

Report of the Estimates Committee on the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Agriculture)—Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute, Mandapam Camp.

12.02 HRS.

MOTION RE : REPORTS ON INDUSTRIAL PLANNING AND LICENSING POLICY

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI F. A. AHMED) : I beg to move :

“That the Interim and Final Reports on Industrial Planning and Licensing Policy by Dr. R. K. Hazari, laid on the Table of the House on the 7th April and 16th November, 1967, respectively be taken into consideration.”

In July 1966, Prof. Hazari was appointed honorary consultant to the Planning Commission to review the operation of industrial licensing policy and to suggest in the light of the present stage of economic development where and in what directions modifications should be made in the licensing policy. Dr. Hazari submitted his interim report in December 1966 and this was followed by the final report submitted by him in September 1967. The recommendations in the interim report related mainly to the licensing system and procedure and the final report includes recommendations relating to tax, and credit policy. The analysis of licensing policy and framework as well as the major recommendations on licensing policy made in the final report are substantially the same as in the interim report.

Sir, the major recommendations made in the Interim Report are, firstly, Government should select certain basic industries for development as priority industries and should pre-empt foreign exchange, etc. for those industries. Secondly, any project with fixed assets of Re. 1 crore or above or having capital good imports of Rs. 25 lakhs and above should be considered for approval by

Government only if it is supported by a thorough feasibility report. Thirdly, licences in the priority sectors should be selected after inviting something like tenders. Fourthly, the non-priority sector should primarily look after itself so far as their foreign exchange requirements are concerned. Fifthly, as a measure to prevent the growth of monopoly, normally the big business-houses should not be given more than one licence and/or capital good clearance in each industry; and also that, as a matter of policy, certain traditional activities should be closed to specified larger industrial houses and their associates. Sixthly, industries amenable to regional allocation should be specified in advance and wherever feasible should be indicated at the beginning of each Plan period. Seventhly, the exemption limit for licensing of new industrial undertakings should be raised from Rs. 25 lakhs to Rs. 1 crore, and for substantial expansion it should be 25 per cent of existing licensed capacity or Rs. 25 lakhs whichever is more and for new articles it should be fixed at Rs. 25 lakhs. Lastly, an application for capital goods clearance should be deemed to have lapsed automatically if it is not approved two years.

In the Final Report, in so far as the licensing system is concerned, the following additional recommendations have been made : to reduce administrative delays, foreign exchange quotas should be allocated on an agency basis to the State Directors of Industries for disbursement to units below Rs. 7.5 lakhs. It has been further suggested that if the experiment is successful this may be followed for units up to Rs. 25 lakhs. Secondly, the concept of ‘new articles’ should be abolished. According to Dr. Hazari, there does not appear to be any meaningful or purposive distinction between substantial expansion and new article. He, therefore, recommends that, if the new article requires little or no investment except effective utilization of existing investment, issue of a licence would be a futile exercise. On the other hand, if the manufacturer of a new article requires a substantial investment, it should be treated as a case of substantial expansion. Thirdly, in so

[Shri F. A. Ahmed]

far as substantial expansion is concerned, in the Interim Report it was suggested that the exemption limit should be 25 per cent of existing licensed capacity or Rs. 25 lakhs whichever is more; it has now been suggested that the exemption limit should be up to Rs. 25 lakhs or 25 per cent of the existing investment in capital equipment. He has at the same time suggested that no restriction should be imposed on the installation of domestically-produced equipments.

Fourthly, the purpose of licensing should be to regulate investment; not product-wise capacity or production. Fifthly, industrial licences should be valid for a maximum period of two years and if they are not implemented by that time they should lapse automatically without any formalities.

In so far as tax and credit policies are concerned, Prof. Hazari has suggested now in his final report that credit planning should assume the role of principal strategic control for guidance of investment in both fixed assets and inventories. Nationalisation of banks has been indicated for effective credit planning.

In fiscal policy, Prof. Hazari has suggested linking of major tax concessions such as development rebates, tax holidays, etc., with the plan priorities; and the use of excise duties to mop up excess profitability where it is not consistent with priorities.

In regard to import policy, Prof. Hazari has suggested that over a period of time the import policy should be liberalized in respect of those products where the cost differential between domestic production and imports is so adverse as to make domestic production uneconomic.

After a preliminary examination of the Interim Report, Government have already appointed a Committee under the Chairmanship of Prof. M. S. Thacker to enquire into the working of the industrial licensing system during the past 10 years. The terms of reference of this Committee were indicated in my statement in this House on the 19th July, 1967. A Committee of the Cabinet

has also been set up to review the overall economic and industrial policies of Government to see how far the objectives for which they were framed have been achieved and whether any modifications are needed in those policies.

Apart from recommendations directly relating to industrial licensing policy, Dr. Hazari's final report also contains certain recommendations relating to tax and credit policies. It has also been suggested that it would be difficult to undertake separate credit planning unless the link control of industry and banks in the same hands is snapped by nationalisation of banks. On the main question of nationalisation of banks, Government have already announced their decision in this House on the 14th December, 1967.

The Thacker Committee and the Special Cabinet Committee to which I have made a reference are still at work. It will, therefore, not be possible for Government to indicate their decisions on the various recommendations contained in Dr. Hazari's interim and final reports during the course of this debate. I can, however, assure hon. Members that all the suggestions which they may offer will be given due consideration before final decisions are taken on the recommendations contained in the two reports.

MR. SPEAKER: There are some amendments. I shall first place the motion before the House. Motion moved:

"That the Interim and Final Reports on Industrial Planning and Licensing Policy by Dr. R. K. Hazari, laid on the Table of the House on the 7th April and 16th November, 1967 respectively, be taken into consideration.

Are hon. Members moving their amendments?

श्री सु० अ० लाल० (कासगंज) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अभी बताया गया है कि गवर्नमेंट ने थैकर कमेटी

MR. SPEAKER: He will get a chance to speak.

श्री सु० अ० खां० : आप मेरी बात सुन तो लें इस के अलावा और कोई मीका नहीं होता है कि आप हम से यहां कहें ।

MR. SPEAKER : Let me proceed with the amendments.

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA (Mandya) : Sir, I beg to move :

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, name-ly :—

"This House, having considered the Interim and Final Reports on Industrial Planning and Licensing Policy by Dr. R. K. Hazari, laid on the Table of the House on the 7th April and 16th November, 1967 respectively, is of the opinion that the Government has miserably failed to implement the licensing policy in a manner so as to curb the concentration of wealth in a few hands as directed by the Constitution and has deliberately pursued a policy influenced by big capitalist interests which has resulted in the growth of big industrial houses to the detriment of progress of socialist economy in this country." (1)

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Sir, I beg to move :

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, name-ly :—

"This House, having considered the Interim and Final Reports on Industrial Planning and Licensing Policy by Dr. R. K. Hazari, laid on the Table of the House on the 7th April and 16th November, 1967 respectively, holds the Government responsible for showing favouritism in the matter of granting licences and therefore recommends to Government :—

- (i) to amend the Companies Act banning donations to Political Parties; and

- (ii) to appoint a Commission of Inquiry to investigate into the whole affair." (2)

श्री सु० अ० खां० : मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि कोई मामला बिजिनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी में डिसाइड होता है और यहां पर आ जाता है । मेरे जैसे लोगों के लिए, जो उस के सदस्य नहीं हैं, इस वकत कुछ कहने के अलावा और कोई रास्ता नहीं है ।

MR. SPEAKER : For the Congress Members the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs was there. Let us proceed now—
Shri Amin—

श्री सु० अ० खां० : यह बड़ी ज्यादाती है ।

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai) : Sir, since Shri Krishna has moved his amendment, which is the first amendment on the list, and since he is new to the House I think he should be asked to speak first.

MR. SPEAKER : I will call him also.

SHRI R. K. AMIN (Dhandhuka) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to offer my comments on the interim as well as final reports of Dr. Hazari, I would like to make the comments on the four broad points which have been covered by Dr. Hazari. The first point he has touched is with regard to the wider aspects of the planning on the basis of which he has made certain recommendations (Interruption). He has also covered the licensing system as such and made some suggestions on the licensing system. He has also made a study of big business houses and indicated that it has led to monopoly and concentration of the economic power. Lastly, in making recommendations about his report on the licensing system he has made certain recommendations about the fiscal and credit policies. All these four broad aspects I would like to touch in my comments.

Before I do so, I would like to say that this is a report behind which I smack a conspiracy. I think that it has been motivated not from the point of

[Shri R. K. Amin]

view of an academic study or any objective study but something else is behind it, some ulterior motive is behind it. It is apparent from a study of it; the way in which statistics have been utilised, the way in which statistics have been presented, the way in which conclusions have been brought in the way in which only a one-man committee was appointed and also, I would go a step further and say, the way in which the conclusions of the report were out before the Government could make deliberations on them,—all these prove that there is some ulterior motive behind this report. What was the demand? Was there any popular demand for the appointment of a one-man committee in the Planning Commission? There was none. If there was a demand for a detailed study of the concentration of economic power or monopoly in this country, then there were already two committees working on them—the Mahalanobis Committee and the Monopoly Commission. Both of them were working on this question. They studied the problem and they presented their reports. So, was there any need of Hazari Committee, a one-man committee, just to look into a very limited number of files and come to the conclusion about the broader aspects of our economy? I think there is a conspiracy, either on the part of the Civil Servants of the Planning Commission or on the part of certain people who are motivated to impute certain motives to make a scapegoat for the failures of planning so that they can cover up their failures, or it may be an internal strife between the Ministry and the Planning Commission, because they may be envious about the licensing system which is at present under the control of the Ministry and the Planning Commission wanted to have a control over this. That is why, knowing that Dr. Hazari has already made a study of it, he has already taken a side, he has already published his book on corporate finances as early as 1960-61, knowing his views, they made a plan, a conspiracy, since they found that Dr. Hazari was a convenient medium to them, and that is why he was appointed as a one-man committee

Having been appointed in June 1966, within a month he presents a note as if he has already come prepared in the Planning Commission and presented a note and this is just another one. Then he presents a supplementary note within three months and by about December he presents an interim report. When the interim report was published, there were lots of comments in the economic weeklies and elsewhere in the press, but he refused to take into account those comments and criticism and even in the final report he stuck to the same plea which he was making, although it was very apparent that he had committed lot of blunders in presenting that report. That is why I smell something of a conspiracy behind it and that is why I say that it is not a fair study, an objective study and, therefore, the conclusions arrived at by the report should not be taken into account.

Let me now come to the wider perspective which has been presented in the report, which is about planning. Now he has indicated that we should have planning by targets *i.e.*, the command economy of the Russian type. So far, in the three Plans we had the same type of planning, we gave it up and we propose to go again to planning next year. But, before we do so, this is the time for us to ponder over and decide that we should not commit the same blunders which we committed during the last fifteen years. If we refuse to take lessons from it, I am sure we will go the same disastrous way we were going so far.

I would like to say here that it should not be misunderstood that we are against planning. But we do not want target planning, we do not want command economy; we want planning for creating a climate of growth. The planning should be done with a view to create a climate of growth by utilising the entrepreneurial talent of the people, by harnessing our energies for the maximum output in our country. That is the type of planning we want to see introduced in this country, planning for increased production, not planning by target or planning for a command

economy with licence, control and all that which will ruin us. Therefore, before taking into consideration the recommendations made by Dr. Hazari, we have to remember that at the back of his mind he had a particular type of planning, and that is why I say that his recommendations are irrelevant in so far as such individual studies are concerned.

I now come to the licensing system as such. I hold that in order to prove that the licensing system has not worked well so far, it has led to pre-emption of capacity, it has led to multiple system of licensing, it has encouraged the concentration of economic power in certain fields, it was not necessary to study the statistical information which has been presented by Dr. Hazari.

He himself has said, "My data are partial, incomplete and in some cases not fully reliable; they should be taken as rough indicators of magnitudes, not precise amounts." He himself has further stated in his report that his data suffer from severe limitations. He also suggests that within the limited period of six months allotted for the study it was not possible for him to examine the extent to which implementation of licensing policy has achieved its objectives. Further, he has said that the only statistical information which he has utilised is from the files of the Industry and Mineral Divisions of the Planning Commission and not from elsewhere. Not even the other aspects have been co-ordinated by him. It is only on a limited study that he would like to arrive at the conclusions applicable to the entire economy.

In the final report he has given tables after tables—tables by size of firms, tables by number of applications made, tables by number of applications granted. These things are applicable if it is a fair sample. But what has he done? He has taken 1,000 licensing applications out of which the data is available for 500; 500 have been rejected and he has taken up only 500. Even that data he has taken at the time the application was given. He has not pursued the data. It means that he had no fair sample and if you have not got a fair sample, in statistics you will say that you cannot

come to the conclusions which are applicable to the entire population or the whole case.

If I come to the licensing system as such, I know it for certain that the system itself is such that it cannot work properly. You know, you have to apply for a licence and you do not know whether you can get the licence or not. There are about 7 or 8 committees which will go through it. One does not know when the obstacle will come. You cannot be sure about foreign collaboration unless and until you get a licence. So, only when you get a licence, then alone you can try for foreign collaboration. And those people will say, "Unless you get foreign collaboration, you cannot be given a licence". You are required to have a licence even for a new unit, for changing the name, for changing the location, for even producing the by-product. If you are proposing to have one more by-product, you must have a licence for that also. For a number of things you require a licence.

Who can meet those demands? Your public sector itself is keeping 45 guest houses in Delhi. Why are they keeping 45 guest houses in Delhi? It is in order to move the files. Who are the small entrepreneurs who can keep guest houses in Delhi? Who are those persons who can wait for it? Who are the persons who can invest first the money before getting a licence? Having got the licence, who are the persons who are having the contacts with the foreign collaborators to get better terms so that they can confirm the licence? For all silly little things letters of intent are being granted. If the name is to be changed, if you want to go from one location to another location, you require a licence. The system is such. It does not require any statistical study. Even by the study of the system you can state that it is bound to lead to pre-emption. If I make a rule that those who will stand in a queue in the morning will receive a particular thing, anybody will be tempted to keep his relatives and other people to stand in the queue so that he can get it. Your system is bad. Your licensing authority is bad. That is why somebody could take advantage

[Shri R. K. Amin]

of it and a number of licences were granted. If at all Birla had got the licences—whether he has got it or not has to be examined—it is the fault of the licensing system as such; it is the fault of the implementation of the system as such rather than the fault of the individuals who got the licences.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : He had to work under that system.

