

our national economy and also the dedicated service of its scientists and technicians.

16.38 hrs.

RE: DISCUSSION ON INCREASE IN PRICES OF ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-TARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): This morning a feeling was expressed by hon. Members on both sides of the House that there should be a discussion on the increase in prices of essential commodities. At that time I said that I will report to the House the reaction of the Government. It is true that this subject was discussed earlier in this session. All the same, Government are agreeable to a discussion. I suggest that this discussion may be under rule 193 and it may be taken up on the 15th May.

16.39 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE. FERTILIZER CORPORATION OF INDIA—contd.

श्री दरबारा सिंह (होशियारपुर) : महापति महोदय, हमारे दोस्त श्री मुहा ने एक निहायत संजीदा मसला उठाया है और हम के बारे में मुझे खुशी है इस बात की कि उन्होंने पूरे तौर पर इडियनाइजेशन के लिए एक केम बनाया है। यह चाहिए भी था क्योंकि हम चाहते हैं कि हमारा मुक्त सेल्फ सफिश्येंट हो कर लिहाज में, और आज तो फर्टिलाइजर की बहुत जरूरत है हम बाग के लिए कि हमारे फूडग्रेन्स ज्यादा हों। हम पिछले सालों से कोशिश करते आए हैं और उन कोशिश में हम बहुत हद तक कामयाब नहीं हो सके कि फर्टिलाइजर उस भिक्वार में मिल सके जिस में हमें जरूरत है। इसलिए यह मामला और भी भद्रम हो जाता है और हम के ग्राम एंड कान्स सोचने की जरूरत है। मुझे उन पर कोई शक नहीं है, जिस ढंग से वह लागू है और यह खुशी की बात है कि यह पब्लिक सेक्टर के हक में बोले हैं। पब्लिक सेक्टर हम चाहते हैं, हमारी गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी भी यह है कि जहां तक हो सके पब्लिक सेक्टर को मजबूत किया जाय। जहाँ जहाँ बराबिकों हैं उस को दुबस्त किया जाय। हममें कोई दो राय नहीं है। मैं यह बातें इसलिए कहना हू कि हम उन के साथ सहमत हैं इस बात में।

अब मैं कुछ चीजें अर्ज करना चाहता हू। मैं यह कहना हू कि ठीक है काम करने में कभी कभी सुखी हो सकती है। काम करने में कभी कभी थोड़ी बहुत कड़ी कमी रह जाती है। लेकिन यह कमी कार्ड सरकार बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकती कि धारविट्टेरिनो मार्ग चीजें हानी रहे। मैं ए० सी० सी० किसी के भी खिलाफ नहीं हू। यह एफ० सी० आई० ना नई आई० है हमारे मामले (व्यवधान) मैंने न बनवाया कहा न मुखर्जी कहा। मैं तो ए० सी० सी० कह रहा हू। मुझे नहीं पता है कि कौन है कौन नहीं है। मैं इनका नहीं जानता। मैं सिर्फ यह जानता हू कि वहाँ एक नया काम कर रहा है। मैं हमेशा टेक्नापेट्स के हक में रहा हू। इसलिए कि उनको टेक्निकल बातों का पता होता है। टेक्निकल बातों का पता हो, हमारे मुक्त का आगे में जाय, इसमें कार्ड का रायें नहीं हो सकती। यह होना चाहिए। लेकिन यह भी है कि हमारे टेक्नापेट्स, मैं नाम नहीं लेना चाहता, बड़ी बड़ी जगहा पर वह है, लेकिन उन का काम वहीं खड़ा है, मुक्त की प्रोडक्शन आगे में जाना चाहते थे, वह वही खड़ा है, लाइमिंग कर्ट चीजों में आया है प्रोग कारण यह है कि वह अपने ढंग की वहा पाबन्दी लगाने हैं, कि यह होना चाहिए, वह होना चाहिए। मैं कोई आई० सी० एम० या इस क्लाम के हक में नहीं हू न मैं किसी के खिलाफ हू। (व्यवधान)

आप की बागी प्राप्ती तो आप बोल लेना। मैं यह अर्ज करना हू कि टेक्नापेट्स के हक में मैं इसलिए रहा हू कि इन का काम करने दिया जाय क्योंकि इन को पता है कि कहां खराबी है और कौन गग काम हमें करना है। शायद आई० ए० एम० या दूसरे लोग उन बाग को जान नहीं पाते। लेकिन कई बार यह समझते हुए भी मैं अपने अन्दाज में कुछ चीजें रखना चाहता हू। हमारे दोस्त ने कहा कि प्राध में .01 परसेंट था। रुपया नहीं बना सके कि कितना है। रुपया किस ने दिया और कौन वह है। किन दूसरी चीजों में रुपया देने वाली वह 13-14 पार्टीज थी ? किस वजह में दिया गया ? इस की क्या न एम्बवायरी की जाय ? मैं समझता हूँ आप इसके

[श्री दरबारा सिंह]

अदर डीप जाय तो आप को इस के साथ बहुत सी जुड़ी हुई बातें मिलेंगी जिस से आप सारे देश भर की एक०सी०आई० का काम देख पाएंगे। यह दूसरी एक०सी०आई० हमारे पास आई है। पहली थी फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया। हमने उस के बारे में भी बहुत कुछ कहा था कि उसके अदर खराबी है उस का दुरुस्त किया जाय। उस एक०सी०आई० में यह स्थिति रही कि नकैड बैंक फार्मिंग से लेते रहे और जा फ्लावर मिल्स है उनका बैंग स डाल कर देते रहे और सारा रुपया एक० सी० आई० खुद अपनी पाकेट स देती रही। कगडो रुपये इस तरह स दिए गए। ऐसी बातें होती रहीं। (ब्यबधान) मैं उस की बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ। नाम उसका भी एक० सी० आई० है। मैं उस एक० सी० आई० को छींचता हूँ। लेकिन यह एक० सी० आई० उससे कम नहीं है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (ग्वानियर) उमक चैयरमैन साहब कहा गए ?

श्री दरबारा सिंह उम के चैयरमैन साहब आप से मिलने गए होंगे।

मैं उसकी बात कहना हूँ इसलिए कि वाना में खराबी है। मैं बिमी का नाम नहीं लूना, न मुझे उनका नामा का पता है। थोड़ी सी बात मैं रखना चाहता हूँ।

वह प्राइविल काई एक्टिंग जनरल मनजर प्लानिंग और डेवलपमेंट है।

उस आई न जा बाड बना हुआ है जा मजूरी देना है, उमन मजरी दे दी कि इनका मैनजर रखना चाहिए। मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से यह कहना हूँ कि इसका आप दरियाफन कीजिए आया की मजरी दी या नहीं दी और नहीं दी ता अब तक काहे के लिए रखे हुए है उनका ? दूसरा यह है कि 1950 में यनिशन पब्लिक नबिस कमीशन न इस आदमी का जा वहा काम करना है, मुवाजिम है उस का रिजकट किया और उम को आज वही रखे हुए है। किनने रखा है ?

1961 में नगल और सिन्धी की कटिलाइजर कैम्पूरी को इकट्ठा करके यह एक० सी० आई० बनाई और नगल या गोरखपुर में आपका प्रोडक्शन बढ़िया है। लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ यह सोन और और जो है दुर्गापुर, कोचीन और बरोली इनमें आप का प्रोडक्शन किस हद तक बढ़ा है ? पचास परसेंट वह है। इन जगहों पर कितना प्रोडक्शन हुआ उसका भी अन्वाखा कर लीजिए और यह जा कोचीन में है, हम न एक और भी हालत देखी है जिस आदमी का भार पीट कर कहा मैं निकाला गया उसपर अटैक हुआ, एसाट किया गया उसका उस आदमी ने जितना आखा हिस्सा उसका तैयार किया है वह बकिंग में है और आखा हिस्सा जिन लागू की हिकाजत करन के लिए यहा लागू बाल रह है, उनका तैयार किया हुआ वह वही खडा है और वह प्रोडक्शन नहीं दे रहा है, कोचीन में यह हालत है। आप देख लीजिए और इस का दरियाफन कीजिए। मैं नाम नहीं लूंगा बिमी का क्योंकि कहते हैं कि यह अमेरिका वान है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह कौन है केमिका ? उसकी कौन मदद ले रहा है ? केमिको अमेरिका की फर्म है, उम का आग वान के लिए बिमन मदद की है इस का भी दरियाफन कीजिए।

एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ और उसने दा आदमिया का नाम भले लन पडग। यह एक फर्म है जिनने अदर दा आई ह एक बम्बई में काम करता है एक बलकत में काम करता है। और वह एजट है किसके ? मोनेटे एडिटाइटली की फर्म है सब में निक्म्मी है उनसे और कहते हैं कि इंडियन यहा तैयार करके देते हैं। परन्तु प्रोजेक्ट सलर-सलर करोड क जा हैं उससे मे 35 करोड क करीब बाहर ले लाते हैं। ता क्या यह इंडियन तैयार हुआ रहा है ? यह दा आई है कपाडिया आई है उन का नाम मुझे आता है लेकिन कबोडिया या कपाडिया ऐसे कुछ नाम है। वह कराडो रुपये की जामदाद के सालिक है। मैं उनकी परसनल बातो में नहीं जाना चाहता कि कितने हीरे जवाहरात गादियों में और दूसरी

जगहों पर उन्होंने दिए हैं, कितना करोड़ों रुपया उनके पास है ? यह कहाँ से आया उन के पास ? किन्तनी जायदाद उनके पास पहले थी ? यह सारी बातें आप दरिफाक्त कीजिए । आप शायद उस ऐजेंसी को जानते न हों । पाच परसेंट, दस परसेंट वह दूसरों को देने हैं और फिर यह सारे कार्ट्रिज लेते हैं । यह कौन कर रहा है इस के बारे में, दरियाफुक्त कीजिए । यह कोई छोटी बात नहीं है । जाते जाते यह कह गए कि कोई बात नहीं है, कुछ इस चीज का क्याल रखें कि आप ने स्टेटमेंट दिया । आप न कटा कि प्राइमा फेसी तो कोई नहीं है लेकिन मस्पिशन है । वह प्राइमा फेसी और मस्पिशन दोनों जुड़े हुए हाते हैं उसके साथ । तभी तो प्राइमा फेसी बनाता है । मे अपने दोस्त में इतफाक करना अगर वह एम्बवायरी को वाइडेन करते और कहते कि मारी एक सौ ब्राई की एम्बवायरी कर बीजिए, कार्ड कमी है तो उस को दूर कीजिए और अगर वह दोस्त त्रिन के नाम उन्होंने लिए वह अच्छे है ता क्यों व उन की मदद की जाय ? लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक ही धक्के में तीन हजार प्राइमी रखे गए हैं । किस बात के लिए और किस ने रखा ? प्राविट्रिनी रखा । किमने ईजाजत दी ? टेक्नोकेट्स की बात मुझिए । यह जो नान-इजीनियर्स हैं उनको मलेक्ट किया जाना है चीफ इजीनियर की पोस्ट के लिए ।

ये बहुत अच्छे टेक्नोकेट है—जा किली मुनोवामिटी से नहीं पड़े है, उनको चीफ इजीनियर बना कर रखा हुआ है . .

