

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

"That this House agrees with the Fifteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 6th March, 1968."

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I have to make a submission on item 6 of the order paper.

You remember, apart from the Business Advisory Committee's job, whatever items have been fixed, there was a discussion that we should appoint a certain committee to scrutinise the Budgets of West Bengal, Haryana and Uttar Pradesh. I want to know as to what has happened to that, whether the committee has been appointed or is likely to be appointed.

MR. SPEAKER : I was also there at that time. Committees are appointed for all the places where there is President's rule; committees are appointed with the Members of Parliament of the respective State and some others also. Now the Haryana Committee has been appointed. About the other two States, the moment the President's Proclamation is taken up, the Committees will be appointed, and these Committees will naturally go into these.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI (Mandsaur) : On item 6, I have an important point to make. So many no day yet-named motions are admitted every session, but not even one of them is taken up practically. For this session, I have received a note from the hon. Minister that till May, no no-day-yet-named motion can be admitted. Nearly 40 or 50 motions are there.....

MR. SPEAKER : No, no. He may please sit down.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : I only want to submit this point. If half an hour can be found for half-an-hour discussions, at least 45 minutes should be found for these no-day-yet-named motions. These are more important than many of those issues.

MR. SPEAKER : He may sit down.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : I have suffered in all these things.

MR. SPEAKER : Maybe, it looks like that. All these questions are discussed in

the Business Advisory Committee; persons belonging to all parties raise the points.

Now I am putting the motion to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"That this House agrees with the Fifteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 6th March, 1968."

The motion was adopted.

12.09 hrs.

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

MR. SPEAKER : Now we take up further consideration of the motion moved by Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed on the 6th March, 1968, on Dr. Hazari's Reports on Industrial Planning and Licensing Policy.

We have taken 2 hours and 40 minutes and we have 4 hours and 50 minutes left. I think, we can ask the Minister to reply at 5.30. . . Yes, at 5.30, the Minister will reply.

Mr. Yogendra Sharma to continue his speech.

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा (बेगूसराय) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल मैं इस देश में इजारेदारी के बढ़ने के कारण बता रहा था। मैंने निवेदन किया था कि हमारी सरकार के भीतर सरकार है; इजारेदार घरानों और राजनेताओं की मिली-भगत है; यही नहीं, बल्कि कुछ उच्चाधिकारियों की मिली-भगत से भी इजारेदारी के बढ़ने में मदद मिली है। इसमें लाइसेंस-व्यवस्था ने भी एक बड़ी भूमिका अदा की है। जहां तक इजारेदार घरानों और उच्चाधिकारियों की मिली-भगत, साठ-गांठ और अपवित्र गठबंधन का प्रश्न है, मैं इस सिलसिले में बिड़ला के पंद्रह उच्चाधिकारियों के नाम पेश करना चाहता हूं। जो कि या तो हमारी सरकार के भूतपूर्व उच्च-अधिकारी हैं या अभी जो हमारी सरकार के उच्च अधिकारी हैं उनके रिश्तेदार हैं। जब हमारी सरकार के उच्च अधिकारियों

में और इजारेदार के घराने के उच्च अधिकारियों में इस तरह की सांठगांठ होगी तो फिर कैसे नहीं शासन का उपयोग इजारेदारों के लिए होगा ? जिन पन्द्रह बिरला के अधिकारियों का नाम मैं पेश करता चाहता हूं वह नाम इस तरह हैं :

"B. N. Saxena, Chief Executive of the Birla group of industries in Delhi. He is the brother-in-law of K. B. Lall, Secretary to Ministry of Commerce.

Dharampal Singh, deputy to Saxena. He retired as Deputy Chief Controller of Imports and Exports in November, 1966, and in March this year joined the Birlas.

Ananda Deva Tayal is the brother-in-law of the notorious Dharma Vira, now Governor of West Bengal, formerly Secretary to the Union Cabinet.

M. P. Singh, close relative of a recently retired Chairman of the Board of Direct Taxes.

J. Dayal who retired as the Financial Commissioner of the Railway Board.

Prem Kumar, son of Y. J. Dennisson, who is in service as Deputy Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

A. C. Bannerjee, relative of L. K. Jha, formerly Secretary to the Prime Minister, now Governor of the Reserve Bank.

A. V. R. K. Shastari is related to a big boss in the Board of Direct Taxes.

A. S. Srivastava, a relative of a Joint Secretary to the Government of India.

H. C. Jain was sacked by the Birlas in August last following the 'priority call' scandal. He is a relative of L. C. Jain, Secretary to the Ministry of Transport and Communications.

He was sacked by Birlas after he was exposed in that scandal."

तो यह पन्द्रह जो बिरला के बड़े-बड़े अधिकारी हैं वह या तो हमारे सरकारी अधिकारियों

के रिश्तेदार हैं या भूतपूर्व सरकारी अधिकारी हैं। तो कैसे नहीं यह संभव है कि सरकारी विभागों का और सरकारी साधनों का इस्तेमाल इजारेदारों के हक में हो ? इसलिए आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि यह जो अपवित्र सांठ-गांठ है इसको तोड़ा जाए। जब तक यह नहीं तोड़ा जाएगा तब तक हम इजारेदार घरानों को इजारेदारी बढ़ाने से नहीं रोक सकते हैं। अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा समय सीमित है और मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता हूं। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं बहुत अदब के साथ और बहुत गंभीरता के साथ कि यदि हम लोग इजारेदारी को नहीं बढ़ने देने के लिए कृत-संकल्प हैं, कृत-प्रतिज्ञा तो अवश्य हैं मगर यदि कृत-संकल्प भी हैं तो कृपा कर के अब जैसा कि फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब ने कहा कि हम विचार कर रहे हैं, कैबिनेट सब-कमेटी बनी हुई है, एक ठेकर कमेटी बैठी हुई है, तो यह तो जब भी कोई समस्या होती है तो समस्या को डालने के लिए आप कमेटी बिठा देते हैं। सवाल यह है कि अब कमेटी बिठाने से काम नहीं चलेगा, इस त्रिगुट को, इस अपवित्र गठबन्धन को आप तोड़िए और तोड़ने के सिलसिले में हम कुछ सुझाव देना चाहते हैं। हमारे दल की ओर से श्री एस० एम० बैनर्जी ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है उसका समर्थन करते हुए मैं कुछ सुझाव पेश करना चाहता हूं।

(1) कंपनियों पर प्रतिबंध लगाया जाए कि वह राजनैतिक दलों को चन्दा नहीं दें। क्यों नहीं आप यह करते हैं ? आप यदि खाद-एगा तो मुंह खाता है और आंख शरमाती है। आप जब तक खाते रहिएगा आप की आंख शरमाती रहेगी, आप बिरला की सेवा करते-रहिएगा। और यदि आप सेवा नहीं करना चाहते हैं तो क्यों नहीं यह कदम उठाते हैं कि कम्पनी ला के अन्दर संशोधन कर के चन्दा देने पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाने का ?

(2) बिरला के कारोबार की जांच के लिए एक कमीशन बहाल कीजिए कमीशन एक्ट के

[श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा]

अनुसार। ऐसा कमीशन नहीं जैसाकि आप बिठाते हैं। उससे कुछ नहीं होना है।

(3) मैनेजिंग एजेंसी की प्रथा को खत्म कीजिए। जब तक मैनेजिंग एजेंसी की प्रथा खत्म नहीं करते हैं तब तक आप इजारेदारी की प्रथा को नहीं रोक सकते।

(4) योजना को छुट्टी जो आप ने दे दी है तीन साल तक की वह छुट्टी देने के बजाये उसको सही रूप में, गहराई के साथ लागू कीजिए और इसलिए लागू न कीजिए कि एक फिजिकल टागेंट तय कर दीजिए और यह तय कर दीजिए कि इतना रेट ग्रोथ हम करेंगे। नहीं, आप प्राथमिकता तय कीजिए कि इस प्राथमिकता के साथ हम औद्योगिक विकास करेंगे और उस प्राथमिकता के अनुकूल, उसके अनुरूप आप ऋण को, लाइसेंस को और साधनों को लगाइए। अभी क्या है? अभी कोई प्राथमिकता नहीं है। कहां ऋण जा रहा है कोई पता नहीं। कहां टैक्स जा रहा है कोई पता नहीं। यदि आप के कुछ सामाजिक उद्देश्य हैं तो सामाजिक उद्देश्य के अनुकूल आप ऋण में, कर में, लाइसेंस में और साधनों का बटवारा करने में उस नीति को अपनाइए। वह आप अभी नहीं अपना रहे हैं। अफसोस तो यह है कि उस योजना को आप ने छुट्टी दे दी है। यदि योजना को आप ने छुट्टी दी तो आप इजारेदारी को तोड़ नहीं सकते। इसका मतलब है कि आप इजारेदारी को तोड़ना नहीं चाहते हैं, उसे बढ़ाना चाहते हैं।

(5) भविष्य के लिए, कुछ परम्परागत उद्योगों का दरवाजा इजारेदारों के लिए आप बन्द कर दीजिए। क्यों नहीं वह आप बन्द करते हैं? यदि आप इजारेदारी को नहीं बढ़ने देना चाहते हैं तो हमारे यहां जो बहुत से परम्परागत उद्योग हैं उनका दरवाजा इनके लिए क्यों नहीं बन्द कर देते हैं और यदि आप नहीं बन्द करते हैं तो हम कहेंगे कि आप पाखंड कर रहे हैं। लोगों को कहते हैं कि हम इजारेदारी तोड़ना चाहते हैं और अमल में आप उसे बढ़ाना चाहते हैं।

12.14 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

(6) लाइसेंस देने में नये और छोट लोगों को आप प्राथमिकता दीजिए। बड़े-बड़े जो यह घराने हैं, मैं सिर्फ बिरला की ही बात नहीं करता, बिरला हैं, डालमिया हैं, अमीचंद प्यारे लाल हैं, जिनके नाम मशहूर हैं, उनको क्यों आप प्राथमिकता देते हैं? आप ऐसा कीजिए कि यह प्राथमिकता आप छोटे लोगों को और नये लोगों को दीजिए।

(7) लाइसेंस देने में अपेक्षाकृत पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्रों को प्राथमिकता देनी चाहिए। लाइसेंस देने का पिछले दस वर्षों में जो रवैया रहा है, उससे पता चलता है कि उन्हीं क्षेत्रों में अधिक-से-अधिक लाइसेंस दिए गए हैं जो अपेक्षाकृत अधिक विकसित हैं जैसे महाराष्ट्र है, बंगाल है। आप क्यों नहीं पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्रों को लाइसेंस देते हैं और उसमें ऐसी प्रायश्चित्ती बनाते हैं?

(8) आठवां मुद्दा यह है कि औद्योगिक योजना का कारार बनाने के लिए बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण कीजिए। इस रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है कि जब तक कुछ मुट्ठीभर लोगों के हाथ में उद्योग भी रहेंगे और बैंक भी रहेंगे तब तक आप इजारेदारी को बढ़ाने से रोक नहीं सकते हैं। इसीलिए बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण की मांग उठी और आज राष्ट्रीयकरण की मांग इतनी उचित हो गई है कि शासक दल के भी बहुत से लोग इस मांग को उठाने से बाज नहीं आते हैं। पता नहीं आज क्यों वह चुप हो गए हैं? हमें अफसोस से कहना पड़ता है कि इजारेदारी को कम करने के लिए, कमजोर करने के लिए बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण की मांग ने जो प्रसिद्धि पा ली है, अपना औचित्य स्थापित कर लिया है उसकी वजह से उसका खुलेआम विरोध करने की हिम्मत नहीं होती है तो द्रविड़ प्राणायाम के जरिए से सामाजिक नियंत्रण के नाम पर उसका विरोध कर रहे हैं। हम अर्ज करना चाहते हैं कि अगर आप ईमानदारी से इजारेदारी को रोकना चाहते हैं तो आप तब तक नहीं रोक सकते हैं

जब तक कि बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं करें और यह आप की नीयत इजारेदारी के खिलाफ है या आप उसको बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, इसकी कसौटी है कि आप बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करते हैं या नहीं। सामाजिक नियंत्रण यह, एक ऐसा द्रविड़ प्राणायाम है जिससे कि फिर आज देश की ऋण-राशि बड़े-बड़े इजारेदारों को ही मिलेगी।

आखिर में मैं कान्फ़्लूड कर रहा हूँ और कान्फ़्लूड करते हुए यह कहना चाहता हूँ, मैं जानता हूँ बड़े-बड़े इजारेदारों के खिलाफ आवाज उठाने में कीमत देनी पड़ती है। हमने सुना है कि एक भाई चन्द्रशेखर ने बिरला के खिलाफ आवाज उठायी तो कांग्रेस दल की ओर से उसे राज्य-सभा का टिकट ही नहीं दिया जा रहा है और हम ने सुना है कि हमारी जो प्रधान मंत्री हैं, जो अभी यहाँ मौजूद नहीं हैं, उनके हाथ पांव कांप रहे हैं कि यदि उन्होंने इजारेदारी के खिलाफ कदम उठाए, यदि उन्होंने बिरला के खिलाफ कदम उठाए तो प्रधान मंत्री के पद से हटा दी जायेंगी। प्रधान मंत्री के पद से आज उन्हें इजारेदारी के खिलाफ, बिरला के खिलाफ कदम उठाने की हिम्मत नहीं हो रही है। भारत ऐसे प्राचीन परम्परा वाले देश के नेतृत्व के लिए आवश्यकता है कि उनके अन्दर साहस हो, हिम्मत हो और यदि वह साहस और हिम्मत नहीं दिखाएंगी, इन इजारेदारों के सामने और बिरला के सामने छुईमुई की तरह रहेंगी तो छुप जाएंगी और देश रसातल को चला जाएगा। इसलिए मैं शासक दल से अपील करूंगा कि हिम्मत दिखाएं, गांधी की परम्परा के ऊपर चलें, गांधी जी सिद्धांत के सवाल पर कांग्रेस को भी छोड़ने से बाज नहीं आए, उन्होंने कांग्रेस की सदस्यता भी छोड़ दी। तो यदि आप को इजारेदारी के खिलाफ लड़ने के लिए यह कीमत भी चुकानी पड़े तो चुकाइए। देश आपको कंधों पर उठाएगा इजारेदारों से लड़ने के लिए। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी पार्टी के श्री एस० एम० बैनर्जी के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI SHANTILAL SHAH (Bombay-North-West) : I am afraid that the discussion which is being held is being diverted from the main subject, namely, examination of the licensing policy to a discussion of Birlas only. The terms of reference were to review the operation of the licensing under the Industries Act broadly over the last two plan periods and to consider and suggest modifications. In the interim report, Dr. Hazari has confessed on page 3 the defects about the data on which he had based his conclusions :

“Briefly the data are partial, incomplete and in some cases not fully reliable.”

If an academic person were to deal with subject like this, it would have been much better if he held his hand till complete and reliable data was available rather than make an interim report without full data. That detracts from objectivity and the academic value of the report. It is quite possible that when Dr. Hazari was going through the report, he found the name of a certain firm ? was occurring rather too often and if it be so it was also quite proper for him to look into the activities of this firm or some other firm. He had to select one firm to which he thought great attention was necessary and therefore, I would not make a grievance if he examined only one firm rather than the two or three which have been mentioned. Tatas, he says, did not undertake any activity; Martin Burns were not doing anything. He says that Birlas were more active in these fields. On page 10 of the interim report he mentions the activities of the Birla firms. These are of two types : a very large diversification of the various industries in which they have gone and the areas. Para 10 says :

“The large number of Birla proposals and the amount of investment contemplated therein are diffused over the entire industrial structure. Except basic steel and power generation, almost every kind of industrial product capable of domestic manufacture is covered in the Birla perspective plan. There is evidence of interest in new and rapidly growing industries, particularly, aluminium, electrical goods, chemicals, cement, man-made fibres and yarns, heavy

[Shri Shantilal Shah]

engineering, alloy steel, pig iron, tools, timber products, newsprint, and pipes and tubes but traditional industries like cotton sugar, vanaspati and paper are by no means ignored."

About the geographical area, it has been mentioned :

"While West Bengal and Maharashtra continue to be their prime location, Birlas have ventured on a large scale in recent years into Madhya Pradesh, Andhra, Rajasthan, U.P. and Gujarat and are also developing interest in Assam, Madras, Kerala, Punjab, Orissa and Bihar. There is one project in Kashmir (and the blank in the Birla map in Mysore has been filled up of late by the acquisition of a cement company and a machine tool company)."

If this is the way in which they had been dealing, what is wrong? Is something wrong with the industrial Act or the licensing policy or with Birlas? Any private entrepreneur will certainly do as much as he can within that law. The implementation of the licensing policy has gone astray. Our duty, therefore, is to see that the policy is set right rather than blame some individual or industrial house. The licensing authorities may have gone wrong or may be the whole policy has gone astray. It would not, therefore, be fair to make a scapegoat of some industrial house and say that they are wrong. The law permits them to apply for licences and this is still a free country. Anyone can apply for an industrial licence and he may get a licence or may not get a licence. The only grievance that can be made against them was that they were thus able to pre-empt a large number of licences. If they were able to pre-empt what the licensing authorities doing? If one industrial house gets a number of licences, it is not the fault of that house; it is not the fault of the applicants if they get a licence. If there are too many people who apply, the licensing authority has to see whether there was any necessity, who has the capacity and who will be able to do it?

In the matter of starting new industries, it requires an active, imaginative policy and enterprise. In all these, what is wrong if

out of three big firms mentioned one of them has shown imagination and enterprise? I do not see anything wrong about it. The only way to check any wrong activity would be by legislation. We can certainly curb the monopolies by legislation, and if we find that their industries are very profitable we can certainly curb the profits by levying excise duties and also by providing that those excise duties should not be passed on to the customers. We can also levy income tax. I am of the view, that at present the country is in need of production. Anybody who has the capacity to produce should be allowed to do so. If he goes wrong, the Government must have a hand which is long enough and powerful enough to curb him, whether it is profit or monopoly, but even in trying to do something, we have made mistakes. Therefore, we want to rap the monopolists. I think we are trying to hide our own mistake in trying to blame somebody else.

If Mr. Birla or, say, myself, wanted to start an industry, which bank would give me that much credit which they can command and which foreign collaborator would look at me and which technician will place his technical know-how at my disposal? Therefore, there are certain things at which one may be good or one may not be capable. Certain people are capable for something and certain people are not. I am a good lawyer but I am not certain if I am a good businessman or a good industrialist.

AN HON. MEMBER : You are a good advocate.

SHRI SHANTILAL SHAH : Yes, Sir, if I think that the industry is in the interests of my country, I will certainly say so. That is not wrong, and in running any industry there is nothing wrong about it. Therefore, my main point is this. In such matters, let us not look at it from an individual point of view. When the country is developing, the first thing is to produce goods, and unless the country produces goods, the question of distribution of the goods, the question of new wealth and so on will not arise. I am afraid that rather than encouraging production and then thinking about distribution we are first thinking as to how the goods shall be distributed before they are produced.

There are certain defects which have been pointed out in the recommendation. They should be looked into, and Prof. Hazari, both in the interim report and the final report, has made a telling point which I am afraid we have been overlooking. That is with reference to the market mechanism. Market mechanism is an element in economics of which notice is now being taken all over the world. It is a theory which is developing, and unless we look into the market mechanism more and more and cease to rely on licensing less and less, we will not succeed.

After all, what will licences do? It is a negative policy. The licensing policy can say, "this shall not be done," but it can never say that this shall be done. What ought not to be done, one can prevent. The necessity today is not to prevent things but to see that things are done. For that purpose we ought to make better use of the market mechanism. That is referred to at page 15, para 12-3 of the interim report of Prof. Hazari from which I may quote :

"In a mixed economy, with a relatively small but fast growing public sector in industrial production, and a large but not so fast growing private sector subject to various administrative controls, the allocation of resources is guided by a combination of market forces and administrative directions. Since the private sector generates the bulk of resources, which are a common pool upon which both public and private sectors draw and since economic activity takes place in a traditionally free environment, it is obvious that the market mechanism is in fact of greater import than administrative fiat."

What has happened is that we are neglecting the market mechanism and we have tried to go ahead with production with licensing policies, and for all that, a licence is not a thing which can produce; it can only curtail and curb. Therefore it is high time that rather than spending all our time on this, let us see how we can have more production and how by that production we can improve the country's wealth. A long list of Birla applications has been

given at page 74. It is not necessary for us to go into it. One thing has been mentioned that after making an application and after a licence is given, they do not follow it up. I would certainly say that a person who applies for a licence ought to follow it up when it is given. But it is no use blaming them only. A man in the private sector will do what suits him. But if the licence was not followed up, could it not be cancelled and given to somebody else? Why were not these remedial actions taken? Let us not go into individuals finding out who is at fault and so on. The Government has appointed two committees—one under Prof. Thacker and another Cabinet sub-committee to deal with it. Let us try a new experiment. Let us give up putting in too many curbs and controls by way of licensing, etc. Let us attend more to the market mechanism, both in the public and private sectors. Before we come to distribution, if we see that the goods are produced and the country becomes wealthy not in currency notes but in the sense of possessing goods and services, then this discussion would be fruitful. Otherwise, it will be just a discussion with some people saying that the capitalists are good and some others saying that capitalists are bad. All capitalists are not bad and all capitalists are not good. Good and bad are equally distributed amongst all of us.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : The Government is bad.

SHRI SHANTILAL SHAH : Some Governments are bad and some are good. Bad governments like those in West Bengal will go and good governments will continue.

My suggestion is that this report should be seriously considered. The mistakes in the licensing policy ought to be corrected and market mechanism, which is a new experiment suggested in the report, ought to be developed. This is the way in which the discussion will be fruitful.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : Sir, I have not much to say about this report. I do not believe that this professor had any enmity with anybody. But there is no doubt that he seems to have been taken away by his own theories and he has gone

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

far beyond his allocated tasks. He has gone into the question, if I may say so, whether our planning is right or wrong and into financial and monetary questions. He has gone into a variety of subjects and made a variety of recommendations.

I do not understand why this report should have come here. It should have gone to those who appointed him to do this job. Why appoint a committee under Pro. Thacker or somebody else or have a sub-committee to consider this report? Did this report go to those who had appointed this gentleman to do certain investigations?

A lot has been said here about the House of Birlas, Birla brothers, cousins or brothers-in-law. The reference to the Birlas was by way of an example. I cannot blame the Birlas. They know that every politician and administrator has a price.

They seem to know the price that anybody, whether in the administration or in the political field, would think sufficient to induce him to do something for them. They are clever people and they know their business. They have expanded their business with the help of the Government, with the help of the administrators, with the help of the politicians. If that help were not given to them they would not foreclose the licences and they would not have this big business. They also know that they must do something to placate public opinion. So they established many philanthropic institutions also. I really cannot see how they can be blamed for doing all these things. They are done in every society. Dr. Hazari was not an enemy to the Birla House, he has given only that as an example to hang many of his theories.

Somebody here yesterday said that the relatives of Birlas are doing nothing and they are getting salaries and other advantages. Let us look to ourselves. The relatives of politicians, their widows, their sons and their children enjoy certain positions which neither their education nor their ability nor their experience justify. The Birlas at least invest money and work. There are those in India who doing nothing had amassed great wealth. If a commercial man does the same thing I think we cannot throw the first stone. Let those who have not sinned in this matter throw the first stone. But I

think today everybody would like to throw a stone to prove that he is innocent. I think this report should again be sent to the Planning Committee and there is no need of appointing a separate committee for examining it.

Further, Sir, he has talked of certain things. For instance, take the nationalisation of banks. Nationalisation of banks under a Government that is corrupt? I really wonder at my communist friends and at my socialist friends. They blow hot and cold in the same breath. They condemn this Government as corrupt. They condemn that this Government does not know its job. Then they want to put all the economic life at the mercy of this Government. Let us be clear about that. Either this Government is good and it must nationalise industries, nationalise all economic life and everything else with it or let us frankly admit that this Government is rotten and the more things we put under it the more will be our loss. While the capitalist loses the money of those who trust him with their money, the Government loses our money without our consent. They may incur any amount of losses. I have heard that there is in Bangalore a public undertaking which is called the Machine Tools Factory. I am informed that Rs. 3 crores worth of goods are lying there unsold. Even if Birlas were to have Rs. 3 crores worth of goods lying unsold they might go into liquidation, though these people do not mind going into liquidation because they can come up again and again.

So let us first make up our mind whether we want to have a private sector or do we want to have a public sector under this Government. As long as this Government lasts, whether it is private sector or it is public sector, it will go wrong. It is no use blaming the capitalists. It is their business to amass wealth, and as long as there is a private sector and the private sector is in an economy which is arranged as the economy is arranged on capitalist bases then big fortunes will be made. It is true that the public create all wealth, but when wealth is in private hands some of the public rely upon that wealth for their maintenance, for their wages, for their salaries. Once you allow a capitalist order to exist where you rely upon those capitalists for

many things, many more things than you like they will be masters.

I take it that we have discussed enough about this report. The whole thing will have to be reviewed. We will have to think whether we have done well in our Planning. We will have to think whether we have done well in issuing licences to private enterprise and not allowed the market mechanism to function. We will have to see whether our administrators are honest. Above all, we have to see whether our politicians are honest, because as a Persian proverb says, that when the political authority takes without payment one grain of salt the administrators will loot the whole country.

Let us find out whether we take grain of salt without payment. I know very well, those who are denouncing this firm of Birla Brothers—or cousins—have received help from that very source often enough, and if they are denouncing them today I think they have an idea that they may be paid more money to keep their mouths shut. It is just as it used to be, gold, money was given by Britain to Danes and the Danes came again in order to get more money. I am afraid there may be some people, some politicians who want more money from the Birlas and denounce them so that they may give more money. I have no great love for the Birlas or the whole tribe of them.

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा (हमीरपुर) : जो पहले लेते हैं उनका क्या है ?

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : जो पहले लेते हैं they are not good people. जो उनको डिनाऊंस करके पीछे लेना चाहते हैं वह और भी बुरी बात करते हैं ।

We are engaged in this hunt uselessly. We are all in the same boat; we are all sinners. Let us look to ourselves, and if we behave properly, if all of us behave properly, others will also behave properly.

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO (Kakinada) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I wish to offer a few remarks in an objective way on the subject which is under discussion today, namely

the Hazari Report. I assume he was appointed by the Planning Commission, with the approval of the Government, for the objectives mentioned in the Report.

The areas of industrial planning and licensing policy in which he had to work was left to his discretion. He was given two main topics with regard to the licensing system but with regard to the other details he was given a certain amount of discretion and freedom to roam into the other areas also. It seems that the Planning Commission has selected a gentleman of its own choice to inquire into the performance of the Commission itself. I understand that he is a Professor and an academic economist and also a Director of the Times of India group of concerns, owned by one of the biggest industrial houses. We know the history of these industrial houses. They are always at loggerheads with one another, they pull down each other, but they combine against others when their own common selfish interest is affected.

I understand that he is a professor and this is a one-man commission. I do not know how far he was able to have his prejudices and pre-conceived notions about the economy of the country excluded from his report, but after perusing the report one gathers the impression that he is not able to shed his shibboleths, ideas or ideals because he has roamed far afield from the terms of reference and has suggested nationalisation of banking also. This is a topic which has got its ideological tones, it has got its own administrative and political implications and the ruling party and the Government have announced their policy decision about it and they have already introduced a Bill in the other House with regard to banking. When matters have gone so far with regard to Government policy, this gentleman wants to shed light and his intelligence on the policy of the Government and advise them to retrace their steps.

