

I will continue later.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN (Coimbatore): Sir, at the time when the pendemonium broke out last time, I was questioning the Minister why he wants to take the various units under SAIL, leading to over-centralisation, when the Government is claiming that it is wedded to the philosophy of decentralisation. One of the objectives of establishing a holding company was that the mode of taking decisions and arriving at conclusions would be those adopted in industry, rather than those adopted in the civil services and, therefore, in the words of the late Shri Mohan Kumaramangalam, "the existing decision-making process would be streamlined and the holding company would introduce industrial culture instead of the culture of the civil services". Why is it that

If one goes back to what was the object of forming the holding company, the SAIL, it was said at that time that it would be responsible for the "integrated development of iron and steel industry and also control the inputs." Therefore, I could very well understand if the Minister had taken a very firm stand and saw to it that the Bharat Coking Coal also comes

under his Ministry, because we all know that when it is under another Ministry, what has happened. There has been a sad deterioration of the ash content. Of course, the Minister was good enough to reply to me on the 23rd of February, saying:

"There has been a gradual deterioration in the quality of coal being supplied to the steel plants. The ash content in the coal has gone up to about 20 per cent, as against the norm of 16.5 per cent to 17 per cent. Consequently, the ash in Blast Furnace coke has gone upto the level of 26 per cent to 28 per cent, as compared to the design stipulation of 22-23 per cent."

Now, the Bharat Coking Coal is under the Ministry of Energy. He should have brought it under the SAIL. He does not take any decision on this. On the other hand, he says that "a reference was made to the Ministry, suggesting the transfer of the coking coal washeries and the connected collieries, where these are integrated units, from Coal India Limited to the Steel Authority of India" Now long talks are going on about this. But, as far as this dismemberment of SAIL is concerned, it is sprung on Parliament without any discussion or debate anywhere. Why could he not have a debate on this question just like the debate was held on the holding company? Why is it that you brought this Bill and you insisted on passing this Bill before the Budget, otherwise there would be delay and all sorts of things? Why could you not discuss it with the workers? After all, they are meeting you on the first March. Why could you not have a debate with everybody? When you say that you take workers into confidence, why not take their point of view and see to that that all the viewpoints are taken in order to make SAIL more effective, stronger rather than weakening the whole public sector, particularly the steel industry, in this manner. The idea of setting up the holding company was to overcome the whole procedure of taking decisions

and arriving at conclusions which were being adopted at the Secretariat level. In the past when a public sector undertaking had drawn up certain plans the technocrats in the public sector undertaking and the senior engineers would send their plans to the Government, the minion bureaucracy sitting in the Ministry including the Department of Finance and Planning Commission would go into it and then by petty-fogging it, would send it or clarification and this way, there used to be a process of delay in decision making. Therefore, the idea was to liberate the public sector particularly the important key steel industry, from the clutches of the bureaucracy so as to make it more commercial and production oriented. Late Mohan Kumaramanglam said this about the aim of the holding company:

"To hand over those of the Government's powers today vested essentially in the Secretariat, a civil service organisation, dominated by civil service procedures to the holding company, whose personnel will be drawn from professional managers who have come up from inside industry and who will run this organisation on industrial-commercial principles....The holding company is a major project in the field of industrial development as well as of managerial and administrative reforms."

Therefore, I thought that the Minister would have explained to us where we stand but the very shabby manner in which he moved this Bill, makes me terribly suspicious because he does not give us opportunity to discuss his viewpoint and the report. When the holding company was formed, we were told that in six months' time the reports of the company would be available to Parliament. We, of course, are in a position to judge today because we have seen what profits SAIL has made and how our steel industry has looked upon from the time the SAIL was formed. Why is it that the Minister wants to revert to the old system? Why does he want more centralisation instead of

[Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan]

allowing the subsidiaries to function as they are which has proved to be successful? Otherwise, you could not have that much of profits that you have now. Now, you are having the same procedure of delay in decision making and that affects the people down below. Therefore, I join with Mr. Stephen and others in opposing this Bill. I would tell the Minister that democracy does not only mean restoring people's rights; democracy does not only mean restoring freedom of the press; democracy does not only mean that the ruling party should get a share in AIR news including the news about election results in Karnataka but democracy and democratic functioning, the very essence of it means that before you take a major decision like this, you have a proper form of discussion. I, therefore, would appeal that even at this stage he can withdraw this Bill and say that he is having further discussion—a mere democratic process—before bringing it before Parliament.

श्री मनी राम बागड़ी (मथुरा) : मभा-
पति महोदय, मैं आप से यह जानकारी
चाहूंगा कि सदन में किसी एक ग्रुप के समस्त
सदस्य गैर-हाजिर हों, जैसे कि चह्वाण
साहब के ग्रुप के सारे सदस्य गैर-हाजिर
हैं, तो उस को आप क्या मान्यता देंगे,
उनको किस तरह से मानेंगे?

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN (Arkonam):
I want to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS rose—

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND
MINES (SHRI BIJU PATNAIK): Mr.
Chairman, Sir, we have got one hour
and five minutes. We should try to
finish it within that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was going to
make that very request.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: From that
side, they have already spoken.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We should try to
finish it within the time extended.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: I have to
answer to questions raised by Mr.
Stephen, Mrs. Parvathi Krishnan and
others

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: I shall also
raise some vital questions and you
will answer them.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: We should
try to finish it within the extended
time.

