

[Shri Randhir Singh]

Court—may remain as it is. But about (b)—one shall be chosen from among the Chief Justices of the High Courts—, suppose the Judge is the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court or is a Judge of that Court. The Chief Justice of a High Court is to sit in judgment in an inquiry to be held against the Chief Justice or a Judge of the Supreme Court. This is something which will cause embarrassment to the Chief Justice of the High Court. Certainly, a Supreme Court Judge is senior to a High Court Chief Justice.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : No.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : This is my view. Instead of that, the hon. Home Minister should think of having the President of the All India Bar Council as one of the members of this Committee.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : He may be considered as a jurist.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : Just as the Bench is very important, the Bar is no less important and if the President of the All India Bar Council is taken as a member of the Inquiry Committee, it will give more authenticity and sanctity to the Committee.

As regards (c)—one shall be a person who is, in the opinion of the Speaker or, as the case may be, the Chairman, a distinguished jurist—the hon. Home Minister will appreciate that there will be no harm if a jurist member of this august House is taken on the Committee.

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY : That is still worse.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : My hon. friend said something about cl. 3(7). Suppose the judge suffers from a physical or mental incapacity. This is something very serious. I do not know why he is not appreciating it. If he refuses to make a statement under sec. 342 Cr. P.C., it means he is guilty. The law of presumption is available in such cases. This is something, according to law, which should remain a part of this Bill. I feel there is great and urgent necessity for this. With these observations, I fully support the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER : It is 4.58 P.M. now. I think one more hour is necessary for this. We shall postpone it tomorrow and take up the next item now.

As for the next item we have only one hour for the discussion. It is not as if every Party must have its say. The debate need not necessarily be on party basis. Whoever is ready may get up and speak.

16.58 HRS.

DISCUSSION RE. HINDUSTAN STEEL LIMITED

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore) : By this discussion this afternoon, the House is provided an opportunity to go into this most important prestige public sector project which has an investment of Rs. 1,000 crores, 36 per cent of the total investments in the public sector. These three plants, controlled by Hindustan Steel Ltd., Bhilai, Durgapur and Rourkela, are blessed by three most important countries with their technical and financial assistance, namely, Russia, UK and West Germany. In the course of the last twelve years these plants have already incurred a loss of Rs. 120 crores. There is no improvement in sight yet. We are faced with an imminent situation by which 1968-69 may close with another loss of Rs. 20 crores.

The Hindustan Steel Ltd. has been discussed on the floor of the House on various occasions in the form of debates, but mostly in the form of questions. Various enquiries have been made and reports submitted containing useful recommendations and there had been repeated assurances from the Ministry to improve the things. In spite of those assurances that they would implement those recommendations and the wastage of so much time in investigations, reports and recommendations no improvement is in sight and the steel plants continue to be in the grip of serious crisis and there is labour indiscipline and the persons in the managerial cadre are unable to control the working of the mills while the situation is deteriorating. According to the hon. Minister Mr. Sethi, the situation in

Durgapur has started deteriorating. The labour situation has become intolerable. There are many causes for this bad performance managerial inefficiency, labour indiscipline, production losses, idle capacity, excessive manpower, pricing and revenue policy and so on. Because this discussion is limited to one hour, I shall confine myself to a few specific points which had not been discussed in this House. Before doing so, I wish to point out that the Ministry of Steel and Mines is functioning more or less like a caretaker department; it is ineffective and it is waiting for a Minister to be appointed, regardless of whatever loss may happen in the steel plants.

17.00 Hrs.

There are two specific points which I wish to deal with firstly. The Ministry of Steel had formed the habit of defending the working of the HSL and its losses by adducing the argument of gestation period. It is now eight years since all the three plants were commissioned. Every time there is a discussion in the House, we are told that it has a long gestation period. Nowhere in the world is a modern steel plant expected to have a gestation period of more than five years. It is already eight years; still they say that this is gestation period. It is fallacious because if larger investment causes lower efficiency and losses, new plants will always be uneconomic. Modern technology and scientific methods will continue to be uneconomical according to the theory propounded by our steel ministry. The results shown by the HSL in the last seven or eight years also indicate that the gestation period is not the cause of inefficiency. Logic demands that during the gestation period the maximum losses should be in the first few years and thereafter the losses should continue to diminish. The story here is the other way round. The losses go on rising from 3.21 crores in 1959-60 to Rs. 23.90 crores in 1962-63. Then they start diminishing and in the year 1964-65 there was a profit of Rs. 4.32 crores. Then again all of a sudden we find that the loss in 1966-67 is Rs. 20.10 crores and in 1967-68 Rs. 40.00 crores. If the theory of gestation period holds good, the losses

should have been diminishing and we must have already started making profits by now.

Whenever we take up for discussion the low efficiency of the public sector projects, they pick up a few weak threads of the private sector here and there to cover up the inefficiency of the public sector. It completely ignores the brighter side of the private sector. This is entirely fallacious. By comparing like this, you cannot convert the loss of Hindustan Steel into profit. Similarly, by comparing like this, you cannot convert the profits of the private sector into losses. Fact is fact. Therefore, this attempt only deceives us as to what the fact is.

Coming to the points which I wanted to discuss: let me take excessive manpower in Hindustan Steel Limited. It had been recognised and it has been admitted by the Government that these plants suffered by excessive manpower although in spite of the recognition, they have failed to take any positive action by now. More than that, there are two other things which are serious. If we admit that there was excessive manpower, and there is excessive manpower in the Steel plants, how do you possibly justify that, in spite of the excessive manpower, we are still incurring overtime payments to a considerable extent?

In this respect let me quote from the Mahatab Committee report. It is clearly indicated therein that the incidence of excessive manpower is so much that it raised the cost of production of steel in our country. In the case of Bhilai it is from Rs. 3 to 4 per ton; in the case of Rourkela, from Rs. 5 to Rs. 6 a ton and in the case of Durgapur, from Rs. 10 to Rs. 11 per ton. This is in addition to the excessive manpower in our plants. Beyond that, where is the point, when you have excessive manpower in your factories, of giving contracts for those jobs which could be easily handled by your departmental labourers? In several of the sections of Hindustan Steel Limited, 50 per cent of the jobs are still being done by the contractors, and separate payments are being made. This is a drain on national

[Shri D. N. Patodia]

wealth, and in spite of excessive manpower, we are suffering from all these ills. The result is that our per-man annual productivity has come to be the lowest in the world. Let me quote some figures.

In Czechoslovakia, it is 104 tonnes a year; in the USSR, it is 135 tonnes a year; in USA, it is 150 tonnes a year and in Japan it is 187 tonnes per year. And in India, it is 57 tonnes a year. What a comparison? To what low depths we have fallen in the matter of productivity?

The next point over which I want to dwell is the pricing and fiscal policies. One of the reasons why our public sector plants are inefficient is our very defective pricing and fiscal policies pursued from the very beginning. It would be interesting for you to learn that between 1955 and 1965, the increase in the price in India had been the highest compared to the world. Indian prices rose by 80 per cent—an increase in 10 years. Compared to this, in Belgium, the rise was only by eight points; West Germany, 10 points; United Kingdom, five points. In Japan, the price in fact came down; the prices were reduced by 20 points; whereas in India, it increased by 80 per cent. The result was that the Indian steel today is the most expensive steel in the world compared to the cost of production.

17.09 Hrs.

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

In this context, let me briefly deal with the recent price rise introduced by the Government of India. You will remember that a few weeks back, the Steel Ministry announced a price rise of about Rs. 50 a tonne. Here are two parallel situations. On account of the rising cost, the steel plants cannot afford to run economically until there is a price rise; on the other hand, if the steel becomes expensive, then all the engineering industries in India will turn uneconomically; their cost of production will rise; their economy will be affected, and their exports will be affected. Here was a situation where the Government

should have taken a judicious decision by which on the one hand, the steel plants should have been properly compensated for the cost, and on the other hand, the engineering industries should be permitted to live. Here was a case when they should have demarcated the optimum levels of taxation. Here was a case where the excise duties and taxation must have been reduced. This is how productivity and growth of this industry or any industry, as a matter of fact, is curbed by wrong fiscal and pricing policies of the Government before it is permitted to grow. The result is that even the Government of India had to revise its targets. The original target in 1970-71 for the production of steel was 18 million tonnes. It has now been reduced to 8 million tons, *i.e.* less than 50 per cent. Apart from other factors, one important factor for this is that you have made steel so expensive that its consumption has been restricted. It is no more exportable at fair prices. It is no more consumable. The raw material cost has become high for engineering industries that they cannot expand. This is the result of your pricing and fiscal policy.

Then, there is utter lack of salesmanship. The public sector projects, which the Hindustan Steel tops, are a living example as to how bad salesmanship can be in any organisation. They do not know how to serve a customer. They do not know what is aggressive sales policy. They have regular complaints for bad packing and bad quality. If they receive a complaint from a customer, they become arrogant and stop supplies to him rather than meet him and satisfy him. Why do the Government not learn from the example of their own Departments when acting as a Buyer? The Indian Railways are buying steel every year from foreign countries. I know many cases where claims have been lodged after 12 years of supply and foreign supplies have immediately met those claims very satisfactorily. But in the case of HSL, if you raise a claim today, it takes years before the claim gets to the proper file of the Secretary or General Manager. Then they create all sorts of troubles and raise legal complications. Their sales contract is some-

thing frightening. A customer will feel discouraged to enter into a sales contract with them. He will think what the hell he is signing.

