

13. 15 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: SUGAR PROBLEM

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): What about sugar?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas): I shall make the statement today or tomorrow. This is a long statement.

Mr. Speaker: Tomorrow he might make the statement.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What about the adjournment motion?

Shri A. M. Thomas: Tomorrow I shall make the statement.

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): Why not he place it on the Table of the House today?

Shri A. M. Thomas: I can place it on the Table of the House.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): It can be circulated to Members.

Mr. Speaker: He might place it on the Table of the House.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Sir, I lay the statement on the Table. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-1846/63*].

13.15½ hrs.

REQUISITIONING AND ACQUISITION OF IMMOVABLE PROPERTY (AMENDMENT) BILL*

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Works, Housing and Rehabilitation (Shri P. S. Naskar): Sir, on behalf of Shri Mehr Chand Khanna, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1952.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend

the Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1952."

The motion was adopted.

Shri P. S. Naskar: I introduce the Bill.

13.16 hrs.

MOTION RE: COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS—Contd.

Mr. Speaker: We will now take up further consideration of the two motions on the Committee on Public Undertakings, moved by the Minister of Industry. Shri Heda may continue his speech.

श्री हेडा (निजामाबाद) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल मैं इस समिति के अधिकारों के सम्बन्ध में अपने विचार प्रकट कर रहा था। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि इस समिति को निम्नन्देश प्राक्कलन समिति और लोक लेखा समिति के समान अधिकार होने चाहिए। परन्तु फिर भी सरकार का जो यह प्रस्ताव आया है उसमें बाधा नहीं होती। एक बात और कह दूँ और वह यह कि अधिकार समिति को सारे प्राप्त हो जायेंगे और वह समिति इतनी महत्वपूर्ण रहेगी कि यह समिति जो बहेगी उसका विरोध करना या उसको टालने की बात सरकार के लिए बड़ा मुश्किल होगा। अ.ज. पब्लिक सैक्टर के सम्बन्ध में चर्चा होती है और उस के बारे में लोगों को इस प्रकार की चिन्ता है कि इस समिति का जो भी निवेदन होगा उस निवेदन का अत्यन्त महत्व रहेगा। इसलिए मुझ विश्वास है कि प्रोसीज्योर में, कार्यवाही में कुछ भी अधिकार दिये जायं, लेकिन उसके अधिकार प्राक्कलन समिति या लोक लेखा समिति से किसी भी प्रकार कम नहीं रहेंगे।

उस के बाद मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह समिति १० लोक सभा और

*Published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II—Section 2, dated 19-11-1963.

५ राज्य सभा के मੈम्बर्स को लेकर बनाई जा रही है, १५ मैम्बर्स की यह कमेटी जो बनाई जा रही है वह काफ़ी नहीं होगी। पब्लिक सैक्टर जिस प्रकार से बढ़ रहा है, नई नई कम्पनियां आ रही हैं, सैकड़ों, करोड़ों रुपया इस के अन्दर लग रहा है, उस को देखत हुए इस समिति का कार्य वास्तव में लोक लेखा समिति या प्राक्कलन समिति से बड़ा है न कि कम।

कुछ सदस्यों ने २० लोक सभा के और १० राज्य सभा के मैम्बर्स को लेकर यानी ३० मैम्बर्स की संख्या रखने की जो बात कही है, मैं समझता हूँ कि ३० की संख्या ठीक होगी वैसे मैं खुश होता अगर उसकी संख्या और भी बढ़ाई जाती।

एक बात मैं और निवेदन करूँ। आज ही एक वक्तव्य अखबारों के अन्दर पढ़ने को मिला। उस की वजह से एक बड़ा प्रकाश पड़ता है कि पब्लिक सैक्टर के जो हमारे बड़े बड़े काम चल रहे हैं उन की किस प्रकार की परिस्थिति है। श्री राज बहादुर ने एक वक्तव्य देते हुए श्री ज० आर० डी० टाटा की बहुत प्रशंसा की। एयर इंडिया इंटरनेशनल के अन्दर ६६ लाख और कुछ हजार रुपया बतौर पांच परसेंट डिबेंड के उनका होता है। सरकार की जिसमें इतनी पूंजी लगी है उस मूलधन के ऊपर ५ फीसदी जो उनको डिबेंड दिया है उसके वास्तव विशेष धन्यवाद दिया। श्री टाटा ने जो उसका जवाब दिया उससे जो आंकड़ मिलत हैं उनसे मालूम होता है कि इस कम्पनी ने तकरीबन ३३ प्रतिशत मुनाफ़ा किया है। हमारे कुछ पब्लिक सैक्टर प्रोजेक्ट्स ऐसे हैं, जिन के मैनेजमेंट का, काम चलाने का अधिकार हम ने एक अच्छे परखे हुए और इस काम में प्रवीण व्यक्ति को सौंपा और उस का लाभ उठाया। मैं आंध्र प्रदेश से आता हूँ और वहां मुझे एक दूसरी ही बात दिखाई दे रही है। आप को याद होगा कि हाल ही में आंध्र प्रदेश के चीफ़ मिनिस्टर ने इस बात का उल्लेख किया कि वह आंध्र पेपर मिल को, जो कि 1400 (Ai) L.S.D.—6

राजमहेन्द्री में है, जो पूर्णतया सरकारी कम्पनी है, जिस को गत कई वर्षों से सरकार चलाती आ रही है और जिस को बढ़ाने की कार्यवाही सरकार ने की है, कुछ प्राइवेट व्यक्तियों के हाथों में सौंप देना चाहते हैं। कुछ वर्ष पहले आंध्र के कुछ पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों को ले कर मैं उस मिल को देखने गया था और हम ने देखा कि वह मिल अच्छा काम कर रही थी, उस की प्रगति बहुत संतोषजनक थी और वह मुनाफ़ा भी हासिल कर रही थी। इस के बावजूद चीफ़ मिनिस्टर साहब ने यह घोषणा की कि वह उस मिल को प्राइवेट व्यक्ति के हाथों में सौंप देना चाहते हैं। मालूम यह होता है कि सरकार के पास जो पांच छः और कम्पनियां हैं, उन को भी वह इसी प्रकार प्राइवेट हाथों में सौंपा देना चाहते हैं। यह क्यों हो रहा है। मैं चीफ़ मिनिस्टर साहब को अच्छी तरह से जानता हूँ। वह बड़े उन्नतिशील विचारों के हैं। वह कोई प्रतिगामी विचारों के नहीं हैं। लेकिन इस प्रकार इस का एक प्रतिगामी कदम उठाने के लिए वह क्यों मजबूर हुए? मेरे खयाल से एक ही कारण हो सकता है कि उन्होंने देखा कि इन मिलों को चलाने के लिए जिस प्रकार के व्यवस्थापकों और मैनेजर्स की जरूरत है, उस प्रकार के व्यवस्थापक उन को पब्लिक सैक्टर के वर्तमान तरीके के तहत नहीं मिल पाते हैं और यही कारण है कि उन्होंने इस प्रकार का कदम उठाने की बात सोची।