SHRI R. K. AMIN : In the final report that Shri Hazari has presented the shortcomings of the licensing system had been mentioned, such as, the lack of overall policy guidelines to reinforce and supplement the Plan targets, tendency to rely on certain *ad hoc* criteria, losing sight of the relevant importance of different projects and their products, lack of relationship between fulfilment or actual fructification of licences and the lack of assurance of resources even though the licence has been issued. I even add two more, namely, that it can by itself never achieve the objectives of economic policy. The entire objective of economic policy, like regional balance, encouraging the small entrepreneurs, stopping the concentration of economic power and encouraging technology—these are economic objectives that have to be fulfilled by the licensing system which the licensing system cannot do. It is beyond it; it cannot do it. Why? You take the total investible resources in the country out of which 60 per cent is commanded by the public sector and only 40 per cent remains. Out of 40 per cent, about 20 to 25 per cent goes to the private sector in the field of agriculture. So, only 15 to 17 per cent of the investible resources remains for the investment in the private sector on the industrial side. There also, there are small-scale industries and the large-scale industries. In the case of the large-scale industries, hardly 10 per cent of the investible resources of the country remains. By controlling this 10 per cent, can you control the pattern of all the hundred per cent? Certainly not. Can you control the pattern of all the investment in the small-scale industries sector? Certainly not. The nature of the licensing system is such that you

cannot go to small-scale entrepreneurs and you cannot also go to those who have no means to come into the picture. Your system was such that it was not in a position to carry out what you had imposed upon it.

Moreover, since the objectives were conflicting among themselves, on one side, you could achieve one, say in the field of small-scale industries, then you could not achieve the technological development. If you can achieve the regional balance, you cannot get the fullest economy of the foreign exchange component. They were conflicting among themselves and because they were conflicting, they gave a good deal of power in the hands of the administrators. If all the powers are in the hands of the administrators, criteria cannot work. You know how bribe and corruption takes place. That is why I say the system itself cannot work because you are imposing a burden to carry out those objectives which are inconsistent among themselves.

Now, let me come to the main charge which has been put on the licensing system, the charge being that it has encouraged the concentration of economic power and monopoly. Regarding this, I would like to discuss monopoly in four important ways, (1) concentration of economic power *i.e.* in which sense you accept the concentration of economic power, (2) monopoly which necessarily means monopolistic restriction and monopolistic attitudes; (3) monopoly and bigness of firms, are they synonymous, do they go hand in hand together and (4) what will be the fate of monopoly in the context of the growth of economy. You must have all these four different aspects in your mind, then alone you can say whether a particular business house has misbehaved or a particular house has done his job.

Now, about the concentration of economic power, I would only say that the Monopolies Commission has given two meanings, (1) concentration country-wise and (2) concentration product-wise. In so far as countrywise concentration is concerned, it has said in very categorical terms that concentration of economic power was there during the Second World War when only the organised

industry was ready to take up the challenge. We wanted a rapid economic development and, therefore, it is they who could have done the job. When the organised industry had a big profit, instead of distributing those profits, they kept it as a surplus and ploughed back in the further development of the industry so that, Monopoly Commission concluded that the concentration of economic power on a country basis was good for the economic development of the country.

Now, only the second thing remains, concentration of economic power examined on the products basis. Let me take the products basis. Now, we say, in our economy, it is not monopoly but it is the monopolistic attitude which is unhealthy which comes in the way of economic development and monopolistic attitude means restriction of the output, restricting the entry and raising the prices of the products. If from Dr. Hazari's Report had I found those things, had he made a study of certain firms and indicated that they raised the prices unnecessarily or they made a profit unnecessarily or they had restricted the entry, I would have certainly said that monopoly is against the interests of the economic development of the country. But from the report, interim as well as final, I do not find any indication that a monopolistic attitude has been shown by any of the firms which he has studied.

Now, let me take the question of bigness and monopoly. You know it for certain that large scale unit is not necessarily bad. Large scale gives you the economies of scale. If you go beyond the economies of scale or the optimum Has he made any study in his report unit, then probably the largeness may be in order to have the economic power, which indicates that here is the optimum unit, say, in pulp or in rayon or in the cement industry, and beyond that optimum unit, the firms in the Birla group or in the Mafatlal Group or the Tata Group have gone?—and also they have gone beyond on with a view to acquiring the economic power rather than the economies of scale. If they had gone beyond the economies of scale, then I

would have certainly said that it is monopoly power. But from the study one cannot ever come to the conclusion that they have gone in order to increase the largeness simply because they wanted largeness and not because of economies of scale.

You know, Sir, that these are the days of automation. Nowadays, even a company like the GEC is merged with the Associated Electric Industries. Because of automation in Germany, bigger and bigger industries are coming into existence. The technology is changing day by day, and when the technology is changing day by day, the optimum unit is also changing day by day. In the context of the technology, in the context of the need for meeting foreign competition, very soon we shall be required in all our products to meet foreign competition, and unless and until our costs are low, we would not be in a position to meet the foreign competition in view of that, we shall have to go in for a bigger optimum size. In view of the fact that automation is coming quickly, your idea of bigness has to be quite different today from what it was some ten or fifteen or twenty years ago.

Take the instance of our very very big firms. Take, for instance, the first ten big firms in our country. They are not big by any standard in America. Take the 200 big American firms, and compare our ten big firms with them, and you will find that our big firms are just pigmies, and our big firms do not stand anywhere in so far as bigness is concerned.

Therefore, I urge that one should not confuse bigness with monopoly. Along with this aspect, the growth of the economy also shall have to be kept in mind. When the country is going ahead with new development and new industries, will there not be some units which will be expanding in the initial period? In the initial period, you are bound to have one or two firms which will be first working on an experimental basis, and as soon as they find success, they would immediately go ahead to the large scale industry. So, please do not bother and

[Shri R. K. Amin]

do not confuse bigness with monopoly. When they start very low and they become big, do not think that they are becoming big simply because they wanted to become big. Do not confuse it that way. So, in the initial period, for a particular commodity, if there are one or two firms, do not consider them as monopolies, because they are coming up initially. In 1950 we did not have any production of fertilisers. Now we are producing fertilisers in three or four firms. Do we say that we have the monopoly of fertilisers? Certainly not? It is inevitable for such a thing to happen in the growth economy. In the growth economy for a time, just as you give a patent and just as you give a good-will, likewise, for the time being some sort of monopoly may be necessary in order to give an incentive. Then alone they will spend money on technological development, and on research. And when they do the research they will implement the research only when they are assured for some time of a particular type of market. This is very necessary. It was necessary when England started its economic development. It was necessary in America. It will be necessary for any under-developed country and it will be necessary for India also to give that incentive.

Therefore, bigness of one or two firms should not be confused with concentration of economic power or monopoly, and if anyone believes it as monopoly then he just kills it. So, let us not do like that. If we do it, then we shall nip it in the bud, the very economic development which is taking place in our country.

As an example of concentration of economic power, in the report, the house of Birlas has been taken up. Now, what are the charges which have been imposed upon Birla? There are three or four charges which have been imposed upon Birla. The first charge is that they have concentrated on consumer goods industries and have not bothered about basic industries. The second is that they have spread out all over the country, they are manufacturing all sorts of products and are not confining themselves to two or three industries. The third

charge is that they have got the licences, but these licences have not gone through the Capital Goods Committee, that something happened in between and they must have manipulated the licences without these passing through the Capital Goods Committee. It has even been mentioned that as compared to other business houses, the number of licences they have got is disproportionately large over a period of years. It is said that there were 938 applications out of which they sanctioned 375 licences, that is a big number of licences was taken by them and by doing it they have pre-empted the capacity.

Let us take these charges one by one. Let us take the Birla Group as such. Simply because somebody bears a Birla name, simply because somebody is related to them, simply because somebody had a connection with them some few years ago, simply because somebody had got the finances from them, everybody has been bracketted with Birlas. The author himself makes a contradiction. In 1960, when he was writing in the *Economic Weekly*, he mentioned 346 companies as being in the Birla group. He reduced the number to 270 in 1961, that is, in one year he came down from 346 to 270. But again this same mistake has been committed by him. He said that in 1957-58 the Birla group contained more than 300 companies. In 1964, the Monopolies Inquiry Commission checked up everything. They determined—and it is their figure on which we have to rely—the number and put it as 151 companies in the Birla group. Hazari was knowing this, that it was ISI. Still in his Interim Report as well as in his Final Report, he sticks to the 300 figure, which he had produced in 1958.

I have checked up that list and I can very easily point out the inaccuracies. To take an example, the Jorhat Electricity Company, which was sold out in 1958 to the Government of Assam, has been put in the Birla group. A company which is owned by the Assam Government—it is not known how on earth it could come under the Birla group. It only shows that there is something wrong with his calculation.

AN HON. MEMBER : Birla and Government are the same !

SHRI R. K. AMIN : Let me take the total number of licences received by them and see whether they have received an unduly large number of them. The total number of applications, even according to Hazari's definition—I am taking his definition; it does not matter even if it is a wrong definition—even by that wrong definition comes 938 between 1957 and 1966, a period of 10 years. Although his study was confined to 5—6 years, from 1959 to 1966, for the sake of exaggerating, he takes the figure so far as Birlas are concerned from 1957 to 1966. Having taken that, he does not give the entire list of 938 applications. In his interim report, he gives a list of 661. We are to take it for granted that the rest of them, simply because Hazari tells us they are Birla's, they are Birla's. Even if I take the definition in the Monopolies Inquiry Commission Report, it comes to 481. Out of these, the licences given were 175. If I take out the multiple licences, if I take out the licences for just changing any name, for changing any location and for some expansion of by-products, if I take out all these, there hardly remain 50 licences for new articles. When you confine yourself to the consumer industries, for example, the chemical industry, you know there are a number of by-products for which you have to take new licences from time to time. Over a period of nine years, 50 licences have been granted to him. Has he committed any crime whatsoever for 50 licences? During that period you have issued 9,000 licences. It is unnecessarily magnified in order to create a great furor. If we examine it with coolness, we will find that it is just exaggeration.

Are the Birlas big? How do they look as compared to the bigness of foreign firms and bigness of others in our own country? There was a book published some time back in which 200 top companies have been listed. Birlas comes as the fourteenth. Thirteen others are still bigger. I am not talking of the public sector.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA
(Delhi Sadar) : In the world?

SHRI R. K. AMIN : In our country. Tata has got 13 companies, whose total fixed capital's net worth is Rs. 277 crores. Birlas have 19, and their total is Rs. 163 crores. Yet, they have been picked up.

Recently there was a merger of G.E.C. and A.E.I. G.E.C. is such a big company and still it thought it was necessary to merge with A.E.I. Compared to such bigness, this is a pigmy and we are telling them, "You are so big, you have increased your size, and you are threatening the competitiveness of our economy."

Has he prevented anybody from taking licences. Nothing has been proved in the Hazari report. There is not a single product in which they have a monopoly. You take rayon. There are others like Babubhai Chinai, Baroda Rayon, the Gaekwards etc.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Appoint a commission for all.

SHRI R. K. AMIN : You take cement manufacturing. There also, Birlas are not alone, there are others. There is not a single product in which you can point out that Birlas are alone, and that they have pre-empted or stopped anybody entering into the market.

What I would like to plead is that if Birla has committed any blunder of having restricted output by his monopoly, by all means you punish him, I have no objection, but if it is necessary for the economic development of our country, if it is in the larger interests, then we must also appreciate what he has done. He was the first in several respects. It was Birla who started Hind Cycles first, aluminium production was first started by Birla, automobile production was first started by Birla, even bamboo pulp production was done by Birlas first. Instead of appreciating, we are deprecating him.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Who started contributing to the Congress Party first? Birla.

SHRI R. K. AMIN : Even about the Congress, before 1947 who was associated with the Congress? It was Birlas. I was told by no less a man than the

[Shri R. K. Amin]

veteran millowner of Ahmedabad Amritlal Seth, that in 1931 one day early in the morning he received a call to say, "Mahatmaji's Sabarmati Ashram is in trouble, you send him Rs. 20,000, I will send you." As early as 1931 he took care.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Make him a Minister.

SHRI R. K. AMIN : No, I am going to charge these people. Before 1947 he was dedicated; others were also dedicated, but the moment they got power they became devoid of dedication, while he has not changed.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Have you some statistics about contributions made by Birlas to the Congress since 1947?

SHRI R. K. AMIN : You can ask the Congress Party.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh) : I do not think there is any harm. Why should Congress be ashamed about it? When we were in the national movement, the others were helping the British Government... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. You will get your chance. If you feel that anybody has insulted your party, you can take the opportunity to explain the position when you get your chance. Instead you always prefer to talk across the table.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : They charge the Congress Party.

MR. SPEAKER : Your name is in the list of 21 persons; you can certainly speak about this when you are called—not now.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : There are many other things in the report. The report does not consist of things relating to Birla only. Why should there be concentration on one point alone?

SHRI R. K. AMIN : So far as foreign collaboration is concerned, they were the pioneers and recently even foreign countries are inviting Birlas to look after

their industries. The Saurashtra Government handed over the Digvijay Wollen mill to Birla when it was in a hopeless condition. When the Mysore Cement factory was almost sunk, it was handed over to Birla. Even the Indian Rayon was in a bad state when it was handed over to Birla. Even the Kerala Government wanted him to start industries. Instead of appreciating all this, we are putting obstructions. At a time when we are having a recession, at a time when there is a strike by the industrialists and when the equity market and share market are not working at all, if there is anyone who is willing to invest money in industrial ventures instead of giving him encouragement, you stop him from starting industries.

Before I sit down, I should like to make a reference to the last point about nationalisation of banking. It was not within the terms of reference of Hazari. Yet he dared to put it there. Banks act as purveyors of money and manufacturers of money. Before thinking of nationalisation and social control and all that, please consider whether their functions as purveyors of money and manufacturers of money will be done better in the present situation. The situation that you are visualising will not give any impetus to banks to act as purveyors. Probably, a monopoly situation will be created by the recommendations of the Hazari report and these functions will not be performed. Today banks are advancing money on the basis of financial criteria; if these recommendations were to be implemented, they would do so on political criteria—that is, pressure by M. Ps and M.L.As. If banks advance money on financial criteria, there is safety for the economy and currency system as also for the depositors. If that is not so, there will be no safety. They do so on a competitive basis at present. If this system is changed, it will not be so and it will not do good to the country.

MR. SPEAKER : Each Party has got its allotted time. The Swatantra Party had forty minutes only and put up only one speaker; he has taken his time after the Minister had spoken. Every Party can take its time; there is no difficulty

The Congress Party has three hours and if the Minister takes half an hour or forty minutes, they will have about two hours. If hon. Members confine themselves to ten minutes, about ten or twelve people can be accommodated. There is a list of 21 speakers with me. If they take less, other also can be accommodated. Otherwise, each party can take its own time.

