

[Mr. Deputy Speaker]

"That this House do agree with the Fourteenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 17th May, 1972,"

The motion was adopted.

15.31 hrs

RESOLUTION re NATIONALISATION OF LEADING INDUSTRIAL HOUSES—Contd.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER : We will now take up further discussion of the Resolution moved by Shri H N Mukerjee on 5th May, 1972 for which 2½ hours were allotted. We have already taken one hour and the balance is 1½ hours

Shri Satpal Kapoor to continue his speech

श्री सतपाल कपूर (पटियाला) : डिप्युटी स्पीकर साहब, मैं इस रेजोल्यूशन की भावना से पूरी तरह इतिफाक करता हूँ, उस से पूरी तरह एग्री करता हूँ।

हमारे यहाँ कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि पहले प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाया जाये, इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोमथ को तेज़ किया जाये, उस के बाद उस को नेशनलाइज करना और डिस्ट्रिब्यूट करना हमारे अल्टीमेट में होगा और हम जब चाहे तब उस को नेशनलाइज और डिस्ट्रिब्यूट कर सकेंगे। मैं इस थ्योरी से इतिफाक नहीं करता हूँ। मैं उन लोगों के से नहीं हूँ, जो यह समझते हैं कि पहले बिड़ला, टाटा, साहूजन वर्ग रह बड़े-बड़े मानोपली हाउसिज देश में कारखाने खड़े कर लें, हम देश के लोगों को लूट लें और फिर सरकार जब चाहे तब उन को नेशनलाइज कर लेगी।

15.31 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair.]

पिछले कुछ सालों में देश में मानोपलीज बढ़ रही हैं। हम मानोपलीज को कर्ब करने के लिए मानोपलीज बिल लाये, लेकिन उस सिलसिले में बहुत कुछ नहीं हुआ। बल्कि यह हुआ कि मानोपलीज कमीशन ने मानोपली हाउसिज को वे लाइसेंस दे दिये, जो कि वे चाहते थे। पिछले तीन चार सालों में हमारे यहाँ किसी भी मानोपली हाउस को किसी लाइसेंस के लिए मायूस नहीं होना पड़ा—हाँ, उस के लिए एफर्ट जंकर करनी पड़ी।

इस वक्त मानोपलीज कमीशन में ऐसे लोग बैठे हैं—मैं किसी की चर्चा नहीं करना चाहता—, जिनका अपना विश्वास मानोपलीज को कर्ब करने में नहीं है। उन का अपना विश्वास यह है कि अगर कोई बिज मानोपली हाउस अपना प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाना चाहता है, तो उस पर एतराज नहीं करना चाहिए, अगर कोई एक्सपेंशन की स्कीम ले कर आता है, तो उस की मदद करनी चाहिए। आज का मानोपलीज कमीशन मानोपलीज को कर्ब करने के बजाये उन को एनकरेज कर रहा है।

मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से मुतालिबा करना चाहता हूँ कि मानोपलीज कमीशन को दोबारा बनाया जाये, उस को रीकास्टीट्यूट किया जाये। उस में ऐसे लोग होने चाहिए, जिन की कनविक्शन, इरादा, नीयत और भावना यह हो कि मानोपलीज को कर्ब करना है। पिछला उन्चुर्बा यह बताता है कि इस वक्त मानोपलीज कमीशन में जो लोग बैठे हैं, वे मानोपलीज को एनकरेज करने वाले हैं।

हमारे यहाँ जो टैरिफ़ कमीशन बना हुआ है, अगर कोई बिज मानोपली हाउस

उस के पास किसी प्राइव्शन की कीमत बढ़ाने के लिए चाये, तो अगर वह तीन घाने कहे, तो टैरिफ़ कमीशन उस को चार घाने देने के लिए तैयार है। टैरिफ़ कमीशन में जो लोग बैठे हैं, वे किस क्लास से ताल्लुक रखते हैं, वे किस क्लास की नुमायंदगी करते हैं, यह देखना है। इसलिए टैरिफ़ कमीशन को भी रो-कॉन्स्टीट्यूट किया जाये। उस में ऐसे लोग लाये जाने चाहिए, जो देख सकें कि बिज़िनेस हाउसिज़ का सही मकसद क्या है।

कहा जाता है कि अगर प्राइव्शन बढ़ेगा, तो सोशल रिफ़ॉर्मिंग होगी, सोशल प्राबलम्ज हल होगी। देश में प्राइव्शन बढ़ा, बिग मानोपली हाउसिज़ बड़े, बिड़ला, टाटा, डालमिया की ताकत बढ़ी, लेकिन यह बात साफ़ है कि सोशल प्राबलम्ज दूर नहीं हुई हैं, बल्कि सोशल प्राबलम्ज फ़ीएट हुई है। डिस्पैरिटी बढ़ी है, कम नहीं हुई है। बिग मानोपली हाउसिज़ हमारे यहां यह क्लेम करते हैं—हमें दुनिया का नक़शा मालूम है, इंडिया का सरमायादार वह सरमायेदार नहीं है जिस ने फ़्यूडलिज़्म को ख़त्म किया हो। इंडिया का सरमायादार वह सरमायादार है जो प्रिंसेज़ की गोद में बढ़ा, सट्टेबाज़ी से, पूट के बिज़नेस से और टैक्सटाइल्स से घाने घाया और हिन्दुस्तान के आज़ाद होने के बाद हमारी मेहरबानी से घाने घाया। एफ़िषमेंट—इंडस्ट्रियलाइज़ेशन के लिए इंडियन कैपिटलिज़्म ने बहुत बड़े एफ़र्ट्स नहीं किये हैं, बहुत बड़ी मेहनत नहीं की है। सरमायेदार प्राइव्शन इसलिए नहीं करता कि लोगों का अक़रत किस बात की है। वह इसलिए करता है कि किस चीज़ की मार्केट में क्षपत है। वह पैदावार इसलिए करता है कि प्राकटि किन्न चीज़ में प्यादा मिलता है। हमारे यहां प्लानिंग कमीशन ने गाइड

लाइन दिए कि हमारी बेसिक नोइस यह है उस के मुताबिक़ प्राइव्शन होना चाहिए। लेकिन गाइड लाइन किस ने तैयारी ? उस में डिफ़ाल्टर कौन है ? उस को पूरा न करने की जिम्मेदारी किस पर है ? कुछ लोग हमारे साथी क्विटसाइज करने हैं कि पब्लिक सैक्टर फ़िज़िल घाउट हो रहा है। पब्लिक सैक्टर फ़िज़िल घाउट नहीं हो रहा है। पब्लिक सैक्टर और प्राइवेट सैक्टर का कांसेप्ट भ्रमल है। पब्लिक सैक्टर इसलिए इंट्रोड्यूस किया जाता है, इसलिए घाने लाया जाता है कि जो हमारी बेसिक नोइस है या जिस चीज़ को जरूरत है उस को पैदा किया जाय। हमारी बेसिक नैसेसिटीज़ को कौन पूरा करता है ? पब्लिक सैक्टर करता है। प्राइवेट सैक्टर क्या करता है ? प्राइवेट सैक्टर का कांसेप्ट यह है कि प्राइव्शन उस चीज़ का करे जिस में प्राफ़िट हो। इसलिए अगर हम यह सोचते हों और हमारे में से भी कुछ साथी ऐसा सोचते है, तो यह ठीक नहीं है। मैं तो ऐसा नहीं सोचता। पिछले साल के लोक सभा के एलेक्शन और इस साल के असेम्बली के एलेक्शन में लोगों ने किस लिए वोट दिए ? किस ज़रूरे के तहत, किस फ़ीलिंग के साथ वोट दिए ? लोगों का यह यकीन था और यह यकीन है कि समाज में तब्दीली लायी जायगी, समाज को बदला जायेगा, एकोनामिक स्ट्रक्चर में तब्दीली होगी। अगर हम इस प्रजेंट सिस्टम और प्रेजेन्ट एकोनामिक पालिसी के मुताबिक़ चलें तो समाज में तब्दीली घाने वाली नहीं है। यह समाज इसी तरह चलेगा इस समाज को बदलने के लिए लोगों को और रास्ता अक़्यार करना पड़ेगा। इसलिए रेजोल्यूशन की जो भावना है उस से मैं इतराक़ करता हूँ। लेकिन मिस्टर बेनर्जी की जो तरमीम है, मैं चाहूंगा कि मिस्टर एच० एन० मुक़र्जी उस तरमीम

[श्री सतपाल कपूर]

को मान ले। ऐसा एक दिन में नहीं हो सकता कि प्रायः प्रायः घंटे के बाद सारे मोनोपली हाउसेज को खत्म कर दे। इसलिए जो तरमीम उन की है उस को वह मान लें तो काफी हद तक प्राबलम साल्व हो सकती है कि फोर्थ फाइव ईयर प्लान में हम तमाम मोनोपली हाउसेज को टेक धीवर कर लें। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस रेजोल्यूशन की इस तरमीम के साथ तार्किक करता हूँ।

डा० कैलास (बम्बई दक्षिण) : माननीय सभापति जी, मैं प्रोफेसर हीरेन्द्र मुखर्जी के प्रस्ताव की भावना का आदर करता हूँ और उस का समर्थन भी कर सकता हूँ। इस में कोई शक नहीं कि देश को अग्रर समाजवाद के रास्ते पर जाना है तो समाजवाद में रोड़ा घटकाने वाले जो व्यक्ति हैं या जो इस प्रकार के उद्योगपति या उद्योगपतियों के कारखाने हैं उन्हें हमें जल्दी से जल्दी यह विश्वास दिलाना होगा कि देश में जो भी बल उत्पादन होगा वह हर व्यक्ति के पास पहुँचना चाहिए और उस नाते यह आवश्यक हो जाता है कि सरकार जो यह सोचना पड़ेगी कि जो 75 मोनोपली हाउसेज हैं उन को हम जल्दी से जल्दी किस प्रकार इस दृष्टिकोण की ओर ले जाए कि जो भी देश में उत्पादन हो उस उत्पादन की कीमतें इतनी कम हो, इतनी ठीक हो कि साधारण व्यक्ति भी उन वस्तुओं को उपयोग कर सके। श्री सतपाल कपूर ने ठीक कहा कि यह 75 मोनोपली हाउसेज जो भी उत्पादन करते हैं वह सिर्फ लाभ के कारण अपने पजे में रखा है तथा अपने उस जाल को बढ़ाते चले जा रहे हैं। क्या सरकार यह नहीं कर सकती कि जो यह जाल बिछाए जा रहे हैं उस जाल को तो अपने न बढ़ने दे ?