श्री सचर गृह कब हुआ है ?

श्री बरबारा सिंह यह अभी हों रहा है—गलन होगा तो दुरुस्त कर देंगे ।

पेंट्रोसियस और रसायन मंत्री (श्री देवकान्त बरुआ) नाम बताला दीजिये, तब तो पता चलेगा । बाद में बनला दीजियेगा ।

श्री बरबारा सिंह प्राइवेट में बनला दूंगा । मैं आप की सर्विमिड का नाम पानियामेन्दी तौर पर नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ ।

और भी बहुत सी बातें हैं—मैं किसी पॉलीटीकल प्राइमी का नाम नहीं लेना चाहता कि किस तरह से उनका इन्वाल्वमेन्ट है और न ही मेरा मेमा स्वभाव है । मे इनना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि जितने एम्बल बोर्ड ने नहो किये हैं, उन को आपस कीजिये, क्यों वहा रखे हुए है और कौन उस के लिये जिम्मेदार है । इस किस के फ्राइलेंट एक्शन के लिये उनको इतनी पावस दी हुई है और जो उन की मर्जी होती है करते हैं । मिनिस्टर का क्या पता है । ये सरकार के नीचे घाले करोड़ों रुपयों पर बँटे हुए हैं जरा गहराई में जाइये, आप का पता चल जायेगा कि किन्तनी बड़ी बड़ी मछलियां हा गर्ड है, किन्तनी फँट हो गई है ।

एक और तमाशा है—भाज कल लकव दिखे जाने है—जैसे पदमश्री मिलना है—जिस प्राइमी के बोलेस बनाया, रिमर्श की, उनको ता कुछ नहीं मिला, लेकिन जा दूमेने बड़े माहब थे, उन्होंने ले लिया, क्योंकि वह उसके माहब थे, बड़े थे—जरा इस जालसाजी को दाय्यापन तो कीजिये ।

श्री सचर गृह एकमपटं कमेटी बँटाइये ।

श्री बरबारा सिंह आपने बहुत अच्छी बात कही है, मुझ का मपटं किया है । आप कार्ड इन्वेस्टीगेशन कमेटी कायम करे जिमसे कि तमाम चीज मामने आये, इर्रगुलर और फ्राइलेंट तरीके से जा बाम चल रहा है, वह रुक मके ।

एक बात मुझे याद आई—मगर गृह माहब ने कहा कि दो हज़ार एजेंसीज है । उनमें 200 के करीब काधारपटिव मोमायटीज है । आप कीजिये को दीजिये, डिमएबल्ड को दीजिये, अनएम्पनायेड इन्जीनियर्स को दीजिये, लेकिन जो दूसरी घुमपटं है उस से बचाइये । आप मीधा कोआपरेटिव्ज को दीजिये या जो कलैक्टिव तौर पर काम करने वाले हैं उनको दीजिये । मार्कोटिया फीडिंगन्ज या जो दूसरी इन्स्टीचून्ज है उनको मारफन दीजिये, धकेलों का देने हैं तो यह डिस्क्रिशन उनके पास चली जाती है, यह तरीका ठीक नहीं है, इसी लिए ये मारी बातें हो रही है ।

[श्री दरबारा सिंह]

मेने पाम बहुत सा मैटीरियल है लेकिन म बाबू कर गया हूँ म यहा दना नहीं चाहता । आप पूछता ना कि कइ दे दूंगा । म श्री ममर गुरु से इतिहास करता हूँ कि हमकी पूरी तरह से एन्कवायरी कराइये और अगर सजा क बाबिल हा तो सजा दीजिये और जा बहिया पाम करने वाले हैं दर म काम कर रहे है—उनको मौका दीजिये । आप हम की गहराई म जायेगा तो कराया रुपय की गन्धी मिलेगी । हम न अमरीकन माइड म ताल्लुक रखते हैं और न रशियन माइड म ताल्लुक रखते है लेकिन इसम जो गन्धी है उसका दर कराना चाहते है । आखिर इन के बन्ध अमरीका म पढते है— किमकी वास्ट पर पढते हैं यह सब को पना है । व अमरीका मे पढते है यू० एम० एस० आर० म नही पढते है । मै यह बात इस लिये बहता हूँ कि यह इस्लाम भी मौजूदा पर आयगा किसी और पर नहीं आयेगा । जा बान हर्ट है— उसी का आप के मामल रख रहा हूँ— बहुत मा अनाज डिस्कलर हा गया वाकी बा ५० हजार किचटल बाबल है यह मारा डिस्कलर करने क लिये नैयार है । हम किमाना का फिटिदाइजर बस द । अगर आप चाहते है कि अनाज ज्यादा पैदा हा ता उसकी कितनी कैपसिटी हे उसका पचास परसेट कैपसिटी ता बन्द पडी है हमलिय कि इन के अन्दर बार चल रही ह । कौन किस जगह जाय एन इजागबाल का तीन टजार मिनने चाहिये 500 बाल को 200 मिलन चाहिये पहले हम का हल कीजिय । मैं आप की मारफत मिनिस्टर माइब से इस्तुद्दा करता हूँ कि आप महरबानी करके हम बीछी इन्कवायरी कराइये पोस-मील एन्कवायरी न कराइये—कभी आन्ध्र की कराली फिर बाई मबाल उठा ता उसकी इन्कवायरी कराली—नाकि यह बहिदा एक दफा मे बन्ध हा जाय ।

MR CHAIRMAN Now before I call the next speaker I find that there are about 11 names from both sides The question is if the House wants to sit for

a longer time, certainly some more time can be allowed Otherwise we have to restrict the time So, I would like to have the opinion of the House

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K RAGHU RAMAIAH) We may sit upto 7 O Clock

MR CHAIRMAN All right

Mr Jyotirmoy Bosu

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) I am not particularly keen on going into the personal likes and dislikes preferences and failures Before I speak anything I would like to go on the working of the Fertiliser Corporation of India as it is shown in the Estimates Committee's report the latest one that we have before us the Fortieth Report, 1972-73 which says

The consumption targets laid down for the Fourth Plan Period and the consumption achieved has been indicated year wise as follows

Target consumption 1971-72—	32.0
lakh tonnes of nutrients the	
total consumption achieved—	26.5
lakh tonnes	

It is said

The Committee regret that in spite of the acknowledged role of fertilisers in augmenting agricultural production under the Indian conditions the annual consumption achieved during the first three years of the Fourth plan was consistently less than the plan targets”

It further says

The Committee are constrained to note that the net addition of installed capacity for the production of fertilisers in the country during the Fourth Plan period is likely

to be only 13.99 lakh tonnes as against the original Plan target of 27.55 lakh tonnes”.

Let us see the utilisation of the built-in capacity in the country by the so-called Fertiliser Corporation giant headed by Mr. D. K. Borooah, the hon. Minister.

SHRI RAJA KULKARNI (Bombay-North-East): It is not headed by him.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: He is the controlling Minister.

SHRI D. K. BOROAH: I was not the controlling Minister in 1972-73.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: No Government talks like that. Let us not hear things which should not be said.

SHRI D. K. BOROAH: I thought you mentioned my name. Therefore, I said it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: At present you are answerable to the House. Sir, the utilisation of capacity in the public sector of Nitrogen and Phosphate during 1970-71 and 1971-72 is: installed capacity in 1971-72 is 660,000 tonnes while the actual production for that period did not exceed 402,000 tonnes. In terms of percentage the utilisation does not exceed 60.9 per cent of the installed capacity in the public sector and in case of the private sector it is much much higher. The Committee has said:

“The Committee consider that it is nothing short of tragic that at a time when the country requires more and more fertilisers in order to step up agricultural production to meet the requirements, the fertiliser plants in the public sector should not be able to produce as per their installed capacity. In the case of single superphosphate, the production was 39 per cent in 1970-71 and 36 per cent in 1971-72.”

Then we come to the price factor. We have peasants, tillers and the people in the country who have the lowest *per capita* income in the world, that is about 73 dollars per head. But in the case of fertilisers—Mr. Borooah should be pleased to hear—they have to pay the highest amount for any fertiliser anywhere in the world. If you take into consideration the price paid by the farmers per 100 kgs. of plant nutrient in US dollar, while in West Germany the peasant pays 28.7 dollars for Ammonium Sulphate, the Indian farmer pays 34.3 US dollars and the French farmer pays only 26 US dollars.

In France it is 23.3 dollars. In this country of ours, it is 34.3 dollars. In Ceylon it is 21.1 dollars. This is the position. This is the performance. They are so much boasting about it and waxing eloquent. What has the Estimates Committee said about the matter. I would like to quote that. It says:

“The prices of three of the nitrogenous fertilisers are directly controlled by Govt. The issue prices fixed for fertilisers imported by the Central Fertiliser Pool, which constitute about 50 per cent of the total consumption of fertilisers in the country influence prices of other types of domestically produced fertilisers. Thus Government is directly or indirectly controlling the prices of fertilisers in this country. Yet the cultivators’ prices of fertilisers in this country are about the highest in the world”.

They say, highest in the world...

“...Even these prices are not considered by the fertilizer industry to be reasonable and attractive enough for new investment”.

17 hrs.

The price is far from realistic. A person has to pay at least 100 per cent more on

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu]:

the price quoted. What are the Government doing about it? What justification have they got to keep the FCI? Whose purpose does it serve? It is a stranglehold of monopolists. Mr. Borooah's predecessor gave an assurance that during the Fourth Plan three-fourth of the new capacity would be in public sector. We know the class character of the Government. We know the great love of the Government to monopolists. We know how you surrender to Birlas and Tatas and your other godfathers in the country. Private sector foreign monopolists are reaping high dividends.

I will tell you another instance how the foreign monopolists are prospering. Recently the Japanese monopolist Toyo and Company was given licence for 5 units. What happens to your *garibi hatuo* programme? This is how you surrender before the foreign capitalists. In private sector the utilised capacity is 79.4 per cent. I will give you example how it operates and I have got with me documentary evidence. What is the performance of your fertiliser division at Kanpur? The black and white document shows this to be 79.4 or 80 per cent but you are not even getting 60 per cent. In public sector, during 1970-71 the super-phosphate production units were 36 and in the private sector, 144 units. In regard to Single Super-phosphates during 1970-71, it is 36 in public sector and 172 in the private sector.

I now come to the Madras project which has been described as a turn-key project. We went to that place and we visited that plant. It has been repeatedly emphasised that this is a turn-key project. You have been a freedom-fighter, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure you would be surprised about this. The Government has got absolutely no control over the marketing structure of that company for the first eight years. This is the position. Do we have a small American kingdom in this

country where the Government of India's powers and authority are not good enough. That is what it is. That is the class character of Mr. Borooah and his party. That is why they are surrendering. That is why today a poor peasant has to give blood and sweat for earning dividend for the monopolies.