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा (हमीरपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इंडस्ट्रियल प्लानिंग ऐंड लाइसेंसिंग पालिसी पर डाक्टर आर० के० हजारी की जिस महत्वपूर्ण रिपोर्ट पर सदन में बहस शुरू हुई है उसके लिए हमने पिछले सेशन में भी कोशिश की थी कि उस पर बहस हो लेकिन ऐसा नहीं हो पाया। अन्त में आपने और पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स के मिनिस्टर साहब ने इस सेशन में उस पर बहस करने का मौका देकर हम लोगों पर कृपा की है।

एक साथी ने इस सिलसिले में बिड़ला जी की वकालत की है। मैं बिड़ला जी के बारे में अभी न कह कर बाद में कहूंगा। पहले मैं हजारी रिपोर्ट और जो हमारा कांस्टीट्यूशन इस मिलमिले में है उस पर ही गौर करूंगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे संविधान की धारा 39 बी और सी में कहा गया है कि गवर्नमेंट ऐसे साधन अपनाये जिससे राष्ट्र की आर्थिक क्षेत्रों में दौलत और दालत पैदा करने के साधन चंद हाथों में जाकर जनता के हित के विरोध में प्रयोग न किये जा सकें।

उसके बाद इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी रेजोलूशन हमने पास किया है। उसमें कहा गया है :

1. इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट पांच साला योजना में दी गई प्राथमिकता और निशानों के मुताबिक दिया जाना।

2. स्मॉल स्केल इंडस्ट्री को बड़ी इंडस्ट्री के मुकाबले से बचाया जाना।

3. मोनोपली और चन्द हाथों में दौलत को आने से रोकना।

L10LSS/68—5

4. नये उद्योगपतियों और नये उद्योगों की होसला अफजाई करनी।

5. इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट का इस तरह किया जाना कि यह हर हिस्से में फैले।

12.52 Hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

यह हमारे संविधान में था और उसके बाद हमने उसे रेजोलूशन में पास किया। हमने एक इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट ऐंड रेगुलेशन ऐक्ट बनाया। उसमें जो कुछ तथ्य हैं और उनका जो परिणाम निकला है उसके ऊपर मैं आगे कुछ कहना चाहूंगा।

संविधान की धारा 39 बी और सी की मंशा पूरी हुई है या नहीं। यहां हम राष्ट्र के उन नेताओं के स्थान को नहीं भुला सकते जिन्होंने कि संविधान में वह धारा रक्खी थी। उसको उन्होंने इस खयाल से रक्खा कि इस देश को एक सोशलिज्म के रास्ते पर हमें ले जाना है। इस वक्त हमारे नेता स्वर्गीय जवाहरलाल जी नेहरू, भूतपूर्व राष्ट्र-पति डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद और शास्त्री जी नहीं हैं लेकिन उन संविधान के बनाते समय माननीय मुरारजी भाई, जगजीवन राम मौजूद थे, वह वहां पर उस समय बैठे हुए थे और मैं समझता हूँ कि उन्हें याद होगा और उन्हें इसका खयाल भी होगा कि उन्होंने उस समय संविधान के अन्दर किस खयाल से इन बातों को रक्खा था? लेकिन अध्यक्ष महोदय, हम तो रास्ता भूल गये। हमने संविधान में वह चीज लिखी, कानून को बनाया। कानून बनाने के बाद हमने यह समझ लिया कि हम ठीक रास्ते पर चल पड़े हैं, सोशलिज्म के रास्ते पर चल पड़े हैं और अपने आप हम मंजिल पर पहुंच जायेंगे। हमारा खयाल था कि हम शिमला जायेंगे, ऊंचाई की तरफ जायेंगे। यहां पर बता दिया था कि आप हावड़ा मेल पर चले जाइये आप शिमले में पहुंच जायेंगे। हम स्टेशन पर जाते हैं और कालका मेल अप के बजाय डाउन

[श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा]

में चढ़ जाते हैं और होता यह है कि शिमले के वजाय हम कलकत्ता पहुंच जाते हैं। जब हम कलकत्ते में पहुंच जाते हैं तो सोचते हैं कि हमारे लीडरों ने क्या कहा था ? हमें तब याद आता है कि कालका मेल अप में चढ़ना था और हम चढ़ गये डाउन में और इस तरह वजाय शिमले के कलकत्ते आ पहुंचे हैं। कलकत्ते में जाकर सोचते हैं कि वहां पर तो बिड़ला का घर है; अब अगर वहां से शिमला जाना है तो दूसरी तरफ से हमें आना होगा।

संविधान की धारा 39 के बारे में जैसा मैंने पहले कहा है उसके मुताबिक महालोनवीस कमेटी सन् 1964 में बनी थी और उसकी रिपोर्ट आई थी। अब उसके वाद मोनोपली कमीशन की रिपोर्ट आई है और मोनोपली कमीशन और महालोनवीस कमीशन ने यह साफ तौर पर कहा है कि हमारे संविधान की धारा इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी रेजोलूशन और इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट ऐंड रैगुलेशन ऐक्ट, पर भी अमल नहीं हुआ है। जब यह हालत हो तो पूंजीपति इस कमजोरी का फायदा क्यों नहीं उठाते ? उन्होंने पूरा फायदा उठाया। उस का नतीजा यह हुआ कि हिन्दुस्तान की 50 करोड़ जनता के मालिक यह 28 बड़े पूंजीपति बन गये हैं जिनकी कि लिस्ट डाक्टर हजारी ने इस रिपोर्ट में दी है। बिड़लाज के अलावा 27 और बड़े पूंजीपति कौन हैं उनके नाम मैं बतलाना चाहूंगा।

1. बिड़ला
2. जे० के०
3. टाटा
4. श्री राम
5. बालचंद
6. साहू जैन
7. बांगुर सोमानी
8. ए० सी० सी०

9. किलाचंद
10. बी० रामकृष्णा
11. बी० पटनायक
12. साराभाई
13. अमीचंद प्यारेलाल
14. कामानी
15. मफ्तलाल
16. बजाज
17. किलोस्कर
18. कस्तूरभाई
19. शेषायी
20. अनन्तरामकृष्णन्
21. महीन्द्रा
22. वाडिया शंपूरजी
23. बजोरी जालान
24. थापर
25. मोदी
26. गोइनका
27. चिनाई
28. जयपुरिया

यह 28 ऐसे बड़े पूंजीपति लोग हैं जो कि 50 करोड़ गरीबों के खून के प्यासे हैं और जिनको कि वह ऐक्सप्लोएट करते हैं। लेकिन आज बिड़ला आदि का सवाल नहीं है बल्कि हमारे सामने जो सवाल है वह यह है कि जो हमने संविधान बनाया है, जो हमने रास्ता अपनाया है, जो इस पार्लियामेंट ने रास्ता अपनाया है हम उस रास्ते पर चल रहे हैं या नहीं चल रहे हैं ? देश की एकोनामी पर इन लोगों ने कंट्रोल कर रक्खा है। बैंक्स इनके पास हैं, इन्श्योरेंस कम्पनीज इनके पास हैं। इसके अलावा इंडस्ट्रीज इनके पास हैं। न्यूज पंपर इंडस्ट्री, यह जो प्रैस है, यह सारा का सारा इनके कंट्रोल में है। इन चारों चीजों पर इनका कंट्रोल रहने के कारण

इन्होंने गवर्नमेंट और समाज को इन चारों तरीकों से अपने पंजों में जकड़ रक्खा है।

अभी मेरे साथी ने जो कुछ कहा है वह अपने दिल से नहीं कहा है। वह उनकी दिल की आवाज नहीं है। जाहिर है कि अगर दिल की आवाज होती तो वह इस ढंग से नहीं कहते जैसे कि उन्होंने कही। उनकी स्पीच को सुन कर ऐसा मालूम दे रहा था कि वह बिड़ला की वकालत कर रहे थे और जो लिख कर ले आये थे उसी को उन्होंने पढ़ दिया।

यह बात मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि मोनोपली कमीशन ने जो रिपोर्ट दी, मोनोपली कमीशन ने कहा है कि 75 घराने जो हैं उन 75 घरानों के अन्दर उनका कितना कैपिटल है। उसमें कहा है कि उनका 50 फीसदी पेढ अप कैपिटल है। 646 करोड़ हमारा कैपिटल है। 50 फीसदी कैपिटल के ऊपर इन बड़े-बड़े घरानों का कब्जा है। 2606 करोड़ रुपये के इनके ऐसैट्स हैं। आप अंदाजा लगाइये कितनी बड़ी जायदाद इनके पास है? उसके बाद मैं आपको अर्ज करूँ कि 5 लाख रुपये की कम्पनी जिनका कि सरमाया है वह 86 परसेंट है। कम्पनियों की तादाद के हिसाब से 14 परसेंट कैपिटल उनका है। जो डेढ़ परसेंट कम्पनी हैं उनका कैपिटल 53 परसेंट है सारे कैपिटल का। कौन कहता है कि उन्होंने देश को लूटा नहीं है? कौन कहता है कि उन्होंने इस देश को दोनों हाथों से लूट कर अपनी तिजोरियों को नहीं भरा है?

इसके बाद अब मैं थोड़ी सी बातें कहना चाहूँगा और वह इस वास्ते मुझे कहनी पड़ती है कि बिड़ला ने हमको लूटा है। मैं उनकी लूट को आपके सामने रखता हूँ। उस पर से पर्दा उठाना चाहता हूँ। कुछ अखबारों ने बिड़ला के बारे में यह कह दिया कि वह महात्मा हैं या संत हैं। वह क्या करते हैं? वह धर्म-शाले बनवाते हैं, मंदिर बनवाते हैं लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह बिड़ला उस तरीके के संत या महात्मा हैं जैसे कि एक चोर चोरी

करता है और चोरी के माल में से कुछ को दूसरे को दान में देकर खुश करता है और बाकी का माल अपने पास रखता है। यहाँ तो वह चोरी करता है और वहाँ वह उसमें से कुछ दान में दे देता है और वह अपने आप को धर्मात्मा कहता है तो क्या वह वास्तव में धर्मात्मा कहलाने योग्य है? मेरा कहना है कि बिड़लाओं ने यह सब गड़बड़घुटाला किया है। मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि जितना जुर्म बिड़ला ने किया है, जितने मुजरिम बिड़ला है अगर और कोई शख्स उसका एक हजारवाँ हिस्सा भी जुर्म किये होता तो वह जेल के सीखचों के अन्दर कर दिया गया होता। बिड़ला ने जो कसूर किये हैं उनमें से एक-आध यहाँ मैं बतलाना चाहूँगा और उससे आप समझ सकते हैं कि उन्हें इन जुर्मों के लिए क्या सजा मिलनी चाहिए थी। वैसे मैं यह सब बतलाना नहीं चाहता था लेकिन मेरे दोस्त ने छेड़ दिया इसलिए उसे मैं बतलाये देता हूँ। इन बिड़लाज की कम्पनियों को 1959—64 के अर्से में 375 इंडस्ट्रियल लाइसेंस मिले जो कि 384 करोड़ रुपये के थे जिसमें 284 करोड़ रुपये का फारेन एक्सचेंज काम में लिया। इस के अलावा उनके कारखानों को उन कम्पनियों को पहले से जो इम्पोर्ट एंड एक्सपोर्ट के रा मँटीरियल और कंज्यूमर्स गुड्स के जो लाइसेंस मिले हैं उनका कोई हिस्सा कितना नहीं है मगर कुछ चीजों के जो आंकड़े या हिस्सा हमें मिला है उसके मुनाबिक यह फारेन एक्सचेंज की रकम 1,000 करोड़ रुपये से ज्यादा है। यह 1,000 करोड़ रु० से ज्यादा है। इसमें से 200 करोड़ रु० के लगभग फारेन एक्सचेंज की चोरी की है—इसके सबूत मौजूद हैं—और वह विदेशी बैंकों में बेनामी नामों से जमा कर रक्खी है। यह रकम अन्वर-इन्वार्सिंग और ओवर-इन्वार्सिंग और कमीशन के जरिये से हेरा-फेरी कर के पैदा की गई है। अगर इस की तहकीकात हो तो पता चलेगा कि यह हेरा फेरी इस से भी ज्यादा है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Member may continue after Lunch.

13 Hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

MOTION RE. REPORTS ON INDUSTRIAL PLANNING AND LICENSING POLICY—contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Prem Chand Verma may resume his speech. He has already taken 12 minutes. He has to conclude in five minutes.

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा : दस बारह मिनट बाकी हैं और इतना समय तो मुझे मिलना ही चाहिये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो सारी गड़बड़ी बिड़लाज ने की है उसके मैं कुछ उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ जिससे पता चलेगा कि उन्होंने किस तरह से गवर्नमेंट को धोखा दिया है। उनकी एक ओरियेंट पेपर मिल्ल है जहाँ पर क्राफ्ट पेपर और प्रिंटिंग पेपर बनता है। क्राफ्ट पेपर पर एक्साइज ड्यूटी चालीस पैसे फी किलोग्राम लगती है और प्रिंटिंग पेपर पर पंद्रह पैसे फी किलोग्राम के हिसाब एक्साइज ड्यूटी लगती है। इन धर्मात्माओं ने एक्साइज अफसरों से मिल कर क्राफ्ट पेपर के ऊपर प्रिंटिंग पेपर की मुहर लगवा कर पंद्रह पैसे किलो एक्साइज ड्यूटी देकर क्लीअर कराया और इस एक केस में अस्सी लाख रुपये से ज्यादा का धोखा सरकार को दिया।

इनकी एक कम्पनी है इंडिया लिनोलियमज लिमिटेड। इस कम्पनी की अपने प्रोडक्ट की सारे हिन्दुस्तान भर में मोनोपली है। इस एक ही कम्पनी को लाइसेंस दिया गया है दूसरी किसी को नहीं। इसमें बेइंतहा मुनाफा है। इस कम्पनी ने पिछले आठ सालों में अपनी प्रोडक्ट की कीमतों में 252 परसेंट

का इजाफा किया है। इसके माल को सरकार खरीदती है और थोड़ा बहुत नहीं, लाखों करोड़ों रुपये का खरीदती है। कोई टैरिफ कमिशन नहीं बिठाया या कोई जांच नहीं की गई। इस कम्पनी के मुनाफे को कम करने के लिए बोगस औरतों और दूसरे लोगों का नाम रखा गया है जिन्हें हजारों रुपया महीना दिया जाता है जिसका मकसद इनकम टैक्स की चोरी करना है। एक श्रीमन्नी मोहनी देवी हैं जिनको दो हजार रुपया महीना मिलता है। एक श्रीमती आशा देवी साबू हैं जिनको 3250 रुपया माहवार मिलता है। एक श्रीमती उषा देवी साबू हैं जिनको 3250 रुपया माहवार मिलता है। एक श्रीमती मलका देवी साबू हैं जिनको 3501 रुपया माहवार मिलता है श्री ताग चन्द साबू बिड़ला कम्पनियों से पचास हजार रुपया माहवार अलग लेते हैं। मुनाफों को कम करने के लिए इस तरह की कार्रवाइयां यह कम्पनी करती रही है।