It is well-known that his preliminary report or the interim report leaked out in the press. Within a month or two of his appointment he gave a third report and then another preliminary report. Before the preliminary report has seen the light of day, the letters he has written to the Planning Commission leaked out to the press and a

[Shri Thirumala Rao]

controversy rose about it. Since the preliminary report was published, a storm was raised about it and a discussion was also held in the other House. Now comes the final report.

After the final report, or even before the final report came, the Government of India appointed the Thacker Committee. This is not a one-man Commission but a Committee consisting of several members. It has started working and we have seen in the newspapers that Shri Thacker has complained that all the leading industrial houses are not co-operating with him by giving the information which has been wanted from them. We have not heard anything more about it but we presume that the committee is working smoothly and is gathering material to submit its report.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : They have no office.

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO : You can supply the office.

Then, there is a Cabinet sub-committee consisting of ministers. How many committees have gone into this matter? One a preliminary letter which is confidential; then, an interim report which was published; then a final report and above all these things there is the Thacker Committee and the Cabinet sub-committee. That means, the Government must have come to the conclusion that the material submitted by Shri Hazari is not sufficient for them to go about and formulate a comprehensive policy of long standing about the industrial development of the country.

When all these matters are before the Government where is the hurry and the necessity for Government to bring this report before this House or that House which is a one-man report, which is a scrappy report and which is also prejudiced. My suggestion is that the discussion of this report need not have been held in this House or in the other House when Government is thinking of a more comprehensive and wide range of investigation before it comes to a final decision on how industries must be developed in this country and what were the shortcomings not only with regard to the licensing system but also with regard to

banking and entrepreneur capacities and other matters connected with industrial development. Therefore I say that this is a wholly unwarranted discussion.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Barmer) : Why are you participating in it then?

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO : I want to tell them not to waste the time of the House.

I want to say one thing about the Planning Commission. It is really the Planning Commission which is partly responsible, and for the rest of it the Government of India in the concerned departments, for the present difficulty in industrial development. When the Planning Commission was set up by the late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, he had great ideals and great plans and he largely succeeded in implementing those plans about bringing up a public sector in industry in this country on a very large scale. But, as everybody knows, before the end of the third year of the Third Five Year Plan the Planning Commission's expectations had not been realised. It started sagging. Its plans have gone away because it is a commission not of industrial experts, entrepreneurs and people with any business experience but only of people with academic qualifications or high civilians. Therefore there is always a snag. The Planning Commission has not the capacity to implement its proposals. Still, it was considered a super-Cabinet in this Government in those days. It was a supernumerary Cabinet before whom every Cabinet Minister had to run with files in his armpit to get the okay of the Planning Commission. My complaint is that they are only theoretical planners. If the constant complaints from the Chief Ministers in the States to satisfy the Planning Commission... (Interruption).

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH) : It is totally wrong that the Cabinet Ministers run to anybody with files.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali) : He is wrong. His bearers run with the files.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : That also is totally incorrect.

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO : I may tell my hon. friend, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, that his advent into the Cabinet did not coincide with the beginning of the Planning Commission. By the time the Planning Commission started fading out you have risen as a minister. I know, several of my friends in the Cabinet used to go and stand before them. I was a member of the Estimates Committee before whom Sir V.T. Krishnamachari appeared as a witness. I put a question to him, "You are almost an equal to the Prime Minister; that is the impression; is it correct?" He laughed it away and said, "No".

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur) : He was more than a Prime Minister.

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO : The Planning Commission was set up with certain ideas, but it has not fulfilled those ideas. Two senior Cabinet Ministers, one of them an ex-Home Minister, were vice-chairmen of the Planning Commission. The late and the present Prime Minister have seen the futility of running the show as it was running before. The highest in the country has said that this Planning Commission has developed into a great empire with a building costing Rs. 2 crores which has got all the equipment and paraphernalia of a responsible Government. But the results are not commensurate with the importance given to it nor the money spent on it. Therefore, the present Prime Minister has seen to it and has, with the assistance of the Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission and the Cabinet Minister, liquidated the Planning Commission and given a new child which is born now shorn of all its powers.

If there is anything wrong with the licensing system, if so many licences have been issued, what was the Department doing about it? What were they doing about it? Wherever there is a control, corruption is concomitant of it; it gives birth to corruption. Corruption is a child of controls. I would like to give you a piece of news published in the *National Herald* in the first issue of 5th March which gives the following information, as to how the Central Investigation Bureau has tracked down so many officials as well as licence-holders. Misuse of licences is the heading of the news.

I would like to give a few statistics here. A sum of Rs. 8 crores was involved in the misuse of licences; Rs. 6 crores during the last three years between 1962 and 1967. The survey of the Home Ministry—it is not of the Industry Ministry or that of the Planning Commission—reveals that the number of firms involved were 1100 and the number of licences covered 2200. In 1967, the C.B.I. took up 2090 cases against public servants and 246 cases against others. In the previous years, there were 2,208 and 258 cases respectively. 68.4 per cent of the cases registered in 1967 arose from the information gathered by the C.B.I. (Interruption). It is an interesting story as revealed by the Home Ministry. Of these, 489 cases were sent to court for trial and 1,730 for departmental action. In 1967, 361 public servants, 42 gazetted officers and 319 non-gazetted and 628 others were sent up for trial in courts. The number of public servants reported for departmental action was 25,53,401 gazetted officers and 252 non-gazetted staff. 452 cases against public servants were dropped for want of evidence. Of the cases that were sent to courts, 84.2 per cent resulted in convictions and 86.8 per cent resulted in departmental punishments. The C.B.I. laid about 200 traps involving 24 gazetted officers during 3 years period. About 400 cases of possession of assets by public servants disproportionate to their known sources of income were investigated. Of these, 133 involved gazetted officers.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The hon. Member may conclude now.

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO : It is a rampant thing. Can you fix the responsibility on any individual person or any individual firm about this matter? If you can prove it, by all means, treat with them and punish them. But until the Thackersay Committee and the Cabinet Sub-Committee sifts all the material that is before them, there is no point in having this sort of half-hearted discussion about this Report.

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

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO : I want another 5 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : We have to adjourn for lunch.

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO : After lunch, I will close.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : That is not possible. I can give you a couple of minutes now. You conclude now. We are short of time.

13 hrs.

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO : All right, Sir.

The question of public sector is there. There was only private sector during the British days. There were only public utility services like the Railways, Posts and Telegraphs, etc. We have reoriented the industries sector only after the advent of Independence. Nearly 60 per cent of our major industries are in the public sector. A lot can be said about the public sector. I have no time now to say about that. But the private sector cannot be dispensed with in this country. It is serving a useful purpose and it is no use of talking out one individual or one concern like the Birlas who are the second biggest in the country.

They have brought an industrial regeneration in this country. There may be corrupt individuals among them and they may be caught hold of and punished. But you cannot destroy the whole unit of the industry. I can tell you that, in Andhra, they have revived certain industries like asbestos Alwyn and Siripur Papers which were languishing and were to be closed down; they intervened and now they are flourishing. They have done a lot in so many directions. I am not holding a brief for any of them, nor am I a Birla-baiter. But I want honest criticism in an objective way. There may be wrongs and mistakes both in the public sector and in the private sector but it is for the Government to rectify them it is for the departments concerned to rectify them, it is for the Ministers concerned to rectify them, and these should not be used for political purposes. Where a man in some corner of the country was defeated, they openly say that they are going to make this an issue. I was also defeated when I was a Minister in 1952 by my own leader, Shri Sri Prakasam, because I was following Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Then should I go about abusing him?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That is all. We have to adjourn.

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO : Thank you, Sir.

The Lok Sabha Adjourned for lunch till Fourteen of the clock.

13.02 hrs.

The Lok Sabha reassembled after lunch at fourteen of the clock.

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

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

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, Shri Chintamani Panigrahi. I would request hon. Members from the Congress Benches to confine their remarks to ten minutes each, because I have to accommodate a large number of them.

SHRI SHEO NARAIN (Basti) : For the Opposition Members you give even 30 minutes but for us you are giving only ten minutes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : They are taking their party time. So, that kind of complaint cannot be made.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Bhubaneswar) : I was listening to the speech or rather the short intervention of Shri J. B. Kripalani. I thought that it would be very interesting to hear the confessions of an old man and an old woman also. I took it in that light because he had said that he had not read the Hazari report at all, and it is good that he has not read it. For all questions, whether economic, political or social or scientific, cynicism is the only answer, so far as some people of this country are concerned.

I do not want to deal with any personal monopoly houses or names in particular but I want to confine myself to some basic issues which this report has opened. During the last 18 years, we have invested nearly Rs. 30,000 crores in the planned development of this country. Naturally, during the early sixties when the members of the Planning Commission gave the idea to the Late Prime Minister Nehru—then I was also Member of the second Lok Sabha—that the national income had gone up by 47 per

cent and the *per capita* income by 20 per cent, as Nehru was a man of the masses and always moved with them, the question naturally arose in his mind as to where this rise in the national and *per capita* income has gone. Since then he was trying to find an answer to this question. In pursuance of that, committee after committee has been set up. Then the Monopolies Inquiry Commission was constituted. Now we have the Hazari Report.

Some hon. friends were asking : why is it that one after another of these committees are being appointed and reports published? It is because the roots of these monopoly houses have become so deep in these 20 years that after 20 years they have not been able to unearth all the mischiefs and all the crimes that they have committed on this country when they country has been engaged in rapid industrialisation.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : Like the Bharat Sewak Samaj.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : I hope that the Thacker Committee which has now been appointed will be able to find a final answer to this question.

In this connection, I would draw the attention of the House to one significant aspect. When it was appointed, it was said that its report would be available in six months. But I am surprised at the way it is proceeding. It is not a question of any particular monopoly house. It is the bureaucracy also which involved. It is the combination of the monopoly houses and the bureaucracy which is throttling the progress of this country.

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai) : And the Ministers, and the Cabinet.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : What is the basic problem which the Monopolies Commission and the Hazari Report have revealed before the country? It has revealed that there is concentration of 27 per cent of the total assets and 28 per cent of the total paid-up capital of the 75 business groups in these two top groups, Tatas and Birlas. They have thrown some light on this.

MILLS/68—6

In this connection, I would like to ask the hon. Minister to see that all the relevant data and files should be made available to the Thacker Committee. But it has come to our notice that when it asked for files relating to business houses, the Ministry officials have replied—they are in collusion with these houses—asking for the numbers of the files which the Committee wanted and then they would find out. There are thousands of these files; even with regard to one concern, there may be 50 to 70 files in respect of one party. I hope no impediments will be placed in the working of this Committee, all co-operation will be given to it, all facilities and data supplied to it so that it would be in a position to find the final answer to all these questions which we are discussing every now and then.

A recent survey of 40 companies has revealed that the maximum shares held by 1/10th of the share-holders account for 82.5 per cent of the total shareholding, the share-holding of 5/10th account for 95.3 per cent; 75 per cent of the investments in the 40 government companies come from the LIC and the banking institution.

In this connection, I am just mentioning—since there is not enough time to deal exhaustively with—it the Vivian Bose Report. They also went into the working of certain monopoly houses. What are their findings? They have said :

“These groups resorted to serious irregularities in the management of companies including manipulation of accounts, fraud, deceipt, cornering of shares etc. with a view to prompting the personal interests of the group masters”.

Here is the report of the Vivian Bose Commission its findings are clear. If it applies to one monopoly house, it applies to other monopoly houses also.

I am sorry that some of the hon. Members spoke in this House in a way which might have created an impression among the galaxy of Birla executives that they have a strong lobby here. Do not

[SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI] have this mistaken idea as if Birla is supreme: Parliament is supreme and it can go into the affairs of any of the monopoly houses in this country. So that was not the true voice of the Congress of the voice of the people of this country.

It has been argued that with their huge incomes the big business houses will have enough surpluses for re-investment. I calculated how far they have invested and what investments have been made. A survey was made by the National Council of Applied Economic Research and they pointed out that virtually all saving in India is effected by just fifteen per cent of the household whose income is Rs. 3,000 and that corporate savings have not played a substantial role in the Indian economy; in fact they account for just two or three per cent of the national savings.

It is said that these monopoly houses re-invest their profits for the prosperity of the country. The figures that I quoted belie those observations. On the other hand they act as a stranglehold on capital formation. What is the capital formation? The investment in private sector is nearly Rs. 9,000 crores and the 19 per cent return of this investment which is claimed by the Forum of Free enterprises gives them annually about Rs. 1,000 crores. Therefore, within the last ten years the return on investment in the private sector has given them Rs. 10,000 crores. Where is the re-investment?

There is then the question of capital formation. I agree that they are being invested: Where? You can find this answer; the Finance Minister has answered to one of our questions. The income-tax arrears of these big monopoly houses come to Rs. 528 crores. You see how capital is formed. Tax evasion at the rate of about Rs. 200 crores a year during the last decade comes to Rs. 2,000 crores: (*An Hon Member*..Where did you get it?) You check your accounts. Thus the total comes to Rs. 2,528 crores. That is the capital formation of the big monopoly houses and this forms part of the extremely effective, unorganised money market that operates from one end of India to the other end. A parallel Government is being run; it becomes not a question of a big business house but one of parallel

Government. Just like the Central Intelligence Agency of America, with these 2528 crores of black money, this parallel Government topples the Governments in States—Congress or non-Congress—when a Government goes against the principles which are beneficial to the monopoly houses so they are in fact ruling this country for the last twenty years. It is a conspiracy of the bureaucracy and the big monopolists to deprive the common people the fruit of their twenty years of toil. This is the sort of capital formation that we have.

Therefore, what happens?

The burden on the people is growing every year. During the past 20 years, when I analyse all the plan expenditure, I find that the burden has been growing because these monopoly houses have been escaping from tax—tax-evasion—and all kinds of laws. We find that the common man has paid by way of taxation Rs. 19,173 crores and the non-tax revenue has been to the tune of Rs. 4,014 crores. The income-tax during the last 20 years has been Rs. 3,209 crores. This is how the monopoly houses, with so much investment, have helped the national economy to grow.

Sir, I see you are rather very impatient. With only one or two instances, I shall conclude. I wish to quote from a statement made by Mr. L.N. Birla. He said it not in India but in America. In welcoming the joint ventures of Indian and foreign businessmen, he said:

"The foreign business investments in India went up to nearly 1,333 million dollars in 1966 from 333 million dollars in 1948 : a 300 per cent increase in less than two decades. American investment during this period had gone up by 2,000 per cent from the comparatively small order of 13 million dollars in 1948. The total number of collaboration amounted to 2,560 in 1957-58 and it has increased by now."

Now the question comes as to how the foreign exchange is used, and how the collaboration of Indian big monopoly and foreign collaborator has worked. There is no time to go into that question. With one more instance, I shall conclude my speech. They say that they are helping to

develop the technical knowhow. This is how the big business monopoly houses do it. May I tell you that from 1956-57 to 1965-66, by way of royalty, we have paid Rs. 17.47 crores to the foreigners? Technical and service fees come to Rs. 78.4 crores other professional fees come to Rs. 133.4 crores. Altogether, Rs. 229.5 crores have been paid in this respect. What is the technical know-how they have developed?

I have no time to go into the question of the banking institutions. I would only point out that almost all the credit during the last 15 to 20 years has been taken from the private banking institutions as well as from the LIC. The LIC has invested from 1957 to 1967, Rs. 1,414 crores in the private sector and this is the LIC which is directing the investment policy of this country. The maintenance imports were increasing. When it is said that we must nationalise the banking institutions, it is not because we are so much enamoured of nationalisation. Shri J.B. Kripalani said it is a corrupt government and therefore do not nationalise the banks. But what do we find? Unless you nationalise and have effective control on the credit institutions, both on banks and general insurance, it is not possible, by whatever methods you apply, to go ahead. You say social control and all that. You cannot check the rise of these monopoly houses. Therefore I submit that the Government should come forward with more effective measures, and this Committee which has been appointed must first work satisfactorily and come out with a report very soon, and all facilities should be given to it.

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हजारों साहब की जो रिपोर्ट है, मैंने उसको पूरा देखा है, यह मेरे विचार से बिल्कुल वन-साइडेड है। मेरे मित्र प्रेम चन्द जी जब कल बोल रहे थे, तब मैं हाउस में बैठा था, जब उन्होंने बिरला जी को बड़ी गालियाँ देनी शुरू कीं, तो मैंने उनसे एक सवाल पूछा कि आप उन पर क्यों नहीं आते, जिन्होंने कि लाइसेंस ईशू किये। जो इस गवर्नमेंट की मशीनरी को चलाते हैं, जो लाइसेंस ईशू करने वाले अधिकारी हैं, उनको क्यों बकशते हैं। कोई भी

बिजनेस मैन जो इस देश का नागरिक है, अगर वह कोई बिजनेस चलाता है, तो मैं उसको बेलकम करूंगा, लेकिन मैं विदेशियों को बेलकम करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ, मैं ब्रिटेन और अमरीका को बेलकम करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ...

एक माननीय सदस्य : और चाइना को ?

श्री शिव नारायण : चाइना को भी। लेकिन मैं अपने देश के किसी भी आदमी को बिजनेस चलाने के लिये बेलकम करूंगा। जब डा० हजारी ने बिरला हाउस को पिन-प्वाइन्ट किया, तो मैं उनसे पूछता हूँ कि उन्होंने अभी-चन्द प्यारे लाल को क्यों छोड़ दिया? जब हमारे पिछले फूड मिनिस्टर सुब्रह्मण्यम साहब हमारे सामने पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी में आये, तो मैंने उनसे दो सवाल पूछे थे, मैं उनको यहां पर रिपीट नहीं करना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि वे 12 सितम्बर के अखबार में छप चुके हैं।

हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब ने खुद ही कह दिया है कि यह रिपोर्ट वेस्ट-मेपर बास्केट में फेंक देने लायक है, इसके लिये उन्होंने पहले ही एक कमेटी बैठा दी है, एक कैबिनेट कमेटी भी बैठी हुई है। इस लिय मैं यहां पर कोई बिरला साहब की बकालत नहीं करना चाहता हूँ, लेकिन जिन्होंने लाइसेन्सेज ईशू किये, आप पहले उनको लें, ऐसे बहुत बड़े-बड़े लोग हैं, जो इसमें इन्वाल्ड हैं, मैं यहां पर उनके नाम नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ...

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : Shall we hang them ? (Interruptions).

श्री शिव नारायण : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस मुल्क के दो टुकड़े करने वालों में नहीं हूँ। मैं इस देश के संविधान में विश्वास करता हूँ, मेरे मित्र को उसमें विश्वास नहीं है। मैं उनको बताना चाहता हूँ कि मैं इस मुल्क का एक वफ़ादार सिपाही हूँ और ईमानदारी से इस मुल्क की गाड़ी को ठीक चलाना चाहता हूँ,

[श्री शिव नारायण]

यहां तक कि गवर्नमेंट को भी नहीं बकशता हूं, आपकी तरह से लिफ-चिप की बात नहीं करना चाहता हूं। मैं अपने देश के किसी भी नागरिक से, चाहे बिरला हो, टाटा हो, साहू-जैन हो, हमारे देश का जो नागरिक है, उससे पैसा मांगना गुनाह नहीं समझता हूं, लेकिन विदेशों से मांग कर खाना गुनाह है... (व्यवधान)

इन हजारी साहब को प्लानिंग कमीशन ने एप्वाइन्ट किया था, इस प्लानिंग कमीशन को देखिये—मैं तो चाहता हूं कि इस प्लानिंग कमीशन को ही वाइप-आउट करो, यह इस देश पर अननैसेसरी बर्डन है, अननैसेसरी लक्जरी है जो इस पर खर्च किया जा रहा है, इस को हटाना चाहिये। मैं अपनी गवर्नमेंट से अपील करना चाहता हूं कि हमारी प्राइम मिनिस्टर हेड आफ़ दी गवर्नमेंट हैं, हमारी कैबिनेट सुप्रीम है—वह इस काम को सम्भाल सकती है—

कहें कबीर जब से चतो, तब से सही,

मान्यवर, मैं चाहता हूं कि इस देश की गरीबी की समस्या हल हो, दरिद्रता खत्म हो। चाहे बिरला साहब हों, या जो भी हों, मैं बिरला साहब से अपील करना चाहता हूं जो पैसा आपके पास टैक्स का बाकी है, वह गवर्नमेंट को दो, क्योंकि नो-गवर्नमेंट बिना टैक्स के नहीं चल सकती है और जो गवर्नमेंट के टैक्स की चोरी करता है, वह महान चोर है, चाहे जो हो। इस लिये मैं चाहता हूं कि हजारे कमेटी की जो रिपोर्ट है...

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (उज्जैन) : जो चोरो को छूट देने वाले हैं, वे महा-चोर हैं, ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री शिव नारायण : वह तो आपकी शकल बता रही है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Ignore the interruptions and address the Chair.

श्री शिवनारायण : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस देश की अर्थव्यवस्था को ठीक करने का विचार रखता हूं और चाहता हूं कि देश की मोनोपोली... (व्यवधान)... मैं गवर्नमेंट से यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आप बरायें-मेहर-बानी इस हजारे कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को वापस लें। मिनिस्टर साहब का स्टेटमेंट इस बात का सुबूत है—उन्होंने पहले ही ठीकर साहब की कमेटी एप्वाइन्ट की है, अपनी कैबिनेट की भी एक कमेटी बनाई है—यह इस बात का सुबूत है कि गवर्नमेंट का खुद इसमें विश्वास नहीं है। इस लिये हजारी कमेटी की बजाये पंच-हजारी कमेटी मुकर्रर की जाये, उससे इस देश का भला होगा। मैं सरकार से अपील करूंगा कि इस हाउस का टाइम वेस्ट न किया जाये, इस रिपोर्ट को वापस लें और आपने जो कमेटी बनाई है, बैठ कर इमानदारी के साथ इस मुल्क के बड़े-बड़े पूंजीपतियों से और तमाम लोगों से कहा जाये कि सही मायना में इस देश का कल्याण करो। अंग्रेज बनिया बन कर आया था और उसके बाद वह यहां पर काबिज हो गया था। मैं गवर्नमेंट को सावधान करना चाहता हूं, हमने 200 वर्ष गुलामी की जंजीरों में गुजारे हैं, अब सावधान हो जाइये—जो फौरन-एक्सचेंज का नारा इस देश के अन्दर लगाते हैं, यह खतरे की घंटी है और उससे यह गवर्नमेंट सावधान रहे।

हमारे डी० एम० के० के भाई जो यहां पर बहुत बलबलाने हैं, मैं उनको भी सावधान करना चाहता हूं। 1857 की लड़ाई के इनके कारनामे हमको भूले नहीं हैं।...

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : Sir, I do not know how all these are relevant to the present discussion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Let him have his way. Let him not be interrupted.

श्री शिव नारायण : मैं गवर्नमेंट से कहूंगा कि अपने एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को टाइट-अप करो, ठीक करो, क्योंकि सरकार के लिये आप जिम्मे-

दार हैं। ये जितने ब्यूरोक्रट और आइ० सी० एस० हैं, ये अभी से अपने लिये इन्तजाम कर रहे हैं। दे-आर-नाट-लायल टू दि गवर्नमेन्ट, दे आर लायल टू बिरलाज एण्ड टाटाज। ये रिटायर होने के बाद वहां जायेंगे। इसलिये मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूं कि अपनी मसीनरी को टाइट करो, इनको हटाओ। जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने तसलीम किया था कि 10 क्लास पास आदमी इनसे अच्छा काम कर सकता है। मैंने इनके हज़ारों मामलों को पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी में देखा है, मेरी जेब में नोट्स हैं अगर आप इजाज़त दें तो बतला सकता हूँ—18 करोड़ रुपया सालाना गवर्नमेन्ट का बच सकता है, अगर रेल्वे के फ्री-पासेज गवर्नमेन्ट बन्द कर दे, यह मैंने इस लिये कह दिया कि रेल्वे बजट पर बोलन का मुझे मौका नहीं मिला था।

इसलिये, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस हज़ारी कमेटी की रिपोर्ट का विरोध करता हूँ और चाहता हूँ कि यह वापस हो।

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, many of my friends on the other side who have been attacking Dr. Hazari for the Report I think they have not read the last portion of the report. If they have carefully read it, I am sure they would not be attacking it, because in the last portion Dr. Hazari basically stands with them. He has clearly stated that he does not recommend the dissolution of the monopoly; he wants the retention of the monopolies but without the monopolistic abuses, just like a socialistic society without socialism. So, basically, he has recommended the retention of monopolies; just some monopolistic abuses to be removed. When that is the position, why should they get angry?

But there is a reason for it. I do understand why they are attacking the Hazari Report, because that report is one more addition to the armoury exposing the fraudulent professions of the Congress Party. I would not say that his contribution was the exposure of concentration of wealth and growth of monopoly. I do not say

that was his contribution. The concentration of wealth and growth of monopoly has been there for the past so many years for everyone to see. But what Dr. Hazari has exposed is that planning and licensing procedures and the machineries of government acted as the very instruments which reared concentration of wealth and growth of monopolies by showering benefits of pets and god-fathers of the Congress Party. That is what he has exposed.

If the Government were to dare tell us that these were developments behind their backs, I would say that they are trying to befool this House, befool the people and befool the country at large. Take, for example, the break-up figures of licences approved between 1964 and 1966. Of the total investments approved, the share in favour of companies with more than Rs. 1 crore capital is 69 per cent, whereas the share in favour of companies with less than Rs. 10 lakhs capital was a mere 2 per cent. Then, of the total import components approved, the share in favour of companies with more than Rs. 1 crore capital each was 68 per cent, whereas the share in favour of companies with less than Rs. 10 lakhs capital each was a mere 1.7 per cent. Yet if the Government tell us that they could not detect this earlier, are we to take it that the Congress Party do not have members who are qualified enough to make even these simple arithmetical deductions? Let us take another aspect—short-circuiting of licensing procedures in regard to applications in favour of foreign collaboration.

Government says that this is done to attract foreign investments. The Government says that it is the country's interests. Take alkaline and Chemical Corporation of India Limited, which is started in collaboration with ICI, which is a foreign concern. A share of Rs. 100 in 1959 has earned Rs. 241 by 1966. Does this benefit go to India? One may say, "All right, it is good; it is a fine company that gives profits". But does this difference go to our country substantially? No, because 87.25 per cent of the shares belong to foreigners and as such the major portion of the wealth is looted out of the country. And here is a government which so moulds its licensing policy as to attract loot by foreigners; just

[Shri Umanath]

because the Indian counterparts get a few crumbs, this treachery is paraded as patriotism.

Let us take another aspect of the licensing policy, namely, issuing newer and newer licenses even while the installed capacity is lying idle. Here is what the Chairman of the Indian Engineering Association, Industrial Furnaces Division, says—I quote from the *Economic Times* of 6th September, 1967.

"The present idle capacity in the industrial furnace industry is approximately 60 per cent and it is apprehended the situation will worsen further Despite the existence of a licensed and established furnace industry, several companies who are not in this industry have been importing parts, drawings and designs for furnaces from abroad and getting them fabricated in India."

This policy leads to increasing the existing unutilised capacity, on the one hand, and waste of foreign exchange on the new licences, on the other. By this, the nation is made to pay just to oblige certain patrons of the Congress Party. That is the reason, I say.