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि इन 75 मोनोपली हाउसेज के अलावा बहुत से बिदेश के मोनोपली हाउसेज हैं। कांग्रेस के प्रस्तावों और जनसाधारण की इच्छाओं को देखते हुए हम यह कभी भी बर्बाद नहीं कर सकते कि परदेश के व्यक्ति यहाँ पर आ कर जो उपभोक्ता को रोजमर्रा के काम में आने वाली वस्तुएँ हैं उन को बनाएँ और उन को एक दिन के लिए भी और ज्यादा रखा जा सके। ब्रिटेनिया बिसकुट की बात कहे, कोका कोला की बात कहे या ऐसे दवाई के कारखाने वालों के नाम में लूँ, वह किस प्रकार से सामान्य जनता के काम में आने वाली वस्तुओं के दाम ज्यादा बढ़ा रहे हैं? हम ने इसी सदन में रात के 12 बजे रात्रि तक बैठ कर पेटेंट ऐक्ट पास किया था। उस पेटेंट ऐक्ट को भी लागू करने के लिए मालूम नहीं सरकार क्यों रुक नहीं बना रही है या क्या और कर रही है क्योंकि उस नाते हम देख रहे हैं, पार्क एंड डेविस है, मे एंड बेकर, सेम्बोज कम्पनी, ये बाहर के लोग यहाँ पर उसका फायदा उठा रहे हैं, कोई स्विटजरलैंड से, कोई अमेरिका से आकर यहाँ बंठा है और साधारण जनता को सूट रहा है। कुछ दिनों पहले ही इस सदन में ही नहीं बाहर भी यह बात आई थी, धाकड़े यह सिद्ध करते हैं कि इन को हजार परसेंट, दो हजार परसेंट, तीन हजार परसेंट तक के मुनाफे ले रहे हैं। इसी प्रकार कालटेक्स है, एस्को है। अगर हम प्रोफेसर मुखर्जी साहब के प्रस्ताव को मजूर नहीं कर पाते तो इस कारण से नहीं कर पाते कि इतनी बड़ी रकम कम्प्लेक्सन के छन में हम किस प्रकार से देंगे या अगर हम उन को कुछ बर्षों में देने की बात करें तो भी देश में घन इनना कम है कि दूसरे कानों के लिए जनता को सुविधाएँ पहुँचाने के लिए दूसरे पास पर्याप्त धन नहीं है। इसलिए यह

तो आज अवश्य सोचना चाहिए कि हम एक घोर तो आदर्शन ब्रैड को बनाते रहे हैं तो दूसरी घोर ब्रिटानिया बिस्किट जो परदेशी है उस को भी चलने दे रहे हैं। हमारे दवाइयों के कारखाने बने हैं और साध-माय ये परदेशी कारखाने और घाने बढ़ते चले जा रहे हैं। जब जब हम ने प्रश्न यहां पर उठाया कि परदेश के दवाइयों के बनाने के साधन सारे भारत के हाथ में चले जाने चाहिए तो उत्तर मिलता है कि हमारे पास टेकनिकल नो हाउ नहीं है, हमारे कारखाने वालों ने अपने रिसर्च डिपार्टमेंट को इतना नहीं बढ़ाया। मैं तो इस को मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ। सैरा सम्बन्ध काफी दवाई के बनाने वाले कारखानों से है। बगाल कैमिकल्स है, और दूसरे दवाइयों के कारखानों के नाम गिनाए जा सकते हैं जिन के पास पूरे साधन मौजूद हैं। कहीं न कहीं तो हमें कदम उठाना पड़ेगा जिससे परदेशी दवा के कारखानों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हो।

प्रोफेसर मुखर्जी साहब ने यहां प्रस्ताव ला कर कम से कम देवा मे यह वातावरण तैयार करने का काम तो किया है। हम प्लेटफार्म पर खड़े होकर राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात किया करते हैं, हम ने मोनोपली ऐक्ट भी बनाया है, लेकिन वह इस तरह का बनाया है कि हमारे मंत्री जो उस दिन जबाब देते हुए यह कह रहे थे कि वह डिफेक्टिव है और हमें उसे कुछ बदलना पड़ेगा, तब ही हम मोनोपली हाउसेस को कंट्रोल कर सकेंगे। हम क्यों नहीं तरमीम लागू चाहते, जब हम ने यह निर्णय लिया है कि हमें मोनोपॉलिस्ट्स को खत्म करना है तो हम अपने कायदे कानूनों में क्यों जल्दी तबदीली नहीं करते। कम्पनी अधिनियम के मिनिस्टर साहब ने स्वयं इस सदन में कहा है कि उसमें कुछ

इस प्रकार की तकलीफें हैं, जिन की वजह से हम पूरा एक्शन नहीं ले सकते। तो प्रश्न यह है कि हमें कितने दिनों तक इन 75 शोषण करने वाले व्यक्तियों से बंधे रखना है और इन 75 के आलावा जो लोग भारत के बाहर से आकर यहां बैठ गये हैं, उन्हें कब वापस करना है? मैं चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय जब जवाब दें तो हमें इस बात का उत्तर देने की कृपा करें कि मोनोपली हाउसेज को किस कदम से, किस प्रकार से खत्म करेंगे और जो फोरेन-मोनोपॉलिस्ट्स हैं उन को जल्द से जल्द कब खत्म करेंगे।

इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि इस वक्त देश में वातावरण इस प्रकार का है और हमारी सरकार भी चाहती है, लेकिन फिर भी हम उनको हटा नहीं पा रहे हैं। हमारे विरोधी पक्ष के मित्र और हम यह कहते रहते हैं कि चीजों के दाम न बढ़े। हमारे मित्र सतपाल कपूर जी ने कहा कि ये लोग जो उत्पादन कर रहे हैं, अगर इनका राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दिया जाय तो चीजों के मूल्य नहीं बढ़ेंगे। मैं इस विचारधारा को वहीं मानता। मैं ऐसा मानता हूँ कि इसके लिये फेसब प्रोग्राम होना चाहिये, किस प्रकार हमें हर वर्ष रुकम बढ़ाना है, जिम से कि 5 से 15 वर्षों के अन्दर इस मसला में यह कहा जा सके कि अब यहां पर कोई मोनोपली हाउस नहीं रहा है।

इस नाते में प्रोफेसर मुखर्जी साहब के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ और मंत्री महोदय से यह प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि कम से कम हमें यह यतायें कि इस में कितनी फाइनेन्शियल इम्प्लीकेशन्स हैं, क्या सरकार के पास इतना पैसा है कि अगर राष्ट्रीयकरण किया तो वह इसको बरदाश्त करने के लायक है? अगर वह ऐसा विश्वास दिला

[डा० कैलास]

सके कि पाच साल, 10 साल या 15 साल मे इन के ऊपर हावी हो जायेंगे, इनको कंट्रोल कर सकेंगे, तो मे आशा करता हूँ कि प्रो० मुखर्जी अपना प्रस्ताव वापस ले लेंगे। लेकिन इस मे कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि प्रो० मुखर्जी साहब ने इस प्रस्ताव को लाकर एक राष्ट्रीय कार्य किया है, उन्होंने देश के वातावरण को जिन्दा रखने के लिये, बल देने के लिये एक बहुत बढ़िया प्रश्न इस सदन के सामने ला कर रखा है और मे इसके लिये उनको धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

*SHRI K SURYANARAYANA (Eluru)
Mr. Chairman, Sir, the demands for nationalisation of the prominent and big industrial concerns which have come to be known as the Monopoly Houses has been there for a long time. But for one reason or the other it has not been possible for the Government to nationalise them so far. For this, the Government has been charged with ulterior motives on political considerations, I do not agree with this contention. I feel that economic considerations have been and are the only factor which has prevented the Government from nationalising these monopoly houses. As it is the various public undertakings have been posing great problems to the Government. And without sorting out the problems and difficulties besetting these public undertakings, I feel it is not proper for the Government to buy more trouble in saddling themselves with these private concerns. Taking over these concerns might mean taking up more burden than the Government can bear. Even so, I agree with Prof. Mukherjee that Government should not any longer delay in nationalising such of the industries which are essential for the planned economic development of our country. But I am aware that Government is hastening slowly in this matter

because of the huge amounts of compensation that will have to be paid to these industrial houses on their nationalisation.