SHRI D. N. TIWARY (Gopalganj):
Sir, this is a very vital Bill affecting
lakhs of people. I also want to have
my say on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your name is
also there. Then, I will call a mem-
ber from this side and then from the
other side.

Shri Hukmdeo Narain Yadav.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: Then, the
time may be extended to that extent.

श्री हुकमदेव नारायण यादव (मधुबनी):
मभापति महोदय, इस विधेयक के सम्बन्ध
में मैं नीति का यह सवाल उठाना चाहता
हूँ कि सरकारीकरण और राष्ट्रीय-
करण, यह दो बहुत विवादास्पद विषय
रहे हैं। हम सरकारीकरण के पक्ष वाले
नहीं हैं, राष्ट्रीयकरण चाहते हैं।
राष्ट्रीयकरण का अर्थ यह होता है कि किसी
भी संस्था में कम से कम जितना संभव न
हो सके, न हो, लेकिन सरकारी हस्तक्षेप
विल्कुल न हो, उसका नाम ही राष्ट्रीयकरण
है। जहाँ सरकार का ज्यादा से ज्यादा हस्त-
क्षेप होगा, वह सरकारीकरण है, उसको
राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं कहा जा सकता।
इसलिये जो लोहा वाला विधेयक सदन के
सामने आया है, इस विधेयक में सरकार

का हस्तक्षेप है । लोहे की कंपनियां अलग अलग बनाई गई हैं । लेकिन उसके एक अंश में मैंने देखा है कि सीधे इस्पात मंत्रालय के द्वारा उसका नियंत्रण रहे और उस के भीतर वह सब संस्था और कंपनी काम करें तो मैं समझता हूं कि सरकार का नियंत्रण उस पर ज्यादा होगा । जब कि सरकारी नियंत्रण कम होना चाहिये ।

उनके जो निगम बनाये गये हैं या कार्पोरेशन बनाये गये हैं वह अलग हैं । निजी कंपनियों के द्वारा जो इस्पात कारखाने चलाये जाते हैं, और सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में जो इस्पात कारखाने चलाये जाते हैं, दोनों में आज कोई अन्तर है क्या ?

टाटा के जरिये चलाया जा रहा जो जमशेदपुर में इस्पात कारखाना है और दुर्गापुर, राउरकेला व भिलाई में सरकार के जरिये जो इस्पात कारखानों का संचालन हो रहा है, क्या उनकी व्यवस्था और बनावट में या संचालन में कोई बुनियादी फर्क है ? कोई बुनियादी फर्क नहीं है ।

सभापति महोदय, इस बात को गौर से देखें कि सरकारी संस्थाओं में, सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में जो पूंजी लगी हुई है, जैसे आपका हिन्दुस्तान स्टील लिमिटेड है उसमें 31-3-77 तक 1591.70 करोड़ की पूंजी लगी हुई थी और इसी तारीख तक 85.88 करोड़ का घाटा लग गया । सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के बोकारो स्टील लि० में 1194.90 करोड़ की पूंजी लगी हुई थी और उसमें 42.73 करोड़ का घाटा लग गया । इस तरह से सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में निरंतर जो घाटा लगाया गया, इसके कारणों की जांच होनी चाहिये कि सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में क्यों घाटा लगता रहा और सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के

नाम पर पूंजीपतियों को लाभ देने का काम भी होता रहा जो निजी उद्योग चलाते थे ।

सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में जो घाटा लगता था, जनता की पूंजी से उस घाटे की पूर्ति हो जाती थी । इस्पात का दाम बढ़ा दिया जाता था, जिसके परिणाम स्वरूप निजी कारखानों के इस्पात के दाम भी बढ़ जाते थे । इसलिये सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के नाम पर इतने दिनों तक निजी क्षेत्र को लाभ पहुंचाने का काम ही होता रहा ।

सभापति जी, मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि जमशेदपुर कारखाने के जो सबसे बड़े अफसर हैं, उनमें और सरकार के बोकारो भिलाई और दुर्गापुर के कारखानों में जो बड़े-अफसर हैं, उनके रहन-सहन, ठाठ-बाट, शान-शीकत व ऐशोआराम में कितना अन्तर आया है ? जो जमशेदपुर में टाटा के जरिये चपरासी को वेतन दिया जाता है और उसके प्रबन्ध निदेशक को वेतन दिया जाता है, उसमें कितना फर्क है । और सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में जो इन लोगों को वेतन दिया जाता है, उसमें कितना फर्क है ?