एक और उदाहरण मैं देता हूँ। एक जीवाजी राव काटन मिल्ल है। इस मिल ने इनवैस्टमेंट लिमिटेड ग्वालियर जिसका इक्विटी कैपिटल केवल पांच लाख रुपया था उसमें 1 करोड़ 90 लाख रुपये के क्वार्टर परसेंट वाले प्रेफेस शेर खरीदे केवल इसलिए कि जीवाजी राव काटन मिल्ल से दो करोड़ रुपया निकाल कर उसके मुनाफे को कम किया जाए और इसका लाभ जाती अगराज के लिए दूसरे तरीके से उठाया जाए। इस तरह से लाखों रुपये का इनकम टैक्स इन्होंने हज्म किया।

हिन्दुस्तान में किसी को इतनी तनख्वाह नहीं मिलती है जितनी कि बिड़ला ग्रुप आफ इंडस्ट्रीज वाले देते हैं। इसी से आप बंदाजा लगा सकते हैं कि इनके पास कितनी दौलत है। श्री डी० पी० मंडलिया को तीस हजार रुपया माहवार मिलता है, श्री एम० डी० डाल्मिया को बीस हजार रुपया माहवार मिलता है, श्री एस० एन० हेडा को बीस हजार, श्री टी० सी० साबू को बीस हजार रुपया,

श्री आर० के० बिड़ला को पंद्रह हजार रुपया महीना मिलता है। यह है सोशलिस्ट हिन्दुस्तान की तस्वीर जो कि इंडस्ट्रियल लाइसेंसिंग पालिसी की असफलता से सामने आई है। एक तरफ तो वे आदमी है जिसको खाने के लिए रोटी नहीं मिलती है, बाजार में भूखा मरता फिरता है और दूसरी तरफ ये लोग हैं जिनको पता नहीं चलता है कि जो पैसा उनको मिलता है, उसको खर्च कैसे किया जाए।

अब मैं इनकी इनश्योरेंस कम्पनीज पर आता हूँ। न्यू एग्जियाटिक इनश्योरेंस कम्पनी और रूबी जनरल इनश्योरेंस कम्पनी जो बिड़लाओं की हैं उनके मुताल्लिक गवर्नमेंट आडिटर्ज ने कहा है अपनी रिपोर्ट में कि इन कम्पनियों के स्टाफ के जरिये बिड़लाओं ने एक ऐसी साजिश कर रखी है जिससे शेयर-होल्डर्ज को कम्पनी के काम के मुताल्लिक सब्ज बाग दिखाये जाते हैं और बहुत बड़ा धोखे का कारोबार इन कम्पनियों में होता है।

फिर आप इनवेस्टमेंट कम्पनियों और ट्रस्ट्स को लें। ट्रस्ट के जरिये से लाखों रुपये का हेरफेर होता है और हर साल किसी न किसी इनवेस्टमेंट कम्पनी को दीवालिया करार देकर लोगों को लूटा जाता है। इनके जरिये, इन ट्रस्ट के जरिये इनकम टैक्स की चोरी भी होती है।

बिड़लाओं ने आई०एफ०सी०, आई०सी०आई०, आई०डी०बी०डी०आई०, एस०एफ०सी० और एल०आई०सी०जैसी जितनी फ्रेडिट इंस्टीट्यूशंज हैं, जितनी पब्लिक इंस्टीट्यूशंज हैं उनका सारे का सारा रुपया इन्हीं के काम में लगता है और इन्हीं का उन पर कंट्रोल है। हजारी साहब ने लिखा है कि जब तक बैंकों के ऊपर और फ्रेडिट कम्पनीज के ऊपर आपका कंट्रोल नहीं हो जाता है तब तक ऐसे जो काम हैं, इनको रोका नहीं जा सकता है, इन चीजों में सुधार नहीं हो सकता है।

विदेशों में इनकी कम्पनियां हैं और इनके द्वारा अंडर इनवार्यसिंग और ओवर इनवार्यसिंग का काम किया जाता है। विदेशों से जो बिड़लाओं का करोड़ों रुपये का माल आता है उस पर ओवर इनवार्यसिंग होता है जिससे फारेन एक्सचेंज को विदेशों में रख लिया जाता है और जो भारत से माल भेजते हैं उसमें अंडर इनवार्यसिंग करके बाकी रुपया विदेशी करंसी में वसूल करके ब्लैक फारेन एक्सचेंज के मैनेस को बढ़ाते हैं।

अब मैं आटोमोबाइल इंस्ट्री के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। भारत सरकार ने आटोमो-बाइल इंस्ट्री में स्माल स्केल इंस्ट्री के लिए कुछ खास रियायतें दे रखी हैं ताकि छोटे-छोटे स्माल स्केल इंस्ट्रीज के कारखाने पुजें बगैरह बनायें और ये बड़े कारखानेद्वारा उनसे खरीदें। मगर बिड़लाओं ने और किला चन्द ने बेनामों से अपने कंसर्न शुरू कर दिये और इस वक्त दर्जनों स्माल स्केल इंस्ट्री यूनिट खड़े करके इस रियायत से भी फायदा उठाया जा रहा है।

इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंस के सम्बन्ध में भी पक्षपात होता है। वह एक बहुत बड़ा स्कैंडल है। मैं सिर्फ एक मिसाल देना चाहता हूँ। हैदराबाद एसबेस्टीस सीमेंट प्राइवट्स लिमिटेड का रा मैटीरियल, एसबेस्टोस फाइबर, इम्पोर्ट किया जाता है। उसके लिए इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंस कारखान की कैपेसिटी के मुताबिक दिये जाते हैं। गवर्नमेंट ने 1963 में एक हुकम के तहत कारखानों को कैपेसिटी बढ़ाने से रोक दिया था, ताकि रा मैटीरियल के और लाइसेंस न देने पड़ें। लेकिन बिड़लाओं ने बिना लाइसेंस लिये उसकी कैपेसिटी 48 हजार टन से बढ़ा कर 2, 20 हजार टन कर दी और इस तरह उस कानून की मिट्टी प्यीद कर दी। गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से उनको एक साल के लिए 53. 51 हजार रुपये का फाइबर इम्पोर्ट करने का लाइसेंस भी दे दिया गया। कानून की खिलाफत करके पर कोई एक्शन

[श्री प्रेम चन्द बर्मा]

न लेकर उनको दो लाख रुपया सालाना का मुनाफ़ा सीधा दे दिया गया।

इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट मिनिसटर ने राज्य सभा में यह एलान किया कि जब तक थैकर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट नहीं आ जाती, तब तक बिड़लाओं को कोई लाइसेंस नहीं दिया जायेगा। इस एलान के बावजूद सरकार ने उनको गोआ में फर्टलाइजर की फैक्टरी लगाने का लाइसेंस दे दिया। जब हमने इस हाउस में यह सवाल उठाया, तो मिनिसटर साहब ने जवाब दिया कि वह लाइसेंस हमने नहीं दिया, पेट्रोलियम एंड कैमिकल्स मिनिसट्री ने दिया है। मैं सरकार से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट मिनिसट्री और पेट्रोलियम एंड कैमिकल्स मिनिसट्री एक गवर्नमेंट की है या दो गवर्नमेंट की। यह कितनी हैरानी की बात है कि जब कैबिनेट की जायंट रेसपांसीबिलिटी है, तो एक कैबिनेट मिनिसटर के नीति के एलान के बाद दूसरी मिनिसट्री द्वारा एक ऐसे शख्स को फर्टलाइजर फैक्टरी का लाइसेंस दे दिया गया, जिसके मुताल्लिक एन्क्वायरी हो रही है। यह धांधली है।

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकारी अफ़सरों में बिड़ला के एजेन्ट भी बैठे हुए हैं। बिड़ला तो यह बात कहते हैं कि पार्लियामेंट में भी मेरे एजेन्ट बैठे हुए हैं।

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : माननीय सदस्य इस पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों को बिड़ला का एजेन्ट बता रहे हैं, यह उचित नहीं है।

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : यह गलत बात है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He says that it has already been reported in the press and he is only reproducing what has appeared in the press.

श्री प्रेम चन्द बर्मा : यह बात मैंने नहीं कही है। बिड़ला ने यह बात कही है, जो रिकार्ड पर है। जो नन्दा ने यह बात कही है, जोकि

प्रोसीडिंग्स में है। श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने यह बात कही है, जो कि प्रोसीडिंग्स में है। श्री बिड़ला कहते हैं कि मेरे पचास मेम्बर हैं—मैं पचास मेम्बर जब में रखता हूँ।

मुझे मालूम नहीं कि वे कौन मेम्बर हैं, लेकिन वे आप के सामने आयेंगे, बोलेंगे और उनकी वकालत करेंगे।

जहां तक थैकर कमेटी का नान्लुक है, वह 22 जुलाई को बनाई गई और उस को कहा गया कि वह छः महीने में अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दे। 22 जनवरी को वे छः महीने खत्म हो गए, लेकिन आप जान कर हैरान होंगे कि अभी तक बिड़लाओं ने थैकर कमेटी को कोई इनफॉर्मेशन नहीं दी है, जिसकी वजह से वह कमेटी कोई काम नहीं कर सकी है।

मेरा मुतालिबा है कि थैकर कमेटी तो जो कुछ जैसे करेगी, वह करेगी, बिड़लाओं के तमाम फ़ाड़ों और गलत कार्यवाहियों की जांच करने के लिए इन्क्वायरी एक्ट के मातहत विवियन बोस कमीशन की तरह एक सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जज की अध्यक्षता में जुडिशल कमीशन आफ़ एन्क्वायरी विठाया जाये, ताकि वह दूध का दूध और पानी का पानी कर सके। इससे सरकार भी इस इलजाम से बरी हो जायेगी कि वह बिड़लाओं के खिलाफ़ एकशन लेने में घबराती है।

बिड़लाओं और दूसरे 74 बड़े इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट इदारों के मालिकों, चैयरमैनो, डायरेक्टरों या उनके नुमायंदों को पब्लिक क्रेडिट इंस्टीट्यूशनों की डायरेक्टरशिप या एडवाइजर की हैसियत से फौरन हटा दिया जाये, ताकि वे आईन्दा पब्लिक मनी का नाजायज फायदा न उठा सकें।

1957 से जितने इंडस्ट्रियल, कनज्यूमर गुड्स या रा मैटीरियल के जितने भी लाइसेंस उनको मिले हैं, उनका दुस्त इस्तेमाल हुआ है या नहीं और उनको कुल कितनी फारैन

एक्सचेंज के लाइसेंस दिये गये हैं, इस बारे में सब तफ़्सील सदन के सामने रखी जाये ।

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal) : On a point of order. I draw attention to an unfortunate remark of Shri P. C. Verma, though he might not have meant it. If I have followed his Hindi speech correctly, he said 'Now, we will see those members who will take *vakath* on behalf of Birlas. They are the men of Birla'. These remarks are most unfortunate.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) : That will mean restraint in freedom of expression.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH : I want that the record must be put straight.

SHRI RAJARAM (Salem) : He is right. What is wrong in the remark he made ?

SHRI SITARAM KESRI (Katihar) : Why should such remarks be passed against any MP ?

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : This is their Party affair. Why should we come in there ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I would like to utter a word of caution. This is casting some sort of aspersion on others who are likely to participate. It should be avoided.

SHRI K. N. TIWARY (Bettiah) : When they are supporting China and Russia, why cannot one support Birlas and Dalmias ?

SHRI SONAVANE (Pandharpur) : His remark that those who speak hereafter in favour of Birlas would be proved to be men of Birlas or agents of Birlas is really casting aspersion. It should not go on record. If an hon. Member says about the hon. Member who has just now spoken in denunciation of the Birlas that he is an agent of somebody else, what would happen ? If such a remark were made, that should also not be in the record. This would be casting aspersion on members.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have already ruled when Shri Venkatasubbaiah raised the point that no speaker should cast aspersions. What we are debating is the Hazari Report and whatever is there is relevant. We are not discussing Birlas here.

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli) : Birlas come in by the backdoor.

SHRI DHIRESWAR KALITA (Gauhati) : We are not only discussing Birlas but their agents also.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That is his interpretation. What we are debating is the Hazari Report.

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA (Mandya) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, let me at the outset congratulate Dr. Hazari on placing before the nation such a valuable report which would have far-reaching consequences. It only proves that the present licensing system, for which the present Government is largely responsible, is a calculated deception perpetrated on our constitutional obligations.

What is our constitutional obligation ? That is borne in one of the directive principles of State policy enshrined in our Constitution :

"The State shall, in particular, direct its policy towards securing that the citizens men and women, equally, have the right to an adequate means of livelihood; that the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good".

"and (c) that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment."

With this background it would be better for us to scrutinise the report which has been placed before this House.

When the Prime Minister of India presented the third Five Year Plan, he made certain observations with reference to our industrial objectives; he said then :

"...development along socialist lines will secure rapid economic

growth and expansion of employment, reduction of disparities in income and wealth, prevention of concentration of economic power, and creation of the values and attitudes of a free and equal society... The tendency towards concentration of economic power has to be countered in a variety of ways—firstly, through the extension of the public sector... secondly, through widening opportunities for new entrants and thirdly, through effective exercise of Government's powers of control and regulation and use of appropriate fiscal measures."

What is it that the Government has done? It was in the year 1955, if I remember aright, that the Avadi session of the Congress took place and it became a socialist organisation, according to them. We hotly contest that claim. They say that session started the socialist path; socialism later on devoured the Congress Party completely. The Hazari report concerns itself with the happenings from 1956 to 1966 it was only in the 1967 general elections the monopoly of power that the premier political party was holding till then was shattered. If we oppose political monopoly, we also oppose concentration of economic power in one or a few industrial houses. This discussion would not serve its purpose if you simply witchhunt some of the big industrial houses. I am not willing to do that, even though I am one of those who firmly believe that the big industrial houses have taken advantage of the present licensing policy of the Government. Naturally the main culprit in this case, the true offender is the Congress Party which is in power in the Centre and in some States. Coming to the big industrial houses, I know how unscrupulous they can be; I also know that they can browbeat, blackmail, bribe and tempt any man in power. They are after power without any scruples. While talking about the industrial licensing system, we say that the regional imbalances have to be checked. We must see the plan objectives. Plan priorities must be strictly adhered to. What was the Planning Commission doing all these years from 1955 to 1966? Did they not have complete control over the governmental machinery. My hon.

friend who opened the debate on behalf of the Swatantra Party made the case that the Government was 'camouflaging'; they wanted to hide the failures of the Planning Commission; in order to hide those failures they are making a scapegoat of Birla. I agree with that criticism but with half of it only. I know that the Plans have failed; the country and the ruling party had realised it. But where do we go from here? In one breadth we say that we are going to stem this rot of economic power being concentrated in the hands of a few individuals or in a few big business houses. How are we going to do it? It is not the opinion of the Swatantra Party that there is no concentration of economic power in this country. But the point is whether it had been gained by these big industrial houses taking advantage of the present licensing system or whether those houses used unscrupulous means to get that power. A very bad example of these things has come to my personal knowledge. In Mysore when a new cement plant had to be started, one of the big industrial houses applied and the timid Mysore Government which is just a handmaid of the capitalists in this country, recommended that application. Subsequently, a few young men in Mysore who were fresh in the field of industry wanted to start a cement plant and when they approached the Mysore Government, they were told that an application had already been recommended to the Central Government and it was not possible to recommend this application. Subsequently what happened? It is to this that the Hazari report refers repeatedly. Their applications are meant to fore close licensable capacity. Letters of intent were issued to a big industrial house to start a cement plant in Mysore State. The considerations that weighed in granting a licence to this company were that it was financially sound; it had the needed experience to start a fresh industry and thirdly it had worked out foreign collaboration. Now, would a foreign company come forward to assist a comparatively new entrepreneur? I appeal to the Government to consider the whole policy of issuing licences. The present policy has to be changed taking into consideration the three reports

which had been made : Mahalonobis report, report of the monopolies enquiry commission and the Hazari report along with Swaminathan committee's report which dealt with certain aspects of the industrial licensing system. The new policy should suit our national needs and our economic and industrial objectives.

