

और दूसरी क्रान्ति है सामाजिक समानता की, जन्म पर आधारित जाति की कल्पना को समाप्त करने वाली। तीसरी क्रान्ति है काले-गोरे की असमानता को मिटाने वाली बंधवार-विरोधी क्रान्ति। चौथी क्रान्ति है उपनिवेशवाद-विरोधी राष्ट्रीय स्वतन्त्रता की क्रान्ति। दुनिया के अधिकतर हिस्सों में तो यह क्रान्ति सम्पन्न हुई है, लेकिन अफ्रीका में, खास करके पुर्तगाली साम्राज्य के नीचे आज अफ्रीका के कई देश हैं जिनको राष्ट्रीय स्वतन्त्रता अभी तक प्राप्त नहीं हुई है। यह क्रान्ति भी आज अधूरी है। पांचवीं क्रान्ति है पूंजीवाद और असमानता-विरोधी क्रान्ति। छठी क्रान्ति है एक तिहाई विकसित और औद्योगिक राष्ट्रों की दुनिया, एक तिहाई दुनिया, और दूसरी और अविश्वसित राष्ट्रों की दो तिहाई दुनिया इनके बीच में जो मतभेद है। विगत 27 सालों में कम होने के बजाय बढ़ता चला जा रहा है, तो उसको खत्म करना भी आवश्यक है। और सातवीं क्रान्ति है नर-नारी समानता की क्रान्ति। और इस विधेयक का सम्बन्ध इस सातवीं क्रान्ति से है। यह सातवीं क्रान्ति ही इसका आधार है।

सभापति महोदय, मेरा जो विधेयक है उसका मकसद तो सीमित है। मगर इसके द्वारा मैं उन सारे सवालों को उठाना चाहता हूँ जिनका सम्बन्ध उदारता और ममानता से है। हमारे संविधान में सभी लोगों को कानून के सामने समानता प्रदान की गई है। लेकिन हम लोग जानते हैं कि कानून की इस मान्यता को आज कार्यान्वित नहीं किया जा रहा है। कानून ने कहा है कि सभी लोगों को कानून का समान संरक्षण मिले। लेकिन वास्तविकता यह है कि इस तरह का समान संरक्षण आज नहीं मिल रहा है। समाज में कुछ लड़कों को, कुछ बच्चों को अनौरस और भ्रूषण माना जाता है, उनके कदम-कदम पर अपमानित किया जाता है। नतीजा यह होता है कि यह मासूम बच्चे, यह फूल बचपन में ही मुर्दा जाते हैं। तो क्या इस सदन का यह कर्तव्य नहीं है कि जिन बच्चों का कोई अपराध नहीं है उनके साथ इस तरह का व्यवहार कम से कम कानून और संविधान के आधार पर न किया जाय, और इस तरह का एक आन्दोलन हम लोग चलायें जिससे समाज की जो कल्पना, समाज के जो अनुदार विचार हैं, परम्परागत विचार हैं उनमें कोई परिवर्तन आवे ?

सभापति महोदय, आज का समाज, इसके बारे में दो रायें नहीं हैं कि, सम्पत्ति-अभिमुख और पुरुष-प्रधान है और बहुत सारे जो आधार हैं कानून के और मान्यताओं के, इसके पीछे यही दकियानूसी दृष्टिकोण है। और नतीजा यह होता है कि सम्पत्ति-अभिमुख और पुरुष प्रधान समाज अविवाहित माताओं को पतिता का दर्जा देता है और उनकी सन्तति के साथ दुर्व्यवहार करता है। इसलिये इस विधेयक के द्वारा मैं इस बात का प्रारम्भ करना चाहता हूँ। इससे सारी समस्यायें तो समाप्त नहीं होतीं, लेकिन इस विधेयक के द्वारा एक नई उदारवादी परम्परा कायम करने की मैं कोशिश कर रहा हूँ।

सभापति महोदय, हमारे प्राचीन इतिहास की ओर देखा जाय तो हमेशा ऐसी माताओं की तरफ और बच्चों की तरफ देखने का दृष्टिकोण हमेशा अनुदार नहीं रहा है।

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member may please continue his speech next time.

Now we take up Half-an-Hour Discussion.

18.00 hrs.

#### HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

##### SUPPLY OF MACHINERY TO HEAVY ENGINEERING CORPORATION, RANCHI

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH SOKHI (Jamshepur) : I rise to raise a discussion on points arising out of the reply given to my unstarred question No. 2231 on 7th March, 1974 in connection with the Heavy Engineering Corporation, Ranchi.