मेरे एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में सरकार ने बताया है कि दुर्गापुर में वर्ग-1 श्रेणी के 1934 अफसर हैं, जिनको 359 लाख रुपये सालाना वेतन दिया जाता है । इसकी तुलना में 18,088 तृतीय श्रेणी के कर्मचारियों को केवल 1143 लाख रुपया दिया जाता है । दूसरे शब्दों में प्रथम श्रेणी के एक कर्मचारी को जितना वेतन दिया जाता है, उतना वेतन द्वितीय श्रेणी के तीन कर्मचारियों को और तृतीय श्रेणी के 5 कर्मचारियों को दिया जाता है । प्रथम श्रेणी और चतुर्थ श्रेणी के कर्मचारियों के वेतन में तो बहुत अधिक असमानता है ।

[श्री हुकमदेव नारायण यादव]

अगर इस सम्बन्ध में सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में भी कोई नियम और कायदा नहीं होगा, तो सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र और निजी क्षेत्र में चलने वाले उद्योगों में कोई फर्क नहीं रहेगा। और यदि उनमें कोई फर्क नहीं रहेगा, तो फिर हम कैसे यह मांग कर सकते हैं कि हमारे उद्योगों का संचालन सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में होना चाहिए।

कोई देश कितना बलवान है, यह इस बात से आंका जाता है कि उस में अन्न और इस्पात का उत्पादन कितना होता है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कारण है कि हिन्दुस्तान में अब तक केवल 8 मिलियन टन लोहा ही पैदा होता रहा है, जब कि चीन में 30 मिलियन टन, जापान में 102 मिलियन टन और जर्मनी में 40 मिलियन टन लोहा पैदा होता है, हालांकि जापान तथा जर्मनी छोटे देश हैं। इस्पात के उद्योग में हिन्दुस्तान का सोलहवां स्थान है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि देश को इस स्थान से ऊपर लाने के लिए, और ज्यादा इस्पात पैदा करने के लिए, सरकार क्या उपाय करेगी।

जब सरकार सार्वजनिक उद्योग का विस्तार करना चाहती है, तो उसे यह नियम बनाना चाहिए कि उस में सरकारी हस्तक्षेप बिल्कुल नहीं होगा, क्योंकि सरकारी हस्तक्षेप और नियंत्रण से काम मुचाक रूप में नहीं चल सकता है। यह आवश्यक है कि सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के उद्योगों को स्वतंत्र किया जाये और उन पर जिम्मेदारी डाली जाये कि अगर उद्योग में घाटा होगा, तो उस उद्योग का संचालन करने वालों और मजदूरों को उस घाटे में हिस्सा लेना चाहिए। यह नहीं होना चाहिए कि हमेशा मजदूरों का बोनस बढ़ाते चले जायें। अगर कम्पनी लाभ में चले, तो मजदूरों को बोनस जरूर मिलना चाहिए,

लेकिन बोनस की मांग का समर्थन करने वालों को यह भी हिम्मत के साथ कहना चाहिए कि अगर घाटा होता है, तो संचालन करने वाले लोगों और मजदूरों को उस घाटे में हिस्सा लेने के लिए तैयार रहना चाहिए। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए कि घाटा तो दूसरों के मत्थे और नफे में हिस्सा लेते रहें। अगर सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र को ठीक तरह से चलाना है और उस का ठीक तरह से विकास करना है, तो उस में सरकारी हस्तक्षेप कम से कम होना चाहिए।

हम सरकारीकरण के हमेशा विरोधी रहे हैं और राष्ट्रीयकरण के समर्थक रहे हैं। राष्ट्रीयकरण का अर्थ यह है कि उद्योग में राष्ट्रीयता का भाव होना चाहिए, उस का उत्पादन राष्ट्र के हित के लिए होना चाहिए और उस में काम करने वाले राष्ट्र के प्रति समर्पित भाव से काम करें। यह नहीं होना चाहिए कि सरकारी पूंजी पर, जनता के पैसों पर ऐंशो-आराम, फ्रैगन और घोटाले हों।

जनता पार्टी की सरकार को अपने वायदे के अनुसार न्यूनतम और अधिकतम वेतन में 1 और 10 का अन्तर रखना चाहिए। अगर सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में जाड़ लगाने वाले को 1 रुपया रोज मिलता है, तो वहां के सब से बड़े अफसर को 10 रुपये रोज से ज्यादा नहीं मिलना चाहिए। ऐसा करने पर ही कोई असरदार काम हो सकता है। सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के बड़े बड़े अफसरों की जाना-शीकत और ठाठ-वाट पर नियंत्रण होना चाहिए। अब तक यह स्थिति रही है कि सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में जन-कोप के करोड़ों रुपयों का दुरुपयोग होता रहा है।

मैं मांग करता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान स्टील लिमिटेड और बोकारो स्टील लिमिटेड आदि में अब तक जो करोड़ों रुपये का घाटा हुआ है, उस की जांच करने के लिए एक

उच्च-स्तरीय समिति बनाई जाये, जिस के द्वारा राजनैतिक स्तर, सरकारी स्तर और अफसरशाही के स्तर पर होने वाले घोटाले की जांच की जाये। सही नाने में सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के विकास के लिए एक नये रास्ते को सोचा जाय तब कहींकुछ हो सकता है ।