माननीय मंत्री, श्री राज बहादुर, के आज के वक्तव्य में मैं यह दृष्टिकोण देखता हूँ कि जब पब्लिक सैक्टर में कोई प्रोजेक्ट ठीक तौर पर न चलता हो, तो उस को राष्ट्र के किसी अच्छे परखे हुए व्यक्ति के हवाले किया जा सकता है और उसको कामयाब बनाया जा सकता है। हिन्दुस्तान में पेपर मिलें कई चल रही हैं और कई तो बहुत कामयाबी के साथ चल रही हैं। खुद आंध्र प्रदेश में एक पेपर मिल को मैं जानता हूँ, जो कुछ वर्ष पूर्व १४

[श्री हेडा]

एक प्रतिदिन का उत्पादन नहीं करती थीं, लेकिन आज वहाँ १०० टन से ज्यादा उत्पादन हो रहा है और बाहर से और कोई पूंजी लिये बाँर, जो पूंजी उन्होंने कमाई है उस से वह एक और प्लांट विजयवाड़ा में लगा रही है। हम देखते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में एक दो नहीं कई पेपर मिलें ऐसी हैं, जो कामयाबी के साथ, सफलता के साथ, चल रही हैं। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि आंध्र प्रदेश गवर्नमेंट के लिए यह आसान होगा—मुश्किल नहीं होना चाहिए—कि वह किसी अच्छे व्यवस्थापक की सेवायें हासिल कर के अपनी पेपर मिल को चलाए, जैसे कि हम ने श्री जे० आर० डी० टाटा की सेवायें एयर इंडिया इन्टरनेशनल के लिए हासिल की हैं।

वास्तव में पब्लिक सैक्टर की जो खराबी है, उस में जो दिक्कत पड़ रही है, अगर थोड़े शब्दों में मैं कहना चाहूँ, तो एक तो यह है कि वहाँ पर जिस प्रकार के काम करने वाले अधिकारीगण हमें चाहिये, वे वहाँ उपलब्ध नहीं हैं। आज जो लोग वहाँ जाते हैं, वे आई० ए० एस० मनोवृत्ति के होते हैं और उन की ट्रेनिंग और प्रशिक्षण पूर्णतया ठीक नहीं है। वे फ्राइलों में अपने आप को डूबो लेने वाले होते हैं। लेकिन वहाँ पर हम को ऐसे टेक्निकल आदमी चाहिये, जोकि उस विषय की अच्छी तरह जानकारी रखते हों।

एक तरफ हम कहते हैं कि हमें इंजीनियरों की बड़ी जरूरत है, लेकिन दूसरी तरफ वास्तव में क्या होता है? एक विद्यार्थी आई० ए० एस० की तरफ जाता है और दूसरा विद्यार्थी इंजीनियरी की तरफ जाता है। आगे चल कर दोनों काफ़ी अच्छी उन्नति कर के कहीं पास में आ जाते हैं, तां इंजीनियर को आई० ए० एस० के नौचे काम करना पड़ता है। भले ही देश में इंजीनियरों की आवश्यकता अधिक है और कारखाने की

कामयाबी और नाकामयाबी की असली वजह इंजीनियर ही होगा, लेकिन इस के बावजूद होता यह है कि इंजिनियर्स को आई० ए० एस० के तहत काम करना पड़ता है। मैं आप को एक आश्चर्य की बात बतलाऊँ कि फ़ारेन अफ़यर्स मिनिस्ट्री के एक सज्जन से मेरी मुलाक़ात हुई, जो आई० एफ़० एस० थे। मैं ने उन को पूछा कि उन के क्या विषय थे। उन्होंने कहा कि मैं तो इंजीनियर था। इस पर मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ और मैं ने उन को पूछा कि जब आप इंजीनियर थे, तो आप आई० एफ़० एम० की तरफ क्यों गये। उन्होंने कहा, "मैं इंजीनियर हो कर क्या करता? आखिर किमी आई० ए० एस० के नौचे काम करना पड़ता। अब मेरे आई० एफ़० एम० होने पर इंजीनियरों को मेरे नौचे काम करना पड़ेगा।" वास्तव में यह सही बात है। और सरकार तो एक कदम और आगे चली गई है—इंजीनियरों को अब आई० ए० एस० के इम्तहान में नहीं बैठने दिया जाता, उन को बार कर दिया गया है, रोक दिया गया है कि वे आई० ए० एस० की परीक्षा में नहीं बैठ सकते। एक तरफ हम कहते हैं कि देश का औद्योगिकरण करना चाहिये, यह युग विज्ञान का युग है और टेक्नोलॉजी और टेक्निकल प्रशिक्षण का सर्वोपरि महत्व है, लेकिन दूसरी तरफ हम इंजीनियरों के साथ इस प्रकार का व्यवहार करते हैं। हाल ही में कुछ मिनिस्टर्स महोदय के ये वक्तव्य आये हैं कि टेक्निकल हैड का जो भी खयाल होगा, वह खयाल चलेगा, न कि आई० ए० एस० आदमियों की मनोवृत्ति। इस के बावजूद आज हम क्या देखते हैं? जितने भी बड़े बड़े पब्लिक सैक्टर प्राजक्ट्स हैं, जिन के बारे में राष्ट्र में बड़ी चिन्ता जाहिर की जाती है, जिन की कामयाबी के बारे में शक़ा प्रकट की जाती है वहाँ पर ठीक तीर से काम करने वाले आधमियों को नहीं लगाया जाता है।

अगर आप पब्लिक सैक्टर के जैनेरेल मैनेजर और प्राइवेट सैक्टर के जैनेरेल मैनेजर की जीवन-चर्या को देखें, तो बड़ा स्पष्ट अन्तर दिखाई देता है। प्राइवेट सैक्टर का आदमी सुबह आठ, साढ़े आठ बजे घर से चला जायेगा। एक बजे तक वह अपने दफ्तर नहीं आता है। वह फ्रैक्टी के अलग अलग विभागों में जायेगा। वह वहाँ पर खड़ा हो कर किसी से बात न करने हुए देखता रहेगा कि कौन किस तरह काम करता है, कौन सा मिस्त्री कुशलता के साथ काम कर रहा है, कौन सा इंजीनियर कैसा काम कर रहा है, कौन सी मशीन ठीक हालत में है। वह सारी बातें देखता रहेगा और अपने दिल में आक्रान्ता रहेगा कि किस आदमी को प्रोमोशन देने की आवश्यकता है, कौन आदमी ठीक काम कर रहा है, किस आदमी की वजह से फ्रैक्टी ठीक काम कर रही है और किस की वजह से नुकसान या बाधा हो रही है। इस के बाद वह डेढ़ दो बजे अपने दफ्तर आता है और टेबल पर रखी फाइलों को देखता है।

इस के मुकाबले में पब्लिक सैक्टर के जैनेरेल मैनेजर का क्या हाल है? वह सुबह जल्दी नहीं उठ पाता है, क्योंकि किसी काकटेल पार्टी या डिनरमें पहले गान थोड़ी ज्यादा चली जाती है। इसलिए सुबह शरीर कुछ अलसाय हुआ रहता है, पेट साफ नहीं रहता है। वह मुश्किल से ग्यारह बजे आफिस पहुँच पाता है और उस के बाद वह फाइल में अपने आप को खपा देता है। परिणाम यह होता है कि वह केवल कागजी काम ही कर पाता है। वह व्यावहारिक तौर से नहीं देख सकता कि कौन सा काम ठीक चल रहा है और कौन सा ठीक नहीं चल रहा है।

डा० मा० श्री० अग्ने (नागपुर) : क्या वह व्यवहार जानता है ?