One of the important considerations while granting a licence to a firm is its financial soundness. Let us pause for a while and analyse the theory of financial soundness. We have said repeatedly that the credit system and the banking system in our country needs to be thoroughly looked into. Demands for the nationalisation of the banking system have been made both within and outside this House. And now, as a panacea to all evils that the country is facing, as a panacea to all of our economic problems, the present Finance Minister is thinking on the lines of bringing these banks under active social control of Government. Let us see the damage, the mischief, the present banking system has done to further the concentration of economic power in a few of the industrial houses.

I should like to quote from the Mahalonobis report here wherein a point is made that in the 10 leading banks of the country, you find common directors who are in one way or the other associated with The big industrial houses in this country. I am not singling out any one industrial house. To me Birla is the same as JK or Sahu Jain or any of the industrial houses. I quote :

"The dominance of industrial directors on the Boards of commercial banks is seen to be much greater in the case of the first eight banks—

They are, the Bank of India, the Central Bank of India, Punjab National Bank, United Commercial Bank, Bank of Baroda, Allahabad Bank, Indian Overseas Bank and the United Bank of India.

"—in whose case they numbered 59 out of nearly 77, or nearly 77 per cent of the total. It is evident from

the above that there is a significant link in the form of common directors between the leading banks and the large-sized industrial undertakings."

Here lies the mischief. In order to put an end to further concentration of economic power in the hands of some of these big establishments or industrial houses, it is necessary, it is paramount, that first we should think in terms of nationalising banks, nationalising the credit system in this country. That is the need of the hour. No excuses would be tolerated by the people of India. I do understand that whenever a Birla takes over a plant which is otherwise sinking, naturally, probably the magic touch of the Birlas or the magic touch of the private sector makes it all right as was pointed out by the learned Member who spoke for the Swatantra party. I concede that point. I concede that whenever Birla takes over a firm, probably it is better managed, or the other argument is always there, namely, that they manipulate the accounts. But I am not at all going into that question. That does not mean to say that we are giving a blank cheque to the public sector undertakings. He also made the point that some of the public sector undertakings own guest-houses in Delhi. Why do they own them? If the public sector undertakings own guest-houses, it is bad; if private sector undertakings have guest-houses, it is equally bad. It is equally worse. So, two wrongs do not make a right. I do not know what these guest-houses have. Probably, in the United States where I had the privilege of living, so many other things go on there. (Interruption).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Order, order. He is making a useful contribution. But his time is already finished. I have given him a little more latitude. Please try to conclude now.

AN HON. MEMBER : It is his maiden-speech.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is his maiden-performance ; I know.

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA : Now, I move on to my next point. I will be

[Shri S. M. Krishna]

concluding, Sir. I really appreciate the latitude you have shown me by extending the time.

Sir, today the country needs certain frank speaking. Are we true to the professions of socialism, the pronouncements promising the people of this country that our ultimate goal is carving out a socialist State? Repeatedly I hear and I read pronouncements by men, men and women, in authority that they believe in socialism. The Congress President, who also happens to be a Mysorean and who incidentally continues to be the Chief Minister of Mysore State... (*Interruption*).

AN HON. MEMBER : What is the harm ?

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA : It has been reduced as a part-time assignment in Mysore State. That is the wrong with that.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : That is monopoly.

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA : Monopoly of power, monopoly of both the offices (*Interruption*). If we are true to our pronouncements, towards socialism, towards the socialist goal, then we need to see the Government doing something serious about it. Simply they cannot hoodwink the people for ever. In the name of socialism, one of the greatest capitalist governments is existing in this country. In the name of socialism, we find a systematic exploitation of the people of this country. Fifty crores of people who are living in this country demand of this Government that they have to be frank and brave. It only the brave who can serve the motherland.

With these few words, I again commend Dr. Hazari for the very valuable report he has made.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE (Ratnagiri): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, Dr. Hazari's report is not the first of its kind. He had the Monopolies Inquiry Commission Report, we had the Mahalonobis Report and this is the third report. Neither has the Government, I would say, as far as rules

and regulations with regard to committees are concerned, been totally inactive. There have been plenty of procedures laid down. Nevertheless, we have to admit that in spite of all these committees, inquires, commissions and the various committees that scrutinised and vetted the licences before they were given, gross anomalies do exist. This is what the report points out.

I think the matter under consideration is not that we are out to chastise or to say that x, y or z has done this, that or the other. I think the matter under consideration is what is wrong in this system, that in spite of all the precautions that are taken the result which comes about is totally different from what most of us in this House would like to see.

The most distressing fact, I think, today is this atmosphere of mistrust which prevails everywhere. We are so happy to accuse each other. There is mistrust among politicians, businessmen, bureaucrats and so on.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : And inside the Cabinet.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE: If we are to function in a democracy, if we are to function in the midst of a mixed economy, we have to evolve some pattern whereby the sort of things which have happened do not happen.

Now, let us understand that there is a great deal of difference between types of socialism in the same way as there is a great deal of difference between Buddhism here and Buddhism in China. So, socialism in some parts of the world is something quite different from the socialism that we want here.

AN HON. MEMBER : You want socialism of the Birla group.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE: I will leave it to the hon. Member to define what type of socialism he wants (*interruptions*). The socialism which my hon. friends have in mind is not the type of socialism which we want to establish here. According to us, socialism would mean a more equitable

distribution of wealth, more opportunities for people and so on. I want to make it quite clear here that the socialism which we want is not of the extreme type, which means that the total control of the economy is in the hands of the State. We do not want that type of socialism where the total control of the economy is in the hands of the State we want to make it quite clear. We are functioning in a mixed economy. We have laid down specifically our aims and objects in the Industrial Policy Resolutions of 1948 and 1956 and, therefore, there should be no confusion over that.

I do agree with some of the hon. Members that there are grave irregularities, grave anomalies, and that they should be set right. At the same time, one must understand that in a developing economy there are certain imponderables, like shortage of finance, shortage of managerial skill and technical skill. Therefore, it becomes very much more difficult to combine all these so that the economic development of the country is not arrested, so that people get equal opportunities, and this, you must admit, is far more difficult when you do not have an authoritarian government which my hon. friend would like to have here. Of course, we do not agree with them on that point. We want socialism without authoritarian government. We also want to see that justice is accorded to our people. Suppose there is a trained scientist and a trained industrial worker, we want to see that they are given fair opportunities. We want to see that there is not so much of economic concentration in a few hands so that the rest of the people have no chance—because, economic concentration of wealth is not just a question of money. It has a much more comprehensive meaning. That is the thing we want to stop. It is not a question of having money. There is also another thing, which we have to bear in mind when we consider the licensing system. When Company A, B or C has been referred to, you must remember that the licensing system is such that for expansion, for new undertakings and such things a series of licences

are required. From Dr. Hazari's report it is very difficult to assess as to what categories of licences they have got. It is very difficult to assess under what circumstances, under what economic conditions, under what pressures, political or extraneous, these licences were given. It is not enough to take a statistical record of a firm and say that it has applied for X number of licences, it has been granted X minus 20 licences and, therefore, that firm has received favouritism from the Government. I am not prepared to accept that contention on any ground. From purely statistical data one cannot say under what conditions certain licences were given.

I will give you an example. For a number of years fertiliser manufacture was licensed and no company was able to execute that licence; yet, today in the country there is grave need for fertilisers. I do not know what the Government is going to do and what it means to do.

I say this that certain demands develop and under certain conditions Government is required to act in a certain manner. Unless one is able to go into this, in the totality of the thing, and to understand as to what are the requirements, what are the pressures operating at a given time, it is not possible to say why X number of licences were granted to a certain company.

Then, I come to the point of finance. I have been going through some of the statements that have been given out by the ICICI, Industrial Finance Corporation etc. What do we find? We find that in 1966-67 the finance made available was far below what it was in 1965-66. When you want to set up a company—today you want to set up, say, a big company making fertilisers or for manufacture of agricultural implements or tractors or something like that—you have the know-how, you have the men but you do not have the finances. These finances have to come from some place. Obviously, they come either indigenously or from outside. This decision has to be finally made by the Government. The Government has the choice of resources and it is for the Government,

[Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee]

at a given time, to make up its mind as to which type of resources it should choose of the available resources, by which I mean by foreign collaboration or not. I am not in favour of having too much of foreign collaboration. I am sorry to see that the percentage of foreign collaboration is rising.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : It cannot be helped.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE : But sometimes it becomes unavoidable. I would request the Government to use the highest discrimination and discretion when they allow foreign collaboration licences to come through.

SHRI HIMATSINGKA (Godda) : They do it.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : As they do everything else.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE : But I must say that it is not possible for any superficial report to deal with this entirely. The whole industrial policy must be gone into comprehensively. Without doing this, if you bring in this sort of mistrust, shouting down one person, you shouting at us and we shouting at you, it is not going to bring about any kind of harmony, it is not going to bring about the promotion of our economic development and it is not going to bring about a solution of our problem of unemployment. I am not referring to any person or any company.

I do admit that irregularities exist, that anomalies do exist. The question is to find out what makes it possible for these anomalies and irregularities to come about in spite of the many committees which exist.

AN HON. MEMBER : You give your solution.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE : I will give my solution at the end. I am not as rigid in my views as Shri Nambiar is.

As I was saying, the Industrial Finance Corporation, for instance, sanctioned only Rs. 30.1 crores in 1966-67

whereas in 1965-66 it was able to give Rs. 48.4 crores; the ICICI was able to give only Rs. 19.1 crores whereas the previous year it was able to give Rs. 29.6 crores; and, similarly, the Industrial Development Bank was able to give only Rs. 33.83 crores as against Rs. 59.56 crores. This is the amount that one can raise indigenously. This is the basic problem up against which we come.

We want these anomalies to be corrected—and I am hundred per cent for the correction of these anomalies—I believe that unless you have a broadening of the industrial base and you make it possible for the small and middle industrial group to grow, you will not be able to avoid concentration of wealth. It is no use having a negative approach to it. The positive approach to it is to provide credit facilities, to provide special protection to the small and medium industries and to make it possible for them to get the help and the support they need. This is the positive approach to it, not to kill what is there, but to make it possible for other things to grow which will counteract the monopolistic growth. This is what you asked me : What is the method ? This is the method.

There are hundreds of young engineers and young scientists. Make it possible for them to promote individual industries. What happens is that whenever they go asking for credit, when they are up against this big web of rules and regulations, permits and licences, they do not know how to get about. This is where a big industrialist has advantage over a small man. If the Government could set up a bureau where a small man or a new man gets some sort of help which a big industrialist can pay for if the Government could make it possible for the small and medium industries to have credit which they cannot get at present, then this kind of economic concentration of wealth could be reduced. I know a considerable amount of credit has been available to them. Credit and finance are the main things. When a man makes a small machine or something, he is squeezed out of production because a big industrial group

gets the licence of import from outside. That should not happen.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Member should conclude now.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE : Lastly, I want to say that this is no small matter on which we can shout at each other because, along with this economic concentration of wealth, there is also the link-up with foreign collaboration and foreign collaborators. We have seen in China what has been the result of this sort of a thing. We have seen that when there is an awakening among the people and if that awakening is not recognised by the Government, there can be dire results. Therefore, to safeguard the interests of the old generation like us, as to safeguard the interests of the young generation, I think, it is necessary that we see that the fullest opportunities are given to the young people, to the worker, to the agriculturist, and that we do not have a few people, about 20 families, who have crores of rupees and who can, through control bank credit, etc., keep everything in their own hand.

I want to make it clear that this would not be possible except when certain important personalities, whether in or out of politics, who are in a position of power, have helped to bring about this kind of growing tendency where few people keep power in their hands. Therefore, it is not merely a question of economic concentration of power but it is equally a question of concentration of political power.....

AN HON. MEMBER : As in the case of Congress.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE : It is not only the Congress. It is any party in any State. I have been to almost every State and the people in power want to see that industries come there. What do they offer? They offer concessions in electricity, in land, in water, in everything. To whom do they offer? Not to the small man. What are these people sitting on the Opposition side saying to me? What are their Governments in some States where they are in power doing? Have they not done

the same thing? I have been to almost every State. The same methods are adopted by you as by any other political party in power. If you are serious about it, then only we can do something.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : I did not want to interrupt the lady Member. But she will admit that plethora of licences lead to licence.

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam) : It would have been better if we had waited for the Thacker Committee's report, because that report would have given us a full picture of the way in which the industrial licensing policy has been worked in this country. Anyhow, since we are now having a discussion only on the Hazari report, both interim and final, I would like to say something on that.

The hon. lady Member who preceded me defined socialism as having very many comprehensive meanings, and particularly so from the standpoint of the Congress.

SHRI SHEO NARAIN : His is American socialism.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : Probably, Shri Sheo Narain may introduce another socialism called American socialism.

14.56 HRS

[SHRI G. S. DHILLON in the Chair]

But whatever may be the definition of socialism by the political party in power and whatever may be the opinion of the lady Member for herself in regard to socialism, I may point out that certain definitive definitions have been given in the Constitution and also in the Second and Third Five Year Plans on economic and industrial growth.

As pointed out already by my hon. friend Shri S. M. Krishna, it has been specifically provided in the Constitution in article 39 that :

The State shall, in particular, direct its policy towards securing—

- (b) that the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good;

[Shri Sezhiyan]

- (c) that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment;

We find a similar thing stated in the Second and Third Five Year Plans also. The First Five Year Plan did not concentrate so much on ideology. But when the Second Five Year Plan was drawn up, they had put it very plainly there. I would like to quote from the Second Five Year Plan in this connection, because I do not want to give the House and the outside world a loose interpretation that by socialism we do not mean that concentration should be avoided. The Second Five Year Plan says :

"The benefits of economic development must accrue more and more to the relatively less privileged classes of society and there should be progressive reduction of the concentration of income and wealth and economic power."