What about Mr. Chidambaram's naphtha-based fertiliser plant at Tuticorin? Why is he a specially favoured person? His predecessor, Dr. Triguna Sen, threatened to resign because he opposed installation of a naphtha-based fertiliser plant at Tuticorin but Mr Chidambaram of M/s. Maruti Ltd. had to be obliged and, as such, at the cost of the country a licence had to be given. I do not know whether Mr. Borooah will have the same attitude and courage to show, as was shown by his predecessor.

SHRI D. K. BOROOAH: Did he resign?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: During his regime it was not done. Afterwards he was not made Minister, because he became inconvenient for somebody here.

Now, I will give one example, that is, of Indian Explosives Fertiliser Division where the government has share-holding. I will show you the capital structure, rated capacity and so on and so forth. I will quote from the original balance-sheet:

The President of India	..	12.75 per cent
I.C.I. Limited	..	51.02 per cent
Public	..	26.22 per cent

They are again ICI stooges and International Finance Corporation who believes in....

श्री शंकर बयाल सिंह (बतरा) : प्वाइट प्रॉफ
 आई. सी. ए. लिमिटेड, सर । आपने एक सदस्य को कितना समय
 दिया है बोलने के लिए यह मैं जानना चाहता
 हूँ ।

समापति महोदय : यह कोई प्वाइंट ग्राफ प्रार्डर नहीं है ।

श्री शंकर बवाल सिंह : मेरा प्वाइन्ट ग्राफ प्रार्डर है, ग्राप सुन तो ले ।

समापति महोदय : ग्राप बैठे । ग्रापने पूछा है कि कितना समय दिया गया है तो यह प्रोसीजर का सवाल है, टाइम के बारे में इन्फार्मेशन का सवाल है । जब वे बैठ जायें तब ग्राप पूछ सकते हैं । स्पीच के अन्दर कोई नयी बात हो ता उसपर प्वाइंट ग्राफ प्रार्डर उठा सकते हैं ।

श्री शंकर बवाल सिंह : मेरा प्वाइन्ट ग्राफ प्रार्डर तो सुन लीजिए ।

मेरा प्वाइन्ट ग्राफ प्रार्डर यह है कि भवन की प्रक्रिया नियमावली के नियम 352 के अनुसार बोलने की एक प्रक्रिया होती है । जब कोई सदस्य बिंबेट में हिस्सा ले रहे हैं तो उनके लिए नियम 352 की प्रक्रिया है । माननीय सदस्य फटिलाइजर के बारे में बोलते बोलते मारुती और न मालूम किम किम के बारे में बोलने लगे तो इनके बारे में मैं आपकी रुचि चाहता हूँ । ग्राप उन से एक सी आई के बारे में ही बोलने के लिए कहेंगे न कि दुनिया भर की चीजों के बारे में । मैं आपकी रुचि चाहता हूँ ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : I think the hon. Member has raised the question whether an hon. Member can bring in matters which do not pertain to the question that is being discussed. I would certainly like, and it will also raise the dignity of the House, if we only confine ourselves to the question that is being discussed and outside things are not brought in. I hope the hon. Members will confine their speeches to the question that is being discussed.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : Sir, I only wanted to mention about the Naphtha-based fertiliser plant, licence for which has already been given. I withdraw Maruti from the market. The plant will produce Urea fertilizer at its full-rated capacity amounting to 4,50,000 tonnes a year. But, I will

show in the course of few minutes how they are over-producing and black-marketing the fertilizer which is in short-supply and people are fleeced of the money. Now, just see the profits of this fertilizer company. Mr. Singh is approving partnership with the fertilizer production project of the Government. The profit in 1971 was Rs. 2,48,60,000. In 1972, in one year, Mr. Singh, the Company got. . .

श्री शंकर बवाल सिंह : मेरा प्वाइंट ग्राफ प्रार्डर है । नियम 352 के अनुसार माननीय सदस्य जब बोलें तो चेयर को गैज़म करें ।

समापति महोदय : मैंने सुन लिया है, ग्राप बैठिये ।

SHRI DAMODAR PANDEY (Hazaribagh) : Sir, my point of order is this. Under rule 352, he should only address the Chair and not Mr. Singh or Shri Panigrahi.

This discussion is only related to the Fertilizer Corporation of India. It has nothing to do with the Kanpur factory of I.C.I. and all the information which the hon. Member is now seeking to give here in the House is only in relation to I.C.I. Kanpur and nothing else. It does not relate to Fertilizer Corporation of India.

MR. CHAIRMAN : As far as addressing the Chair is concerned, I think, Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu should restrain himself when addressing this House.

As regards the point raised by Shri Damodar Pandey, this House is discussing about the Fertilizer Corporation of India and its working and not I.C.I. Kanpur factory.

If there are some direct or indirect considerations or connections in the working of the Corporation, then these may be mentioned. But if it is an independent issue of a different nature, then it should not be mentioned. So, I would request that if only it has a direct or indirect connection with the Corporation, then alone it should be mentioned.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, I thank you for your guidance. Now, this company has Government as a partner. In one year the profits of this Company rose from Rs. 2,48,50,000 to Rs. 7,40,13,400, and how funny it is, in 1971 when the amount was Rs. 2,48,00,000, taxation was Rs. 3,40,000.

But when the profit became three times, namely Rs. 7.40 crores, the taxation came down to Rs. 2.73 lakhs. That is the position with regard to fertiliser production and the Government's policy of surrender to the foreign monopolists.

I want to bring to the notice of the House also the fact that the poor farmer is really struggling to get his pound of fertiliser but he is made to pay twice as much as he should at the factory gate. This particular concern of which the Government of India is a partner has involved itself in serious criminal malpractices. It has a director nominated by Government, may be from the FCI or from the administrative branch. But in spite of that, nothing is happening, and they have been indulging in blackmarketing and the British owners are making hay while the sun shines. Two brothers are contractors, one a loading and unloading contractor and the other a transport contractor, and they are Bal Krishan & Co. and Bansal Road Carriers. They were formed particularly for Indian Explosives Ltd. (Fertiliser Division) They have been doing excess loading. In the period from January 1972 to March, 1973, a huge quantity of urea has been missing from the factory Rejected wagons, sent back often with bags full of fertiliser have been found. Recently, 22 bags of urea were found by Kalyanpur police station in UP.

On 20th January, 4 trucks belonging to Messrs. Bansal Road Carriers—I would not like to mention their numbers here—containing 8, 10, 8 and 10 tonnes of urea respectively were passed out of the factory in the name of Mr. Ram Duttamal Gungaram, GT Road, Karnal, Haryana,

but later on, one truck bearing some UPC number has been struck off the challan body. I have got a photostat copy of the challan. If you so desire, I can lay it on the Table of the House, and I wish to lay it on the Table of the House. This is a clear example of how they are stealing fertiliser from this plant and blackmarketing in the outside bazar and fleecing the poor farmers at double the cost at the factory-gate, which gives them an enormous profits, as I have shown from the balance-sheet, etc.

Then, what are they doing with regard to the employees? They are treating their employees in the most shabby manner and there have been cases of severe victimisation, suspension, lay-off and victimisation of the trade union leaders.

We want to know whether it is a fact that the present scandal or the trouble about the FCI about which Shri Samar Guha and others have spoken just now, is due to the fact that some ruling party leaders have been interfering with the affairs, and some ruling party politicians have been patronising suppliers of coal and sulphur and wanting dealerships and agencies for themselves and their stooges and wanting jobs for their candidates.

This is why a campaign has started. We know about the Andhra scandal already. The whole set-up of the FCI under this Government is seething with corruption and malpractices. This has come out because some people on that side, wanted juice out of it and some people resisted, and, therefore, the thing has come to light. It is a matter for shame. I say that some officers need not be made scapegoats of this. If they have done a good job and they have not been proved to be dishonest, Government must protect them. I say that there should be a thorough parliamentary probe, not by the CBI because the CBI is a pocket edition of the other side which is primarily used for blackmailing people; there should be a thorough parliamentary probe in which Members of this House should participate so that they could go

into this vital matter and bring truth to light.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Even though we have extended the time by one hour, we shall have to confine ourselves to a time limit for speeches.

श्री सतपाल कपूर: क्या यह फोटोग्राफ टेबल पर रखा जायेगा? हल्ल के मुताबिक इसके लिए सीकर साहब की एप्लवेल जरूरी है। और फिर यह कौन सा ऐसा रिलिक्ट डाकुमेंट है?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It will be placed before the Speaker and he will decide whether it is to be accepted for laying on the Table or not.

Unless and until we have a time limit for speeches, we will not be able to conclude this by 7 P.M. How much time will the Minister take?

SHRI D. K. BAROOAH: Not more than 20 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the rest of the time will have to be divided. Shall we say: five minutes each?

SHRI D. K. PANDA (Bhanjanagar): It is a very important subject. Why not extend the time further?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Ten minutes to each member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will first have ten minutes and then, if necessary, five minutes.

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MOHAPATRA (Balasore): The discussion today is very important inasmuch as the officers of the Fertiliser Corporation of India as well as MPs, may be the people of the whole country, are interested in it. The volumes of literature supplied to us by the officers, and contradictory reports circulated among MPs, may be the people of the whole country that this is an amazing fact of controversial debate we are undertaking.

I had participated in the debate on the Food Corporation of India when I had levelled serious charges with documentary attestation against the higher-ups in the Corporation. Surprisingly no action has been taken and all our points have been thrown to the dustbin—gone down the gutter.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore): To whom did he give it?

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MOHAPATRA: How is it that the entire focus of attention is on the three Directors only who, fortunately or unfortunately, came from West Bengal? I do not hold any brief for any officer. That is not in my character. I have never stood in defence of any bureaucrat or technocrat who I have known to have played a role against the progressive policies of our country. But now I have to say one particular thing, that is why these three officers have been made the butt of all attack. There is something very serious inside the entire story, something very serious behind the curtain.

Dr. Chakravartty, as I know from records, is a man of high calibre, one of the rare intellectual scientists country has ever produced. Securing a Padma Sri in 1954, till today he has had a number of awards of international medals for his contributions in a field where they have been accepted as very important. The latest international award was given in the recent Catalysts' Conference held in Vienna where he was honoured.

Shri Mukerjee, who has gone on leave, apparently under instructions from our able Minister, because our Minister probably did not want that he should be there to pressurise the inquiry or put bias into the minds of the officers, is also a man of great calibre. He has attended numerous international meetings under the aegis of the UNO. He had gone on an invitation to socialist country like the USSR where his merit has been recognised. He is a man whose contribution in his field cannot be forgotten or written off.