श्री हेडा : वही मैं निवेदन कर रहा हूँ। इसलिए पब्लिक सैक्टर में हम को

जितनी सफलता मिलनी चाहिए, वह नहीं मिल रही है।

मैं समझता हूँ कि जब हम ने समाजवाद को मान लिया है और पब्लिक सैक्टर को लेकर हमने आगे बढ़ना है, तो इस बारे में कोई रास्ता हमको निकालना पड़ेगा। जो समिति स्थापित होने जा रही है, उसके विचार बहुत काम आयेंगे। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि चाहे इस समिति को पूरे तौर पर अधिकार दिये जायें या न दिये जायें, यह समिति जो भी कार्य करेगी, जो भी अपने विचार जाहिर करेगी, सरकार को उनकी कद करनी पड़ेगी। बल्कि एक हद तक मैं यह कहूँगा कि प्राक्कलन समिति और लोक लेखा समिति के जो विचार आते हैं, बहुत महत्वपूर्ण और अच्छे विचार आते हैं, गवर्नमेंट उनको एक हद तक दरगुजर कर सकती है, एक तरफ रख सकती है, यह भी हो सकता है कि यह हाउस भी उसका नोटिस न ले। लेकिन इस कमेटी के जो भी विचार होंगे और उसकी तरफ से जो भी सुझाव आयेंगे, उन पर न सिर्फ सरकार का अमल करना पड़ेगा, न सिर्फ यह सदन उन पर ध्यान देगा, बल्कि उन पर कामयाबी के साथ अमल होगा। राष्ट्र इस समिति के कार्यों की तरफ बड़ी आशा और आतुरता के साथ देखता रहेगा।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

The Minister of Law (Shri A. K. Sen): I would only like to deal with a few points on the constitutional position of this motion, which have been raised by some hon. Members on the other side, particularly, Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

It has been suggested that the Ministry of Industry has not consulted the legal advisers of Government in formulating this motion. That, if I may submit, is incorrect, and the Law Ministry has been kept in touch with the formulation of this proposal

[Shri A. K. Sen]

from the very beginning, and I personally had a large part to play in the formulation of the ultimate proposal last time as also this time.

The point raised was whether the motion impinged upon the exclusive financial rights of the Lok Sabha. The exclusive financial rights are contained in articles 109 and 110 dealing with money Bills and article 113 of the Constitution. In short, it means that all money Bills have to originate in the Lok Sabha, and all amendments concerning the money Bills so introduced as also all proposals for the purpose of varying the original money Bills or for repealing the money Bills ought to originate in the Lok Sabha and not in the Rajya Sabha. Similarly, with regard to estimates brought before the House, the Rajya Sabha cannot amend or vary or repeal any of the estimates. That means, therefore, that the exclusive financial rights of the Lok Sabha, as those of the House of Commons, in England, are related only to the initiation of Money Bills.

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur): As he is giving a legal interpretation of the constitutional position, could he also enlighten the House on article 117 which provides that no Bill which comes within the definition of a Money Bill can be introduced in the Rajya Sabha? But this has been going on. I once raised this point here, but it was talked over. I have raised this matter several times. Now that he is giving an interpretation, he may also cover that point, whether any such Bill can be introduced in the Rajya Sabha, and whether even if a Committee is appointed, it can—when we are not in session—make a report and whether that report can also be discussed in the Rajya Sabha, whether the Report can be amended, whether there can be misuse of money

and all those things. So 117 may also be looked into.

Shri A. K. Sen: Article 117 has nothing to do with the present position. That article says that no Money Bill shall be initiated without the recommendation of the President. What the hon. Member possibly has in view is article 110, which I have dealt with, which says that all Money Bills shall have to be initiated only in the Lok Sabha. Article 109 says that a Money Bill shall not be introduced in the Council of States. Article 110 has defined what Money Bills are. Article 113(2) says:

“So much of the said estimates as relates to other expenditure shall be submitted in the form of demands for grants to the House of the People, and the House of the People shall have power to assent, or to refuse to assent, to any demand, or to assent to any demand, subject to a reduction of the amount specified therein”.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Article 117 is similar.

Shri A. K. Sen: 117 only puts in the provision concerning assent of the President.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, that has been worrying the hon. Member. He brought it to my notice also. But that would be the subject matter of a separate discussion, not at this moment.

Shri A. K. Sen: It is more or less a limitation on the part of the Lok Sabha to entertain a Money Bill; though moneys are the exclusive jurisdiction of the Lok Sabha, yet no such Bill is to be introduced without the recommendation of the President. That has nothing to do with the present position we are considering.

Therefore, we have to see whether any of those exclusive privileges as contained in articles 109 and 113 are impinged upon by the motion we have proposed. If it did, such a motion will be automatically invalid, *ultra vires* the Constitution. There is no power which could take away a privilege exclusively granted to the Lok Sabha by a motion of the Lok Sabha itself. Even the Lok Sabha cannot divest itself of those exclusive privileges—that is a well-settled principle of law—whether by motion or by law.

We shall see when we deal with the functions of the Committee that we are doing nothing by way of giving any powers to the proposed Committee which takes away the exclusive powers of the Lok Sabha. In fact, we could not. The power of the Lok Sabha, as I said, is to initiate Money Bills and to pass estimates either with or without amendment or to reject estimates as proposed by Government. All that we want to do is to give this new Committee functions as mentioned in paragraph 2 of the Motion, namely,

“(a) to examine the reports and accounts of the public undertakings specified in the Schedule” . . .

All accounts are to be examined by this Committee. That is not a matter with which the Lok Sabha is concerned exclusively.

“(b) to examine the reports, if any, of the Comptroller and Auditor-General on the public undertakings” . . .

That is also a matter not exclusively assigned only to the Lok Sabha.

“(c) to examine, in the context of the autonomy and efficiency of the public undertakings, whether the affairs of the public undertakings are being managed in accordance with sound business

principles and prudent commercial practices” . . .

That means, while examining them, we have to bear this in mind.

“(d) such other functions vested in the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee in relation to the public undertakings. . . .”

as are covered by rules of procedure.

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): May I seek a clarification? Article 113(2) says:

“So much of the said estimates as relates to other expenditure shall be submitted in the form of demands for grants to the House of the People, and the House of the People shall have power to assent, or to refuse to assent, to any demand, or to assent to any demand subject to a reduction of the amount specified therein”.

But in certain cases it may be that the House may defer its decision and may like to call for a report of the Committee. If there are some expenditures to be incurred on some of these public undertakings, the House may at any stage decide that it cannot just at that time take any decision, but shall wait for a report from the Committee going to be set up. But that Committee will not consist exclusively of the Members of this House. What will be the position?

