16.54 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION *RE* DISAPPROVAL OF INCHEK TYRES LIMITED AND NATIONAL RUBBER MANUFACTURERS LIMITED (NATIONALISATION) ORDINANCE, 1984

AND

INCHEK TYRES LIMITED AND NATIONAL RUBBER MANUFACTURERS LIMITED (NATIONALISATION) BILL

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now the House shall take up items nos. 3 and 4 together, for which 1½ hours have been allotted. Prof. Soz to move the Statutory Resolution and also to speak.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ (Baramulla) : I beg to move the following resolution :—

> "This House disapproves of the Inchek Tyres Limited and National Rubber Manufacturers Limited (Nationalisation) Ordinance, 1984 (Ordinance No. 4 of 1984) promulgated by the President on the 14th February, 1984."

I want to make this clear that I am an ardent suppporter of the socialistic pattern of society and I welcome nationalisation. But I have moved the resolution only to make it known to the House that the government does these things, take these measures rather haphazardly. Now you can see that both Inchek Tyres Limited and National Rubber Manufacturers Limited have been sick units for a number of years. And the Government had already taken over these two companies and these companies have been under the control of the Government for the last six years. And, therefore, one does not understand the delayed proposal, the delayed Ordinance suggesting nationalisation. You can see that Government takes these measures only after there is a great hullabaloo, there are strikes and workers suffered from insecurity and in that atmosphere of uncertainty which some times, I do not know whether it is a design that they should cry hoarse, they should organise strikes and thereafter the Government rises to the occasion.

Now, it was in 1972 that the Indian National Chemical Workers' Federation wanted the nationalisation of both the Companies and from that time now it is more than 11 years since when the workers, that is, the representative body of the workers, the Federation, came forward and requested the Government to nationalise. But they have not done it. Now, finally the Government came forward with this Ordinance. The reason why I say that the Government does these things haphazardly is that there is no cohesion in the Government policy ; on 14th February the Government got the Ordinance promulgated and at that time the hon. Minister suggested that Parliament was not meeting. The Ordinance says,—

> "And whereas Parliament is not in session and the President is satisfied that circumstances exist which render it necessary for him to take immediate action."

Now this happens on 14th February and on 23rd February the Parliament was meeting. So, there was no necessity for this Ordinance and immediately after some time, now, there is the Bill. This shows that there is no cohesion in the Government policy to take corrective measures.

Now as far as the Ordinance is concerned, I have no disagreement with it, but there are one or two measures that have been suggested which are very good. One step is that the workers, under this Ordinance, and now under this Bill, become employees of the Government. It is a very laudable step and then the other measure is that the principle of compensation, that also is a very laudable step and a detailed procedure has been suggested. But in that it has not been specifically mentioned that, I think the hon. Minister may say something about that verbally but in the Ordinance as also in the Bill which will come up later, it has not been specifically suggested or mentioned that top priority will be given to the payments that are due to the workers. And the procedure that has been suggested, I think it is a very laudable thing, that the compensation will be given and a Commissioner will be appointed. But sub-clauses (3) and (4) to Section 21 indicate that the Commissioner meant for compensation shall have arbitrary powers. I would invite your attention to sub-clause (3) of Section 21,

It says—

"(3) Every claimant who fails to file the proof of his claim within the period specified by the Commissioner shall be excluded from the disbursement made by the Commissioner.

(4) The Commissioner shall, after such investigation as may, in his opinion, be necessary and after giving the concerned company an opportunity of refuting the claim and after giving the claimant a reasonable opportunity of being heard, admit or reject by order in writing the claim in whole or in part."

17 hrs.

The Commissioner will have to receive these claims and thereafter he will advertise. But when he advertises in certain newspapers there is no mention that those claimants will receive registered letters or letters direct from the Commissioner. That should be provided. Otherwise, it is a kind of red-tapism whereby people can suffer. The claimants may be 100 or 200. It is not a big thing to write to them on their respective addresses. The period of time within which he will decide the claims has not been mentioned here So, the Commissioner becomes all powerful and there is no check on him and he can work according to his own whims and fencies. In clause 4 when he gives an opportunity to a company, there could be an individual claimant. So, here it should be mentioned the concerned company or the individual claimant. There has to be a time period within which the claim has to be settled.

The other clauses regarding compensation, taking the workers into the employment of Central Government are very laudable ones. But my complaint was that the Government is having these measures in a haphazard manner, which it should not have done.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Resolution moved :

"This House disapproves of the Inchek Tyres Limited and National Rubber Manufacturers Limited (Nationalisation) Ordinance, 1984 (Ordinance No. 4 of 1984) promulgated by the President on the 14th February, 1984."

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI PATTABHI RAMA RAO) : I beg to move :*

"That the Bill to provide for acquisition and transfer of the undertakings of the Inchek Tyres Limited and the National Rubber Manufacturers Limited, with a view to securing the proper management of such undertakings so as to subserve the interests of the general public by ensuring the continued manufacture, production and distribution of tyres, tubes and other rubber goods which are essential to the needs of the economy of the country and for matters connected there with or incidental thereto, be taken into consideration."

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :

"That the Bill to provide for acquisition and transfer of the undertakings of the Inchek Tyres Limited and the National Rubber Manufacturers Limited, with a view to securing the proper management of such undertakings so as to subserve the interests of the general public by ensuring the continued manufacture, production and distribution of tyres, tubes and other rubber goods which are essential to the needs of the economy of the country and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, be taken into consideration."