Even in the Industrial Policy Resolution the broad objectives have been clearly enunciated in the following terms namely, avoidance of monopoly and prevention of concentration of wealth, protection of small-scale industries against undue competition from large-scale industries and distribution of industrial development on a more widespread basis in different regions.

Therefore, it has been clearly enunciated in the Constitution, in the Five Year Plans and also in the Industrial Policy Resolution that concentration of economic power should be avoided and monopolistic growth should be eschewed and our planning and industrial licensing policy should be defined and implemented with that end in view.

Even those Members who are not very harsh on this concentration of power and who feel that it is inevitable that monopoly should come into force would concede that even in the advanced countries like the USA, there is a constant effort through statutes to control and curb monopolistic growth. Since

even the USA is at it, I think we should be all the more vigilant against this concentration of wealth and monopolistic growth in our industrialisation. But some may argue that to a certain extent monopoly has to be allowed, and in the beginning of economic growth it is an inevitable thing or a necessary evil. This point has been considered in the Third Five Year Plan and while stating the objectives of planned development, the Third Plan has this to say :

"Disparities in income and wealth which arise from industrial and economic growth raise a series of complex problems. The first of these concerns differences in levels of earned income. In advanced countries these have now been greatly reduced. On the other hand in under-developed countries, unless special measures are taken in the first phases of economic development itself, there is a tendency for them to become even larger than before."

Therefore, the argument that up to a certain stage, we should allow monopoly or concentration of economic power does not hold good. This has also been considered by the Planning Commission themselves.

15.00 HRS.

We have incorporated this aspect of socialism, prevention of monopoly growth and prevention of concentration of power in the Constitution. It has been incorporated in the resolutions. It has been included in election manifestoes of the Congress Party. But all these things are very happily on paper only. When it comes to actual implementation by Government, action is lacking. Every now and then, they say that socialism is their avowed goal. But in which direction are they moving?

This reminds me of the story of a person who was going to a particular destination. He saw a bystander and asked how far that particular town was? Suppose it is the town of Delhi. The bystander said, 24,980 miles. But the person said 'Somebody told me it is only about 10 miles from here'. The bystander said, 'Yes, that is when you are going by the direct route. But as

you are going in the opposite direction, it will be 24,980 mile to go round the world and then come to Delhi'. Socialism is the avowed goal, as Delhi was the avowed goal. But they are going in the opposite direction to reach it.

The Hazari Report has disclosed that the industrial licensing system has failed of its purpose of attaining certain social and economic objectives; it has, on the contrary, perpetuated many abuses for removing which the policy was enunciated. So these very objectives have been defeated. In many cases the loopholes and very loose rules have been taken advantage of by the industrial houses; in some others, there has been very blatant connivance.

Regarding the Hazari Report, some hon. Members have contested the data on which it is based and said they are incomplete. Even Dr. Hazari has conceded that point. But these have not been contested even by the Birla House. If the figures had been wrong, they would immediately have come out with a denial. After the disclosure of the Interim Report, there was a press conference addressed by Shri D. P. Mandelia, Birla's chief executive. He met the press on August 18, 1967. He did not contest the figures given by Dr. Hazari. The whole burden of his argument was that the Birla companies were not the property of the Birla family but were national concerns with investments by the public. I am ready to accept his argument that they are not Birla family concerns. If they have come out of the investments of the public as he said, we welcome them as national concerns. In that case, there should not be any objection to nationalising them. If the chief executive of Birlas himself concedes that they do not belong to the Birla family but to the public, there should be no objection at all to nationalising not only the Birla houses but all those other concerns which are national concerns.

Nobody should feel hurt at the disclosures in Dr. Hazari report. We are dealing with a malady which has arisen in the operation of the licensing system not only in regard to the Birla concerns but all concerns. If they belong to the

people, they will be submitting their annual reports and all those things to the public. But the people at large suffer; whenever there is unhealthy competition leading to disastrous results, whenever there is a fore-closure, all these things affect the entire country. That is our concern in this matter. The Hazari report has focussed the attention of the country to the splitting up of the Birla 'empire'—that word had been used by many speakers. About fifteen years ago, in Tamilnad, there was a book called, "Birla Maligaiyin Marmangal"—the 'Mysteries of Birla House' and it was sold in thousands. People read it avidly as they would Maha Bharatha, Madamanakamarajan Kathai, Treasure Island, etc. I do not know whether people will be reading this report also in the same way. So much mystery is revealed in this report also. Some of the industrial houses have become developmental houses. The Hazari report refers to the deliberate attempt by a few influential groups to foreclose licensable capacity by putting in multiple applications for the same product. Quite often there was considerable delay in the utilisation of such multiple licences even after the Capital Goods Committee approved. Dr. Hazari himself has stated that Birlas have not followed up about one half of their licences. It is the country which suffers in this process. It has been argued that only those who have got the capacity to establish industries come forward and snatch away all the licences. They say that those who stand in the queue get the ticket. But those who thus get the ticket do not enter the theater nor do they allow others to go in. The myth of capacity has also been exploded by Hazari in his report. He has said in his report that the resources were totally inadequate in certain cases. On page 9 the report says :

'It is perhaps no accident that certain Birla companies which appear repeatedly among the ranks of applicants—and some which do get approval for their proposals—have little to boast of in their balance sheets and profit and loss accounts. ... (they) have very small assets to show against the licenses issued to them. ...

[Shri Sezhiyan]

Aryavarta, Bikaner Commercial and Eastern Equipment and Sales...."

He mentions some other industries and then goes on :

"Manjushree, which holds licences/letters of intent, among other things, for acrylic fibre, bamboo pulp, steel castings and cotton spinning had, on 30th September 1964, a share capital of Rs. 5,000 and no liabilities or assets to speak of."

A company not having a share capital of Rs. 5,000 has applied for so many licences and got them too. Therefore, it is a myth to say that they take into consideration the capacity to establish industries. It is because they associate their names with big business houses, that this myth is created. Some hon. Member said that there was the connivance of the Government also. The Government has also failed, because, here, I concede that point that if they had been clever enough to get these things done, we cannot blame them. The Parliament has got the control over the Government and they are doing it only through them and they can control those business houses. Therefore, our chief objection is this, and the point that I want to raise is that the Government have been negligent; in many cases they have been negligent wantonly also. It has been pointed out in some papers openly how the officers who have been at the highest echelons in some of the important economic ministries go to occupy lucrative positions in private business after their retirement. Where they go after retirement is a thing to be considered very carefully by the Government. Some of the things which have come in are very revealing. It has been reported in the papers. One retired Deputy Chief Controller of Imports and Exports—he retired in November, 1966 got employed in March 1967 in one of the big industrial firms. In the same firm you can find a retired Chairman of the Railway Board, a retired Income-tax Commissioner, a retired Chairman of the Tarriff Board, a retired Chairman of the Board of Direct Taxes, a retired Financial Commissioner of Railways and

another retired Deputy Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

AN HON. MEMBER : Which is that firm ?

SHRI SEZHIYAN : Birlas. Only you dragged it; I did not say that. (*Interruption*) Therefore, I want to know how far these kinds of loopholes in the licensing system have been connived at by the officers. This is a point which has to be watched and investigated upon by the Government.

Secondly, not only concentration of economic power has been there. There has been a regional imbalance which also has to be noted. This also to a certain extent has been brought out by the Hazari Report. Even when the five Year Plan was being drafted, it was stated that there has been a regional imbalance. It was conceded that certain regions were very backward industrially and economically and those regions also should be brought forward and put on a par with other parts of the country. Therefore, the regional imbalance should be taken into account. I will not go through the entire report because certain communities instead of certain regions have been pointed out there. I would not go into that. I will speak for my own part: now, the entire southern region has been clubbed together; under one bracket they have put the entire southern people. The southern people have got only 7.8 per cent of the investment available in this country. Only so much was their capacity. (*Interruption*)

AN HON. MEMBER : What are those communities ?

SHRI SEZHIYAN : Marwari people, the Gujarati people etc. Now, the southern people have contributed only 7.8 per cent of the investment capital available in the country. If you take the population, it should have been 23 to 25 per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER : What is the position about the public sector ?

SHRI SEZHIYAN : It has not been given in the Hazari report. If my hon. friend Prof. Amin is able to give me I will be very thankful to him. That also will show an imbalance. (*Interruption*).

So, the regional imbalance is there, and that is also a most dangerous thing. In Calcutta and Bombay, together, they combine it and it comes to 36 per cent of the investment capital, and if you take all the communities there, comes to about 46 per cent. That is my recollection. Instead of this house or that house, if the Birla House has not been there, some other house would have come in and knocked off all these things. Therefore, in the ultimate analysis, the basic reason for the trend towards the concentration of economic power and wealth in this country is the structural defect in our financial system, namely, the existence of the private banks and financial institutions. As long as the banking institutions remain under the control of big industrial houses, there is hardly anything that the Government can do to check these unhealthy trends towards concentration of economic power, let alone the entire licensing system.

Lastly, I want to mention a word of caution. We know how the nationalised life insurance is functioning. In 1956 I was one of those who welcomed the nationalisation of life insurance. Even now I accept the basic principle of nationalisation, but it should not be implemented by a person who does not have faith in nationalisation.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : It should be run by Dr. Hazari.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : Not by Mr. Mody, by any stretch of imagination. (*Interruptions*). When a decision is taken, it should be implemented in good faith by persons who have got every faith and conviction in nationalisation and socialism. Mere lip service will not do any good for this country.

श्री त्रिभुवन विश्व (मोतीहारी) : सभापति जी, श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब ने अपने बयान में कहा है कि उन्होंने थैकर कमेटी बनाई है जो सारी बातों की जांच करेगी। मैं उनसे प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि सभी इंडस्ट्रियल हाउसिंग की, जो भी बड़े बड़े हाउसिस हैं उनकी जांच की जाए इसी एक हाउस की जांच न की जाए। तभी न्याय होगा।

M10LSS/68-6

ऐसा लगता है कि डा० हजारी ने एक आदमी के साथ बैर विरोध के कारण इस प्रकार की रिपोर्ट पेश कर दी है। ऐसा मालूम होता है कि एक बायस्ड रिपोर्ट पेश उन्होंने कर दी है।

इस पार्टी से कोई इन्कार नहीं कर सकता है चाहे इस पार्टी के लोग हों या उधर वाली पार्टी के लोग कि बिड़ला जी का इस देश के राजनीतिक जीवन में जबरदस्त स्थान रहा है। महात्मा गांधी भी उनके पास कई बार जाकर रहा करते थे। जहाँ पर वह मारे गए वह भी बिड़ला हाउस ही था। डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद उनके पास रहा करते थे, श्री राजागोपालाचार्य जो कि आज डी० एम० के० के नेता बन बैठे हैं तथा दूसरे बड़े-बड़े नेता भी वहीं उनके पास रहा करते थे। यह स्वाधीनता के पहले की बात है।

आज हम स्वाधीन हो चुके हैं। आज हम किसी को भी गाली दे सकते हैं। मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है इस पर। अगर बिड़ला के हाथ में मौनोपोली है, अगर मौनोपोलाइजेशन कुछ एक हाथों में हो गया है तो उसको आप कर्ब करें। लेकिन इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि कोई आदमी अगर देश का भला करता है या किसी आदमी ने अगर देश का भला किया है तो उसकी उसके लिए हम प्रशंसा न करें। कौन कह सकता है कि स्वाधीनता की लड़ाई में उसने चन्दा नहीं दिया, स्वाधीनता की लड़ाई में खाना पीना नहीं दिया। मैं पी०एस० पी० वालों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे जायें और अपने उन नेताओं से पूछें जो इस सदन में नहीं आए हैं कि उनको चन्दा उन्होंने दिया है कि नहीं दिया है, देता है या नहीं देता है। हम लोगों को चुनाव में नहीं मिलता है लेकिन इन लोगों को मिलता है। और ये कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लोग जो इतना बोलते हैं, क्या यह सच नहीं है कि स्वाधीनता की लड़ाई जब हम लड़ रहे थे तो इन्होंने ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट का साथ दिया था, हमको पकड़वाने

[श्री विभूति मिश्र]

की कोशिश की थी, इस काम में अंग्रेजों की इन्होंने मदद नहीं की थी .

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा (बेगुसराय) : आपसे ज्यादा जेलें हमने कहीं हैं और हम सब जानते हैं ।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : मुझे पकड़वाने की कोशिश आपकी पार्टी वालों ने की । मैं पुराना कांग्रेसी हूँ । मैं जानता हूँ कि आपने ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट का साथ हमारे खिलाफ दिया ।

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur) : We can have an investigation as to how many sons and sons-in-law of Congress people are employed in big industrial organisations.** So, why do you attack us like that ?

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH : On a point of order, Sir** This is very wrong. I want that it should be expunged from the records.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : It is a statement of fact and I repeat it.**

SHRI K. N. TIWARY : His party takes money from foreign countries (Interruptions).

श्री विभूति मिश्र : सभापति महोदय, हमने मिक्सड इकोनोमी के प्रिंसिपल को अपनाया है । हमारे देश में पब्लिक सेक्टर भी है और प्राइवेट सेक्टर भी है—

SHRI SONAVANE : What is your ruling on the point of order raised by Mr. Venkatasubbaiah ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is expunged.

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA : Sir, I rise to a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN : While discussing Dr. Hazari's Report it is much better to discuss it on merits rather than referring to individuals. As far as I can see, there is enough material in the report which we can discuss without recriminating each other.

मैं श्री विभूति मिश्र से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस रिपोर्ट में ही इतना कुछ है कि वह बगैर जाती हमले किये बहुत कुछ कह सकते हैं । वह बुजुर्ग हैं और पुराने पार्लियामेंटेरियन हैं ।

श्री शिव नारायण : उन लोगों को भी तो बुजुर्ग का लिहाज करना चाहिए । श्री विभूति मिश्र उनके वाप की उम्र के हैं ।

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : Sir, while speaking anybody can quote a fact. If he has said that ** is employed somewhere.

AN HON. MEMBER : **

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : ** or if a relation of somebody here is employed somewhere and somebody mentions it, I do not think it comes anywhere near parliamentary privileges and that it should not be expunged.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore) : Sir, when you have given a ruling how can it be debated upon ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have already told you that if you can name some individual it is all right. But making a recriminating reference, in particular, to ** I do not think, is a good thing (Interruptions)

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore) : Sir, Shri Bibhuti Mishra has used his tongue freely looking this side. We are not going to take it lying low.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : Already, Sir, a Member from their party, while referring to Mysore, where the Government is presided over by the Congress President himself, said that the Mysore Government connived in giving licences to one of the industrial houses in Mysore because that particular industrial house was their financiers. If this kind of a charge can be made on the floor of the House certainly the Congress Party has a right to reply to that. Therefore, if you permit this kind of a thing to go on in this House

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair. vide col. 1977

the reply also has to be allowed to remain.

SHRI S. KUNDU : There must be reply but not mud-slinging. You can disprove it with facts.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : We know how money goes to them. We know all that they practise (*Interruptions*). We know it more than they think we know.