Shri A. K. Sen: The House can inform itself through any agency. It can take the evidence of experts, it can even appoint, say, an accountant, to help it or it can appoint even a Committee wholly outside the House to give it information regarding a particular matter. That has nothing to do with the power to vote demands or to reject the demands. That has not been divested. In fact, we could not allow the House of the People to divest itself of that exclusive jurisdiction. How can it do so without amendment of the Constitution?

Shri Morarka (Jhunjhunu): May I ask a simple question? How is it that no Member from the other House is appointed to the Estimates Committee? Is it not because the Estimates Committee's functions are considered to be the exclusive prerogative of this House? If that is so, since functions of the Estimates Committee are also going to be given to this Committee, why should Members of the other House be included in this Committee?

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): This was also the query made last time. That was why the Government was advised and persuaded to say in regard to a specific provision under the original motion brought forward by Shri K. C. Reddy, the then Minister, that in so far as the Estimates Committee's functions were concerned, the Members of the Rajya Sabha would not be associated with it and would not participate in it. If that were so, the Estimates Committee's functions cannot properly be said to be performed by this Committee with Members of the other House.

Shri A. K. Sen: None of these matters was dictated by constitutional requirements, but by requirements of expediency and policy. Because of the terrific opposition raised by some hon. Members here about taking away a part of the Estimates Committee's jurisdiction and conferring it on a Committee in which the Rajya Sabha was also represented, we thought it advisable at one time to bring about a compromise between the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha to bring about certain provisions of that type; but they met with equal opposition in the Rajya Sabha, who are equally jealous of their rights to go into the accounts and business records of public undertakings, as they are entitled to. Therefore, as a matter of compromise, ultimately we have brought all these things into one motion so that it may have the acceptance of both the Houses.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: When the legal position is otherwise, why was

any compromise thought of? If it is the sole prerogative of the Lok Sabha to discuss a Money Bill and all those things, why for compromise's sake—just because some people claim the right to discuss or pass anything concerning Money Bills—do this thing? If it is the sole function of this House to say whether the money of a particular company or undertaking is used in the proper way as sanctioned by Parliament, the compromise question does not arise.

Shri A. K. Sen: If the speeches of the hon. Members of the Rajya Sabha as also the observations of the Chairman are read, it would convince the hon. Member that they were not claiming any right to deal with Money Bills or deal with matters contrary to what the provisions are in the Constitution. What they said, as they do even now, was that they had the right to go into the working of public undertakings. They are not estimates, they are not money bills. They certainly can see, as one of the Houses, whether a public undertaking is managed properly according to sound business principles, whether the moneys of the public undertaking have been properly utilised or wasted. That has nothing to do with the question whether the Lok Sabha alone is the custodian of money bills or whether the Lok Sabha alone is the legislative body to compose estimates.

As I said, I personally have knowledge of how the two Houses came to loggerheads on this matter because of conflicting claims. One wanted to keep the entire matter within its own jurisdiction, the other did not and we must come to a compromise, instead of allowing the two Houses to quarrel over such a matter. I remember that the Chairman of the other House then said that that House would appoint its own committee to go into public undertakings, in which case these undertakings would have to account before the committees of the two Houses separately on the same matter, a procedure which would

keep them engaged throughout the year.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Is it not by-passing the constitutional obligation that all matters relating to moneys should be the sole and exclusive monopoly of the Lok Sabha?

Shri A. K. Sen: No, Sir, I would have been most completely opposed to any attempt to curb the powers of the Lok Sabha in regard to the passing of money bills or passing of estimates. It has nothing to do with it; it is merely a watch dog over the affairs and business activities of public undertakings.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): There is one more clarification I would like to ask, with your permission.

The Estimates Committee at present is authorised to examine major Government policies and to suggest alternative policies. That privilege is not being taken away from the Estimates Committee, because in the motion it is mentioned:

"Provided that the Committee shall not examine and investigate any of the following matters, namely: . . ."

That means to say that it will have all the powers of the Estimates Committee except going into matters of major Government policy. That means to say the whole of the Government can be examined, all departments can be examined on major policies of the Government, but not the public sector. Neither this committee nor the Estimates Committee will examine it.

Shri A. K. Sen: The Estimates Committee remains untouched.

Shri Tyagi: How can the Estimates Committee examine it? Will the right to examine major Government policy as to these projects also remain vested

in the Estimates Committee? Will they be able to take it up?

Shri A. K. Sen: So long as the Lok Sabha does not take away that power from the Estimates Committee, and so long as rule 310 remains unamended and the power of the Estimates Committee to examine questions of policy and suggest alternative policies remains, there is no question of the Estimates Committee being affected by this resolution.

Shri A. C. Guha: In reply to Shri Morarka's objection, the hon. Law Minister stated that because last time some Members took objection to the inclusion of the Members of the Rajya Sabha in this committee, they have made some compromise, but it is not only on that basis. Yesterday also I referred to what the Prime Minister himself stated in his speech in 1953. In the course of the discussion on the motion for the inclusion of Rajya Sabha Members as Associate Members of the Public Accounts Committee, he stated clearly:

"There is another Committee, the Estimates Committee. A distinction is made by us between the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee."

So, he admitted that the functions of the Estimates Committee should be the exclusive right of the Lok Sabha, and there the Rajya Sabha Members should not have any right to interfere. But, by this resolution, a part of the Estimates Committee's functions are given over to a committee in which the Rajya Sabha Members also will be sitting. I do not know how the hon. Law Minister can compromise this position with the admission made by the Prime Minister himself about the rights of the Estimates Committee and of the Lok Sabha.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: My objection is as to the constitutional propriety of investing the proposed committee with the association of Members of

[Dr. L. M. Singvi]

the Rajya Sabha, with estimates functions. It is said in paragraph (d) that the proposed committee would have—

“such other functions vested in the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee in relation to the Public Undertakings specified in the Schedule..”

If, according to the statement of the Law Minister, there is nothing to exclude the new committee from undertaking the functions of the Estimates Committee, what are those functions which are peculiar to the Estimates Committee alone? What is the differentiation, as was mentioned by Shri Guha, between the functions of the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee, and if there is a distinction or line of demarcation, how would that be preserved while investing the new committee with the functions proposed? Why was it considered all along the line that the functions of the Estimates Committee would not be performed by the Public Accounts Committee? Is it not a fact that if the interpretation of the Law Minister is accepted, it would pave the way for inclusion and association of the Members of the Rajya Sabha in the Estimates Committee also?

Shri Warrior (Trichur): Will there be any overlapping of the functions of the Estimates Committee and this committee on public undertakings? Will the Estimates Committee also go into the estimates of these undertakings besides the committee on public undertakings? Where is the clear line of demarcation?