The reply to my question was given by the Deputy Minister of Heavy Industry; regarding the non-supply of complete machinery, plant and machine-tools for the heavy Engineering Corporation, Ranchi.

[Sardar Swaran Singh Sokhi]

for its rated capacity and full production, I would submit that it has recently been detected by the management, as I was informed by the managing director, Mr. Kini, during my last visit to Ranchi on the 8th February, 1974. He showed me the project report which he called his Bible.

My question was regarding the entire HEC but the reply given was only confined to the HMBP which was only a department of the HEC. The HEC, Ranchi, since its inception, during the last two decades has gone into the hands of about half a dozen managing directors and chairmen, and once our present Minister of Steel and Mines, Shri K. D. Malaviya was also the chairman of the HEC. As a result of the frequent changes in the top officials of the management, no one worked wholeheartedly there. I think more than 50 per cent of the capital has been eaten away by now. The HEC never made any profit and it is very clear from its records. The Heavy Industries Minister Shri T. A. Pai had himself admitted and accepted while addressing the Indian Engineering Association at New Delhi on 27th March, 1974 that HEC was a sick giant which was expected to halve its loss this year.

I want to know for such losses, who is to blame. The words 'heavy losses' in the Heavy Engineering Corporation sound very well, because both are heavy—the losses and the Corporation.

Sometime back, the blame was put on labour unrest, political tensions and disturbances and recently, on power shortage. But no one so far could find it out, till it was detected recently that there are some major reasons for loss in production.

I admire the brain of the officers of the Ministry of Heavy Industry who very intelligently drafted the reply to my question. Just in one paragraph, they tried to give a reply to all the three parts, (a), (b) and (c) of my question, a reply which is, I must say, very vague. Generally, the Ministry officials are in the habit of giving such vague replies and the Ministers defend

them here. The officers take undue advantage of the situation. This is not the case only of this Ministry but almost all Ministries are not free from this disease. I hope at least Shri Pai will check this disease in his Ministry to save his old reputation.

It is an admitted fact the HEC never reached its target or worked to its full production capacity. It is really surprising to read about the shortage of machinery supplied. In the reply, it has been stated and admitted in a roundabout way. I quote :

"On account of the modification in the product-mix of the plant and the assessment that the installed machining capacity is likely to prove inadequate, the additional requirements of balancing facilities are being determined in consultation with the National Industrial Corporation and the Soviet experts".

What does this mean? It has got to be clarified by the Minister. What does 'machining capacity is likely to prove inadequate' mean? Again I come to the point—this sort of reply is not only vague but a serious attempt to misguide the Parliament.

Here are a few pertinent points to which I want categorical replies from the hon. Minister of Heavy Industry.

Why is modification in the product-mix of the plant needed now? Why was the necessity felt to assess it at this late stage when the project report was lying with the HEC management so long and the Ministers were sleeping over it in the last two decades? Is it a fact that the installed machining capacity and the machine tools at HEC proved inadequate? What are the additional requirements of machine tools for the balancing capacity in detail? How much foreign exchange would be required to provide the same? Why were the Soviet Export company having experts, and the foreign collaborator companies were not approached earlier?

Or, did they never mention these balance requirements? In the project report and the scheme submitted for approval of the Government of India, before signing the agreement with the Soviet Export Company, which supplied the HEC plant and erected it? Or, was it overlooked by our engineers, managing directors and chairman of the HEC and their predecessors and the Minister of Heavy Industry? I would also like to know whether our National Industrial Development Corporation along with the Indian Design Bureau are capable of tackling the matter independently, when we are erecting many huge plants designed by them indigenously in the country. When actually did this inadequacy and requirement to reach full production by HEC come to their knowledge, which has been proved by the reply itself?

To my great surprise, why has the Managing Director of HEC, Mr. Kini, who joined only last year in August, been replaced by the Ministry and a new Managing Director, Mr. S. K. Warriar, appointed only on the 1st or second April, 1974—it appears from the news report, a cutting of which I have got here, with me—when this half-an-hour discussion was pending before this House? It creates some doubt in my mind, when he has been removed so urgently and a new man has come. He was there only for the last six or seven months.

Then, the next question is whether the design was faulty, as well as the planning and scheme as regards the project report. I want to know whether the Government of India is prepared to take steps to recover the heavy losses to the tune of crores of rupees from the designers and the foreign collaborator-companies who prepared the project report, and when the plant was erected by the Soviet experts.

What is the reason of this unusual delay in the installation of the additional balance machinery required and the facilities? What was the reason in sending the present General Manager of HEC to Russia sometime

back, and what discussions did he have with the Soviet expert and what are the details of discussion he had with the designers and foreign collaborators, and what is the outcome of the discussion?

