरा मैंने इसे नहीं पढ़ा है, और बातें भी इसमें लिखी गई हैं। अगर गवर्नमेंट यह मानती है कि को-आपरेटिव से हमें ज्यादा बढ़ना चाहिये, मैं भी ऐसा समझती हूँ कि को-आपरेटिव के माध्यम से हम कंज्यू-मर्स कर्मांडिटोज, प्रतिदिन के काम आने वाली उपभोक्ताओं की वस्तुओं को ज्यादा से ज्यादा प्रोत्साहन दे तभी हम इस दिशा में अपने पैरों पर खड़े हो सकते हैं। प्राइवेट सैक्टर का जो कट-थ्रोट कम्पीटीशन होता है जिसके पीछे प्राइवेट मोटिव होता है, केवल मुनाफे की भावना से आगे बढ़ते हैं, उसका तभी मुकाबला किया जा सकता है। यह कहना कि हमारी सरकार प्राइवेट सैक्टर की तरफ बढ़ रही है, ऐसा मैं नहीं मानती हूँ, बल्कि हमारी पूरी नीति समाजवाद की ओर बढ़ने वाली है। हमारी सरकार ने रोलिंग प्लान और एक साल का प्लान, इस तरह की चीजों को छोड़कर फिर से एक सैल्फ क्राफ्टिंग जैनेरेट किया है, एक आत्म-विश्वास भारत की इकनामी में पैदा किया है। हम फिर से पंच-वर्षीय योजना लागू करने जा रहे हैं, जिसके लिए योजना आयोग और इंडस्ट्रीज मिनिस्ट्री के द्वारा विचार-विमर्श हो रहा है। हमारा लक्ष्य यही है कि हम 1956 के औद्योगिक-नीति प्रस्ताव को आधार मान कर, जिसको इकानॉमिक कांस्टीट्यूशन आफ इंडिया कहा जाता है, देश के आल-राउंड विकास की ओर आगे बढ़ें। उस समय भी इस तरह के सवाल उठाये गये थे, लेकिन प्रैक्टिकल इकानॉमी यह कहती है कि जहाँ जरूरत है इस बात की कि हम बड़े उद्योगों को बढ़ायें, वहाँ छोटे उद्योगों का भी विकास करें। यह बात व्यवहार में भी

सिद्ध हो चुकी है, इस लिए इस बारे में किसी नये भंगड़े का प्रश्न ही नहीं है।

उत्तर प्रदेश एक बहुत बड़ा सूबा है, जिसकी जनसंख्या भी बहुत ज्यादा है। उसकी तरफ विशेष ध्यान देने की जरूरत है। अभी तक केन्द्र से उत्तर प्रदेश को औद्योगीकरण के लिए जो मदद मिलती रही है, वह उसकी जनसंख्या को देखते हुए काफी कम है। जब हम आल-इंडिया प्लान एलोकेशन के देखते हैं, तो पता लगता है कि उत्तर प्रदेश को उद्योगों के लिए 500 करोड़ रुपये दिये गये, जबकि देश भर में इंडस्ट्रीज के क्षेत्र में 12,000 करोड़ रुपये खर्च हुए। मुझे आशा है कि उद्योग मंत्री उत्तर प्रदेश के औद्योगीकरण के सम्बन्ध में इस बात का विशेष ध्यान रखेंगे।

मैं सीतापुर से मेम्बर हूँ। मैंने अपने चुनाव के दौरान देखा है कि वहाँ कितनी गरीबी है और वह कितना पिछड़ा हुआ क्षेत्र है। मैं चाहती हूँ कि वहाँ पर कुछ उद्योग लगाये जायें, जिससे वहाँ के गरीब लोगों को एम्प्लायमेंट मिल सके। सीतापुर में दो तीन ऐसे कारखाने लगाये जा सकते हैं, जिनके लिए वहाँ रामटीरियल मौजूद है। एक तो वहाँ जूट का कारखाना लगाया जा सकता है। वहाँ काफी जूट पैदा होता है, जो कलकत्ता और दूसरी जगह भेजा जाता है। वहाँ पेपर मिल भी लगाई जा सकती है। उसके लिए भी वहाँ पर काफी सामग्री और रा मटीरियल है। सीतापुर में दरियों का काफी अच्छा केन्द्र है और उनका व्यापार होता है। अगर को-आपरेटिव सैक्टर में स्पिनिंग मिल लगाई जाये, तो बूनकर भाइयों और वहाँ के लोगों को काम मिलने में आसानी रहेगी और उस उद्योग को भी इससे लाभ होगा।