Shri Morarka: When answering Shri Tyagi, the Law Minister said, if I understood him correctly, that the Estimates Committee would continue to examine the policy of the Government in respect of these undertakings. Does it mean that so far as public undertakings are concerned, the work

would be done by two committees, the Estimates Committee doing what it is doing today and this new committee doing what is envisaged in this resolution? If so, is it not a self-defeating proposition, because the Law Minister himself said that if the two Houses had two separate committees, the public undertakings would have to justify themselves before both and the entire year would be spent only in that work? Is it the intention of Government that the Estimates Committee would continue to do the work which it is doing at present *vis-a-vis* public undertakings in examining Government policy or that functions would also vest in this new committee?

Shri A. K. Sen: As I said, the Estimates Committee was set up by a resolution of the Lok Sabha, and the relative rules are contained in rules 310 and 311 of our rules of procedure. It says its functions would be—

“to report what economies, improvements in organisation, efficiency or administrative reform, consistent with the policy underlying the estimates, may be effected;

“to suggest alternative policies in order to bring about efficiency and economy in administration;

“to examine whether the money is well laid out within the limits of the policy implied in the estimates; and

“to suggest the form in which the estimates shall be presented to Parliament.”

Public undertakings are not specifically mentioned in rule 310 though the sweep is wide enough to cover public undertakings, and they have been going into the working of public undertakings.

Shri A. C. Guha: Will you refer to rule 308?

Shri A. K. Sen: The question of constitutionality would arise only if we wanted to give any function to this proposed body which in any way curbs the exclusive rights of the Lok Sabha. I have dealt with that point.

The next point is, as Dr. Singhvi said, whether we are not giving this committee part of the functions of the Estimates Committee? The very motion says we are. So far as the functions of the Estimates Committee relating to public undertakings are concerned, we are giving them, subject to the limitation that questions of policy and other functions will not be within the purview of this Committee. Therefore, questions of policy and other things, so far as large undertakings are concerned, still remain with the Estimates Committee. But it is expected as it is the convention with regard to most of these committees, with regard to Committees of both the Houses, that one does not tread over the field covered by the other already, and therefore, when these Committees are set up exclusively, the work of going into the economies, workings and accounts of public undertakings—what has been covered by the Committee of both the Houses—it is expected, would not be covered by the Estimates Committee; for its own sake, only that part which is not covered and that would be questions of policy, administrative reform, alternative economies and so on, might be touched upon by the Estimates Committee. That is a matter of convention and not a matter of constitutionality. On the merits, the hon. Minister of Industry will no doubt answer all the points which have been raised. I intervened only for the purpose of clarifying the doubts raised by some hon. Members as to whether we are not seeking to give to this joint committee something which is exclusively the privilege of the Lok Sabha. That, I hope, I have clarified, and the hon. Minister of Industry will no doubt tell the House about the rest.

Mr. Speaker: Shri U. M. Trivedi.

Shri Daji (Indore): Before Shri Trivedi begins his speech, may I make a submission? You are the custodian of the rights and privileges of the House. With great respect, I may say that the position as explained by the hon. Law Minister has not carried us any further. In fact, so many doubts have been left if not duplicated. With great respect, I may say—perhaps it may be too much to say—that confusion has been made worse confounded. In the circumstances, when there is the question of the rights and privileges of this House under the Constitution, and when you have been following since yesterday the trend of the debate which cuts across party lines, I may submit that the discussion may be fruitful in one way, but on this particular matter, we are nowhere nearer solution. Now, we are told that the Estimates Committee shall continue to function.

Mr. Speaker: Let us cover the journey first. Shri U. M. Trivedi.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, when I read this motion, when it was brought before the House in the last session, I was wondering as to what was the particular utility for which this motion was being put before the House. We have got the Public Accounts Committee and we have also got the Estimates Committee. The functions of the Public Accounts Committee are prescribed in sub-rule (3) of rule 308, as follows:

“It shall also be the duty of the Committee—

- (a) to examine the statement of accounts showing the income and expenditure of state corporations, trading and manufacturing schemes, concerns and projects together with the balance sheets and statements

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

of profit and loss accounts which the President may have required to be prepared or are prepared under the provisions of the statutory rules regulating the financing of a particular corporation, trading or manufacturing scheme” etc.

A similar provision does not exist for the Estimates Committee. Rule 310 is silent on the question of public undertakings or what is now described as State corporations. I was, therefore, wondering whether this motion is merely a ruse to secure for the Government some—I will not call it sinecure—solatium for such of the Members who have been kept out of position of power, just to give them this crumb so that they may be satisfied.

13.54 hrs.

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

Shri A. C. Guha: Including Opposition Members.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): They are nowhere near!

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Opposition Members are always there only to apply brakes; they are not for greasing. I was, therefore, wondering and am still wondering what useful purpose is going to be served by duplicating this power which has already been vested in the Public Accounts Committee and which can be enjoyed by the Estimates Committee by a little change in the provisions of rule 310. Why are we not doing it? Why has this particular motion been brought forward?

Just now, the hon. Law Minister was pleased to say that the Estimates Committee will continue to function so far as the public undertakings are concerned. That means we will have duplication of work by the same Mem-

bers of Parliament in one Committee and by other Members of Parliament in the other Committee except that probably they will sit in two different rooms. The Minister has not taken pains to explain to us why this necessity has arisen.

Then, let us examine why the limitations are being put upon it. In item (2) (c) of the motion, it has been said as follows:

“to examine, in the context of the autonomy and efficiency of the Public Undertakings, whether the affairs of the Public Undertakings are being managed in accordance with sound business principles and prudent commercial practices;”

Any lawyer who has understood the elementary principles of law will tell you what these words “prudent commercial practices” mean. A man is prudent if he discharges the duties imposed upon him by way of trust in his day-to-day affairs in the administration of the work which has been entrusted to him. But immediately thereafter, a curb has been put upon the functions to be discharged, and in the proviso under item (2), it has been put down that this Committee shall have nothing to do with matters of day-to-day administration. What is prudent commercial practice and what is this non-interference in day-to-day administration?

Shri Tyagi: “Night to night” can be put!

Shri U. M. Trivedi: As Shri Tyagi has put it, the only thing that this Committee will have to do is some benighted work.

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): Day includes night.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Reading it as it is, I find that a long list of work has been imposed upon this Committee. What is the ultimate aim of this?

We have the misfortune developing upon us for the last 12 years—I have been watching it—that the reports of the Public Accounts Committee are not looked into by the Ministries concerned, day in and day out, year in and year out, serious remarks. And pointed remarks have been made by the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee. These reports are not being looked into except that they are issued to the Members of Parliament most of whom also—well, I do not know—do not look into them and do not make proper use of them. But at least the Government on whom a duty is cast to look into those reports should do so, but they too do not look into them. So, the report of this Committee or whatever work will be done by this Committee will be another waste of paper. Whether it will be a waste of paper or whether there will be some utility to be found in it is a problem for any sincere and sane person to consider. Is there any aim behind it? Is there anything incumbent upon the Government that the recommendations made by this Committee will be accepted by the Government, or, is there any suggestion in this whole drama that is being enacted here that this Committee shall make any recommendation? What is this committee going to do? Read the report of the Comptroller and Auditor General, put some questions and formulate its report saying “we asked these questions and these were the answers” and then we keep quiet about it. Is this what the committee is going to do or is it going to be invested with powers to make suggestions and to see that the suggestions are carried out? No; our Minister is very much right when he shakes his head.