हमारे बिहार में कई ऐसे प्रधान कार्यालय थे, अभी संशोधन में हम लोगों ने देखा है कि उन को वहां से हटाया जा रहा है । यह नहीं होना चाहिए । बोकारो का कारखाना स्टील बिहार में बनाता है, लेकिन वहां के बसने वाले आदिवासियों को वहां झाड़ू देने की नौकरी में भी नहीं रखा जाता । वहां के मूल निवासियों की जमीन ले ली गई, लेकिन उन को उस में नौकरी नहीं दी जाती, बाहर वाले वहां जा कर वावू बन गए । स्थानीय लोगों को कोई सेवा की जगह नहीं दी गई । मैं सरकार से मांग करता हूं कि जहां कारखाना बने वहां के स्थानीय लोगों को नौकरी उस में दी जाय और केवल बाहर वालों को ही उस में न भरा जाय । इस के अलावा मैं उन से निवेदन करूंगा कि जो भी प्रधान कार्यालय बिहार के अंदर बोकारो या रांची वगैरह में हैं उन को बिहार से न हटाया जाय । यह-बिहार-वासियों के साथ घोर अन्याय होगा ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Alagesan.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: There may be many other speakers, who wish to speak on this Bill. If the House agrees, we may extend the House further.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: We are agreeable to extend the House; we want more time.... (interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are two speakers from this side on the list. If the speakers cooperate, I think, we can finish it within the time or at the most, we may require 10—15 minutes more. If the House agrees, we may

extend the House by half an hour at the most.

What do you propose?

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: I do not think anybody from this side is anxious to speak. Let us finish this Bill today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: From this side also there are three names, Shri Pabitra Mohan, Shri Tiwariji and Shri Ramdas Singh. If they opt not to speak, then it is all right.

श्री रामदास सिंह (गिरिडीह) : सभापति महोदय, इस बिल पर गंभीरता से सोचने के लिए समय देना चाहिए और इस का टाइम बढ़ाना चाहिए... (व्यवधान)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am in the hands of the House. Let the House decide whether we should sit for a few minutes more.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: I think, this Bill should be passed today whatever time it takes.... (interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Members do not agree.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: They are agreeing; we agree to pass it today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They are not ready to extend the time;

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: My party is ready to extend the time, ask the opposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Alagesan has said that they have no objection. He is ready to sit late.

Should I take it that all of us are agreeable to sit for some more time? I think, it is agreed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

श्री युवराज (कटिहार) : जिन लोगों के नामों की अभी चर्चा की गई है उन के अलावा श्री लखन लाल कपूर, युवराज और रामदेव सिंह के संशोधन आप के सामने हैं। इसलिए मैं आप से आग्रह करूंगा कि अगर सात बजे तक यह हाउस चलता है तो चले और कल भी अगर बढ़ाने की जरूरत हो तो 6 बजे के बाद समय बढ़ा कर इस को चलाया जाय।

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): I do not agree that the House should be extended beyond 6 P.M. daily.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: I do not know where my friends were earlier. जो संशोधन उन्होंने दिया है उस का तो मैं ने मान लिया है, तो उस में और भाषण देने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। इस को जल्दी खत्म किया जाय।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Alagesan. I would request you to make the points only.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN (Arkonam): I am the only speaker from the opposition, you have to give me sufficient time.

श्रम तथा संदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राजन मंत्री (श्री लारग साय) : समापति महोदय, इस के लिये 1 घंटा 5 मिनट समय बढ़ाया गया था। मैं माननीय सदस्य से निवेदन करूंगा कि यह बिल आज पास होना चाहिये। अगर दो-चार मिनट समय आगे बढ़ जाय, तो इस में कोई ऐसी बात नहीं है।

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: Our objection to the Bill is not only to the contents of the Bill but also to the manner which it is being rushed through this House....

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: I do not know why they are repeating. I have

already expressed regret. I thought this House discussed it in the initial stage and no other points they have to add. Therefore, I said it should be put through. I did not mean any disrespect to any Member and certainly to the Opposition Members. That I will never do.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Patan): No-body is there in the Opposition now.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: It is not only a question of respect. It is the procedure that is being adopted. There were objections raised to this Bill even at the introduction stage. It was my hon. friend, Shri Stephen who raised objection at the introduction stage. At that time the hon. Minister for Steel, Shri Biju Patnaik said, "I do not wish to have a lengthy discussion. That will come at the consideration stage." He said a few words. Sir, it has been the usual practice in this House that whenever a Bill is brought forward and whenever a Bill of this far-reaching repercussions (Interruptions). What is this sort of thing? What is this group discussion? This is not your pocket borough, Mr. Biju Patnaik. This is the Parliament of India (Interruptions). I do not treat it as my pocket borough. I treat it with respect.

Sir, it has been the practice, a uniform practice in this House that whenever a Bill is brought forward, especially a Bill of this nature, a Bill of such a far-reaching nature is brought forward, the hon. Minister moves the consideration motion by explaining the provisions of the Bill. That has not been done. When I go through the Rules book, there is nothing said about it. Perhaps there is a lacuna. The Speaker is going to tighten up the rules of the House and this thing may be looked into....

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: Not tighten up, to improve them.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: Yes, I mean to improve them.

Sir, whether there is any rule or not, it has been the uniform practice in this House that when the Minister rises to move for consideration of the Bill, he explains the provisions of the Bill. Here he has done no such thing. In fact, when Mr. Stephen or somebody rose to speak on the Bill, he said, 'No, no. 5 minutes.' This I would like to submit....

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: Are you talking on the Bill or are you talking about the Minister?

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: I am talking of both. I chose to speak on the contents as well as on the manner in which it was being rushed through....

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: I stand corrected, I told you already. What is the purpose of repeating it?