I hope the hon. Minister, Mr. T. A. Pai, will give a detailed, categorical reply to the satisfaction of this august House.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu—absent. Shri Ramavatar Shastri.

**श्री रामावतार शास्त्री (पटना) :** सभापति जी, जिस सवाल पर हम यहां प्राधे घंटे की चर्चा कर रहे हैं, इसके जवाब का पढ़ने से मुझे कम से कम यह स्पष्ट मालूम हुआ कि सोवियत रूिनियन ने समझौते के मुताबिक तमाम मशीनों को सप्लाई कर दिया। फिर भी हमारे देश में सोवियत रूस विरोधी लाबी और खासतौर से जो निजी पूंजीपतियों के समर्थक हैं या उसकी व्यवस्था के समर्थक हैं, वे ज़रूरत-ब-ज़रूरत इस तरह के सवाल उठाकर हमारे दो देशों की दंतली में दरार पैदा करने की कोशिश करते हैं और मुझे माफ करेंगे सरदार जी, मेरे इयाल से इन्होंने भी यही काम करने की कोशिश की है।

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह सोझी : आप मुझ पर यह आरोप क्यों लगाते हैं, मैं मशीनरी को अच्छी तरह जानता हूँ।

**श्री रामावतार शास्त्री :** मैं यह दावा नहीं करता हूँ कि आप नहीं जानते। पहले भी एक बार इन्होंने प्राधे घंटे की चर्चा उठाई थी और उसकी भी टोन यही थी। इसलिए मैं यह बात कह रहा हूँ।

**श्री बी० बी० नायक (कनारा) :** आप क्या रूस के एम्बेसेडर हैं ?

**SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI :** Let me express my views, and when you will get your chance, you can express your opinion.

**श्री बी० बी० नायक :** आप क्या रूस के एम्बेसेडर हैं ?

**श्री रामावतार शास्त्री :** Please hear me.

मैं रूस का एम्बेसेडर नहीं हूँ। वह यहाँ भी नहीं सकते। लेकिन हम हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के एम्बेसेडर हैं और प्रगतिशील ताकतों के

[श्री रामावतार शास्त्री]

एम्बेसेडर हैं। हम टाटा और बिड़ला के एम्बेसेडर नहीं हैं।

SHRI B. V. NAIK : You say a thing and get away, and silent people sit here. If we say it back again, you get annoyed about it. Sir, you should protect the Members of this House from such things.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI : No-body has said anything against you.

SHRI B. V. NAIK : Do not attribute motives.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI : You speak so many \* \*

SHRI B. V. NAIK : I know what \* \* you are indulging in.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, please. Are you imputing motives to anyone in this House, Mr. Shastri ?

SHRI B. V. NAIK : I request that the word \* \* must be expunged. It is Parliamentary ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : That will be looked into.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री : मेरा इम्प्रेशन है कि इस तरह की बातें हमारे देश में हो रही हैं और ये इस सदन में मौके बंद मौके उठती रहती हैं और इनका असर हमारी दोस्ती पर बुरा पड़ता है। इसी की ओर मैं इशारा कर रहा था। इसी पृष्ठभूमि में मैं सबाल पूछता हूँ।

क्या यह सच है कि एच ई सी की मशीनों के बारे में पता लगाने के लिए, अध्ययन करने के लिए, सोवियत यूनियन के विशेषज्ञों का कोई दल भारत आया था और आया था तो क्या उसने कोई रिपोर्ट सरकार को दी ? अगर दी तो उसमें जो सुझाव थे वे क्या थे उनको अमल में लाने के लिए सरकार ने कौन सी कार्रवाई की ?

क्या यह भी सच है कि सोवियत यूनियन से आई कुछ मशीनें आज भी पूरे तरीके से इस्तेमाल में नहीं लाई जा रही हैं, यदि हाँ तो इसके क्या कारण हैं ?

क्या यह भी सच है कि वहाँ के कुछ अधिकारी कारखाने के काम को भीतर घान, सैंबोटान करके इस बात के प्रचार के लिए मौका बेस्टिड इन्टरेस्टम को दे रहे हैं कि सोवियत यूनियन इसके लिए दाँधी है, उसकी मशीनों में खराबी है ? क्या सैंबोटान की बात भी समय-समय पर अधिकांश मुनने को मिली हैं मजदूर संगठनों की तरफ से या दूसरे लोगों की तरफ से ? यदि हाँ तो इसे खत्म करने के लिए आपने कौन सी कार्रवाई की है ताकि एच ई सी फुल स्विग के साथ काम कर सके और उसके काम में रुकावट पैदा करने वाले लोगों का परदा फाश किया जा सके और बुनियादी मशीनें बनाने में हम आगे बढ़ सकें ?