14 hrs.

The Minister of Industry (Shri Kanungo): That does not mean anything.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I thought he was shaking his head meaning “no”.

Shri Tyagi: They are only required to examine and not to report.

Shri K. C. Sharma: The result of the examination would be reported.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Mr. Sharma is a very experienced lawyer and parliamentarian. He knows English much better than I do. But I find that the functions of the committee shall be:

“(d) such other functions vested in the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee in relation to the Public Undertakings”.

I know the reports of the PAC are not worth the paper on which they are written. With very great respect to my hon. friend, Shri Tyagi, I would say that Government does not care a two-pence for the PAC and the PAC has carried no weight whatsoever with the Government or with anyone of us.

Shri Tyagi: I think the Minister may clarify. Is this committee going to report to the House or to the Minister?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I will help my friend, Shri Tyagi. Rule 310 of the Rules of Procedure says: that the functions of the Estimates Committee shall be:

“(a) to report what economies, improvements in organisation, efficiency or administrative reform, consistent with the policy underlying the estimates, may be effected;

(b) to suggest alternative policies in order to bring about efficiency and economy in administration;

(c) to examine whether the money is well laid out within the limits of the policy implied in the estimates....”

The Chairman of the Estimates Committee is here and he will tell us whether the provision which is con-

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

tained in Rule 308 (3) is applicable to Rule 310. This resolution says:

"(d) such other functions vested in the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee in relation to the Public Undertakings . . ."

So far as public undertakings are concerned, where is the function that is being delegated in any manner to the Estimates Committee? I have yet to come across any provision where any delegation of this function has been made to the Estimates Committee.

Shri A. C. Guha: When the public undertakings which involve investment and expenditure of Government money, are not excluded, they automatically come under the purview of the Estimates Committee. The committee have been examining public undertakings every year and the reports are being placed before the House. If the hon. Member does not take care to see the reports of his own committee, we are helpless.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I am very particular about it and I draw a good deal of knowledge from it. But at the same time, I am only pointing out the legal position that exists. You may be overstepping the limits.

Shri K. C. Sharma: He never oversteps; he is a cautious man.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I know he has been a Minister and he is cautious.

The provision which exists in Rule 308 (3) about the functions of the PAC is not embodied in Rule 310. I would like him to get that embodied, so that we may be standing on a strong legal footing.

Shri A. C. Guha: There has been no question of the authority of the Estimates Committee.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Then, what about the conflict between the two committees, apart from duplication? One committee will make one suggestion and the other committee will make another suggestion. Is it the idea of the Government that these two committees should fight amongst themselves? One may pull one way and the other may pull another way; one will make one suggestion and the other will make another suggestion. Government will laugh at both and say "We are not satisfied with either of you and so we put your suggestions in the waste paper basket". Would it not be possible to lay down that because this resolution is with reference only to the public undertakings, therefore, the functions of the Estimates Committee to that extent may be curtailed, so that there need not be duplication and conflicting reports by two committees of the House?

We know a good deal of wastage of money is taking place in public undertakings, barring the State Trading Corporation, which has a monopolistic trade and carries on a cut-throat business. Otherwise, what is the return that we are getting from the public undertakings that we have set up? Rs. 1701 crores have been invested by us in public undertakings. Most of them are with interest-free loans for a period of years. On an investment of Rs. 1701 crores, we have got a return of Rs. 1.9 crores. It is an eye-opener to everybody. Here is the Income-tax Officer who catches the throat of an ordinary assessee if he makes a return of less than 6 per cent. He will not believe and he will say "You must have a return of 6 per cent." But with this huge investment of Rs. 1701 crores, the return is not even 1.9 per cent; it is just Rs. 1.9 crores. So, it is all the more reasonable that there should be a greater probing into the affairs of the undertakings. But can it come this way? Unless and until you give powers to interfere with the day-to

day administration, it will not come. It will not be possible when you do not allow this committee to function in the manner in which it should. With all that, Government is still afraid of this committee. Suppose some intelligent man gets into it. So, a check is again put. Hindustan Aircraft Limited, Bangalore, Bharat Electronics Limited, Mazagon Docks Limited and the Garden Reach Workshop Limited are not to be touched.

Shri Kanungo: If he reads the motion as it is today, he will find that there is nothing to prevent these companies being looked into by the proposed committee.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Is there any further motion?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They are included; they are not excluded.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Is Part III dropped out?

Shri Kanungo: My speech has made it clear that the distinction between these things has been left to the good sense of the Committee—that is to say, without mentioning it they would look after the security aspect of it.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Do you mean to say that they will have a right if they want to?

Shri Kanungo: Yes.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Very good. To that extent, Sir, I stand corrected, because I have only got this resolution that has been supplied to us.

Shri Morarka: But it would require an amendment, as the hon. Member is pointing out, because the motion as it stands might give the meaning as given by the hon. Member.

Shri Bade (Khargone): He has only made it clear in his speech.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He will make it clear in his reply.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I have also not made any false allegation.

On the floor of the House I would like to know where we stand.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The motion itself must be amended. It should be amended properly to make clear the idea.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Where does it exclude them?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Here it is said:

“Every Government company whose annual report is placed before the Houses of Parliament under sub-section (1) of Section 619(A) of the Companies Act, 1956, other than the Public Undertakings included in Part III hereof.”

Shri Tyagi: Literally speaking they are excluded.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The normal meaning I can gather is only this.

Shri K. C. Sharma: There should be a clear provision to include these undertakings. If there is no clear provision, *ipso facto* they are excluded. Even the Minister's speech does not carry any weight in view of the provisions in the motion itself.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Sir, I will take some more time because this is a very important motion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has already taken 20 minutes.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Sir, I crave your indulgence for a few more minutes.

Shri Warior: Will the Minister move an amendment on this point?

Shri Kanungo: The only amendment I am moving is the one I have given notice of yesterday.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Are you not giving an amendment on this point?

Shri Kanungo: No.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Then the position stands as it is.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Then let us give an amendment.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Sir, I would, therefore, ask this question. If army estimates and defence expenditure can always be a subject matter of enquiry before the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee and if the powers of the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee are given to a committee of the Houses, I see no propriety in making this suggestion that this Committee, which is also a Committee of this House, is to be excluded from exercising the powers of the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee with reference to these particular four undertakings. What explanation is there available from the side of the Government to keep these undertakings out of the purview of this Committee? I hope the Minister will take care to properly and satisfactorily explain why these have been kept out of the picture.

There is another thing—that is the constitutional position—which strikes me as very strange. This struggle between this House and the other House for which the Government has shown a good deal of solicitude has been going on for the last ten years since 1953. I do not see any reason whatsoever to get over the constitutional provisions and associating the members of the Rajya Sabha with this Committee. They are big people. I have got very great regard for them. All of them are very intelligent and all of them are very good.