सीतापुर मूंगफली की खेती के लिए भी मशहूर है। वहाँ बहुत छोटे-छोटे मूंग-फली का तेल निकालने के कारखाने हैं, लेकिन कोई बड़ा वनस्पति का कारखाना नहीं है। अगर वहाँ पर पब्लिक सैक्टर में या को-आपरेटिव सैक्टर में वनस्पति का कारखाना लगाया जा सके, तो वहाँ पर उत्पादकों का जो एक्सप्लायटेशन हो रहा है, क्योंकि उन्हें फायदे से कीमत नहीं मिलती है वह खत्म हो सकेगा और वहाँ की जनता को लाभ होगा।

इन शब्दों के साथ उद्योग मंत्रालय की मांगों का समर्थन करती हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: A list showing the numbers of cut motions to the Demands for Grants in respect of the Ministry of Industry treated as moved on the basis of the slips received from Members concerned, has been put up the Notice Board for the information of Members.

In case any member finds any discrepancy in the list, he may kindly bring it to the notice of the Officer at the Table immediately.

SHRI R. K. MHALGI (Thane): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to adopt a pragmatic policy regarding cement industry with a view to remove the acute shortage of cement. (4)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure in nursing the sick units and their management. (5)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to evolve and effectively implement a policy to promote industrial activity in backward areas of Maharashtra (21)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to promote labour intensive industries in view of the unemployment problem in Maharashtra (22)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to run the District Industrial Centre Scheme more effectively and vigorously (23)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to rationalise the licensing policy (24)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to give boost to the small scale industries in the country. (25)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to assist small scale industries in export promotion or activities. (26)]

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to meet the urgent requirement of sick units of small scale industries of Maharashtra by the Government of India. (56)]

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Slow implementation of the "action-plans" of various D.I.C.'s in Maharashtra. (57)]

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to start centrally sponsored industrial projects in the backward areas of Distt. Thana Maharashtra (58)]

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Appointment of worker-Directors in the industries—Specialty in Public Undertakings. (59)]

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to check the feeling of frustration among the entrepre-

neurs of Small Scale Industries in India (60)]

SHRI T. R. SHAMANNA (Bangalore South): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re.1".

[Failure to give necessary impetus to the growth of new industries in the country by giving finance and technical assistance. (11)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to have a well-organised scientific system to regulate the industrial promotion and development of industries in the country. (12)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to properly organise and foster rural industries. (13)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to allow regional imbalance in respect of industrial development in the country. (14)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to find out alternative measure to run factories when there is power cut. (28)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to press effectively with the Railway authorities for allotment of wagons when there is wagon bottleneck to get raw-materials and finished products dispatched. (29)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to take steps on war footing to produce the required quantity of essential goods to help consumers and save foreign exchange. (33)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to appoint top executives in public sector industrial concerns, such persons who have ability and technical knowledge of business management. (34)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to mitigate the hardship to publishers and students caused by paper shortage and high cost of paper. (35)]

SHRI BHOGENDRRA JHA (Madhubani): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Under-utilisation of the capacity of the Heavy Engineering Corporation, Ltd. Ranchi. (36)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Lack of orders for Heavy Engineering Corporation, Ltd. Ranchi. (37)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to provide suitable employment to engineers particularly in Bihar. (38)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to start industrial estate and yarn producing factory at Pandaul and Madhubani district of Bihar. (38)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to open subsidiary industries of paper from bagasse and industrial alcohol from molasses around sugar industries in North Bihar and U.P. (40)]

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need of opening brick-Kiln industry in Madhubani, Sitamarhi Darbhanga, Saharsa and other district of Bihar. (46)]

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to open subsidiary industries for industrial alcohol paper from bagasse near sugar mills in North Bihar. 47)]