श्री मोहम्मद इस्माइल (बैरकपुर) : चेयरमैन साहब, जो बिल इस हाउस में लाया गया है उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूं। हमारे कोलीग ने कहा है कि गवर्नमेंट ने 6 मास तक इस चीज को सीरियसली नहीं लिया। इसका ताल्लुक खास तौर से मेरी कांस्टीटुएन्सी से है। वहां से कितने ही रेप्रेजेन्टेशन्स दिए गए, कितने ही डेपुटेशन आए, प्राइम मिनिस्टर तक आए लेकिन सभी जगह यही कह दिया गया कि कंसिडर कर रहे हैं। 6 हजार लोग और उनकी फेमिलीज का

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

सवाल था। मुझे यही कहना है कि डिले करने की क्या जरूरत थी? एकाएक आपकी नींद खुली और आप आर्डिनेन्स ले आए चूंकि पार्लमेन्ट नहीं चल रही थी। इसके बाद स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के साथ आप के रेप्रेजेन्टेटिव्ज बैठे और एग्रीमेन्ट हो गया कि अब कारखाना खुलेगा लेकिन वह एग्रीमेन्ट भी अभी तक पूरा नहीं हुआ है और यह भी डेफनिट नहीं है कि वह कब तक इंप्लीमेंट होगा।

कहते थे कि जब नेशनलाइजेशन होगा, तब इम्पलीमेंट होगा। फिर छः हजार मजदूर अनसरटेंटिटी की जिन्दगी बसर करने लगे। अब आप का यह आर्डिनेंस आया है, जिसकी वजह से आप यहां पर बिल लेकर आए हैं। यह आपने बहुत अच्छा काम किया है। मैं चाहता था कि इन्डस्ट्री मिनिस्टर, श्री तिवारी जी, भी यहां पर उपस्थित होते। मैं बताना चाहता हूं कि मेरे निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में कारखाने बन्द हैं और लॉक-आउट हैं। लॉक-आउट ही नहीं क्लोजर किए हैं और बैंकों ने लिक्विडेशन कर दिया। ऐसी हालत में हजारों मजदूर वहां पर बेकार बैठे हुए हैं, अनिश्चित समय के लिए। पता नही उनका क्या होगा। सरकार अपना कोई निर्णय नहीं देती है और न ही राज्य सरकार उसमें इन्टरविन करती हैं। लोग जलूस लेकर उनके पास जाते हैं, लेकिन कोई नतीजा नहीं निकलता है। मैंने भी चिट्ठी लिखी थी, उसका भी कोई जवाब नहीं मिलता है। इसलिए मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि ऐसा बर्ताव मजदूरों के साथ क्यों किया जाता है?

मैं आपको एक और उदाहरण देता हूं। इस सम्बन्ध में मंत्री महोदय से मिले छः महीने पहले कि क्या होगा, वे भी कोई जवाब नहीं दे सके और कहा कि अच्छा देखा जाएगा। कोशिश कर रहे हैं। इससे पहले जितने भी रिप्रजेंटेशन दिये गये उन सबको कोई जवाब नहीं मिला। लेकिन अब जवाब मिला है कि उसको लिक्विडेशन में कर दिया। 900 आदमी बेकार पड़े हुए हैं, अभी तक कोई निर्णय नहीं लिया गया है। यह इन्डस्ट्री मिनिस्ट्री का फंग्शन हैं। जो इतनी प्रामपट होकर इतने दिनों के बाद अब यह बिल लेकर आए हैं, जिसका मैं समर्थन करता हूं। लेकिन मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं कि इन्डस्ट्री मिनिस्ट्री को अपना इस प्रकार का एटीचूड बदलना चाहिये। यह मजदूरों के साथ तमाशा करने का सवाल नहीं है, जब चाहा बन्द कर दिया और जब चाहा खोल दिया। मैनेजमेंट और आई०आर०सी० की गलतियों की वजह से इस प्रकार के काम होते हैं। मजदूरों ने सैक्रिफाइस किया है, जो बोर्ड बना है, उसने उस पर ध्यान नहीं दिया। मैं एक बात यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जो एग्रीमेंट है, उसको कैंसिल करना होगा। दूसरे टीटागढ़ में आठ-दस हजार मजदूर ऐसे ही पड़े हुए हैं, उनकी ओर ध्यान देना होगा। उनको चिट्ठी लिखी जाती है, उसको कोई जवाब नहीं आता है। कहा जाता है कि कम्पनी के ड्यूज बहुत हैं, जिसकी वजह से कंपनी नहीं चल सकती है, इसलिए उसको बन्द कर दिया। कहा जाता है कि सैन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट के पास जाकर बात करिए। मेरी कान्स्टीचूयेंसी में बिन्नी मिल्स आई०आर०सी० नहीं चला रही है। उसको बैंक चला रहा है। वह भी सिक-इन्डस्ट्री है, लेकिन अभी तक इस मिनिस्ट्री का कोई फैसला नहीं हुआ है।

मैं एक-दो बातें और कहना चाहता हूं। कानपुर में जे०के० रेयन है। मालिकों ने वहां मजदूरों से कहा कि 50 परसेन्ट तनख्वाहें कम करो, अगर इस बात पर राजी हो तो कारखाना खोलेंगे क्योंकि कम्पनी को मुनाफा नहीं होता है। अभी तक कोई फैसला नहीं हुआ है और मिनिस्ट्री की तरफ से भी कोई इन्टरवेन्शन अभी तक नहीं हुआ है। वहाँ 9 हजार मजदूर बेकार पड़े हैं। इस बात का जवाब भी आपको देना चाहिये।

आपके अन्दर एक नई आदत शुरू हो गई है—जब किसी कारखाने को लेते हैं और उसमें नुकसान होता है तो बैंकों से कर्जा ले लेते हैं।