But the only question is that here is our Constitution which makes this distinction that it is the Members elected by the people at large only who are the real members of the House of Commons of this country and who are vested with the power of exercising control over the expenditure by the Government or over money Bills. No amendment can be moved by anybody else. That House has got no power whatsoever to make any suggestion or move any amendment to the estimates. They have no power to cut down a paise or add a paise to the expenditure. What are the functions of the Estimates Committee? The functions of the Estimates Committee include certainly making recommendations of this type. They can suggest alternative policies in order to bring about efficiency and economy in the administration. What is economy in administration? It means suggesting a cut or saying that the expenditure should be curtailed. Who is going to exercise that right? In this Committee it will be the Members of this House along with the Members of the Rajya Sabha. That means the Members of the Rajya Sabha will have a voice in suggesting a cut in the expenditure of the Government. Is that the constitutional position? Is article 109 meant for it? Is article 110 meant for it? Are these the protection given in article 113? I would therefore say, all this solicitude apart, all these empty platitudes apart, whatever explanation the hon. Law Minister has given, there is absolutely no justification and it is constitutionally and in every way an illegal thing that we are doing, that in this motion we are saying that Members of the Rajya Sabha be associated with this Committee so that this Committee may function properly. I say, Sir, from the very beginning I have felt, and I do reiterate it even now, that if the object of the Government is only to satisfy some people, to satisfy some Members of the House saying that here is a crumb thrown to them for showing their power or satisfying their glamour for

power, then it is a different thing altogether, but, if the object of the Government is that there should be a check on the expenditure, on the way in which money is expended by the Government, on the way in which money is to be utilised from the funds raised from the public, then I think this motion to that extent is not fair.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (कश्मीर):

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक घंटे से कमेट्री पर बहस चल रही है। उससे हम सभी को एक बात लगी होगी कि लोक सभा में रूप पर ज्यादा बहस होती है, सार पर कम। अगर हम लोग इस पर ध्यान रखें कि सार पर ज्यादा बहस किया करें तो उससे देश को ज्यादा अच्छा फल मिले।

मैंने कल श्री दाजी के भाषण को ध्यान से सुना यह समझने के लिए कि कम्युनिस्टों या उनके समर्थकों का क्या रुख है। उन्होंने लोक दायरे के कारखानों की आरती तो जरूर उतारी लेकिन अपने सभी तर्क से साबित किया कि जितनी जल्दी यह लोक दायरा खत्म हो जाए उतना अच्छा है। यह कैसे होता है, यह जानने की जब मैंने कांशिश की तो फिर मुझे एकाएक कानूनगो साहब के भी भाषण की याद पड़ी। उन्होंने अपने भाषण में जो कुछ उदाहरण दिये, इंग्लिस्तान के दिये और वहाँ की लोक सभा के दिये। जब कि बहस हो रही थी लोक दायरे पर, सरकारी कारखानों पर, तो उन्होंने ज्यादा सोचना चाहिये था सोवियत रूसके उदाहरणों और बातों पर। लेकिन कुछ हम लोगों का तरीका ही ऐसा हो गया है कि हम बहुत ज्यादा लोक दायरा और निजी हमारा मिला जुला करके सोचा करते हैं और किसी परिणाम पर नहीं निकल पाते। यह भी हो सकता है कि रूस की बातें अगर सच वा यहाँ होतीं तो शायद रूस की और भी बातें सामने आतीं वहाँ अत्याचार जरूर है और में उनको कतई पसन्द नहीं करता हूँ। लेकिन जिस ढंग से सरकारी कारखाने

यहाँ चलाये जा रहे हैं उस ढंग से अगर वहाँ चलाये गये होते तो क्या होता। इन मंत्रियों और इन मैनजरों का, यह कहना बड़ा कठिन है। कुछ थोड़ा बहुत जो मैं प्रधान मंत्री के सुकर्मों या कुकर्मों के बारे में बोलूंगा तो नताने की कांशिश करूंगा कि उनका क्या भाग्य होता रूस में। अभी खाली मैं इतना बता देता हूँ कि हमारी हमेशा ही आदत के मुताबिक हमने लोक दायरे और निजी दायरे को एक दूसरे से बहुत सिखाया पढ़ाया है। दुनिया भर में निजी दायरा इन्तिजाम के मामले में ज्यादा अच्छा होता है, लेकिन लालच के मामले में ज्यादा खराब होता है, और सार्वजनिक दायरा, सरकारी कारखाने, बदइन्तजामी बहुत ज्यादा करते हैं, लेकिन उनमें कर्तव्य की भावना ज्यादा होती है। यह दुनिया भर का फंका है। लेकिन हम हिन्दुस्तानी तो समन्वय किया करते हैं। इसलिए हमारे यहाँ के निजी दायरे के कारखाने, करोड़-पतियों के कारखाने, इन्तिजाम में भी बिगड़ते चले जा रहे हैं, और नफ़ा और लूट तो करते ही हैं, और इसी तरह से सार्वजनिक दायरे के कारखाने, जहाँ एक तरफ इन्तिजाम में बहुत बिगड़े हुए हैं, वहाँ दूसरी तरफ करोड़ पतियों के कारखानों की लूट करने की आदत भी सीखते चले जा रहे हैं। यह एक बड़ा जबरदस्त समन्वय अपने देश में चल पड़ा है, और जब तक हम इस बुनियादी तथ्य को नहीं समझेंगे कि लोक दायरे के कारखाने तभी अच्छे चल सकते हैं जब लोक भावना हो और जो हमारे सभी जीवन के लक्ष्य हैं वे बदल जाते हैं, तब तक ये कारखाने कुछ फायदा नहीं पहुँचायेंगे।

अब मैं यह मान कर चलता हूँ कि जो हमारी समन्वयी चीज है यहाँ सरकारी कारखानों के बारे में उसको छँड़कर के सरकारी ध्यान देगी कि ये लोक कारखाने निजी कारखानों से अलाहिदा चलाए जाने चाहिए। अगर उसी ढंग पर चलाना है तो इनकी क्या

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

जरूरत पड़ी हुई है। और मैंने इस वहस में यह भी देखा कि करीब करीब एक ही तरह की कसौटी रख कर दोनों को जांचा जाता है। लोक कारखानों के लिए कसौटियां भी अला-हिदा होनी चाहिए, और मैं कुछ बुनियादी कसौटियां आपके सामने रखता हूँ।

पहली कसौटी यह है कि औद्योगीकरण के फैलाव में सरकारी कारखानों की ज्यादा मदद हो सकती है बनिस्वत करोड़पतियों के कारखानों के। हमारी उन्नति का दर बहुत नीचा है। पूंजी इकट्ठी नहीं हो पाती, सरकारी कारखानों में मुनाफे की गुंजाइश नहीं है—कम से कम करोड़पतियों के मुनाफे की—इसलिए जो कुछ सरकारी कारखानों का मुनाफा हो वह और ज्यादा कारखाने खोलने में इस्तेमाल हो सकता है, और इसलिए सरकारी कारखानों की पहली कसौटी है कि हिन्दुस्तान के औद्योगीकरण में वह कितनी ज्यादा मदद पहुंचाते हैं।