[Shri Shyam Sundar Mohapatra]:

Mr. Ghose is also a man of great calibre. How is it that all those people of high calibre have become the butt of attack? I personally feel—and because I am a trade unionist knowing the working in the public sector undertakings—I have never seen any public sector undertaking having on its upper strata, administrative officers of such a high calibre. I can challenge. Let somebody name anyone. Not, not even in Hindustan Steel where my activity is concentrated. What are the interests involved in this?

Somebody told me that foreign vested interests are involved in this country. Which are the country? Those who want that we should import sulphur to our country? May be the United States; vested interests are there. I do not mean the Government. May be Canada, may be even a small socialist country, Poland, which is supplying us. I make a parity between these countries. Are they interested in supplying sulphur to us and do they want that our Indian technical know-how should not grow and we will depend on them and we will not try to have a coal-based industry?

The coal mine-owners of India who were supplying Sindri for the last 20 years inferior quality of coal were taken aback when, two years ago, Dr. Chakravarty and Mr. Mukherjee went there, inspected the spot of loading and unloading and found out to the utter dismay, utter surprise of those suppliers, that they were caught red-handed supplying an inferior type of coal. Is it for that the coal mine-owners of this country are up against these officers? Is it also for the fact that big monopoly houses were interested like big monopoly Rallis of India and Jardine Anderson? Are they also interested in this matter? I am not making any comment. I am only bringing before the whole House certain things which we should know.

The Fertiliser Corporation of India, under the leadership of Dr. Chakravarty, were trying to patronise small dealers and were

trying to give employment to unemployed engineers. Probably 400 of these unemployed engineers who could not get into service have been given employment by the Fertiliser Corporation of India.

There is another thing. At this moment, we are importing 50 per cent of our requirements from foreign countries. Is it that the foreign suppliers want that we should not have our own indigenous production and we will depend upon them for decades together? Is it the policy of the imperialists, of the international capitalists that they will try to subvert the economic resurgence of such undeveloped countries like ours, who are marching ahead with progressive decisions?

Now, as far as technology is concerned, there are foreign engineering houses who want that we should not develop our own technology and know-how and should depend on them. A group of scientists in India want that we should depend on the Japanese technical know-how or we should go over to the United States of America, and depend on their know-how. Much has been spoken about Toya for instance. Here is a letter which I have got; it is written by Mr. S. N. Ghose, Chief of Publicity Division, Indian Oil Co., to Mr. D. P. Dhar, the hon. Minister. It is very amazing. It is a long letter of many pages. It says

SHRI D. K. BOROOAH : Is it a published letter?

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MOHAPATRA : I do not know. I have got it. I can lay it on the Table. It says:

"I am one of those who feel that if and when the indigenous design *cum* engineering firms are overloaded it is necessary to invite foreign firms to do the job. But before giving the job to the foreigners, a set of issues should be invariably studied; they are as follows: are the indigenous firms in the relevant fields really overloaded, or is there scope for their passing on the less specialised responsibility to other firms within the country and

thus be able to accept more responsibility for design and engineering proper?"

What I want to impress here is this? The Fertiliser Corporation of India has built so many plants in the country with new devices and a new technical know-how and with a spirit of dedication to serve the country. With a spirit not to depend on the foreign technical knowhow and foreign money or foreign collaboration, they are doing a wonderful job. What is the clique in this affair? That a section of scientists want that we are not capable persons to do this and we should depend on some Japanese or some other firms? I bring to the notice of the hon. Minister who is a very competent man having seen life in many fields to judge things from the nationalist stand-point and not to surrender to pressure of any kind, whether national or international.

Dr. Mukherjee's involvement in that affair came out after 13 lakhs was recovered from Andhra and Mysore. It was probable that Mr. Mukherjee wanted to get back the money to the Government exchequer. I know there are firms who simply do things. The Rajasthani friends here will excuse me, if I say so *Marwari Ganesh ko palat detha hai* you declare insolvency and run away with enormous liability and never pay. Like that there was a liability of more than Rs. 2 crores. If these dealers had run away with the money what could we have done? Mr. Mukherjee might have been rash or jealous; he was trying to take some initiative which as an officer he should not have done. If as an officer he had not taken any initiative was there anything against him? Nothing. He devised a trick by which he wanted to get his money back to the Government exchequer and laid a procedure by which he realised the money. Technically it may be a fault or it may be irregular, but as far as our nationalistic stand-point is concerned, Government should have profit and not loss. That was the point. Those who cheated should somehow be brought back to book under

some pressure so that money can be realised. If all these things are taken into consideration I think Mr. Mukherjee needs a sympathetic deal.

The question is about technocrats and bureaucrats. This question should be discussed at the national level. I personally feel that whether a person is a bureaucrat or a technocrat unless he is committed to the ideology of the country, he should never hold that position. The time is fast changing. Somebody has circulated this blasphemous literature quoting from Mother India of Baburao Patel, a perverted person, who advertises every week in papers for a medicine called sivasakti; take it and you will be very powerful as far as your hormone is concerned. The hon. Chairman belongs to Bombay and he must have known him. Baburao's literature says that Indira Gandhi wants committed people and that is why these people are there. The whole country in fact wants commitment to the country for the type of ideology which our country has accepted: Socialism. If these three top people fulfill that condition I think there should not be any misgivings about them as far as their performance is concerned.

Lastly, I will quote one Oriya saying.

Asare khulu sansare, seram sasure mandiram

We used to consider father-in-law's house something like *saram*, or the best, khad or fertiliser. But now the situation has changed and real happiness is considered to be in earning profit. *Saram Sara Vikrayam*. *Saran*, Fertiliser is not available. Fertiliser is not available to the common man in this country. Every cultivator is suffering. *Sara saravikrayam*. Sell it in the black market, then you become rich. The condition of the country as far as fertiliser is concerned is that it is in short supply and so it is going into black market, but let us not penalise any officer for it. Let us make a thorough study of the whole thing. If it is essential, let there be a reshuffle. Otherwise there should not be any reshuffle. I hope the

[Shri Shyam Sunder Mohapatra]

hon. Minister will consider everything before he decides one way or the other.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Guha don't get exited at what has been said here.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I have gone through all these documents. I know there are a large number of friends here and I do not want to have a dig at them. These things have been circulated. I have with me all these documents. So, do not talk about it too much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Banerjee.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, when I speak, I have to mention about three officers. Unfortunately, they are all Bengalis. I am also a Bengali by birth. I can support this. I am a Bengali elected from Kanpur by lakhs of people and I cannot be influenced by parochialism.

At the very outset, I would like to read out a letter sent to Shri P. C. Sethi when he was Minister for Petroleum and Chemicals by one of the Members of this House. The letter is dated 3-9-1971. It reads as follows :—

"Respected Sethi Sahab,

I am grateful to you for assuring us to thoroughly inquire into the shocking charges against S/Shree K. R. Chakrawarti, S. K. Mukharji, O. K. Ghos and their associates. Majority of M.Ps. are anxious to see that these manipulators are turned out from F. C. I. at the earliest."

"It is requested that inquiry be entrusted to former Chairman Shree Satish Chandra, I. C. S., Secretary Defence Supply or Shree Govind Narain, Home Secretary. But it should not be given to Shree K. D. Malviya, B. Mukherji or Shree Haksar or any other official having

alight link with these clever fellows. The facts speak themselves and their termination should not be delayed in name of inquiry otherwise we will have no other alternative than to make a combined request to you, Prime Minister, Finance Minister and Congress President. Hope a quick justice from you."

This is a letter written by Shri Shailani of Aligarh which is personal and top secret.

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MOHA PATRA : How do you vouchsafe?

17.39 Hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARI in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Don't reply him directly.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, this is a photostat copy. If you want, I can lay it on the Table *

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I can produce this letter. I have read it out

श्री सतपाल कपूर प्वाइट ग्राफ आर्टिस्ट ।
मिस्टर बैनर्जी या मिस्टर गुहा यह बताएंगे कि
य, लेटर मिस्टर सेठी को लिखा है । यह आर्कि-
गियल डायप्लेट है यट इनके पास कैसे आया ?

एक पार्लामीय सदस्य सेठी साहब ने दी हागी ।

श्री एस० एम० बनर्जी यह बिट्टी मेठी साहब
के पास से हमारे पास कैसे आई टम मे कोई
बगाली जाइ नही है कि उधर मे उधर कैसे आ
गई । ऐसी चीजे बहुत आया जाया करती है और
यह चीजे अगर हम लोगो को न मिलें तो पार्लिया-
मेट मे हम कुछ कर ही न सकें । इसलिए मैं
समझना हू कि यह हमारा प्रिविलेज है और मे
आशा करता हू कि हम प्रिविलेज को हम रहने
देगे वरना हम बोलेगे कैसे ?

*The Speaker not having subsequently accorded the necessary permission the document was not treated as laid on the Table.

Then, Sir, S/Shree. Samar Guha, Indrajit Gupta, Tridib Chaudhuri, Era Sezhan, S. N. Mishra, Shiv Kumar Shastri, R. V. Bade, Md. C. Koya, Jyotirmoy Basu, Shamim Ahmad Shamim, Purshottam Mavalankar, M. Satyanarayan Rao, M. Godfrey, Pilo Mody and S. Mohanty, Members of Parliament, have submitted a memorandum to the Prime Minister.

They did not submit it just to save three Bengalis. They have said :

"We further suggest that the Director and the General Manager whom you have asked to proceed on leave should immediately be recalled to duty. There cannot be two different standards—one for the Fertiliser Corporation and another for the Food Corporation."

We say, due to lack of pest control, we are losing lakhs of maunds of wheat and rice. But who is the biggest pest? It was Sardar Iqbal Singh. Every member spoke against him, but he remained, whereas these officers have been asked to go on leave. The memorandum further says:

"We are not aware if C.B.I. themselves have made a specific reference in respect of these officers being asked to proceed on leave to facilitate an enquiry; if this is not so, we see no reason, as to why they had in the first instance been asked to go on leave and thus victimised. In that event, they should now be recalled to duty immediately."

I am against victimisation. I am not going to say about Dr. Chakravarty getting his Padma Shri because he is an intellectual. Many people get it these days. But he got other awards also and improved the working of the FCI. I am against increasing the price of fertilisers. I want that the fertiliser factories owned by the private sector to be taken over by the Corporation. Not for a moment will I say that some officers should be victimised because of a sectarian and narrow approach, because of the pressure

of Shaw Wallace and others. It is a tragedy that in this House instead of taking an impartial, objective and dispassionate attitude, we take such a sectarian and narrow attitude. I would, therefore, request the Minister to appoint a committee of this House; I am prepared for it. If Mr. Chakravarty is found guilty, he should not only be asked to proceed on leave, but should be immediately dismissed from service. Public sector should have no place for shirkers. We want good workers. But if there is no fault on the part of Mr. Chakravarty, if he is a victim of circumstances, if *Nagar Soth* and *Nowkar Shahi* are combined against Mr. Chakravarty and others, these officers should be recalled immediately. If they are guilty, let them be punished. But let it not be done through a partisan attitude. I would urge on the new minister to take an objective view and not depend on what Mr. Yadav Or Mr. Banerjee or Mr. Chapaldu says. Let him rise above. Banerjees, Yadavs and Pandeys. Then I am sure he will be able to take a correct decision. This is not the only letter—Mr. Shailani has written. There are many letters like this written by him in which an impression has been sought to be created that persons like Mr. K. D. Malaviya and Mr. P. N. Haksar are *persona non grata*. If we show those letters to the Prime Minister, Mr. Shailani may lose his seat here. I do not want that something should happen to him. I have quoted it only to show how people were hatching a plan against these officers. I am not supporting the case of these officers. I simply want an impartial, enjective and dispassionate enquiry.