उसके बाद बैंक से कह देते हैं कि तुम लिक्विडेशन की दरख्वास्त करो और इस तरह से वह कारखाना बन्द हो जाता है। मिनिस्ट्री से पूछते हैं तो वह कहते हैं—हम क्या करें, बैंक ने लिक्विडेशन की कार्यवाही की है। तीन-चार महीने पहले ही ऐसा एक कारखाने में हुआ है—हमने उसकी पैटीशन यहां पार्लियामेंट में दी हुई है। आपका यह एटीच्यूड बिलकुल गलत है। क्या यही आपकी इण्डस्ट्रीयल पालिसी है? बामर लारी कम्पनी है जो सरकार की है—उसके लिए एन्क्वारी कराई गई और मालूम हुआ कि वह इकानामिकली वायाबिल हो सकती है, लेकिन अभी तक कोई स्टेप नहीं लिया गया और अब मिनिस्टर साहब कहते हैं कि हमने उसको डी-नोटिफाई कर दिया है। अगर आपकी मिनिस्ट्री का यही एटीचूड है तो इन्चेक-रबड़ का भी यही हाल होगा। यहां के अफसरों और वर्कर्स ने मिल कर फैसला किया है और आप से अपील की है कि जब आप इस कारखाने को नेशनलाइज करने जा रहे हैं तो हम आपके साथ कोआपरेट करेंगे और प्रोडक्शन को बढ़ाकर दिखाएंगे। उन्होंने हमारे समर मुखर्जी साहब के पास चिट्ठी भेजी है जिसमें कहा है कि इस काम के लिए सरकार हमारा कोआपरेशन ले, जो बोर्ड बनाया जाय उसमें हमारे नुमायन्दे को लिया जाय, इस काम में हमारी राय ली जाय जिससे कारखाने का प्रोडक्शन बढ़ सके। लेकिन अफसोस यह है कि आपकी अब तक की प्रैक्टिस कुछ दूसरी है। आपकी प्रेक्टिस यह रही है कि जिस कारखाने को टेक-ओवर किया उसमें ऐसे आदमी को भेज दिया जो टैकनीकल-हैड नहीं है, जो वहां जाकर दल-बाजी शुरू कर देते हैं, जिससे प्रोडक्शन नहीं होती है। वर्कर्स को कहा जाता है कि अब गवर्नमेंट ने ले लिया है—इसलिए आपको डिस्प्लेंड होना होगा। इस तरह के एटीचूड से प्रोडक्शन नहीं बढ़ सकती है। आपको यहां एशोरेंस देना चाहिए कि आप उनको कोआपरेशन हासिल करेंगे और जो बोर्ड बनेगा उसमें उनके नुमाइन्दे को लिया जाएगा ताकि उसमें वर्कर्स पार्टिसिपेशन हो सके। इन्चैक रबड़ के वर्कर्स ने आज तक बहुत सफर किया है। यह कारखाना मेरी कांस्टीचूएन्सी में है। मैं देखूंगा कि आप उनसे कैसा कोआपरेशन लेते हैं—इस लिए इस बात को यहाँ मैंशन कर रहा हूं। अगर आप उनसे कोआपरेशन लेंगे तो उनका 100 परसेन्ट कोआपरेशन आपको मिलेगा। उनकी चिट्ठी हमारे पास है, उसको यहां पर रखने की जरूरत नहीं है। मैं फिर यही कहना चाहता हूं—आपने इसको नैशनलाइज किया है, इसके लिए तिवारी जी को बहुत धन्यवाद। हमारे तिवारी जी इतने सीधे आदमी हैं कि वे सबके लिए हां कह देते हैं, लेकिन करते उल्टा हैं। उनकी यह आदत मेम्बर आफ पार्लियामेंट के साथ है, यहां तक कि कलकत्ता जाते हैं तो हमारी गवर्नमेंट को भी मिसलीड करके आते हैं। यह जरूर हो जाएगा लेकिन आखिर में वह लिक्वीडेशन में चली गई। यह तरीका इंडस्ट्रीज मिनिस्ट्री को बदलना होगा। बड़ी-बड़ी बातें हम लोग करते हैं लेकिन होता कुछ नहीं है।

अभी आडीटर जनरल के बारे में जो बिल आया, वह अभी पास किया है और हमने कहा कि पब्लिक फाइनेन्सेज पर कुछ कन्ट्रोल होना चाहिए, एल० आई० सी० और बैंक पर कंट्रोल होना चाहिए। अगर ऐसा हुआ तब कहीं जाकर कुछ हिन्दुस्तान में हो सकता है और पार्लियामेंट का कुछ कन्ट्रोल हो सकता है। मैं आपको एल० आई० सी० की एक मिशाल देता हूं। कलकत्ता में रीज होटल के लिए एल० आई० सी० ने एक आदमी को पैसा दिया गया और कई लाख रुपया खर्च करके स्मगलर से दोस्ती करके वह आदमी भाग गया। वह होटल अभी तक ऐसा ही पड़ा हुआ है। उसकी बिल्डिंग पर लाखों रुपया खर्च हुआ है लेकिन एल० आई० सी० पर आडीटर जनरल का अगर कोई कन्ट्रोल होता है, तो वह उससे पूछता कि इस पैसे का क्या हुआ है और उस आदमी का क्या हुआ जिसने पैसा लिया था। वह एक बहुत नामी आदमी है। अब सब वर्कर्स ऐसे ही बैठे हैं और बिल्डिंग ऐसी ही

पड़ी है और सरकार का लाखों रुपया उसमें डूब गया है। इस तरह के पब्लिक फाइनेन्सेज पर कन्ट्रोल न होने से कुछ नहीं हो सका है। इस चीज को आप कैसे बदलेंगे।