Another very important point is that Hindustan Steel is suffering from various types of production losses. It has been subjected to criticism by various committees and various reports but no action has been taken. Apart from various remarks made by these reports, there are several other things which have come to my notice. Firstly, furnace productivity per cubic meter Blast Furnace is very low in India. In Japan it is 2 tons. In India it is 1.1 ton. This eats into the profits of HSL. Secondly, consumption of coke per ton of hot metal is the highest in India. In Japan it is 0.5. In India it is 0.9. The result is, raw material cost per ton of steel produced is possibly the highest in this country. It is as much as 64.6 per cent in the case of HSL where as by all standards—national and international—it should not go beyond 50 per cent. Thirdly, there is complete lack of imagination in regard to product mix. They plan their production 12 months or 2 years in advance. They do not care to see what is likely to be the demand for various products. Regardless of the demands, they go on producing according to their plan. The result is that the most moving item which is the profitable item is in short supply and the least moving item is in excess. Salesmanship demands that we should have a proper balancing between demand and profitability. We should produce only those items which give us maximum profit. I am sure if they apply their mind a little more judiciously to these points, the whole balance sheet of Hindustan Steel will be converted in two years. There is no doubt about it.

With regard to managerial and administrative problem, this has been discussed on many occasions. The present system of appointing General Managers, Directors, etc.—picking up one from here, the other from there, taking some on deputation, some on loan, some on assignment—has completely failed.

There is no coordination at all. It has been suggested by various authorities to

form some independent institution to make selections for senior managerial calibre. Many assurances have been given. Dr. Chenna Reddy made a statement. But there is absolutely no result. Let me quote here what is the result. As a result of selecting inappropriate persons to these jobs in the course of the last ten years you will be surprised to know that as many as over hundred persons have changed on the Board of Directors, seven Chairmen have changed and the head office of Hindustan Steel has been changed five times at five different places. This is how Hindustan Steel Limited has been working.

Regarding export pattern I will agree with the Government of India that so long as they want to develop export within the available capacity of production they may do so, but I completely disagree with them when they justify expansion of steel plants on the grounds of exports. Sir, the steel industry is a terribly capital intensive industry. For every one tonne of capacity you need an investment of nearly Rs. 2,500 out of which Rs. 750 is in the form of foreign exchange. As against that, one tonne of steel in international terms will cost about Rs. 600. The ratio of investment to productivity is 5 : 1. It is a very bad investment. You can select many other industries with a very much higher ratio, even a ratio of 1 : 1. Recently 60,000 tonnes of billets was sold for export to Ceylon. Under what circumstances was that sold? Billet is a scare item in this country. We need billets for various rolling mills who again in turn export their products. We have exported this quantity or we are thinking of exporting this quantity at the cost of suffering of these rolling mills in India who also would have earned foreign exchange. I am not prepared to accept the thesis that we should export our products for which our own industry suffer and due to which our further exports suffer.

These are the various factors for which Hindustan Steel Limited has been suffering and a very deep thinking to correct these evils and defective working will be needed to put this concern on a firm footing.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If I call every hon. Member from every Party to speak on this subject I will have to ask them to confine their remarks to 5 minutes. I will also be very watchful and the moment a Member goes outside the scope of the debate I will have to pull him up. I hope hon. Members will keep this in mind and excuse me for this. I will have to conclude the discussion at 6.00.

SHRI S. R. DAMANI (Sholapur) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have very carefully listened to the points made by the hon. Member who spoke just now. It is a fact that the working of Hindustan Steel is not satisfactory. In this connection our ex-Minister Dr. Chenna Reddy has already submitted a detailed report in April last showing what are the reasons for such unsatisfactory working.

Sir, for the success of any industry it is very essential that there shall be co-operation between the management and workers. That is how in all the industrially developed countries like Germany, Japan, England or America the industries have developed and that is how their cost of production is low. They are producing more in the industrially advanced countries because there is co-operation between the management and labour in those countries. That is why those countries are successful in the industrial field. The same thing applies to every industry, whether in the private sector or the public sector. Is there any co-operation in industry in our country? Can we find any co-operation between the workers and management? Many of the hon. Members opposite, who are leaders of trade unions of workers of the steel plants, if they co-operate and guide the workers, things can be changed and the working of the plants can be improved. But it is not being done.

The reason for the higher cost of production and lower efficiency is surplus workers and constant labour trouble. Whomsoever you may appoint in the management, if he has to deal with labour problems every day, how can he devote time for improving production or improving the techniques of production? His valuable time is lost in solving labour disputes. So, without the co-operation

of the workers things cannot improve. I would like to inform those hon. Members who are criticising the working or performance of the steel plants, who are charging the government for the failure of these plants, it is due to their non-cooperation that we have to find ourselves in this pitiable position. I want to make this very clear.

In Durgapur those workers who were employed for construction work, they do not allow themselves to be retrenched. They want to continue in employment even though their work is over. In Rourkela also the same thing happens. If the steel plants have to carry with such huge surplus labour, how can they achieve efficiency? Similarly, there are strikes for every small dispute. How much man-days are lost and how much of production is lost due to these strikes? I hope the hon. Minister would enlighten the House as to what are the actual losses that the Hindustan Steel has suffered due to strikes, surplus labour and non-cooperation of the workers. I am sure that if these factors are taken into consideration in the accounts the result will not be very disappointing.

All the same, I would like to say that there are certain directions where improvements can be made by the authorities like sales policy and production. Shri Pande has submitted a report in this connection. The Administrative Reforms Commission has also presented a report. They should be considered and implemented as early as possible, because these steel plants contribute to a large extent to the exchequer and to the nation.

In the end, I would again request hon. Members opposite to give full co-operation in the running of these units and in implementing the recommendations of ARC so that these units can function efficiently and produce better results.

श्री बृज भूषण लाल (बरेली) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज स्टील प्लांटों के बारे में जो चर्चा हो रही है—अब तक आम तौर से हम सब की यह डिमाण्ड रही है कि इस किस्म के प्लांट जहाँ तक हो सकें प्राइवेट सेक्टर के बजाय पब्लिक सेक्टर में हों, जिन इण्डस्ट्रियल से अपने देशान को फायदा पहुंच सकता है, उनको पब्लिक

अपडरटेकिंग्स के तेहत लाया जाय। मगर इन तीन स्टील प्लांटों का पिछले 10 सालों का जो बकिंग सामने आया है, जिसमें 120 करोड़ रुपये का नुकसान हुआ है, इससे बड़ी नाउम्मीदी पैदा हुई है। अगर यह नुकसान शुरू-शुरू में होता तो हम यह समझ सकते थे कि शुरू-शुरू में नातजुबेकारी की वजह से ऐसा हुआ है या बहुत-सी चीजें ऐसी होती हैं जिनमें शुरू-शुरू में खर्च करना पड़ता है। लेकिन 1967-68 में 40 करोड़ रुपये का जो नुकसान हुआ है उससे एक बात साबित होनी है कि इनके अन्दर जरूर कोई मिसमैनेजमेन्ट है या कोई कमी है, जिसको सरकार दूर नहीं कर पा रही है और यह नुकसान बढ़ता चला जा रहा है।

अब जहां तक नुकसान का ताल्लुक है—हर आदमी जानता है कि जब तक मैनेजमेन्ट ठीक नहीं होगा, कम्पॉटेन्ट हाथों में नहीं होगा, एफिशियेन्ट नहीं होगा तब तक कोई भी कन्सर्न हो, चाहे प्राइवेट हो या पब्लिक सैक्टर में हो, उसको नुकसान होगा। आज आपके मैनेजमेन्ट की पॉर्जाइशन यह है—मैं सब से पहले बोर्ड आफ डायरेक्टर्स को लेता हूँ, वे लोग कितना इन्टरेस्ट लेते हैं—इस तरफ आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ। बोर्ड आफ डायरेक्टर्स की मीटिंग्ज होती हैं, लेकिन वे लोग एक्सैन्ट रहते हैं, यह उनके इन्टरेस्ट का उदाहरण है। अक्सर बोर्ड आफ डायरेक्टर्स की मीटिंग्ज वहां होती हैं, जहां डायरेक्टर साहब को सहूलियत हो। बजाय इसके कि मीटिंग प्लांट पर हो, जहां वे तमाम कमियों को जा कर देख सकें, उनके रेजिडेन्स के पास होती है, कभी दिल्ली में की जाती है या कभी कलकत्ते में की जाती है। मिनिस्टर साहब ने यह एशोरेन्स दी थी कि ऐसे लोगों को हटा कर उनको डायरेक्टर बनाया जायगा जो इस काम में इन्टरेस्ट ले रहे हैं लेकिन मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि अभी तक इस तरफ कोई तबज्जह नहीं दी गई है।