श्री सिवनाथ सिंह : दगली बगाली को बचाता है

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Sir, here is a Member who has taken oath under the Constitution who says: बगाली बगाली को बचाता है।

I never expected such parochial behaviour, parochial outlook from the hon. Members here.

श्री सिवनाथ सिंह : हमारी वही समझ में आया है

MR. CHAIRMAN : I would like to say to the hon. Members that it does not look

[Mr Chairman]

nice to wound the feelings of other Members of the House I heard Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu making some remarks against Shri Mohapatra, which were not in good taste I do not know whether they have come on record

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU Sir, you have mistaken me You have wrongly heard me

MR CHAIRMAN I will look into the records

SHRI S M BANERJEE Sir on a personal explanation

मेरे मौखिक ज्ञान न कहा है कि बंगाली बंगाली को बचाना है। मैं हाथ जोड़ कर कहना चाहता हूँ—बंगाली बंगाली की बात नहीं है। हस्कर साहब बंगाली नहीं हैं बंटी भारतीय बंगाली नहीं हैं बंगाली बंगाली का सवाल नहीं है।

MR CHAIRMAN There is no question of Bengali Bengali or Bihari Bihari There is no provincialism here

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA Sir, he should withdraw those remarks

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU Sir, I want to clear all misunderstandings I have greatly appreciated the speech of Shri Mohapatra In fact I have applauded his speech I said that there are chaps in politics who are on the pay rolls of the American and British capitalists I did not refer to Shri Mohapatra I take my hat off to him

SHRI DINESH JOARDER (Malda) Sir, these remarks should be expunged

MR CHAIRMAN Shri Raja Kulkarni

SHRI RAJA KULKARNI (Bombay—North East) Mr Chairman, Sir, in this debate on the working of the Fertilizer Corporation I am sorry the whole debate is being reduced to a particular incident and the action taken by the Ministry in relation

to that I am not here to defend either the action taken by the Ministry or the people against whom action is taken I know personally Dr Mukherjee as well as the Trombay Factory Manager, Shri Duleep Singh They are very good people very efficient people They may be good administrators They may be technically qualified and efficient Yet when it comes to the question of the management of a big organisation, whether they are at fault or not, if there are lapses on the part of the organisation, somebody ought to be taken to task when the charges are proved If the charges are not proved, justice has to be done to them

Here so far as the personal charges are concerned the Minister has already made it quite clear on the floor of the House that the cases have been referred to the CBI I would not therefore like to go into them

My point is that even the best and the efficient people at the helm of affairs do not make the organisation as a whole a good organisation as such How to evaluate the working of the Fertiliser Corporation of India? Are we only going to say that because there are two or three persons at the helm of affairs who are very good and efficient technocrats and educated people that the working of the organisation is good? I humbly differ from this view point The working of a public sector organisation has to be evaluated has to be looked at from the point of view of the expectation of the whole country from a public sector organisation The criteria is two fold it plays in fulfilling these expectations

Specially in the fertiliser industry we know during the last 2½ years, under the management of these very good and efficient persons they were facing problems They were solving some problems but some new problems were created under their management also I am personally concerned with the industrial relations in one of the factories at Trombay I am the President of the workers union which is a recognised union I have the honour and privilege of dealing with big people in the Fertiliser Corporation, I find, new prob-

lems were created not because management wanted to create problems but because there were various complex relationships whose working they could not prevent. However, they had to shoulder the responsibility.

I know of an incident—I do not remember the name—of a Marketing Officer. Two years ago, in the Trombay factory, this incident happened. There was a Marketing Officer who was charged with corruption. A case was filed in a police court in Bombay. He was acquitted. It is these people who refused to reinstate the Marketing Officer. It indicates that the decisions are taken not necessarily out of subjective intentions of the efficient people of the top. But there are certain forces which are working in the organisation, which they are not able to manage.

What I am saying is that if the working of the F.C.I. has to be evaluated, we must look beyond even these persons who are at the helm of affairs. What exactly we must look at. Today, we know, what the Estimates Committee has said and what the Planning Commission has also said. Every hon. Member has said that the fertiliser industry is such where more than 50 per cent of our consumption requirement are to be imported. For the year 1973-74, even the target has been scaled down. It has been brought to 3.93 lakh tonnes. Even half of that target is not being produced indigenously. The Fertiliser Corporation represents only one-third of that.

We wanted that the Fertiliser Corporation should develop. It has got 5 production units. There are another 7 units which are either under construction or are being projected. Now, even if these people would have been there, is it advisable to give additional 11 units which are to be projected under the Fifth Plan to the F.C.I.? It is now being thought whether with these people remaining on their posts, the F.C.I. as a whole should or should not be given all the 11 units. About Rs. 1500 crores are being invested in these new plants.

Whether such a big giant should be allowed to grow, whether the good people will be able to manage, whether they will remain to be good if that giant organisation comes up, all these things should be considered while reviewing the working of this organisation. It has made progress, no doubt. But looking to the expectations and the needs of the country, the organisation has not come up to the mark. It needs a lot of improvement.

As the Petroleum Minister Shri, D. K. Borooah, has stated on the floor of this House, a structural and functional reorganisation of the FCI is necessary, and I suggest that the whole House should uphold it in this discussion and request the Petroleum Minister to come out with an immediate plan for a thorough reorganisation of the Fertiliser Corporation of India.

SHRI SATYENDRA NARAYAN SINHA (Aurangabad): Ordinarily, I would have welcomed the announcement of the Minister that he was going to reorganize the set-up of the FCI in view of certain complaints from some hon. members, but looking at the massive achievements of the FCI in the field of engineering, expertise, technical knowhow, and the way it has proceeded towards the achievement of our national objective of self-reliance, looking at the qualities of the technocrats who are heading the organisation whom I happen to know for some years now—I knew Dr. Chakravarti when I was a member of the Board of Directors some 15 years ago and I also have known Dr. Mukherji for long and they have impressed me as devoted, sincere and efficient workers—and knowing also the achievements that they have made and the recognitions they have received both in India and abroad, I feel diffident in welcoming this decision. I am quite aware that the fertilisers today are selling at a very high rate and prices of fertilisers are almost breaking the backbones of the peasants. But are we going to blame Dr. Chakravarti or Dr. Mukherji for that? As

[Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha]

far as I know, they have tried to introduce a different distribution pattern. Formerly it was being done through monopoly houses, but now they have brought in cooperatives and small dealers, educated unemployed. And it was for the State Governments to keep a watch on these dealers; if they are indulging in mal-practices, they should be brought to book. It is beyond the competence of the Fertiliser Corporation of India or the marketing organisation of this Corporation to stop the malpractices. It cannot be done. And if allegations have been made, if irregularities have been reported, to the Minister, I think, keeping in view the record of achievements of the FCI and the attainments of these technocrats, the Minister should not have rushed into taking the action to ask these people to go on leave—merely on suspicion.

18 Hrs.

This is in sharp contrast to the attitude adopted by the Government in regard to another FCI, the Food Corporation of India about which almost every hon. member of this House who participated in the discussion made specific and serious allegations against its Chairman. There, even before the probe was completed, the Government did not announce their intention that they were going to ask him to resign. They merely said that they were going to have a probe into it. I would certainly submit for the consideration of the Minister that in taking this hasty action—I am afraid I am using rather a strong expression—but it is a hasty action, in my opinion, and in so doing, are we not stigmatising these two officers who have done good service so far and have earned a good name? Suppose the inquiry reveals that no guilt could be attached to them, in that case, will they not carry a stigma against name?

Secondly, Dr. Mukherji when he was made in charge of Marketing and Production, had a legacy of Rs. 2.5 crores to realise. I listened to the letter which was just read out where an hon. Member of the House wanted the probe to be entrusted

to the former Chairman, Shri Satish Chandra. But it was during his regime that there was a backlog of Rs. 2.5 crores of outstanding dues from dealers and it was Dr. Mukherji who made efforts and realised more than Rs. 2 crores.

SHRI SATISH CHANDRA (Bareilly) :
It was Mr. Satish Chandra, ICS.

SHRI SATYENDRA NARAYAN SINHA . I would not say that he has not committed some irregularity. In his over-zeal, he might have done so. This is a subject of inquiry and the blame can be laid only after the inquiry but before that, asking them to go on leave is a harsh action and then hon Minister may kindly reconsider this decision

Sarda Darbara Singh spoke of the seething corruption in the Fertiliser Corporation and spoke of many irregularities in the matter of appointments and promotions.

Well, it is not for me here to make any comments on it, not being in possession of the facts. But all these allegations make out a strong case for a comprehensive inquiry and I support my friends, Shri Samar Guha, Shri Bosu and Shri Banerjee, when they pleaded with the Minister for a thorough probe into this organisation before taking any drastic action.

I also submit that these technocrats are responsible for having set up factories on the basis of coal which is a much more difficult process than fuel-based factories. They have been entrusted with the units worth a thousand crores of rupees. Currently, the Action Programme Committee has made a recommendation that negotiations should be carried on with Toya of Japan and the Engineers India Ltd. be entrusted with setting up five factories in collaboration with Toya. I would like to know whether it has been enquired from the FCI if they are in a position to take up this job or not.

Have they expressed their inability to do so? I am told that they have the technical knowhow of setting up the factories. The peripheral lack of knowledge can be

bought from other countries. Keeping in view the objective of selfreliance, is it not proper for us to encourage these scientists and technologists to go ahead in this field? They have developed the skill of commercial production of catalysts which we are even selling outside. The action which the Minister proposes to take, without having a thorough probe, will administer a big shock to these technologists and also the organisation itself. Let him consider the proposal to appoint a Parliamentary Committee to go into the whole matter. I request him to ponder over this suggestion of mine. Let a Parliamentary Committee go into the matter deeply and let it suggest remedies so that the FCI could be made more efficient and more effective. Whatever Irregularities or lacunae might be there may be removed. The committee may suggest remedial measures. So, I request him to consider this suggestion. Thank you.

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR (Hamirpur) : I will start with one interesting observation that this FCI is established under Companies Act under Section 619A. It gives its reports annually. We have to judge it by its past performance. Some of the opposition members waxed eloquent on the performance of the experts. Two Committees of this House on which opposition is fully represented through election of its Members, have made observations. I will quote from these reports to demolish the image that the opposition friends tried to build up to the effect that these people who are highly qualified, who are technocrats, who have saved the country from doom, etc. etc. are being victimised.