जहां तक गवर्नमेंट का ताल्लुक है, हम बहुत सी बातें सुनते हैं कि गवर्नमेंट स्माल स्केल इन्डस्ट्रीज के लिए यह कर रही है और वह कर रही है और उनको बढ़ावा दिया जा रहा है लेकिन जो बिग मोनोपोलिस्ट हैं, वे छोटी-छोटी इन्डस्ट्रीज में अपना काम कराते हैं, अपना माल बनवाते हैं और अपना छापा उस पर लगाकर उस माल को अपने नाम से बेच देते हैं। अगर पकड़े जाते हैं, तो फिर लोक-आऊट कर देते हैं और इस तरह से सैकड़ों हजारों वर्कर्स बेकार हो जाते हैं। इस तरह की जो बातें हैं, उनसे स्माल स्केल इन्डस्ट्री वालों को बचाया जाना चाहिए और अपोजीशन की तरफ से जो इस तरह की बात कही गई है, उसको सीरियसली लेना चाहिए। यूनियन्स की बातों को सुनना चाहिए। आज तो वर्कर्स जो पेटीशन देते हैं या कुछ बोलते हैं, उसकी कोई हियरिंग नहीं होती है। मेरा कहना यह है कि यूनियन्स के रेप्रेजेन्टेटिव्ज को बुलाकर और वर्कर्स को बुलाकर बातें करनी चाहिए और यह जो धांधलेबाजी चल रही है, यह खत्म होनी चाहिए।

मैं आपको बताऊं कि उषा जो एक बहुत बड़ी कंपनी है, उसका काम यह है कि फेन्स के पार्टस् वह इन्सीलियेरी इन्डस्ट्रीज में वर्कर्स से बनवाती है और फिर उनको निकाल देती है। जब उन लोगों ने आन्दोलन किया तो उसको बन्द कर दिया। एन्सीलियरी इन्डस्ट्री में जो वर्कर्स काम करते हैं, उन्होंने अपनी मांगें ऊषा कंपनीके सामने रखी और आप जानते ही हैं कि वह डी० सी० एम० वालों की एक बहुत बड़ी कंपनी है लेकिन उन लोगों को पूरी तनख्वाह नहीं दी जाती है। जब लोगों ने यह सवाल उठाया, तो उनको रिट्रेन्चड कर दिया और जब उन्होंने कहा कि हमें आप रिट्रेन्च क्यों कर रहे हैं, तो फिर कम्पनी को बन्द कर दिया। 6 महीने तक वर्कर्स इसके लिए लड़ते रहे और छः महीने भूखे मरने के बाद अब वह फैक्ट्री चली है। इस तरह से सरकार की जो गाइड-लाइन्स हैं इन्सीलियेरी इन्डस्ट्रीज को मदद देने की, वह मानी नहीं जा रही हैं। आपकी इंडस्ट्री मिनिस्ट्री में यह क्या हो रहा है। नेशनेलाइजेशन जो आप ने किया है वह एक बहुत अच्छी बात है लेकिन मेरा कहना यह है कि आपको इस काम में यूनियन्स का कोआपरेशन लेना चाहिए, वर्कर्स का कोआपरेशन लेना चाहिए। तभी यह ठीक से चल सकता है। अलग-अलग नहीं बल्कि जो सेन्ट्रल आर्गेनाइजेशन्स हैं, उनसे मिलकर इस काम को करना चाहिए और जो लीक आउट करके चले जाते हैं, उनके खिलाफ कार्यवाही करनी चाहिए। इसके बारे में सरकार को प्रस्ताव दिया है और तजबीज रखी है। ये लोक-आउट क्यों होते हैं और मालिक फैक्टरीज को बन्द क्यों करते हैं, इसके बारे में आप को यूनियनों से बात करनी चाहिए और वर्कर्स का काआपरेशन लेना चाहिए।

मैनेजमेंट में वर्कर्स के पार्टीसिपेशन की बात भी की जाती है लेकिन मेरा कहना यह है कि इस दिशा में कुछ नहीं हो रहा है। मैनेजमेंट वर्कर्स को कोई राइट्स नहीं देता है और एक वर्कर को उसमें नाममात्र के लिए रख लेते हैं और उसको डांटकर जो करवाना होता है, करवा लेते हैं। इस तरह से सही माइनों में वर्कर्स का पार्टीसिपेसन मैनेजमेंट में कैसे हो सकता है। आप बिना वर्कर्स की कोआपरेशन के इंडस्ट्रीज को नहीं चला सकते हैं और आपकी जो पालिसी मैनेजमेंट में पार्टीसिपेशसन की है, उसको सही माइनों में अमल में लाना चाहिए और जो वर्कर्स हैं और जो प्रोडक्शन फोर्स है, उनका कुल कोआपरेशन लेना चाहिए। आप जिस तरीके से भी उन्हें मदद दे सकते हैं, वह दें। आप उनको मदद देने के लिए जो चाहें वह करें। नहीं तो वर्कर्स की बात को कौन सुनेगा।

अब मैं और न बोलते हुए इस बिल को सपोर्ट

करता हूं और आपसे उम्मीद करता हूं कि आप वर्कर्स से हर तरह की कोआपरेशन लेंगे और इनको आगे अच्छी तरह से चलाएंगे।

*SHRI N. SELVARAJU (Tiruchirapalli): Mr. Chairman, Sir, on behalf of my party the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam, I rise to support the Incheck Tyres and National Rubber Manufacturers Limited Nationalisation) Bill, 1984. This is a welcome measure. This need not have been delayed by five years. I am sure that this bill will receive universal support from all sides of the House.