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to instal pulping plants at Rameshwar Nagar in Darbhanga district of Bihar. (48)]

DR. VASANT KUMAR PANDIT (Rajgarh): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure in promoting nucleus industries in backward areas particularly in the under-developed districts of Madhya Pradesh like Rajgarh, Vidisha and Guna. (68)]

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to set up coordinating machinery to give sufficient raw material to small scale industries in backward areas. (69)]

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to set up coordinating machinery for marketing and sale of the products from small scale industries. (70)]

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to identify items of production for the small scale sector and promote such industries. (71)]

SHRI R. P. VERMA (Kodarma): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure of Mitco to set up the proposed mica-paper factory at Jhumari Telaiya with foreign collaboration for boosting up export of insulating materials. (74)]

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure in setting up a Mica-bonded glass factory at Kodarma for developing scientific use of Mica-implements. (75)]

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to re-start the Gayday Iron and Steel Co., Kodarma for manufacturing special pipes of various sizes and diameter which is under 'lay off'. (76)]

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to utilise the acquired 30 acres of land at Domchanch

Hazarigagh (Bihar) for manufacturing electrical and electronics equipments. (78)]

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to provide constant work to the workers and employees of H.E.C. Ranchi as requested by the Hatia Shramik Sangh. (79)]

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to provide orders of machinery and other engineering equipments for setting up plants in the country by H.E.C., Ranchi for its constant running. (80)]

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to set up Village and Small Industries in the districts of Giridih, Hazaribagh, Santhal Parganas, Palamau and Singhbhum. (81)]

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to allot materials and equipments received in aid from Denmark and Germany to Hazaribagh and Giridih Districts of Bihar which are most backward districts. (82)]

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to set up a Paper mill in Bihar in order to utilise the forest wealth between Kodarma and Giridih. (83)]

"That the demand under the head Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Indifference to set up proposed H.M.T. watch factory in the

backward area of Hazaribagh. (84)]

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to provide practical training to rural entrepreneur by taking them round the industries in Delhi, Punjab, Haryana, Maharashtra and Gujarat. (85)]

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to give electricity and necessary implements and provide information about marketing to industries. (86)]

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Indifference towards removing backwardness by promoting small scale industries in Ichak, Baikatha, Jainagar, Makcho and Satgawon of District Hazaribagh in Bihar. (87)]

"That the demand under head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to bring under the purview of National Small Scale Industries Corporation, Tisri, Gavan, Deori, Birni, Bagodar, Dhanwar, Jamna, Bengabad and Shandey which are the most backward blocks of district Giridih. (88)]

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to direct every district industrial centre to set up at least 5 industrial units under the area of every police station]. (89)

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be

reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to announce the policy to promote officers of the district industrial centres with a view to increase production in Village industries]. (90)

SHRI R. P. DAS (Krishnagar): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to take into account the importance of traditional metal utensils industry of Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Bihar and Orissa in rural economy]. (91)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to encourage the present paper industries of Nadia district, West Bengal]. (93)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to give financial assistance to new paper mills of Nadia, West Bengal]. (94)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to ban manufacturing of Cigarette totally by statutory legislation]. (95)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to ensure supply of raw materials to the manufacturer-cum-labour owner of the metal utensils industry of Nabadwip, Dharmā, Matiyari and other centres of West Bengal]. (99)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be

reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to remove acute shortage of cement in most of the districts of West Bengal]. (100)

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to establish a branch of the Mineral and Metal Corporation of India at Bakharia, a village in Basti of Uttar Pradesh and at Nabadwip, a town in Nadia, West Bengal to solve the raw material problem of the traditional metal utensils industry]. (103).

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to develop industries in the backward districts of West Bengal such as Nadia, Murshidabad, Bankura, Malda and West Dinajpur]. (104)

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to supply raw materials like pure copper, tin, zinc, nickel, brass, bronze to metal utensils industry at controlled price]. (105)

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to provide adequate financial assistance to metal utensils industry]. (106)

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to make the Nadia district industrial centre more effective in respect of traditional and non-traditional industries of the district]. (107)

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to develop the traditional brass and bell-metal industry of West Bengal]. (108)

SHRI E. BALANANDAN (Mukandpuram): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to include workers' representatives in the Board of Directors in industries under public sector]. (92)

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced to Re. 1."