मैनेजमेन्ट की तरफ भी कोई तबज्जह नहीं दी गई है। जनरल मैनेजर्स को इतनी बाइड-

पावर्स दे दी गई हैं कि वे जिसको चाहते हैं एप्वाइन्ट कर लेते हैं, स्टाफ की जरूरत हो या न हो, वे एप्वाइन्ट कर लेते हैं। जिसका नतीजा यह हुआ है—यह एडमिटेड फैक्ट है—कि इन प्लांट्स में इतना सरप्लस स्टाफ हो गया है कि जिसकी वजह से कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन बहुत बढ़ गई है। होना यह चाहिये था—जैसा कि एन्क्वायरी कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है कि सरप्लस स्टाफ को वहां से फौरन रिट्रेन्च करना चाहिये, और उनको दूसरे अपडरटेकिंग्ज में लगाया जाय—लेकिन इस तरफ अभी तक कोई तबज्जह नहीं दी गई है और कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन वैसे की वैसे चली जा रही है।

आज आपके वर्क्स में जो एफिशियेन्सी नहीं है, उसकी वजह यह है कि उनके अन्दर लैक-आफ-कान्फीडेन्स है। आपके यहां मैरिट पर प्रोमोशन नहीं होती है, जनरल मैनेजर जिसको चाहते हैं तीन-तीन, चार-चार प्रोमोशन्ज दे देते हैं जिसकी वजह से बैड-ब्लड क्रियेट हुआ है। मैं आपके सामने दो-तीन सुझाव रखना चाहूंगा—अगर मंत्री महोदय उन पर ध्यान देंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उनसे काम ज्यादा अच्छी तरह से हो सकेगा और यह नुबसान भी कम हो सकेगा। मेरा पहला सुझाव यह है कि दो इन्क्वायरी कमेटी बनाई जाय, एक इस्टेब्लिशमेन्ट्स के लिये और दूसरी कर्माशयल बेसिज पर बनाई जाय। जो इस बात को देखे कि आपकी जो प्रोडक्शन हो रही है और जो सेल होती है, उनका रेशो कितना है कितनी रिक्वायरमेन्ट है, कितनी डिमाण्ड है, उसके हिसाब से आप प्रोडक्शन करते हैं या नहीं। ऐसा न हो कि आप प्रोडक्शन करते चले जाय और बाद में माल न उठे।

जहां तक एफिशियेन्सी का ताल्लुक है—मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि आपके तीन प्लांट्स हैं, आप इनके अन्दर इन्टरमल बेसिज पर प्रोमोशन रखिये, जो जहां पर डिजर्व करता है उसको वहां भेजिये, जिसकी जहां पर जरूरत हो उसको वहां पर रखिये। आपके यहां

[श्री बृज भूषण लाल]

ऐसा नियम नहीं है कि जो आपके वर्कर्स हैं वे दूसरे प्लांट में जाय, जो एक जगह एक्सपीरियेन्स हासिल करें, उसके एक्सपीरियेन्स का दूसरी जगह इस्तेमाल हो सके, एक तरह से पूल आफ़ एक्सपीरियेन्स कौमन होना चाहिये ताकि उसकी जहां जरूरत हो इस्तेमाल हो सके। हैड ऑफ़ डिपार्टमेंट्स के बारे में आपकी यह पालिसी थी कि 90 परसेन्ट हैड ऑफ़ डिपार्टमेंट्स दूसरी जगह जायेंगे, लेकिन 10 परसेन्ट भी एक जगह से दूसरी जगह नहीं भेजे गये। नतीजा यह होता है कि एक जगह के हैड ऑफ़ दो डिपार्टमेंट का दूसरी जगह फायदा नहीं उठाया जा रहा है। इससे वर्कर्स भी सफर करते चले जा रहे हैं। इसलिये मेरा आपसे यह अनुरोध है कि आप अपने मैनेजमेंट को सम्भाल, जो बेकार खर्च हो रहा है, उसको रोके। अगर आप इस चीज का तरफ़ ध्यान नहीं देंगे तो पब्लिक का विश्वास—आज जो हम चिल्ला रहे हैं कि ये सब काम पब्लिक अण्डरटेकिंग्स के अण्डर आने चाहिये—इसमें हो रहे नुक़तान को देख कर टूट जायगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि नतीजा महोदय एक स्टेटमेंट पेश करें कि क्या बजह है कि पिछले 10 सालों में इन तीनों प्लांटों में इतने करोड़ रुपयों का नुक़तान हुआ है।

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur) : Sir, Shri Patodia has done a good service in bringing out revealing facts with regard to the sufferings of HSL. The Government, in any business undertaking, should have a clear policy as to how they are going to manage it. But, unfortunately, in these steel plants, in the past so many years there has not been a clearcut policy even with regard to the basic issue as to how they are going to manage these.

SHRI VIRENDRA KUMAR SHAH (Junagadh) : They have a clear policy as to how to mismanage these.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : So many ministers have come and gone and every minister has toyed with the idea of de-centralising the management. Another minister has come to centralise the management and again there is a con-

troversy going on. I know for certain that between the top-level executive of the H.S.L. and the management on the spot, there is a lot of unhealthy controversy which is hampering the healthy development of the whole steel plant. This is a basic thing that they have not attended to so far.

With regard to the potential created in our steel plants, there is the need and scope for diversification. That is not being done. Even today, there are many things which are being imported and which could very well be manufactured in our own steel plants. I would like just by way of an example to point only one thing, that is, the mild steel product. That is still being imported. But I am told it could very well be manufactured in our own steel plants.

The third point that I would like to stress upon is about labour relations which are hampering production. Much is accounted for go-slow tactics which had to increase in the cost of production. How are you going to solve this problem? I would like to blame the Government squarely on this issue. They could very well say it is because of the inter-union rivalries that the work is being held up and there is a sort of go-slow tactics and all the kinds of tactics being adopted. But I would like to know from the Minister, categorically, what they have done with regard to the promotion of labour welfare and healthy labour relation in their undertakings.

I know in some of the public undertakings they have got a sort of intelligence wing to spy on the workers. Can any undertaking, without relying on the workers, without depending on them, without making a human approach to understand their feelings and to see that they also take a pride in the working of the undertaking, ever hope to succeed? They can never succeed. You can pass as many laws as you like. Can you really make a man or compel a man to work if he is bent on going slow? So, the whole question is about the approach that the management has got to make towards labour. Here I find, particularly in all the steel plants, they have miserably failed. Their whole approach was rather militant and they wanted to put

them down. There was no human touch in any of their steel plants with the result they have taken a sort of inimical stand towards the management and they are considered to be, virtually, enemies of the public sector undertakings. When you treat the labour as your enemy or you treat them with suspicion or you feel you cannot rely on labour, can you ever hope to succeed in your undertakings? I am speaking with some background knowledge in these matters.

With regard to another committee with which I have been associated, we had the evidence of a few General Managers of the public undertakings. One General Manager of a public undertaking told us—he was not prepared to use the word 'spy' which I was using—that without an intelligence wing, he cannot manage the undertaking. Subsequently, on another day, there was another General Manager who said that the very idea was obnoxious and humiliating. He said, "How can I suspect my own men? How can I manage my undertaking with that feeling?" These are some basic issues involved. Unless Government takes them up, they will continue to suffer losses. I believe, simply on the idealistic grounds, we cannot justify the losses of public undertakings and that too in on business concern. Unless they are able to do something concrete in this direction, there is no use justifying it on idealistic grounds.

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा (हमीरपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे दोस्त श्री पटोदिया जी ने हिन्दुस्तान स्टील के मामले में दिलचस्पी ली, अच्छा किया और मैं इसका स्वागत करता हूँ। ऐसे मामलों को, जिनसे जनता का सम्बन्ध हो, जिनमें जनता का पैसा लगता हो, जनता के विश्वास की बात हो, जनता के कोआपरेशन की बात हो, इसे हाउस में डिस्कस किया जाना चाहिए। परन्तु डिस्कस करने के पीछे हमारी नीयत क्या है, उसको हमें साफ रखना चाहिए। हम पब्लिक अन्डरटेकिंग्स को डिस्कस करें, उन पर विचार करें लेकिन इसको प्रोपेगन्डा का रूप नहीं मिलना चाहिए। हमारी पब्लिक अन्डरटेकिंग्स की जो इमेज है, उसको अगर हम

डिमेज करते हैं तो उससे देश का भला होने वाला नहीं है।

श्री बेवकी नन्दन पाटोदिया : वह तो डिमेज हो चूकी।

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हिन्दुस्तान स्टील को जो हमने बनाया, उसकी जो प्रोजेक्ट रिपोर्ट थी, उसको मेरे दोस्त ने पढ़ा होगा। उस रिपोर्ट में साफ लिखा हुआ है कि इतने साल तक घाटा रहेगा। अभी तो उसमें और घाटा होगा। उस प्रोजेक्ट रिपोर्ट में ही यह साफ लिखा हुआ है। . . . (व्यवधान) . . . अगर मेरे दोस्त दुर्गापुर जायें, भिलाई का कारखाना देखें, रूरकेला का कारखाना देखें या वोकारो जो अभी बन रहा है उसके कारखाने को देखें तो उन्हें मालुम होगा कि हिन्दुस्तान की एक नयी शकल बन रही है, एक नया हिन्दुस्तान बन रहा है। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