India is a vast country which cannot be fully covered by rail transport facilities. Transport by roads has assumed serious significance in the face of increasing wagon shortage and paucity of funds for developing railways. Transport by road means lorries and trucks which require tyres and that too tyres fit for long haulage. In other words tyre has become a vital commodity in the development of our economy. In metropolitan towns public transport is not able to meet the growing demand of the people. Hence the production of cars, motors, three wheelers and two wheelers has been stepped up considerably. We have recently set up Maruti Udyog for producing small cars. This leads to growing demand for tyres of all types and varieties. But, unfortunately the tyre industry is in the stranglehold of MRTP and FERA companies, who have no compunction in exploiting the demand and supply situation so far as tyres are concerned.

The Government of India in October 1983 reduced the excise duty on tyres and expected that this benefit would be passed on to the consumers. But the tyre manufacturers not only swallowed that monetagry benefit but also hiked up the tyre prices. Incensed by this avarice, the hon. Finance Minister has in his 1984-85 budget withdrawn the concession in excise duty on tyres. He has ventilated his ire also in his Budget speech.

Sir, the Indian Petro-chemical Corporation, which is in the public sector, is selling the polybutadene rubber at a throwaway price. There was a Parliamentary Question about this only the other day. The pioneering private sector producing styrene butadene rubber is selling this synthetic price at constant prices for so many years, irrespective of the fact of increase in the inputs like coal and power. In addition to this, the tyre giants are importing synthetic rubber from abroad in many devious ways. One of the devious ways was plugged last year by the Finance Ministry. The price of imported synthetic rubber is no doubt cheaper and inspite of all this, the tyre prices are going up at a phenomenal pace. The tyre companies do not allow the indigenous installed capacity for synthetic rubber to be fully utilised. They are more concerned for amassing profits. They sell tyres at fancy prices though they get the inputs at depressed prices. Sir, under a system called DHARMADHA one tyre company is collected huge sums of money from the transporters. If they show any reluctance the supply of tyres is delayed. Recently the capital city of Delhi witnessed violent clashes and conflict between the transporters and the tyre companies. There is no doubt that the tyre companies are exploiting the situation. The Bureau of Industrial Costs and Prices has several times studied the cost structure of tyre manufacturing and this body has given many recommendations, which have not yet been implemented by the Government. I will also refer to the import of natural rubber to contain the price of indigenous natural rubber though the production is picking up. Just because natural rubber is available at a low price abroad, we are importing it with the idea of stabilising the price of natural rubber. It means that natural rubber is also being made available at competitive prices to the tyre manufacturers. Inspite of all this soft approach to tyre manufacturers, they are not reducing the tyre prices.

In view of this continuing recalcitrance, I suggest with all the force at my command that the import of synthetic rubber should be banned for ever. If the ban on import of natural rubber poses any problem, then there should be a permanent standing committee to ensure proper production and distribution pattern of tyres

*The original speech was delivered in Tamil.

at competitive prices to the consumers. This is very much necessary for transport economy of the country.

I would go to the extent of demanding nationalisation of all the tyre units in the country, which alone will help in consolidating the economie gains that we have a achieved so far. I am sure that just by nationalising Incheck tyres and National Rubber the Government will not be able to achieve the objectives enumerated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons of this Bill.

I would substantiate my demand by referring to the fact that the farmers in our country transport their produce by bullock carts. They transport the grains from the field to their tenements; they carry the sugarcane from the field to the factories. They bring the inputs like fertilisers, seeds etc. in such bullock carts. They cannot do these things in trucks or lorries. It will be impossible for them to meet the fuel costs, particularly in the environment of ever increasing agricultural input costs. They are harassed by the increasing price of tyres for these bullock carts. The Centre has levied excise duty on such tyres. The State Government levies heavy dose of sales tax on such tyres. The hon. Minister cannot dispute that bullock carts still play vital role in our agricultural economy. The political leaders shout from house topes that the needs of farmers would be given prime importance. In reality the needs of the farmers are given the lowest priority. If what we profess is really to be practised, then I demand the removal of excise duty on the tyres of bullock carts and also the issuance of directives to the State Government for removing sales tax on such tyres. Sir, this must be done if we want to sustain the green revolution of our country.

The accumulated losses soared to Rs. 25.81 crores in the Inchek Tyres and to Rs. 18·74 crores in National Rubber Manufacturers as on 31.3.1982. The Centre has come forth to undertake this huge financial drag in order to save about 4500 workers from unemployment. I welcome this Bill mainly because of the Government's concern for the plight of workers. We have to commend this effort of the Government inspite of severe financial constraints.

Sir, I belong to the party, the D.M.K. which is wedded to nationalisation of all core sector units for the growth of the country. The Tamil Nadu Government headed by Dr. Kalaignar Karunanidhi started the nationalisation of bus transport in Tamil Nadu. The bus owners of Nilgiris District took up the legislation to High Court first and then to the Supreme Court the bus nationalisation Act passed in 1973. After ten years, in 1983 the Supreme Court has upheld the bus nationalisation legislation of Tamil Nadu Government. Instead of hailing this judgement and implementing it, the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, who is concerned more with his personal popularity and affluence, has sidetracked the provisions of the Bill and has allowed private bus owner to enter the field again. He has circumvented the provisions of the Act in many devious ways to serve his ulterior motives.

Just a while ago the House passed the taking over of Ganesh Flour Mills' units. I should say that there is this public impression that the Government is taking over only sick units. In other words, the Government is coming to the succour of those industrialists who have exploited such units for personal ends. They also have this experience that the public sector undertakings after a few years of operation start losing. They compare this performance with that of private sector units which are best managed. This impression of the people must be eliminated. You should send a talented team of managers to man these two units so that they become an example of efficiency. Secondly, the Government should not hesitate to take over profit-making units also in the interest of the nation. If the economic circumstances demand such taking over, the Government should not be reluctant in taking over profit-making units also like the tyre giants who repatriate huge profits outside the country and who show scant respect for the laws of the land and who are not interested in the economic development of the country.