On this particular point I give the example of the scooter manufacture. Lambretta was given a licence but even while its installed capacity, a substantial part of it, remained unutilised, VESPA, another company, was given the licence. Why was it done? Because the owner of VESPA was none other than the godfather of the Congress Party, Shri Ramakrishna Bajaj.

Sir, at first sight I was elated to notice that a company with Rs. 5,000 capital was granted a licence involving crores of rupees investment. I thought, here was at least one instance where a small entrepreneur was favoured with a big licence. But I was shocked to find that the Rs. 5,000 company was floated by none other than Shri Birla, the great. There is an English saying that one must cut the coat according to the size of the cloth. In Birla's case he cuts himself according to the size stipulated by the Government to shower benefits on him.

Much surprise was expressed even by certain Members of the ruling party about the vertical growth of Shri Birla through the licensing process. But they conveniently forget that this very growth had the blessings of their own Government as clarified by Shri T.T. Krishnamachari in his Budget speech in 1964-65. I quote :—

"I am not here to disprove that concentration has taken place to some extent. In a developing economy, a certain amount of proliferation in industrial activity on vertical lines can be permitted".

This is what Shri Krishnamachari has said. Having permitted the same, what is the use of expressing surprise at the results of their own Government's conduct?

Sir, I found that the 13th in rank in the amount of investment approved was a person who did not find a place in the 75 big business houses. One would think that here is another instance of the Government's attempt to diversify industrial expansion with a view to covering non-monopoly sections as well. But that was not to be. The person suddenly promoted to that rank was none other than Shri Aminchand Pyarelal. A person who is a non-entity in the industrial field is sanctioned overnight an investment equal to half as much as that sanctioned to the Tatas in 1959-60, in one year alone. The fact of his having found a place in the blacklisted firms is perhaps the qualification for his promotion in the industrial field!

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : That shows the advantage of siding with the Congress.

SHRI UMANATH : Thus, by now it must be clear that the Congress Government in the name of capturing the commanding heights of the nation's economy was actually carrying on their shoulders the big business and financial crooks, both Indian and foreign, to the commanding heights of the nation's economy.

What are the remedies? Dr. Hazari says that apart from credit planning etc. the following should be done. I quote :

"The Government should declare that certain traditional industrial articles shall be closed in future to the

specified 10 or 15 largest industrial houses already established in these articles ; they shall not be permitted to expand in these areas"

How ridiculous it is to expect that monopolies can be curbed by changes in licensing procedures, credit planning etc. by this Government. It is as ridiculous as to rely on the customs officials of a country to resist armed invasion ! Let us not forget that it is the monopolies who control the licensing procedure, the machinery and this very Government and not vice versa. Dr. Hazari has just forgotten the important and most elementary truth. That is why, even though the Cabinet Sub-Committee took over the functions of scrutinising Birla applications after the interim report was published, the Cabinet Sub-Committee approved newer licences to Birlas knowing fully well that he had still about 50 per cent of the approved licences unutilised.

Sir, world history and economics teach that growth of capitalism inevitably leads to monopoly. This is law of development of capitalism throughout the world (*Interruption*) I am proving from these things. Here, in this House, it may be like that. But outside people have started realising it. That is why despite the so-called anti-Trust laws and anti-monopoly laws enacted in U.S.A., U.K., Canada, etc., monopolies have continued in those countries to grow to the detriment of independence and sovereignty of other nations.

The late Prime Minister Nehru challenged and said that he will build capitalism without allowing concentration of wealth in this country and towards this end, the Industrial Policy Resolution, the Tariff Act, the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, the Capital Issues (Control) Act, the Companies Act and a host of other Acts were enacted to prevent the formation of monopoly. But the state of affairs today shows that Indian economy under this so-called nationalistic rule of the Congress is no exception to the world law of development of capitalism and all these Acts to prevent monopoly were only meant as window dressings to cover the process of development of monopoly.

Here, I would like to say that unless the line of building capitalism is given up, unless the monopolies are broken up, unless the means of production are taken over from Indian and foreign looters, the direction cannot be changed. These are possible only if the present Government who are the servitors of these looters are removed from power.

Finally, I would like to mention one point. I think it was yesterday that Acharayaji got up, when the question of big companies financing the Congress Party came up, and said that the Congress Party, when he was there as the General Secretary, never received a single pie from the coffers of big business but got only from the four-anna membership of the ordinary Congress Members. Now, I would like to bring to the notice of this House the following. This is from Louis Fisher's book "Life of Mahatma Gandhi", edition 1951, pp. 401-403. I quote :

"Talking in May 1942 to Louis Fisher Gandhi is reported to have said that "practically all of the Congress budget came from rich capitalists" and although "actually we are very little influenced by the thinking of the rich, it creates a silent debt"."

All these are the words of Mahatma Gandhi. The other part is given by Mr. G. D. Birla himself. (*Interruptions*) I am now quoting Mr. G. D. Birla ; I am giving the confirmation. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No interruptions please. He is quoting from a book. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE (Ratnagiri) : On a point of order, Sir. This is what foreign writer has said.. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Order, order. This is not fair. He is quoting from a book. What is the objection ?

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE : My point of order is this. Some foreign author has written something. Mr. Umanath says that this a fact. Anybody can say anything. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI UMANATH : I know the Congress Party is receiving money from big business. *(Interruptions)* The Congress Party is the agent of the big business. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Kindly resume your seats.

SHRI UMANATH : I know you are taking money from Birlas. What are you talking ? Pure nonsense. *(Interruptions)* You are the agents of Birlas..

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Order, order. You are losing your own time. I would like to point out to Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee.. *(Interruptions)*

Mrs. Sharda Mukherjee raised a point. The book is in circulation for so long a time. I have read it and most of the members have read it. He is quoting from it giving a reference. It was never contradicted. There is no point of order.

The hon. Member may continue.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE
rose—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : She will have to resume her seat.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE :
Let me explain.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No explanation now.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE :
You must give me an opportunity..

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : There is no right of reply. I have disposed of the point of order. I will not permit her.

I will point out another thing. On the basis of the same book, or some other book by the same author Mahatma Gandhi's film is being prepared and released. Therefore, there is no point of order. The hon. Member may continue.

SHRI UMANATH : If the hon. members had been patient, I would have given the quotation from the other side also confirming the position. The other side is a book written by Mr. G. D. Birla entitled "In the Shadow of Mahatma", Edition 1952, where there are frequent references like this. I am giving the quotation.

"Bapu, to whom I could refuse nothing and who was accustomed to turn to me for help in all his plans.."

While coming to the question of financial help, this reference off and on comes. I am giving quotation from Mr. Louis Fischer, I am also giving quotation from Mr. G. D. Birla, who has been financing. This is the thing... *(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE :
It cannot be tolerated.

SHRI UMANATH : You have got another person to say that. You contradict it. You cannot deny. This is as clear as broad daylight.. *(Interruptions)* You cannot deny. It is as clear as broad daylight that all along the Congress Party has been taking. I will give you the latest instance. This has been stated in the other House by your own Minister, Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed. When cement decontrol was done, the excess money out of decontrol was entrusted to a Cement Manufacturers and Owners Committee. The Minister himself has revealed that CACO paid Rs. 10 lakhs out of these to the Congress coffers for the election fund.. *(Interruptions)* Why are you getting angry ? You cannot hide this. The fact is there that as long as.. *(Interruptions)* Don't worry. When your things get exposed, naturally you get upset.. *(Interruptions)* Non-sense. Don't talk non-sense. You are getting money from Birla. You are getting money from big business, Indian and foreign. You are getting all sorts of money. The Congress Party is getting money from foreign capitalists and Indian capitalists. You are getting angry because of that..

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Order, order..

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh) : He attacks me personally. How can he say this ? I challenge him..

SHRI UMANATH : There are charges against you. There are charges against you. The country knows that charges are against you. What is the use of your challenging it ?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA :
I am challenging Mr. Umanath..

SHRI UMANATH : Already money has been taken by the Congress Party.. *(Interruptions)* Your own Minister has said this. Money has been taken.. *(Interruptions)* I am on my legs. I am not yielding. I am on my legs.. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : This is a deliberate attempt to prevent Shri Umanath from speaking. This is not fair.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I would like to point out to Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha that she will be getting an opportunity to speak later, and she can contradict the hon. Member. From what I could hear, Shri Umanath has quoted something..

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Lady Members generally interrupt Shri Umanath.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Order, order. This is not fair. I shall have to take serious note of this.

If Shri Umanath has made any incorrect statement, then Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha will later have an opportunity to contradict it when she speaks. If he has made any personal allegation, certainly it is objectionable. But when he is quoting from a statement made on the floor of the other House, she cannot take any objection to it. Now, Shri Umanath should try to conclude. *(Interruptions)*

श्री मु० अ० खां (कासगंज) : यह आपका इशारा है आप उन्हें गद्गद देकर कहलवा रहे हैं... *(व्यवधान)*

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : After Shri Umanath finishes, kindly call me so that I could reply.

SHRI UMANATH : Guilty conscience is shouting.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : I have not taken any money.. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SONAVANE (Pandharpur) : On a point or order..

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Hon. Members are taking away their own time by these things. I shall not be able to accommodate all those who want to speak. I must tell them this very plainly.

SHRI SONAVANE : On a point of order. I would like to know how an hon. Member can quote from the proceedings of the other House. That is not allowed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Do we not quote Minister's statements here ? It is not a question of the other House. It is the Minister's statement which has been quoted. Has he no right to quote it ? If it is wrong, the hon. Member can contradict it later.

SHRI SONAVANE : He cannot quote from the proceedings of the other House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Hon. Members are losing their time now. I shall not be able to accommodate all of them. So, let them not interrupt unnecessarily.

Now, Shri Umanath should try to conclude.

SHRI UMANATH : In conclusion, I would like to submit that all this kind of legislation to curb monopolies etc. is not going to work. As mosquitoes and scorpions are produced out of garbage, if you go on just gassing them, leaving the garbage, the mosquitoes will go on multiplying in a continuous process. Similarly, capitalism is the garbage..

SHRI PILOO MODY : What nonsense !

SHRI UMANATH : Leaving capitalism in this country intact, if you go on with legislation then the legislation will be just like gassing. Unless this line of development of capitalism is given up, and unless the monopolies are broken up it is not possible to check their growth.

These can be checked only if this Government which consists of the servitors of big businessmen is thrown out. Unless that happens, nothing can be done to check monopolies.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : What about my name ? I was No. 3 in the list.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I cannot be dictated to in this manner.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) : Yesterday, I was No. 3 in the list. How is it that I have not been called ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have called Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani. She should try to conclude in ten minutes.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI (Gonda) : I shall try my best, but I cannot promise.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : I was No. 3 in the list yesterday. How is it that you are not calling me ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Member may ask his Chief Whip and the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : Mr Deputy Speaker, Sir.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am not blaming him. If four Members get up in this manner and start speaking simultaneously, how is it possible to accommodate ?

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : As Shri Randhir Singh has stated, his name was third in the list yesterday. Today also, his name was there. If you ask me, then I would say that you should go by the list.

SHRI SONAVANE : My name was fifth in the list. But you have called the Member whose name was seventh in the list.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He will get his time later. I have to see that all States are represented and all sections are represented. If I were not to call senior Members, then it does not look proper.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : I was the first to have been called today. Why have I not been called ?

SHRI SONAVANE : Have we to catch your eye ? Or are you going by the list ? I suggest that you go by the list or call Members according to your discretion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am not bound to go by the list. I have to see that every section of opinion and region is represented. There is also some seniority to be taken into account. Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani is a senior Member of this House.
Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani.

(M.)

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : You go according to the list prepared by Birla.. (Interruptions).

श्री मु० अ० खां : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या सिर्फ सीनियर्स को ही चांस मिलेगा, बाकी को नहीं मिलेगा ? आप सिर्फ चन्द आदमियों को बुलाते हैं, बाकी को नेगलेक्ट करते हैं। यह कोई तरीका नहीं है कि आप सिर्फ सीनियर्स को बुलायेंगे और बाकी को चांस नहीं देंगे। क्या यही आपका फैसला है ? क्या हम लोग यहां केवल झगड़ मारने के लिये आये हैं ? हम भी उसी तरीके से चुने हुए हैं जिस तरीके से सीनियर्स चुने हुए हैं।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Randhir Singh, if you are casting any aspersion on the Chair, you will have to withdraw it. I am not influenced by Birla or anyone for that matter.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE (Kolaba) : On a point of order. This is a very serious situation. An hon. Member of the Congress Party, and a very responsible member at that, has cast aspersions on the Chair. I should really think that he should withdraw it before we can proceed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is for Members to uphold the dignity of the Chair. I entirely agree with the hon. Member, Shri Kunte. I have warned Shri Randhir Singh.

SHRI RABI RAY (Puri) : He must apologise.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If this method is followed, we cannot proceed at all. It is not a question of A or B sitting in the Chair ; it is a question of upholding the dignity of the Chair.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : I have got the utmost respect for you. But I must express my sentiment. My name was third on the list yesterday. I was the first today. Still I have not been called (Interruptions).

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : (Calcutta North East) : Can't you stop that nonsense ? what is that fellow doing there, the Minister ?

Can he not regulate these things on their side ?

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam) : These words that he has used that the list is prepared by Birlas must be withdrawn or expunged.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : Here we have the ruling Party. Here is a leader of that Party, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, sitting there. I expect that they should control their own Party. If they cannot control their party in the House, how can they control the country ? (*Interruptions*). This is not fair to the Congress Party, not fair to us, not fair to the country.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : There is no lack of control here in this Party. If the hon. Member, Shri Madhok, suggests that I should impose some control over this Party, he had better start with his own Party. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : Is this kind of nonsense to pass muster in this House ? I want your ruling. Here the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs cannot do something about it. He has not got the decency to apologise on behalf of his Party to the House. So many times the Leader of the Jan Sangh has apologised on behalf of members of his Party to the Chair. But here they have not got the gumption to do so, these egregious fools who know nothing about Parliament. (*Interruptions*).

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : Shri Mukerjee wants to teach sense to the House. He should go to China and learn sense. (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have already indicated....(*Interruptions*).

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : Mr. Mukerjee had been reprimanded by the whole House for his non-sensical behaviour.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : You should be sent out.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : On a point of order.....(*Interruptions*). Yesterday I

used certain expressions which were not at all unparliamentary but then I was hooted and heckled. . . (An Hon. Member: rightly) rightly or wrongly by the group and I withdrew them in all obedience to you and to this House.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : I have already withdrawn it. What is this ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : My point of order is whether the remarks of the Haryana acrobat or Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, Bhim club leader should remain on the record. He has said that my leader prof. Hire Mukerjee should go to China. These words should be expunged.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Randhir Singh had already withdrawn his remarks; this need not be pursued further..... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Dr. Ram Subhag Singh has accused my deputy leader Mr. Mukerjee who has never been accused of bad manners ; Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, in his wisdom which is always missing, said that he should go to China to learn better manners. Such remarks do not add to the dignity of the House and the Congressmen are today very angry because some members are attacking their leader in this House....(*Interruptions*.)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I request all sections of the House to co-operate with the Chair in conducting the proceedings with dignity and decorum. No harsh expressions need be used.

SHRI TULSHIDAS JADHAV rose—

15 Hrs.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Order, order. Mr. Jadhav, it is all over. Do not rake it up. If time permits, I am going to accommodate everyone, not otherwise.

SHRI A. SREEDHARAN (Badagara) : Sir, on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : What is the point of order ? There is nothing before the House on which you can raise a point of order.

SHRI A. SREEDHARAN : The point of order is this. Under rule 4 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : What is the number ?

SHRI A. SREEDHARAN : No. 4—F.O.U.R. It says :

“The members shall sit in such order as the Speaker may determine.”

Some Members on the Congress side are not sitting in their own seats. I submit, therefore, that they may be asked to go back to their seats.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I would request all the Members to occupy their seats.

श्री तुलशी दास जाधव (बारामती) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी आपसे और हाउस से
भी विनती है कि.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Jadhav, please resume your seat. If I permit you to raise any point of order, then 10 Members will rise from this side. It is not necessary now.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, may I just appeal to all the Members from the other side of the House to allow the proceedings of the House to go on in a normal and peaceful manner ?

SHRI SONAVANE : Sir, I rise on a point of order. I invite your attention to direction No. 115A of the Directions by the Speaker. This is in relation to the calling of Members to speak. There are three sub-clauses in this direction. The procedure has been set out here, indicating how they have to submit the names to you for being called. In sub-rule (2), it is stated as follows:

“Unless a member rises in his seat and catches the Speaker's eye, he shall not be called upon by the Speaker to speak, irrespective of whether he has sent his name through his party or group or written direct to the Speaker.”

This is what the rule says. Nobody catches your eye. You simply go on calling them. This is not the procedure to be followed. This is after all your own direction. (*Interruption*) One of these methods is to be followed; by a Member catching the eye of the Speaker or by rising in his seat. Only then you can call the Member. Or, you can go by your list. But what you follow is not according to the rules.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This is a serious matter. You have not read the last portion. For the benefit of the House, I shall read the last portion. It is clearly stated there.

“The Speaker shall not be bound by the lists or order in which names have been given by parties or groups or individuals directly....”

Shall I read the whole thing ?

SHRI SONAVANE : What about sub-rule (2) ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please resume your seat.

SHRI SONAVANE : I rely on that rule.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If you are going to raise this in this manner I do not think there is any substance in your point of order. Please resume your seat. You are losing your chance.

Regarding calling of names of persons, as I have already said, this House is representing the whole country, all the regions, and all sections of opinion are there, and it is my responsibility, for a fair debate, to see that all sections are properly represented.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, since yesterday this very important discussion on the Hazari report is going on more or less in a manner as if it is a pro-Birla or anti-Birla discussion. Sir, this is a unique report of its kind because for the first time since we became independent, an assessment of the working of the industrial policy has been attempted. The objective of our policy was to foster industrial growth, which is most important for this country, which has been

suffering from abject poverty and lack of development. Therefore, it would have been proper for us to discuss it with greater dispassion and with a proper perspective.

Let us see why was it at all necessary to appoint this committee. For the last 20 years, we have been trying to accentuate our industrial growth by all possible means through the public sector, private sector and cooperative sector. Each of these sectors has a place in our economy. Each sector is not in exclusion or in suppression of the other sectors, but each is supplementing the other sectors. That is why we say ours is a "mixed economy." We have also said that small industry will have a place in our industrial growth, because we consider it is a labour-intensive, involves less capital yields, quicker return and regional dispersal also is easier. We want a very fast rate of growth and our resources are very limited. To achieve all these things within a measurable time, it is necessary that we have a definite and clear industrial policy. It is also necessary to regulate, control and channelise our limited resources, financial, material and otherwise.

Briefly, the objectives of the industrial policy which we have adopted are to regulate industrial development, to channelise resources according to the planned targets, to check, prevent or avoid growth of monopolies and concentration of wealth, to protect small industries from competition from big industries, to encourage new entrepreneurs, to have regional distribution to give technological help and advice and also to help entrepreneurs adopt modern economic processes, etc. To achieve these objectives, our main instrument is the Industrial Licensing Act of 1951. From 1951, this policy was being followed and regulation was ought to be made under this Act. It is therefore, very surprising that though we have had a planned economy for 16 years, till 1966 nobody thought that a review was necessary. I should think that planning implies time to time, periodical reviews, assessment and re-assessment, because unless there is a review they cannot know where they are lagging behind and rectify the mistakes. Planners have not merely to fix targets. They should also know where

we have lagged behind the targets. Unless they know where we have lagged behind the targets, how are they to make perspective planning? Perspective planning requires all these things. Therefore, to that extent, our working was very defective. In 1966 we found that the industrial growth has come about in an unregulated way; growth we were certainly having, but pattern of growth was distortions from our objective. Seeing all this, Shri Barve, who was a member of the Planning Commission at that time, thought that it was time to have a review and Shri Hazari was appointed an honorary consultant and was asked to review the licensing policy. I am going into it in a little detail and I hope you understand why I am doing it. His terms of reference were "review the operation of licensing during the first and second Plan, particularly during the last six or seven years, also including orderly phasing of licences with reference to capacity and targets." Secondly, he was to suggest any modifications in the policy or execution.

It was a very big task; it was not a small task. He had to make a review of the development for the last 16 years which, in spite of planning, in spite of direction, has taken place in a rather chaotic manner. I do not know what facilities were given to him. As far as I know, the facilities given to him were very limited. He was assisted by his own research students. He was asked to submit his report within six months. The work that has been done by this gentleman, I should consider, is rather stupendous good work. His documentation is good. The kind of criticism that was levelled against Dr. Hazari by Shri Amin, I think was most uncharitable and uncalled for. He said that it was a "conspiracy" that the report was made, "not out of consideration for proper economic development but with some ulterior motive." What is the ulterior motive? He is a professor, an academician. He was asked to go into the question of industrial licensing. He had limited resources and he was given a limited time. He has tried to make as good a job out of it as he could. Yet, the man himself is more than modest. What does he say? He is an honest scientific thinker. He has stated that the resources at his disposal were not

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

full. He has himself stated that he had seen only files of the Licensing Committee, Capital Goods Committee and some inter-Government correspondence. So, it was not possible for him to go into the whole matter in a comprehensive way. He says so. He says: "my data is limited." His assessment has suffered from the limitation of data and he has stated it not once but again and again. Therefore, it is quite possible that when a comprehensive survey has not been made, when recommendations have been made or conclusions arrived at from partial information, there is a possibility of a percentage of error. He himself admits it. But, at the same time, on that account alone, the report cannot also be brushed aside, as some of the Members seem to have done. The report gives us very valuable information.

He has analysed the defects in planning and also in execution. He has gone into the functioning of the DGTD, he has gone into the functioning of the other agencies; he has pointed out the defects at the governmental and also the entrepreneurial level; he has also directed our attention to the fact that the development has not following the objectives we are seeking, that it is being diverted. He has made very many valuable recommendations. Maybe, in some of the recommendations he may have gone slightly beyond what he was expected to do. But, if he has done so, he has done it with the object of the betterment of the country. His object is that the industrial development should be on proper lines and if it is going off the rails, these are the ways in which it can be pulled back.

What are the implications of a comprehensive survey, that also I want to place before the House. How is a licence granted? What is the procedure? The licence is not granted by one complex of institutions. It has to pass through a whole complex of institutions. When an application is made to the Ministry, eight copies of that application are made and these 8 copies go to 8 agencies including the Planning Commission, State Governments, Ministry of Economic Affairs, DGTD, Transport etc. Then it goes to the Licensing Committee, where it is sifted. After sifting, the Licensing Committee merely issues a Letter of Intent. The Letter of Intent merely

says: we think that you are qualified for a licence; but go and get the other necessities for your licence so that we can see whether you are capable of doing so. So, he has to create suitable conditions for getting a licence.

When he gets a Letter of Intent, he has to get the okay from the Capital Goods Committee, the Foreign Agreements Committee, the Project Report from DGTD, finance accommodation from the bank and also what are known as "Effective steps" which are very voluminous. I need not go into them.

After doing all this, he again goes to the Licensing Committee. Then the licence is issued. The matter does not end there. After the licence has been issued the Reviewing Agency, depending upon the industry concerned, may be, the Controller of Textiles, the Commissioner of Iron and Steel or some other authority, has to nurse and look after the licence; it has to watch the licence to see that the licensee is taking adequate steps. If the licensee does not take the steps, they have to revoke the licence.

So, the licensee is not such a free agent that he can just function in any way. The whole thing has been organised with checks and balances. Therefore, a proper assessment means that we must look into the working of these organizations and institutions and after scrutinising the entire process we have to say where the blame lies and for what reasons the licence has not been executed.

I want to ask a question from the Ministry concerned. In 20 years why did they not think it necessary to have a comprehensive survey? We are spending crores of rupees. We are a backward country and we are trying to develop at a fast pace. We want to go far. But from time to time we have to check and see where we are going and what we should do in order to go on the correct road. Why was this not done for two decades?

Now what does the report reveal? The report has revealed that in spite of planning, in spite of control and regulation, in spite of all this the picture is chaotic. Industrial growth has taken place but our objective has not been fulfilled. I cannot

go into all the details but I shall just touch upon a few points. First of all, take some of the failure of planning to which he has drawn our attention. He has said that "planning has failed to set up list of priority industries which should receive preferential priority for foreign exchange and scarce goods." He has also said that "it has failed to synchronise or adjust the pace of licensing and revocation to actual trend in capacity and output in relation to emerging demand." Then he has said that "planning did not take proper notice of effect of lags in fulfilment" and so on and so forth; that planning did not indicate proper guidelines; that no indication of precise areas whether industry has to be encouraged was given; that there was no "well-ordered" priorities and flexibility in inter-related programmes; that licensing covered too wide an area. Here he describes that thousands of licences have been given and they have accumulated and that it is impossible for an administrative department to look into this mess of licences.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Very lucrative also not to look into.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : Planning involves calculation of many factors but it is very difficult to assess correct capacity. Suppose, a capacity is calculated as the production of 10,000 cycles in a particular factory. Does that mean that this capacity is 10,000 for one shift, for two shifts or for three shifts? There are so many lacunae. As early as 1958 a note on Capacity Concept was prepared by the Planning Commission. I would like to know what has happened to that note? I think, the note is slumbering in one of the pigeonholes of the Planning Commission since 1958. A most important factor is assessment of the capacity. We do not even know the quantum of capacity required or available. If we do not know the volume of the capacity, how are we going to make plans and then execute them?

As I mentioned before, perspective planning is necessary and perspective planning has to take account of the shortfalls and lags. Unless it is taken care of and unless it is treated in the strategy of the Plan itself

the Plan gets distorted; planning gets out of focus. Therefore the conclusion is :

"Licenses have not performed their functions of regulation and control and for the licensee it was merely a formal passport."

These are his words. The licensee had to get help from the Government. That the licensee did not get because hundreds of licences were issued. It was a passport with which people were roaming about. He goes on to say :

"The deficiencies are fundamental and they indicate the need for better and more effective planning by Government and the entrepreneurs and recasting scope and working of the licensing mechanism."

Then DGTD's functioning also is very defective. The DGTD has functioned, as he describes, for "scrutinising amorphous proposals."

The DGTD should have been more effective. It should guide; it should give technical advice to regulate the things.

The other objective before us is the avoidance of concentration of wealth and monopoly. That has not been fulfilled. The Report is an eloquent testimony to that.

Another objective was to develop small-scale industries. The other objective was that new entrepreneurs should get the help. That has not taken place because whenever a new entrepreneur comes, the main consideration has been of finance and when the main consideration is of finance, naturally, the big houses who have financial backing and experience, will come in. Then, to pick out a particular industry and to blame it is not fair and proper.

As far as fore closing is concerned, we have to see whether the licensee took a licence with the object of foreclosing, or after he took a licence he could not implement it, at what stage and how he could not implement it. That can only be cleared through the kind of survey; I have mentioned. What he has, in few words, tried to do is to focus the dangerous tendencies in which we are moving. In all fairness, the interpretation that we have tried to lend to his statement is not there. He has himself

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

said, "I have based my conclusions on limited information." Therefore, there may be a certain amount of defects.

What are we supposed to do at this stage ? At this stage, we have to take the industrial situation of the country and decide our course. We are suffering from recession ; we are suffering from unemployment ; we are suffering from lack of purchasing power ; we are suffering from all the ills that the industry can suffer. At this stage, we have to think how we have to develop the country. We must develop our public sector as well as the private sector. We cannot move by raising only slogans. The Government thought that it was necessary to have a more comprehensive survey and so the Thacker Committee was appointed.