अगर आप मुझे इस तरह से बोलने नहीं देंगे तो फिर मैं भी आपको बोलने नहीं दूंगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जहाँ तक पब्लिक अन्डरटेकिंग्स का सवाल है, मैं समझता हूँ प्राइवेट सेक्टर वालों, पूंजीपतियों और समायोदारों का इसमें हाथ है, वे यह चाहते हैं कि ये फेल हो जायें। पब्लिक सेक्टर का जहाँ तक सवाल है, आपने देखा होगा कि हर रोज़ मेरा कोई न कोई सवाल यहाँ पर होता है, मैं पब्लिक सेक्टर को क्रिटिसाइज़ भी करता हूँ, गलतियों के लिए मिनिस्टर साहब को भी क्रिटिसाइज़ करता हूँ। हम इस बात को छिपाना नहीं चाहते हैं, हम समझते हैं कि उसमें गलतियाँ हैं, चोरियाँ हैं, इरेगुलैरिटीज़ हैं, खामियाँ हैं। लेकिन उन खामियों, चोरियों या गलतियों का यह तो मतलब नहीं है कि हम पब्लिक अन्डरटेकिंग्स को ही समाप्त कर दें और प्राइवेट सेक्टर और पूंजीपतियों के हाथ में सारे हिन्दुस्तान को दे दें। वोकारो, भिलाई, दुर्गापुर, हिन्दुस्तान स्टील ये जितनी अन्डरटेकिंग्स हैं, यह एक नया हिन्दुस्तान है। इस नये हिन्दुस्तान में,

[श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा]

हमारी जो आने वाली नस्लें हैं उनको विश्वास होगा कि हम अपने पावों पर खड़े हो रहे हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने जब फंसला किया कि हमें हेवी इंजीनियरिंग के कारखाने लगाने हैं तो उनके दिमाग में यह बात थी कि हम दुनिया को दिखा सकेंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर क्या चीज नहीं बन सकती है। मेरे दोस्त इम्पोर्टर और एक्सपोर्टर हैं, वे एक मामूली मुई को भी बाहर से मंगवाते थे लेकिन आज हिन्दुस्तान स्टील के कारखाने हैवी-इंजीनियरिंग की बड़ी बड़ी मशीनें बना रहे हैं। मेरे दोस्त कहते हैं कि घाटा हो गया। एक हजार करोड़ रुपया लगाने के बाद अगर 120 करोड़ का घाटा भी आया (व्ययधान) तो वह कोई बहुत बड़ा घाटा नहीं है। इसके साथ में टाटा का उदाहरण देता हूँ। आप उनकी बैलेंस शीट पढ़िए। उनका कारखाना कब बना था? टाटा का जो कारखाना है वह डेप्रिप्रिएशन में निकल चुका है। उसका सारा का सारा पैसा निकल चुका है। उस कारखाने का मुकाबिला हम हिन्दुस्तान स्टील से कैसे कर सकते हैं? आप प्राइवेट सेक्टर का मुकाबिला हिन्दुस्तान स्टील से करें यह मुनासिब बात नहीं है।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहूंगा। जहां तक पब्लिक कार्निफर्डेंस की बात है वह मेरे दोस्त कुछ भी विचार रखते हैं लेकिन वह याद रखें कि अगर पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग पर से पब्लिक का कार्निफर्डेंस उठ जायगा तो उससे देश का भला नहीं होगा। और न उनका ही भला होगा।

इसके साथ-साथ मुझे यह कहना है कि मुझे भी इस संबंध में कुछ तजुर्वा है। इसलिए मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से कहूंगा कि वह इसमें सुधार लाने की कोशिश करें। जैसा कि पटौदिया साहब ने कहा है कि जो ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन बदलता रहता है, उसका नतीजा अच्छा नहीं होता है क्योंकि किसी अफसर को यह मालूम नहीं कि वह कब है और कब नहीं है। डेपुटेशन पर जो आबमी जाते हैं उनको कोई इन्टररेस्ट

नहीं होता है। वह तो यह समझते हैं कि जब तरक्की मिलेगी तब अपने बोरिया बिस्तर बांध लेंगे। इसलिए मेरा यह सुझाव है कि जिसको आप वहां भेजें वह कम-से-कम पांच साल तक वहां रहे और उसका लियेन सेंट्रल गवर्नटमें से खत्म हो जाना चाहिए ताकि उसको यह पता हो कि हम यहां पर बैठे हैं और हमारी पूरी जिम्मेदारी है।

वहां पर जो एकाउंटिंग का सिस्टम है जो हिसाब किताब का सिस्टम है वह ठीक नहीं है और वह ऐसा गड़बड़ रहता है कि पता ही नहीं लगता है कि दरअसल हो क्या रहा है? यह पता ही नहीं लग पाता कि कहां से और क्या माल खरीदा जा रहा है, किस रेट पर खरीदा जा रहा है और यह कि क्या यहां पर बनाना है और जो बन गया वह किस भाव में बेचा गया और कहां बेचा गया? इस तरह की एक बड़ी बंगालिग वहां पर चलती है। वहां पर यह ठेकेदार लोग करोड़ों रुपये खा जाते हैं। इसलिए यह बहुत जरूरी है कि पब्लिक सैक्टर इंडस्ट्री में परचैज, सेल और प्रोडक्शन इन तीनों के ऊपर पूरा-पूरा नियन्त्रण होना चाहिए और उनमें ठीक से काम चले इसकी पूरी व्यवस्था हमें करनी चाहिए।

इसके साथ-ही-साथ ठेकेदारों के जरिए काफ़ी बोगस खर्चें दिखलाये जाते हैं और लाखों रुपया गलत हाजिरी आदि में व्यर्थ चला जाता है। मैं चाहूंगा कि मिस्टर साहब इस कंट्रैक्ट सिस्टम पर विशेष रूप से ध्यान दें और इसमें आ रही खराबियों व गड़बड़ियों को दूर करने का माकूल इंतज़ाम करें। आज देश बड़ी उत्सुकतापूर्वक स्टील की इस पब्लिक सैक्टर इंडस्ट्री की तरफ़ देख रहा है कि वह कैसे लोहे का उत्पादन बढ़ाती है और इसके लिए मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से अर्ज करूंगा कि वह इस पब्लिक सैक्टर की इंडस्ट्री को कामयाब बनाने के लिए सभी संभव क़दम उठावें।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Some of the criticism levelled by Shri Patodia are understandable. It is true that much has to be done in public sector projects like the steel plants, Bhilai,

Rourkela and Durgapur, specially the last two.

But what is the aim of such criticism. He has not concluded that the ultimate solution or salvation lies in denationalisation or handing them over to the private sector.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : Nobody will accept them. Do not worry.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : He has said there is inefficiency, excessive manpower and other things. I admit that the greatest tragedy in this country is that if there is inefficiency in the public sector, there is dishonesty in the private sector. We have to weigh between inefficiency and dishonesty. Inefficiency can be changed to efficiency, but dishonesty cannot be changed to honesty. That is our experience of so many years with the private sector. So naturally we have to gear up our machinery to see that these public sector projects, which according to the late lamented Pandit Nehru, are places of pilgrimage, should be cleansed of these defects. But the whole difficulty is that these places of pilgrimage are in the hands of some renowned *pandas* who take everything that is there. That should be changed.

I agree that payment for overtime where there is excessive manpower is wrong. But it sometimes happens that in a particular section—I have 20 years of experience in the work of an ordnance factory—you have to work overtime to produce certain jigs and fixtures for other sections where mass production is on. This sometimes happens. But I agree that extravagance should be stopped.

There is another thing—labour relations. When Dr. Channa Reddy was here, he had some ideas and he discussed them with us. He was of the view that there should be one Union for a unit or at least the representative Union should be granted recognition. What is happening in the steel plants in Bhilai or Durgapur or Rourkela. There is inter-union rivalry. On behalf of the All India Trade Union Congress, I can declare here that we shall be satisfied if there is a ballot and that union which secures more than 51 per cent or 60 or in some

cases 90 per cent votes should be regarded as the representative union for two years. Unless that is done, I am afraid the labour relations will not improve.

We have heard much in the House about labour participation in management. It is still not clear to me why in these steel plants we are unable to accept somebody who knows about the labour problems as one of the directors on the board. We bring wrong people and put them in the right places. Recently, one of the consultants was called by the Prime Minister to become the Deputy Chairman of the HSL and he said that he could become the chairman. One person was already in view and he was brought as chairman of the steel plant. I request the hon. Minister to throw some light on this. Is the situation going to change? He should not be cowed down and bullied by the private sector. We all really want progress towards socialism. The day will come when in spite of the eloquence of Mr. Patodia and Tapuriah the public sector will grow. But the efficiency of the public sector must improve so that we can ultimately nationalise those in the private sector.

