

grammes, industrial programmes and other things. But now we want to take it to a greater detail so that there is consultation of the Members of Parliament and other organised bodies in the formulation of the Fourth Plan. We have drawn up a programme. For example, last November, the National Development Council approved its programme that the preliminary memorandum for the Fourth Plan will be ready in April, 1964. Then, in August-September, we will hold a series of discussions with various bodies, the State Governments and others and in January-February 1965, the draft outline of the Fourth Plan will emerge. So, I propose that at all stages there should be consultations with the Members of Parliament and their reactions taken so that they should have active co-operation in the formulation of the Fourth Plan. When the draft outline of the Fourth Plan emerges, certainly at that stage Parliament can discuss it and after consultation with the State Governments, discussing their State Plans, in October-November 1965, in January-February, 1966, that is, in one year from that, we will have a final report on the Fourth Plan which can be discussed by the House, adopted and all that. It is our idea that in the formulation of the Fourth Plan not only the Parliament should be consulted but really the democratic processes of planning should be extended to as far a length as possible and the defects that we have learnt as a result of the experience that we have gained in respect of planning, particularly in the industrial planning or in the coordination of agricultural programmes, should be removed. Even now, we have taken advance action. That is very important. We have taken a number of feasibility studies, whether a project is feasible or not. All that has to be gone into before we take up any project. A number of working groups are working at the various levels in various departments and even at State levels working groups are working and when the preliminary shape of the Fourth Plan will come, I

think, at that stage also the consultation of the Members of Parliament and all other informed opinion will be brought to bear on this through intimate discussions.

I am very grateful to the House for giving so much time to it and throwing the light of its criticism on the mid-term appraisal of the Third Plan. As I have said already, I can assure the House that I have benefited by the discussions. We are very keen in the Planning Commission and in the Government to benefit by the criticisms. I am also happy at the emotional impact it has made, because if the Plan succeeds, the country succeeds, and on the success of the Plan depends the future of the country and the fulfilment of the hopes of many millions of people. The Government and the Planning Commission are aware of this emotional impact, and the discussion has made it very clear that we rise and fall with the success and failure of the Plan.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The discussion is over now. There can be no more questions now. We shall take up the next item.

16.11 hrs.

INDIAN TARIFF (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of International Trade (Shri Manubhai Shah): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, be taken into consideration."

This Bill mainly seeks to amend the First Schedule to the Indian Tariff Act in order to give effect to Government's decisions on certain recommendations of the Tariff Commission, which are: (a) to continue protection beyond 31st December, 1963, in the case of sericulture, antimony, ACSR (Aluminium Conductors Steel Reinforced) and AAC (All aluminium

A

[Shri Manubhai Shah]

conductors), electric motors, cotton textile machinery, power and distribution transformers, piston assembly, and automobile power plugs, and (b) to discontinue protection with effect from the 1st January, 1964 on engineers' steel files, bicycles, and diesel fuel injection equipment.

A review of the dyestuff industry protected up to 31st December, 1964 was undertaken on the basis of the recommendations in 1954 of the Tariff Commission. There is no change either in the existing *ad valorem* duty or import duty or customs duty or the existing period of protection.

Copies of the Tariff Commission's report on all these industries have been circulated to hon. Members and Government's resolutions thereon have been laid on the Table of the House, and notes on each of these industries have been circulated by us to hon. Members. I would not, therefore, take the time of the House by going into the details of each of these industries. The Tariff Commission's recommendations for the continuation of protection or de-protection, as the case may be, have been already well deliberated upon here several times. I am sure that hon. Members taking very detailed interest in many of these industries must have gone into all these data that we have supplied.

I shall first give the House a brief resume of the work of the Tariff Commission with particular reference to protection to indigenous enterprises. Under the provision of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, a permanent Tariff Commission was constituted in January, 1952. The main functions of the Commission are: (i) dealing with references from Government on matters relating to tariff and custom protection generally to the infant industry of this country, (ii) undertaking *suo motu* inquiries into the working of protection, (iii) keeping

a continuous watch over the progress of protected industries, and (iv) dealing with references from Government on fixation of prices of different commodities, whether protected or not.

During the last three years, the Commission in exercise of these functions completed as many as 26 enquiries into the continuation of protection and 12 enquiries into the price structure of commodities including some of the protected articles. Important among the price enquiries were raw rubber, cement, woollen yarn and fabrics, sugarcane price-linking formula, steel and pig iron, cotton yarn and cotton cloth.