With these words I support this Bill and resume my seat.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) :

Mr. Chairman, I echo what my friend, Mr. Ismail has said that this is a long long over due measure—the nationalisation of these two companies. Of course, it is better late than never.

I welcome it very much because, we have been pressing for it for many many years. The Minister may not know it but his senior Minister has received at least half-a-dozen deputations which came from Calcutta composed of all the trade-unions in these two factories including the union of the ruling party. The Congress union along with other unions together have been agitating for years now for nationalisation so that these two companies can be put on a proper footing and can be saved and run properly. There is no explanation given here why this long delay has taken place. There is a long gap. The management take-over was 7 or 8 years ago and only now after repeatedly telling us that the matter was still under consideration, this step has been taken. Any-way, as I said, it is better late than never.

There are some points here which must be explained, I suppose, by the Government. When the House is being asked to vote a compensation which amounts to almost Rs. 5 crores to the two companies—Rs. 490.04 lakhs, a little short of Rs. 5 crores—which is not a very small sum, the House should be told at least what is the basis of the calculation of this figure. How have they arrived at this figure of Rs. 5 crores ? This is in addition to the other amount of Rs. 50,000, a year which is going to be given to them also. There is no explanation given is the House supposed to judge for what such a large amount is to be paid out of the Consolidated Fund of India ? Some explanation must be given as to how it was calculated and the basis of calculation. Nothing is there.

Then, Sir, we would like to have some assurance about the new management set-up which the Government proposes in order to run these two companies. Two companies, judging from the Press report that I have seen, are going to be functioning as a single concern now and the report is that one of the old established companies in West Bengal, Andrew view is to be given the authority of looking after these concerns. We do not know. We want to know authoritatively from the Government on the floor of the House what is the arrangement now proposed for the actual management of these two concerns.

Then, the question will come about the workers' participation. I am glad that the Labour Minister is here. Only recently, his Ministry has circulated another scheme for workers' participation in management. I do not know how many such schemes have been circulated or discussed and accepted also in the last several years. But new schemes go on being formulated because, obviously, nothing effective is taking place yet.

I was interested to see the other day a book which has been published recently and has attracted some attention also because the author happens to be one of the Ministers of the Central Government. I that book, he has written in one place on the question of workers' participation in management that, whenever an industry is running into losses or is sick, so many people come forward and say, let the workers take it over and run it, but the moment an industry is running properly or profitably or is sound lines, the workers are forgotten completely. Nobody brothers about them. The whole attitude is as if they are some sort of an inferior people, who do not have any kind of intelligence to contribute to the running of a concern. So, I want to know from the hon. Minister what is the Position in respect of this type of company which has been running at such heavy losses and which has been sick. There are a large number of sick units in West Bengal. I for the moment will confine myself to that State only though there are certain things happening all over the country. There is a whole group of companies which are in this plight. Nowhere do we ever find any serious attempt being made to enlist the active cooperation of the workers in running the management of these concerns.

Now, I would like to know, in the case of the Inchek Tyres Limited and National Rubber Manufacturers Limited, the new set up which is going to be brought in, whether

the workers are going to get any part in the management of those concerns or not.

Just now, we have heard that the salaries and wages for the month of January, 1984, have not yet been paid to the workers. I would like to know what is the latest position regarding this. I have received a complaint from there that they have not received their salaries and wages for the month of January. If that is ture, I would ask, why it is so. Who is responsible for it ? If it is now being paid, let him confirm that also. But these kind of things raise very many doubts in our mind as to what kind of management is going to be brought in there now.

I only want to say that, as my hon. friend, Mr. Ismail, has said, we are thoroughly dissatisfied with the policy or rather lack of policy of the Government towards this whole problem. I can tell you from 3 or 4 examples in West Bengal that the Government does not seem to have any clear or any coherent policy as to how they propose deal with this problem of companies which are either sick or which are mismanaged or which are running in big losses or which have been rendered sick by previous owners. What is their line of thinking ? They must tell us what is their policy going to be. We find that they have been experimenting with so many things.

Some companies were handed over to the I.R.C.I. I have in mind a very well-known, a long-established and one of the pioneers in their own field in this country, that is, the Bengal Potteries Ltd. which is manufacturing not only the table-ware or the crockery but also manufacturing a large number of porcelain products which are required by the electrical industry, like, insulators, capacitators and all that. They have got two factories in Calcutta. The Bengal Potteries are supposed to have fallen sick. They were handed over to the I.R.C.I. for restoring it back to health. But the gentleman—I do not want to name him—who was put in-charge of this whole rehabilitation process was the very same gentleman under whose managing directorship the company was first made sick. The same person was kept. Now, after large amounts of money from the I.R.C.I. being injected into these concerns, which are under the control of the same gentleman, the situation still is quite hopeless. One does not know how this company will carry on.

In this case, we are repeatedly asking that if Inchek and the National Rubber can be taken over and can be run as nationalised concern, why not the Bengal Potteries ? The Government has no answer. Just last week I received a letter again, in reply to my query, from Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari, because there was a rumour that they were trying to hand it over to some private party. In fact, at one time, a name was being bandied about. It was the name of Birlas and it was said that they were interested in taking it over. Anyway, in his reply to me, Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari has stated that it is not proposed to hand it over to Birlas and that Birlas are not interested in it or something like that. But, what they propose to do, nothing is stated.

Last time, I was informed by the Senior Minister that he is sending some high official of his Ministry to Calcutta to discuss there, with the State Government, as to how to deal with this Bengal Potteries. But this is going on year after year. 5,000 people are there and they do not know what their fate is going to be the next day why they should follow one criterion in one case and another criterion in another case, we do not know.