I just want to say about the Thacker Committee. That was appointed on the 22nd July with the stupendous task of seeing whether the big houses have got all these monopolies, etc. How has the Thacker Committee been treated by the Government ? They have no office to work ; their budget was sanctioned on the 22nd December ; their staff is not yet in position and they are asked to give the Report of a comprehensive nature within six months which are nearly over. What about their letters ? For two months, the Chairman of the Commission has not got a reply to his letter addressed to the Minister. The Minister may have good intentions. But the Department may be out of his control. He may be riding a horse which is so powerful that though he has the reins in his hands, he does not know where the horse is going. I would like to tell the Minister that this kind of laconic way of dealing with this will not do. One has to be more serious with it. Now, we have invited the whole world, spending crores of rupees for the UNCTAD here. Instead of that, we would have done better if we had seen to the proper implementation of the Industrial Policy Resolution, proper regulation of the controls and better fulfilment of the objectives.

What I want to say is that there is no point in blaming this man or that man, in indulging in witch-hunting, by the private sector against the public sector or by the public sector against the private sector. That will not do. It is time we thought

of getting together and putting our heads together to work for the betterment of the country.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : Sir, I did not want to interrupt the lady hon. Member ; I did not want to break the thread of her argument. But the argument comes to this that the Planning Commission is wrong, the Government is wrong, everything is wrong in this wretched land.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : May I say...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No, no. That is all. If I allow, there will be no end to it. Shri Bal Raj Madhok.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have read the Report of Dr. Hazari with the care it deserves and I have also listened with patience to the fire-works that the comments of the hon. lady Member on it caused in this honourable House. One thing which becomes clear immediately once you go through the Report is that Dr. Hazari allowed the political and ideological considerations to take the better of him as an academician.

If he had not gone beyond the terms of reference, it would have been alright. The terms of reference were very clearly given by him in his own Report. They were :

- “(i) To review the operation of licensing under the Industries Act broadly over the last two Plan periods and more closely over the last six-seven years, including the orderly phasing of licensing with reference to targets of capacity.
- (ii) To consider and suggest in the light of the present stage of economic development where and in what direction modifications may be made in the licensing policy.”

This was the task entrusted to him and this was, in itself, quite a big task, and if he had applied his mind to it—he did apply his mind to some extent and some of the suggestions that he has made are really thought-provoking and they should be

looked into—it would have been useful. But he has brought in so many extraneous things in his Report which has made it a subject of controversy not only in the country but in the Congress Party itself because the Congress Party, as everybody knows, is as much divided into camps as the Opposition is, and their division has become very clear from how people have reacted to this Report.

15.27 Hrs.

[SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARYA *in the Chair.*]

Now the wider question is how is the industrial policy of this country to grow and how we are going to increase production. Before the British left, there was very little industry in this country and that was in private hands ; mainly in the hands of two or three business houses which had taken the initiative in those matters. When the British left, we naturally wanted that we should develop our economy, develop our industry, at a very fast pace. For that purpose, the Government of India passed some Resolutions, passed the Industries Development Act also, in which it was clearly laid down that we were going to have a mixed economy, *i.e.*, that the private enterprise will be allowed to proceed but the State also will come in. In a developing economy, that is quite natural and necessary too. There are certain fields in which private capital and private enterprise is not available and so, the state should come in. That was in the beginning. But in course of time, as the late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, began to get infatuated with the so-called socialism, then the balance that had been properly struck began to be given up and more and more stress began to be laid on the public sector, and for that purpose, attempts were made to drive out the private enterprise from the field for that purpose, a number of administrative methods were adopted and one of them was this licensing. As things have moved, the public sector is growing very fast, and of the total public investment available in this country, about 60 per cent is going to the public sector, and out of the 40 per cent that is left, about 20 to 25 per cent goes to agriculture and small industries and only 15 to 20 per cent is left for the medium scale industry which is run by the so-called business houses and other industrialists.

In this matter too, the thing which is really important is whether these private entrepreneurs and private industrialists and the public sector industries can work together or not. Actually we have so much leeway to make, that there is enough scope for both the public sector and the private sector and they should co-operate to develop the country. But instead of collaborating and co-operating, they are trying to pull each other's legs. Since the public sector has the advantage of being the State sector, being the pet-wife, the private sector is being victimised in every possible way and things are being done or said which, I do not think, are fair to anybody. There are defects and those defects should be removed. But one thing, we must remember, and that is that these two have to go together. Ours is a democracy and democracy based on free thinking. Where there is no free thinking, there can be no free expression, there can be no free association. Therefore, we must have free thinking. There can be no free thinking without free living. If I am dependent for my living on somebody else, then I cannot have free thinking; if anyone is living in such a way that he is in the hands of the State or somebody else, then he cannot think freely. Therefore, a free economy is a necessary concomitant of democracy.

Some people talk very glibly about democratic socialism. I wonder what they mean by this term. If they mean social justice by this term, just as there is in Western Europe, I have no quarrel with it, and I stand for it. But if they think, as my hon. friends from the Communist Party think, that socialism is what prevails in China or in Russia, then I would say that democracy and socialism are incompatible ; they cannot go together. I can understand their anxiety that private sector and private enterprise should be completely ruled out and everything should come under State control because they want that everything should be under State control and the State should be run by a party and that will be the only party and no other party will be allowed to exist. Actually, when everybody is under State control, there will be no scope for any other party. That is why there is no opposition party in Russia or in China ; or other communist countries. There can be only one party in such countries. I can

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

understand their thinking that way. But I ask those who do believe in democracy how they reconcile democracy on the one side with socialism on the other. The two are irreconcilable. I agree that in a developing economy, you cannot rule out the State coming in *laissez-faire* is an outmoded thing; it cannot come back. But the State must come in only when it must and where private enterprise is not available and when it comes it must come as a competitor and not as a monopolist. Monopoly is bad. Tatas' monopoly is bad. Birlas' monopoly is bad. But State monopoly is worse. Wherever there is concentration of economic power it is bad. But when there is concentration of economic and political power in the same hands, then it becomes the greatest monster. We know what is happening in China and Russia. Therefore, we must prevent political and economic power getting concentrated in the hands of the State. I am opposed to political and economic power getting concentrated in the hands of some individuals. But if the nations vigilant, if we are really a democracy then we can check it. But if the State gets all the power, who is going to check the State because the State will finish everybody?

So, the basic question is whether we are going to remain a democracy or whether we are going to deteriorate into a dictatorship of one party which controls all the means of production and distribution. We are not going to allow the latter. I think the Congress Party also understands this thing barring a few fellow-travellers who are there in that party.

If we have to reserve a big section or a big part of industry for the public sector, then it means that a small part remains with private industry or private enterprise. This has been given effect to through the system of licensing. Naturally, some established houses, some who had technical know-how and managerial skill with them and who hands money with them had a superiority over the others. I do agree with my hon. friends that they might have abused their position also. In this country, as things are, a man with a long purse and a man with a long pull has an advantage over others, and naturally, the big business-houses which have a long purse and a long pull have some advantages over others.

But for that the Government are more to blame. It is the system that we have established and it is the bureaucracy that we have established and it is the system of licensing that we have established that have helped such people with big purses or as could afford to corrupt the officials. Therefore, if the blame has to be put anywhere, it has to be put on Government. It was the Government which gave the licences and which had the control over the system. Why had they not simplified the process? Why did they not see that the process had helped some and put a premium on corruption and put some people to a disadvantage? Therefore, if anybody is to be charged, then it is the Government which has to be charged.

An attack has been made on certain business-houses. I do not hold brief for anybody. But one thing is clear that it is these business-houses which have put India on the industrial map of the world. Think of this country what it was when the British left. It was the Tatas and it was the Birlas and it was some other industrialists who had done yeoman service. Even now they are doing it, with technological advance, there is a need for bigger industries, and there is a need for bigger concerns which can spend money on research and technical know-how and which can compete with the latest technical developments in other parts of the world. We are not living in isolation. Therefore, we cannot completely do away with large concerns. When we admit the need of large concerns, then certainly some business-houses or some business concerns have to be large. But they are not large compared to the business-houses that are there in other parts of the world. The other day I had read in the papers that the two big electrical concerns, namely the GEC and AEI had combined together even though each one of them was a very big concern by itself, because they felt that if they could come together, their cost of production would become less, and their sales organisation would become better and they could spend more on improvement.

When you condemn these big houses, I would ask you to remember one thing. You say they are corrupt. I agree they may be corrupt. You say agencies have been given to relatives. May be correct. You say that they are making use of their money

to get licences. May be true. But after spending all this money, are they not showing some profits? They are not becoming a burden on the public exchequer. On the other hand, what is happening to our public sector concerns? We have invested so much money in these undertakings. But their cost of production is not cheaper, rather it is more costly. Every year we, the tax-payers, have to pay for their losses. The Finance Minister in his budget speech told us the other day that the public sector plants have incurred a loss of Rs. 41 crores in one year.

Compare these two things. May be the private sector people are bad. Even though they are bad, they are developing the country. At the same time, they are not putting any unnecessary burden on the taxpayer while in the public sector, due to their corruption, inefficiency and high cost of production, the whole burden has to be borne by the people, the tax-payers.

Therefore, in this matter, we have to take a balanced view. What is that view? I think in this respect, Dr. Hazari has some good suggestions. He has suggested that we must reserve some sector for small industries. He has suggested that small entrepreneurs who want to start a small industry in some town or provincial capital should not be forced to come to the Centre and run from pillar to post for getting foreign exchange. The foreign exchange needed by them should be given to them on the spot by the Director of Industries. This is a good suggestion.

Our experience, however, is that wherever you put authority in one man, there is chance of corruption. So instead of giving that power solely to the Director of Industries, there should be a committee which should include some industrialists, some economists and some officials. They should disburse the foreign exchange, according to the needs of each individual case.

In this matter, we have to reserve a definite field of production for small industry. If in the same field there is a small man and a big industrialist, the latter will drive the former out of the field. It is not a question of production alone. What we need is more employment also. This aspect cannot be overlooked. Therefore, while we have to

produce more, we have to do it in such a way that more hands are needed and more hands are put to produce it. This employment aspect is very very important.

Hence we must reserve a section for them. For example, we did something in this direction by saying that *dhoties* should be produced only in the handloom sector. But even there, the mills have come in. Such production should be reserved for small sector, for which licensing is not needed and foreign exchange also is not much needed. These industries should grow in small towns and rural areas so that the employment potential may also grow there.

The second suggestion he has made—again a good one—is that the big industrial houses should not be given licences for the traditional type of industries; they should use their technical know-how and resources for developing new lines. There is a lot of scope for them. Why should Tatas and Birlas be allowed to open soap or textile factories? Let the smaller people do it. Let the big houses use their know-how and resources for tapping new lines for which we still depend on imports from abroad.

Thirdly, Dr. Hazari has suggested that in the matter of imports, we should be liberal, that those things which are most costly to produce here should be imported. For example, if we could get an item for one dollar from abroad whereas to produce it here costs 2 dollars or more it is better we import that item, because we need not make the common man suffer for our inefficiency or failure to run industry in the proper way at the right time. Therefore, for items in which indigenous cost of production is much more, we should be liberal in the matter of imports.

Fourthly, he has said that the limit for getting licence should be raised. Licences may not be needed for industries requiring capital of a crore or less. Again, for industries which need no foreign exchange, there need be no licence. We may lay down priorities and capacities and within these priorities, if anybody wants to set up an industry, he should be allowed. Instead of discouraging them, we should encourage them. If foreign exchange which is scarce, is involved, if considerations of

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

national security are involved, these matters can be properly regulated.

A suggestion has been made that banks should be nationalised. Apart from the merits and demerits of that suggestion, you say that you stand for mixed economy ; so, some industries will be in the public sector and some in the private sector. How on earth can you take away the means of investment from the hands of private sector ? This cannot happen. Those who say that they want nationalisation of banks are those who want a totalitarian regime and complete state control of all economic activity. Most Congressmen do not want it because that cuts at the root of democracy. By making this suggestion Dr. Hazari has not only transgressed his terms of reference ; he has shown his ideological predilections which make him suspect. He should not have done so. Had he confined himself to the terms of reference, there would not be any grouse against him.

Then, what is our experience of nationalisation of other industries ? Take insurance, for instance. There is more corruption, more inefficiency—all at the cost of the tax-payer. So far our industries and our economic activities have been controlled by two groups, the organised capital through its power of money and organised labour through its power of blackmail. Somebody controls the former ; and somebody else the latter. We represent neither of them but the common man, the consumer, who is the real sufferer. 95 per cent of the people are consumers. It is they who ultimately suffer. I say that the economic policy and the industrial policy of this country must neither be capital oriented nor labour oriented but above all consumer oriented ; it should look after the interests of consumers. The controversies about left and right and isms and other things are all irrelevant. Actually there should be one ism ; that is Indianism. We should look at these things from the Indian point of view. We must look into the conditions under which we are living and formulate our policies accordingly. Whether these policies affect adversely capitalism, communism or socialism—is irrelevant ; what is relevant is whether these policies serve our country. A national and rational approach is needed and ideological considerations and political consi-

derations should be kept in the background. We should not find scapegoats nor go witch-hunting. These industrial houses have done a great service to the country. If there is any corruption or weakness, remove them. They are mainly in the system in your bureaucracy. Simplify the licensing system and improve the administration and remove the defects. Finding scapegoats will serve nobody. I think this country and this House owe it to Birlas and Tatas for putting this country on the industrial map of the world. Today, while we are begging everywhere, we can also be proud that there are some countries which come to us, to Birlas and Tatas inviting them to come and open industries in their countries. That raises our prestige. Do not tar everybody with one brush. If there are mistakes and shortcomings and failures, remove them with a strong hand but do not indulge in witch-hunting. That is my request.

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : चेयरमैन महोदय, मैं हजारी रिपोर्ट को देश के लिए एक तारीखी और एक इन्कलाबी कदम समझता हूँ। यह रिपोर्ट इस देश के आर्थिक हालात पर, देश के एक्सिटादियात पर एक बाइबिल है। जैसे कि कार्ल मार्क्स ने कम्युनिस्ट मेनिफेस्टो लिखा था ऐसे ही इस प्रोफसर ने हिन्दुस्तान की एक्सिटादियात के लिए, इंडियन एकोनामिक मेनिफेस्टो लिखा है। अगर इस पर अमल नहीं किया जाएगा तो इन्कलाब आ जाएगा। क्यों आ जाएगा, उसको सुनते जाइए। इस देश में, शहर में और देहात में, किसान में और गैर-किसान में ऊंच नीच है। गवर्नमेन्ट उसकी जिम्मेदार है। यह सरकार रेजोल्यूशन बड़े-बड़े पास करती है, बड़े-बड़े इन्कलाबी कदम उठाने की बात करती है लेकिन उनको इम्प्लीमेन्ट नहीं करती। मैं कांग्रेसी होते हुए भी बड़े जोर से इस बात की निन्दा करता हूँ। कांग्रेस वकिंग कमेटी ने जो टेन प्वाइंट प्रोग्राम बनाया और पार्टी के एम० पी० ने जिसकी तरफ ध्यान दिलाया उसकी बहुत-सी बातें इस रिपोर्ट में दर्ज हैं। यही वजह है कि मुखालिफ तरफ के हमारे दोस्त इस किस्म की तोहमत हमारे ऊपर लगाते हैं।

अब भी अगर इस देश में सबसे ज्यादा कोई इन्कलाबी पार्टी है जो कि देश का भला चाहती है और जो देश में इन्कलाब लाएगी तो वह कांग्रेस ही है। चेयरमैन साहब, यह बात मैं इस वास्ते कहना चाहता हूँ कि कुछ हाथों में देश की माया, देश की दौलत सिमट कर रह गई है। बेचारे किसान तो बराबर मर रहे हैं, उनके ऊपर सीलिंग है, 30 ऐकड़ से ज्यादा जमीन रख नहीं सकते। लेकिन सरमा-एदार कितने शहर के शहर की जायदाद रख सकते हैं, ला-तादाद कारखाने रख सकते हैं, बैंक्स, इन्श्योरेन्स कम्पनीज़, सारी तिजारत रख सकते हैं, उनके ऊपर कोई सीलिंग नहीं। मैं इस तरफ तबज़ह दिलाता चाहता हूँ इस सरकार की भी और उस तरफ जो दुपली बजाते हैं, सोशलिज़्म की, उनकी भी। यह चीज़ ज्यादा देर बर्दाश्त नहीं की जा सकती। इस देश में गरीबी ज्यादा बढ़ती जा रही है, गरीब और गरीब बनते जा रहे हैं और अमीरों का यह हाल कि जो पहले लखपती थे वे करोड़पती हो गए, जो करोड़पती थे वे अरबपती हो गए और जो अरबपती थे वे खरबपती हो गए। लेकिन अब यह बात बर्दाश्त नहीं की जा सकती। आप बम्बई, कलकत्ता, मद्रास और दिल्ली को देखें तो यह अन्दाज़ा नहीं लगा सकते कि यह गरीब देश है। लेकिन इसके बरक्स आप देहात में एक गरीब हरिजन की झोपड़ी को देखें, उसके नंगे बदन और सड़ी हुई अंतड़ियों को देखें, जो वहां पर बीमारियां हैं उनको देखें, जो मिट्टी के घोघे वहां बने हुए हैं उनको देखें, जहां पर कोई सड़क नहीं, पानी नहीं, तालीम नहीं और आजकल की कोई तहजीब नहीं। यह जो हमारा देश है इसके लिए रुपए की जरूरत है। यह रुपया कहां से आएगा? इन लोगों की जेब से हमें रुपया निकालना है जो कि अरबों रुपया कमाते हैं और दुनिया भर की बदमाशियां करते हैं, कर्प्शन करते हैं।

मैं सरकार को विश्वास दिलाता हूँ कि अगर आप इस काम को नहीं करोगे तो यह चक्कर चल रहा है, कोई दूसरा करेगा। इस काम को

तो होना है। इस देश के मुट्ठी भर आदमियों के हाथ में दौलत नहीं रहेगी, उनकी इजारेदारी नहीं रहेगी, उनकी ठेकेदारी और मोनोपली नहीं रहेगी। अगर रहेगी तो यह देश गरीबों का है, वे इन्कलाब कर देंगे। इसलिए मैं जिम्मेदारी के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आपने किसान की जमीन की सीलिंग मुकर्रर की है तो आपको उन ठेकेदारों और मोनो-पोलिस्ट्स के लिए भी सीलिंग मुकर्रर करनी पड़ेगी जिनकी शहर में मिल्कियत है, जिनके पास अरबन प्रापर्टी है। आपको कारखानों की सीलिंग भी मुकर्रर करनी पड़ेगी, टाटा, बिरला और डालमिया की सीलिंग भी मुकर्रर करनी पड़ेगी। आपने बड़े बड़े रजवाड़ों को बेमुल्क का नवाब बना दिया, बड़ा अच्छा काम किया। बड़े-बड़े जमींदारों की जमीनें ले लीं वह बड़ा अच्छा काम किया लेकिन उनको लाख और दो-दो लाख रुपया जो उन्हें बतौर प्रिवी पर्स के मिलता है जो करोड़ों रुपया वह इस तरह कमाते हैं उस पर भी सरकार को सीलिंग करनी पड़ेगी। साथ-साथ यहां के बिज़नेसमैन, बाहर के बिज़नेसमैन और बड़े-बड़े शाही रजवाड़े मिल करके जो इस देश के 50 करोड़ गरीब देशवासियों को चंगुल में दबाये रखना चाहते हैं उसको और अब ज्यादा बर्दाश्त नहीं किया जायगा यह रिपोर्ट उनकी तरफ एक इशारा है। डा० हजारी ने बिलकुल साफ तरीके से सरकार के सामने उस तरफ बढ़ने का प्रोग्राम रक्खा है और हकीकत यह है कि करो या मरो वाली बात इस समय पैदा हो गयी है। अगर उस रिपोर्ट की सिफारिशों के ऊपर सरकार द्वारा अब भी अमल नहीं किया जाता है तो यह भारत देश अब ज्यादा असें तक जिंदा नहीं रह सकेगा। मैं जज़्बात में आकर ही यह नहीं कह रहा हूँ बल्कि हकीकत सरकार के सामने पेश कर रहा हूँ। आज अपने देहातों की और वहां के गरीब किसानों और हरिजनों की दयनीय अवस्था देख कर देश में एक टीस पैदा होती है। मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह देहात और गरीब देहाती लोग इस देश का हिस्सा और इसके

[श्री रणधीर सिंह]

वाशिंग्टन नहीं हैं जो उनके साथ इस तरह की उपेक्षा बर्ती जा रही है ?

एल० आई० सी० द्वारा वह 1000 करोड़ रुपया बड़े-बड़े शहरों, बम्बई, कलकत्ते आदि पर ही खर्च किया जा रहा है। यह 1000 करोड़ रुपया देहातों में गरीब किसानों और हरिजनों को आवास आदि सुविधाएं प्रदान करने के लिए क्यों नहीं खर्च किया जाता है ? करोड़ों देश-वासी बगैर मकान के हैं उनके लिए इस रुपये से सरकार मकान क्यों नहीं बनवाती है ? हमारे भूतपूर्व स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू स्लम्स को देख कर बहुत दुखित हुए थे और उन्होंने इस बात पर अपना शोध व दुःखद आश्चर्य प्रकट किया था कि आज के स्वतंत्र भारत में भी अभी तक उस तरह के स्लम्स विद्यमान हैं। आज भारत को स्वतंत्र हुए 20 साल से भी अधिक हो गये हैं लेकिन यह स्लम्स की समस्या हमारे बीच में मौजूद है। गरीब हरिजनों के वास्ते मकान नहीं हैं और उन्हें आज भी एक जगह से हटने पर कच्चे मकान दूसरी जगह पर बनाने को मजबूर होना पड़ता है। शहरों में लोगों को मकान बनाने के लिए एल० आई० सी० फंड द्वारा 80-80 हजार और 1-1 लाख रुपया दिया जाता है लेकिन देहातों में बसने वाले गरीब हरिजनों को 1000 रुपया भी नहीं दिया जाता है। मेरा कहना है कि यह नाइंसाफी ज्यादा दिनों तक बर्दाश्त नहीं की जा सकती है और मैं चाहूंगा कि एल० आई० सी० 1000 करोड़ रुपया देहातों में गरीब किसानों और हरिजनों के आवास आदि की व्यवस्था करने पर इस्तेमाल करे। सरकार को वह रुपया उनको ऊपर उठाने के लिए इस्तेमाल करना होगा। खाली बड़ी-बड़ी तकरीरें झाड़ने से ही काम चलने वाला नहीं है बल्कि सरकार को जितना भी सरमाया वह बैंकों आदि से जुटा सकती है, वह अरबों रुपया हिन्दुस्तान के देहातों और वहां के रहने वाले गरीब किसानों और हरिजनों की हालत बेहतर करने के लिए इस्तेमाल करना

होगा वरना यह देश ज्यादा असें तक भुखमरी की हालत में नहीं रहने वाला है और यहां जरूर तबदीली आकर रहेगी। सरकार को बैंकों को नेशनलाइज करना होगा। इसको वह ज्यादा दिन तक टाल नहीं सकती है। कोई ताकत इसे रोक नहीं सकती है इसलिए मैं चाहता हूं कि सरकार जल्द-से-जल्द बैंकों का नेशनलाइजेशन कर दे। यह एक इनकिलाबी कदम है जोकि आगे बढ़कर पीछे को नहीं हट सकता है। मैं तो तिजारत के बाबत भी कहना चाहता हूं कि हमें तिजारत को भी नेशनलाइज करना पड़ेगा। अगर हमने तिजारत को नेशनलाइज नहीं किया तो दूसरे भाई इस बात को करेंगे लेकिन यह बात होकर रहेगी।

मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि ऐसी बात नहीं है कि सारे-के-सारे महाराजा लोग खराब है। तवारीख इस बात की गवाह है कि महाराजाओं में भी अनेकों देशभक्त हुए हैं जोकि देश व कौम की खातिर फांसी पर लटके हैं। राजा महेन्द्र-प्रताप एक महाराजा थे लेकिन वह एक बहुत बड़े देशभक्त व शानदार व्यक्ति थे। इसी तरह बड़े-बड़े जो सरमायदार हैं उनमें भी कुछ अच्छे आदमी हैं। इसलिए इस तरह से अगर हमारे दोस्त ज़िद बांध कर बैठ जायें कि सारे महाराजा और सरमायदार सब के सब खराब हैं और देश के खिलाफ हैं तो वह एक गलत बात होगी और कम-से-कम मैं ऐसे आदमियों में अपने को शुमार नहीं करवाना चाहता। मैं उन आदमियों में से हूं जो कि बिड़ला की कदर करते हैं। मैं बिड़ला की कदर इसलिए करता हूं कि अगर वह 1000 रुपये कमाता है तो उसमें से वह 10-15 या 20 रुपये अच्छे व जनोपयोगी कामों के लिए भी खर्च करता है।

यह नहीं कि 10 रुपया उधर दिखाकर 90 रुपया अपनी जेब में डाल लिया और अपनी तोंद को मोटी करता रहे। बिड़ला ने व्यापार में काफ़ी पैसा कमाया है लेकिन उसने देश में जनता की भलाई के लिए भी अच्छे अच्छे काम किये हैं। हरियाणा में भी बिड़ला ने जनता की भलाई के कार्य किये हैं। पिलानी में

बिड़ला के काम को जाकर देखो तो आपकी आंखें खुल जायेंगी कि कैसा अच्छा काम वह वहां पर कर रहा है ? मैं कोई कम्युनिस्टों की तरह ढपली बजाने वाला तो हूं नहीं कि बस अपने आकाओं का ही पुराना राग बजाये जाऊं और जो सच्ची बात हो उसे न कहूं । मैं अपने दोस्तों को कहना चाहूंगा कि वह जाकर पिलानी बम्बई और कलकत्ते आदि शहरों में देखें कि बिड़ला ने जनता के लिए क्या क्या काम किये हुए हैं ? एक नहीं, सैकड़ों कार्य बिड़ला ने जनता के कल्याण के लिए करे हुए हैं और मैं उनकी दाद देता हूं लेकिन वक्त आ गया है जबकि बिड़ला खुद कहे कि वैलथ की सीलिंग मुकर्रर की जाये ।

देश ने सोशलज्म की ओर कदम बढ़ाया हुआ है और जो कदम एक मर्तबा आगे बढ़ चुका है, वह पीछे नहीं हट सकता है । अगर कांग्रेस उस मंजिल की तरफ देश को बढ़ा कर नहीं ले जायेगी तो दूसरी इनकिलाबी पार्टियां इस काम को करेंगी । यह काम हर सूरत में होकर रहेगा । यह जनसंघ और स्वतंत्र पार्टी जो कि उलटा नारा लगाती हैं वह इस बढ़ते हुए तूफान में बह जायेगी इस री में वह ठहर नहीं सकती । यह सोशलज्म का नारा इस देश के 50 करोड़ गरीब इंसानों का है और उसके आगे जो यह मुट्ठी भर सरमायेदारों के जो इजारेदार बनते हैं, उनके जो हरावल दस्ते बनते हैं वह उसका क्या मुकाबला कर पायेंगे ?