[Allowing intermediaries who have no stake in the industry in the export trade of coir and coir products]. (101)

"That the demand under the head Village and Small Industries be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to give sufficient financial aid to the development programme proposed by the Kerala Government for Coir Industry]. (102)

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Patna): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1"

[Need for not amending the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956]. (109)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1"

[Failure to make policy changes in the joint sector of Industries]. (110)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1"

[Failure to do away with the capitalist system in industries]. (111)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1"

[Failure to nationalise all the basic industries]. (112)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1"

[Failure to break the stronghold of Indian and foreign capitalists in industries]. (113)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1"

[Need to nationalise more industries in the country]. (114)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1"

[Failure to accelerate the pace of industrialisation in the country]. (115)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1"

[Failure to nationalise the industries of foreign capitalists]. (116)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1"

[Failure to check the remittance of profit by multi-national industrialists]. (117)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1"

[Failure to control bureaucracy and check malpractices/corruption in public sector industries]. (118)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced to Re. 1"

[Failure to include the representatives of labourers in the Board of Directors of public sector industries]. (119)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to check wasteful expenditure in public undertakings]. (120)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Need to give incentives to set up small industries in Backward areas of the country]. (121)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to nationalise Bata Shoe Company]. (122)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to prevent Bata Shoe Company from sending profits outside the country]. (123)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Need to set up industries near all district headquarters in Bihar]. (124)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to procure raw materials for small industrial units]. (125).

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to lay a net work of small industries in the country]. (126)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to put a curb on the profit of Industrialists]. (127)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to realise the tax-dues from industrialists]. (128)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to check the expansion of capital by monopolists]. (129)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Need to give an opportunity to the unemployed to start industries]. (130)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to expand the village and small industries in rural areas]. (131)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to lay down an industrial policy for all round development of each State]. (132)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Need to frame State-wise schemes for industrial development]. (133)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to increase the number of industrial establishments, in the public sector in Bihar]. (134)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to set up industries near Patna town]. (135)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Need to set up a button factory in public sector in Mehsi in Motihari district in Bihar]. (136)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to set up industries in North Bihar]. (137)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to set up a paper factory in the cane-growing areas of Bihar]. (138)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to nationalise the Dalmia Cement Factory in Bihar]. (139)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Need to set up a cement factory in the public sector in Bihar]. (140)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to ensure proper supply of power to the industries]. (141)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to set up industries in the backward areas of the country]. (142)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Need to set up H.M.T. watch factory in Bihar]. (143)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Need to set up industries between Moghulsarai and Patna]. (144)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure to remove the shortage of cement in Bihar] (145)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Industry be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Need to nationalise the cigarette factories]. (146)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has requested that as all the Demands for Grants are expected to be voted by the House by the evening of 23rd July, 1980 after which the Finance (No. 2) Bill will be taken up for consideration, it will be possible to pass the Bill without a sitting of the House on Saturday, 26th July, 1980. He has suggested that the sitting of the House fixed for Saturday, the 26th July, 1980 may be cancelled. I think the House agrees to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House has agreed. Now, I call Mr. Neelalohithadasan to speak. He may take the rest of the 7 minutes and conclude his speech and at 6 P.M. the House will adjourn.

Mr. Neelalohithadasan

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN (Trivandrum): Sir, the present Government has not so far declared its industrial policy. If the pronouncements made by some of the Ministers of the Central Cabinet here and there are taken as the industrial policy of this Government, I think, it is clear that this Government is going against the Industrial Policy Resolution of the Congress Government of 1956, headed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the policies pronounced in the election manifesto of the ruling party in the 1980 elections. The Government is not having any idea in regard to the development and growth of the public sector. Even in his budget speech the Finance Minister is keeping mum about basic developments of the public sector. For example, take Bharat Heavy Electricals, Bharat Heavy Plates and Vessels and Bharat Heavy Engineering. As regards the development of these basic industries in the public sector the Government is not having any idea at all. And as regards the problems of States like Kerala, the Government is continuing its negligence. Kerala is having very good advantageous circumstances for industrial development. Kerala is the only State in India which is having surplus power; it is having water in abundance; it is having skilled and trained manpower; there are no pollution problems in Kerala. In spite of all these advantages, compared to other States, the Centre has not started enough public sector industries in Kerala. Always negligence has been shown to Kerala—whether it was the Congress Government, the Janata Government or the Lok Dal Government. During the time of all the Governments Kerala has been neglected.