The Commission has wide discretion in regard to application of the general principles relating to fixation of protective tariff. The effects of protection of industries on other industries and on prices are continuously watched both by the Commission and by Government. The Commission reviews prices as well as the progress of the protected industries and other goods referred to it by Government.

Many industries on the protected list have registered a considerable expansion, as hon. Members would see from the reports, both in the number of units as well as in capacity and also a notable increase in output. This expansion was accompanied by diversification of production. The performance of the industries in regard to fixation of prices, maintenance of quality and availability of domestic products has been generally satisfactory. While there may be some complaints of quality here and there, I am glad to say both from personal knowledge as well from the opinions of the various people involved in these industries and the consumers that the quality of Indian goods is continuously going up, particularly, that of the manufactured articles. The contribution of the protected industries to the industrial development of the country has been quite significant.

There were 28 industries on the protected list on 1st January, 1960. On the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, six industries and also parts of some industries have been completely de-protected showing thereby the vi-gorous health which these industries have achieved and which no more require to be classed as infant protected industry. The principal consideration that the Commission kept in mind in de-protecting these industries was that they had sufficiently developed during the reasonable period of protection enjoyed by them and had reached a stage when they would have to carry on successfully without any more protection.

On the 1st January, 1963, the number of protected industries stood at 22, and 11 of these are protected up to 31st December, 1963. It may be pointed out that the supply position of the majority of the protected commodities improved largely due to increase in domestic output. Barring a few commodities, the role of imports in meeting the country's requirement was insignificant in these sectors. The country has already attained self-sufficiency or near-self-sufficiency in certain important protected commodities, namely calcium carbide, stearic and oleic acids, most of the protected varieties of dyestuffs, single-cylinder pumps, ACSR and AAC conductors, and spinning rings and carding engines.

The Commission has also been maintaining a careful watch over the performance of protected industries in relation to the quality of the product. The manufacturers on their part have by far and large shown an awareness of their obligation to maintain the quality of their products. The products of most of the manufacturers are well received in the markets and many of them are now engaged in export market for these commodities, and the very fact that from the foreign markets also, many of these manufactured products and machinery have received good response shows that the quality is con-

tinuously being maintained and improved. Although protected commodities are classed because of the progressive improvement in quality, the Commission considered that there was still scope for improvement in some cases. I need not repeat how many measures we have brought forward in the current year on improvement of quality and enforcement of standards on different products including those products entering the export markets. It is a note-worthy feature that the ISI has evolved certain standard specifications for many of the protected articles and the manufacturers endeavour to conform to these specifications. Many producers have also taken steps to obtain certification marks for their products. The Commission's careful watch on the behaviour of the protected industries in regard to the prices charged by them has tended to regulate their profits.

Another significant feature was that a large number of companies ploughed back their profits into industry. Government have been anxious that the burden on the consumer imposed by protection is reduced to the minimum possible. In determining the quantum and degree of protection, that is, the import or other duties to be levied to protect the infant industry of the country, the Commission always assesses the likely effect of protective tariff or other form of protection on the interests of the consumers or of industries within the commodities in question.

The fact that six industries have been protected during the last three years and some of the important parts of other industries also have been de-protected, that is, to say, the fact that protection has been withdrawn from these industries is indicative of the Commission's anxiety to reduce the burden on the consumer and ask the protected industries to face the competition with other producers. Even in the case of industries that continue to enjoy protection, the

[Shri Manubhai Shah]

burden was not very heavy. The protection is mostly for a short period, and I can assure the House that has been the constant policy of Government that the protection should be the minimum and for the least possible period that an industry inescapably has to be given in all developing countries. The consumers' interests, therefore, are paramount and are to be safeguarded by the Commission's vigilance over prices, availability and quality of the protected commodities. In short, the Commission bears in mind the country's interest in general and the consumers' interest in particular in the impact of protective tariff.

Sir, I wanted to take, if I may, the permission of the House not to go into the details of these industries. But I may remind the House that the industries on which the tariff protection is sought to be continued as per the Commission's recommendations are: sericulture, antimony, ACSR, and AAC. conductors, electric motors, cotton textile machinery, power and distribution transformers, piston assembly and automobile spark plugs. And the industries which are sought to be de-protected in this Bill are engineers' steel files, the bicycle industry. This country has attained the cycle age. Practically we are one of the biggest producers of bicycles in the world. We have very good quality bicycles as well as a large production, almost 1.5 million per annum. And then, the diesel fuel injection equipment is also being de-protected.