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: I would like to tell the Janata Party. (Interruptions). Please do not interrupt me. Though we may be two Congress for other purposes, but as far as the opposition to the Janata Party is concerned, we are one Congress.

Now, he said that we have no right to dispute the manner in which he is trying to put this Bill through. I would like to remind him, the hon. Minister for Steel of the statement that he issued after coming out of the jail. He issued a statement fully supporting Sanjay Gandhi and the 20-point programme....

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: Really? Where did you read it?

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: That was the statement that he issued. We read that in the press.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: Please read that. This is the case of the Congress, I say.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: It is this gentleman who said, "We have no right to talk about the procedure in this House."

I would like to say again while answering objections at the introduction stage he said—

"The holding company idea was stated by my predecessor Shri Kumaramangalam. I am only taking it upto a final stage of making one company. It is not a part of the Ministry. It will be a separate company. Instead of a holding company, it will be commanding company with full authority to deal with the production...."

While moving the Bill he said that he is continuing what late Shri Kumaramangalam has done. He is following the foot steps of Shri Kumaramangalam. I would like to suggest that the two gentlemen are so polls apart that one cannot follow the other.

I would like to tell him that the two are brought up in different philosophies. This Minister is a private sector man, out and out a votary of the private sector and a beneficiary of the private sector.

The other day when Shri Stephen pointed out that the Minister has mining interests, Shri Jagannath Rao said he had given it up long ago; we also know him as the Proprietor of a Steel Company called Kalinga Tubes. The hon. Minister has got his own interest in the steel business. Now he is trying to alter the structure. Steel production has to be viewed in this light. And what is he doing now? He is doing just the opposite of what Shri Kumaramangalam did. He said that he was following Shri Kumaramangalam. That is why I am making this point.

The purpose of setting up this holding company which was a new experiment has been explained by late Shri Kumaramangalam himself. Shri Kumaramangalam announced "that

[Shri O. V. Alagesan]

the Government had decided in principle to set up such holding companies not only in the steel and allied industries, but in other sectors where large scale economic operations were involved."

This idea of holding company, he not only wanted to be implemented in the field of steel production but he wanted it to be extended to other fields also.

Now the hon. Minister here comes before the House and just reverses the process and yet he tells us that he is following Shri Kumaramangalam. What is he doing now? Broad policy decision and the integrated steel production in all these companies which was being looked after by SAIL is being departmentalised. He seeks to bring it under the control of his Ministry. There are so many steel plants—with a vast investment of Rs. 3000 crores or so—these are managed by Board of Directors. The SAIL was intended to co-operate the production activities of all these steel plants. Now, what the Minister seeks to do through the Bill is this: he wants to run the steel mills from his office in the secretariat. That is what he intends to do. And this Minister is capable of it. During Panditji's time, Sir, he was sitting in a room in the Secretariat calling himself the Defence Adviser or perhaps he was called by others Defence Adviser, and in that capacity he travelled to America and there he said things as if he was the Defence Minister and he came to grief on that account, and he had to leave the job. So, Sir, now again, he is trying to play the same gimmicks. While saying that he is following Kumaramangalam, he is doing just the opposite thing. Why do you change the set up? When you change the set-up should you not tell us how this set up has failed? Should you not tell us how the holding company concept does not suit steel production? Should he not tell us that the holding company which was

formed and working for about 3 or 4 years has failed in what respects? Should he not tell us whether it has not produced profit or production has gone down why he should change it? Should he not tell us all these things? Or, is it merely change for change's sake? Or, does the Janata Government want to change everything which the previous Government did? I just want to know all these things. Now, he has not said anything about it. He has not enlightened this House on this matter. He has not told us the reasons why he is trying to change, why is changing the 'holding-company concept' which Mr. Kumaramangalam introduced and he wanted to extend it to other fields as well. Why should he end this concept even in the field of steel itself? I would like the House to look into the record of SAIL. Let us know what has been its record. Let us know the record of these steel mills including TISCO. They produced in 1976-77 10 million tonnes crude steel and 7.1 million tonnes saleable steel, which is a record, which is established by SAIL. The production in 1976-77 was as much as 19.3 per cent higher than that in 1975-76. Again the 1975-76 production was higher than in 1974-75 by 17.4 per cent. What has the Minister to show to us as his record? Really, Sir, when he took over as Minister I was happy. I associated him with a certain amount of dynamism which he had shown as Chief Minister of Orissa. Now, what has been his record? Here is a publication, SAIL News, his own Ministry's publication. It is a SAIL publication. Well, it gives certain figures. It gives the figure of saleable steel as 7.16 million in 1976. It became 7 million in 1977.

For saleable pig iron, it was 1.762 millions in 1976; it got reduced to 1.453 millions in 1977. This is the record that the hon. Minister has shown. He put all the blame on the SAIL. I would tell him that it is due to the interference of the hon. Minister, that

the SAIL has been handicapped in its working.

Again I am quoting these things. At the time of the budget what did the hon. Minister say? He made a very novel declaration, a very bold declaration. He said: 'I am going to do without the budgetary support. We thought that he would bring some money from his pocket or elsewhere from Orissa or America. This is what he said. Don't you remember?

'I am going to do the steel production without any budgetary support.'