When the first popular Ministry headed by Shri C. Rajagopalachari came to power in the then composite state of Madras, a statute was enacted by which the debtor if he has already paid twice the amount of the principal he borrowed was discharged of his liabilities of further payment and the loan was deemed to have been fully repaid. That is to say there was a moratorium on debts. Earlier the farmers had also faced the situation where with exorbitant interest the total sum on a principal of Rs. 100 was Rs. 500. Similarly these big industrial houses which have now become monopoly houses have started with a small capital only. The share of the capital invested by them may not be more than ten to twenty five per cent of the total. But they have grown into these leviathan organisations with the liberal financial assistance of the Government. So I request that Government should fix a time by which they would be able to take over these concerns even though at present, due to financial considerations, it is not able to do so.

After the last mid-term elections in 1971, we have decided that the actual workers should share the profits of their labour. We had also resolved that Government funds should not be invested in these private concerns. In spite of this we find that the financial assistance given by Life Insurance Corporation of India to the various private industries in 1971-72 is of the order of Rs. 362.50 crores as compared to Rs. 225 crores in 1969-70 and Rs. 200 crores in 1970-71. Out of this assistance, the share of the big monopoly houses is 68.62% in 1971-72. From 8.26% in 1969-70 it jumped to 100% in 1970-71. This information has been given by the Minister in reply to a question in Rajya Sabha. While on the one hand we have decided not to encourage

*The Original speech was delivered in Telugu.

monopoly houses in their expansion, it is ironic that the LIC., a Government organisation, should help these big houses financially. There seems to be a dichotomy of profession and practice.

Many of these industrial houses have grown to their present size with the help of the Government, with the blood and sweat of the factory workers. As in the case of the moratorium on debts I had earlier mentioned, if the Government takes over these enterprises without compensation, I do not think that the Constitution stands in the way. In the Constitution were written the various safeguards, privileges and privy purses of the Maharajahs. But we have now abolished these anachronisms through an amendment to the Constitution. I do not therefore think that it is such an insurmountable task for the Government to take over these monopoly houses. Just four years ago, their number was 50 and it has now grown to 75 and may be in another decade it might be 200 even. It is no doubt financially possible now for the Government take to them over. I therefore urge upon the Government to formulate a time-bound programme for gradual and eventual nationalisation of these big industrial houses. These houses have become what they are only after Independence with the protection and encouragement of the Government. During the Britishers time they were only small concerns with little or no help from the Government then. As a result of the Gandhian philosophy of encouraging and protecting indigenous enterprise. Government had all along been considerate them. But these monopolists took undue advantage of the Policy of the Government and proved to be a detriment to the planned economic development of our country.

In conclusion, Sir, I would like to say that in tune with our declared policy of land to the tiller, these industrial houses should be nationalised and handed over to

the workers with whose sweat and blood they have grown into this leviathan.

SHRI SYED AHMED AGA (Bara-mulla) : I am reminded of a verse and that is :

जो बाहिमत है उनके चूम लेती है कदम मंजिल,

जो बुज्दिल है वह गर्दे कारवा की बात करते हैं।

جو باہمت ہیں انکے چوم لبتی ہے
قدم منزل

جو بزدل ہیں وہ گردن کارواں کی بات
کرتے ہیں -

I refer to those who say that we do not have the means to nationalise these houses. I strongly support the resolution moved by my learned friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee and I think that it is necessary that we must go ahead with their nationalisation as quickly as we can.

Some days ago, it was stated here that the loans and shares invested in these big monopoly houses might be converted into equity and that would give some sort of a control to the Government to share the management. I consider it a half-way house. I am for the total nationalisation of the 75 business houses right now. Why is it that they grew? They grew because of the mixed economy and they took advantage of the various financial institutions that we had created in the country and they are still growing because they can use their influence to draw from the industrial bank of India, Industrial finance corporation, LIC, Unit Trust of India, general insurance and so on and so forth. 35 per cent of our population gets Rs. 15 per month and these 7-8 families are having 35 per cent of the total income. In such circumstances, we cannot wait anymore; we have seen enough of mixed economy. We had the Monopolies Act last time; what did we see? In spite of all that there

[Shri Syed Ahmed Aga]

is domination by 75 houses. In spite of the noise that we created here ever since 1967-1 have been here since 1967—we have given more licences to these people. Out of 611 licences, 113 have gone to Birlas in 1971. Birlas are in 16 States Tatas are in 9 States.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): You gave them the Mithapur licence the other day.

SHRI SYED AHMED AGA: Yes, to Tatas and Goa Fertilizer to Birlas. In the first 27 of these 75 houses, comes a firm M/s. Sundaram Iyengar and Son Private Limited. They were permitted collaboration with a US firm to manufacture brake and clutch bearings. These can be manufactured in the small scale sector, giving employment to people. I do not understand why this collaboration had been permitted. I am told that there are sixty concerns with foreign collaborations. I want to say that it is necessary to have in public sector the production of essential commodities in this country, for example, medicines, coarse cloth. Mahatma Gandhiji talked of khadi; it was then to fight the Lancashire mills. Today what is needed is cheap coarse cloth. Government should have gone into the production of coarse cloth so that people could clothe themselves. We hear that so many people died because they lived on the pavements. We hear that 171 persons died because of the heat wave; they had no shelter. While these things are happening, we cannot wait for 75 business houses to be tackled in a modest manner. The question of compensation has been unduly raised. These people dabble in political fields also. I shall conclude with the following verse, which you will appreciate.

जिनकी घाँसों को रुखे सुबह का धारा
भी नहीं ,

उनकी रातों में कोई शम्मा मुनव्वर कर
वै ।

जिनके कदमों को किसी राह का सहारा
भी नहीं ,

उनकी नजरों पे कोई राह उजागर कर वै ।
जङ्गी आँकड़ों को रुखे सुबह का धारा
भी नहीं
अन्की रातों में कोई शम्मा मुनव्वर
कर वै ।
जङ्गे कदमों को किसी राह का सहारा
भी नहीं
अन्की نظरों पे ते कोठी राह अजागर
कर दें -

16 hrs.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwash): I rise to support the Resolution moved by Prof. H. N. Mukerjee. Sir, the question of monopoly is not a new phenomenon in the year 1972. No doubt, these houses were in existence before independence but the big monopoly houses have grown bigger and bigger after the Congress party adopted the slogan of socialist pattern of society, I think somewhere in 1953 or 1956 in Avadi. This is strange that after the taking over the slogan of socialist pattern of society the monopoly houses should have grown twice or thrice or even many times bigger than the original capital. Sir, is the Government not aware of this fact? It is not true that the Government was not aware of it. In 50s Nehruji spoke about it. But the Government appointed a Committee—Committee on distribution of income and levels of living which was known as Mahelenobis Committee as far back as 1964 where the Committee revealed:

“The working of the planned economy has contributed to the growth of big companies in Indian industry. The growth of private sector in industry and especially of the big companies has been facilitated by the financial assistance rendered by public institutions like the IFC, the NJDC etc.”

Sir, this was in the year 1964. What action was taken? Instead of taking action the Government wanted to appoint another enquiry committee. Again Monopoly Enquiry Commission was appointed. In

the year 1965 the Report came. It is again the crux of the present Resolution. It is based upon the report of the Monopolies Inquiry Commission. It categorically stated :

“Big business was at an advantage in securing the licenses for starting new industries or for expanding the existing capacity.”

This was given in the year 1965. Then what action was taken after 1965. The Government was very strong at that time but nothing was done. Again another Professor was invited from Bombay and he was asked to go into the same question. In 1966 Prof. Hazari submitted a report His conclusion was the large and medium sized business groups enjoyed a higher ratio of approval in licensing applications as compared to others and their share in the investment applied for land approved had tended to rise over the period—most important being the House of Birlas.

This is what all the three Committees—Mahelenobis Committee, Monopolies Inquiry Commission and Hazari—did. Everything was over before 1966 and the Government could not do anything because in 1967 election came. All the time and during all these years we were talking about curbing the monopoly, not to give licences to these big houses. At the time of election of 1967 the Government and the ruling party went and surrendered before the big monopoly houses, got money from them and again all the licences were given to them.

Again, not satisfied with this, they appointed another Committee which is known as Industrial Licensing Policy Inquiry Committee. Its report came in 1969. It also mentioned almost the same points, of course, in a different capacity. It said, “The licensing system worked in such a way as to provide a disproportionate share in the newly licensed capacity to a few concerns belonging to the large industrial

sector. The maximum benefit of all this went to a few Larger Houses.”

Sir, how does it happen? This committee which went into the licensing policy came to the conclusion that there was no coordination between the financial institutions on the one side and the Ministry of Industrial Development on the other. It dealt elaborately with advancing of loans by public financial institutions and observed :

“The public sector banking institutions are also found to extend favoured treatment in the credit facilities offered by them to the large industrial sector. The House which seems to benefit most is that of Birlas, the others being Mafatlal, Tata and ACC. In the investment portfolio of LIC also, the position in 1966 as compared to that in 1956 shows a clear shift in favour of the House of Birlas.”

Coming to the consequences and effects of concentration of power in the hands of a few, it is enormous. It affects all walks of life in the country—politics, economics, the whole structure of our country is affected. When I say that ruling party takes money and issues licences, I am not taking in the air. The committee came to this conclusion :

“But people cannot be blamed if they believe that it is the hope of favours to be received that induces such payments and after the election is over, businessmen try their best to see that the investment made by them brings satisfactory return.”