मैं कहना तो और बहुत कुछ चाहता था लेकिन चूँकि घंटी बज चुकी है इसलिए अपनी बात को मैं खत्म करूंगा । इस रिपोर्ट में जो-जो बात कही गई है सब सही बात उन्होंने कही है । देश के हित में, काम के हित में और 50 करोड़ इंसान जो यहां पर बसते हैं उनके हित में यह बात है कि इस रिपोर्ट पर जल्द से जल्द अमल किया जाय । हुक्मत हमेशा इस तरह की रिपोर्टों पर जब अमल करने का सबाल आता है तो हां तो वह कह देती है लेकिन दरअसल वह उन पर अमल नहीं करती लेकिन

मेरा कहना है कि अब उसकी यह झूठी हां काम नहीं देगी । हां, अगर सरकार करती है तो उसे अमल में भी लाना होगा । दो रिपोर्टें, इस हजारी रिपोर्ट से पहले भी आ गयी हैं और यह अब तीसरी रिपोर्ट आ गयी है और मुझे शक होता है कि पहले की तरह सरकार इस पर भी अमल नहीं करेगी । मैं पूरे जोर के साथ यह बात कहना चाहता हूं कि सरकार वैसी चीज न करे या तो वह कमिशन और इस तरह की इनक्वायरी बैठाया न करे और अगर बैठाये तो फिर जो उनकी रिपोर्ट्स हों उन पर वह अमल भी किया करे । सरकार ऐसा न करे जैसा कि उसने कच्छ के बारे में तो जो कमिशन ने फैसला किया है उसको तो वह मान रही है लेकिन बाकी और जितने कमिशन हैं उनकी रिपोर्ट्स पर वह अमल नहीं करती है । सरकार को यह नहीं देखना चाहिए कि जनसंघ वाले उसके बारे में क्या कहते हैं, स्वतंत्र पार्टी वाले क्या कहते हैं या यूनाइटेड पार्टी क्या कहती हैं उसको तो देश की भलाई को ध्यान में रख कर ताकि इस देश के करोड़ों गरीब किसानों, मजदूरों का भला हो इस रिपोर्ट पर सरकार अमल करे ताकि हमारा देश खुश-हाल हो और हमें दूसरे मुल्कों के सामने जाकर हाथ जोड़ना न पड़े और दुनिया में हमारा देश एक ताकतवर, खुशहाल और समृद्धिशाली देश बने । मैं आप का बड़ा मशकूर हूं कि आपने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया ।

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : Mr. Chairman, before you call the next Member to speak, I have to correct what was stated by a Communist Member. I had stated yesterday that the AICC did not receive any money from any capitalist. He has stated that Luis Fisher has written that Gandhiji told him that he received money from the capitalists. I myself stated that Gandhiji received money from the capitalists ; but not one single copper of that was given to the AICC funds. He received money for the philanthropic work that he was doing. For him all the work that he did was political work ; whether it was the uplift of the harijans, or it was

[Shri J.B. Kripalani]

Hindi prachar, or Hindu-Muslim unity or charka, they were all, in his eyes, political work. So, I think my hon. Communist friend, Shri Umanath—he is neither Uma nor Nath—he cannot contradict me in what I have said.

SHRI S. KUNDU : Your facts are all right. But that is only for the period when you were the Secretary.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : I was Secretary of the Congress Party for 12 years before independence. The Congress has become worse ; that may be a common point between you and me, but I am saying that in purely political work the AICC did not receive any money from any capitalist.

SHRI S. KUNDU : That was during the period you were there.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I think Shri Kripalani has made his position clear. I hope that has served his purpose.

SHRI S. KUNDU : There is no doubt about the national standing of Shri Kripalani. We all know his national position.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : I am not talking of my national position. I am talking of the All India Congress Committee and I can say that Gandhiji, from the funds that he received from the capitalists, did not contribute one paisa to the AICC. I tell you how this impression has got about. This was the cry raised by the British and it was taken up by the capitalists themselves that they helped the Congress. The Congress funds came from the middle class and from the fees that we got ; it did not come from any capitalists.

16 Hrs.

SHRI S. KUNDU : Your Congress.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : What do you mean by "Your Congress ?" I am talking of the Congress before independence ; I am not talking of the Congress after independence.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Acharayaji has finished his statement. That is enough. Shri Amrit Nahata.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : सभापति महोदय, आपका यह नियम है कि एक सदस्य इधर से बुलाया जाता है और एक उधर से। उधर से दो कैसे बुलाये जा रहे हैं। एक इधर से होना चाहिये और एक उधर से।

MR. CHAIRMAN : That much of discretion the Chair has with it. Since the time is allotted there will be no harm in that. Shri Nahata.

श्री अमृत नाहाटा (बाड़मेर) : सभापति महोदय, इस सदन में इस बहस के दौरान यह कहा गया कि हजारी साहब किसी व्यक्तिगत वैर-भाव के कारण यह रिपोर्ट लिख गये। मेरी यह मान्यता है कि हजारी कोई बहुत ही क्रान्तिकारी विचारों के आदमी नहीं हैं। वह एक बहुत ही आर्थोडाक्स किस्म के अर्थशास्त्री हैं और एक अकेडेमीशियन के नाते उन्होंने हमारे देश की लाइसेंसिंग प्रथा का अध्ययन कर के रिपोर्ट पेश की है। यहां उनके कुछ सुझाव ऐसे हैं जिनसे मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ, फिर भी मैं मानता हूँ कि एक ऐसे अर्थशास्त्री ने जो कि हिन्दुस्तान के प्राइवेट कारपोरेट सेक्टर के अध्ययन में दिलचस्पी रखता है, जिसने एक पुस्तक लिखी है, जिसको कई माननीय सदस्यों ने पढ़ा होगा और जो कि बहुत ही अर्थपूर्ण ग्रन्थ है, हमारे देश की लाइसेंसिंग प्रथा का अध्ययन किया है। उस अध्ययन में उन्होंने मंजूर किया है कि वह जो कुछ कह रहे हैं उसके लिये उनके पास पूरे आंकड़े नहीं थे, पूरे तथ्य उनके पास उपलब्ध नहीं थे, लेकिन जो सीमित तथ्य उन्होंने दिये हैं उनको चुनौती देने का कोई आधार हमें नजर नहीं आता। मैं यह निश्चित मानता हूँ कि बिड़ला बन्धुओं के पास जितने साधन हैं उनके द्वारा यदि कोई तथ्य उनमें से गलत होते तो उन्होंने उनका खण्डन कर दिया होता। उन्होंने आज तक किसी फँक्ट का खण्डन नहीं किया, अतः यह सिद्ध है कि जो फँक्ट हजारी ने पेश किये हैं, भले ही वह सीमित हों, अधूरे हों, अपूर्ण हों, लेकिन जो

फैक्ट्स दिये गये हैं वह फर्म हैं, निश्चित हैं और उनको हमें मान कर ही चलना होगा।

हजारी साहब ने कोई बिड़ला बन्धुओं का अध्ययन नहीं किया, उन्होंने अध्ययन किया हमारी लाइसेंसिंग प्रथा का, लेकिन उन्होंने मिसाल के तौर पर बतलाया है कि इस प्रथा में कहां पर गड़बड़ है, कहां अव्यवस्था है, कहां गलती है, जिसकी वजह से जो बिड़ला बिग हाउसेज हैं उनको इतने लाइसेंसेज मिले। बिड़ला की कुल 938 ऐप्लिकेशन्स लाइसेंसेज के लिये थीं, जिनमें से 228 नये ऑटिकल्स के लिये थीं, 267 एग्जिस्टिंग इंडस्ट्रीज के एक्स्पेंशन के लिये थीं और 443 न्यू अन्डरटेकिंग्स के लिये थीं। यह भी हजारी ने बतलाया है कि बहुत-से लाइसेंसेज के लिये दो-दो, तीन-तीन ऐप्लिकेशन्स थीं। उनके कई अच्छे दफ्तर चलते हैं उनके यहां लियाजा के लिये बहुत-से लोग होते हैं और उन्होंने एक-एक लाइसेंस के लिये दो-दो, तीन-तीन ऐप्लिकेशन्स दी हैं। अगर हम यह मान कर चलें कि एक लाइसेंस के लिये औसतन दो अर्जियां थीं और उन्होंने कुल साढ़े नौ नौ अर्जियां दीं तो इसका अर्थ यह होता है कि उन्होंने करीब 400 लाइसेंसज के लिये अर्जियां दीं और उन्हें लाइसेंस मिले 375। अर्थात् यह नतीजा निकाला जा सकता है कि बिड़ला बन्धुओं ने जितने लाइसेंसेज मांगे उनको करीब-करीब शत प्रतिशत लाइसेंस मिले। यह तथ्य हजारी रिपोर्ट से स्पष्ट होता है।

कहा गया है कि उन्होंने देश का औद्योगिक विकास किया है और इसके लिये उनको श्रेय दिया जाना चाहिये, जब कि हकीकत यह है, और हजारी खुद कहते हैं, कि 400 लाइसेंस लेने के बाद आधे लाइसेंसेज पर, यानी 200 लाइसेंसेज पर, वह बैठ गये। उनको उन्होंने कभी इम्प्लमेंट नहीं किया। उन्हें इसमें दिलचस्पी नहीं थी कि वह देश का औद्योगिक विकास करें, उनकी दिलचस्पी इस बात में थी कि कोई दूसरा लाइसेंस न ले ले। भविष्य में, कोई

दूसरा छोटा उद्योगपति या सहकारी संस्था या नया इंजीनियर उस क्षेत्र में आ जाए उसको प्रि-एम्ट करने के लिये, मार्केट को फ़ोरक्लोज करने के लिये...

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : Who granted those licences and why did they do it ?

श्री अमृत नाहाटा : क्यों दिये, किसने दिये, वह भी मैं निवेदन करता हूं। एक प्रश्न उठाया गया है कि इसमें दोष किसका है। मैं इस समस्या पर नहीं जाऊंगा और न हजारी गये हैं। लेकिन एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूं। मेरा एक भाई है : वह बहुत बड़ा चीट है। उसने मेरे मामा के ड्राफ्ट से 30 हजार रुपया उड़ा कर झूठा खाता खोला और बम्बई भाग गया। हमको जब मालूम पड़ा तो हम बम्बई गये और उसको पकड़ा। आप सुन कर हैरान होंगे कि उसने कहा कि आप मुझे क्यों पकड़ते हैं, मेरा तो यह धन्धा ही है। आप मामा से कहिये कि सावधान रहे। यह उनकी बेवकूफी है कि पोस्टमैन कब ड्राफ्ट लेकर आता है इसका उनको पता नहीं है। इस तरह से अगर यहां यह दलील दी जाये कि झूठे लाइसेंस में किस तरह की तिकड़म रहती है और लाइसेंस की मोनोपोली हिन्दुस्तान में कायम करना उनका काम है, इसलिये उनसे कुछ मत कहो, तो इससे मैं सहमत नहीं हूं। मैं यह मानता हूं कि हमारी लाइसेंस प्रथा में खामियां हैं, मैं यह मानता हूं कि यहां गलत ढंग से लाइसेंस दिये गये हैं, और उसके कारणों का मैं बाद में जिक्र करूंगा, लेकिन अगर हम इसको मान लें कि इस देश के अन्दर कुछ इजारेदार देश की सम्पत्ति को हड़पना चाहते हैं, देश के लोगों ने मेहनत मजदूरी कर के जो राष्ट्रीय सम्पत्ति पैदा की है उसको कुछ मूट्ठी भर लोग हड़पना चाहते हैं, जो हड़प रहे हैं, इस लिये उनको बख्श दिया जाये, उनको क्षमा कर दिया जाये, यह नहीं हो सकता।

इस सदन में एक इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी प्रस्ताव पास किया गया है और उस प्रस्ताव के मातहत

[श्री अमृत नाहाटा]

एक कानून बनाया गया इंडस्ट्रियल ऐक्ट । उस कानून में स्पष्ट कहा गया कि देश की जो औद्योगिक नीति होगी उसका मकसद क्या होगा । मैं उसको पढ़ कर सुना दूँ :

- “(i) to regulate industrial development;
- (ii) to canalise resources according to plan priorities and targets;
- (iii) to avoid monopoly and concentration of wealth;
- (iv) to encourage new entrepreneurs;
- (v) to distribute industrial development in different regions; and
- (vi) to foster technology and economic improvements.”

यह हमारा लक्ष्य था और उस लक्ष्य को प्राप्त करने के लिये लाइसेंस एक हथियार सरकार के पास था । हजारी रिपोर्ट से एक नतीजा स्पष्ट निकलता है कि इस हथियार को इस्तेमाल कर के उनमें से कोई लक्ष्य प्राप्त नहीं किया गया ।

वह लक्ष्य पराजित किये गये हैं, बल्कि उन लक्ष्यों के विपरीत काम हुआ है । न तो नये एंटरप्रेनर्स को प्रोत्साहन मिला है न मोनोपोली को रोका गया है, न कंसेंट्रेशन आफ वेल्थ को रोका गया है और न ही टेकनिकल और एका-नामिकल इम्प्रूवमेंट हुआ है । मैं स्पष्ट कहना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे हजारी रिपोर्ट हो, चाहे उसके पहले की विवियन बोस रिपोर्ट हो, चाहे मोनोपोलीज कमीशन हो, चाहे महालोनोविस रिपोर्ट हो, एक चीज स्पष्ट होती है कि हमारे यहां जो योजनाबद्ध प्रगति हुई है उसमें हम समाजवाद की तरफ नहीं बढ़े हैं, पूंजीवाद की तरफ भी नहीं बढ़े हैं, हम इजारेदारी पूंजीवाद की तरफ बढ़े हैं और कुछ इने-गिने परिवार जो हैं उन्होंने सम्पत्ति पर कब्जा कर रखा है ।

यह क्यों हुआ ? कल एक सम्मानित सदस्य ने कहा कि लाइसेंस देते वक्त किस चीज को देख कर निर्णय करना चाहिये । ऐप्लिकेंट के पास टेकनिकल नो हाऊ है या नहीं, फाइने-श्लल रिसोर्सेज हैं या नहीं, यह देखना पड़ता है कि वह उद्योग लगा सकता है या नहीं । हजारी

रिपोर्ट टेकनिकल एक्स्पर्टाइज की बात कहती है । अगर टेकनिकल एक्स्पर्टाइज की बात ली जाये तो बिड़ला को क्या-क्या लाइसेंस दिये गये हैं । आपको मुन कर ताज्जुब होगा । हजारी रिपोर्ट में लिखा गया है कि :

“The large number of the Birla proposals and the amount of investment contemplated therein are diffused over the entire industrial structure. Except basic steel and power generation, almost every kind of industrial product capable of domestic manufacture is covered in the Birla prospective plan. There is evidence of interest in new and rapidly growing industries, particularly aluminium, electrical goods, chemicals, cement, man-made fibre and yarn, heavy engineering, alloy steel, pig iron, tools, timber products, news-print and pipes and tubes, but traditional industries like cotton, sugar, vanaspati and papers are by no means ignored.”

अब अगर कोई भगवान हो या विश्वकर्मा हो तब ही उसके पास इतना टेकनिकल नो हाऊ हो सकता है और वह हर तरह की इंडस्ट्री लगा सकता है । अगर फोर्ड कोई लाइसेंस लेगा तो वह मोटर इंडस्ट्री लगा सकता है, यूनियवर्सल फ्रूट्स हो या कोई टेकनिकल कम्बाइन हो तो वह शक्कर, आरचर्ड और फ्रूट पैकिंग की मोनोपोली करेगा, लेकिन हमारे यहां ऐसे बन्धु हैं जो हर तरह की इंडस्ट्री में टांग अड़ाते हैं, हर तरफ हाथ पसारते हैं । इस तरह की टेकनिकल एक्स्पर्टाइज तो कोई भगवान हो या विश्वकर्मा हो उसी में आ सकती है । अब आप टेकनिकल स्टेबिलिटी की बात लीजिये ।

“It is, perhaps, no accident that certain Birla companies which appear repeatedly among the ranks of applicants and some of which do get approval for their proposals have little to boast of in their balance sheets and profit and loss accounts. A rough sample check with data available in the Company Law Board reveals that Aryavarta Industries, Bikaner Commercial, Eastern Equipment and Sales, Manjushree Industries and Orient General Industries, which put in a large number of applications for a

variety of products are either trading and/or finance companies or, have very small assets to show against the licences issued to them."

उनके पास पैसा भी नहीं था, टैक्नीकल नो हाऊ भी नहीं था, फिर क्या कारण है कि ये लोग इतने लाइसेंस ले कर बैठ गए। इसके कई कारण हो सकते हैं।

एक बात यह कही गई है कि ऐसे कई सबूत हैं कि जिनमें इन्होंने लाइसेंस मांगा, इनको तो मिल गया लेकिन दूसरों ने मांगा तो उनको नहीं मिल सका। लाइसेंस देने के मामले में भी बिड़लाज को प्रेफरेंस दिया गया दूसरे उद्योगपतियों के मुकाबले में। इसके कुछ उदाहरण मैं आपको देना चाहता हूं। हैदराबाद एस्बेस्टोज सिमेंट प्रॉडक्ट्स लिमिटेड एक इनकी कम्पनी है। इसको लाइसेंस मिला एट दी कास्ट आफ एस्बेस्टोज सिमेंट लिमिटेड जो कि एक दूसरी कम्पनी है। इसकी कैपे-सेटी बिड़ला की कम्पनी की कैपेसिटी से करीब दस परसेंट ही कम थी लेकिन बिड़ला को जो फारेन एक्सचेंज मिला वह 53,51,000 रुपये का मिला जबकि इस कम्पनी को केवल 9,99,000 रुपये का मिला।

एक और मैं मिसाल देता हूं। एक ओरियेंट पेपर मिल्स लिमिटेड, अमलाई में है। उसने गवर्नमेंट की अनुमति ले कर इम्पोर्ट एक्सपोर्ट बैंक से लोन की बात की। इस कम्पनी को जो लाइसेंस मिला वह बहुत अधिक का मिला।

फिर बिलासपुर में बिड़लाज की एक दूसरी कम्पनी थी। वहीं पर मैकलायडज को जंगल की लकड़ी काटने का ठेका नहीं मिल रहा था। लेकिन बिड़ला की कम्पनी को मिल गया।

एक ब्रिजराजनगर का यूनिट है। वहां पर उसने बिना लाइसेंस के ड्रुलेक्स बोर्ड मशीन स्थापित कर दी। उसके बाद कहा गया कि हमारे पास मशीन है, हमें इस बास्ते लाइसेंस दे दो।

एक पब्लिक सैक्टर यूनिट है, हिन्दुस्तान इंस्ट्रुमेंट्स लिमिटेड। उसके पास टैक्नीकल नो हाऊ था। लेकिन उसको एक्स-पेंशन की इजाजत नहीं दी गई लेकिन सैंचुरी कैमिकल्स जोकि बिड़ला की थी, उसको मिल गयी। इस तरह की और भी बहुत सी मिसालें मेरे पास हैं लेकिन समयाभाव के कारण मैं उनको दे नहीं सकता हूं।

जहां तक बिड़ला कंमर्ज के साथ फारेन कोलैबोरेटर्ज का सम्बन्ध है, फारेन कोलैबो-रेशन का सम्बन्ध है, उनकी संख्या 115 है। पता नहीं कहां से फारेन एक्सचेंज इनको मिल जाता है, क्यों उनको फारेन एक्सचेंज मिल जाता है। पैसिल से लेकर इंजन तक बनाने तक फारेन कोलैबोरेटर्ज इन्होंने किया है। ये चोरियां करते हैं इनकम टैक्स की, एक्साइज ड्यूटी की तथा दूसरे टैक्सों की, फारेन एक्सचेंज रेग्यु-लेशन की परवाह नहीं की जाती है।

प्रश्न पूछा जा सकता है कि ऐसा क्यों होता है, कौन करता है। यह इसलिए होता है कि बड़े बड़े अफसर हमारे जो हैं वे जब रिटायर हो जाते हैं तो बड़े बड़े उद्योगपति इनको नौकर अपने यहां रख लेते हैं। एक तो कारण यह हो सकता है।

दूसरा कारण यह भी है कि हमारे देश के प्रजातंत्र में जो लाबी प्रथा नहीं होनी चाहिये थी, अमरीका की उस कृत्रिम लाबी प्रथा को हमारे प्रजातंत्र पर लादने की कोशिश की जा रही है। राजनीतिज्ञ और जनता के प्रतिनिधि इन लाबीज के प्रतिनिधि बन कर अपना प्रभाव डालते हैं और दबाव डालते हैं।

लेकिन सब से बड़ा कारण यह है कि बड़े बड़े उद्योगपति जब अर्जी ले कर आते हैं लाइसेंस की तो कहते हैं हमारे पास फाइनेंस है हम पैसा ले आए हैं। अब जो पैसा है यह कहां से वे लाते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान की जनता ने, हिन्दु-स्तान के मध्यम वर्ग ने एक एक पैसा बचा कर बैंकों में जमा करवाया है और वह 3500

[श्री अमृत नाहाटा]

करोड़ रुपया होता है। अब यह जो 3500 करोड़ रुपया है बैंकों में यह इन बड़े बड़े उद्योगपतियों के हाथ में है और इस पैसे को इस्तेमाल करने का लाइसेंस इनके पास है। इस पैसे से ये बड़े बड़े उद्योगधंधों की स्थापना करते हैं। और भी कई कारण हो सकते हैं। सरकारी अफसरों के साथ इनकी मिली भगत हो सकती है, राजनीतिज्ञों का अनुचित असर हो सकता है। लेकिन बुनियादी कारण हमारी जो व्यवस्था इस समय चल रही है वह है। 3500 करोड़ रुपया इन बैंकों में जनता का जमा है और जो बैंक हैं उन पर बारह जो बड़े बड़े परिवार हैं उनका अधिकार है, उन पर इनका कब्जा है। उनके पास जब तक ये बैंक रहेंगे तब तक कंसंट्रेशन आफ वैल्यू रहेगा और कंसंट्रेशन आफ वैल्यू देश में चलता रहेगा। डा० हजारी ने सिफारिश की है कि इन बैंकों में इन पूंजीपतियों का तो केवल 48 करोड़ रुपया है बाकी सारा जनता का है और इस पैसे पर जब तक ये लोग हावी रहेंगे तब तक लाइसेंस प्रणाली कैंसी भी आप अपनायें देश में सम्पत्ति का केन्द्रीयकरण होगा। इसलिए डा० हजारी ने सिफारिश की है कि बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाए ताकि ये जो फाइनेंशियल रिसोसिस उनके पास हैं, उनकी डिसपोजल पर हैं इनको उनसे छीना जा सके और तब आप प्लान प्रायोरिटीज तय करें, टारगेट्स तय करें और उस हिसाब से तब आप औद्योगिक लाइसेंस दें।

अन्त में मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। जनसंघ के नेता मधोक साहब ने बहुत बढ़ चढ़ कर राष्ट्रवाद की बात कही है। बात बात में वह राष्ट्रवाद की बात कहते हैं। वह कहते हैं कि हमें न पूंजीवाद चाहिये, न समाजवाद चाहिये, हमें कोई वाद नहीं चाहिये, हमें तो राष्ट्रवाद चाहिये। कहते कहते वह यहां तक कह गए कि जो जो चीजें हिन्दुस्तान में महंगी बनती हैं, और विदेशों में सस्ती बनती हैं उन चीजों को हमें विदेशों से मंगाना चाहिये,

वहां से इम्पोर्ट करना चाहिये। मैं उनसे जानना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसी कौन-सी चीज है जो यहां सस्ती बनती है। दो सौ वर्ष तक हम अंग्रेजों के गुलाम रहे, उन्होंने हमारा शोषण किया, यहां पर उद्योग धंधों को पनपने नहीं दिया, उनको कृत्रिम ढंग से रोके रखा, प्राकृतिक सम्पदा को पिछड़ा हुआ रखा और इस कारण से मुई से ले कर बड़ी-से-बड़ी मशीन तक विदेशों में सस्ती बनती हैं और हिन्दुस्तान में महंगी बनती हैं। बाहर से सब चीजों को मंगाने का अर्थ भारत के औद्योगिक विकास को रोकना होगा और देश को विदेशों के हाथ गिरवी रखना होगा। अगर ऐसा होगा तो यह राष्ट्रवाद नहीं, बिड़लावाद ही साबित होगा।

SHRI P. VISWAMBHARAN (Trivandrum) : Dr Hazari has done a great service to this country by bringing out these two brilliant reports. But I think that this Government is deliberately delaying decisions and directions on these reports because they want to see that usefulness of the recommendations is defeated. According to me, there is no need to appoint new committees to go into this question of licensing and industrial policy. If it is a question of monopoly, then it has been clearly brought out by the Monopolies Inquiry Commission. Dr. Hazari has given very clear decisions and recommendations. I repeat that a new committee has been appointed deliberately to delay action on the recommendations of Dr. Hazari.

The Thacker Committee was appointed six months ago and at that time it was suggested that that committee should submit its report within six months. But that period of six months has elapsed. It has been stated here that that committee was not even given facilities to work. A few months after the appointment of that committee, the chairman Prof. Thacker had to write to the Minister of Industrial Development and Company Affairs that the officers of his Ministry were not co-operating with the committee and that the committee had not been provided with even accommodation and staff. So, this was a deliberate attempt to delay decisions. It is common knowledge that whenever Government want to shelve any issue, they

appoint a committee, and the Thacker Committee is also one such. I do not understand the necessity for that committee.

Some of the decisions and recommendations of Dr. Hazari are very clear, and they demand immediate implementation. I am sorry that a senior Member of the Congress like Shri Thirumala Rao should have attributed motives to Dr. Hazari. He said that there was no need for Dr. Hazari to have submitted his interim report in a hurry, and he said that within a few weeks after the appointment of the Hazari Committee he had submitted the interim report. That is not correct. It was after the expiry of six months, after the full term of the committee had expired that Dr. Hazari had submitted his interim report. He could not submit his final report because he was not provided with all the facilities and the Ministry and the industrialists were not sufficiently co-operative, and, therefore, he submitted his interim report. After six months of appointment, he had submitted his interim report because that interim report was called for and some urgent action was called for on the basis of that report.

16.18 Hrs.

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

I would now refer to one such important action required. He had recommended in his interim report that all unimplemented licences issued before December 31, 1964 should be revoked. Fifteen months had passed, and I would ask the Minister what action has been taken on this recommendation. Similarly, he has recommended that steps should also be taken to revoke the unimplemented CGC approvals and licences if the applicants had failed to make an adequate rate of progress. Should there be any new committee to go into this question. These things should have been inquired into, and these recommendations should have been implemented by the Ministry itself without referring the matter to any other committee.

So my point is that appointment of a new committee or commission is only delaying tactics, nothing more. What will happen to the Thacker Committee report is also

anybody's guess. We all know what has happened to the Monopolies Commission report, the Mahalanobis Committee report, the Swaminathan Committee report, the Vivian Bose report and lately the Hazari Report. So one need not be much hopeful of these new committees.

My suggestion is that if at all a new committee is to function, it should be to fix responsibility, not to go into matters already gone into by Dr. Hazari. On the one side, it was said that the big business houses were at fault in securing licences by all foul means. Somebody added the bureaucrats to that category. But I charge these Ministers with the same offence. They are the main culprits in this whole muddle. This Ministers-bureaucracy-big houses axis has fostered monopolistic tendencies in this country. There is no use excluding Ministers from this axis; there is no use leaving out the bureaucrats from this. All these three should be taken as a combination and dealt with accordingly. If a commission is appointed for that, I would welcome it. It should be a statutory commission under the Commissions of Inquiry Act which should go into the question of fixing responsibility of the Ministers concerned, the officers concerned and the business houses concerned.