He was immediately relieving the Finance Minister of the financial burden on investment in the steel sector. That was what he said. Now, what did he do? He said that he would do without the budgetary support. Let him answer. The budget document for 1977-78 says that the outlay on steel was going to be Rs. 576 crores. This is the budgetary support. In 1977-78 if he is going to forgo the budgetary support, let him tell this House. Now this Rs. 576 crores includes Rs. 557 crores for the four million tonnes expansion of Bokaro. Again,

Bhilai four million tonne stage.	Rs. 167 crores.
Kudremukh Iron Ore Co.	Rs. 137 crores.
Salem Steel Project	Rs. 13 crores.

So, the budgetary support that he is getting is to the tune of Rs. 576 crores. Now, what about the tall claim that he made on the floor of the House? He said that he was going to do without the budgetary support. What has it come to? If the hon. Minister tells that he is going to improve the working of the steel mills by keeping it under his department, are we going to believe it?

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: It is under my department.

3739 LS—14

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: It is not under your department. You go through the statement of objects and reasons of the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have taken already fifteen minutes. You will please wind up.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: But, I am very relevant. This is what the statement of objects and reasons says:

"Having regard to the present nature of these activities and potentialities for the future, it would also be greatly advantageous if the units/companies concerned therewith function directly under Government."

So, there is a difference. Formerly they were not functioning directly under Government. So, just as he did when he was an adviser in Defence in the Jawaharlal Nehru days, he would make the Chairman of the SAIL or the Managing Director of SAIL sit in an adjoining room of the Secretariat and he would go on meddling in the affairs of the steel companies and bring steel production to ruin in this country. It is for that purpose that he has brought this Bill and it is with that view that he wants this House to pass this Bill without any consideration. I wish to tell you that there is objection to the Bill not only from this side of the House but many members on that side also are taking exception to this Bill. It has not been sufficiently discussed. I do not know whether the hon. Minister has taken the Cabinet into confidence and given the reasons for trying to change this set up. He does not seem to have done so. Similarly, if he has not taken his own Cabinet into confidence, has he taken the ruling party into confidence? What it discussed in the party? I do not know. He is bringing about a big change. He is killing the idea of holding company. He asks us to immediately agree to it without any

[Shri O. V. Alagesan]

discussion, without any debate. He is not prepared to take it to the Select Committee. He is not prepared to elicit public opinion. He is not prepared to hear the other hon. Members of the House. The time is so short that you have to ring the bell.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have taken 18 minutes. Mr. Stephen on your side has also taken 25 minutes.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: I sympathise with you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: So, Sir, I, along with my hon. friends on this side and on the other side oppose this Bill in toto.

श्री द्वारिका नाथ तिवारी (गोपालगंज): सभापति जी, हिन्दुस्तान स्टील के ढांचे में बराबर परिवर्तन होता रहा है और जैसे औरंगजेब के समय में हुआ था दौलताबाद से दिल्ली और दिल्ली से दौलताबाद और फिर दौलताबाद से दिल्ली जो हो रहा है यह बन्द होना चाहिये। सरकार की खास हिदायत है कि जितने भी हैड आफिस हैं कम्पनियों के दिल्ली से बाहर हों। लेकिन उसके बाद भी मंत्री जी चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान स्टील का हैड आफिस दिल्ली में रहे। पहले हिन्दुस्तान स्टील का आफिस दिल्ली में था। एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी ने अपनी 33वीं रिपोर्ट 1958-59 में सिफारिश की कि दिल्ली में हिन्दुस्तान स्टील का हैड आफिस नहीं रहना चाहिये और उन्होंने अपनी रिकमंडेशन नम्बर 45 में हिन्दुस्तान स्टील के हैड आफिस के लोकेशन के बारे में राय दी कि दिल्ली से हटा कर वहाँ रखा जाये जहाँ स्टील प्लांट्स नजदीक हों। और इसलिये यह दिल्ली से उठा कर रांची भेजा गया। और उस सिफारिश को (व्यवधान)

Please stop these things. You are not a superman that you will poke your nose everywhere. I am giving arguments. If you have arguments to advance you may do so.

सरकार ने एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी की रिकमंडेशन को स्वीकार किया और 1963 में एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी को जवाब में कहा

"The Head Office of the Hindustan Steel Ltd. has been shifted to Ranchi."