So, it affects the politics of the country. They hold crores of black money with which they pollute the politics of the country. The committee observed :

“We cannot also ignore the unfortunate reality that some big businessmen do not hesitate to use their deep pocket to try to corrupt public officials,

[Shri G Viswanathan]
in the attempt to continue and increase
their industrial domain "

This is what is happening. We thought that at least after the massive mandate given to the ruling party, this would stop. But after this great leap forward, after nationalisation of banks, it has not stopped. Some big houses are getting more and more licences. During this session, we have been asking Government why more licences are given to big houses, but no minister has come forward with any reply. Out of 159 new licences, 114 have gone to big houses. Why is this hypocritical Government sitting here and talking of socialism?

The Industrial Policy Resolution is being violated day in day out. The Resolution says that except those private sector steel plants which existed at that time in 1956, the future of steel production will be in the hands of public sector. But most of the mini steel plants have gone to the private sector. Government should explain why they are violating the Industrial Policy Resolution and preferring private sector to public sector in giving licences for mini steel plants. Yesterday the Finance Minister evaded replying to the question as to why licences are given to them. When are they going to stop it? This resolution moved by Shri Hiren Mukherjee demands that these big houses should be nationalised. If possible, let them nationalise these big houses. Or at least let give them an assurance that they will not help the growth of monopoly in this country and further licences will not be given to them at least hereafter.

श्री भारद्वाज राय (घोसी) : मान्यवर इसी सदन की बहुत पुरानी बात है पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू एक समय भाषण देते समय हिन्दुस्तान की प्रगति की चर्चा कर रहे थे, और आंकड़ों से यह सिद्ध करने का प्रयास कर रहे थे कि भारत ने स्वतंत्रता के

बाद हर क्षेत्र में काफी प्रगति और विकास किया है। एकाएक उन के दिमाग में एक प्रश्न उठा कि आखिर इतना धन जो देश में पैदा हुआ वह गया कहाँ? तो इसी की जांच के लिये महालनबीस कमीशन की स्थापना हुई थी उम कमीशन ने रिपोर्ट दी कि स्वतंत्रता के बाद जितना धन हिन्दुस्तान में उस समय तक पैदा हुआ है और हो रहा है उस का 70 फीसदी कुछ मुठ्ठीभर आदम-खोरो के घर में चला जा रहा है। इसकी रोकथाम अगर नहीं की गयी तो सारी प्रगति और विकास और तरक्की चन्द घरों तक ही सीमित रह जाएगी। और उसी के बाद हम एकाधिकार राव कमीशन की स्थापना हुई। जिस ने इस बात को बताया कि 75 मील के मोदागर और खून के व्यापारी परिवार हमारे देश में हैं जिन के हाथ में करोड़-करोड़ दो तिहाई हिन्दुस्तान का धन पहुँच चुका है। अगर आँकड़े भेरे गलत नहीं हैं आँकड़े बड़े भ्रमक भी होते हैं, तो 30 हजार करोड़ पूँजी में 20 हजार करोड़ पूँजी जा प्राइवेट सेक्टर में लगी हुई है वह इन 75 मानवपत्नी परिवारों की है। इसलिये यह स्थिति बहुत भयावह है। इन अगर मच्छू पूँजीपति परिवारों में सबसे बड़े टाटा और विडना है।

बिड़ला साहब की पूँजी मभी आकड़ों से, जहाँ तक मुझे पता लग सका है, स्वतंत्रता के समय 35 और 40 करोड़ ले अधिक नहीं थी। लेकिन आज बिड़ला साहब की पूँजी 600 करोड़ के ऊपर हो चुकी है। और यही दशा उन के बड़े भाई टाटा साहब की भी है। मान्यवर, ये बड़े-बड़े पूँजीपति परिवार हिन्दुस्तान की अर्थ नीति और राजनीति का पूरी तरह प्रभावित हो नहीं कर रहे हैं बल्कि अपनी फीलादी पकड़ में पूरी तरह जकड़ते जा रहे हैं। बिड़ला परिवार तो स्वतंत्रता के

पहले जंगे भ्राजादी के जमाने भी हिन्दुस्तान की राजनीति को प्रभावित कर रहा था। यह भ्रकस्मात् घटना नहीं है कि हिन्दुस्तान के एक सर्वमान्य नेता, लोहपुरुष बल्लभभाई पटेल और राष्ट्रपति महात्मा गांधी दोनों बिड़ला भवनों में ही परलोक सिंधारे—एक बम्बई में और एक दिल्ली में। ये 75 पूंजीपति परिवार अपने धन के बल से हिन्दुस्तान की राजनीति को बुरी तरह प्रभावित कर रहे हैं। दलों को चन्दा दे कर, नेताओं को पंसा दे कर अपने चंगुल में फंसाते चले जा रहे हैं। ये पंसे के बल पर उम्मीदवार खड़े करते हैं, उम्मीदवारों को बेहिसाब खर्च के लिये धनराशि देते हैं और जीते एम० पी० को चंगुल में रखने का प्रयास करते हैं। समाचार-पत्रों में यह प्रकाशित हुआ था कि 1967 के चुनाव में बिड़ला साहब ने 100 एम० पी० के उम्मीदवारों को एक, एक लाख रुपया दिया था और इस प्रकार एक करोड़ व्यय किया था। जिस में से 40 जीते और 60 हार गये। और उन 40 में कांग्रेस पार्टी के, जनसंघ और स्वतंत्र पार्टी के लोग थे, जिनमें सबसे अधिक संख्या कांग्रेस पार्टी की थी। यह चर्चा देश भर में उस समय चल रही थी। 40 संसद सदस्यों की बिड़ला—लौबी एक सदन में भयावह शक्ति है।

प्रधान मंत्री पद के लिये मोरार जी देसाई और श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी में जब टक्कर हुई थी बिड़ला साहब ने एड़ी और चौटी का पसीना एक कर दिया था। साढ़े चार करोड़ रु० उन्होंने व्यय किया था कि मोरार जी देसाई जीतें और इन्दिरा गांधी किसी प्रकार जीत न सकें। इसी तरह राष्ट्रपति के चुनाव में भी इन 75 परिवार पूंजीपतियों ने अपनी धनराशि का इस्तेमाल कर के चुनाव को प्रभावित करने की और

संजीव रेड्डी को जिताने की कुचेष्टा की थी। 1967 के लोक सभा के मध्यावधि—चुनाव में शासक दल को बम्बई से 24 करोड़ और अहमदाबाद से 3 करोड़ की धनराशि चुनाव में प्राप्त हुई थी.....

सभापति महोदय : माननीय भारखंडे राय जी, आप बड़ी दूर तक चले जा रहे हैं। आह गांधी जी से ले कर राष्ट्रपति जी तक चले आये। राष्ट्रपति का नाम जनरली यहां नहीं खीचा जाता है। थोड़ा सा रेस्ट्रिक्ट अपने आप को करना चाहिये।

श्री भारखंडे राय : मान्यवर, अप्रासंगिक कोई बात नहीं है। मेरा तात्पर्य कहने का यही है कि किस प्रकार यहां की राजनीति को पूंजीपतियों द्वारा प्रभावित किया जाता है। मेरा कहना यह है कि यह पूंजीपति अगर नहीं हटाये गये, यह 75 परिवार समाप्त किये गये तो हिन्दुस्तान की राजनीति को करप्ट कर के रख देंगे। राज नेता उनके हाथ जड़खरीद गुलाम बन जायेंगे। और जैसे अमरीका, फ्रान्स, इंग्लैंड की राजनीति है उसी तरह हमारे मुल्क की राजनीति भी हो जायेगी। जिस प्रकार अमरीका में चाहे डेमोक्रेटिक पार्टी का शासन हो चाहे रिपब्लिकन पार्टी का रूल हो, लेकिन वहां का शासन मूलतः पूंजीपतियों के ही हाथ में रहता है। वही युग भारत में भी आ जायेगा जब फ्रान्स में द्वितीय महा युद्ध के समय कहा जा रहा था कि 100 फेमिलीज रूल फ्रान्स। वे 100 परिवार ही फ्रान्स का वस्तुतः शासन करते थे और इसी कारण फ्रान्स का इतनी जल्दी पतन हो गया था। इसलिये यह प्रश्न आर्थिक ही नहीं, परन्तु उस से भी गम्भीर राजनीतिक भी है, जिस की तरफ मैं, आप, सम्माननीय सदन और विशाल जनता, का ध्यान आकर्षित कर रहा हूँ।