I do not have any illusions that this Government will appoint such a commission or will implement the Hazari or any other report of any such commission because all these recommendations go against them.

Much has been said about Birlas. I do not discriminate between Birlas and other business houses. I take all of them together. I do not think Dr. Hazari has excluded any of the big business houses from his report.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : He has given an example.

SHRI P. VISWAMBHARAN : Not exactly example. From the information available, he found that Birlas were comparatively more guilty than some other houses. It is up to the Government to prove whether the other business houses are also guilty. But I do not think this Government will probe further into this

[Shri P. Viswambharan]
matter because the Congress Party's main source of income is big business house donations. There is no use hiding that fact.

Some heat was generated a little while ago when Shri Umanath made some statement. I should like to bring to the notice of the House some more recent figures. I do not go to the Gandhian days. During 1961-64, the total declared donations to political parties by business concerns was Rs. 115 lakhs, out of which Rs. 98.13 lakhs went to the Congress Party and Rs. 15.69 lakhs to the Swatantra Party. According to the Minister in charge himself as disclosed in the account year 1966, the Congress got Rs. 15.89 lakhs from companies. The Swatantra Party got Rs. 4.43 lakhs. These are the figures given out by the Minister of Industrial Development. These figures are collected from the accounts of the companies. There are other large donations which are not declared. I know that Rs. 10 lakhs which was mentioned by Mr. Umanath is outside these figures because that was not given by a particular company but by a combination of manufacturers. These figures show why this Government hesitates to take any action against defaulting businessmen and why the Swatantra Party also comes to their rescue. I do not waste my time urging on this Government to usher in the era of socialism and all that; we have no illusions about this Government. But I should point out that it is this Government that has appointed this Commission and it has submitted its report and it is their duty at least to take some decision on that report. Even after fifteen months of the submission of this report, when the House has been given an opportunity to discuss that report, it is an utter disrespect shown to this House to say that a decision is still to be taken. Much has been said about the credit-worthiness and technical know-how of the Birlas. My friend who had spoken just before me has quoted from Hazari's report about their credit-worthiness and all that. But I should like to bring to the attention of the House a statement made by no less a person than Shri Nijalingappa, the President of the Indian National Congress and Chief Minister of Mysore. My learned friend here who spoke on behalf of the Swatantra Party said that it was the Birlas who started the automobile industry in this country.

If they did so, I charge that it is these same Birlas who stand in the way of the development of the car industry and who stand in the way reducing the price of cars in this country. As we all know, Mr. Nijalingappa has been trying for the last several years to get a small car factory established in Mysore and this is what appears in a newspaper :

"Mr Nijalingappa said that he was trying his level best to get a licence from the Centre for this small car project. Once clearance was received it would not take long to manufacture it. Asked if his project was being bogged down by some capitalist at the Centre, he hesitated and then remarked : 'possible ; it is for you to judge'."

This is the statement of the President of the Indian National Congress and still I am sorry to point out that friends on that side are coming forward with praises for the glorious services rendered by Birlas. The industrial philosophy and the outlook of this Government has to be changed.

Now, the industrial philosophy of this Government seems to be, strengthen monopolies, produce less, maintain high costs and retain the benefits of modern science and technology for the privileged few. This philosophy has got to be changed to increase production, reduce costs, and bring down the prices to the reach of the common man. This should be the objective of any government.

I now come to another point which has not been touched by anybody here, that is, the regional imbalance in industrial development. Dr. Hazari was asked to go into that question also and he has made some revealing observations. He says :

"the bulk of approved investments during 1959-1966 were in Maharashtra, West Bengal, Madras, UP, Bihar, MP, Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat in that order, with Maharashtra a way up on the top. Curiously enough, the share of Maharashtra, West Bengal and Gujarat in the number of approvals was much larger than the amount of investment."

Then he says :

"About 46 per cent of the approved investment in 1959-1966 was in the three top States, Maharashtra, West Bengal and Madras."

Again, he proceeds to state that "the approved investment for new undertakings in West Bengal during 1959-1966 was Rs. 100 crores only against Rs. 171 crores in Maharashtra" and so on.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You should conclude now.

SHRI P. VISWAMBHARAN : I shall conclude in a couple of minutes. My point is that some States do not find a place in the industrial map of India. Somebody was boasting that this country finds a place in the industrial map of the world. But in this country certain States and certain areas do not find a place in the industrial map. Take the case of Assam, for example. I have got all the tables with me. Now-where does Assam find a place in the industrial map of India.

SHRI HIMATSINGKA (Godda) : There are a number of industries in Assam.

SHRI P. VISWAMBHARAN : Permit me to quote some figures according to Prof. Hazari.

SHRI HIMATSINGKA : Prof. Hazari may not have seen it.

SHRI A. S. SAIGAL (Bilaspur) : Most probably Prof. Hazari has not visited Assam.

SHRI P. VISWAMBHARAN : It is not we who appointed Prof. Hazari. It is this Government who have appointed him and it is this Government who have supplied information to him. Not we. If we take the approvals of licenses during the period 1959-66 State-wise, the percentage for Assam is 0.82, and the investment percentage is 1.27. For Kerala, it is 2.17 and 2.26, while the percentage for Maharashtra is 31.90 and 21.46 respectively. Well, Assam's case has been challenged, and so I leave it to the Assam people. But I have the authority to say about Kerala ; I come from the State of Kerala which has been completely neglected during the last 16 to 17 years of planned development. Out of the total industrial investment of Rs. 2,500 crores in the public sector, the total investment in Kerala State is a meagre sum of Rs. 25 crores, which is just one per cent.

And still you approach us to promote national integrity and all that. Of course we are doing that. But that is the position. My point is that the monopoly should end. The monopoly enjoyed by individuals and business-houses should end and, at the same time, this regional monopoly should also end.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha. Just 10 minutes. I would like to appeal again that if you confine your remarks to 10 minutes each, I can accommodate some more Members.

SHRI K. N. TIWARY (Bettiah) : But you are giving 10 minutes to some, 15 minutes to some others and so on.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That is party-time. I have explained it several times. There is no use complaining.

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा (बाढ़) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कल से इस रिपोर्ट पर बहस हो रही है और बहुत कुछ कहा जा चुका है। मैं उन बातों को दुहराना नहीं चाहती। पर इतना जरूर कहना चाहती हूँ कि श्री हजारी का जो इरादा है कुछ चीजों को सामने लाने का वह तो बहुत सही है। कई लोगों ने उसकी दाद भी दी है, मैं भी दाद देती हूँ कि उन्होंने कुछ ऐसे रास्ते दिखाये हैं कि हमारे यहां 20 वर्षों की योजना, 15 वर्षों की योजना में क्या हुआ है और किस तरह से औद्योगिक विकास हुआ है। जहां तक इस रास्ते को उन्होंने दिखाया है उसे ईमानदारी से दिखाने की कोशिश की है। पर मैं यह जरूर कहूंगी कि अपनी रिपोर्ट जब वह सरकार के सामने लाये तो खुद अपनी ही बातों को कमजोर कर दिया। उसी रिपोर्ट में इस बात का हवाला दे कर के कि कई मामलों में इस तरह जो बिजनेस बढ़ा है, बड़े बड़े उद्योगपतियों के द्वारा बढ़ाया गया है, उससे फायदा भी हुआ है। अब आप देखिए, हमारे लिए मुश्किल यह हो जाती है कि उनकी एक किताब है Corporate Sector जिसमें उन्होंने यह कहा है कि टाटा और मार्टिन बर्न ने जो इतना बड़ा औद्योगिक

[श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा]

विकास किया है, टाटा, बिरला और मार्टिन बन यह तीन ही ऐसी कम्पनियाँ हैं जिनका बहुत बड़े पैमाने पर विकास हुआ है और बहुत ज्यादा टोटल कैपिटल उनमें लगा हुआ है। तो मार्टिन बन और टाटा के बारे में उन्होंने कहा कि जो विकास हुआ है वह बहुत अच्छा हुआ है और उन लोगों ने यहां जो चीज पैदा की है उसकी सही कीमत लगायी है। देश को उससे बड़ा फायदा हुआ है। उन्होंने इस हजारी रिपोर्ट में भी बिरलाज के बारे में कहा, मैं उसको पढ़ना चाहती हूँ, दो तीन बातें कहीं, मैं उसको अंग्रेजी में पढ़ती हूँ क्योंकि उनकी रिपोर्ट अंग्रेजी में है :

- (a) "The recent general slack in investment or pessimism in expectations has not affected Birlas."
- (b) When the other groups of industrialists were shy in active during the period, the Birla group ventured into new lines of manufacture.
- (c) "Among business groups, Birla appears to have reduced its import component substantially". While the average proportion of import component out of total investment of all private sector industries, including Birla companies, for the period 1964 June to 1966 was 63%, the average of Birla companies only was 56%.

अब अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुश्किल यह हो जाती है कि हम फिर हजारी साहब के जो सुझाव आये हैं उसका क्या नतीजा निकालें ? इस रिपोर्ट पर बहस की जो बुनियाद होनी चाहिए थी वह यह कि उससे हमें एक रास्ता मिलना चाहिए था। हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को क्या क्या करना चाहिए इन बातों को कम करने के लिए, मोनोपलीज को कम करने के लिए, कांसेन्ट्रेशन आफ वेल्थ को कम करने के लिए उसके बारे में सुझाव होते तो अच्छा था। उसमें उन्होंने यह सब जो भूमिकाएं बांधी कि जो मौजूदा परिस्थिति है, जितना आर्थिक स्तर अव्यवस्थित है उसमें यही हो सकता है, तो उसका अर्थ क्या निकालें। एक तरफ तो

कहते हैं कि यही हो सकता है दूसरी तरफ कहते हैं कि यह नहीं होना चाहिए था। तो हमारे लिए बड़ी मुश्किल हो जाती है कि हम कौन-सा रास्ता अख्तियार करें। मैंने एक ही बात सुनी है। हमारे हिन्दुओं में एक ही अवतार माना जाता है त्रिमूर्ति का अवतार ब्रह्मा, विष्णु और महेश का। विष्णु पालन करते हैं, ब्रह्मा पैदा करते हैं और महेश संहार करते हैं। परन्तु एक ही परमेश्वर के वह तीनों रूप हैं। श्री हजारी साहब ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में त्रिमूर्ति का रूप धारण कर लिया है। हमारे लिए बड़ी मुश्किल है कि हम कौन-सा रास्ता अख्तियार करें। इसके बावजूद हम भी यह जरूर कहना चाहते हैं कि इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि इतने दिनों की योजना के बाद, यह सरकार के लिए जवाब देने की बात है कि ऐसा हुआ क्यों ? आखिर हजारी साहब को बुलाया क्यों गया ? हजारी साहब को बुलाया इसलिए गया कि सरकार ने खुद इस बात को महसूस किया कि हजार हमने कानून बनाए मगर ऐसी जगह पैदा हो जाती है कि जहां से हर ऐडवांटेज निकल जाता है और यह कोई नई बात हम नहीं कर रहे हैं। यहां पर जो कुछ हो रहा है वह और मुल्कों में हुआ है। दूसरे मुल्कों ने उसके खिलाफ कदम भी उठाए हैं। अपने यहां अगर ऐसी बातें हुईं तो हम जानना चाहते हैं कि ऐसी बातें क्यों हुईं ? आज तक हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार सब कुछ निगलती आई है और इस बात का जवाब नहीं दे पायी। सारी कमजोरी जो यह है सरकार की कि जो कुछ हुआ है उसको घोंटते चले गए हैं और जवाब नहीं दे पाये हैं। आज ऐसा हुआ क्यों ? 1951 में यह बिल पास हुआ इंडस्ट्रियल रेगुलेशन ऐक्ट और 1952 में यह लागू कर दिया गया। 1952 के बाद हजारी कमेटी 1966 में बनाई गई। पांच वर्षों के बाद स्वामीनाथन साहब की एक कमेटी बनाई गई इस बात की जांच करने के लिए। स्वामीनाथन साहब ने सिर्फ कानून के सारे पुर्जे ठीक कर के रिपोर्ट दे दी। उससे यह कत्तई मालूम नहीं हुआ कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार में कहां कहां ऐसे पेंच हैं कि जहां कि

इस तरह की बातें होती हैं। फिर हजारी साहब आये। हजारी साहब की रिपोर्ट आई है तो सोचने की बात है कि "सारे कानून बनाने के बावजूद, आपके सारे कदम उठाने के बावजूद ऐसा हुआ क्यों?" मैं यह बात आपसे कहना चाहती हूँ कि मोनोपोली कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को आप देखें, जो नोट-आफ-डिसेन्ट उसमें दिया गया है, उसके एक सदस्य ने कहा है—मैं उन की बातों को भी अंग्रेजी में रखना चाहती हूँ, क्योंकि उन्होंने उस बात को अंग्रेजी में कहा है—उन्होंने कहा कि—

"He pointed out in his minute of dissent that since the economic decisions of the Government are taken in response to the attitude of the person engaged in economic activities, these decisions are necessarily influenced by these people."

सवाल यह है कि आखिर जिनको फैसला करना था, उन्होंने सही तरीके से फैसला नहीं किया, उन्होंने उन चीजों को होने दिया, अब अगर यहां दोष देकर हम निकल भागना चाहते हैं, तो हम अपनी जिम्मेदारी को सही तरीके से प्रतिपादित नहीं करेंगे। ठीक है—आप बिरला को गाली दीजिये, टाटा को गाली दीजिये, मार्टिन बर्न को गाली दीजिये, फर्क कुछ नहीं पड़ता है, क्योंकि मोनोपोली और कन्सेन्ट्रेशन आफ वेल्थ की जो परिभाषा है, वह अलग अलग है। मोनोपोली अलग चीज है, कन्सेन्ट्रेशन आफ वेल्थ अलग चीज है। मोनोपोली को खत्म करने के लिये और मुल्कों में भी कानून पास हुए हैं, अमरीका में भी कानून पास हुआ—एन्टी ट्रस्ट लॉज के मुताबिक कोई इण्डस्ट्री अगर एक चीज का उत्पादन कर रही है, तो उसके लिये यह जरूरी हो जाता है कि वह दूसरों को भी एक अनुपात में पैदा करने के लिये दे। इस लिये जहां तक कन्सेन्ट्रेशन आफ वेल्थ का सवाल है, हजारी कमेटी से उसका निष्कर्ष नहीं निकलेगा, निष्कर्ष इससे निकलेगा कि कितने छोटे आदमियों की एप्लीकेशन आई और किस कारण से रिजेक्ट हो गई हैं। कुछ सदस्यों ने फोर-क्लोज़र की बात कही बिरला के बारे में

में। मैं जानती हूँ, सरकार से मेरा कुछ नज़दीक का वास्ता पड़ा था, मैं जिस वक्त वित्त मंत्रालय में थी, तो मैं देखती थी—एक लाइसेंस आपने दिया, तो उसके साथ आपको हजारों कौम्पो-नेन्ट्स के लाइसेंस देने पड़ते हैं, उसके बाद इण्डस्ट्री कहां लोकेट की जाय उसके लिये राज्य सरकारों से पूछते हैं, इन सब चीजों में दो-तीन साल लग जाते हैं। आप खुद उस दर्वाज़े को बन्द करके रखते हैं, जहां से कि लाइसेंस मिलता है और उद्योगों का विकास होता है। तीन साल तक पेन्डिंग एप्लीकेशन रख दी, फिर सारी कंपैसिटी के लाइसेंस एक में सीमित कर दिये और दूसरों को लाइसेंस नहीं दिये, लिख कर भेज दिया कि इस चीज का लाइसेंस दिया जा चुका है, हम लाइसेंस नहीं देंगे। मैं जानना चाहती हूँ कि इसमें दोष सरकार का कितना रहा है और कितना उन इण्डस्ट्रीयल हाउसेज का रहा है, जिनके पास लाइसेंस गये हैं। जैसा श्रीमती कृपालानी ने कहा—आपके पास तो मिनट मिनट पर हथियार हैं, आप उसकी जानकारी कर सकते थे, आपने छानबीन क्यों नहीं की।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ज्यादा बक्त नहीं लूंगी, सिर्फ इतना ही कहना चाहती हूँ कि हजारी कमेटी से—उसमें बिरला की चर्चा हो या न हो, टाटा की चर्चा हो या न हो, मार्टिन-बर्न की चर्चा हो या न हो—हम इस निष्कर्ष पर नहीं पहुंचते हैं कि इण्डस्ट्रीयल कन्सेन्ट्रेशन आफ वेल्थ जिम तरह से हुआ है, उसका परिमार्जन किस तरह से होगा, किस तरह से वह खत्म किया जायगा।

आपने पूंजी की बात की—टाटा की एप्लीकेशन आई हुई है—फाटलाइज़र के लिये—200 करोड़ रुपये की इण्डस्ट्री बनेगी। अगर आप इस अनुपात से देखें कि दो सौ करोड़ रुपये का वास्ता है या 300 करोड़ रुपये का वास्ता है, तो इससे तो मोनोपोली या कन्सेन्ट्रेशन आफ वेल्थ की कोई तस्वीर आपको नहीं मिलेगी। यह तो इण्डस्ट्रीयल कौम्प्लैक्स में

[श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा]

हो सकता है। इण्डस्ट्री आपको चाहे पांच सौ करोड़ रुपये की बनानी पड़े, हमारे हिन्दुस्तान स्टील का इन्वेस्टमेंट क्या है—एक हजार करोड़ रुपया, तो यह कह देना कि चाहे स्टील प्लांट हो या और किसी चीज का प्लांट हो, दो सौ-तीन सौ करोड़ रुपये से ज्यादा नहीं होगा, इससे कन्सेन्ट्रेशन आफ वेल्थ या मोनो-पोली नहीं रहेगी, इससे इण्डस्ट्री नहीं बढ़ सकती है। आप यह देखिये कि रास्ते में रुकावटें कहां कहां हैं। जो आपका मोनोपोली बिल है, उसमें जो कुछ भी आप करने जा रहे हैं, मेहरबानी कर के इस बात को जरूर कीजिये कि जो भी छोटे आदमी आपके पास आते हैं, उनको जरूर मौका दीजिये। आज अगर बिरला मोटरकार की इंडस्ट्री बनाते हैं तो कहिये कि इतने कौम्पीनेन्ट्स बनाने का काम आपको दूसरों को देना होगा, सारे कौम्पो-नेन्ट्स आप खुद नहीं बनायेंगे। अमरीका में ऐसी बहुत सी कम्पनियां हैं, जैनरल मोटरकार कम्पनी है, उनको मजबूर किया जाता है कि 40-50 या 60 प्रतिशत खुद करें और बाकी का दूसरों को बांट कर करें। सारा काम खुद करने का उनको अधिकार नहीं है।

मैं, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह कहना चाहती थी, अगर आपको वाकई मोनोपोली को खत्म करना है तो आप मजबूर कीजिये, बिरला को मजबूर कीजिये, टाटा को मजबूर कीजिये, जिस रास्ते पर बह गये हैं, 100 परसेन्ट प्रोडक्शन की मोनोपोली उन्होंने अपने हाथ में रखी हुई है, यह गलत है, ऐसा आपने क्यों होने दिया। गारमेंट इण्डस्ट्री, कपड़ा सीने की इण्डस्ट्री की मोनोपोली एक आदमी के हाथ में दे दी जाये, ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये। आप के हाथ में ताकत है। आप कह सकते हैं कि 50 प्रतिशत से ज्यादा हम आपको उसमें नहीं जाने देंगे, आप दूसरे उद्योगों में जायें। आज कई इण्डस्ट्रीज में बह 100 परसेन्ट बिजनेस को कंट्रोल करते हैं, आप उनसे कहिये कि 60-70 या 50-40 प्रतिशत अपने शेयरों को बेचकर

उस इण्डस्ट्री को डाइवर्सिफाई करें, अलग-अलग करें। लेकिन आप यह सब नहीं करते हैं। अगर आपको जरूरत होती है तो यहां आकर गालियां सुनवा देते हैं। दो-चार गालियां सुनवा कर परदा-नशीन हो जाना चाहते हैं। तो इससे तो उसका उपचार नहीं हो सकता। आप पर्दानशीन नहीं हो सकते, आपको खुलकर मैदान में आना पड़ेगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक ही शेर आपको सुनाना चाहती हूं। फखरुद्दीन साहब से तो उसका ज्यादा ताल्लुक नहीं है, लेकिन उनके जो सारे आफिसर्स हैं, उनसे ताल्लुक है। यह जो उनका सोलर-सिस्टम है, यह जो महा-सौर मंडल है, उसके चक्कर में घूमने से ही सब काम हो जाते हैं और आपको पता भी नहीं चलता—क्या होता है, कम-से-कम उस सौर-मण्डल का हिसाब-किताब लीजिये। पिछले 15-20 वर्षों से हम देखते हैं, उनकी यही हालत रही है—अकबर इलाहाबादी ने ब्रिटिश सरकार के हुक्मामें के बारे में जो कहा था—वही इन पर भी लागू होता है—

कौम के शम में डिनर खाते हैं हुक्कामों के साथ, रंज लीडर को बहुत हैं, मगर आराम के साथ।

मैं फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब से भी एक बात कहना चाहती हूं—वह मुझ से शेर सुनना चाहते हैं। फखरुद्दीन साहब—

रिंद इतने गुनाह नहीं करते, जितने परहेजगार करते हैं।

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR (Basirhat) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, after the remarks of the hon. Minister the discussion on this report has become largely academic and that is one reason why I wanted to intervene. He has himself said that the decision is to be taken only when two other committees have completed their studies and after that the Government will let us know their views.

In this debate in the House, a certain amount of heat has been introduced which was probably unnecessary. There are certain firms in this country about which lots of things can be said. Wherever there have

been large industrial combines, occasionally there have been lapses also. Lapses should be condemned but we should not have any witchhunt. This also we should remember. So far as the Birla house is concerned, I think we should remember two things. Before independence they had identified themselves with the national struggle and after independence they have taken the Indian mercantile flag, the Indian commercial flag, out to overseas countries. I have heard in Nigeria, Ethiopia, even in Scotland and Canada, praise for the efficiency and entrepreneurship of this house. But that is not the issue today.

The issue is : How are we going to control the concentration of wealth and check the tendency to monopoly of which, undoubtedly signs have been known ? Therefore I am afraid that Government cannot escape its responsibility.

16.48 Hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

When the entire licensing policy was in the hands of the Government and not a leaf could fall from a tree without the Government's permission so far as industry and commerce in this country are concerned, it does not lie with the Government to blame anybody else. If there is any concentration of wealth, it does not lie with the Government to charge anyone else with responsibility for this kind of monopolistic tendency.

I think, it is due primarily to defective planning. In the Hazari Report there are two observations to which I would like to draw the attention of this House. In one place Dr. Hazari has said :—

“Market mechanism has far greater import than administrative fiat.”

This is a fact which we cannot ignore. When certain economic forces are operative, they have to be recognised and the policy of the country has to be so shaped that recognising those forces we give it a turn so that the common man may benefit and there is no monopoly and concentration of economic wealth. I am afraid, Government has not moved in that direction.

It is true that the Hazari Report has also suggested that there should be a certain list of priorities. On this matter I think there

is room for far more careful thinking. If we define those areas in industry which from the nature of the case must be large scale units and if we define that these units will be of a particular character, the danger of monopoly and concentration of wealth can be very largely overcome. As far as I can judge, there are certain industries which must, from the nature of the case, for example, production of power in any form—whether it is atomic power or electricity thermal or hydro electric—be large concerns. Similarly, metallurgy, whether it is iron and steel or aluminium, must be a large concern. Petrochemicals, whether it is refineries or fertilisers, must also be large concerns. Electronics must also be large concerns. Transport also must be large concerns. Banking also, which is the basis on which the whole industrial development takes place, must be in large concerns. These are six areas where from the nature of the case the unit has to be large.

If it is decided that these industries shall be in the public sector, one of the major instruments through which monopoly is established, through which concentration of wealth and control of economic life take place, will be removed. But then we have to change, simultaneously, the conception of what is a public concern, what is the public sector. I think, here, the Government will have to change its attitude. The public sector need not mean hundred per cent ownership by the State. In fact, one of the developments in recent years has been the radical change in the industrial outlook throughout the world. Ownership and control have been separated and, not only ownership and control, even control and management have been separated. Therefore, if we follow on the lines of development in the other industrially developed countries of the world, we can here also determine that the major industries which provide in a sense the basic structure of all the industrial and economic development shall be in the public sector,—that the Government has a majority share, perhaps, 51 per cent share and 49 per cent share may be thrown open to the public. Similarly, in the management also, in the Directorate, it should not be a bureaucratic set-up alone. Today, whenever there is any talk of nationalisation, one is apt to shudder because nationalisation means bureaucratisation.

[Shri Humayun Kabir]

In the existing conditions in India, this kind of bureaucratisation, instead of advancing economic interests of the country, instead of destroying monopoly, may create a greater danger of concentration of economic and political power in the same hands. Therefore, we shall have to change the conception of public enterprises. Anything in which the Government or other public bodies has 51 per cent share will be a public concern and the 49 per cent share will be distributed among the general public. In the Directorate also, in the management also, there should be this reflection so that the Government does not depend only upon its officers. I have nothing against officers; some of them are very good. But at the same time, by their very training, by their very attitude and outlook, they are not always the best business entrepreneurs. An industry must take risks; an industry must go into new fields whereas a bureaucrat, by the nature of the case, plays safe. For this reason, if we change the character of the Directorate in the public sector, that will solve a number of problems.

There is a great deal of fear of nationalisation of banks among businessmen. If banks are nationalised under this formula with 51 per cent of the shares owned by the State and 49 per cent of the shares given to the public and in the share of the administration also, in the management and control also, there is a proportionate voice of the Government, but not an exclusive voice of the Government, then in that case, we avoid the dangers of nationalisation and, at the same time also avoid the risks of concentration of capital or of monopoly production or of monopoly distribution which have become a danger in this country.

Along with this changes, I would like to make another point. In these great industrial complexes which may be built up by Government, not built up by Government alone but built up with Government assistance, through Government initiative, with a major share owned by the State, in these concerns, there must also be competition. The idea of having only one unit for one industry in the country has proved to be a costly mistake. Wherever there is monopoly, there is loss of efficiency; wherever there is monopoly, there is a danger on and this danger does

not become less if instead in some private individuals, you place some public official there. The risk is always there. Therefore, from that point of view, if we have public enterprises of this type in the major sectors of the industry which compete with one another there will be no question of control by any individual or by any family or by private hands. At the same time, we provide for both efficiency and national welfare. We have the advantages of national planning, we have the advantages of public ownership and control and we avoid the risk of monopoly.

If on these lines a move is made, I am sure, we can to a great extent, avoid this danger of monopoly development of any type.