अब दूसरे मिनिस्टर आये उनको भी कुछ ऐक्सपेरिमेंट करने का मन हुआ और प्राइवेट सेक्टर यानी टाटा से एक अधिकारी को जिसका नाम श्री बदूद खां था, इसका चेयरमैन बना दिया और वह सेक्रेटरी स्टील मिनिस्ट्री के भी बना दिये गये। कोई प्राइवेट सेक्टर का आदमी केवल चेयरमैन ही न हो, बल्कि मिनिस्ट्री का सेक्रेटरी भी हो जाये, कहीं ऐसा आपने देखा है? यह आश्चर्य की बात है पहले कभी नहीं हुआ था। और चूँकि वह चेयरमैन थे इसलिये मंत्रालय के सेक्रेटरी भी हो गये और उनकी मुविधा के लिये रांची से फिर दिल्ली हैड आफिस ले आया गया। अब वह न सेक्रेटरी हैं और न चेयरमैन हैं। अब क्या मुविधा होगी सरकार को? हिन्दुस्तान स्टील का हैड आफिस वहाँ रहना चाहिये जहाँ नजदीक में प्लांट्स हों। रांची से दुर्गापुर पास है, रूरकेला नजदीक है, बोकारो नजदीक है, आसनसोल नजदीक है। भिलाई प्लांट उस वक्त भी था जिस वक्त हैड आफिस रांची में गया था। तो भिलाई वहाँ से गवर्न होता था। और दिल्ली से जितनी देर लगेगी भिलाई जाने में उससे कम समय लगेगा रांची से जाने में। यदि हवाई जहाज से जायें तो नागपुर में ठहरना पड़ेगा और फिर वहाँ से मोटर से चलना पड़ेगा। तो क्या फन है कि दिल्ली में हैड आफिस को रखें? क्यों रखें?

बिहार एक बड़ा दब्बू स्टेट है। जो आता है वहां से हैड आफिस उठा कर दूसरी जगह ले जाता है।

श्री हुकम देव नारायण यादव : बिल पास नहीं होगा इस तरह से।

श्री द्वारिका नाथ तिवारी : रांची से उठा कर दिल्ली लाये थे इसलिये कि श्री वदूद खां को सुविधा हो।

श्री बीजू पटनायक : उनसे पूछिये जो उस समय सरकार में थे, मुझ से क्या पूछ रहे हैं।

श्री द्वारिका नाथ तिवारी : आप कहते हैं कि पिछली सरकार की गलतियों को सुधार रहे हैं। क्या इसी तरह सुधारेंगे।

श्री लखन लाल कपूर : (पूर्णया) : इसीलिये इस बिल को सेलेक्ट कमेटी में भेजा जाय।

श्री द्वारिका नाथ तिवारी : इसलिये मैं मंत्री महोदय से रिक्वेस्ट करूंगा कि इस हैड आफिस को दिल्ली न रखकर उसको रांची ले जायें क्योंकि वहां यह दफ्तर सब स्टील प्लान्ट्स से नजदीक पड़ेगा, वहां से ज्यादा कंट्रोल हो सकेगा। अपने तमाशे के लिये या सेक्रेटरिएट के कंट्रोल के लिये दिल्ली में इसका आफिस वह न रखें।

दूसरी बात इन्होंने अपने बिल में बताई है कि रिक्वेस्टरीज का हैड आफिस जो बोकारो में था, उसे भिलाई ले जायेंगे। मैंने इस पर प्रमैडमेंट दी है, मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि क्यों ले जायेंगे? ऐसे ही जब मन में आया आपने कह दिया? क्योंकि इस बात को आपने मान लिया है इसलिये मैं इस पर अधिक बहस नहीं करूंगा।

लेकिन मेरा जो प्वाइन्ट है कि स्टील का हैड आफिस रांची होना चाहिये, क्योंकि वहां से सब जगह आने जाने में सुविधा है, वह जरूर होना चाहिये। स्टील कंपनी के पास दो दो हवाई जहाज हैं जो कि रांची से कलकत्ता 35 मिनट में पहुंच जाता है। दिल्ली से पहुंचने में बहुत समय लगता है। हरेक सुविधा वहां पर है, लेकिन चूंकि बिहार कमजोर प्रान्त है, इसलिये जो मन में आया मनमानी करने लगते हैं उसके साथ।

रांची में पंच-महला मकान बना हुआ है, दिल्ली में बनाना पड़ेगा, या यहां पर लाखों रुपया किराये का देना पड़ेगा। वहां स्टाफ के लिए भी और आफिस के लिये भी मकान हैं, सब सुविधाएं हैं। लेकिन ज़िद है कि हम दिल्ली में आफिस रखेंगे। ज़िद से गवर्नमेंट चलाने से लोगों का कल्याण नहीं होता है, इसलिये निवेदन करूंगा कि ज़िद को छोड़िये और उचित बात करिये।

SHRI PABITRA MOHAN PRADHAN (Deogarh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, there is not enough time to speak on this but I will not take much time. The Bill seeks to restructure various public sector Iron and Steel factories, mines and other connected businesses thereunder. The purpose of the Bill is for better management of and greater efficiency in the public sector steel plants.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, while supporting the Bill, I would say that the Minister in his Statement of Objects has said that the efficiency of the management and the development of the public sector steel and mine units would be increased and that with the development of Rourkela and Bhilai factories the goods produced in those factories could be sold at a very cheaper rate. But for this purpose, he should make his efforts to develop the Paradip port which is his own child. And to develop the Paradip Port means to have a rail link in between

[Shri Pabitra Mohan Pradhan]

Rourkela and Talcher, in between Sambalpur and Talcher. Without that even though he says that there will be much profit, and better management and more efficiency it cannot be achieved, because without proper transport facilities for moving the goods produced in those factories, the purpose cannot be achieved. So, I suggest that hon. Minister should try at least to develop the Paradip Port, which is the deepest Port in the entire Eastern coastal area of our country as also connecting this port with the Steel factories with rail links. The Minister should also try to establish the second steel plant in Orissa together with extension of the Rourkela steel plant as is schemed.