In conclusion I would like to say that this is a Bill with which the House is very familiar, and it is more or less like an annual function that the Government has to discharge in placing before this august House all the reports on the different industries. And this year the Tariff Commission needs to be congratulated, because in one single year they have produced

reports giving massive information and containing recommendations on fourteen important industries and prices.

With this submission, Sir, I beg to move this Bill for the support of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, be taken into consideration"

One hour is the time allotted. Six to seven minutes each.

Some Hon. Members: The time may be extended.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will extend it by half an hour. Shri Warior.

Shri Warior (Trichur): Simply because the Minister has said that this is only an annual function, the Chair should not take it that the matter is not serious.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No. I am extending the time by half an hour.

Shri Warior: I generally agree with these recommendations of the Tariff Commission, but there are certain things which must be brought to the notice of the Government, and I am touching only the most important ones.

The first is about the aluminium industry. Do the aluminium industries require another lease of protection? I have been able to gather some information about these aluminium industries. One is the Indian Aluminium Industries Limited.

An Hon. Member: The Minister is not hearing you.

Shri Warior: I think the Planning Minister is planning something with the Minister in charge of the Bill. Or is it the foregone conclusion that the Bill is passed? Then there is no necessity for us to take part in it.

Shri Manubhai Shah: I am listening.

Shri Warior: I am sorry, and I think the Planning Minister after he has done well should not plan another speech now with the Industries Minister.

Sir, the technical collaboration of the Aluminium Industries Limited is with Aluminium Laboratories Limited, Canada. You must see how much capital is Indian and how much is foreign. No doubt the foreign capital must have some incentive for investment in this country. But at the same time, does it require that this investment of foreign capital should have an undue advantage by way of tariff protection?

Actually, the company made a net profit of Rs. 15.90 lakhs after making provision for depreciation to the extent of Rs. 14.87 lakhs and after providing a sum of Rs. 30.50 lakhs for taxation. The payment of the final dividend comes to about 15 per cent, or Rs. 15 lakhs. If 15 per cent profit is made by a company, then I think it is a very reasonable profit—or not very unreasonable. Because, usually, in business in India people think of about 10 to 12 per cent only. And if it is 20 per cent, then we can say that it is more than sufficient, more than what the foreigners are demanding for investment in India. This was to be looked into.

The story of the other one, the Indian Cable Company which is the next aluminium company, is much better. The Indian Cable Company has reported a higher profit, namely of Rs. 156.85 lakhs. And this is after depreciation and everything. The net profit for last year comes to about Rs. 63.85 lakhs. There is a slight difference. The previous year it had knocked off Rs. 66.97 lakhs, but the accounts on 31st March 1963 show a profit of Rs. 63.85 lakhs. So, after their appropriation accounts are all closed, they now have Rs. 87.40 lakhs in reserves. They have brought over 1752(Ai)LSD—6.

from the previous account Rs. 87 lakhs. When so much reserves are transferred and so much profits made, should this industry require any more protection? I think the Ministry must look into it. Not that I am very jealous that the foreign participants will take away a huge slice of the profit because their investment is here; but actually when we say there is protection, the other side is unprotected, the consumer side. The industries side is protected, no doubt. But it is paid through the nose by the people. Any protection means only that the people pay more than actually they should pay. In the hurry, or in the worry, of protecting certain industries should we tax our people more? That is always the question which comes up foremost when these Tariff Commission reports come before us.

Shri Manubhai Shah: Which industry is the hon. Member referring to? Is he referring to the general gamut of industry or any particular industry?

Shri Warior: I was saying about the aluminium industry. I am speaking only about the industries which are noted down in the Bill as requiring a longer lease of protection.

That is all I wanted to say about the aluminium industry. I have given the figures. Perhaps the hon. Minister was not as attentive as he ought to have been.

Then, taking the textile machinery industry, there also the situation is not very much appreciable, in this sense. In the Note circulated to us by the Ministry of International Trade in connection with this Bill, it is said that the Tariff Commission is not unaware of the situation in the textile machine building industry. They say that there are many complaints about these machines, especially about their quality; it wears out much more easily; not only that, the quality is very much sub-standard.