The Hazari Report has, again, made a very interesting suggestion about planning. That there may be two types of planning, compulsive targets and indicative targets. If that is combined with the other suggestion made by Dr. Hazari that in the case of a large number of industries—I would place a very large section of the entire industrial output of the country into that sector, what may be called the consumer industries—if for them the whole process of licensing is abolished, I think, it would be a great step forward. This would offer chances to the small man, to the middle-man and to new entrepreneurs. Today, the position is that the more regulations you have, the more agencies you have, the more persons in control you have, the more you play into the hands of the big houses. What happens is that whenever one makes an application, that application has to be followed up. Hundreds of forms are to be filled up in which information of all kinds is asked. A lot of this information is unnecessary. I have seen some of these forms myself and in some cases I have tried to cut out some of the unnecessary information. All kinds of useless information is accumulated. A big business house with its resources, with its contacts, with its connections throughout the country can very often satisfy those conditions whereas the new entrepreneur cannot. One of the speakers suggested—I forget who it was—that one of the means of developing the economy, diversifying the economy and broadening the base of our economic structure is to allow young engineers, young technocrats, to come forward.

But how can a young engineer come forward, how can a young technocrat come forward, if he has to go through this jungle of forms, the jungle of regulations, through all these different committees?

You heard a little while ago, what has to be done after you get the licence. Getting a licence itself is sometimes a painful process and I know, months and sometimes years, pass before the licence is issued. And that is not the end of the story. After the licence has been issued, there is the Capital Goods Committee; you have to go to the Capital Goods Committee, you have to go from one committee to another. A big firm—one of the established industrial units—can find the people who can look after all these details, but a new entrepreneur cannot. Therefore, if licences are abolished so far as a large sector of industries is concerned you will encourage new people to come in.

The question arises where will they find the finances, where will they find the funds? I have made a suggestion about modified nationalisation of banking, as I would call it, a kind of public control of banks without the Government taking over the banks. Because if the Government takes over the banks entirely, there are very grave risks and it may result in a collapse of the economy because of the improper and sometimes injudicious use of funds. That danger will also be there. But wherever there is an admixture of public and private talent, State may control and at the same time co-operation of the private entrepreneurs is also taken—whoever has the skill, whoever has the knowledge, whoever is experienced will be given an opportunity. In that case, these banks will finance to a large extent the new entrepreneurs who want to come in. The Government may even prescribe that a certain proportion of the capital available, the assets of any bank, will be given to such new entrepreneurs. I think it was a year or 1½ years ago, that a concept was introduced that when loans are advanced, you should not look at the mere material assets of the applicants but look also at his trustworthiness, look at his creditworthiness, look at his skill and experience. If on the basis of these factors, small advances are made, I think, it would not only help to diversify the economy, increase the employment in the country, but it will also serve as a very

effective check against the tendency to monopoly and concentration of capital against which we are all fighting.

Then, Dr. Hazari has made one more suggestion which, I think, is also deserving of consideration, in regard to projects of less than Rs. 1 crore. He has given this figure, but what figure should be there, the Government can decide. Today upto Rs. 25 lakhs, no licence is necessary. That figure may be increased and the area may be enlarged. On these lines, we could move. Simultaneously we should strengthen the public sector as well as the cooperative sector and the private sector. Of course, their co-operation is needed. In the peculiar situation in which we are placed in India today, the major task, I think, for the country's economy is to find employment on as large a scale as possible. In order to find employment, I think, we have to shift the emphasis to some extent. For a little while, a larger proportion of the national resources should be diverted to consumer industries, medium, small-scale and cottage industries. We have the classic example of Bokaro. We could have increased the steel and iron capacity of the country, which is sought to be provided by Bokaro, by investing about Rs. 500 crores if we had developed and expanded the existing units at Rourkela, Bhilai and Durgapur. Instead of that, we go in for a new plant and we spend over Rs. 1000 crores for producing the same amount of steel. In the economic situation in which we are placed in India today, we cannot afford this luxury of tying Rs. 500 crores for some five to seven years in the hope that later on steel and iron may be required. Therefore, the emphasis should be somewhat shifted and we should remember the three or four major points which I will recapitulate now. We should earmark six or seven major industries like transport, power, banking, metallurgy, petro-chemicals, heavy engineering, electronics, etc.—the list may be examined carefully and expanded if necessary—in which the public sector must play a decisive role. Foreign collaboration should be allowed only in those sectors. No foreign collaboration should be allowed in any sector outside this list of priorities.

17 Hrs.

Secondly, we should encourage the banks

[Shri Humayun Kabir]

to give advances to new entrepreneurs and especially encourage technocrats to come into the field so that they may start medium small and cottage industries on their own and develop them. We very often think that cottage industry is not something worthy of being looked at. But we should not forget that a large part of the total industrial effort of Switzerland goes into cottage industries, and a very large part of the industrial wealth and output of Japan is derived from cottage industries. They have diversified their output greatly. If we combine these things, I think that not only can we prevent the concentration of capital, not only can we check monopoly but simultaneously we can offer employment to millions of our young men and women who are today without any hope and because they are without any hope there is a sense of despair and frustration in the country. If we can lift that atmosphere of despair, it will be the greatest service that this Parliament can do; if this Parliament can indicate this to Government, then it will be the greatest service that Parliament can render to this country.

DR. MELKOTE (Hyderabad) : This morning, we have spent a good bit of time, may I say we have wasted a good bit of time, in trying to bring down Mr. Birla on the floor of this House. Birla is not under discussion at present. What is under discussion is the Government policy and the principles enunciated by Government and how they have been implemented.

If we consider the Hazari report in detail we shall find that he has mentioned some of these companies just to bring to our notice how decisions can be taken on certain matters, but incidentally possibly the concerns of Birla and also several other companies have been mentioned. By referring to these firms and mentioning them in his report, I feel that Dr. Hazari has done a lot of injustice to one particular firm. I belong to the INTUC, and as such we dislike the Birlas the most. And yet we have got to look at these things in an objective manner.

We are here discussing this report because certain basic questions are involved. I have been here in this House since 1957, and I know that this question of monopoly and concentration of power has been coming up before us for discussion on various

occasions. I remember that I was one of the Members on the Committee on Wealth Tax. At that time, a point was made out that concentration of power was taking place and we should called for a report. The then Finance Minister Shri Morarji Desai placed before us the relevant data. The data indicated that there were at that time about 30,000 odd firms existing in India and they could be divided into two categories, the big industries and the medium and small industries. The total number of big industries was somewhere about 7,000 and the smaller industries were to the extent of about 23,000 or 24,000. The capital investment on these 7,000 big industries was about 80 per cent while that on the 25,000 or 24,000 small industries was only 20 per cent. Therefore, concentration of power was taking place in the hands of a few, because those 7,000 industries were manipulated by about 175 industrialists. That is the main point here for consideration, namely that there is a concentration of power taking place not merely in the Birla group but in the Tata group and in so many other groups. And we have to consider how we can stop this monopoly accruing in the hands of a few.

The main point is that in 1962 when the Third Plan commenced, there were demands made in this House and on account of pressure from Members, a Committee was appointed. We have got the report before us.

Let us now take a few facts of detail into consideration. In 1956, when I happened to be a Minister in the ex-Hyderabad State, I happened to meet the late Panditji and place before him very squarely some of the problems facing the country. We were trying to take lands from the landlords and distribute them. I asked, what about the big people in the cities who have got money? What about these big industrialists? Then he casually remarked—I am mentioning what I consider to be the purport of his talk with me—'Dr. Melkote, how many industries have you in this country? We have just started industrialising'. In the First Year Plan, we had an investment of Rs. 2,200 crores. Even then, how many industries could be put up, how much capital could be invested in industries? In the Second Plan, the figure went up to Rs. 7,000

crores out of which about Rs. 2,000 crores was given to private industries. Out of that different industrialists got some allocation and we had a number of industries. In the Third Plan, we had the figure of about Rs. 10,000 crores. Even there, on the number of industries started in the public sector, the money invested was much more. Of course, in the hands of a few people, there was concentration of economic power and there was a monopolistic tendency coming up. But who was responsible for this? Is it the industrialists? We function in a democracy and you have got particular rules and regulations. Within these restrictions, these things have come up. If in spite of that, this has happened, who is responsible? I would ask this question of Government and it is they who have got to answer. It is not a question for Birla or X, Y, Z to answer.

The Hazari Report brings to the forefront the point that Government have not acted wisely. But then at what stage of development were we? We started from scratch. We tried to build up the economy of our country. If these industrialists had not come forward—I am not referring to any particular industry; I am referring to all of them in general—if these industrialists had not developed industries in the manner they did, in a manner in which Government were not capable of doing, because the bureaucracy was not capable of doing it at that particular time they had to be trained, if these things had not been done by the industrialists, would we have been able to face the Chinese aggression in 1962, and later the Pakistani aggression in 1965 in which we acquitted ourselves very nicely? Would this have happened, if these industrialists had not helped the nation in that way? If it is asked, are they patriots, I say, yes, they are patriots. They have also gone out of the country and established industries. Let us give credit to them.

But while giving credit to them, I would like to point out to the Government that there is a big lapse on their part. By not checking them, monopolistic tendencies have developed. Concentration of economic power has vitiated the social structure that we had envisaged. It is in order to consider this aspect that this Report has been brought in.

So far as the Report is concerned, Dr. Hazari has mentioned at several places that the data he has been able to collect are inadequate. In many places, he has over shot the mark, and he had to come to some conclusions. Incidentally, I do not consider as fortunate the reference in the report to sections of our people, as for example, so many Gujaratis, so many Marwaris and so many others. In the context of national integration, this question of bringing in Gujaratis, Marwaris and others rather vitiates that concept. But even so, the aspect of the distribution of economic power which he has touched upon has got to be taken into consideration.

Therefore, it is now for Government to consider in the light of the Report how we have tried to develop the country, how there could be diversification, what are the defects and deficiencies which have to be rectified and what revision of policy is called for.

Dr. Hazari has made numerous suggestions which it is for us to consider. I personally feel that if the Government had come forward with their own conclusions after full examination of the report and placed them before the House for our consideration, we would have been in a better position to discuss the Report. Having a discussion here before Government had taken their decisions does not seem to me to have much meaning, because it is Government's policy we have to consider. What we have to consider is whether the present policy is adequate or whether it has to be revised in the light of the Report. So I personally feel that discussion at this stage is premature. If the Cabinet Committee or the committee appointed under the chairmanship of Prof. Thacker had placed their conclusions before us, discussion here would have been more fruitful.

श्री रामाबतार शर्मा (ग्वालियर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जितने भी प्रतिवेदन हाउस में आये हैं उनमें इतना बड़ा विवाद नहीं उठा, जितना इसमें उठ खड़ा हुआ है। प्रथम तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि डा० हजारी की जो रिपोर्ट है वह एक आदमी की है। डा० हजारी ने इसके लिये बड़ा प्रयत्न किया है, अपना बहुत समय

[श्री रामाबतार शर्मा]

दिया है, पर वह एक अर्थशास्त्री हो सकते हैं। उद्योग के विषय में, या जितने उद्योगपति हैं, छोटे या बड़े, उन सब के विषय में जानने का दावा वह नहीं कर सकते। इस लिये यह एक व्यक्ति की रिपोर्ट ठीक नहीं है।

दूसरी बात जो डा० हजारी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में कही है वह यह कि उन्हें जो कुछ सामग्री उपलब्ध हुई प्रथम तो वह पक्षपातपूर्ण और अविश्वसनीय थी, दूसरे वह जितनी सामग्री चाहते थे वह भी किन्हीं कारणों से उनको नहीं दी गई। तब फिर इस रिपोर्ट का क्या अर्थ होता है जब कि सामग्री ही पूर्ण नहीं दी गई ?

तीसरी बात यह है, जैसा कि हमारे कई वन्धुओं ने बतलाया, कि हमारी जो लाइसेंस प्रणाली है वह सही सही नहीं चल रही है। सरकार की तरफ से उसको सही ढंग से नहीं चलाया जा रहा है। जितने भी लोगों को लाइसेंस दिये गये हैं उनमें से कुछ बड़े-बड़े आदमियों के नामों का उल्लेख डा० हजारी ने किया है। अब प्रश्न यह उत्पन्न होता है कि यह बात ठीक है कि बड़े-बड़े आदमियों ने लाइसेंस लिया। बिड़ला ने लिया, टाटा ने लिया। सब ने इसका लाभ उठाया और वह लाभ उठा सकते हैं। लेकिन आप यह सोचिये कि गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से ऐसी कोई प्रणाली तो नहीं थी कि वह लाइसेंस छोटे लोगों को कौनसा दिया जायेगा और यह बड़े लोगों को कौनसा दिया जायेगा। जिस तरह का बड़ा कारखाना अल्यूमिनियम का बिड़ला जी ने लगाया या बांस से पल्प बनाने जो कारखाना बिड़ला जी ने लगाया, वह लाइसेंस अगर मुझको दे दिया जाता तो क्या मैं उस काम को कर सकता था, या किसी छोटे व्यक्ति को दे दिया जाता तो उसका क्या होता ?

अभी जैसा श्रीमती मुचेता कृपालानी ने बतलाया अपने भाषण में, हमारे यहां लाइसेंस देने की प्रणाली इतनी आसान नहीं है। उसके बारे में भी, न जाने कितनी खोजबीन की जाती है और उसके बाद वह दिया जाता है। आज के दिन जो भाव इस हाउस में प्रकट किये

जा रहे हैं उनको सुन कर मुझे बड़ा दुःख हो रहा है। दुःख इस कारण हो रहा है कि आज हजारी रिपोर्ट के ऊपर बिल्कुल विचार नहीं किया जा रहा है। यह बात नहीं है कि आज हमारे सारे अधिकारी ऐसे हैं जो रिश्तत लेने वाले हैं या बिड़ला के काबू में हैं। अगर आज उनके ऊपर भी इस हाउस में दोषारोपण होता है तो यह अच्छी बात नहीं है।

मैं श्री हजारी से यहां बिल्कुल सहमत नहीं हूं और कोई भी बुद्धिमत्ता का काम उन्होंने नहीं किया है जहां उन्होंने अपनी फाइनल रिपोर्ट में नक्शा बना कर कहा है कि इतने गुजराती, इतने महाराष्ट्री, इतने मारवाड़ी और इतने बंगाली आदि लोगों को लाइसेंस दिये गये हैं। क्या यह साम्प्रदायिकता की बात नहीं है, क्या यह जातिवाद बढ़ाने के लिये विष नहीं उगला जा रहा है ? आज शायद मैं सब से पहला व्यक्ति हूं जो यह कहूंगा कि पालियामेंट के अन्दर कल से लेकर आज तक जो समय बरबाद किया जा रहा है वह ठीक नहीं है और यहां पर हजारी रिपोर्ट पर गौर करने की जरूरत नहीं है।

मैं यहां पर कल से जो वातावरण देख रहा हूं उससे मालूम होता है कि हजारी रिपोर्ट या उसके तत्वों पर बहुत कम लोगों ने अपने विचार प्रकट किये हैं। मुझे तो ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि हजारी रिपोर्ट के लिखने वाले किसी एक कम्पनी के सदस्य हैं जो कि किन्हीं कारणों से बिड़ला साहब से नाराज हो गये हैं। उसका कारण मुझे मालूम नहीं है। हालांकि मैं इस क्षेत्र में नया ही आया हूं परन्तु इतना जरूर बतला सकता हूं, जैसा हमारे बुजुर्गवार श्री कृपालानी ने कहा जो कि हमारे ग्वालियर प्रदेश से ही चुन कर आये हैं, उन्होंने कहा कि कांग्रेस को पैसा नहीं मिलता था, आज भी उन्होंने कहा कि गांधी जी को पैसा नहीं मिलता था, बिड़ला से कौन लेता था ? जहां तक मैंने देखा है हमारे कांग्रेस के बुजुर्ग ही नहीं, हमारे परम पूज्य गांधीजी स्वयम् उन्हींके यहां

रहे और उन्हींके यहां से सब कुछ मिलता रहा और उस समय जितने भी नेता थे उन्हें मिलता रहा है।

सवाल यह रह जाता है कि जितने बड़े कारखाने हैं इनको चलाता कौन है। जैसा मैंने पहले कहा, मुझे या मेरे भाई श्री शिव नारायण को या जो मेरे मित्र हरियाना के बोल रहे थे उनको लाइसेंस दे दिया जाय तो वह कैसे चलायेंगे यह मुझे नहीं मालूम। श्री शिव नारायण और हरियाना के मित्र ने यह कोई मुझाव नहीं दिया कि लाइसेंसों का वितरण कैसे किया जाये। लाइसेंस लेने के लिये मैं भी तैयार हूँ। लाइसेंस के बारे में हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों ने भी कहा। उनसे मैं एक सवाल पूछना चाहूँगा। क्यों साहब, बिड़ला साहब तो आपके केरल में कारखाना खोलने के लिये वहाँ नहीं गये थे जहाँ तक मुझे मालूम है केरल वाले ही बिड़ला साहब की खुशामद करके केरल में गये हैं।

दूसरी बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि राज्य सरकारों के या खुद गवर्नमेंट के जितने कारखाने चल रहे हैं उनकी क्या स्थिति है। मैं मिसाल देने के लिये तैयार हूँ, लेकिन मैं डरता हूँ कि मेरे सरीखे आदमी के लिये जल्दी ही घंटी बजा दी जायेगी। फिर भी मैं संक्षेप में कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो भी सरकारी कारखाने चल रहे थे उनके लिये बिड़ला जी को बुला कर उन्होंने कहा कि आप चलाइये। इसका परिणाम क्या अच्छा नहीं निकला? अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप एक राज्य के चीफ मिनिस्टर रह चुके हैं, आपको अपने यहां की याद होगी कि बिड़ला के हाथ में जाने से पहले आपके यहां के कागज के कारखाने की शेअर वैल्यू मार्केट में क्या थी। जिस दिन वह बिड़ला के हाथ में गया वह 40 परसेंट बढ़ गई। इसका कारण है कि उनके हाथ में कला है। मैं भी चाहता हूँ, आप चाहते हैं या नहीं, कि मैं लाइसेंस लूँ और सबसे बड़ा आदमी बनूँ, मैं भी बिड़ला के टक्कर का हो जाऊँ।

इसमें दो मत नहीं हैं कि सभी ऐसा चाहते हैं कि वह बड़े आदमी की बराबरी कर सकें, लेकिन यह हो कैसे? कला तो मुझ में है नहीं। मैं छोटा-सा उदाहरण अपनी गवर्नमेंट का भी देना चाहता हूँ। अगर गवर्नमेंट यह निर्धारित कर दे कि इतने छोटे छोटे कार्य जो हैं उनको कोई बड़ा आदमी नहीं कर सकेगा, छोटे लोग ही करेंगे, तब तो बात दूसरी थी, लेकिन आपने ऐसा नहीं किया, बड़े लोगों को ही दिया और उन्होंने काम को किया। आज हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने 3000 करोड़ रुपये अपने पब्लिक सेक्टर में लगा रखे हैं, लेकिन उनको क्या मिलता है? यहां पर सरकार के लोग बैठे हुए हैं, वह बतलायें। 1/2 परसेंट। लेकिन जो बड़े-बड़े उद्योगपति हैं उनके पास यह कला है, उनके बाप-दादों के वक्त से यह काम होता चला आया है। आप टाटा को देखिये कि वह कितना कमा कर दे रहे हैं—9 परसेंट, थापर आप को दे रहे हैं 13 परसेंट, बिड़ला आपको कमा कर दे रहे हैं—10 परसेंट। आपने 3000 करोड़ रुपये लगा रखे हैं और कमा रहे हैं 1/2 परसेंट, रोज क्वेश्चन्स में सुनते हैं कि आज यह नुकसान चला गया कल वह चला गया, आज 41 करोड़ का नुकसान हो गया; आज 10 लाख 50 साल का नुकसान हो रहा है। आप इस तरह से कारखाने चला रहे हैं, बिड़ला अगर अच्छी तरह कर रहे हैं तो कोई बुरी बात नहीं कर रहे हैं।

आज बहुतांश ने कहा कि बिड़ला ने धार्मिक कार्यों में भी पैसा लगाया है। मैं एक धार्मिक आदमी हूँ और महन्त दिग्विजयनाथ का पुराना शिष्य हूँ, मैं कह सकता हूँ कि धार्मिक क्षेत्र में बिड़ला जो कुछ करके दिखला चुके हैं उतना उद्योगों में लगे हुए जितने पूंजीपति हैं, उनमें से किसी ने नहीं किया। आज आपको वह मार्ग पसन्द नहीं है इसलिये आप कुछ भी कह लीजिये, लेकिन आप इसी लिये दुःख पा रहे हैं।

दूसरी बात यह है कि आज बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण पर बड़ा जोर दिया जा रहा है। कहते

[श्री रामाबतार शर्मा]

हैं कि इन बड़े आदमी को दे दिया, उन बड़े आदमी को दे दिया लेकिन बैंक क्या करें ? आप ही बतलाइये कि यदि बैंक बिड़ला को नहीं देंगे तो क्या महन्त जी को देंगे ? आखिर उनको इतना पैसा कैसे दे देंगे ? आप कुछ भी कहें, मुझे तो आज ऐसी गन्ध आ रही है कि यह हजारी रिपोर्ट कांग्रेस पार्टी ने महज बिड़ला को बदनाम करने के लिये तैयार कराई है ताकि उनके ऊपर टीका टिप्पणी हो। मैं तो केवल यही देख रहा हूँ, जिस तरह यहां पर ग्वालियर की राजमाता के साथ हुआ। वह दस साल तक यहां श्री सहगल के पास बैठती थीं। जैसा मैंने सुना है, उनका बहुत अच्छा स्वभाव था, देवी की तरह से थीं क्योंकि दस साल से वह कांग्रेस के साथ थीं। आज पलटा खाया तो फलानी बात फलानी चीज, वह मक्कार हैं और बड़ी गद्दार निकलीं। कम-से-कम मुझे तो ऐसी कोई बात मालूम नहीं हुई। यही बात आज बिड़ला आदि उद्योगपतियों के साथ हो रही है।

SHRI HIMATSINGKA (Godda) : Sir, the report has been discussed threadbare. The suggestions made by Dr. Hazari were indicated by the minister when he moved the motion. Birlas made applications for a number of licences which were diffused over a large number of industries which were needed in the country to meet the growing demands of the country. A large number of things which were being imported are now being manufactured here. There is no mention in any of the findings of Dr. Hazari that the Birlas have stood in the way of any other applicant for licence. In fact, in page 11, about foreclosure, he himself has said :

“Whether and if so to what extent this performance actually blocks the entry of other existing or potential entrepreneurs and thereby shuts competition is an open question which cannot be answered straightaway on the basis of the data in hand.”

Another factor why there are a number of applications by a particular firm is that certain other big houses which might have

come forward to industrialise the country did not take any interest. It has been mentioned by Dr. Hazari himself that they did not make any application. Therefore, if a firm makes an application and others do not come into the field, that firm should not be blamed for that. On the contrary, a large number of industries have been set up by them and they are running very well.

As mentioned by Mr. Sharma just now, the communist members have tried to show that Birlas influenced whom when they were requested to set up a factory in Kerala for manufacturing pulp ? That is the only factory producing rayon variety pulp from bamboos in the whole world. Special terms were offered by Mr. Namboodiripad, the Chief Minister of Kerala, to induce Birla Brothers to set up the factory, because they felt that none else would perhaps be able to do that.

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli) : That is an exception, not the general rule.

SHRI HIMATSINGKA : The communists offered special terms. They promised that there will be no labour trouble, that bamboos will be supplied at cheaper rates, etc. Now they say they have got a monopoly.

Nothing has been said in the report to show that they have stood in the way of small entrepreneurs. On the other hand, thousands of small industries have been started with the finance supplied by the number of financial institutions started by Government. As a matter of fact, Government has tried to do as much as possible for industrialising the country. The report has also indicated a number of defects which exist in the grant of licences. It is for the Government to take steps to plug them.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा तो कहना यह है कि इस परिवार ने हिन्दुस्तान में जन्म ही क्यों लिया ? यह वह परिवार है जहां महात्मा गांधी ने अपनी आखिरी सांस छोड़ी और सरदार पटेल ने भी अपनी आखिरी सांस छोड़ी। महामना पंडित मदन मोहन मालवीय ने जब काशी विश्वविद्यालय स्थापित करने की आवश्यकता

समझी तब उस परिवार ने अपना सर्वस्व तक दे देने का प्रस्ताव किया था। सरदार वल्लभभाई पटेल ने जब वल्लभ विद्यानगर, आणंद की स्थापना की थी तब भी उन्होंने चैक बुक निकाल कर उनके सामने रख दी। न केवल शैक्षणिक क्षेत्र में बल्कि धार्मिक और सामाजिक क्षेत्र में भी आप देखेंगे तो दिल्ली ही में लक्ष्मी नारायण मंदिर द्वारा मालूम पड़ेगा कि कैसे हिन्दुस्तान के हिन्दू सम्प्रदायों को उन्होंने एकत्रित करने का प्रयास किया है। इसी तरह सारनाथ का नवनिर्मित बौद्ध विहार है। न केवल इस देश में बल्कि इस देश के बाहर विदेशों में भी चाहे वह थाईलैंड हो या इंडोनेशिया हो, कम्बोडिया हो, नेपाल हो, लंका हो, वर्मा हो, इस परिवार की यह परम्परा रही कि वह सभी स्थानों पर देश की आदर्श सांस्कृतिक मान्यताओं की दृष्टि से एकीकृत करना चाहता था, कहीं अगर उसको यह पता होता कि इतना सब कुछ करने के पर स्वतंत्र भारत में बीस बरस के बाद उसको यह भी दिन देखने होंगे और गानी तथा अपमान उसको पुरस्कार के रूप में मिलेगा तो शायद उस परिवार का प्रारम्भ से ही निर्णय कुछ दूसरा होता। अगर हम लोगों ने समाजवाद की व्याख्या में यह भी सम्मिलित कर लिया है कि एक विशेष औद्योगिक संस्थान को इस प्रकार गालियां दे दे कर अपमानित किया जाए और तिरस्कृत किया जाय तो सोचना होगा कि हम यहां पर बैठ कर जिस प्रकार की चर्चा करते हैं और जिस प्रकार का निर्णय लेते हैं क्या वह निर्णय इस संसद के गौरव के अनुरूप है? हमें कुछ इस प्रकार के कार्य करने चाहियें जिससे देश में इस संसद के प्रति आस्था जगे।

आज सब से बड़ा प्रश्न यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान से गरीबी को कैसे दूर किया जा सकता है। है। हिन्दुस्तान में साठ सत्तर प्रतिशत व्यक्ति खेती के ऊपर निर्भर हैं और मुश्किल से 35 प्रतिशत आदमी ही इस प्रकार के हैं जो सर्बिस में हैं या इंडस्ट्रीज में हैं या दूसरे इसी प्रकार के धंधों में लगे हैं। जहां तक विदेशों का सम्बन्ध है वहां स्थिति इससे बिल्कुल भिन्न

है। अगर हमने अपने देश का औद्योगीकरण नहीं किया और इसी प्रकार की स्थिति रही तो इसका वही नतीजा होगा जैसा अभी डा० के० एल० राव ने इंजीनियरों की बेकारी के बारे में वक्तव्य देते हुए प्रकट किया है। उन्होंने कहा है कि लगभग पचास हजार इंजीनियर हिन्दुस्तान में बेकार हैं और डेढ़ लाख काम पर लगे हुए हैं। क्या इस प्रकार बेरोजगारी का हल या देश का औद्योगीकरण हम कर सकेंगे? खास तौर से मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूं कि सरकारी क्षेत्र में लगभग तीन हजार करोड़ रुपया लगा रखा है जिसमें से एक हजार करोड़ रुपया केवल हिन्दुस्तान स्टील के अन्दर लगा हुआ है। आप यह तो बतायें आपको उस पर रिटर्न क्या मिलता है? उत्पादन का प्रतिशत क्या है? निजी उद्योगों के अन्दर सब मिला कर अगर पूंजी का हिसाब लगाया जाए तो आपको पता चलेगा कि उसके रिटर्न का कुल प्रतिशत 6-7 परसेंट है। इसके विरुद्ध सरकार द्वारा लगाई गई तीन हजार करोड़ की पूंजी पर रिटर्न केवल आधा और एक परसेंट के बीच में है। क्या यह देश के धन के साथ खिलवाड़ नहीं है।