मैं इस बात को साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ। मेरा मतलब व्यापार के फैलाव से नहीं है, जैसा कि जीवन बीमा निगम ने किया है। उसने अपने व्यापार का फैलाव कर लिया है। उससे मुझको मतलब नहीं है। मेरा मतलब है कि जीवन बीमा निगम से सरकार के कारखानों को इतना ज्यादा फायदा होना चाहिए कि वह हिन्दुस्तान के औद्योगीकरण की गति को बढ़ा सके। यह पहली कसौटी है।

दूसरी कसौटी है कि लोक कारखानों के जरिए देश में समाजवाद के बढ़ाने का मौका होना चाहिए। बटवारा ज्यादा बराबरी के आधार पर होना चाहिए। जिस तरह से करोड़पतियों के कारखानों में मजदूर और मालिक के बीच में या उपभोक्ता और मालिक के बीच में फर्क लूट के कारण हो जाता है वह लोक कारखानों में न होना चाहिए और वहां जो बटवारे के इन्तिजाम

किए जाते हैं वे ऐसे होने चाहिए कि जिससे बराबरी को प्रोत्साहन मिले। यह वह फर्क बता रहा हूँ कसौटियों का कि जो दोनों कारखानों के सम्बन्ध में है।

इसी तरह से तीसरी कसौटी रखना चाहता हूँ कि जो मजदूर और मालिक का रिश्ता है—वैसे खैर करोड़पतियों के कारखानों में भी अच्छा ही होना चाहिए—लोक कारखानों में ज्यादा लोकतन्त्री होना चाहिए और देश के पूरे लोकतन्त्र को भी इन कारखानों को मदद देनी चाहिए।

चौथी कसौटी में रख रहा हूँ कि ये लोक कारखाने कितना ज्यादा लोक हित को बढ़ाते हैं। लोक हित में ऐसे प्रश्न आते हैं जैसे चीजों के दाम या किस ढंग से जनता को सुविधा मिलती है या नहीं मिलती या तरद्दुद होता है। और

पांचवीं कसौटी रखना चाहता हूँ कि इन कारखानों का इन्तिजाम अच्छा होना चाहिए। योग्य आदमी होने चाहिए जो कि कानून को तोड़ें नहीं और दर असल व्यापार के फैलाव और औद्योगीकरण के फैलाव का ध्यान रखें न कि अपने पेट और धन की लिप्सा में पड़ रहें।

ये पांच कसौटियां लोक कारखानों के सम्बन्ध में हैं जो कि

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल)
वेतन का इतना अन्तर नहीं होना चाहिये, यह कसौटी भी होनी चाहिये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : ठीक है वेतन का अन्तर नहीं होना चाहिए। मैंने कहा है कि बटवारे में बराबरी होनी चाहिए। स्वामी जी ने यह बहुत अच्छी बात कही है। इसलिए मैं दूसरी कसौटी को पहले ले लेता हूँ और कुछ उदाहरण देता हूँ, जिनके बारे में मैं कानूनगो साहब से अर्ज करूंगा कि वह

अच्छी तरह से तहकीकात करके लोक सभा को बतायें कि क्या बात है ।

अब साहब रूरकेला का इस्पात कारखाना है । उसके पूरे अंश तो मैं नहीं दे सकता । मैंने कुछ हिसाब लगाया था । कई घंटों की जांच के बाद मैं इस नतीजे पर पहुंचा कि एक हजार अफसर करीब बीस लाख रुपये महीने में नौकरी और सुविधा के रूप में पा जाते हैं और तीस हजार मजदूर महीने भर में तीस लाख रुपया पाते हैं । यह इतनी जबरदस्त विषमता है कि मैंने एक बार प्रश्न किया था कि क्या टाटा नगर में इससे ज्यादा विषमता है, और वहां के बारे में मैं केवल अन्दाजे से ही कह सकता हूँ कि वहां भी इतनी ज्यादा विषमता नहीं होगी । गैर बराबरी सरकारी कारखानों में उतनी ही है, शायद ज्यादा है, क्योंकि देखने का ढंग अभी बिल्कुल बिगड़ा हुआ है । और जब मैं यह बात कहता हूँ तो सिर्फ रूरकेला के इस्पात कारखाने के बारे में ही नहीं सभी कारखानों की । और इन अंकों के पीछे अनुपात पर आप ज्यादा ध्यान देना, अंकों पर नहीं । अनुपात यह है कि एक हजार अफसर २० लाख रुपया महीना, और तीस हजार मजदूर ३० लाख रुपया महीना ।

इसी तरह से मैं आपको जीवन बीमा निगम के मकानों के किरायों के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ । जो जीवन बीमा निगम अपने नौकरों या अर्ध नौकरों को मकानों के सम्बन्ध में सुविधा देता है । करीब दो हजार अफसर हैं । इन के किराये को अगर मैं जोड़ने लूँ तो कुछ अन्दाजा नहीं मिलेगा । हजारों रुपया, कहीं कोई जांच नहीं कहीं कोई तहकीकात नहीं, बड़े बड़े मकान, क्या क्या उनके किराये रहते हैं इसका कोई पता नहीं । और ३५ हजार जो स्टाफ के आदमी हैं उनको १५ रुपया महीना की किराये की सहायता मिलती है । और सात हजार फील्ड वर्कर हैं उनको कुछ नहीं मिलता
1400 (A1) LSD—7.

और ढाई लाख एजेंट्स हैं उनको कुछ नहीं मिलता । ये ४ किस्म के लोग हैं जिनमें ढाई लाख एजेंट और ७ हजार और लोग, करीब पीने तीन लाख आदमी हैं...

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : ये सब बातें प्रस्ताव से असम्बद्ध हैं...

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इसी पर तो हम बहस कर रहे हैं कि सरकारी कारखाने किस तरह से चलाये जायें । सरकारी कारखानों में और सरकारी निगमों में...

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : सरकारी कारखानों के लिये एक कमेटी बनायी जाय यह प्रस्ताव है । उस प्रस्ताव पर कुछ कहिये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : प्रस्ताव पर ही कह रहा हूँ । जीवन बीमा निगम एक पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग है । शायद आप समझे नहीं, मेरा मतलब लाइफ इश्योरेंस कारपोरेशन से है । यह एक सरकारी कारपोरेशन है...

श्री कानूनगो : वह तो इसमें नहीं है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वह इसमें है, आप कैसी बातें करत हैं । मंत्री महोदय को तो ज्यादा नैयारी के साथ यहां आना चाहिये । इस तरह की बातें वह कैसे कर देते हैं । और फिर मैं तो उदाहरण दे रहा हूँ । मान लीजिये कि वह इसमें नहीं आता । मैं तो एक उदाहरण दे रहा हूँ कि किस तरह से आप गैर बराबरी के आधार पर इन्तिजाम चलाते हैं । बिड़ला और टाटा के कारखानों में अगर ऐसी गैर बराबरी होती है तो हम उसके ऊपर आपत्ति करते हैं, और यह सरकार जिन कारखानों को और जिन प्रकरणों को चलाती है वहां पर गैर बराबरी को देख कर तो बहुत तकलीफ और दुःख होता है ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अच्छा अब दूसरा काम लेना है, आपका वक्त कल पूरा हो जायेगा ।