समाप्त महोदय : अब आप समाप्त कीजिए ।

श्री भारद्वाज राय : आप समय नहीं दे रहे हैं, इसलिए आखिरी बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि विदेशी कालोबोरेसन भी हमारे देश के पूँजीपतियों ने शुरू कर दिया है । इसकी और सरकार की नीति प्रोत्साहन देने की है—1971 के लोक सभा मध्यावधि चुनाव के बाद भी रही, इस चुनाव के बाद भी है । सबसे खतरनाक स्थिति यह है कि हमारे हिन्दुस्तान के 75 परिवारों में से जो टॉप-मोस्ट कैपिटलिस्ट हैं, वह नेपाल, मलाया में और अफ्रीकी देशों में अपनी पूँजी लगा रहे हैं । ये एकाधिकारवादी पूँजीपति आर्थिक-साम्राज्यवादी प्रवृत्ति अख्तियार कर रहे हैं । इसकी रोकथाम नहीं की गई तो हमारे देश की विदेश नीतियों में उलझाव पैदा होगा और इन भूभागों के पिछड़े और गरीब देशों से टकराव पैदा हो सकता है । इसलिए इसकी मैं समय रहते चेतावनी देता हूँ । जैसे बंगला देश ने एकाधिकारी पूँजीवाद को समाप्त करने के लिए कदम उठाये हैं, वह हमारे लिए एक नमूना बनना चाहिए । छः महीन की सरकार इतना कर सकती है तो पच्चीस वर्ष की सरकार क्या इतना भी नहीं कर सकती है ? इसलिए इन शब्दों के साथ मैं चेतावनी देते हुए अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ ।

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Mr. Chairman, Sir, although I agree with the spirit of the never of the resolution, I really cannot go all out with him because I feel that mere taking over or nationalisation of all these 75 industries will not really solve the problem. The spirit behind it can be understood. But, will it be the solution? When we say nationalisation, in fact, it means bureaucratisation. That means you give

these industries over to some civil servants or appoint some person from civil service some ICS man or some other man and put him in charge of these industries and ask him to run these industries. We know, what is happening when industries are given entirely into the hands of the bureaucrats. Therefore, what I would actually want is that these industries should be decentralised. When I understand the spirit of nationalisation, it means that they should not end the control of these few monopoly houses but this monopoly itself should go, as was stated in the resolution.

It has been stated in the Directive Principles of the Constitution also. Under Article 39 (b) and (e) it is laid down that the State shall, in particular, direct its policies towards securing ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good and that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment.

Now, this was the objective. But, the whole planning process which we started in the country unfortunately do not lead us towards this direction and objective. The Monopolies Commission itself says that instead of achieving this objective, on the contrary, the planned economy has proved to be a potent factor for further concentration. That is why something has gone wrong basically in our planning. Our planning therefore, ought to be of a method by which this concentration will not take place and having taken place, will be broken. That can be done only if the productive resources are not in the hands of the few, as has been stated in the Directive Principles. The best way is to have these basic industries—most of these are consumer industries—in the public sector. That is our policy. We are taking those steps. Wherever little few are in the

hands of the private sector, they also should be taken in the public sector.

The whole corrupting source is, in fact, in the sector of consumer goods industries. Take, for example, any consumer goods industry. What is happening today is that the entire capital formation is invested in those few industries which serve the profiteering purpose of these houses, that is, the luxuries or the comforts. The necessities of life for the many are not produced. In fact, I would go to the extent of saying that any capital formed and invested in the production of non-priority items is a betrayal, a treachery and, in fact, a theft. Therefore, if at all we want to fight and win this war on poverty, we must see to it that every farthing that is invested in this country is invested first in the necessities and only then in the comforts or the luxuries. Prepare a list of priorities and give priority items in the hands of the people. Let the maximum number of hands produce the maximum items of necessities in this country.

That is the only way to solve the problem of unemployment. You give purchasing power to most of the people of this country and also produce the maximum number of goods which, in fact, is wealth of any nation. That, automatically, will take away concentration. That will mean a positive effort on the part of the Government to see that concentration which has already taken place in the hands of these monopoly houses is broken. You break them up, take it away from them and re-distribute, disperse, it in the hands of the many.

As I said once before and I repeat it that this was the Gandhian economics, as I understand it correctly, The Gandhian economics is as much socialism and is as much valid today as was before. Let us adopt it to solve the growing problem of population of this country. The urgency of the matter can be realised if we consider the fact that in less than 25 years from now.

our population will be 100 crores, How are you going to meet that challenge, provide gainful employment to all the population; give them the purchasing power and also have the necessary goods in the country? The essence of the matter is that the monopolies must be broken.

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MOHAPTRA (Balasore): Mr. Chairman, Sir, having been given a couple of minutes, it is very difficult to indulge in such an important discussion.

We all know that the country today is having a socialist transformation from a feudal or a capitalist economy to a socialist economy. When we are discussing about land ceiling and trying to bring in certain agricultural reforms, keeping in view the poverty of the people, these monopoly houses stand a complete anachronism.

There was a time when we were thinking, as Gandhiji thought and gave us the system of trusteeship, that these capitalists or these agricultural magnates will act as trustees. To Gandhiji, Jamnalal Bajaj, as an American writer wrote, was an ideal trustee because after keeping all that he wanted for his family, he wanted to give everything to Gandhiji. But things later belied all hopes and these capitalists and agricultural magnates have proved to be anti-social elements, particularly, at this time when the whole world is surging ahead towards the goal of socialism.

These industrial houses are not only creating the problem here but they have created the problem everywhere in the world. In the U.S.A., after the civil war, even the Government wanted to curb these combines and there were some legislation also but had no effect. In Sweden also, there were legislations to curb monopoly houses. But the Government could not do anything. In Denmark, on the Swedish pattern, they wanted to curb the monopoly houses through negotiations to bring them under control and there also, the Govern-

[Shri Shyam Sunder Mohapatra]
ment failed. In Belgium also, by the royal decree of 1935, they wanted to prevent abuse of the economic power, but there also the Government failed. In U.K., as early as 1948, there was an enactment to control monopolies and restrictive practices and there were many more legislations after that, but Government could not be successful. In Australia also there was an Australian Industries Preservation Act, and there also the Government could not be successful. Probably in certain Scandinavian countries Government could attain a certain success, but I can bring to your kind notice the very fact that the monopoly houses of India today are in collusion with the monopoly houses abroad and they are going to bring ruin to the socialist economy which we have in our view.

The present condition of India today needs a complete socialist transformation, and we are very much aware that these industrial houses are indulging in under-invoicing and in certain other malpractices which the Ministers are completely aware of but are unable to do anything. Commission after commission have said that the black money in India is to the tune of Rs. 7,000 crores, and these monopoly houses are very much involved in it. When an average individual today in India is not even earning 75 paise a day, we cannot certainly allow these industrial houses to grow into such a big shape and eat up the entire economy of the country.

Sir, the question is about licences. The Monopoly Commission has written that one direction in which administrative action can be fruitfully taken with regard to monopolies is in the matter of issue of licences and in preventing abuse of licences granted, whether to Actual Users or to Established Importers. We have practically failed. I do not know what were the compelling reasons for which Government has come to such serious structures from the opposition, but I think we must be very much conscious of it now that these

industrial houses have influence on the administrative set up and going to subvert the very ideal of socialism.

My hon. friend, Mr. Sathe, has said that it is very difficult to take over these industrial houses unless we bring changes in the bureaucratic set up as to who will be in charge of these houses. I know from my own personal experience having served in bureaucracy for ten years that these bureaucrats in India today are not attuned to the spirit of socialism at all. So unless simultaneously with the idea of taking over the monopoly houses, simultaneously with the idea of running the public sector undertakings on socialist lines, we bring in changes in the bureaucratic set up—we have to attune them to the spirit of socialism—, unless these things run simultaneously, it is very difficult to achieve complete transformation.

While agreeing with Prof. H. N. Mukerjee as far as the spirit of the Resolution is concerned, I must say that, if not immediate steps for nationalisation are taken, at least the initiative should be taken by the Government and by the people to nationalise these houses. In Burma, Government had tried to nationalise even the pharmaceutical shops. And such a big democracy like India should also think that way—should nationalise not only the industrial houses but the entire economy, so that the spirit of socialism will come to the remotest houses of our country.

SHRI Y. S. MAHAJAN (Buldana):
As socialists we are committed to the policy of nationalising any industry when we find it necessary. Our objectives are enshrined in the Constitution which says that the ownership and control of resources should be so distributed that they will subserve the interests of the community.

There should be no concentration of economic power. Only yesterday our Finance Minister said that we will not

hesitate to nationalise any industry if it comes in the way of the interests of the nation as a whole. We are not afraid of nationalising the 75 business houses mentioned in the resolution but, at the moment, I don't think we can act on that resolution because it is an omnibus resolution. Each of the business houses mentioned by him runs about 15 types of business and between them these 75 business houses run about a hundred businesses. We cannot suddenly nationalise hundreds of businesses because we have to consider the matter from the practical point of view. After all, these industrialists know how to run the business. They have acquired a certain business skill over the years, certain technical knowledge and certain know-how and as, pointed out by an hon. Member, if we nationalise them, we may have to hand them over to the bureaucrats to run them. Will that be an improvement? We are not afraid of nationalisation and we have not lost confidence in our ability to curb these monopolies. Let me tell Prof. Mukerjee that we have a licensing policy. We have a capital issue policy and we may not allow an industry to issue capital if it is not in the interests of the nation. It depends upon us. We can fix the prices. We have got a lot of controlling authority which the governments in other countries do not have. America has experience of curbing the trusts and controlling the monopolies. The American Government, however, had none of the powers we have. If we cannot control the monopolies and if we cannot curb their anti social policies, then we can certainly go ahead and nationalise them. But, at the moment, we can not do it because it is an omnibus resolution. Secondly, I dare to say that it has a political motive. Our Government is a socialist Government. We are committed to socialism.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Your socialism is not politics? It smacks politics.