[Shri Warior]

Then, this industry has been under protection for the last twelve years. Even now, apart from the complaints about quality, when I went through this magazine *Commerce* I got to know something else. The complaint was this. And I do not think that that will be a prejudiced complaint, because it is coming from *Commerce* and none other. It was put there :

"The future prospects of the Industry depend, as the Tariff Commission rightly observes, on the possibility of making raw materials freely available. It is a pity that no physical assessment has yet been made of the future requirements of raw materials for the industry and the surplus that may be forthcoming to meet them. Why cannot the industry itself undertake such an estimation through the Textile Machinery Manufacturers Association and the Association of Merchants and Manufacturers of Textile Stores and Machinery?"

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should finish now.

Shri Warior: I may be given a few more minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are eight speakers.

Shri Warior: That is why we requested you to increase the time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have extended it.

Shri Warior: Because, we have to pay these taxes for the next three years. That is the whole difficulty for us. If it is only for a few months, it is different. But for the next three years we cannot revoke anything. Here it is said that after these twelve years of protection, even now this industry does not know how much is its requirement of new raw materials. It has not made any assessment, neither the industry nor their association nor

the Government, nor anybody else. So they think they can go on like this and Government is there as the mother who feeds the child and Government will look after them however, much they lag behind in assessing their requirements.

I was speaking about complaints. The same paper says that apart from quality the consumers of textile machinery have made the following complaints: high prices of indigenous machinery as compared with those of imported machinery; long delivery period—I must say that 'long' is very long—extending from 6 to even 24 months; incomplete fulfilment of orders, lack of spares; insistence on large deposits to be made with orders involving the locking up of funds; absence of pre-delivery erection. These are the complaints. How can this industry gain a market unless it is protected?

16.32 hrs.

[SHRI KHADILKAR in the Chair]

The same thing has to be said about the bicycle industry. This industry is now said to be self-supporting. One might suggest to the Tariff Commission that the landing cost of a bicycle is only Rs. 90 or at the most Rs. 100, including everything, whereas the market price of the indigenously produced bicycle is Rs. 195 TI and Rs. 205 Sen-Raleigh. How is it that the landed cost of the very same bicycle is only about Rs. 100 and the indigenously produced one is selling at Rs. 200? They are obviously knocking off much profit. This is a very important industry. Most of our lower middle class and middle class people use only bicycle for conveyance—I hope Shri Manubhai Shah will listen to this, now that his partner is gone. What is the explanation for this big difference in price? The trick is—I do not know; I am subject to correction—that the collaborators always carry on their import of their raw materials and never try to produce those indigenous materials, pro-

gressively in India itself, so that they can gain much more. If this is the case, this is simply defrauding the people. At least now, will the Minister ask the Tariff Commission to freeze the price at Rs. 200? Or will they allow the price to go up further after releasing it from the obligations of tariff protection? I hope the Minister will give an answer.

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay Central South): This Bill seeks to provide for continuance of protection to 8 industries and also proposes that protection may be discontinued to 3 industries from 1st January 1964. As the hon. Minister has said, this kind of discussion is almost an annual affair and does not call for a long speech. So I shall certainly try to be brief.

There is another reason why we should be brief in such matters and it is that the decisions of the Government are usually based on the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. We have all come to believe that the judgment of the Tariff Commission has been of great value in such decisions. To my mind, the Tariff Commission is one of those bodies that we have with us which have done over a long period of years—I should say almost 40 years—of its existence very valuable work. It has deserved our respect and we have known from experience that the recommendations of the Tariff Commission have been balanced and have always given due consideration to the interests both of the industries as well as of the consumers.

I shall briefly say a few words about three items, that is, ACSR, Piston Assembly and Automobile Spark Plugs. As regards the first, the Aluminium Conductors Steel Reinforced material, I see that our present capacity has increased and it is considered adequate to meet the demand. We have actually banned imports. That is a very encouraging sign. We still of course have to be very careful about the quality of our raw materials. The raw material required is of a very high purity of market prices are still rising.

99.5%. But it is hoped, I understand from the report, that indigenous production will be enough to meet the requirements of the industry by 1964. It is good to know that the collaboration arrangement that has been made in respect of this industry is with a Canadian company, the Aluminium Laboratories Ltd. of Canada. Somehow or other, I have always had the impression that Canada has some kind of leadership of the world in respect of this industry. Whether it is due to the fact that Canada has a tremendous advantage in possessing cheap electric power in the region of the Niagara Falls or anything else, it is a fact, and I am glad that we have been associated with this friendly country leading in the technique of aluminium industry.

Shri Solanki (Kaira): I welcome the Bill, the intentions behind it and the explanations of the hon. Minister.