There is another company, the Hindustan Pilkington Glass Works. It is an old established concern, making sheet glass by very modern methods. Originally it had foreign collaboration and all that. It also fell sick and was closed for a long period. Then they tried a new formula. They caught hold of a well-known foreign bank, the Grindlays. It was brought into the picture. They caught hold of a gentleman in Bombay or, may be, in Gujarat, one Mr. Taktawala who is supposed to own many glass manufacturing concerns in Gujarat. With the help of this money from the Grindlays and with the technical expertise of Mr. Taktawala, we were assured that this Hindustan Pilkington Factory would start functioning again and that this sheet-glass operation would be resumed as soon as possible. That was the most profitable thing to do. But now I read from press reports that Mr. Taktawala is again backing out from the whole affair,

He is not doing what he was expected to do and the Company is again facing disaster. The Sheet Glass Department has not started functioning. We do not know what you are proposing to do.

I read in the newspaper the other day—of course, this is in Bengali. I am afraid I have not got the English version here just now. There is a daily newspaper in Calcutta called 'Ajkal'. This newspaper has brought out a report quoting our Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation Shri Veerendra Patil as having said on the 6th February that in West Bengal three companies, the Containers and Closures, the Indian Rubber Manufacturers and the Carter Pooler, can only survive if they are taken over by the Government and run by the Government. I do not know if this is correct or not but this is what appeared in the press. In the meantime, what has happened ? The Ministry of Industries has publicly announced that this Containers and Closures is to be denotified and allowed to be closed down, and that nothing is to be done about it. Every day we are getting letters and a peals from them, "Please do something to save us, We will be finished". They made a very constructive proposal. They are manufacturers of these containers which are required by the oil industry and you have got a concern in Bengal called, Balmer Lawrie, not the old Balmer Lawrie but the Balmer Lawrie which has been taken over. This Balmer Lawrie could easily take over the Containers and Closures as a kind of subsidiary today because they are interested in making these containers for the Oil Corporation and the other public sector companies and in that case these 800 people could have been saved. I wrote about that and I spoke to the Hon. Minister about that. But now they have replied again saying that nothing can be done. Balmer Lawrie is also not interested. Nobody is interested. So the whole company has been closed down. The same thing has happened with Carter Pooler. At one time it was suggested that the Ministry of Defence might make use of the resources of Carter Pooler to manufacture certain type of equipments, not armaments, of course, but some other type of equipment they needed. But after some time, we find that the whole affair has also been abandoned and that Carter Pooler has been closed down. So, we do not know what is the policy at all which is being followed. Either you have to tell us that you do not intend in future to take over and run this type of concerns which, in the majority of cases, have been brought to this pass by the previous owners or you have to say that you will run it as a joint venture. There should be some policy. I do not support this joint venture idea. But if that is your idea, come out with it and say that the Government cannot do it alone, you will bring in some private party also if he is interested and he and the Government together as a joint venture can run. Or, you say that you will hand it over to the IRCI or you will sell it totally to some private employer. Of course, we will oppose all that. I am saying, after the management has been taken over, which we consider to be as a transition, the first step towards full take-over or nationalisation, they want to go back from management take-over either to joint venture or to closing down the thing altogether, denotifying it. This is a retrograde step and is playing havoc with the industrial economy there. At one time West Bengal used to be taunted and given a bad name that it is a place where strikes take place, all the time there is labour unrest, and so on. Now the statistics will prove, the figures show, that the mandays which are lost due to strikes are much less than the havoc that is being caused by closures which are imposed by the employers—lockouts and closures. I am not mentioning all these other industries. Mr. Ismail has referred to many lockouts there—in Titagarh Paper Mills. As far as jute mills are concerned, everybody knows that last year at one time 21 jute mills were closed down simultaneously. Have you done anything about it ? Do you ever pull up these employers ? All these sermons and strictures are reserved only for the workers, 'you must not go on strike ; if you go on strike, then so much production is lost and that is against the interest of the country' and so on. But all these hundreds of employers take money from banks and public financial institutions without investing their own money, run these concerns and then ruin them, fleece them, steal the money and then one day declare that they have no liquid funds and, therefore, they are closing down the concern. I do not hear your Government saying a single word against those people.

Are they not guilty of ruining the productive assets of this country ? And they are being allowed to do it with the help of public funds. Now the whole thing has been exposed. The private sector is no private sector at all. It is a private sector running entirely on public money, then the money is misappropriated, they are mismanaged and then these companies are brought to this state of affairs. This may have come up in the form of a Bill relating to a particular concern, but it brings in the whole question of what is the government's policy going to be. Therefore, I want to know from the Minister about these companies which I have mentioned, specially the Bengal Pottery which is a very viable concern ; it can have a very good export market also ; it is making on the one hand very high quality crockery and tableware and also these insulators and capacitors for the electrical industry. Why should it be allowed to be ruined ? I cannot understand for the life of it. Production can be diversified and many other things also can be made. The workers are prepared to cooperate. But it is dragging on from year to year. The IRCI has failed to put it on its feet. We begged of the Minister, 'For goodness' sake, remove this gentleman ; he is the man who was responsible for having first made this company sick and you keep him there expecting that he will bring it back to health again ; at least change the management. Even that was not done. So, what is your motive, what is your purpose, we are not able to follow at all. Kindly tell us something if you can. I do not know whether you are prepared with the facts regarding the situation in some of these concerns. Probably you have not come prepared with those about the Bengal Pottery or the Hindustan Pilkington and all that. Out of these three concerns which were mentioned, according to the press report, by Mr. Veerendra Patil in which he is supposed to have favoured the idea of Government taking them over, two of them, I know, the Containers and Closures and the Carter Pooler, have just been closed down. So the Labour Ministry seems to be thinking on some lines and the Industry Ministry seems to be thinking on some other and absolutely contrary line....