SHRI Y. S. MAHAJAN: We have to run the Government. We have a respon-

sibility towards the nation. We are not going to put it into the boiling cauldron so that something may come out of it. We have the necessary power to regulate industries, and we have not lost confidence in our ability to control them. But if we find that an industry is beyond our control, we can certainly nationalise it.

Sir, we cannot accept the omnibus resolution as proposed by Prof. Hiren Mukherjee.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUDHURY): In bringing forward this resolution demanding nationalisation of 75 large houses, Prof. Hiren Mukherjee spoke with his customary eloquence.

I take it that the basic cause impelling him to bring forward this resolution is the important problem of concentration of economic power and the basic purpose of the course of action suggested by him is to find ways and means to put an end to such concentration. Neither the Parliament nor the Government is unaware of this important problem nor do they remain unconvinced on the need for securing an industrial order in which social control will replace private dominance. This is in fact one of the most important aspects of the Government's economic policy. Now the Prof. Mukherjee has brought forward this resolution, it behoves us to examine the basic causes for concentration of economic power and the basic goal of ensuring ways and means to curb it.

Prof. Mukherji has tabled his resolution with reference to the 75 industrial houses listed by the Monopolies Enquiry Commission. We may also take this as the starting point and look into the basic facts. The Monopolies Enquiry Commission based on data relating to 1963-64 identified 75 business houses which had assets over Rs. 5 crores. The criterion adopted by it for

[Shri Moinul Haque Choudhury] purposes of including any particular company in a house was control of 51% equity by the house concerned.

The Industrial Licensing Policy Inquiry Committee which based its analysis on data as on 31-12-1966, also took these 75 houses as a starting point. It however, clubbed two of these houses into one and classified another as a second tier concern of a large house. As such it dealt with 73 industrial houses. This Committee adopted the concept of effective equity being 1/3rd of the total equity and on this basis it included in the 73 large houses 1985 companies apart from 152 second tier concerns making a total of 2137 companies. In addition, it also listed 60 large independent companies which had assets over Rs. 5 crores. This Committee also categorised the top 20 (in terms of assets) of the 73 large houses as larger houses and identified 1005 first tier concerns and 120 second tier concerns, in respect of them. Subsequent examination has also shown that 48 out of the 73 houses have assets over Rs. 20 crores and would thus *prima facie* attract the provisions of the Monopolies Restrictive and Trade Practices Act. These houses cover a wide spectrum of industrial activity and also some activities not strictly industrial ranging from investments, marketing and plantation to light and consumer industries, heavy machinery industries etc. The Industrial Licensing Policy Inquiry Committee clearly showed how these houses had a predominant share in the licences obtained and how some of them had also committed certain irregularities.

There is, therefore, no denying that in the sixties, the problem of concentration of economic power had emerged as an important problem which was apt to be aggravated if unchecked. But it is quite some years since Government realised the need for regulating and curbing such tendencies. That is why the Government appointed a Monopolies Inquiry Commission and later the Industrial Licensing Policy Inquiry

Committee Powers are available in the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, to take over mismanaged industrial undertakings and also to regulate the prices of industrial goods. Government did not consider that these powers would be sufficient to come to grips with this problem. I would not like the Honourable Members to overlook the fact that in the past three or four years, the Government had taken a series of inter-connected measures which will curb the trends of concentration of economic powers by placing controls at strategic points. After all, how does concentration of economic power occur and how does it grow? The basic methods are through establishing new ventures, expansion of existing ones and mergers and take overs in addition to indirect controls and influence through inter- corporate investments, managing agencies, directorships, access to banking institutions and so on. On each of these levers of economic power, Government has now brought in necessary measures of control. So far as industrial licensing is concerned, larger houses will be confined to the core and heavy investment sectors and their expansion in other sectors will be considered only in the event of cost efficiency or an export obligation of 60 per cent or more. 48 out of the large houses, including the 20 larger houses, are covered by the Monopolies (Restrictive and Trade Practices) Act, and cannot establish new undertakings or effect merger, amalgamation etc. without previous permission from the Central Government. Even in respect of the other large houses, wherever they are dominant in any particular field, they will attract the provisions of the Monopolies (Restrictive and Trade Practices) Act. The provisions of this Act are comprehensive and cover industries scheduled in the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act as well as the non-scheduled ones. They cover services as well. Permission under this Act is given only if Government is satisfied that a particular proposal will not lead to the concentration of economic power to the common detriment and also only if that particular proposal will be in

the public interest. The processes of inter-corporate investments are controlled through the provisions of the Companies Act. The managing agency system has been abolished, restrictions have been placed on the number of directorships that can be held by a person and permission is also necessary with regard to the emoluments of the directors.

Government is also examining measures which would effectively prevent the business-houses controlling large industrial undertakings from siphoning off corporate profits for private consumption. In addition, the nationalisation of the major banks has also ensured that the larger industrial houses have no special or preferential access to bank finance. The manner in which the concentration of economic power is being curbed through various policy instruments is illustrated by the position in regard to the licences and letters of intent issued to the larger houses, a matter in which some people have thought fit to criticise without looking into the facts.

As I indicated during my reply to the debate on the Demands for Grants of my Ministry in this House, the percentage of licences issued to the larger houses when compared to the total number of licences is only 7.9 per cent in 1970 and 8.5 per cent in 1971, as against 14.3 per cent, 14.46 per cent and 14.19 per cent in the years 1967-1968 and 1969.

Hon. Members know that most licences are given by way of conversion of letters of intent and actually many of these licences have been given with reference to approvals given earlier to 1971 or 1970.

If we look at the letters of intent which is the real test, the percentage of letters of intent issued to larger houses was 5 per cent in 1970 and 3.7 per cent in 1971. Only 3 of the letters of intent in 1970 are for new undertakings by larger houses. Similarly, in 1971, there were only four letters

of intent for new undertakings by the larger houses. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu had spoken about the spurt in the issue of licences to big business-houses, and quoted extensively from the press reports and other documents, to show that a large number of licences had been given to those big business-houses. Even at the risk of sounding a little repetitive, I must say that the hon. Member should try to understand the difference between licence and letter of intent. As I have said earlier in the House, licences are mostly by way of conversion of letters of intent granted earlier and the carry-on-business licences are given specifically to regularise the cases where the industry was not required to take out a licence during a particular period, but are now required to take out one in view of the latest rules and regulations. In such cases, the legal position is absolutely clear, that is, if effective steps had been taken during the delicensed period or after the grant of a letter of intent, a licence has to be given, and this cannot be refused. All these approvals have been given after careful consideration on merit and after obtaining the clearance of the Cabinet Committee on Economic Coordination wherever necessary, and after following the requirements of the MRTP Act wherever an undertaking is registered.

These figures will conclusively show that Government have been vigorously implementing the policy relating to the industrial licensing with a view to curb concentration of economic power. At the same time, hon. Members know that a very large number of letters of intent have been issued to other parties in the past two years to broad-base entrepreneurship. This liberal licensing has helped the emergence of new entrepreneurs and the broadbasing of entrepreneurship as such which will be an effective answer to the trends of concentration which had emerged in the past. The Government's policy relating to the monopoly houses is also intended to secure such control as may be

[Shri Moinul Haque Choudhury]

necessary in their existing undertakings. That is why the policy has been announced that public financial institutions will have the option to convert loans into equity. Such option can also be exercised in past cases in the event of default. Public financial institutions can also appoint directors in the boards of these companies consistent with their shareholding.

Both Prof. Mukerjee and Shri Bosu referred to the fact that public financial institutions including the LIC and the banks have given a big chunk of their money to the larger houses. While it is no doubt true that the investment policy of the public financial institutions is primarily guided with a view to ensure good return consistent with safety of capital, Government has taken a clear decision now that in future the public financial institutions should play a more positive role through the convertibility clause and nomination. Of their own nominees in the boards of directors of these companies held by these houses or others. It is with the same reason of securing control that Government has called for a vigorous joint sector where the managerial expertise of the private sector can be harnessed to national ends. It is very unfortunate that prof. Mukerjee has seen a sinister motive behind our joint sector concept. We have issued detailed instructions on this subject, particularly relating to the functioning of the State Industrial Development Corporations. We have specifically laid down that the share of the State Industrial Development Corporation should not be less than 26 per cent and no other single party can have more than 25 per cent of the shareholding. It has further been laid down that no larger houses can be associated with such projects without obtaining the specific approval of the Government of India.

श्री भारद्वाज राय : वह तो मिल ही जायगा ।

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUHDURY: I would only like to reassure the House that we have the best of intentions and that the concept of joint sector has been evolved with the sole idea of revitalising our economy in the best national interest. I would also like to assure hon. members categorically that no special consideration is given to big houses for setting up joint ventures abroad. Such proposals are considered by an inter-ministerial committee on joint ventures under the auspices of the Ministry of Foreign Trade, which controls these joint ventures, on the basis of guidelines which have been approved by the Cabinet. The guidelines, *inter-alia*, provide for only a minority participation by entrepreneurs. The participation is only through plant and machinery and no cash remittances are normally allowed except for meeting preliminary expenses.

For the purpose of keeping the record straight, let me reiterate once again that the Government of India has no intention whatsoever of promoting any kind of economic imperialism. I am really sorry that Shri Jharkhande Rai thinks that these larger houses will be able to control our politics.