The 43rd Report of the Committee on Public Undertakings said :

"The Committee are constrained to learn from the representative of the FCI that they did not take serious cognisance of coal shortages till they became rather heavy, that is, over 15 per cent. The committee are unhappy at the way in which things were

allowed to drift resulting in serious loss to the Corporation".

and then, Sir, I quote from the 14th Report of the Estimates Committee of which you had the honour to preside :

"The Committee consider that it is nothing short of tragic that at a time when the country requires more and more fertilizers in order to step up agricultural production to meet the requirements, the fertiliser plants in the public sector should not be able to produce as per their installed capacity. In the case of single superphosphate, the production was 39 per cent in 1970-71 and 36 per cent in 1971-72. In the case of phosphatic fertilisers, the production rose from 57 per cent in 1970-71 to 71 per cent in 1971-72, while in the case of nitrogenous fertilisers, it rose from 57 per cent, to 61 per cent. During 1972-73, a slight improvement has been claimed during the first half of the year, but the final position is unlikely to be much different particularly in view of the power cuts and industrial relations. The Committee see no reason why Government and the project authorities could not accelerate the pace of development. They would like Government to analyse, in detail, the reasons for which each of the plants in the public sector has not been able to achieve production according to its full-rated capacity and to take concerted measures to achieve it by a date to be specified in this behalf. The Committee need hardly stress that in carrying out the analysis and the follow-up action, the best technical talent in the country should be utilised. The Committee would also suggest that the performance of each of these plants should be reviewed at a

[Prof Narain Chand Parashar]

level in the Government at least once in every quarter so that on-course remedial measures, as necessary, can be taken to achieve maximum production at the earliest

The Committee are surprised to learn that a number of plants in the public sector need modernization. Since there is a well laid out scheme for providing depreciation funds every year in each of the projects the Committee cannot understand why the need for modernization or replacement of the plants was not anticipated well in advance and timely action taken to see that the plants were modernized, rationalized or replaced in the best interest of production at economic prices.

Sir, this much about their high talent and their efforts to saving the country from doom.

Sir, the present controversy and discussion springs from a memorandum submitted by 15 hon Members from the Opposition to the Prime Minister and the memorandum ends on a very interesting note.

"We see no reason as to why they had in the first instance, been asked to go on leave and thus victimised. In that event they should now be recalled to duty immediately."

I would like to say that during the Calling Attention on this fertilizer scandal on 14th March this year the hon Minister took a very firm stand in which he had declared his intention or the intention of the Government to reorganise structurally—even vertically and horizontally—the entire Fertiliser Corporation of India is the source of pique and it has angered some of the friends.

I would like the Minister to see that when we put some questions those questions

are disallowed because it is an autonomous body or a public undertaking and, therefore, details are not given. One aspect of the situation has exercised my mind strongly. In the suspense account Rs 13 lakhs have been reported to be missing. It is an eye-opener to the people of this country. People are working at low rates in these factories. They are shocked at such revelation. Therefore we would like even stronger action to be taken and I say that the hon Minister for Petroleum and Chemicals has done the right thing by asking CBI to enquire into the whole affair.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: The hon Minister has not done it. The Board of Directors have done it themselves.

PROF NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR: When we are thinking of such a serious scandal the country has a right to know who is responsible for it. According to my hon friend Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha who has just concluded the procedure followed has been a hasty one. I would like to ask how it is a hasty step. If we do not take strong action the Opposition parties try to flay us and if the Government take strong action then they come to the rescue of those people. Here are stray spokesmen for dilly dallying and delaying in matters of probe into corrupt practices.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Double standards. What happened in the case of Shri Bansilal?

PROF NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR: I would request that Government should institute a high level inquiry into the recruitment of various officers and low-paid as well as high-paid staff in all the five operating units of the FCI. It is the desire of the Members of this House to know how many persons from various States have been included and whether the requirements had been sent to the local employment exchanges or not. These undertakings have grown into big empires, and the actual funds collected for various needs at one place are utilised at another place.

I do not want to say in the words of Shri Darbara Singh that excessive money is spent on marriages of the sons of certain officers or for their education in America or elsewhere. Marriages, of course, are occasions for happiness, and if they spend money lavishly it is no concern of ours. But we want to see how far it is in excess of the normal resources of these officers. That is a moot point. When you can appoint an inquiry commission against Sardar Partap Singh Kairon, when you can think of appointing an inquiry commission against the DMK Government or any other Government, or when corruption charges could be levelled against one Minister or the other and a probe could be asked for, I would submit that we would request that the overall income of these officers at the top tanks of the FCI should be inquired into.

With these words, I wholeheartedly support the demand for the restructuring of the organisation of the FCI, and I hail this announcement by the hon. Minister.

श्री शशि भूषण (दक्षिण दिल्ली) सभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्यों ने इस प्रश्न के सभी पहलुओं पर रोशनी डाली है। जब से श्री के.डी. मानवोय इस विभाग में गये हैं, तब से हम को कोई भी पौलीटिकल टायरेक्शन नहीं मिला है। अब बरभा साहब आये हैं और हमें उम्मीद है कि उनके विभाग के अन्तर्गत जो संस्थान काम करते हैं, उनका कमिटीज पार्लियामेंटल गैरिडेंस मिलेगी। उन संस्थानों में जो आफिशियल काम करते हैं, उनका भी कोई लक्ष्य हाना चाहिए, लेकिन हमने देखा है कि वह सभी कभी नहीं होता है। जब कभी उनमें टेक्नोलेट्स आ जाते हैं, तो इंग्रैनेट्स उनकी मुखातिफ करने हैं और जब उनमें थ्युरो-लेट्स आते हैं, तो टेक्नोलेट्स उनकी मुखातिफ करने हैं। ऐसा सचपं एक जगह नहीं, कई जगह चल रहा है। यह सचपं समाप्त होना चाहिए। बरभों से यू०पी०एम०मी० का चयनमें कोई न कोई आई०सी०एम० आफिशियल रहा है। अब वहाँ एक टेक्नोलेट आ गया है और वहाँ का काम मुखातिफ रूप से चल रहा है। हो सकता है कि

टेक्नोलेट्स का एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का ज्यादा लक्ष्य न हो, लेकिन वे सही रूप से काम कर सकते हैं।

फटिलाइजर कार्पोरेशन में पहले बहुत बर्गलिंग हुई है। कहीं अमरीका के कोलंबोरेशन से और कहीं डूमने कन्टीज के कोलंबोरेशन से फीकटरीज लगाई गईं। मैंने बम्बई की फटिलाइजर फीकटरी को देखा है। अमरीका ने जो सामान दिया था, उसको पूरा बदला गया है और उसके बाद उस फीकटरी का दोबारा चलाया गया है। इसी तरह इस देश में बाल वेन्ड फटिलाइजर बने और इस टेक्नालाजी के लिए हमारे देश के टेक्नोलेट बहुत करते हैं लेकिन फिर भी गॉल्ड वे कर जो ईंजेल और एमरो बीजे मरानो पटनी है वह आयन वगैरह उनमें बनाने की बात पर ध्यान दिया गया। ता हमसे भी देश के अन्दर जिनकी भी फटिलाइजर की टेक्नालाजी है वह हमारे देश के टेक्नीशियन न देवनाप की है और इस बात का हमें फरक जानना है। हमारे यहां के जो फटिलाइजर के टेक्नालाजिस्ट्स हैं उनको दुनिया के माटेस्ट्रुम न मान्यता प्रदान की है। उनमें वर्तन में फ्रीडम फाउंडर्स भी रहे हैं और उन पर कोई आंच उनके अर्थान्तर्गत आवन पर नहीं आनी चाहिए। अचरवर्नी जो जो है मैं कह सकता हूँ कि वह फ्रीडम फाउंडर भी रहे और दुनिया के बड़े बड़े वैज्ञानिक संस्थानों ने उनको मान्यता भी दी है। देश का उन्होंने आत्म-निर्भरता की पालिसी दी है। आज वह रहे न रहे इसका कोई महत्व नहीं है। लेकिन उन्होंने जो काम किए हैं देश में वह भुलाए नहीं जा सकते। हो सकता है कि कुछ लोग बरबाधे से भा कर उनका विरोध करने लें।

पिछली बार मैंने देखा एक डाक्टर विमल जैन है। फटिलाइजर कार्पोरेशन में मामूली बनर्ग है। पन्चमो चिट्टिया उन्होंने अपने आफिशियर्स के खिलाफ राम पीज में लिखवाई। मैं सबी महोदय के पास उन पार्लियामेंट सेन्सर्स को ले जा कर बता सकता हूँ कि किस तरह यह बर्क के काम करते हैं अपने इन्टीट्यूशन के खिलाफ। (व्यवधान) डाक्टर तो वह जैसे ही हैं। डाक्टर

[श्री सति लखन]

विषय जैन उनका नाम है, पश्चिमी यू. पी. के रहने वाले हैं। मैं चाहूँगा कि जब सी. बी. आई. की एन्क्वायरी हो रही है तो ऐसे लोगों के खिलाफ भी होनी चाहिए। सोवियत कारपोरेशन में भी यही हुआ कि वहाँ के लोकल एक प्रायमी थ्रिस्ट्र को खबरे दे रहे हैं, बेयंगमैन के खिलाफ लिख रहे हैं उनमें बांरे में इस दफ्तर जा रहे हैं, दूसरी जगह जा रहे हैं। तो इस तरह की जो कार्यवाही करने है उनके खिलाफ सबन कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए। यह जो एन्क्वायरी हो रही है सो. बी. आई. की इसको तो बोर्ड ने स्वयं माना है और जब मान लिया है तो एन्क्वायरी होनी ही चाहिए। उस एन्क्वायरी में यह भी धाना चाहिए। यह जो तमाम तहरीरें और डॉक्यूमेंट्स हैं, जो वहाँ सारे वेस्टेड इन्व्हेस्ट्मन्ट्स थे, विदेशी कम्पनियाँ जो इसमें शामिल हैं जैसे ग्रुप्यथा महादय वेक्टल कम्पनी है, वह सी. आई. ए. में खबधिन है, एक कितना अमेरिका में छपी है, तीन अर्ध रा तीन दिन पहले वह मन्त्री महादय का दी थी, मुझे धागा है उन्होंने पद नी हागी, वह सब धब दाबारा। यहाँ जापान के जर्गिओ प्रोग्रुमू जर्गिओ से इन्व्हेस्ट्मन्ट में फटिलाइजर फैक्ट्री लगाना चाहते हैं, यह बहुत बड़ा सकिन्ट है, इसलिए हमें अपने देश के जो वैज्ञानिक है उनको निरुत्साहित नहीं करना चाहिए, उन्हें प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिए। जो वैज्ञानिक है उन्हें इस बात पर भी सतोंष है कि हम देश में आज बहुत बड़ा समसधार तबका उन पर प्राम्था रखता है, विश्वास रखता है। तो उस विश्वास को डिगाना नहीं चाहिए और जो कुछ अग्रर गलनियाँ सामने आईं ; ता उनको एन्क्वायरी हो जाये और मझे पूरा विश्वास है कि एन्क्वायरी के बाद हाउस के इनन लोगों ने जिन लोगों का मही समझा है वह मही निकलेगे। जो गलन इत्तिल, दे रहे हैं और जिन्होंने देश में गलन और प्रामक वातावरण बनाया है वैज्ञानिकों के खिलाफ थ्यूरोकेट्स के जर्गिओ मैं चाहूँगा कि उनको सजा दी जाये। इन तमाम चीजों को माथ में ले कर सी. बी. आई. की एन्क्वायरी हो तो ज्यादा कामयाबी होगी।