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member's time is almost over.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : I am sorry for you, Sir. We are making you work overtime.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have already taken 20 minutes.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Actually I do not want to say anything more. The point is that I have to speak for the record because I do not expect that he is going to expound the policy of the Government on this matter, but at least some specific questions I have asked regarding this particular Bill, those at least he should explain one regarding the compensation and the other is about the new management structure which they intend to bring in to ensure that these companies do really now run on proper lines. I hope he will tell us something about that.

SHRI T.R. SHAMANNA (Bangalore South) : I welcome this with a serious reservation.

In the first instance the Bill should not have been brought through an ordinance. The ordinance was issued just 9 days before the Parliament was to meet. The very fact that the ordinance was issued takes away the right of the Parliament to either refer the matter to a Select Committee or for circulation. Such an important Bill should not be brought in the form of an ordinance particularly after allowing this company to be working at a loss for six years after the Government has taken it over. The Government has been sleeping for 6 years and then the ordinance is brought at the last stage. Furthermore, the government has taken only the management in 1977-78. In the meantime they have caused a loss to the tune of Rs. 17 crores in the first company and Rs. 14 crores in the second company and even after the Government has taken over the management, the companies have been incurring more losses than they were incurring before they were taken over. My serious objection here is that with such a huge loss even after six years of management, can we expect the Government to run the concern successfully after nationalising it ? I have my own serious doubts about it.

One serious objection here is that in the case of Maruti Motors, because the

Prime Minister had interest in it, the concern has worked out successfully and in the course of two years, not only the concern was made to produce but it also earned international reputation. Why not the same interest be taken in the other concerns also which have been nationalised by the Government ?

Most of the concerns which have been nationalised in these years have been working at a loss even after the Government have taken them over. In this particular concern, the concern has been nationalised on grounds— the grounds which are given here are : (1) labour trouble, (2) acute shortage of power, (3) financial trouble and (4) non-availability of some raw material. And there is also the question of repairs, renewals and modernisation of machinery, etc. If it is nationalised, unless and until these draw-backs that have been stated here are set right, what good could be done to see that the concern works profitably. Furthermore, the Government is paying now a hard cash of Rs. 4 crores but it is expected to pay more than 3 times that to meet the liability of the bank and the government and these liabilities also are not accounted. Rs. 4 crores will not even suffice to meet one-fourth of the demand which is there to see that the concern is set right. Even if it is taken that the machinery and other things are to be modernised, it is very necessary that they should have more money. Therefore, it is very necessary now that they must down the policy as to how nationalisation has to be done.

Sir, the Company Law provides on how to set right the defects of the companies such as by amalgamation, reconstruction and then absorption of the companies. When two concerns do not work satisfactorily, in order to see that they work economically, the concerns are amalgamated. Bigger concerns work at a loss as compared to the smaller concerns. If the concerns work haphazardly, to give a new life, why not the Government make use of the provisions of reconstruction etc. ? Why should they allow the concerns to work on very heavy losses of the order of crores of rupees ? Why should the losses be borne by the exchequer, the Government ?

Under the provisions of the Act, they are forced to take over these concerns. Under the Industries Development and Regulations Act, they can take over the concerns which are working at a loss for a long time. Furthermore, Sir, I think the Government has taken over many concerns in the course of four years or so. As a Member of Parliament, I know that nearly 20 concerns have been taken over by Government. I hardly find about four or five concerns working satisfactorily and the rest of them are working with heavy losses nowadays.

Now, the Labour Ministry, Finance and the Industry Ministry should sit together and lay down a policy in the basis of which nationalisation has to be done and on how to prevent the concerns from going sick. After the nationalisation if the concerns are run hopelessly bad, then only the question of liquidation can come. To save those concerns, they take them over. They should lay down the policy as to which concerns should be nationalised and which should be liquidated. That policy is very necessary. For that purpose the first thing that is necessary for us to do is this. The Ministry must get into an agreement with labour. In East Germany, a communist country, I find that there is no strike or closure. Why not you enter into an agreement with the labour and see that the strikes are not there ? Why not we follow them in order to see that these concerns run smoothly ? If a concern is not working satisfactorily, hand it over to the labour instead of closing it down. If financial assistance is needed, give that to them so that the concerns are managed by them.

Power is a big problem in our country. When power problem is there, we automatically raise the coal prices by 25%. And many concerns are stopped for want of power. The public sector industries in Karnataka are on the verge of closure because there is fifty per cent power cut there. Unless something is done, how can you see that the industries are regulated ?

With regard to finance, Government must have a policy in regard to this. Many concerns are not running properly because most of their machines are outmoded and

they have to be modernised. For modernisation of machinery, huge capital is required. All this should be studied. Then only it is possible to see that these industries are brought into order. If thus is not done, I am quite sure that in the longrun, the public money will be lost and the country will not be in a position to recover the amount. The sooner we lay down a policy for nationalisation, the better it will be.

I would, therefore, urge upon the Government not to bring in the nationalisation of the concerns in a haphazard way but to see that nationalisation is done in a regulated and practical way.

18.00 hrs.

I am sure that hereafterwards, such a nationalisation does not take place unless and until they have got all the seriousness which they had in regard to Maruthi Limited. Unless the same seriousness as we have taken for Maruti Automobiles, is shown, it will not be possible to regularise the industrial development of the country.

18.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, March 5, 1984/Phalguna 15, 1905 (Saka)

Printed at Samrat Press, 7117/18, Pahari Dhiraj, Delhi.