श्री भारद्वाज राय : वह तो कर ही लिया है ।

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUHDURY: There are a large number of prophets of doom. I do not want Shri Jharkhande to be one of them. In the past this kind of prophesies had been repeatedly made, but if he looks to the mid-term poll and the results thereof and the fate of the big industrialists in the people's hands, I hope he will revise his views. If he looks also to the recent Assembly elections, he would find that people did not return these people. Most of them met their expected fate. Many of them were drowned in Rajasthan itself. We should have faith in the Indian people, they could not be treated lightly and shabbily.

It was true that they could be influenced in the mid-term poll or in the election of the Rashtrapati, then the result would have been otherwise. This is a positive proof of the genius of our people. I would request him with folded hands not to lose faith in our people. So far as my party is concerned, we have not lost faith in our people.

Regarding the so-called Gupta-Pilodia case to which Prof Mukerjee referred to, I am sorry I do not have much details of the case. In fact, the Ministry of Foreign Trade could not give me any details. However, I can assure him that this matter would be further pursued and we will try and look into it. I would certainly agree with him that every Indian national going abroad should behave in a way worthy of the prestige of the country. However if a few individuals misbehave it would certainly not be fair to condemn the operation of joint venture units as a whole.

Prof. Mukerjee has also mentioned about the large number of foreign collaboration cases we have sanctioned recently. Certainly the figure of cases of foreign collaboration sanctioned during 1971 has shown an increase over the corresponding figure in 1970 but I should also like to remind him and other hon. Members that the pattern of our internal demand has also undergone a remarkable change in our country and we are going in for more and more sophisticated items which were not required till a few years ago. We have also entered the export market in a large number of non-traditional items where we have to compete with developed and developing countries. It would not perhaps be appropriate to compare the percentage of foreign collaborations with the letters of intent issued in a particular year in as much as the former is not alone confined to cases within the ambit of Industries (Development and Regulation) Act and the letters of intent of that year but it would only show a trend vis-a-vis the economic activities. However, such a comparison if

drawn would show that the percentage of foreign collaborations vis-a-vis the letters of intent issued were sharply declining. As against 73.5 per cent, 85.7 per cent, 40.4 per cent, and 42 per cent in the years 1967-1968, 1969 and 1970 the foreign collaborations approved in 1971 and the first quarter of 1972 were 24.2 per cent and 19 per cent of the total number of letters of intent issued in these years. Therefore to say that we are allowing foreign domination or foreign imperialism in the field of technology or industry would not be a correct proposition. I can assure the hon. Members that we will continue to be selective but at the same time not shut our doors and windows to new ideas or new techniques.

But let me not digress away from the main topic. I was trying to clear some misapprehensions voiced by some of the hon. Members. Coming back to the measures necessary to ensure greater social and economic justice, there are also two other anecdotes in the long run to the problem of concentration of economic power. That is, growth of the public sector and of the small scale industries. Government are committed to the expansion of these two sectors in a very large way. The public sector will have to control not only the commanding heights but the monopolistic ravines.

As I said in my last speech, its scope is proposed to be enlarged and expanded to consumer industries which are in short supply. With 85 units, the estimated investment of the public sector as it stood on 31st March, 1970 was Rs. 4,500 crores. The anticipated investment during the Fourth Plan ending with 1974 is Rs. 2,800 crores. Thus the total investment in the public sector is expected to be of the order of Rs. 7,300 crores by the end of the Fourth Plan. The Dutt Committee found the asset of the 75 large houses as on 31-12-1966 was Rs. 3418.5 crores. Later it was estimated that their asset was Rs. 4032.4 crores in 1967-68. On the other hand the assets of the entire private corporate sector ex-

[Shri Moinul Haque Choudhury] cluding banking companies on a rough calculation appeared to have reached the level of Rs. 7,500 crores in 1967-78, that is, taking into account large, medium small and every kind of corporate sector

Thus it would be seen that the public sector is gradually getting into a commanding height of our economy. Equally the small scale industries have already shown a spectacular growth rate due to the emphasis placed by the Government on the development of these industries.

I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members again to the fact that the steps taken by the Government which I have enumerated now, constitute a series of inter-connected and complementary measures which together provide an integrated strategy to curb and reduce the concentration of economic power. I have said enough to show that the Government is attacking the very problem which Prof. Mukherjee has in mind with the same aim that he has. The Government is committed to a policy of reducing economic disparities and concentration of economic power. We are actually watching how our policy instruments have been operating and with what results. Many of these instruments have been brought into being in the past three years or so. As and when Government finds any lacunae in these policy instruments, changes will be made or new instruments or policy devised.

Prof. Mukherjee wants nationalisation. Government is not afraid of nationalisation.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU Going on collecting money in the mean time.

SHRI MOINUL HAQUE CHOUHDURY : Government has no hesitation in this matter of nationalisation and has actually nationalised institutions and industries in the past, when it felt necessary. In fact, when it feels necessary, Government will proceed ahead with programmes of

such nationalisation without waiting to be persuaded. But the point is whereas Prof. Mukherjee thinks of only one instrument, viz., nationalisation, the Government thinks of many instruments, including those which I have just enumerated. Government will always be guided by the intrinsic efficacy and relevance of all policy instruments, including nationalisation, in a given situation. In other words, it is not a question of following policy of nationalisation for its own sake, but rather considering it as one of our policy instruments and sign it effectively and quickly wherever we consider it necessary. I cannot do better than to quote, as I conclude, the very pertinent observations in this regard made by the Prime Minister in the Rajya Sabha in her reply to the debate on the President's Address :

"The Government is neither averse to, nor afraid of, nationalisation. But nationalisation has to fit into our overall scheme of priorities with reference to the changing conditions of our economy. We shall nationalise an industry or a unit if it is essential to strengthen the control of the public sector over the economy. That is why 14 major Banks were nationalised and later the General Insurance Companies. We shall also not hesitate to nationalise any unit or industry when there is evidence that it is being managed to the detriment of the national interest. That is why we took over the management of certain coking coal mines and of copper. Nationalisation is one amongst many instruments at the disposal of Government to curb concentration of economic power in private hands, and we resort to it after a careful assessment of the efficacy of the other instruments available in a given situation."

Sir, given the number and variety of instruments at the disposal of Government, the fears which have prompted the hon. Member to move the Resolution are unwarranted. I would, therefore, request the hon. Member kindly not to press his Resolution.

17 hrs.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North East): Mr. Chairman, you will permit me if I begin by saying that during the last two days in this House certain goings on have put me in a mood of the utterest gloom. I was trying to find some cheer from the fact that virtually every Member who participated in the Resolution had supported my Resolution. But I am sent back again into the vortex of gloom by the speech made after obviously very careful preparation by my friend, the Minister of Industrial Development. It is time we heard less about Government taking credit for having nationalised whenever they have wanted to do so, as in the case of banks and general insurance, because you, Sir, would remember how for many long years so many of us in this House and outside had to carry on an agitation in order to make the Government change its attitude, which was one of the utterest hypocrisy, an attitude that social control was adequate. Even the present Prime Minister was very much in favour of social control rather than of nationalisation. And, it was on account of the pressure put upon the Government by the organised movement that there is in the country and by whatever opinion we would muster inside Parliament that bank nationalisation could come about and even that is not giving satisfaction, because the real democratic process of implementation of a policy of nationalisation has not been started and it is not going to be started, because this Government does appear to be committed to a *status quo* policy of keeping things as they are, a policy of safety first. If that is moving towards socialism, God help us! If this snail's pace advance is moving towards socialism, I am not sure whether they have any sense of direction at all. If we are going to perpetuate the power of the money-bags who by various ways, subtle and unsubtle, try to control everything in this country if we do not break the power of money-bags, all this talk about *garibi hatao* and

moving towards socialism is so much abracadabra, sheer moonshine and nonsense. Unless we make up our mind here and now to take some drastic steps, even if that might mean some difficulty, are we going to achieve socialism without going through a difficult process, without austerity, without real national discipline, without calling upon our people to face all kinds of difficulties? Of course, not. The movement towards socialism is not a walk along a bed of roses. A movement towards socialism is not going to be conducted in a manner which has been given any indication of by my friend, the Minister. He referred to the Pilodia-Gupta case in Ethiopia. I have already given to the Minister of Foreign Trade a copy of this extract from the *Ethiopian Herald* dated 2nd April 1972. I do not know why the Ministry of Foreign Trade has not told him more about it. But since I have no more use for it, I am going to pass on to him this extract from *Ethiopian Herald* with regard to Pilodia-Gupta case, after this debate is over.

My main point has been; these monopoly houses, 75 or 73 or more, let us not fight over that sort of thing they are the grievances of all grievances as far as economic disparity and economic decline of this country is concerned. On the face of it, they may point to certain things which they are telling in regard to industrial growth. There are foreign collaborators who are assisting them to do so. But deep down, they are eating into the vitals of our system, making it impossible for any advance towards socialism. They are trying all sorts of ruses like that poster business I am not going to refer to it to get control of this kind, and Rs. 7,000 crores, according to the Wanchoo Committee estimates, is the black money, and it is flourishing. It is more or less openly in the picture.

Only day before yesterday my friend's the senior colleague, the Finance Minister, talked about blackmoney in language

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

which, I hope this Government would have the sense of shame to acknowledge, should never have been pronounced in this House. He said this blackmoney is not hoarded money, it is active money, it is productive money, it is dynamic blackmoney. Sir, you have been in this House long enough to remember Jawaharlal Nehru used to be very fond of this expression "dynamic". Dynamic is an adjective which has come to be used by the Finance Minister of India in regard to black money, if you look at the records, He said how can I get hold of it, because it is not functioning in a secret way, it is open. If it is open, why can't you get hold of it, why can't you catch it? Because, government is hand in glove with the leaders of industry. That is why J R D Tata can talk about 20th century socialism, and he says he is even willing to participate in the 20th century socialism. I do not understand this kind of thing going on. It is a little beyond me.