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli) : A few months back I moved a resolution on the increase in the price of steel products. Immediately after decontrol was told that it was all for the good of the country. Whatever it is, it is now clear that the excise duties and other items of duty also contributed to the high price. Therefore, the consumer has developed a resistance which we find everywhere. So far as steel industry is concerned, I have some difference in approach with my hon. friend to my right. Steel is an important industry in the making of a nation. We are having an industry of this magnitude in the public sector and it is to be welcomed. But the question is : are these steel mills properly managed? Everybody will agree that the public sector undertakings are not managed properly. We have made an investment of Rs. 1,000 crores in this industry. On the Railways, we have invested Rs. 2,800 crores. We know how we are managing our railways. In the public sector undertakings, re-thinking is necessary about labour relations. It is

[Shri Nambiar]

not because we have a soft corner for the labour. What is happening in every industry? Recently, you had trouble in the Railways. I was connected with another public undertaking in Madras State one of the biggest public sector undertakings the lignite mines. There too we had labour trouble recently. I was connected with Sindri fertilisers. There we had labour trouble. I also went to Bhilai. It is not that I go there to create trouble. That is a misunderstanding. I go there after trouble had arisen, to settle it. If there is one party in Madras creating trouble, the DMK party, that party is not in Bhilai or Sindri... (Interruptions). Communists are there everywhere. But the approach of bureaucracy towards labour—that is the question. Mr. Patodia himself gave an answer. He asked: why should you have contract labour when there is surplus manpower? Our bureaucracy will not understand it. You may discuss with them for days and weeks but bureaucracy will say: no. That is the way they behave. Therefore, unfortunately, the bureaucratic mind is to change. Here, by some reason they will understand it; but where are we to find other alternatives? We can change a bureaucrat from the Chairmanship or from a similar key position, and Mr. Patodia or another type of person can take over. We have no objection, but do not go there; the private sector should not approach the public sector with a view to running it down and then switching it over to the private sector.

Our difference is this. The private sector may look as if a little better for any management for a certain reason but that is not going to be the pattern in India. We do not want to encourage the private sector, the monopoly of the private sector; even if that monopoly may be brighter today, we are against it, and we want to break it at all costs. We have no objection to the fact that the public sector is to be encouraged, but the public sector bureaucrats are to be discouraged. Their back has to be broken only with the help of labour co-operatives. Our hon. Member from the Congress side there said that there must be co-operatives. Extend your hand of co-

operation; labour will respond, but do not try to play politics inside. Do not bring in the INTUC or other discredited trade unions there. You give it to the labour; labour will come forward to help you. That is the only way.

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : श्री पाटोदिया जी ने जो बात कही है मैं चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट उस पर ध्यान दे। 57 करोड़ का लास हुआ है दो साल में। मैं चाहता हूँ कि कम्पीटीशन की भावना सभी कामों में आनी चाहिये। ओपन मार्केट में कम्पीट हम को करना चाहिये। मैं ब्यूरोक्रेसी को बिल्कुल खिलाफ हूँ। प्रेम चन्द जी जब बोल रहे थे तो मैंने उस ओर इशारा भी किया था और कहा था कि उधर भी नजर करो। उनको आप ठीक कर लोगे तो इन पूँजीपतियों को हम ठीक कर सकते हैं। इनकी संख्या है ही कितनी। ये ज्यादा नहीं है। इनको हम चंगुल में दबा सकते हैं। लेकिन जो ब्यूरोक्रेट्स हैं इनको भी दुरुस्त करना चाहिये। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मिनिस्टर साहब इस ओर ध्यान दें।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं पी० ए० सी० का मैम्बर रहा हूँ। मैंने इन अंतरटेकिंग्स को जा कर देखा है और इनके जो संचालक हैं उनको एग्जैमिन भी हमने किया है। हमारे यहां इनकम टैक्स की चोरी नहीं होती है, हमारे यहां ब्लैकमेलिंग नहीं होता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो गड़बड़ियाँ हैं उनको दूर किया जाए। गवर्नमेंट क्लिन स्लेट से आए। पूँजीपतियों के मुकाबले में हमारा जो काम हो वह अच्छा हो, उनसे बेहतर हो।

हम आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० या ए० आई० टी० यू० सी० के झगड़े में न पड़ें। लेबर को आप काम करने दें। पालिटिक्स हम वहां न खेलें। मुल्क को आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि वह धन पैदा करे। हमको आज दो दुश्मनों का मुकाबला करना है। संसार में हमारा कोई नहीं है। हमको अकेले ही उनका मुकाबला करना है। मैं सरकार को इस बारे में सावधान करना चाहता हूँ। हम मिल कर रहें। अपनों के लिए

तो हम सी और पांच रहें लेकिन जब दुश्मन से हमारा मुकाबला हो तो हम एक-सी पांच हो कर उसका मुकाबला करें। कमाई करके हम देश की पैदावार बढ़ायें। एक दूसरे को हम कंडेम न करें बल्कि मिल जुल कर गाड़ी को आगे ले जाने की कोशिश हम करें।

इतना ही मेरा निवेदन है।

श्री कामेश्वर सिंह (खगरिया) : हमस जा पहले मित्र बोल चुके हैं उन्होंने काफी कुछ कहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान स्टील में कितना लाम हो चुका है। मैं उम सब को दौहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ। एक बात मैं जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ। आप देखें कि अभी जो हिन्दुस्तान स्टील के चेयरमैन बने हैं वह कैसे बने हैं। इस विभाग के जो मंत्री थे वह नहीं चाहते थे कि वे चेयरमैन बनें। वह वार एट ला है। उन्हें राजनीतिक दलों का तजुर्बा अधिक है स्टील टेक्नॉलॉजी और स्टील प्लांट के मनेजमेंट का उनको तजुर्बा नहीं है, उसमें उनका कोई वास्ता नहीं रहा है। तब क्या आश्चर्य कि इतना लास हुआ। मैं माफ कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री के हस्तक्षेप में वह चेयरमैन बने हैं। वह इसमें पहलें फुड कार्पोरेशन के चेयरमैन थे।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे लोगों का संचालक बनाया जाना चाहिये जो कि इस तरह की चीज को जानते हों। जब तक जानने वाले लोग नहीं मिलेंगे तब तक कोई तरक्की नहीं हो सकेगी। मैं आपके सामने उदाहरण स्वरूप कुछ रखना चाहता हूँ। पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग कमेटी की तीसवीं रिपोर्ट है उसको आप देखें। उसमें कहा है कि जब तक कोई आदमी स्टील प्लांट के बारे में जानेगा नहीं, वह क्या कर सकता है। उसने इनवेंटरी कंट्रोल के बारे में यह कहा है :

Delay in Introduction of Inventory control system : The company auditor's report for the year 1961-62 contains the following observations regarding inventory control :

"There was no scientific system of procurement and inventory control. L38LSS/68-13

Itemwise minimum and maximum order, safety insurance stock levels having regard to the trend of issues and economic sizes of order were not determined."

यह पहले भी गलती हुई है और चंडी साहब के आने के बाद भी तब तक होती रहेगी जब तक मही आदमी नहीं आया।

जब कभी स्ट्राइक होती है या लास होता है तो चाहे वह मनेजमेंट की गलती की वजह से हुआ हो लेकिन कह दिया जाता है कि इस सब का दोष राजनीतिक दलों पर है। उन पर ही सारा दोष मढ़ दिया जाता है। मैं इसका आपको उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। हिन्दू की रिपोर्ट है 16-6-1968 की। उसमें यह आया है :

HSL lists reasons for industrial unrest : New Delhi, May 15—The influence of political parties on trade unions is a major cause of industrial unrest in the public sector steel projects, says the memorandum submitted by HSL to the National Labour Commission.

अपनी गलतियों को ये लोग पोलिटिकल पार्टीज के सिर पर मढ़ना चाहते हैं। एक देहाती कहावत है "ज्यादा जोगी, मठ उजाड़"। जिस मठ में ज्यादा जोगी, महात्मा आ जाएं तो वह मठ उजाड़ जाता है, समाप्त हो जाता है। यही हाल हिन्दुस्तान स्टील का है। आप पांडे कमटी की रिपोर्ट को देखें। उसमें कहा है कि टाप हैवी मनेजमेंट है। आई० ए० एस० केडर के लोगों को इनमें भेज दिया गया है। इनको फंक्ट्रियां किस तरह से चलती हैं इसका कोई अंदाज नहीं है। किसी डिपार्टमेंट में सैक्रेटरी होता है या अंडर सैक्रेटरी होता है उसको भेज दिया जाता है। उसको परसोनल मनेजमेंट का क्या तजुर्बा रहता है।

एक और बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। मेरी बगल में जो भाई बैठे हुए हैं वे तो चाहते हैं कि मारे-का-सारा देश इनको लीज पर दे दिया जाए। केवल हिन्दुस्तान स्टील की ही बात नहीं है। वहां जो खराबी है उसको हमें दूर करना है। हमें उसको सुधारना है। हमें सुधार करके आगे बढ़ना है। समुचा मनेजमेंट

[श्री कामेश्वर सिंह]

हमको बदलना पड़े तो वह भी हम को करना पड़ेगा। मंत्री को भी बदलना पड़े तो वह भी हमको करना पड़ेगा। आप देखें कि पांडे कमेट्री ने क्या कहा था। उसके अनुसार :—

The committee has been critical of the actions of the top management concerned. The senior officers in managerial positions have dual roles to play.