SHRI S. KUNDU : She knows how the money goes everywhere.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : Unfortunately, it is not a question of such secrecy. It goes to them openly. We only know the *modus operandi*. We have accepted money from Birlas during the fight for independence. We have accepted and we have admitted it. But they do not admit it. They quote scriptures because they take from all the industrial houses inside behind closed doors (*Interruption*).

न तो मेरे मां-बाप गये थे और न मेरे बच्चे गए हैं दलाली करने के लिए। उधर जो बड़ी-बड़ी बातें करते हैं, जाते होंगे वे। यह हमारा पेशा नहीं है। न हमें जरूरत पड़ी है दलाली के पैसों की।

SHRI RAJARAM : If all these are facts, I wonder what is the government doing.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, I rise on a point of order.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : Sir, in this discussion may I point out one thing?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Banerjee wants to raise a point of order. Let me hear that first. . . . (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I am raising my point of order under rule 376(2). That rule says :

"A point of order may be raised in relation to the business before the House at the moment."

The business before the House at the moment is this particular Report, the Interim Report and the Final Report of Dr. Hazari (*Interruptions*)

15.27 HRS.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

A point arose when some remarks were made during the course of the discussion on the Hazari Report. My hon. friend, Shri Lakkappa, who is very vocal, mentioned**. Objections were taken to it in the other House.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Other side.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Yes, other side.

श्री शिवनारायण : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, रूलिंग हो चुकी है। अब पायंट आफ़ आर्डर का क्या सवाल है ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Perhaps it is not the same question. Anyhow, please resume your seat. Now, what is the point of order?

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali) : Sir, when a ruling has been given by the Chairman, how can he raise a point of order on the Chair's ruling?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, kindly bear with me for a while. I am not challenging the ruling of the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Even assuming that he is not questioning. . .

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, he has not given any ruling.

श्री मू० अ० सां : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जिन बातों को एक्सपंज कर दिया गया है, माननीय सदस्य उन्हीं को रिपीट कर रहे हैं और वे रिकार्ड में आ जायेंगी। यह अजीब तमाशा है ! जिन बातों को एक्सपंज कर दिया गया है, वे रिपीट हो रही हैं और फिर रिकार्ड हो रही हैं।

SHRI SHEO NARAIN : The Chairman has given a ruling and still it is being reopened.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : When the Chairman has given a ruling. . .

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair, vide col. 1977

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I am not going to mention that at all.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That is the main thing.

SHRI M. A. KHAN : He is repeating that sentence again.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He has assured that he is not going to refer to that at all. That ruling stands. There is no question of an appeal. Without referring to the ruling or challenging the ruling, if you have got to make any statement on a point of order, I am prepared to listen to it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I am not mentioning either the name or the ruling. My point of order arose not because of this. My point of order is quite different, controversy arose in this House as to whether the name** should be mentioned or not. I know, they are eligible for employment and if they are capable they will be employed by somebody; so I do not mind their employment. I am for employment. But I only say that during the discussion such things come and names do appear because we have got certain documents by Shri Chandra Shekhar which were placed there. Those documents may be read out. Some people may read from them. So, I want your guidance.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will consider whether they are in order or not.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Some charges were made against some minister's son rightly or wrongly and the Minister made a statement. I want that no frivolous charges are made against anyone. But when certain names are mentioned and they may be facts, why should that be expunged?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : As I have already ruled, so far as the Chairman's ruling goes, it cannot be questioned and there is no appeal against that. Initially when the debate started

I cautioned all Members not to bring in names as far as possible. As he has mentioned, certain things have appeared in the press regarding certain document presented in the Rajya Sabha. If the factual statement is there, nobody has immunity from criticism; nobody enjoys that in this country. All are equal before the law.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I would appeal to the House, through you, that the matter which we are considering is of a great importance and without bringing in subjective considerations it will be desirable if the entire subject is discussed with an objective view. I was actually admiring the tone with which the debate on this subject was initiated and had been going on. I hope the same spirit will prevail when we are left with only two or three hours to dispose of this matter. Members are entitled to make statements and when they have the right to reply, in the course of their reply they can deal with those points made in other speeches. So far as ministers are concerned, we are Members of the House and can look after ourselves. But I would appeal to the House that as far as possible names of persons, who are not Members of this House and who have not the opportunity to defend themselves, should be avoided. If that is done, it will be in keeping with the dignity of the House.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : उपाध्यक्ष जी, हमारे देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था मिक्सड एकोनामी की है। मिक्सड एकोनामी में पब्लिक सेक्टर भी है, प्राइवेट सेक्टर भी है। पब्लिक सेक्टर में जिस पर हमारा होल्ड है, 22 अरब रुपया लगा है। क्या उस पब्लिक सेक्टर में आमदनी होती है उसको देख लीजिए। प्राइवेट सेक्टर में जो काम करते हैं वह बेसिक इंडस्ट्रीज का काम नहीं करते। बेसिक इंडस्ट्रीज के अलावा कन्ज्यूमर इंडस्ट्री पर वह ज्यादा ध्यान देते हैं और हमारी इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी के अनुसार सरकार ने उनके हाथ में वही काम दिया है।

अब सवाल है लाइसेंस मिलने का। लाइसेंस के लिए सरकार के यहां जो मुहकमा

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair, vide col. 1977.

है उसमें दरखास्त वह देते हैं। दरखास्त देने के बाद उससे लोगों को लाइसेंस मिलता है। लाइसेंस मिलने के बाद अब जिनके पास रिसोर्सेज रहते हैं वह अपना कारखाना लगाते हैं। जिनके पास नहीं रहता है वह कहीं विदेश से उस के लिए पैसे का इंतजाम करते हैं और कारखाना लगाते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार अपने लाइसेंसिंग डिपार्टमेंट को ठीक करे, उसको कहे, वह देखे कि किसको कितना लाइसेंस मिला ? उसमें कितना कारखाना उसने लगाया ? लगाया तो कैसा वह कारखाना चल रहा है और जो सरकार के पास कारखाने नहीं हैं उस कारखाने को लगावे या दूसरे कारखाने को लगावे सरकार को इस बात का ध्यान देना चाहिए। ऐसा करना चाहिए या नहीं करना चाहिए, यह उसको देखना चाहिए।

दूसरी बात एक यह है कि जो हमारे यहां तरीका रहा उस में कोई रोक नहीं रही। रोक नहीं रहने के कारण से इस तरह से हो सकता है कि किसी को कोई लाइसेंस मिला हो, कम मिला हो या बेसी मिला हो लेकिन लाइसेंस मिला तो उसने देश के लिए सामान पैदा किया या नहीं पैदा किया, अगर पैदा नहीं किया, कारखाना नहीं लगाया तो उसको भी देखें। अगर ज्यादा मुनाफा कमाया तो बजट सेशन यह चल रहा है। हमारे यहां फाइनेंस बिल पेश है। उसमें अमेंडमेंट करके उसके ऊपर टैक्स लगाए और टैक्स के जरिए से पैसा वसूल करे क्योंकि डेमोक्रेसी में प्राइवेट सेक्टर रहता ही है और हमारे यहां तो दोनों सेक्टर हैं। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस के ऊपर ध्यान दे कि किस तरह से इसका सुधार कर सकते हैं। हां, अगर यह है कि दूसरा कोई आदमी इसी तरह का योग्य है, अपने यहां कारखाना लगा सकता है, तो जिसके पास बहुत से कारखाने हैं उसको कारखाना नहीं देना चाहिए। यह सरकार का काम है और सरकार को इस डिपार्टमेंट में सुधार करना चाहिए।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, एक बात मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि 1 खरब और 51 अरब चाइना ने रशा से कर्जा लिया और कर्जा लेकर उसने अपने देश को इतना इंडस्ट्रियलाइज बनाया कि 1 खरब और 51 अरब उसने दूसरों को कर्जा दिया है। अभी हाल में एक किताब लाइब्रेरी में आई है जिसका नाम है "दि फारेन एड प्रोग्राम आफ दि सोवियट ब्लाक एंड कम्युनिस्ट चाइना" बार्ड कर्ट मूलर, उस किताब में यह लिखा है। तो किसी से हम कर्जा लें या कोलैबोरेशन करें उसमें कोई बुरी बात नहीं है क्योंकि चाइना ने खुद ऐसा किया और आज वह कितना शक्तिशाली देश हो गया है ? इसलिए अगर हम कोई कोलैबोरेशन करते हैं तो उससे घबड़ाना नहीं चाहिए।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जो प्रोसीजर यह था जांच पड़ताल का उस में मैं हजारी साहब को कहूंगा, वह तो हैं नहीं, एक रिपोर्ट उन्होंने दे दी प्लानिंग कमीशन को। मैं कहता हूँ प्लानिंग कमीशन को अगर दुरुस्त किये होते तो देश आज कहीं आगे बढ़ गया होता। लेकिन जो गोलमाल हुआ वह प्लानिंग कमीशन में गोलमाल हुआ। उसकी खराबी से कहीं मोनोपली हो गई कहीं नहीं हुई, कहीं कम आमदनी हुई, कहीं ज्यादा आमदनी हुई। इसलिए मैं कहूंगा कि प्लानिंग कमीशन के अन्दर सुधार होना चाहिए। ऐग्रीकल्चर सेक्टर की हालत ऐसी है कि वहां किसान को चार पैसा नहीं मिलता है। अगर मिलता है तो गाडगिल साहब आये और कहा कि टैक्स लाना चाहिए। लेकिन मैं एक बात आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आज हम लोग 500 रुपया तनख्वाह पाते हैं और 31 रुपया रोज पाते हैं। जो हल चलाने वाला है वह दो रुपये रोज पाता है तो हम क्लास क्रियेट करते हैं या नहीं करते हैं ? जो 5 हजार रुपया महीना पाते हैं और जो 5 रुपया महीना पाते हैं उनके बीच में हम क्लास क्रियेट करते हैं या नहीं करते हैं ? यही सारी वजह है जिस कारण से हमारे देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था ठीक नहीं

[श्री विभूति मिश्र]

चल रही है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इसके ऊपर ध्यान दे। हमारे विरोधी भाई घबड़ाते हैं। मैं कहता हूँ कि जब आप लोग चार्ज लगाते हैं और आपका उसी प्वाइंट में जवाब दिया जाता है तो आप घबड़ाते क्यों हैं? राजनीति में आदमी को गम्बर होना चाहिए। जब दूसरे पर आप चार्ज लगाते हैं तो दूसरा भी अगर आप पर चार्ज लगाए तो उसमें घबड़ाने की क्या बात है? हम लोग इसी राजनीति में अपनी जिन्दगी बिताएँ...

SHRI S. KUNDU : Again, he is making an election speech. Here is the report he can study it and speak on it.

श्री विभूति मिश्र: उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं अपने विरोधी भाइयों से कहूँगा कि वह हमारी बात को सुनें और दूसरों को भी वही मार्जिन दें जो अपने लिए चाहते हैं।

मुझे यह कहना है कि उन टर्ज आफ रेफ्रेंस के साथ साथ उनको पूरी छानबीन करनी चाहिए थी लेकिन उन्होंने पूरी छानबीन नहीं की है। वह खुद कहते हैं कि हमारे पास पूरा डाटा नहीं है, जब पूरा डाटा नहीं है तो हम रिपोर्ट क्या देंगे। उनको साल भर का मौका और देना चाहिये और पूरे डाटा के साथ सारी बात रिपोर्ट करते। कचहरी में जब तक केस पूरी तरह से साबित नहीं होता है, उसकी हारजीत पर अमल नहीं होता है, ऊपरवाली कोर्ट उस केस को नीचेवाली कोर्ट में वापस कर देती है और कहती है कि इसके बारे में पूरी छानबीन करके रिपोर्ट दो। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि यह रिपोर्ट अधूरी रिपोर्ट है और कुछ ऐसा मालूम होता है कि यह रिपोर्ट कुछ बायस्ड है।

लेकिन एक बात जो हमारे भाई कहते हैं कि हम समाजवादी हैं—आज तक समाजवाद की कोई परिभाषा नहीं बनाई गई। एक बात मेरी समझ में आती है कि मीन्ड-आफ-प्रोडक्शन का राष्ट्रीयकरण हो, ईच एकार्डिंग टु कॅपेसिटी एण्ड ईच एकार्डिंग टु नीड्स—

यह बात तो समझ में आती है, लेकिन आगे कौन सा सोशलिज्म है, वह सोशलिज्म आज तक मेरी समझ में नहीं आया। जो कम्युनिस्ट कंट्रीज़ हैं—आज रशिया भी कहता है कि हमारे यहां पूरा समाजवाद नहीं आया, पूरा कम्युनिज्म नहीं आया—उस किताब को मेरे भाई पढ़ें कि उनके यहां आया या नहीं आया, लेकिन हमारे देश में नहीं आया, तो कौन सी बात है, हमारे यहां तो डेमोक्रेसी है, मिक्स्ड इकानमी है, यहां तो दोनों तरह की बातें चलती हैं। इसलिये, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कहूँगा कि हमारे फखरुद्दीन साहब ने जो कमेटी बनाई है उसमें यह जोड़ें कि सभी हाउसेज़ की पूरी इन्कवायरी कर के, तभी किसी चीज़ का फैसला करें।

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : There has been a misconception about what my hon. friend from the Congress has said. I was the general secretary of the Congress for twelve years before Independence. I can say that not a pie came from any capitalist to the AICC funds. Some moneys that were given by Birlas or others were for purposes of financing activities conducted by Gandhiji such as those of the Harijan Sewak Sangh and the Hindi Pracharak Sangh and so on. There were some moneys given by the capitalists to the Swarajists because they advocated their cause in the Assembly. So far as the Congress was concerned, I can say with authority that not a pie came for political purposes from any capitalist whatsoever.

AN HON. MEMBER : Wherefrom did the money come then?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Shri J. B. Kripalani is talking of the pre-Independence days. What is the position now?

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : My hon. friend has asked wherefrom the money came. It came from the four-annual subscription of the members.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Not now.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : Let my hon. friend listen to me. When we

were put in jail in 1930, the only money which the Congress Committee had was Rs. 25,000. We always lived from hand to mouth.

SHR S. M. BANERJEE : That was Dadaji's Congress.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : Nobody in office ever received more than Rs. 75. We conducted ourselves in the most economical way, and we relied upon our fees for all these purposes.