He says that the consumer is kept in mind, but I think that even today the consumer has a lot to say against the prices. Many industries today are self-sufficient, and if tariff protection is removed, they would come out into the market producing better quality goods. For instance, protection should be removed from electric motors and automobiles. Up to last year Ambassador cars were sold at about Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 12,000 but now they are sold at Rs. 16,000 to Rs. 17,000. Much black-marketing is going on, there is no doubt about it. It does not have to face competition in the country, it is self-protected I would say, and there is no need for tariff protection. I hope the Minister has no soft corner for the people who make these cars. They are making enough money on these cars, and I hope tariff protection would be removed from these cars. People who could otherwise afford to buy these cars at the proper price are now facing difficulties.

Shri Manubhai Shah: That has nothing to do with the Bill.

Shri Solanki: I am afraid black-

[Shri Solanki]

It is a welcome thing that tariff protection has been removed from bicycles, engineering steel files and diesel fuel injection equipment. I would like to know the gain likely after the removal of this protection, and the loss to the exchequer from the continuing protection to the other industries.

Finally, the consumer should be kept in mind. After all, that should be the final goal. Industries should produce goods at satisfactory prices and of good quality. If industries become self-sufficient, they should definitely face competition, produce better goods at lower prices. This is the whole object as the Minister himself has agreed in his statement. I hope he keeps this in mind. That is the way the Tariff Commission can serve the industries of the country.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): I welcome this Bill recommending continued protection to certain industries.

With regard to sericulture, I wonder why, even after decades of protection, we cannot stand competition from countries which started very late.

Sericulture has a number of items, each of which can be considered an industry by itself. Japan today is exporting saplings and seedlings of mulberry of different varieties worth lakhs and lakhs of pounds all over the world. Japan started long after Italy and France, but it has beaten them hollow. Countries like Japan, China, Italy and France even today produce silkworm seed on commercial scale and export it to other countries. It is an industry in itself.

The most important item of sericulture is silk yarn. Sericulture can be divided into mulberry silk and non-mulberry silk. Through the efforts of Government, exports of non-mulberry silk are going up, and I am sure this industry will grow. But simply setting up boards or certain organisations

does not mean that the different aspects of the particular industry are looked into properly.

I had an opportunity last year to speak on sericulture when I moved a small Bill, on its several aspects. In reply, I was given certain assurances, but I am sorry to say that even to this day, nothing has happened. Rather, things have deteriorated. This is a very important industry carried on in 14 out of 16 States of India, and in some of the Centrally administered areas like Tripura and Manipur. So, it should be looked into.

There is tremendous scope for export and consumption within the country, of silk yarn. But what have we done with regard to that? Why are we not making progress qualitatively and quantitatively? In spite of conditions here being excellent with regard to all varieties of silk yarn, we are not making the progress that we should.

The silk fabrics that we export are not made completely out of indigenous yarn. We have to import yarn from Japan. If tomorrow we are not able to get this supply from abroad, what will happen? So, we must develop our indigenous sources of supply both qualitatively and quantitatively.

After decades of protection, even today we cannot stand competition with other countries in sericulture. I would therefore say that this protection cannot be justified. But when I see the present position of the industry in the country, I can say that if you do not give it protection, it will go to dogs. Therefore, it is high time that things are gone into in its proper perspective.

Secondly, you have recommended protection for antimony. While speaking on the report last year, I said that antimony is present in our country and in my State there are a number of places where it is found. What effort has been made to find out the places and process it? Nothing. The depart-

ment of mining, the Central Bureau of Mines and the Minerals Survey Department have done a lot of work. As far as this item is concerned, they have paid no attention. One need not drill deep into the bowels of earth but it can be easily mined. While going through certain parts of Kishtwar and other places in Jammu and Kashmir State, I have seen lumps of this metal lying over the surface. There may be many places in the country like that. We should try to locate those places.

Mr. Chairman: I can hardly give you a minute or two. You should conclude.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: I did not get a chance to speak even in the earlier debate. However, I shall conclude in a minute or two. Aluminium is gaining importance now-a-days; it is the producer's material. Much more efforts are needed, coordinated efforts by the concerned Central and State departments. It has to be protected but we should improve our efforts and try to meet our requirements.

I welcome the removal of protection in respect of some articles. Our quality of exported goods has improved. As the Chairman will not allow me more time, I will say only one thing. Under the cover of protection there should be no profiteering. What is the agency with him to detect that the prices charged are justified? With these words, I support the Bill. I would certainly like to hear what the hon. Minister has to say in respect of my suggestions.