आप सारी गलतियों को पोलिटिकल पार्टीज़ पर मढ़ देते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान स्टील के मैनेजमेन्ट ने जो मेमॉरैन्डम नेशनल लेबर कमीशन को दिया है उसमें से मैं पढ़ता हूँ :—

The memorandum suggests that the Government evolve a device to keep the influence of political parties out of the trade unions.

इसका अर्थ है कि साम्राज्यवादियों को पूरा अधिकार दे दिया जाए कि वे जिस तरह चाहें लेबर को दबा कर रखें, अधिक-से-अधिक उससे काम लें, अधिक-से-अधिक उमको सतारें। यह बात आगे नहीं चल सकती है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मैनेजमेंट की वजह से जो खराबियाँ पैदा होती हैं उनका दोष पोलिटिकल पार्टीज़ के मत्थे न मढ़ा जाए। जो ओवर स्टाफिंग है और जिसका जिक्र पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग कमेट्री की रिपोर्ट्स में है उसकी तरफ ध्यान दिया जाए। जो गड़बड़ियाँ चल रही हैं, वह बन्द हों। मैने आपके सामने हिन्दुस्तान स्टील के बारे में पांडे कमेट्री की रिपोर्ट का जिक्र किया है। परन्तु रिपोर्ट आने के बावजूद भी प्रधान मंत्री या मंत्रालयों के जो मंत्री हैं वे अपने मन की मर्जी के मुताबिक ही काम करते हैं। ये जो रिपोर्टें हैं ये लाइब्रेरियों की अलमारियों की ही शोभा को बढ़ाती हैं।

मेरा अनुरोध है कि मंत्री महोदय हमारी इन सब बातों का जवाब प्वाइंट-बाई-प्वाइंट दें। यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि एक जनरल जवाब दे दिया जाए और मामला खत्म कर दिया जाए। इसका कोई अर्थ नहीं होता है।

श्री शिंकरे (पंजिम) : एक सुभाषित कहा करते हैं कि हू भगवत मुझ में सामर्थ्य दो

मेरे मित्रों से मेरा बचाव करने को। मुझ में सामर्थ्य है शत्रुओं का मुकाबला करने की। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारा जो केन्द्रीय मंत्रिमंडल है वह शत्रुओं का तो सामना कर सकता है, उनका सामना करने की इसमें शक्ति है, सामर्थ्य है, लेकिन हमारे जो तथाकथित मित्र हैं उनका मुकाबला करने का सामर्थ्य तो उनमें नहीं है। इसलिये उनका मुकाबला करने में बहुत मुश्किल आती है।

18 Hrs.

अभी-अभी श्री नम्बियार और दूसरे लेफ्टिस्ट एलिमेंट्स ने हर एक कलर के सोशलिस्ट्स और कम्युनिस्ट्स ने कहा कि वे राष्ट्रीयकरण के समर्थक हैं, लेकिन उनकी कृति से राष्ट्रीयकरण को हानि पहुंचती है, वे अपने कार्यों से राष्ट्रीयकरण को धोखा देते हैं। हमारी हर एक पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग में जो हड़ताल और टूल-डाउन स्ट्राइक आदि होती हैं, उनसे उन कारखानों का काम बन्द होता है और उनको लास होता है। अगर सब का सोशलिस्ट और कम्युनिस्ट इस बात के लिए तैयार होते कि सब पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग में तीन चार साल के लिए इंडस्ट्रियल ट्रूस और पीस हो, वहां औद्योगिक शान्ति हो, तो इन कारखानों को लास न होता। स्थिति यह है कि वे कहते हैं कि वे राष्ट्रीयकरण चाहते हैं, लेकिन राष्ट्रीयकरण को धोखा भी बही देते हैं।

हमारे पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग के मैनेजमेंट, डायरेक्टरों और बोर्ड आदि में ऐसे लोग होते हैं, जिनका राष्ट्रीयकरण में विश्वास नहीं होता है। इस लिए वे भी राष्ट्रीयकरण को धोखा देते हैं। आज सुबह इस सदन में कहा गया था कि स्टेट ट्रेडिंग कॉर्पोरेशन का चेयरमैन पहले एक बड़ा बिज़नेसमैन था। जिन लोगों का राष्ट्रीयकरण में विश्वास नहीं है, वे पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग का मैनेजमेंट ठीक तरह से कैसे कर सकते हैं? उदाहरण के लिए अगर माननीय सदस्य, श्री पाटोदिया, जिन्होंने यह हिन्दुस्तान स्टील लिमिटेड का प्रश्न उपस्थित किया है उनकी किसी पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग के चेयर-

मैन के पद पर नियुक्ति हो जाये, तो वह पब्लिक अंडरटैकिंग ठीक प्रकार से नहीं चल सकेगा, क्योंकि उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण में विश्वास ही नहीं है। जिन लोगों को राष्ट्रीयकरण और पब्लिक अंडरटैकिंग में विश्वास ही नहीं है, वे तो उनमें सैबोटेज करना चाहेंगे। इस लिए ऐसे लोगों को इन पदों पर नियुक्त नहीं करना चाहिए।

राष्ट्रीयकरण की सबसेस के सम्बन्ध में हमारे लेफ्टिस्ट एलिमेंट्स पर ज्यादा जवाबदारी है। वे इस बात का जरूर ध्यान रखें कि भविष्य में सरकारी कारखानों में इंडस्ट्रियल टूस और औद्योगिक शान्ति हो। मैं सरकार से भी यह बिनती करूंगा कि चेयरमैन और डायरेक्टर्स आदि जवाबदारी के पदों पर ऐसे लोगों की नियुक्ति की जाये, जिनका राष्ट्रीयकरण पर हमेशा विश्वास रहे।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF STEEL, MINES AND METALS (SHRI P. C. SETHI) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to Shri Patodia and other hon. Members of the House who have shown a keen interest in the affairs of Hindustan Steel Limited. With the scarce and important resources of the country having been invested in Hindustan Steel it is quite legitimate on the part of Parliament Members as well as other persons in the country, the Press and other people, to show a keen interest in the affairs of Hindustan Steel. From this point of view I really express my deep thanks to the hon. Members for the various suggestions they have made and for the shortcomings that they have pointed out.

18.04 HRS.

[SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR *in the Chair*]

Sir, as far as Hindustan Steel is concerned I would only beg of the hon. Members of the House to look at the picture in its entirety and its proper perspective. From this point of view, I would like to go into a little background, so I would crave the indulgence of the hon. Members for some time in giving this background.

L38LSS/68—14

First of all, I would like to say that the entire price structure of Hindustan Steel Limited, as was envisaged by the Tariff Commission Report in 1962, was a little different. It is well-known to all the hon. Members of this House that the gross block of Hindustan Steel Limited is Rs. 2,500 per ton, as compared to Rs. 950 for Indian Iron & Steel and Rs. 1,250 for TISCO. The Tariff Commission went into this aspect. They were to go into this aspect from the point of view of arriving at standard cost. Instead of arriving at a standard cost, they arrived at a standard steel mill and for that purpose they picked up the Tata steel mills and they provided that the steel price should be fixed on the basis of gross block of Rs. 1,300 per ton. Naturally, this was a very hard thing for Hindustan Steel. If we consider the price structure of Hindustan Steel Limited and the other steel plants, the prices which are given to H.S.L. are Rs. 170 less per ton if we calculate it on the figure of Rs. 2,000 and not on Rs. 2,500, there could have been a formula and a retention price could have been given separately to each steel plant and this could have worked. But, unfortunately, this was not adopted. Not only that, Rs. 1,300 gross block was accepted and ultimately by an order of government it was later on reduced to Rs. 1,176 with the result that the price structure today is more favourably managed in favour of the private sector steel plants as compared to Hindustan Steel Limited.

Now in this debate I would certainly not defend Hindustan Steel by merely saying that it is only because of the long gestation period, as the hon. Member, Shri Patodia, said. There is another factor which I would like to bring to the notice of this House. We are now required to provide 7 per cent depreciation. It is true that according to the recent enactment 7 per cent depreciation has to be provided by the industries. But the 7 per cent advantage is given to the industry in order that they may save in income-tax. But, as far as Hindustan Steel is concerned, we have hardly any saving at the moment and, therefore, this 7 per cent depreciation is hitting us hard. In the year 1964-65, on account of the increase in depreciation from 5

[Shri P. C. Sethi]

per cent to 7 per cent, we had to provide Rs. 8 crores more; in 1965-66 we had to provide Rs. 9 crores more; in 1966-67 we had to provide about Rs. 11.5 crores more with the result that only on account of 2 per cent increase in depreciation that has to be provided, in the case of Hindustan Steel the total enhancement on this account alone is round about Rs. 25 crores.

So far as steel mills are concerned, the straight line method could be adopted for depreciation and the rate could be fixed at 5 per cent. We are making efforts in this direction, we are preparing a paper and we are approaching the concerned Ministries in this respect with the request that Hindustan Steel may be allowed to provide 5 per cent depreciation, although there would be a book adjustment, in order to bring about a better picture, so far as Hindustan Steel is concerned.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : What is the percentage prescribed by TISCO and others ?

SHRI P. C. SETHI : They are providing 7 per cent but they are getting benefit in the matter of income-tax.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : If you make profits, you will also get that benefit.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : That is true, but at present...