Even now the Central public sector investments fall far short of the percentage which is legitimately due to them on the basis of population. So I request the Government to have more public sector undertakings in Kerala and expansion of the existing undertakings like the Instrumentation Limited and Indian Telephone Industries. Sir, even national financial institutions are also showing a step-motherly treatment towards Kerala. They are having only small investments there.

Sir, the Kerala State Industrial Development Corporation has applied for so many letters of intent and approval for the foreign collaboration, in respect of projects like, Refractories Project, Fibre-Glass Project etc. I do not understand why this delay is there. I request the Government to speed up these things and give their approval to the letters of intent at the earliest.

There are traditional industries of Kerala like coir, cashew, handloom, bidi etc. and no steps have been taken by the Government to help them.

Although it has been brought before the Central Government by the State Government of Kerala through the Members of Parliament belonging to various political parties, the Central Government has not taken any step to solve the crisis endangering the very existence of these traditional industries.

As regards Coir industry, I would like to point out that it plays a very important role in the economy of the State and it provides employment to about 5 lakhs of people. This industry helps in earning foreign exchange to a substantial amount. The problems of Coir industry has been gone through by a Study Group and a Task Force appointed by the Planning Commission and also by the Sivaraman Committee. The Kerala Government has also forwarded a scheme for the development of the Coir Industry to be implemented dur-

ing the Sixth Five Year Plan for the approval and financial assistance of the Central Government. The intention is to bring 60 per cent of the industry under the co-operative fold during the five year period. The Sivaraman Committee had strongly recommended more and more co-operativisation to prevent exploitation of the poor workers by the private traders. I request the Central Government to accept the scheme at the earliest and provide financial assistance.

Sir, disparities in the levels of wages fixed for workers in various States have also affected adversely the Industries of Kerala, like Coir, Beedi, Handloom and Cashew. I request the Central Government to bring out the necessary amendments in the Minimum Wages Act so that the Central Government may be provided with adequate powers to pass appropriate orders to narrow the disparities.

Similarly Fatex Foam Industry reserved for small scale sector is now being neglected and is in sad plight. The ruin of foam manufacturing industry in this country is due to the encouragement given to polyurethane foam industry which uses hundred per cent importer raw materials whereas Fatex Foam is a hundred per cent indigenous industry. So, in this case the Central Government should change its policy and encourage the basic indigenous rubber-base industry. Otherwise thousands of workmen would be rendered unemployed due to closure of Foam industries and the economy of Kerala and Tamil Nadu would be affected adversely. I would request the Central Government to take immediate action to save the Fatex Foam Industry.

Now, a third force in the industry has been introduced as tiny match

industry with all Government patronage. I am not opposing the encouragement of these tiny units, but actually what is happening today is that the big industrialists and businessmen themselves are manipulating and migrating to tiny sector complex only to obtain some more benefits from the Government. This should not be allowed and this should be avoided.

Sir, I request the Central Government to pay special attention on the Industrial development of Kerala. Similarly Trivandrum and Cape Comerin are two southern-most districts of our nation. One is part of Kerala and the other is part of Tamil Nadu. Both these districts are industrially very backward and the people of these two districts have begun to think whether they are part and parcel of India or not because they are neglected in such a way in the matter of industrial development of their States, after independence. Sir, if this tendency and thinking of the people is allowed to continue, then I am afraid that that may pave the way for parochialism. To avoid this kind of tendency being nurtured in those people, I would request the Central Government either to appoint a special committee to prepare a master plan for the industrial development of Trivandrum and Cape Comerin Districts or ask the respective State Governments to prepare such a plan and send the same to the Central Government for its approval and implementation. I would once again request the Central Government to pay special attention for the industrial development of Kerala. Thank you.

18.00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, July 23, 1980/Śravana 1, 1902 (Saka).