आखीर में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ, हमारे साथी माननीय पारासर जी ने भी कहा कि कोई पार्लियामेन्टी कमेटी या दूसरी कमेटी इसके लिए बने ताकि धारे एन्क्वायरी हो और वह गलत-फहमी दूर हो सके।

श्री बालोवर पांडेय (हजारीबाग) मभापति महादय, अभी बहुत सी बातें कही गईं। उसमें एक बात यह भी कि कोयला खदान में काम करने वाले लोगों का कोई शायद इन्टेरेस्ट है कि फटिलाइजर कारपोरेशन को बदनाम करे। इसके लिए शाह वालिन और दूसरो का नाम लिया गया। इस तरह की बात कही गई है। मैं सिर्फ इतना ही माफ करना चाहता हूँ कि सिन्डी जो विहार में है शारिया अचल में वहाँ कोई पब्लिक सेक्टर अइन्टेकिंग नहीं था। इसलिए सिन्डी को इसके अलावा और कोई चारा नहीं था कि वह प्राइवेट सेक्टर से कोयला लेते। अभी जब नेशनलाइजेशन हुआ उसके पहले हमेशा वह कोयला प्राइवेट सेक्टर से लेते रहे हैं। जब डॉ. चक्रवर्ती वहाँ मीनेजर थे उस समय भी लेते रहे हैं और उसके पहले भी जब वह नहीं थे। तब भी लेती थी इसलिए आज कोई नई बात हो गई और बाद में एक सज्जन कोई राष्ट्रीयकरण के चेंमियन हो गए, इसलिए राष्ट्रीयकरण के बाद पब्लिक सेक्टर से कोयला लेने लगे इसलिए प्राइवेट सेक्टर कोई नाराज हो गया, यह बात मेरी मसझ में नहीं आई। जब राष्ट्रीयकरण हा गया तो वहाँ कोई प्राइवेट सेक्टर रहा ही नहीं। तो उसका क्या इन्टेरेस्ट हो सकता है? न शाह वालिन की वहाँ कोई कोलियरी थी।

श्री सत्तर गृह वह एन सी डी सी से लिया करने थे।

श्री बालोवर पांडेय वहाँ एन सी डी सी है ही नहीं, यह मैं आप को बता दूँ।

इस तरह से जब प्राइवेट सेक्टर से पब्लिक सेक्टर हो गया तो प्र इवेट सेक्टर को बना कारण हो सकता है इसमें धाने का, यह सब बात मेरी मसझ में नहीं आती (अबबालन) प्राइवेट

सेक्टर टाटा का है जो अपने वहाँ कोयला ले जाते हैं।

मेरे यह कहना है कि मैं कोई व्यक्तिगत किसी की नुक़्ताचीनी इस में नहीं करना चाहता हूँ या व्यक्तिगत तरीके से मेरी किसी से कोई दुष्मनी नहीं है न किसी से दोस्ती है और न फर्टिलाइजर कारपोरेशन से मेरा कोई सीधा सम्पर्क रहा है कि मैं किसी के पक्ष या विपक्ष में बोल। मेरे सामने भी मैटेरियल था उस के प्राधार पर मार्च में जो काल प्रेटेशन नॉटिस सदन के सामने प्राया था उस में मैंने अपनी बात रखी थी। अगर उस में कोई कमिया थी तो मंत्री जी को या कोई भी सदस्य जो उस समय मौजूद थे उन को पूरा हक था कि वह उस को कह सकते थे कि हम ने कोई कोई गलत तथ्य रखे है। मैंने जितने तथ्य रखे थे उन पर आज भी मैं प्रामादा हूँ और यह कहने को तैयार हूँ कि वह सारे तथ्य सही है। मैं दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ उन बातों को इसलिए कि वह सारी बातें रेकार्ड पर है। मैं सिर्फ़ ख़तना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो तौर तरीका वहा चल रहा है, जो वहा के इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशंस की हालत जिस तरह से अफसर नाग प्रापस में वहा लड़ते है, जिस तरह से एक दूसरे का गला काटने का उपाय वहा किया जाता है, उस में सिवाय इस के और कोई ख़ास नहीं है जैसा कि मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि उस को थारो प्रोबेरहाल करना पड़ेगा। जो भी कुसूरवार हो जिस की भी गलती हा उस गलती वाले अफसर को निकाल दीजिए और जो भी काम नायक है, अगर कोई बहुत अच्छा है, नायक है उस के बिना काम नहीं चल सकता। तो जरूरी है उस को रखना ही पड़ेगा। लेकिन कोई जाति पानि के प्राधार पर जैसा कहा गया कि पथनिक माइनरिटी की वजह से इस तरह की बात हो रही है, दो तीन वक्ताओं ने इस तरह से कहा, मैं कोई मनीष चन्द्र की बात या डा० चक्रवर्ती की बात कर रहा हूँ, ऐसी बात नहीं है। जब डा० मुखर्जी और चक्रवर्ती थे तब भी दोनों में यही बात चलती थी। डा० मुखर्जी और डा० चक्रवर्ती दोनों एक दूसरे को काटते थे। तो उस समय कहा [एथनिक माइनरिटी थी ?

मैं कोई जाति पानि की बात नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। मेरा कभी इस में विश्वास भी नहीं है मजदूर प्रान्दोलन में रहने की वजह से। मेरे पास वह रेकार्ड है कि डा० मुखर्जी ने डा० चक्रवर्ती के बारे में क्या लिखा है और डा० चक्रवर्ती ने डा० मुखर्जी के बारे में क्या लिखा है। यह सब बात मैं इस समय नहीं करना चाहता। मैं यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिन की भी गलती हो अच्छे लोगों से भी गलतियाँ हुआ करती है, तो उस की प्रेजिडेंटो देख कर के यह देख कर कि उस को किनना महत्व देना चाहिए, महत्व के प्राधार पर जो भी फैसला हो वह किया जाय और देश के भले के लिए, फर्टिलाइजर कारपोरेशन के भले के लिए इस का रीऑर्गनाइजेशन जरूरी है।

THE MINISTER OF PETROLIUM AND CHEMICALS (SHRI D. K. BAROOAH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to Shri Samar Guha for initiating this debate which has proved to be of great benefit to me and certainly to the Members of the House. I am really grateful to Shri Guha that he praised the working of the F.C.I. in very euloistic terms. I only hope he will extend the same FCI courtesy to the other public sector organisations in my Ministry. (Interruptions).

He indicated that this year the Fertilizer Corporation of India has made a profit to which Trombay alone contributed Rs. 9 crores. Evidently there are other units where the money is lost; it is not as if the performance has been even. Hence, the profit was reduced to Rs. 5 crores.

I am not a scientist. I have been a bit of an administrator and I know the problems of administration, if not of science. Science, once you come out you are cut it is difficult to keep pace with it. Even if you were a brilliant student of science in the college or you were professor of Science, once you come out you are cut off from the main stream of that continuous process. Therefore, it is not for Parliamentarians like us to talk depending on our scientific knowledge. The IOC has

[Shri D. K. Barooah—contd.]

made a profit in 1971-72 of Rs. 31.94 crores and Oil India, made up of 50 per cent Government and 50 per cent BOC, Rs. 4.82 crores. OAL is a small unit and has made a profit of 41.48 lakhs. HAL made a profit of Rs. 12 lakhs. These are small units. So, that the FCI has made a profit does not mean that there are no other units which have not made any profit.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I have not said so. I have said that it had made no loss since its inception.

SHRI D. K. BAROOAH : Whatever we have said is the property of the House. You said that it was the only public sector organisation which had made a profit. Generally I do not take down notes but I took down this part of your speech. There are many : IOC has made no loss. OAL, HAL have made no loss. So when you praise somebody you also reserve some praise for others who deserve it.

I think it is not a correct policy to praise or condemn anybody too much. We should strike a balance. With whatever Mr. Samar Guha has said, I agree to a great extent. There is no doubt. But Mr. Bosu has also pointed out certain things and they have also to be taken note of, particularly the report of the Estimates Committee 1970-73 when this same management was in charge of FCI. Therefore, we have to strike a balance between the achievements and the weaknesses. While you want to assess the total performance of an institution or a group of people, you have to strike a balance. Then only you can get at the truth. Because I have an idea that the truth generally lies in the middle.

There is one point which I should like to refer and that is the point made by Mr. Kulkarni. The performance of an organisation like the FCI does not really depend upon the performance of three men at the top only. It is a bourgeois point of view. When an organisation works everybody has to work and all people have to

work and the credit should go to everybody and not only to three persons at the top. Certainly they should also get credit, but in this organisation to give credit only to three persons or one person is a petty bourgeois attitude.

Somebody said something about scientists and something about technocrats and bureaucrats. All this craze is wrong. If you emphasise the importance of bureaucracy you will go wrong and if you depend too much upon the technocrats the risk is there that you may again go wrong. I will give you one example. Mr. Bosu pointed out that the price of fertilizers in this country was very high.

It is not yet readily available also because our real consumption of fertilisers has fallen and the prices are too high. Whatever it may be, we have to build a fertiliser factory in our country in order to see that we save foreign exchange in fertilisers which we can ill-afford to fritter away. Therefore, fertiliser has to be produced on a massive scale.

Here the question of indigenisation is very important. We have to have indigenisation although I am not quite sure whether all these claims are entirely justified or not. I shall come to this a little later. I am quoting from the Report of the Estimates Committee, 1972-73 which I got from Shri Bosu. It says on page 7 as follows :—

“One of the reasons given for the delay in the commissioning of the fertiliser projects is the attempt at indigenisation of the plants. Asked as to how could the stress on indigenisation be justified when it had led to an increased outlay of foreign exchange on import of fertilisers by delaying the commissioning of the projects, the representative of the Ministry stated...”

I am not concerned with what a bureaucrat does. He might have committed a mistake. It is further stated as follows :—

"In this connection, the Managing Director of the Fertiliser Corporation of India stated that the main object of indigenisation was not to stop the outgo of foreign exchange as much as "to develop our own know-how to arrive at self reliance in our own country" and that "the country which has to be self-reliant in such technology has to pay heavily".