Mr Chairman I have very intently heard the objections of Shri Stephen and Shrimati Parvati Krishnan to this Bill. This Bill is not the child of the Minister himself. It is the child—he has seen the entire file—of Mr. Kumaramangalam, and the child of the previous government. The Bill was in the womb of the previous government and fortunately or unfortunately it was born after this government came into power. So, I should say to Mr. Stephen: it is your child and the child belongs to your family and it comes from your own blood. To Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan I should say that this Bill is her nephew and she should fondly and affectionately take this Bill into her lap. (Interruption)

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: You do not want me to keep quiet when my nephew is being led astray.

SHRI PABITRA MOHAN PRADHAN: No, no. Your nephew will be given all care and all attention and you are there as a watch dog and if your nephew goes astray you will have all the power and the position to check this side that is this govern-

ment. With these words, I support the Bill.

श्री लखन लाल कपूर: सभापति महोदय, यह बिल बहुत विवादास्पद है। इसे इतनी जल्दी पास करना कोई जरूरी नहीं है। आखिर कोई आसमान नहीं टूटने जा रहा है, कोई भूकंप नहीं होने जा रहा है। इसलिए इस बिल पर चर्चा स्थगित कर दी जाये। मैं मंत्री महोदय से आग्रह करना चाहता हूँ कि इस हाउस के सेंटिमेंट्स को देखते हुए इस बिल पर विचार को स्थगित कर दिया जाये और इसे बाद में ले लिया जाय, जब कि इस पर अच्छी तरह से बहस हो सके।

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Jadavpur): The object of the Bill is somewhat clouded.... (Interruptions)

श्री रामानन्द तिवारी : (बक्सर) : सभापति महोदय, हम लोगों ने इस बिल के लिए 7 बजे तक का समय निर्धारित किया था, और अब 7 बज रहे हैं.....

सभापति महोदय : अभी निर्णय हुआ था कि कुछ मिनट बढ़ा दिये जायें, जिससे यह चर्चा समाप्त हो सके। मैंने कहा था कि इसके लिए समय को मैक्सिमम साढ़े सात बजे तक बढ़ायेंगे, इस से आगे नहीं।

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: It seems that the Bill is directed towards conferring greater control to SAIL in respect of different units known as corresponding units. It seems that the Minister is thinking that more centralised control over different units will result in better performance. This is supposed to be the objective. Now, the Ministry is at the apex and is very much controlling the policy. Even the appointment of officers, directors, everything is controlled by the ministry. That control of the Ministry will remain.

What is happening now? The directors of SAIL or SAIL itself will own the different companies. Instead of SAIL being the holding company, SAIL will own the company. That means the directors of SAIL will be directly responsible for these companies. What was there previously?

19 hrs.

The different units were the subsidiaries of SAIL under the Companies' Act and really under the complete control of the Government viz., the Ministry of Steel. I am unable to understand as to what is the real object in changing the ownership of different units to SAIL itself. I should have thought that the party which speaks of decentralisation of power will not try to build up a big giant which will directly control all these units. Our fear is, as in the case of various companies which provide for consultancy, design and engineering services, etc. they are now going primarily under the direct control of the Department of Steel. Probably the Minister has fallen into the trap of some sort of bureaucratic idea of directly bringing in these things under the control of the Ministry instead of giving the different companies, the responsibility of managing these things. Therefore, we would request the hon. Minister to tell us the real principle and object. The Statement of Objects and reasons is very vague. It is stated: "It is essential for proper development of the steel industry that public sector steel plants achieve maximum production and are managed with the greatest efficiency. For this purpose, it would be advisable to bring these plants under the overall control of an Integral company, which should function to the maximum extent possible as an integrated steel complex..."; what is the benefit of having an Integrated steel complex? I believe, after a great deal of consideration, SAIL was brought into existence as a holding company, because after all the Ministry has indirect control.

Through SAIL, it will be able to co-ordinate the policies and the functioning of the different companies. Because SAIL was the holding company it could nominate the Directors and could completely control the policies of the different units. Therefore, this change over is either on paper only, or there is something which is not being disclosed and we would like the hon. Minister to take us into confidence and tell us the real object.

There are two clauses on which I have submissions to make viz., Clauses 14 and 15. This always happens, the Officers of the different units will now become the employees of SAIL. It is always added that they shall continue on the same terms and conditions unless and until such tenure and terms and conditions are duly altered by the Integral company. This power is always taken. Previously the persons were Government employees and they were entitled to the benefits of Article 301; they lose it in one stroke, they come under the control of the holding company, they come under the control of SAIL which will own these companies. Now their terms and conditions and their tenure are subject to alterations the only restraint being duly altered. That is not the protection given to the Government employees. We would like to ask the hon. Minister to give a definite assurance that under this provision, the terms and conditions of the employees will not be changed to their detriment and that they will continue to get all the facilities. We want a clear assurance that bureaucratic control will not take complete grip over the day-to-day functioning of the unit.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: Mr. Chairman Sir, it appears that there are some other friends who also want to speak about it. Already they are restless. They do not want to sit today. Perhaps you can take up this Bill on some other day. It has been approved by the Cabinet and by the Planning Commission. Still since the hon. members do not wish to sit today, it can be taken up on some other day.