SHRI B. V. NAIK : From the question which I am going to put, I hope that the hon. Member who has got a very illustrious name—Ram, Avatar, Shastri—a fantastic name he has got...

AN HON. MEMBER : No dissection of name.

SHRI B. V. NAIK : I want him to live up to the name and not to indulge in dirty politics and impute motives.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI : You are doing it.

SHRI B. V. NAIK : It would be easy for us to say that you are a KGB agent... (Interruptions) Is there no parliamentary freedom here ? You cannot call a man an agent and impute motives... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, please. I put the question to the hon. Member and he made it clear that he did not intend to impute any motive to any hon. Member of the House. So far as one's reading of the question goes, you cannot blame an ordinary Member if he interprets it in his own way. If we were to take exception to these things, it will be difficult to conduct any debate in this House. May I therefore

\* \* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

suggest to the hon. Member not to refer to what Mr. Shastri said but put his question?

SHRI B. V. NAIK : Sir, I think, in a free India, free expression of views, without any fear or being called even as a lobby, should be permitted. There is no point in this. Why should we be scared of our shadows?

Sir, the question was very very specific, whether a particular foreign collaborator has committed any breach of the terms and conditions of the agreement. This was a categorical question, which A or B or C, by chance it is Mr. Sokhi, has put. It should have been answered in a very very clear-cut term 'No', there has been no breach'. That would have been an end of the question and of the answer that was given. By clubbing together items (a) and (b) and saying that (c) does not arise, the Ministry has tried to be clever, when all that we expect in this country is sincerity and honesty.

Recently, I had an opportunity of asking about the functioning of our public sector undertakings. I have gone on record, in a paper like *Patriot* saying that the public sector in this country is capable of tremendous performance. From that point of view, I would like to know what are the bottlenecks? This sector has great potentialities. According to information furnished today, in reply to another question, it is functioning much below its capacity. Is this one of the factors? If no, we would like to know, what are the other factors so that we take steps to reach our 100 per cent capacity and see to it that the infra structure that we have built up in this country begins to produce results, so that we do not have to look towards the USSR of Shri Shastri or the USA of somebody else or some other third country. We should look into this country in depth in order to come to certain conclusions.

THE MINISTER OF HEAVY INDUSTRY (SHRI T. A. PAI) : Sir, I am grateful to my hon. friend Shri Sokhi, for raising a discussion on the performance of

the Heavy Engineering Corporation. This has given me an opportunity at least to inform the House that the functioning of the Heavy Engineering Corporation is quite contrary to what he has now informed the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I think you are conscious of the fact that you have only ten minutes.

SHRI T. A. PAI : Yes, Sir.

I would like to bring to the notice of Mr. Sokhi and Mr. Naik that the question that was put was :

"Will the Minister of Heavy Industry be pleased to state :

(a) Whether the Russian Company has not supplied the entire machinery required for the rated capacity and full production of the Heavy Engineering Corporation, Ranchi, which has been recently detected by the Management from the papers of the scheme available with them ;

(b) Whether Government propose to ask the U.S.S.R. Government for compensation of the losses incurred so far by the Heavy Engineering Corporation and recover the same from their dues ; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?"

Mr. Naik, you will understand that the question asked was, whether they have fulfilled all the agreements that they were required to fulfil. Sir, my Ministry has been accused of twisting the answer. In answer to the question whether they have supplied the entire machinery, we said 'The Soviet collaborators have supplied the entire equipment for HMBP in conformity with the Detailed Project Report'. Why we said HMBP was because, of the three projects in HEC, HMBP is the only Soviet-assisted project and the two are covered by Czech assistance. Therefore, when I am asked a question on the Russian collaboration, does the hon. Member expect me to talk about Czech collaboration? I have given more specific answers

without being very clever. When the question has been put to us, on the working of the Heavy Engineering Corporation, I think, our answer has been very specific. The second question was, whether we are going to claim any compensation for the losses from the U.S.S.R. Since they have supplied all the equipment they were required to supply to us, where is the question of our asking for any compensation from them for the losses? The third question was, if not, why not? Obviously, since they are not responsible for the losses that we have made, how can we ask for the compensation? The answers are very very simple

I would like to say that the project report was designed for ensuring a rated capacity of 80,000 tonnes. The product mix consisted of several things. But, later on, the production programme specified in the DPR for the plant has undergone revision because of the inclusion of continuous casting machines and sintering/pelletisation plants and also due to the modern trend towards higher size equipment such as blast furnaces, coke ovens etc.