My friend, the Minister, was angry with a colleague Shri Jharkhande Rai because he had suggested that before the second world war the 200 families of France had brought about the decline of that country and its defeat by fascism. Here are the 75 odd families who cannot function in the old way because fascism has been exterminated and the world is a very different place from what it had been in 1939. But, in a subtle way, they are going to maintain the control over the economy. They are making it impossible for a country like India really and truly to get into the socialist camp. That is why I want something definite to be done, something vital to be done, something which would appeal to the peoples' imagination.

I am sorry to hear the Minister and his like referring to these election results and saying that "the people have supported us; therefore, all of you keep quiet". Why did the people support you? Because the people believed you. Do not go on saying "you do not have the trust of the people, because they support us". No, it is not

true at all. The people supported you, not because they liked to look of you, the people supported you because they liked the policies which you announced, the people supported you because they found you had brought about some changes in the Constitution which shall enable you to take over this kind of concerns without any kind of an overwhelming burden on the national exchequer. The position was, before the recent constitutional amendment nationalisation has become an almost impossible proposition because compensation would be of such a quantum of money that this country would never be able to afford it. But now we have got constitutional changes with which we can take over concerns and the question of the compensation did not bother us very much. The people heard you. We had to go alongside of you in the last elections to point out how in this Parliament Congressmen and other people joined together in order to bring about the right kind of change in the Constitution. We told our people because of these change in the Constitution today really basic economic measures can be implemented by India. That is why the people give you their vote, because the people believed Indira Gandhi and all the others going about saying that they have really genuine intention of *garibi hato*.

If that is so, why don't you do something about it? Why are you attached to the *status quo* business? Why do you want the private sector still to command the heights of our economy, large parts of our economy except for a non profit-making part of our economy, the private sector still controls the heights and non heights of our economy, and all over the place they are in control. And even our public sector is run in such a bureaucratic fashion that nothing properly and truly can be done, and indirectly an argument is given, supplied by the public sector itself, against the public sector.

That is the kind of thing which goes on, and that is why I say you have to do some

thing drastic, if you want removal of the disparities, if you want the genuine implementation of the near socialistic policies—we have not got anywhere near socialism — take hold of these monopoly people, take the moneyed people who are controlling everything, because of whom the other genuine, honest, patriotic-minded people who are in industry are not able to offer examples. Why don't you take a lesson from countries like Chile, or the German Democratic Republic ? Why can't you have a law that no individual industrial owner can have a concern in which more than 100 people or so are employed ? Why don't you start with something of that sort that the State and the Co-operative Sector must be extended. There must a ceiling on income, a ceiling on property, a ceiling on salaries and if that is so, why can't you move ahead? Your own people, like Mr. Siddharatha Shankar Ray—I said on the last occasion—has declared in Calcutta that several thousand people who are drawing four-figure salary have offered to work for the public sector at lesser salaries. That is the spirit of our people. Give them an opportunity and do not go on saying that private sector has the know-how. A friend there, Prof. Mahajan or somebody was saying that private sector has the know-how. But it is the people, who work by hand or by brain, people like you and me, who have the know-how. It is not the Tatas, Birlas, Mafatlals, or the Dalmias, or whoever might be at the top, who have the know-how. It is the people who help them. They are the people like you and me who do not need any fantastic salary every month. That is why you can take this step.

It is not an enterprise which is too venturesome, too risky. It is a step which is absolutely implicit in the country's pledge that it has advanced towards socialism and we have to do something drastic. Unless you do something striking, you do not strike the imagination of the people. That is why, even though, there may be difficulties, you should take-over the monopoly

houses and do something in regard to that. I do not say nationalisation by itself is the final and ultimate remedy, but you have to work nationalisation in a democratic manner by getting the participation of large number of workers, involving them in tasks of production and giving them a sense of comradeship and a sense of participation in the best sense of the term. Then and then alone can you tackle all the problems, tackle the problem of black money, tackle the problem of disparity, tackle the problem of industrial growth, tackle the problem of inequality and tackle the moral problem, which is so important today and which comes to our mind every time when we find these tycoons wanting to worm their way into the favours of the Government by the kind of activity to which reference has been made in this House so repeatedly during the last two days. I say, therefore, that I am very unhappy with the reply of the Minister. I had a very remote expectation that possibly the Minister would make some kind of a gesture, but this gesture made at the very end has been completely vitiated by the statements which have preceded in a very carefully prepared speech.

I cannot accede to his request that I withdraw my resolution. As for myself, I can accept the amendment move by Mr. S. M. Banerjee. That is the utmost I can go. He asked me to add at the end "within the Fourth Plan period" That is the only amendment which I can accept. Otherwise, I would not say that I withdraw my resolution. I press it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put Amendment No. 1, moved by Mr. M. C. Dagar, to the vote of the House. The question is :

That in the resolution :—

for "immediate" substitute "keeping in view our policy of mixed economy" (1)

[Mr. Chairman]

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I will now put Amendment No. 2, moved by Mr. S. M. Banerjee, to the vote of the House. The question is :

That in the resolution,—

add at the end,—

“within Fourth Plan Period” (2)

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is the third amendment moved by Mr. C. K. Chandrappan. Is he withdrawing it ?

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN : I am withdrawing it.

Amendment No. 3 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, I put the Resolution moved by Shri H. N. Mukerjee to the vote of the House.

The question is :

“This House is of opinion that immediate steps should be taken for the nationalisation of the seventy five leading industrial houses specified in the report of the Monopolies Inquiry Commission.”

The Lok Sabha divided :

AYES

Division No. 6

17 20 hrs.

Bhagirath Bhanwar, Shri
Bhattacharyya, Shri Jagadish
Bosu, Shri Jyotirmoy
Chandrappan, Shri C. K.
Das, Shri R. P.
Godfrey, Shrimati M.
Hazra, Shri Manoranjan

Jharkhande Rai, Shri
Joardar, Shri Dinesh
Mohanty, Shri Surendra
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Panda, Shri D. K.
Pandey, Shri Sarjoo
Rao, Shri M. Satyanarayan
Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar
Saha, Shri Godadhar
Sambhali, Shri Ishaq
Thevar, Shri PKM
Viswanathan, Shri G.

NOES

Ambesh, Shri
Ankineedu, Shri Maganti
Arvind Netam, Shri
Bajpai Shri Vidya Dhar
Banamaji Babu, Shri
Barua, Shri Bedabrata
Besra, Shri S. C.
Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.
Bhandare, Shri R. D.
Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu
Bisht, Shri Narendra Singh
Buta Singh, Shri
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
Choudhury, Shri Moinul Haque
Dasahpa, Shri Tulsidas
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
Dinesh Singh, Shri
Doda, Shri Hiralal
Dumada, Shri L. K.
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
Ganesh, Shri K. R.
Gautam, Shri C. D.
Godara, Shri Mani Ram
Gohain, Shri C. C.
Gomango, Shri Giridhar

Hari Singh, Shri
 Hashim, Shri M. M.
 Kadam, Shri J. G.
 Kajlas, Dr.
 Kakodkar, Shri Purushottam
 Kokoti, Shri Robin
 Kapur, Shri Sat Pal
 Kedar Nath Singh, Shri
 Katoki, Shri Liladhar
 Kulkarni, Shri Raja
 Mahajan, Shri Y. S.
 Maharaj Singh, Shri
 Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mishra, Shri L. N.
 Mohapatra, Shri Shyam Sunder
 Naik, Shri B. V.
 Negi, Shri Pratap Singh
 Oraon, Shri Tuna
 Paiouli Shri Paripoornanand
 Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra
 Pant, Shri K. C.
 Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand
 Partap Singh, Shri
 Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai
 Raj Bahadur, Shri
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramji Ram, Shri
 Rana, Shri M. B.
 Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.
 Rao, Shri Nageswara
 Reddi, Shri P. Antony
 Reddy, Shri K. Kodanda Rami
 Reddy, Shri P. V.
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.
 Sant Bux Singh, Shri

Sarkar, Shri Sakti Kumar
 Sethi, Shri Arjun
 Shailani, Shri Chandra
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Shivnath Singh, Shri
 Siddayya, Shri S. M.
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
 Sohan Lal, Shri T.
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.

MR. CHAIRMAN* : The result of the division is Ayes—1; Noes—78

The motion was negatived

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Shame, shame :

17.20 hrs.

RESOLUTION : *RE PER CAPITA INCOME*

MR. CHAIRMAN : We will now take up the Resolution in the name of Shri Bibhuti Mishra, namely :—

“This House urges upon the Government to fix the minimum limit of per capita income.”

Shri Bibhuti Mishra.

श्री बिभूति मिश्र (भोतिहारि) : सभापति जी, मैं अपने प्रस्ताव को प्रस्तुत कर रहा हूँ। प्रस्ताव यह है—

“यह सभा सरकार से अनुरोध करती है कि सरकार प्रत्येक व्यक्ति की आय को न्यूनतम सीमा निर्धारित करे।”

The following Members also recorded their votes for NOES:—

Shri Chandulal Chandrakar and Shri Biren Engti.