एक भिन्न कह रहे थे कि बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दिया जाए। मैं उनसे एक बात कहना चाहता हूं। बैंकों के पास पूंजी आज कितनी है? सब मिलाकर बैंकों के पास 3600 करोड़ रुपये की पूंजी है। इसमें से रिजर्व-बैंक के पास ग्यारह से बारह सौ करोड़ रुपया जमा है और आठ सौ करोड़ रुपये गवर्नमेंट सिक्यूरिटीज में तथा बांडों में लगे हुए हैं। यह सारा रुपया सरकार के पास रहता है। बाकी सोलह सौ करोड़ रुपया बचता है जिसमें से स्टेट बैंक तथा उससे सम्बन्धित जो बैंक हैं, उनमें भी पैसा है और दूसरे बैंकों के पास भी पैसा है। छोटे-छोटे उद्योग धंधों में भी लगता है और बड़े-बड़े उद्योग धंधों में भी लगता है। ऐसी अवस्था में कितनी पूंजी उनके पास शेष रह जाती है, इसका भी तो अनुमान आप लगायें।

इससे भी बड़ी एक और बात यह है।

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

सरकार के पास लाइफ इनश्योरेंस का पैसा है, पोस्टल सेविंग्स सर्टिफिकेट्स का पैसा है और जो राज्य सरकारों ने ऋण ले रखे हैं उनका भी पैसा है। समझ में नहीं आता है कि फिर कौन-सा पैसा बचता है जो जनता के उपयोग के लिए रह जाता है। इतना ज्यादा पैसा सरकार अपने कब्जे में किये बैठी है और ऐसा करके वह देश के अर्थ तंत्र को स्वयं जानबूझ कर दूषित कर रही है। फिर जिस प्रकार की चर्चा यहां हो रही है उनका मुन कर तो और भी ज्यादा दुख होता है।

जहां तक हजारी रिपोर्ट का सम्बन्ध है अगर आप मुझे पढ़ने की आज्ञा दें तो मैं उसी रिपोर्ट में से तीन चार पंक्तियां प्रश्न के रूप में पढ़ कर आपको सुनाना चाहता हूं। मैं नहीं समझ पाया हूं कि डा० हजारी ने यह रिपोर्ट इस औद्योगिक संस्थान की प्रशंसा के लिये लिखी है या निन्दा के लिये लिखी है। उनके शब्द ही यह हैं :—

“इस घराने ने निस्संदेह भारत के अर्थ-तंत्र के विकास में भारी योग दिया है। उसने प्रतिरक्षा एवं निर्यात अभिस्थापित उद्योगों, यांत्रिक उपकरणों, इंजीनियरिंग स्तुओं, यंत्रों, एल्यूमीनियम, रसायनों, उर्वरकों व सिमेंट जैसे मूलभूत उद्योगों आदि में महत्त्वपूर्ण प्रयत्न किये हैं।”

और भी तमाम यह गिनती यहां की गई है। इस रिपोर्ट में यह भी लिखा गया है कि इनका इस देश के विकास के अन्दर बहुत महत्वपूर्ण योगदान रहा है। इसी रिपोर्ट में आगे जाकर डा० हजारी स्वयं अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहते हैं कि दस वर्ष के अन्दर नौ हजार लाइसेंस दिये गये हैं और इन नौ हजार लाइसेंसों में मोनोपोली कमीशन के आधार पर केवल 151 इस परिवार के हिस्से में आते हैं। फिर आप यह भी देखें कि यह एक परिवार ही तो केवल नहीं है। इसमें उनके रिश्तेदार भी हैं, उनके सम्बन्धी भी हैं। इस औद्योगिक संस्थान के द्वारा चलाये जा रहे उद्योग धंधों में दो ढाई

लाख के करीब लोग काम पर लगे हुए हैं। इस सब के लिए देश को उनका ऋणी होना चाहिये। डा० हजारी ने आगे चलकर स्वयं अपनी रिपोर्ट में लिखा है कि इनके द्वारा चलाये जा रहे उद्योगों में कम से कम विदेशी मुद्रा का प्रयोग होता है। तब समझ में नहीं आता है कि डा० हजारी उनको प्रशंसा का सर्टिफिकेट दे रहे थे या उनकी वह निन्दा करना चाहते थे। यह एक ऐसा परिवार है जिसका राष्ट्र के विकास में, औद्योगिक विकास में विशेष स्थान रहा है। इस सब को देखते हुए यदि अपशब्दों का ही प्रयोग करना था और इस सर्वोच्च सदन के अन्दर इस प्रकार निन्दा का ही इस प्रतिष्ठान को विषय बनाना था तो मैं नहीं समझता कि ऐसा करके दूसरे उद्योग धंधों में लगे लोगों को प्रोत्साहन इस तरह कैसे दिया जा सकेगा? यह तो उनके उत्साह को घटाना ही होगा। हमको सोचना चाहिये कि जब हमारे देश में धरती सीमित है, परिवार नियोजन के कार्यक्रमों के द्वारा हम विचार कर रहे हैं कि किस तरह से अपने देश की समस्या का आर्थिक समाधान करें तो हमको अपने देश के उद्योग-धंधों को बढ़ाना होगा। जहां तक उद्योग-धंधों को बढ़ाने का प्रश्न है, सरकारी उद्योग-धंधों की स्थिति का चित्रण मैंने अभी किया ही है। इस अवस्था में सरकार कैसे इस देश की आर्थिक समस्या का समाधान करेगी? किस तरह वह बेरोजगार इंजीनियरों और अन्य प्रशिक्षित लोगों को काम पर लगायेगी?

डा० हजारी स्वयं अपनी रिपोर्ट में कितने कनफ्यूज्ड हैं, मैं इसका भी एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूं। उनके ही यह शब्द हैं, जो जानकारी मुझे किसी निष्कर्ष पर पहुंचने के लिए आवश्यक थी, वह पूरी नहीं मिल सकी। वह अधूरी, अविश्वसनीय और एकांगी थी। उनका कहना है कि जिन प्रमाणों और तथ्यों के आधार पर उन्होंने यह रिपोर्ट तैयार की, वे “पार्शल, इनकम्प्लीट एंड इन सम सेसिज नाट फुली रिलायबल” थे। इसी से शायद जो व्यक्ति 1960 में इकानोमिकल बीकली में

कहता है कि इस औद्योगिक संस्थान के पास 346 लाइसेंस हैं, वह ही 1961 में कहता है कि उसके पास 270 लाइसेंस हैं और रिपोर्ट में अब वह कहता है कि उसके पास 160 लाइसेंस हैं। जब कि मोनोपोलीज़ कमीशन के अनुसार वास्तविकता यह है कि उसके पास सिर्फ 151 लाइसेंस हैं।

जब डा० हज़ारी ने इतनी विस्तृत रिपोर्ट तैयार की, तो निष्पक्षता की दृष्टि से और साथ ही इसको एक प्रामाणिक रूप देने के लिए भी उनको एक औद्योगिक संस्थान के साथ साथ दूसरे संस्थानों को दिये गये लाइसेंसों तथा अन्य सम्बन्धित आंकड़ों सम्बन्धी भी तथ्य देने चाहिए थे। ताकि एक तुलनात्मक विवेचन हमारे सामने आता। उन्होंने केवल एक ही परिवार या औद्योगिक संस्थान को ले कर समस्या का एक ही पक्ष सामने रखा, दूसरा पक्ष नहीं रखा।

इस रिपोर्ट के एक अंश पर माननीय सदस्य, डा० मेलकोटे ने आपत्ति की है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उसको पढ़ कर मुझे केवल तकलीफ ही नहीं हुई, बल्कि चोट भी पड़नी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि सदन के हर एक माननीय सदस्य की प्रतिक्रिया भी यही होगी। हम सब सारे देश की एकता का स्वप्न देखने हैं और कन्याकुमारी से काश्मीर तक और कच्छ से नेफा तक फैले इस भूभाग को एक देश के रूप में देखते हैं। लेकिन एक व्यक्ति अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहता है कि इतने लाइसेंस मारवाड़ियों को दिये गये, इतने बंगालियों को, इतने पंजाबियों को और इतने सिंधियों को दिये गये। क्या इस प्रकार की रिपोर्ट तैयार करने वाले व्यक्तियों के मस्तिष्क में देश की एकता की कोई और ही कल्पना है? मैं श्री फ़ख़रुद्दीन अहमद, और सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि बराये-मेहरबानी इस प्रकार की रिपोर्टों को तैयार कराते समय वह इन लोगों के मस्तिष्कों को पहले थोड़ा साफ़ कर दिया करें, ताकि महत्वपूर्ण निर्णय और सिफ़ारिशें करते

हुए उनके मन में इस प्रकार का संकुचितपन और इस प्रकार की छोटी रेखायें न हों और वे देश के भाग्य के साथ इस प्रकार खिलवाड़ न करें।

आज जो स्थिति है, उसमें सरकार चाहे कितना ही रुपया परिवार-नियोजन पर लगाए, चाहे खेती को किसी भी प्रकार से बढ़ाने की कोशिश करे लेकिन यदि औद्योगीकरण की उपेक्षा की गई और उद्योग-धंधों में लगे हुए लोगों को उनके परिश्रम का पुरस्कार माली-गलीज, अपमान और निन्दा के रूप में दिया गया, तो हम देश के आर्थिक भविष्य को सुरक्षित नहीं कर सकेंगे। मुझे आशा है कि सरकार इसी दृष्टि से इस प्रश्न पर विचार करेगी।

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Minister.

SHRI SONAVANE : Sir, nobody from Maharashtra has spoken.

SHRI TULSHIDAS JADHAV : We had also given our names.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : You speak on the Thacker Committee Report.

MR. SPEAKER : I cannot help it. I had announced it in the morning.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI F. A. AHMED) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, towards the concluding portion of my introductory statement I had stated that a committee has been appointed under Professor Thacker to enquire into the working of the industrial licensing system during the past ten years. I had also indicated that a committee of the Cabinet has also been set up to review the overall economic and industrial policies of Government to see how far the objectives for which they were framed have been achieved and whether any modifications were needed in those policies.

I had mentioned that the discussion of the Hazari Report in the context of the action taken by Government will be helpful because the suggestions which hon. Members may have occasion to offer will be helpful to us in formulating our policy and, if necessary,

[Shri F. A. Ahmed]

in changing the objective which we have adopted for the purpose of industrial development. From that point of view I am grateful to hon. Members that the debate lasting over seven hours has served a very useful purpose.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA (Gurdaspur) : No purpose at all !

SHRI F. A. AHMED : Well, I am not so ungrateful to the hon. Members for the very valuable suggestions which some of them have given in the course of this discussion. I do not know if my friend who has raised this objection was present here when these observations were made. But I, certainly, think that some of the observations are helpful and will be taken note of when we take a final decision with regard to our policy in this matter.

I would like to remind the House that the objective of our industrial policy is the growth of industries in our country. It is with that objective that certain guide-lines, certain principles, were laid before the country of which the House is aware. Under that guide-line which was adopted as a policy, a certain number of industries were fixed only for being developed in the public sector. Then, there were other industries for which both public sector and private sector were permitted to come in the field and help each other for the purpose of their development and the rest of the industries were left in the private sector to develop. It is on this basis that we have been proceeding since 1952 and this licensing procedure was adopted after the Act was passed by this House in order to regulate the development of industries having regard to the principles we had laid down in the Industrial Policy Resolution.

Now, Sir, if we look into those principles, we find that those principles themselves are conflicting and will not serve the very purpose for which those principles were laid down. On the one hand, in those principles, it was said that we must have quick industrial development in our country by having bigger units and, on the other hand, we said that we should also not neglect smaller units. Now, in the same Industrial Policy Resolution, it was also said that the question with regard to the regional imbalance

should also be taken into consideration. If we look into these things, we find that there are inherent contradictions in the very principles which we have adopted. Therefore, if in some direction or in any direction, things have gone wrong, we cannot say that it is only because of the licensing policy but it is also because of the very conflicting principles which we have been pursuing and which may also be responsible for that. So, the question before us is not to give a subjective consideration of what Dr. Hazari has placed before us but to consider this Report with certain objectives.

Here, I would like to point out that some of the hon. Members have suggested that Dr. Hazari was appointed by the Government at the instance of some Congress Members. I would like to disabuse the minds of hon. Members who have this impression because no Congress Member had taken part or initiative in suggesting that Dr. Hazari should be appointed for the purpose of giving this Report and the Government had not appointed Dr. Hazari to give this Report. Dr. Hazari was appointed, as the hon. Members are aware, as the hon. Consultant in the Planning Commission to review the operation of licensing and so on. He was not appointed by the Government. The Report which was submitted by him was not made to the Government but to the Planning Commission.

Some of the hon. Members have also criticised that he had gone beyond the terms of reference. If I read the Report, I find this is what Dr. Hazari himself has said :

"The precise areas of industrial planning and licensing policy on which I was to work left to my discretion in consultation with the Industrial and Mineral Development Division of the Planning Commission."

Therefore, I submit that it is not proper that we should impute any motive either to Dr. Hazari or to anyone who had appointed him for the purpose of surveying the entire licensing policy and submitting a Report before the Planning Commission. We may not agree. I myself do not agree with many of the things which have been suggested in this Report, but because we disagree with some of the observations which have been made

by Dr. Hazari, we should not say this. I can see that he has spent a good deal of time and also put in a hard labour in placing this Report before the Planning Commission. Therefore, it would not be proper that the hard work put in by Dr. Hazari should be interpreted as if he had done this work at the instance of either the Government or any Congress member or that there was a bad motive on his part in submitting this Report. I hope, the members will not have that point of view, will not accept that point of view....

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : Has the Planning Commission reviewed this Report?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : This Report was submitted to the Planning Commission and I do not know how actually it came into the hands of some members. I was asked to place this Report in Rajya Sabha.....
(Interruptions)

SHRI PILOO MODY : From this you infer that the Planning Commission is looking at it !

AN HON. MEMBER : A deliberate leakage !

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I have no doubt whatsoever that the Planning Commission, when they are engaged in preparing a plan for the future, will certainly look into this valuable document which has been prepared by Dr. Hazari.....

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I want to know whether the Planning Commission has seen the Report. Let him reply to this.

MR. SPEAKER : He has said that it will look when the plan is prepared for the future....
(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : The only copy was spirited away.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : What are the important aspects which have been considered and observed by the hon. members in this connection....

SHRI R. K. AMIN (Dhandhuka) : May I know why was the Report out before you could consider it ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I am not responsible for it.

One of the questions which have been raised by the hon. members is with regard to canalising the investment into priority fields. That was also one of the objectives of our Industrial Policy Resolution which we had adopted in 1956, and I can say that, by and large, that objective has been fulfilled. During the past three Plan periods, I would like to remind the hon. members, we have made a substantial and noteworthy progress in the industrialisation of this country. The basic industries, particularly, machine-building industries and, of late, the chemical industries, as also a large variety of consumer industries, have been developed. It is not necessary for me to cite any detailed figures in support of this. The House is aware of this. But the main point which I would like to stress is that our policies and perspective have been generally in the right direction. Then it has been pointed out....
(Interruptions)

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : There was a lot of conflict between your policy and the actual practice. How do you say that they have been in the right direction ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I have said that in the priority sector—one of the main principles of the Industrial Policy Resolution is this—we have developed industries and I have given a few instances where the development has already taken place, whether in the public sector or in the private sector. Therefore, one of the objectives of the Industrial Policy Resolution has, to a great extent, been fulfilled.

We have been criticised by some members that instead of preferring investment in the public sector, there has been investment under the private sector. I would like the hon. House to remember as to what has been the nature of investment, both in the private sector and in the public sector, in the last three Plan periods.

So far as the figures are concerned, in 1950-51 the contribution of the public sector was less than 2 per cent; this contribution rose to about 8 per cent in 1960 and to about 20 per cent at the end of the Third Five Year Plan. In terms of actual figures, the investment in organised public sector of industry had been Rs. 260 during the First Plan period, Rs. 770 crores during the

[Shri F. A. Ahmed]

Second Plan period and about Rs. 1,330 crores during the Third Plan period.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH : What is the return ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I shall just give those figures. In the Fourth Plan, the estimate is Rs. 3,543 crores.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : With what results ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : The investment in the private sector during the corresponding periods was Rs. 338 crores, Rs. 850 crores and Rs. 1,275 crores respectively, and during the Fourth Plan period, it would be Rs. 2,650 crores. Therefore, hon. Members would realise that one of the objectives of the industrial policy namely that we should increasingly go in for the public sector has to a great extent been achieved.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI (Mandsaur) : And maximised losses.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : If the hon. Member would allow me to proceed in my own way, I shall certainly deal with that aspect of the question also. In this context, I would like the hon. Members to consider the question of monopoly which has been raised by several Members in this House. First of all, we have to consider whether the size of a particular unit, namely whether it is Rs. 200 or 300 or 500 crores is the material thing which has to be taken into consideration or whether in considering the question of monopoly we have to consider the question whether the concentration of wealth and power has gone into the hands of a few persons to the detriment of the public interest. It is only in this context that we have to consider whether there is a certain monopoly and whether there is concentration of power which will be to the detriment of the public interest. Then only we can say whether a particular house, whether the Birlas or the Tatas or Martin Burns and so on are such a house about whom we have to be careful and take the necessary action. I submit that this is a question of policy and on the basis of the achievement and on the basis of the activities of the various houses we have to see whether any of the houses has reached a stage where they can utilise

their wealth for the purposes of wielding any power to the detriment of the public interest, and if they do, then Government will have to look into it and see what measures are called for in order to curb that tendency.

Dr. Hazari has submitted this report on the basis of the figures before him and examined by him. He has come to the conclusion that there were certain irregularities which helped certain people in preventing others from coming in. It is for that purpose that another committee has been appointed. Some hon. Members have asked why only Birlas have been named and why the other business houses have not been included in this. It is only for that purpose that the Thacker Committee was appointed. I would like to remind the House of the terms of reference to the Thacker Committee and they are : to inquire into the working of the industrial licensing system in the last ten years with a view to ascertaining whether the large industrial houses have in fact secured undue advantage over other applicants in the matter of issue of such licences and they have received a disproportionately larger share of such licences; whether there was sufficient justification for this; to assess to what extent licences issued to the larger industrial houses have been actually implemented and whether failure to do so has resulted in pre-emption of capacity and shutting out of other entrepreneurs; to examine to what extent licences issued have been in consonance with the policy of Government as laid down in the Industrial Policy Resolution of 30 April 1956.

Therefore, when this report is before us, it will be possible to see whether in any particular direction there has been abuse any attempt on the part of any industrial house to prevent other people from coming in and getting licences.

In this connection, I would also like to point out that from time to time we have ourselves been giving consideration to the action taken under the licensing system. First of all, for the purpose of procedure, the Swaminathan Committee was appointed. They laid down certain guidelines which are being followed. From 1964, instead of giving a licence, we have introduced

this letter of intent. Under this system, first of all, a letter of intent is issued which holds good for a period of six months. Unless and until action is taken within period the letter is automatically cancelled, unless the applicant applies for extension of the letter giving reasons why he has not been able to comply with the directions in that letter. This has been introduced for the simple reason that once a licence is issued, it is a long procedure before it can be revoked. But so far as the letter of intent is concerned, we need not give notice. It automatically ends if action is not taken within the time stipulated therein.

We have been very careful during the past few years to see that whenever any application is made and whenever any letter of intent is issued on that application, it is not allowed to be extended, and only in exceptional circumstances permission is granted for extension, if for some good reason the party has not been able to undertake completion of the work which has been indicated in the letter.

I am very sorry that our revered leader, Acharya Kripalani, made a reference to HMT Bangalore wherein he said that goods of the value of Rs. 3 crores are lying in stock and suggested that it was not being managed properly. If a unit has continued production and has not been able to sell, not because of any defect in the working of the unit but because of recession and lack of orders, can the fault be attributed to it? May I point out that it is one of our public sector units which has even in 1966-67 yielded a profit of Rs. 126.23 lakhs. It has not given dividend only during the last two years; previous to that it was giving a dividend of nearly 10 per cent, that is till 1964-65, before recession came upon us. I would humbly ask him to keep this in mind. We are trying to sell the stock with us. I hope with the orders we are getting from outside and also with the improvement in the recession position, it will be possible for us to dispose of the stock which has piled up in this unit.

It is for that reason that we wanted to set up a large number of units of HMT in many other areas, to remove the imbalance of some of the States. We find that there is recession and there has been no

demand for these things and so those projects have also been postponed. I hope that he will be satisfied that this unit is not in a bad way.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : Acharyaji has unwittingly made the Minister confess it for the first time.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : Many of my hon. friends have raised objection to the public sector because it does not yield ten or thirteen per cent profit as the private sector units do in some cases, but yields only 0.2 or 0.3 per cent profits. It must be remembered that the public sector units had been set up not only for profit but also for the purpose of satisfying certain social needs... (*Interruptions*). Whatever the hon. Members may say, when we consider the question of profit and loss, we must take into account the expenditure incurred on constructing and maintaining a township, schools and other facilities which are not available in the private sector. Besides, some of the public sector industries are manufacturing capital goods and therefore their gestation period is longer compared to industries which manufacture consumer goods. The private sector engages itself in the manufacture of consumer goods.

SHRI PILOO MODY : You cannot make profit even on shoes.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : We should not be carried away by such statements.

So far as the allocation of expenditure to small scale sector is concerned, the amount has been increased from Rs. 5 crores in the First Plan to Rs. 114 crores in the Third Plan. Apart from the direct assistance and incentives given by the Government to the growth of the small sector and the big organisation built up for this purpose, Government have also used the Industries Act as an instrument to give protection to small scale industry and as many as 47 industries have been reserved for the small sector. I am prepared to consider the question whether some more small industries could be reserved for the small sector. An hon. Member suggested that we should allow import of items even though they are manufactured indigenously, if the import price is cheaper.

(M.)

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : It is Hazari's recommendation.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I am not referring to you alone; some others also referred to it. We must be very careful in allowing such imports; if they are allowed, it is not possible to manufacture indigenous items cheaply. And so we must find out what are the reasons, why that particular item is more expensive than the imported item and if we can take steps to reduce the cost of production, surely that will be a better way than encouraging the import of those items from outside our country.

18 hrs.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : There is a wide gap between profession and practice.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I am sorry Prof. Humayun Kabir is not here. I would just conclude by saying that certainly it is the Government's responsibility, and we are entirely responsible to see that whatever goes wrong is put in order, and I am sorry that such an observation should have come from no less a person than Prof. Humayun Kabir, because he was one of the important members of the Cabinet when these policies were pursued and it is now being considered on the Hazari Committee report.

I submit that so far as the Government are concerned, we are not interested in either A or B. We are only concerned with certain objectives and we are only concerned, whether it is the licensing system or any other system, with what is intended to develop the industry and to see what has gone wrong or anything requires any modification. It is only with that purpose in view that this report will be considered by us and the report submitted by Prof. Thacker will be considered by us and the Cabinet Committee is also considering to what extent the modification in the policy is called for.

Before I conclude, I would like to point out that certain Members are under the wrong impression that no assistance is given to the Thacker Committee for the purpose of doing their work. As far as I know, every facility has been provided to them and they have been given a big office to work and they have also been given a large personnel to

do their work and they are engaged in this work. I can assure this House that whenever they were in any difficulty, the Chairman or the Secretary saw me and I personally saw to it that most of their complaints were removed.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : The Chairman's last letter has remained unreplied to for the last two months.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : After all, whenever there was difficulty, they brought it to my notice or to the notice of the Minister of State. I can assure the House that all their grievances will be redressed and that their work is progressing well.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

MR. SPEAKER : At this rate, the whole House will begin to ask for clarification. No please. Otherwise, we will have to go on up to 8 o'clock. (*Interruption*) Everybody would like to have a clarification. No please. Mr. S. M. Krishna's substitute motion is there : he is not present.

SHRI S. KUNDU : I am here. It is a joint motion.

MR. SPEAKER : Yes; I know. Are you pressing it ?

SHRI S. KUNDU : Yes, Sir. It must be read out.

MR. SPEAKER : Everybody has got it.

SHRI S. KUNDU : It is better to read it to refresh one's memory.

It will take not more than a minute. It is better you read it.

MR. SPEAKER : No please.

SHRI S. KUNDU : I will read it. The substitute motion standing in the name of Shri S. M. Krishna and in my name reads as follows :

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :—

"This House, having considered the Interim and Final Reports on Industrial Planning and Licensing Policy by Dr. R. K. Hazari, laid on the Table of the

House on the 7th April and 16th November, 1967 respectively, is of the opinion that the Government has miserably failed to implement the licensing policy in a manner so as to curb the concentration of wealth in a few hands as directed by the Constitution and has deliberately pursued a policy influenced by big capitalist interests which has resulted in the growth of big industrial houses to the detriment of progress of socialist economy in this country." (1)

MR. SPEAKER : I will now put the substitute motion No. 1 which has been read out just now by Mr. Kundu.

The substitute motion No. 1 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Banerjee's motion also is there.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I will read it. It says : That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER : I will now put Mr. Banerjee's substitute motion No. 2 to the House.

The substitute motion No. 2 was put and negatived.

18-06 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

—Contd.

REPORTED KIDNAPPING OF POLICE
CONSTABLE BY CHINESE EMBASSY
RED GUARDS—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Dwivedy.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI
(Kendrapara) : I have already called the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER : The Minister may now make his statement.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI
VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA) : We have been informed by the Delhi Administration that on March 6, 1968 constables Ghanisham Parshad and Ram Richpal Singh of 24th Btn. of the C.R.P. were returning at about 15.15 hrs. from beat duty in Railway Colony at Sardar Patel Marg to Police Station, Chanakyapuri. They were in uniform. They took a short cut through the Chinese Embassy premises by entering from one of the gates on Nyaya Marg and emerged on the main gate on Shanti Path. When the two constables had come out of the main gate of the Embassy, they were called back by the gate-keeper Bir Bahadur of the Chinese Embassy. One of them, namely, Ghanisham Parshad complied and entered the gate. Bir Bahadur caught hold of him and took him inside the room meant for the gate-keeper and forcibly detained him. Soon after this some Chinese and others came from the main Embassy building and took Ghanisham Parshad inside the main building.

2. At about 17.15 hours the Station House Officer told another Chowkidar of the Embassy, Suraj Bahadur, to inform the Chinese inside the main building that the Sub-Divisional Magistrate and the Sub-Divisional Police Officer would like to talk to them about the detained constable. After some time he returned and intimated that the Chinese would not talk to the local authorities but would deal only with the Ministry of External Affairs. After about 15 minutes the Sub-Divisional Magistrate spoke on telephone to the Chinese authorities in the Embassy and requested them to release the constable. His request was turned down and he was told that they would deal only with the Ministry of External Affairs.