The DPR envisaged production of 21.6 cu. mts. coke even batteries. The coke oven batteries at present being produced by HMBP are 27.3 cu. mts. capacity. Similarly, the DPR envisaged the production of 1033 cu. mts. blast furnaces whereas HMBP are at present producing blast furnaces of the capacity of 2000 cu. mts. The DPR was also based on open hearth steel melting. The present trend in steel making is towards LD convertors. The DPR for HMBP did not envisage pelletisation/sintering and continuous casting, whereas modern steel plants are based on pelletisation/sintering plants and continuous casting of blooms, billets, slabs. It will thus be seen that the product-mix envisaged in the DPR has undergone a drastic change both in quality and quantity.

When the plant was erected, the product-mix was to satisfy the conditions as they were existing at that time for meeting the requirements of the steel industry. If the

steel industry has advanced, naturally the machinery-makers also have to undergo changes. If the same capacity is used for making new type of machinery, it may be that we will not be able to make the same 80,000 tons envisaged in the original DPR. I cannot say that the Russians are responsible for this product-mix. In the beginning we were thinking of 1 million tonne capacity steel plants. We changed our idea with the development and growth of the industry abroad. Naturally the product-mix has undergone a change. In these circumstances, it is not proper for us to find fault with what is the rated capacity now. It is possible that the same machinery may be used for doing many things. When the new management took over recently, we went into the causes as to why the capacity is not being used, whether HEC can perform better, etc. Now we are working two shifts and it can provide 18 lakh machine hours. If we are to reach 80,000 tonnes of mechanical equipment according to the new product-mix, it would require 27 lakh machine hours. Therefore, we had to extend the balancing equipment by adding 39 machine tools out of which 14 tools can be produced by HMTP, another unit in HEC. 3 more machine tools are being transferred from the other units and we have to import 22 machine tools. Recently the officers of HEC were in Moscow negotiating with Russia for giving us the balancing equipment and that is expected.

I agree there have been a number of change in management of the HEC since its inception. It is one of the most developed complexes. I think its production capacity, located in one place, is unrivalled even according to many American visitors who have seen the plant. It can be made into the Skoda of this country if its capacity is fully utilised. It has been said that it has suffered a loss of Rs. 108 crores so far. Last year its loss was Rs. 16 crores. nobody should be happy about it. I had announced in the House that in two years we shall see that it breaks even. The hon. member would be happy that we have tried to cut down the losses by 50 per cent and I assure the House that HEC will

break even next year. If I have been critical of the functioning of HEC, it is not with the idea of condemning it, but with the idea that the next step will be to locate what exactly is wrong. I am convinced that we, as Indians, are capable of looking after big projects efficiently. HEC produced approximately Rs. 31 crores in 1971-72, Rs. 49 crores in 1972-73, Rs. 63 crores in 1973-74 and we have announced a target of Rs. 73.80 crores next year. With all the difficulties we may have, the shortage of raw material and occasional power break-downs in the one union which we had there were four groups within; they had elections recently and we have been able to see happily that the union is a strong union; we are happy that we have been able to negotiate and come to a settlement with them in spite of all these difficulties, we have done our best. Of course, we have to do a great deal, so far as this particular unit is concerned, to go ahead.

SHRI B. V. NAIK : What about the utilisation of capacity ?

SHRI T. A. PAI : In heavy engineering units it all depends upon what we mean by utilisation. If it is 65 to 70 per cent utilisation in a very big unit, it is good because the availability of orders is far more important than anything else. If the steel industry does not expand as fast as we expect, the capacity for the blast furnace becomes idle. Nevertheless, our idea is to explore the possibility of even export.

In the case of BHEL sometimes the utilisation of capacity has been increased to 175 per cent in the boiler plant by trying to see that the ancillary production unit is also encouraged. Here I think the capacity utilisation will be 45 to 55 per cent by next year.

Lastly, I would like to inform my hon. friend that General Kini is very much there and he continues to be the managing Director. The news which he read in the newspapers was about Shri Warrior joining as a member of the Board of Directors. Therefore, he need not have any apprehension that we are displacing any of our executives who have been proved to be first class.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH SOKHI : Can the NIDC design the future plants ?

SHRI T. A. PAI : We have a lot of capacity in this country. We are continuously availing of the available advice that we have from different sectors. But it has got to be of proven worth. While sometimes theoretical guidance is readily available, it will be mostly by people who have not implemented anything themselves, and therefore it has got limited value.

18.30 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday, April 8, 1974/Chaitra 18, 1896 (Saka).*