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : Do you mean to say that you conclude that for all time to come Hindustan Steel will be able to earn only if they have a higher price as compared to TISCO ?

SHRI P. C. SETHI : If a block of Rs. 2,000 had been accepted, the picture would have been entirely different. From 1962 to 1967 Hindustan Steel has shown a loss of Rs. 44 crores. If the gross block of Rs. 2,000 had been accepted for the prices, instead of a loss of Rs. 44 crores we would have shown a profit of Rs. 77 crores. That is the big difference.

AN HON. MEMBER : Jugglery of figures.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : If the price structure was only Rs. 2,000, not to speak of Rs. 2,500, even then the picture would have been different.

The other two or three points that I would like to bring to the kind notice of the House are, firstly, that we have an alloy steel plant at Durgapur—it is certainly in the gestation period if not the other mill steel plants—which has as yet shown a loss of Rs. 7 crores. Besides this, we have the fertiliser plant in Rourkela and that also is running into trouble. On the fertiliser plant we have lost about Rs. 9 crores as yet.

Besides this, I would also like to mention that we have provided amenities, welfare facilities and townships in all the steel plants costing about Rs. 70 crores. The overall picture of these townships and amenities that have been provided to labour and the residents of the townships is that each township is making a net loss. In the year 1966-67 the township account made a loss of Rs. 5.2 crores and in the year 1967-68 the loss was Rs. 5.9 crores. This is also an additional burden on the steel plants, that the steel plants have been loaded on account of these township facilities that are provided.

But because the public sector steel plants were constructed on green sites, it was absolutely essential for them that they should provide these facilities to labour. Therefore we had to do that. Even after doing this we have been able to provide houses only to 70 or 75 per cent of the labour; still we have to provide more houses to some of the labour. As an ideal employer the public sector steel plants are expected to provide more facilities and to that extent certainly we do not grudge it; but, at the same time, as far as accounting is concerned, it is a matter for thought whether these township accounts should be put separately and not be loaded on the steel plants. This is a matter for further consideration.

Apart from this, many other points have been raised by hon. Members. Certainly the question of product-mix is very important. But the public sector steel plants were woven round Government demand because they were expected to produce according to the planned economy and the growth of the country. For example, I would like to cite only one example

and not take much time of the House. It has been said here that the figure of steel production by 1970-71 was expected at the rate of 18 million tonnes. Although it was not 18 million tonnes—it was about 14 million tonnes—it is true that the steel demand has gone down and by 1970-71 we will be round about the figure of 9 or 10 million tonnes.

As I said, the present steel plants were woven round Government demand. For example, the Bhilai steel plant can now produce 5 lakh tonnes of rails. This was done because we were given to understand and it was the plan programme that the railways would be requiring that much of rails. Naturally on account of the Plan pause, recession and so many other factors the railway demand came down.

श्री कामेश्वर सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बात मुझे इसमें कहनी है। भिलाई स्टील से जो रेल बनती है उसके बारे में पब्लिक अंडर-टेकिंग कमेटी की रपट है कि जो भिलाई से रेल बनती है उसमें काफी रिजेक्ट हो जाती है। इस बारे में मंत्री महोदय का क्या कहना है ?

SHRI P. C. SETHI : That is a side issue.

श्री कामेश्वर सिंह : साइड ईश्यू कैसे है ? मंत्री महोदय, कुछ तो बताइए, कुछ तो जवाब दीजिए ।

SHRI P. C. SETHI : I will come to it later on.

As far as rail production is concerned, the railway demand has come down to 1,50,000 tonnes. Although we are trying to export rails, but the requirement of other countries is in other dimensions and, therefore, we had to make changes in the way of rail-making, with the result that we were able to produce more rails for export.

SHRI NAMBIAR : The Railways say that they provided for more capacity thinking that steel will be produced more and they are unable to use the siding capacity. That is what exactly the Railways say. You see the contradiction.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : This is a well known fact that as far as Bhilai is concerned, they have got an installed and production capacity of 5 lakh tonnes of rails per year while the demand of the railways has gone down to the tune of 1.5 lakh tonnes. This year we were able to export rails to Sudan and Iran and we are trying in other countries also. This is only one example that I have given.

There is very little scope in these plants for diversification, but wherever there is scope we are trying to do it. Therefore I would beg of the House to consider that it is not as if we do not want to diversify when we can do it and we want to produce only what is not being sold in the market. These plants, as I have said, were mostly considered and woven round Government demand and on account of the recession and plan pause, certainly to that extent, these plants have been the most hard hit; while the private sector steel plants were conceived and constructed earlier and they came into the market much earlier. Therefore, it is true that their sales organisation is comparatively better. They are producing products according to the requirements of market. From that point of view, to that extent, they are, certainly, in a better position than the Hindustan Steel Ltd. But, at the same time, I would say that the sales organisation in the Hindustan Steel Ltd., certainly, is being geared up and we are making all endeavours in this direction. We have asked the Board to consider how best we can gear up both our export market as well as our internal market.

Apart from this, the hon. Members have also mentioned about labour troubles and the management problems. It is true that the situation in Durgapur is, certainly, causing us anxiety and concern. In Rourkela it is not as bad. In Rourkela, of late, it has improved and, in Bhilai, it is considerably better. But in Durgapur, it is, certainly, causing us concern.

श्री कामेश्वर सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक विनती मुझे मंत्री महोदय से करनी है। बहुत

[श्री कामेश्वर सिंह]

आश्यक है। इसके बीच की बात है। वह भी भूल जायेंगे और मैं भी भूल जाऊंगा...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You cannot go on asking questions while the Minister is making a speech. If the Minister yields, you can ask a question. It is left to the Minister.

श्री कामेश्वर सिंह : ईन्ड करने का सवाल नहीं है। मेरा यह कहना है।

SHRI P. C. SETHI : I would request him to ask questions after I finish.

श्री कामेश्वर सिंह : ठीक है। इसके बीच की बात थी, इसलिए मैंने सोचा कि आपको भी सुविधा रहेगी।

SHRI P. C. SETHI : I would like to cite certain examples. In the year 1967, for example, in Durgapur, there were 95 gheraos; there were 5 strikes; there were 41 demonstrations; there were 57 days of stoppage of work and there were 167 days of go-slow tactics. This is the position.

As far as the inter-union rivalries or Government playing politics is concerned, I would like to bring to the notice of the House that it is absolutely left to the State Governments to recommend recognition of a particular union because it is the Labour Department of the State Government which verifies the membership. The former Minister even offered that, instead of the State Governments verifying it, let some independent authority be created so that some independent authority which is of a semi-judicious nature can go into this problem of recognition of the unions and that they can enquire into the membership. In Rourkela, we did not recognise the INTUC. After the State Government recommended the HMS union, we immediately recognised that. Therefore, it is not from our point of view that we are trying to help a particular type of union. We are prepared to abide by the recommendation of the State Government and, to that extent, we leave it to the State Government. If there is any possibility of creating an independent authority which could judiciously look into the problem of membership and recognition, certainly, we

will be prepared to accept that point of view. But no decision could be arrived at, as you are also aware, because some unions were pressing for a secret ballot while the other unions were not prepared for a secret ballot. On account of this factor, no particular decision could be arrived at as far as this is concerned.

Now, with regard to the productivity also, I would like to say it is true that the productivity in our country, as compared to USA, U.K. and Japan, is low. It is not as low as the hon. Member, Mr. Patodia, has said. He has given a figure of 59. In our expanded programme of Rourkela, Durgapur and Bhilai, our productivity would reach somewhere between 75 to 89. But today it is, certainly, in the range of 60 to 65. To that extent, as compared to USA and UK, it is, certainly, low. But here also we cannot say our productivity is completely low. If we are able to touch a figure of 89 and if you compare with 102 of U.K., then, certainly, we would be considerably improving the situation. But I would admit that today our productivity is low. There is the scope for improvement. To that extent, our efficiency and productivity has to be improved.

Recently, we got a study conducted in regard to the work-force of Bokaro. According to the study, it has come to our light that for 1.7 million stage, we would be requiring the work-force of 13,000 to 14,000 persons. Now in the one million stage of Durgapur, for example, we have got inside the perimeter of the plant and the factory about 18,000 people employed. From this point of view it will be realised that certainly the working force in the plants are more, but we have no idea of retrenching these people. Therefore, we advocated the idea that whenever expansions take place—and expansions do take place; for example, in Durgapur from 1 to 1.6 million tonnes, in Rourkela from 1 to 1.8 million tonnes and in Bhilai from 1 to 2.5 million tonnes and now from 2.5 to 3.2 million tonnes—we would be prepared to absorb the surplus labour in the additional capacity that is created. But now certain

demands are being put up by certain unions that they would not start or commence work on the expanded unit unless we accepted the work-force dictated by them. I am afraid, as far as the management of Hindustan Steel is concerned or even the management of the plants separately is concerned, it would be very difficult for them to accept the work-force dictated by the Union, which is not based on any scientific study done by industrial engineers or any other competent authority. Therefore, to that extent, certainly we will have to take care and it would be difficult for the management to yield to this that they would be accepting the work-force figure of the union. . . .

SHRI NAMBIAR : Did you call all the unions in a conference and discuss the subject ?

SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH : They would never do that.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : I will be glad to do it.

I would like to cite one example instead of bothering the House with more details. For example, in the Durgapur Steel Plant, an additional lime-stone capacity was created. The old unit of this lime-stone carrying capacity, the old conveyor, was out of order and, therefore, the work-force which was working for this unit was asked to work in the new unit. They said, "We would not work in the new unit because it is in the expanded capacity and unless accept the work-force of this unit as well as that unit, we will not work". This is the type of difficulty that we are facing, but we are certainly trying to meet the situation. But it is not a fact, and I would completely repudiate the charge, that we are averse to the labour situation or that we are not sympathetic to them or that we are inimical to them. It is not so. As far as the public sector is concerned, the labour is as much responsible and they are as much a part and parcel of the industry as the managerial people or the management. Therefore, from this point of view I would like to stress that certainly, as far as we are concerned, we are not behaving in that

way or in that fashion towards the labour.

Having said all this, I would certainly admit that it is not as if everything is bright in Hindustan Steel Limited. But certainly there is one bright aspect and I would certainly call it a silver lining as far as Hindustan Steel is concerned, and that is with regard to export. Hon. Member, Shri Patodia, said that we should not construct or build capacity in our country only for export purposes. That is not so. The NCAER has conducted a study and we are having a realistic picture of the situation. But to the extent the demand for a particular commodity is not here, we are trying to export. We are not trying to put up a factory only for export purposes. But we have to balance between certain things and it is from this point of view that we are taking up the construction of Bokaro; it is because we are short in sheets and plates, and even the NCAER study shows that by 1970-71 we shall be short in sheets and plates by 1.2 million tonnes. Therefore, Bokaro is being built. If we do not build Bokaro, we shall be importing sheets and plates to the tune of Rs. 90 crores a year in our country. Therefore, it is not only for export purposes that we are building. We are building for meeting the indigenous demand, but at the same time whatever is surplus, we are trying to export it. I am glad to say that the performance of the Hindustan Steel, as far as exports are concerned, has been considerably good. In the year 1965-66, they had done only Rs. 2.5 crores, but in the year 1966-67, they did Rs. 9 crores and in the year 1967-68, they have done Rs. 30 crores.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : What about export of billets to Ceylon? (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER : 60,000 tonnes ?

SHRI P. C. SETHI : It is not 60,000 tonnes. We have made a contract for 80,000 tonnes to Ceylon. I am very happy. The situation is this. There was a time when units were not being lifted. To that extent, we have certainly improved the situation. Now the market

[Shri P. C. Sethi]

is picking up. When the grades were not being sold, we tried to export them. Therefore, an order for 80,000 tonnes has been booked for Ceylon and as yet, shortage is not being felt.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : Will he check up again? This is not correct.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : This is my information. If there is any shortage of billets in this country, to that extent we would certainly try to restrict exports.

We agree that with regard to many of these items, they were not being lifted and there was consequently a huge stock lying in the mills. Now that we have started exporting, perhaps the fear is expressed that we may be faced with some shortage. That will be taken care of.

Therefore, as I was saying, the export of HSL has improved. But I would certainly admit that there are certain deficiencies which have to be gone into. For example, the Pande Committee brought to our notice the fact of poor maintenance. From this point of view, the steel plants have to be geared up. It has also been shown by several inquiries and committees that our inventory is comparatively high. This is because we had a turn-key job in our steel plants on account of this factor, we were asked to import certain spares, both in the insurance category and such categories which we required every year. We had appointed a committee to look into this. Their report is available. Now we are trying to fix certain norms and estimates and based on that we try to reduce the inventory to the extent possible. So we are certainly looking into this aspect.

SHRI N. K. SOMANI : They are repeating the same thing in Bokaro. They are getting it on a turn-key basis.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : If we receive the drawings for spares, to that extent we shall be depending on our own workshops and to that extent, we shall not have to import; to that extent, our inventory shall be in control.

Then there is another malady also. The Pande Committee and other committees have brought out the fact that

certain technical innovations have taken place. We have to introduce them.

Shri Patodia mentioned the high consumption of coking coal in our blast furnaces. It is true that the consumption is comparatively high compared to Japan. But I would request him to compare like with like. In Japan, they are using coking coal with 6-7 per cent ash content while we are using coking coal with blends which have got anything between 25 and 28 per cent ash content. With the result that we have to have the coal washed in our washeries, and even after that the ash content remains 16-17 per cent. Therefore, our coke rate is certainly high. But certain technical improvements have come to our notice. For example, by using the sinter, we can reduce the coke rate by 100. To that extent, we are trying to introduce more sinters in our use.

There are many other things which have been pointed out. For example, oxygen injection and oil injection in the operation of blast furnaces. All these things have come to our notice and remedial action is being taken so that we improve upon our productivity. From this point of view, any valuable suggestions not only from Shri Patodia but any other persons or body of persons will be welcome and we would certainly consider them for introduction and thus improve upon our technical efficiency. We are moving in that direction.

Something has been said about the management of the plants. It is true that as far as technical personnel are concerned, we have created a lot of technical personnel in our country, but as far as the managerial capacity is concerned, we do not have experienced managerial personnel in our country for managing such huge steel plants.

AN HON. MEMBER : Question.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : We have to draw from various sources persons having administrative ability.

SHRI KAMESWAR SINGH : Like Shri Chandy?

SHRI P. C. SETHI : I would like to repudiate completely what Shri Kame-

shwar Singh said that we have taken in Shri Chandy under certain pressure from the Prime Minister or anybody else.

SHRI KAMESWAR SINGH : He is a Bar-at-Law.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : He is an able administrator. He joined on the 29th May. It is only two or three months since he has joined and it is too early for Shri Kameshwar Singh or anybody for that matter to judge about his performance. He has administrative capacity and he was associated with the Food Corporation. He has graduated from the London University. From all points of view, he has administrative capacity. Therefore, he has been selected. It is true we were lacking managerial capacity and that has been one of our shortcomings. That is why we were trying to find personnel here and there.

The structure of the board of directors was referred to. It is true that in 1963, the then Minister Mr. Subramaniam introduced a change and thereby demolished the functional directors. But later on the reports of the Administrative Reforms Committee and the Pandey Committee also referred to these points. One hon. Member said that the meetings were thinly attended; sometimes the directors did not take that much interest and therefore it was thought proper to change the management again. That is why the then hon. Minister who was in charge of this portfolio Dr. Chenna Reddy announced in the House some changes. We have again announced that we shall have functional directors in the board of management. That is why we are going in for functional directors. We shall be having two deputy chairmen and a full-time chairman. These are the structural changes that will take place according to the announcement of the former Minister. As soon as they come into being, the type of management would change.

With regard to the division of powers between the plant and the management, certainly we shall again go into that aspect in consultation with the chairman of the HSL and we shall try to improve those things.

The hon. Member Mr. Patodia asked why the surplus labour could not be used for construction. If the surplus labour force is in the perimeter of the plant, it is difficult to use it for construction purposes. We have the very sad experience of doing construction work departmentally in Bhilai. Whenever the construction work is done by a contractor, when the work is finished, the labour force goes away and the contractor is not asked any question. In Bhilai we got the construction work done departmentally and now that the work is coming to an end, we find it difficult to retrench these people. There are all pressures from all sides to absorb this labour in the main steel works. It is difficult to do so because the main steel works are already overstaffed. Therefore, we shall have to take a clear decision that wherever the construction work is done, we shall not keep that force or bring that labour force on the regular muster rolls. It was from that point of view that the Hindustan Construction Corporation was started so that work could be taken up by them and the work forces could acquire the required experience in construction work. In the initial stages, it was envisaged that we should have one steel plant every year. But now that is not the position. As I said the Hindustan Construction Company was envisaged from this point of view. But that is not possible at this stage.

I think I have answered all the points raised by the hon. Members. I again thank all the Members for taking part in this debate. . . . (*Interruptions.*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Minister made a promise that he would answer a question by Shri Kameshwar Singh at the end. That promise was made to one Member. So, I will only allow him, Mr. Kameshwar Singh, to put his question. (*Interruption*) Please listen to me. I am sorry I cannot accommodate more Members.

AN HON. MEMBER : The Minister is willing.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Even if he is willing, there should be a limit. And we should be satisfied with the debate

[MR. CHAIRMAN]

that we have had already. If Mr. Kameswar Singh wants to ask a question, he can put a very brief question and a very brief reply can be given.

श्री कामेश्वर सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने कहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान स्टील मैनेजमेंट ने जो नेशनल लेबर कमीशन को मेमोरेंडम दिया है उसमें कहा है कि जो यहां पर मिसमैनेजमेंट लेबर में है उसके लिए पोलिटिकल पार्टिज रेस्पॉसिबिल हैं। मेरा कहना यह है कि इस दोष को आप राजनीतिक पार्टियों पर क्यों

डालते हैं और क्या इस बात को आप मेमोरेंडम में से हटाएंगे ?

SHRI P. C. SETHI : I have not come across the report. We do not want to bring in any political party, but it is a well-known fact that in the steel plants, on account of the inter-union rivalries, there are many troubles.

18.37 Hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, August 14, 1968/Sravana 23, 1890 (Saka).