Shall we agree with this view to let the delay be committed in the installation of the Fertilisers Factory? Shall we allow the common people—the cultivators—in this country to go without the fertilisers? Should we spend foreign exchange for purchasing fertilisers from abroad? Should these matters be left to the technocrat? Certain matters can be left to the technocrats and certain others cannot be left to them. An administrator has to look into all aspect of the problems. The technocrats has got the advantage of being concerned only with one aspect. Therefore, he does it independently. What ever he does, that is independent of the circumstances. But, an administrator has to take a view in which all factors have got to be considered and weighed. Therefore, I say that we must not leave the entire thing to the technocrat only. I am not a technocrat, but I am a Science student. I am not in a position to say what the technocrats have done or what they have not done. All facts are there. They have of course done good work. Take for example Durgapur. It was commissioned by the F.C.I. and the whole mechanisation of the Durgapur Plant was completed two years ago. Even now it has not gone stream. It was entirely done by the F.C.I. If you take Barauni, that has been delayed by two years, the reason being indigenisation of some parts. They were all manufactured by the Indian fabricators. There are other problems also. So, as I said, let us not praise too much.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I hope you have gone through the reason why Durgapur could not be commissioned. I would request you to go into the matter. I do not want to interrupt you.

SHRI D. K. BAROOAH : I have not gone into this. We shall have to do it. That is not my business to go on probing. My business is only to give directions to complete it.

I wanted to give one or two most important things. Somebody said that there were some lobbies—sulphur lobby. How much sulphur did we get from different countries? U.S.A. has hardly any. We do not want to have anything from U.S.A. so far as sulphur is concerned. I do not know about other items. USSR has very little—0.10 lakh tonnes—Canada 1.28, Poland 1.89. Czechoslovakia .11 and Iran 2.11. So, I do not know who runs this lobby. Certainly it is not run by either United States or USSR. I thought in the world today there are super-power lobbies only. These are very small countries and I do not know whether they can afford the cost of a lobby in a country like ours.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I have not used the word 'lobby'. I have said that our scientists have developed a technology of nitro-phosphate, the double compound, without sulphur. They have dispensed with the necessity of import of sulphur.

SHRI D. K. BAROOAH : Mr. Mahapatra took the clue and said, there is a sulphur lobby. So, I was replying to him.

I will not go into the question of technical competence. I am convinced that Dr. Chakravarty has great technical competence and he has done a lot about developing our Indian knowhow and technology. But to say that he can do everything under the sun in the matter of fertiliser production is not correct. It is a little exaggerated like Mark Twain's death. I have looked at it not from the scientists' point of view but from the administrative point of view. Namrup is based on natural gas. We have

[Shri D. N. Barooah]

never done natural gas. So, that was a turn-key job. We have done only with Naphtha. With fuel oil we are going to produce, but, this is the first time fuel oil is going to be used as feed-stock for fertilisers in a big way in any part of the world. Only a few small plants in Europe are there. There is only one big plant which has just gone into production in West Germany based on fuel oil. It is an entirely new technology. So, we have to acquire this technology and take the help of other countries. Therefore, FCI will have to do it. About coal, they are doing very well. It is the Government's policy. Whatever is done in this country is done only after Government goes into it and gives clearance. In the three coal-based factories certainly the scientists have to contribute their mite. Nonetheless it is a national policy that we have to use coal as feed-stock. I have decided in consultation with my officers that we have to go in for coal-based fertilizer because the price of crude oil has gone up from 128 cents per barrel in 1970 to 275 cents today. So, we cannot afford to build any fertilizer factory on Naphtha. After a while it would be difficult to use even fuel oil because it may be costly. So, it is a good thing that new processes are being developed, and all compliments should be given to them for what they have done. But there are other problems like gestation and investment. In Korba it would be of the order of Rs. 129 crores, as against Rs. 80 crores for a fuel-oil-based fertilizer factory. So, we have to consider this problem very carefully, after taking into account all these factors. We have to consider the problem from all angles and utilize the best talent, technocrats as well as administrators.

There is no doubt about the competence of Dr. Chakravarty. There is no doubt even about his success as the creator of modern technology in fertilizer. I would have liked Shri Samar Guha not to raise a particular point because it is already under investigation.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu was very right when he said that as it is the price of fertilizer is very high and if there is any blackmarketing, then the price will go up and the poor man will have to pay more. I fully share his feelings.

In this case there were some arrears to be collected, about Rs. 2 crores. Later on, they collected another Rs. 16 crores as arrears. They have every right to collect the arrears. But they have no right to indulge in blackmarketing or break the law of the land. The sulphate of ammonia is a controlled commodity, the price of which is controlled at both the wholesale and retail levels. The price of one wagon of sulphate of ammonia is Rs. 11,000 but they charged an extra amount of Rs. 4,000.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Who charged it?

SHRI D K BAROOAH : The FCI officers charged it, and that was with the knowledge of Dr. Mukerji, but not with the knowledge of Dr. Chakravarty. Instead of charging Rs. 11,000, if you charge Rs. 15,000, the cultivators are made to pay an increased price for their fertilizer. If a person, either a scientist or an honest businessman, charges Rs. 15,000 for a controlled commodity which actually costs only Rs. 11,000, what treatment can he expect from the House or from the Government? Who will pay this high price? It is paid by the cultivators.

Somebody here referred to businessmen. In my part of the country businessmen used to collect subscriptions for *dharamsalas* and *gosalas*. Whether the common man wanted these facilities or not, he had to pay these subscriptions. In the present case, whether you wanted to save the money for the Government, or give it as a major gift to a religious endowment, that is beside the point. The fact remains that you charged Rs. 15,000 for a commodity which actually costs only Rs. 11,000.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha): The point that was made out here, if I understood it, was that this Rs. 4,000 was being collected in lieu of the money that was due to FCI. Is that the position? Or, is it that they charged more for this commodity?

SHRI D. K. BAROOAH: Proceedings are being instituted for realisation of money from those who have defaulted. Civil cases have been started against him. He is a new contractor. When he wanted a new permit for this, he charged Rs. 4,000 extra per wagon.

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MOHAPATRA: Did he collect Rs. 4,000 extra from the defaulters?

SHRI D. K. BAROOAH: No, not from the defaulters. The reason given was that in the present condition of high prices, it was possible.

They broke two laws, may be in the interest of the Company one is the Fertiliser Control Order which fixes the price and the other is the Essential Commodities Act which decides to which place it is to go. All the fertiliser was booked for Andhra. But it found its way to Madras and Mysore. They have broken two laws. Therefore, I thought, in any investigation because the names of Dr. Mukherjee and the Trombay gentleman were mentioned, not only in the interest of justice and fair-play but in fairness to the officers themselves also, they should not be in a position where they would be suspected of having interfered in the course of justice or having access to papers. The CBI has given a report. There, they have said clearly that a gross irregularity is committed. Dr. Mukherjee knew about it. When they discussed it, may be publicly or privately, whether you discuss it in public or in private, certainly they discussed the matter to break two laws—one was the price fixation and the other was destination.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: In fairness to them, you could also state that they had

a discussion among themselves, that they discussed with the Finance Department, that they also sought legal advice, whether it was legal or not and that instructions were also given but, in the meantime, some field officers did it. When they found that there was a certain procedural irregularity, whether it was procedurally right or wrong, they also sought legal advice. When they themselves found that there were certain irregularities committed, according to their own admission, they immediately convened a meeting of the Board of Directors and immediately, they themselves, including Dr. Mukherjee, asked for CBI enquiry and he issued instructions to all units so that all cooperation should be given.

SHRI D. K. BAROOAH: When the CBI gives the final report, certainly all this will be looked into. Evidently, Mr. Samar Guha knows more than the CBI.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: This is a very unfair remark. During my speech, you noted in what strain I talked. I did not want even to mention the name. Now, if you say, I know more than the CBI, it is not fair, I should say. You also admit everything. Don't provoke me in that way. We have been very fair in having discussion with me frankly a day before. You also said many things which I did not want to bring here. But if you say that I know more than the CBI, it is very unfair. You know what you told me and what I told you. I did not want to make that a matter of controversy on the floor of the House.

SHRI D. K. BAROOAH: I thought I was paying compliments to Mr. Samar Guha's knowledge about these matters because I am sure, being a scientific person, he would not speak in this House unless he had full knowledge of the case; he would either condemn or defend anybody only if he had full information about the case.

What I have said is that I can only go by reports. I have no personal knowledge, I never knew Dr. Chakravarti or Dr. Mukherji or Mr. Daleep Singh. I had

[Shri D. K. Barooah]

hardly heard about them. What I say is that reports are very clear that an illegal act has been done by charging a premium for a controlled commodity for which the common man will have to pay a higher price. As it is, the price, as Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu pointed out, is high; and it will be much higher. Secondly, under the Essential Commodities Act, nothing could be transferred from one State to another, but in this case what was meant for Andhra found its way to Mysore and Madras. Therefore, these are the moot points. If anybody is guilty for that, he will be punished, whatever may have been the purpose. People steal money to build temples. People indulge in blackmarketing to build *dharmshalas*. That is not the point. The point is whether an illegal act was done, whether there was gross irregularity, where there was contravention of the order. I am only concerned about that. Whether it was done under anybody's order or not, is a different matter. But it has been established that Dr. Mukherji knew about it. I have not suspended him. I have only asked him to go on leave. He will get the same salary. If CBI gives the clearance, we will not take any action. I did not know Dr. Mukherji from Adam. I did not know that there was a gentleman called Dr. Mukherji. I have no animus or friendship for him. I am absolutely impartial and objective in this matter. As I said, I had never seen Mr. Daleep Singh before; he came and saw me from a distance the other day. I did not know that he existed. Therefore, I am absolutely objective in this matter. The day clearance is given by the CBI that these people are not guilty, I will not proceed against them. There was a great pressure that they should

be suspended. I refused. At that time I said that there was a suspicion. Now from the CBI's report, that suspicion has been . . .

AN HON. MEMBER : Substantiated.

SHRI D. K. BAROOAH : I would not say that. The suspicion has deepened in my mind. I belong to the middle path, I will not go to the extreme, whether provoked by you on this side or by anybody on that side. I will do what I consider just. Therefore, I would request the hon. member to wait till the CBI gives its final report. If the CBI exonerates anybody, he stands exonerated. If the CBI finds anybody guilty, the legal procedure will be taken recourse to.

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MAHA-PATRA : The last judge is the Government and not the CBI. The report is submitted to the Government. You have to satisfy yourself.

SHRI D. K. BAROOAH : There will be the basis for satisfaction. I will be absolutely uninvolved. I have always been uninvolved, whether it is friends or enemies. I am entirely uninvolved in these matters. I will do whatever is just and proper. I only hope that the hon. members will give me support as they have given today.

MR CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow at 11.00 a.m.

18.58 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till eleven of the Clock on Friday, May 11, 1973/Vaisakha 21, 1895 (Saka).