श्री बड़े (खारगोन) : यह जो टरिफ बिल सामने आया है इसमें कुछ इंडस्ट्रीज को शासन प्रोटेक्शन देना चाहता है। इस प्रकार प्रोटेक्शन दे कर और टरिफ को ऊंचा करके बेबी इंडस्ट्रीज का पालन किया जाता है, और जैसे जैसे वह उद्योग बढ़ता जाता है वैसे वैसे टरिफ को नीचा कर दिया जाता है। अगर कोई इंडस्ट्री प्रोटेक्शन देने पर भी नहीं पनपती है तो टरिफ कमिशन टरिफ बाल को निकाल देता है।

हमने देखा है कि जिन इंडस्ट्रीज को प्रोटेक्शन दिया जाता है उन में बड़ा धोखा रहता है और वह यह है कि

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of order, Sir, I am sure you will agree that when my hon. colleague Mr. Bade is speaking, there should be quorum in the House.

Mr. Chairman: The bell is being rung—Now there is quorum.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Mr. Kamath is very quorum....what shall I say?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: If you cannot say it, do not say.

श्री बड़े : कंज्यूमर के हितों का ध्यान नहीं रखा जाता। उपभोक्ता दो तरह पिसता है, एक तो उसे देश में बने माल का दाम ज्यादा देना पड़ता है और दूसरे उसको टैक्स देने पड़ते हैं ताकि उस उद्योग को प्रोटेक्शन दिया जा सके। तो इस चीज पर ध्यान रख कर किसी उद्योग को प्रोटेक्शन देना चाहिये।

मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान काटन टैक्सटाइल मशीनरी के बारे में दिलाना चाहता हूँ। इस उद्योग में ७०६१७ लाख तो इंडियन कैपिटल है और ६७१५६ लाख फारिन कैपिटल है। इसको सन् १९४६ से प्रोटेक्शन मिला हुआ है और इस को आग सन् १९६६ तक प्रोटेक्शन देने की सिफारिश टरिफ कमिशन ने की है। लेकिन इस के बारे में स्वयं टरिफ कमिशन यह कहती है (पेज ३१ पर) :

"By entering into collaboration with reputed foreign firms the domestic industry has made considerable improvement in the quality of its products. However, the producers have not been able to catch up with the technological development rapidly taking place abroad. Consumers complained about the high degree of wear and tear of indigenous machinery, breakage of their components,

[श्री बड़]

non-interchangeability and short-coming in precision standards."

खुद टैरिफ कमीशन यह कहती है कि यह माल रद्दी होता है और कीमत भी ज्यादा देनी पड़ती है। कारखानेदार बाहर के माल को ज्यादा पसन्द करते हैं। इस उद्योग को सन् १९४९ से प्रोटेक्शन मिला हुआ है। लेकिन इस के माल में सुधार नहीं हुआ है।

और जा लाइसेंस आप ने इश्यू किये हैं उन के बारे में कहा गया है :

"Out of four licences issued for the manufacture of spindles, three have already started production with a capacity of 66,900 on single shift. Only one licence was issued for the manufacture of fluted rollers and the licensee hopes to commence production by the end of 1963."

ये लाइसेंस कब दिये गये थे यह मंत्री जी हाउस को बतायेंगे तो बहुत अच्छा होगा।

मेरा कहना है कि इस उद्योग को आप सन् १९६६ तक प्रोटेक्शन दे रहे हैं लेकिन इस के माल को कारखानेदार पसन्द नहीं करते। वे बाहर के स्पिडिल पसन्द करते हैं क्योंकि देशी जल्दी खराब हो जाते हैं।

दूसरा मुझ कहना है ओटोमोबाइल स्पाकिंग प्लग्स के बारे में। रिपोर्ट में पेज ११ पर दिया गया है कि इस उद्योग में नान इंडियन कैपिटल १२९-३० लाख है और इंडियन कैपिटल १०६-२० लाख है। इस को फिर प्रोटेक्शन दे दिया गया है। यह प्रोटेक्शन सन् १९६५ तक दिया गया है। इस के वास्ते मेरा कहना है कि कैपिटल पर जो गेन होता है वह फारिन कम्पनी ले जाती है।

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may continue tomorrow.

17.00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 13th December, 1963/Agrahayana 22, 1885 (Saka)