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा (बेगूसराय) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम डा० हजारी को धन्यवाद देते हैं कि उन्होंने अपनी रिपोर्ट में हमारे आर्थिक, हमारे सामाजिक, हमारे राजनीतिक जीवन के एक ऐसे कोढ़ की तरफ पूरे देश का ध्यान खींचा है, कि यदि हमने उस कोढ़ को खत्म नहीं किया तो वह हमारे पूरे आर्थिक, सामाजिक और राजनीतिक जीवन को खत्म कर देगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज तक हम लोग जानते थे—लगानखोरी, आज तक हम लोग जानते थे—सूदखोरी, लेकिन इस रिपोर्ट ने हमारे सामने एक नई चीज भयानक राक्षस के रूप में खड़ी कर दी है, जो हमारे आर्थिक, सामाजिक और राजनीतिक जीवन को निगलने के लिये आगे बढ़ रही है और वह कोढ़ है—लाइसेंस-खोरी। तो इस लाइसेंसखोरी के कोढ़ से, जो इस रिपोर्ट में हमारे सामने प्रकट होती है, डर कर या उसकी ओर से देश का ध्यान मूंदने के लिये—जैसा हमारे स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के भाई ने डा० हजारी रिपोर्ट की सच्चाई या उनकी नीयत पर शक किया है—प्रयत्न करने से काम नहीं चलेगा। प्रश्न यह है कि क्या डा० हजारी की रिपोर्ट में पहली बार इजारेदारी की समस्या—विभिन्न तरह के भ्रष्टाचारों के जरिये से, शासकीय यन्त्रों, मंत्री मंडल के अधिकारों को भ्रष्टाचार के जरिये से दुरुपयोग करके—खड़ी की गई है, जिसकी ओर इस रिपोर्ट में ध्यान आकृष्ट किया गया है, क्या यह पहली बार यहां आई है? ऐसी बात नहीं है। इसी आशय की बात हमको पहले के बहुत से कमीशनों की रिपोर्टों में मिलती है। इसके पहले जो

मोनोपोली कमीशन इकबायरी के लिये बना, 1965 में उसकी रिपोर्ट आई थी, उससे भी इस बात की पुष्टि होती है, उसके पहले महालोबोनिंस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आई—उससे भी इस बात की पुष्टि होती है। इसलिये डा० हजारी को यह दोष देना कि वह किसी खास पूंजीवादी घराने के पक्ष या विपक्ष में हैं—गलत बात है, क्योंकि अब तक जो जांचें हुई हैं, जिस हद तक हुई हैं, वे सबकी सब इस बात में एक राय है कि हमारे आर्थिक जीवन में इजारेदारी बढ़ गई है और यह हमारे पूरे सामाजिक, आर्थिक और राजनीतिक जीवन के लिये खतरा है।

यह चीज तब से शुरू हुई, जब कि 1952 में जो औद्योगिक नीति हमने स्वीकार की, औद्योगिक कानून हमने बनाया, उसमें बहुत ही स्पष्ट तौर से स्वीकार किया गया था कि हम देश के आर्थिक जीवन में इजारेदारी को नहीं बढ़ने देंगे। न केवल 1952 के इण्डस्ट्रीज एक्ट में बल्कि सच पूछा जाय तो इस एक्ट में जो बात कही गई थी, वह हमारे संविधान के जो डाइरेक्टिव प्रिन्सिपल्स हैं, उसमें भी है, जिसमें कि यह बात बहुत ही साफ साफ तौर पर कही गई है कि इजारेदारी को नहीं बढ़ने देना चाहिये, उससे सामाजिक, उससे राजनीतिक, उससे आर्थिक हानि है, तो प्रश्न यह होता है कि जब हमारे संविधान ने इजारेदारी के खिलाफ बहुत ही स्पष्ट सिद्धान्त निर्धारित किया है, जब कि इण्डस्ट्रीज एक्ट ने इजारेदारी के खिलाफ बहुत ही स्पष्ट नीति निर्धारित की है और देश के इण्डस्ट्रीज कानून के मातहत लाइसेंस को एक हथियार बनाया गया, औद्योगिक लाइसेंस को एक हथियार बनाया गया—इसके खिलाफ लड़ने के लिये—फिर यह सब कुछ कैसे हुआ? जो लाइसेंस इजारेदारी के खिलाफ लड़ने के लिये हथियार के रूप में इस्तेमाल होना चाहिये था, वह लाइसेंस का हथियार इजारेदारी को बढ़ाने के रूप में इस्तेमाल किया गया—यह प्रश्न है, जो हमें सोचना है।

[श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा]

हम यहां पर बहस को इस दायरे में नहीं रखना चाहते हैं कि यह खास घराना है, उसको ही हमें लेना है, सवाल आर्थिक, सामाजिक और राजनीतिक है कि वह इजारेदारी जिसको तोड़ना चाहिये था, जिसको दूर करना चाहिये था, जिसको दूर करने के लिये, जिसको न बढ़ने देने के लिये लाइसेंस की नीति अख्तियार की गई थी, कैसे वह लाइसेंस की नीति विपरीत परिणाम की ओर देश को ले जाती है—यह प्रश्न सबसे गंभीर और विचारणीय है। इसके सिलसिले में हम बिरला हों, टाटा हों, डालमिया हों, गोयनका हों, इन बड़े बड़े घरानों को उतना दोष नहीं देंगे, क्योंकि उनसे हमने कभी यह उम्मीद नहीं की थी कि वे इजारेदारी की ओर नहीं बढ़ेंगे, क्योंकि हम जानते हैं कि इजारेदारी तो उनके स्वभाव में है; हम जानते हैं कि वह इजारेदारी की ओर बढ़ना चाहते थे, बढ़ना चाहते हैं, लेकिन हम दोष देंगे सरकार को, इस कांग्रेस सरकार को। क्यों कांग्रेस सरकार ने जनता को यह विश्वास दिलाया था कि संविधान के उमूलों की रक्षा के लिए हम इजारेदारी को बढ़ने नहीं देंगे? लाइसेंस देने का हथियार आपके हाथ में दिया गया था उसका इस्तेमाल आपने इजारेदारी के खिलाफ न करके, उसके हक में क्यों किया? यह हमारा आपके ऊपर आरोप है, इस सरकार के ऊपर आरोप है। यदि सरकार और उनके मातहत अधिकारी इस लाइसेंस का सही इस्तेमाल करते, उसी उद्देश्य के लिए इसका इस्तेमाल करते जिस उद्देश्य के लिए इसकी व्यवस्था की गई थी तो आज इस सदन में बहस करने की आवश्यकता न पड़ती। लेकिन ऐसा मालूम होता है कि इस सरकार के भीतर सरकार है, कांग्रेस सरकार के भीतर बिरला सरकार है वरना आज यह क्यों होता? नीति है इजारेदारी को तोड़ने की, इजारेदारी को कमजोर करने की लेकिन नतीजा इसके विपरीत होता है, इजारेदारी बढ़ती है। यह तब तक सम्भव नहीं था जब तक कि सरकार

के भीतर सरकार न होती। हम कहना चाहते हैं—कोई व्यक्तिगत आक्षेप की बात नहीं है—यह एक सामाजिक और राजनीतिक समस्या है। ऐसा क्यों हो रहा है।

इसका एक प्रधान कारण है। हमारे देश के जो बड़े बड़े औद्योगिक घराने हैं उनकी राजनीतिक दलों के साथ मिली भगत है। मैं स्वतन्त्र पार्टी की बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ क्योंकि उनके हाथ में शासन नहीं है। इस समय तो कांग्रेस के हाथ में ही शासन है। मैं देश की पूरी औद्योगिक व्यवस्था के सम्बन्ध में कह रहा हूँ कि उसकी विशेषकर शासक दल के साथ मिली भगत है, साठ-गांठ है। यही एक कारण है कि बजाय इसके कि लाइसेंस को इजारेदारी तोड़ने और कमजोर करने के एक हथियार के रूप में इस्तेमाल किया जाता, उसको इजारेदारी बढ़ाने के रूप में इस्तेमाल किया गया। इसके अतिरिक्त कोई दूसरा कारण मालूम नहीं होता। यदि सरकार के साथ उनकी मिली भगत न होती, मंत्रियों के साथ मिली भगत न होती, हमारे औद्योगिक और आर्थिक मंत्रालय के अधिकारियों के साथ उनकी मिली भगत न होती, तो फिर यह कैसे सम्भव हो सकता था? मैं कांग्रेस और शासक दल के भाइयों से जानना चाहता हूँ कि फिर क्या कारण है कि आपकी नीति के विपरीत लाइसेंस का नतीजा हो रहा है?

इसके सिलसिले में, मुझे माफ करेंगे, इस सदन के बाहर बहुत से अखबारों में बहुत सी बातें स्पष्ट रूप से कही गई हैं। दूसरे सदन में भी शासक दल के ही एक माननीय सदस्य ने भ्रष्टाचारों की एक लम्बी फेहरिस्त पेश की है कि किस तरह से शासक दल और औद्योगिक घराने, खासकर के बिरला घराने की मिली भगत से इजारेदारी को बढ़ाया गया है। मुझे आशा हो तो मैं उस रिपोर्ट की कुछ बातों को इस सदन के सामने पेश करूँ। वह रिपोर्ट राज्य सभा में टेबिल पर रखी गई है और हम समझते हैं यदि आवश्यकता हुई तो यहां

पर भी उस रिपोर्ट को टेबिल पर रख सकते हैं और हम उसको यहां पर रखना भी चाहेंगे। उसमें बतलाया गया है :

"Large amounts of salaries are given to the wives and other relatives of the senior executives of Birlas. These recipients of salaries do not work at all nor do they make any contribution to the company...."

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I rise on a point of order. Our rules provide that when a document is read and quoted by the hon. Member, the relevant portions of it should be laid on the Table of the House. I, therefore, request you to allow him to lay it on the Table.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH : Only when a Minister reads out from some paper, it has to be placed on the Table of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Banerjee, you were a Member and I was a Member. There have been many occasions, and you have seen the former rulings. As I have said, whatever he is quoting from some other document which happens to have been placed on the Table of the other House, I am not permitting him just now to place it here. It will be examined properly and if it is considered, then we shall take it up.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, may I remind you? You are much more mature than I.

श्री अ० सि० सृगल (बिलासपुर) :
उपाध्यक्ष जी, जब कि एक हाउस में एक चीज उन्होंने रख दी, उस के बाद आपको विचार करना पड़ेगा कि उस चीज को इस हाउस में वह रख सकते हैं या नहीं। यह निर्णय आपको लेना है।

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have already said that automatically it cannot be placed on the Table of the House. I do not know whether it has been placed there. (Interruption) I have given my ruling. On this point, I am not going to entertain any objection.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : May I remind you of one thing so that you may refresh your memory and mind? At that historic session, when the CBI report came in, you remember Shri Kamath was there and he read out certain portions. Like Robert Bruce, he fought for days and ultimately, the hon. Speaker, in his wisdom, said that the report can be laid on the Table of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I do remember those days, and I know the ruling. But I have said, let him submit it and we shall see whether it can be placed on the Table of the House. Just now, at the present moment, I am not permitting him straightway to place it on the Table of the House.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Irrespective of what Robert Bruce has done, Guy Fox should not be permitted to do it.

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपकी सेवा में यह रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत कर दूंगा, फिर जैसा भी आप सोचें, वैसा करें। एक दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक साप्ताहिक अखबार "न्यू वेज" है, उसमें 31 दिसम्बर, 1967 के अंक में इस समस्या पर रोशनी डाली गई है कि किस प्रकार से बाबजूद संविधान के आदेश के लाइसेंस का दुरुपयोग इजारेदारी के पक्ष में किया गया है। इस सम्बन्ध में जो बातें कही गई हैं, वे बड़ी ही गम्भीर बातें हैं। मैं नहीं चाहता कि इन बातों को व्यक्तिगत आक्षेप की स्प्रिट में लिया जाय। यह हमारी सामाजिक और राजनीतिक समस्या है और इसी रूप में इसको लिया जाय। यदि कोई गलत बातें हैं तो उनको गलत साबित करना चाहिये और यदि सही बातें हैं तो उसके मुताबिक कार्यवाही होनी चाहिये। जब सारे देश में बात फैल रही है, अखबारों में बातें लिखी जा रही हैं तो फिर हम उसकी ओर से अपनी आंखें कैसे मूंद सकते हैं। (व्यवधान) इसमें कहा गया है कि हमारी सरकार में बैठे हुए बहुत से लोग देश भक्त होने के बजाय बिरला-भक्त हैं। इस सिलसिले में कुछ

मंत्रियों के नाम भी लिये गये हैं। आज उन मंत्रियों की सुरत हम यहाँ नहीं देख पा रहे हैं।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : May I request Mr. Sharma to resume his speech tomorrow? Before we proceed to the next item, I call upon the Minister, Shri Bhagat.

15.59 HRS.

MOTION RE. STATEMENT ON
COMMONWEALTH IMMIGRANTS
BILL OF U.K.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore) :
At what time would the half-an-hour discussion be taken up, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is doubtful. I cannot off-hand say anything on that now.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN
THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL
AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) :
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, a statement was laid on the Table of the House on the 29th February in connection with the new Immigration Law which was passed by the British Parliament on the 1st March. I have also made a similar statement in the other House. Various suggestions have been made as to how this situation can be met.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) :
मन्त्री महोदय कौन सा स्टेटमेंट दे रहे हैं ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Before you move your motion, I have permitted him to make a statement. That is all. He is entitled to make a statement if he so desires, and I have permitted him. You may move your motion later on.

16 HRS.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : The man in possession of the floor is the man in whose name the motion stands. But since it has been your pleasure to allow the minister to make a statement, we would not quarrel about it. But the rules are clear. It is a set debate. At a later stage, the minister can make a

statement, but he cannot take precedence over us, in whose names the motion stands.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have not yet called Mr. Gupta. Before that I have made my observation that I have permitted Mr. Bhagat to make a statement so that it may be helpful to the debate.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा कहना है कि यह एक प्रीसीज्योर की बात है और प्रीसीडेंट की बात है। एजेंडे के हिसाब से मेरा मोशन 4 बजे आना है और चूंकि चार बजे गये हैं इसलिए मुझे पहले अपना मोशन पेश करने और उस पर कहने का मौका उपाध्यक्ष महोदय को देना चाहिए। लेकिन बैसा न करवा कर मंत्री महोदय जो पहले अपना बयान देने जा रहे हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह एक गलत परम्परा होगी। इसलिए मेरी प्रार्थना है कि पहले मुझे अपना मोशन मूव कर लेने दीजिये। अगर मंत्री महोदय कुछ कहना चाहते हैं तो वह बीच में इंटरवीन कर सकते हैं या बाद में अपना जवाब दे सकते हैं। लेकिन मूवर के मोशन मूव करने से पहले मंत्री महोदय का उम पर बोलने देना एक गलत परम्परा को यहाँ पर कायम करना होगा।

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I only wanted to be of help to the House. This is not a new precedent. Many times in the past not only in this Parliament but in the earlier Parliaments also Statements were made in the beginning. It is not a new precedent. But I am not insisting on making the statement, if they do not want it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It should be helpful to the debate and therefore I permitted. But since he himself has withdrawn, Mr. Gupta may begin now. But I will have to be firm about the time—20 minutes.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : Is it a punishment of objecting to the minister making the statement?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He himself on his own has withdrawn. I have not asked him to withdraw.