

[Shri Satya Narayan Sinha]

discuss this matter with them and then only I shall be in a position to say as to when it could be taken up for discussion.

Shri Bade (Kharagone): My resolution has been accepted and that is about the food position in the South India: all my friends from the South are supporting me in that motion. When will it be taken up?

Mr. Speaker: That also would be looked into.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: About the Gulati Commission also, the answer which I have given just now applies to this. I will discuss it with the Minister concerned and then only I will be in a position to say anything about it.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आपने मेरे बारे में जवाब नहीं दिया ।

श्री सत्य नारायण सिंह : ठीक है आपका जवाब नहीं दिया । आपका जवाब तो मुझे सब से पहले देना चाहिए था । लेकिन जिन से यह सवाल सम्बन्धित है वह इस समय हिन्दुस्तान में भी नहीं हैं । इनको इतनी अक्ल तो होनी चाहिए कि उन के सवाल का जवाब प्रधान मंत्री के आने पर दिया जाएगा । उन को यह समझना चाहिए कि जब वह यहां नहीं है तो इस सवाल को न उठाया जाए ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जरा सा अर्ज कर लेने दें मुझे अध्यक्ष महोदय ।

संसद कार्य मंत्री की सी अक्ल तो मुझे नहीं सकती और न इस ज़िन्दगी में मैं चाहूंगा कि मुझे उनकी सी अक्ल मिल जाए । लेकिन इतना तो अर्ज करूंगा कि उनको यह तो अच्छी तरह पता है कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री कब आने वाले हैं । प्रस्ताव भेज दिया गया है, उसको स्वीकार कर लिया गया है, अब उसके बारे में रजामन्दी से तै कर लिया जाए कि उस पर कब चर्चा होगी । लोक-सभा का काम रजामन्दी से ही चला करता है ।

आपसी रजामन्दी हमारी और आपकी हो जाए । यकतरफा तो कोई काम नहीं हुआ करता । इसलिए मैं माननीय संसद् कार्य मंत्री से बहुत नम्रता से कहूंगा कि वह कोई भी तारीख रख लें, 13, 14 या 15 । लेकिन 13 तो शायद इतवार होगा । मैं समझता हूँ कि इन तारीखों में प्रधान मंत्री को भी कोई आपत्ति न होगी ।

श्री सत्य नारायण सिंह : प्रधान मंत्री 7 तारीख को आने वाले हैं । उन से पूछ कर उनकी सहूलियत के अनुसार तारीख निश्चित कर दी जाएगी ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : इस बात का खयाल रखिएगा कि कहीं यह चीज यकतरफा न हो जाए ।

श्री सत्य नारायण सिंह : आप कब हम को भूलने देंगे ।

12.36 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE: MANUFACTURE, CONSUMPTION AND PRICE OF CARS

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसके लिए दो घंटे का वक्त है । बागड़ी साहब को 15 मिनट और बाकी लोगों को दस दस मिनट दिए जाएंगे ।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): It will continue up to 2.30 today?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): There will not be any official business?

Mr. Speaker: This is official business.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सरकार ने बार-बार इस बात का ऐलान किया है कि देश के अन्दर सस्ती कार दे सकेंगे और कहा गया है कि इसका प्रबन्ध कारखानों द्वारा किया जा रहा है । लेकिन बार

बार यह ऐलान झूठा और धोखा गया। बल्कि कारों की कीमत और बढ़ती गयी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक तरफ तो हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर यह चर्चा है कि अगुबम और परमाणु बम बनाया जाए या न बनाया जाए, बना सकते हैं, या नहीं बना सकते हैं। और दूसरी तरफ सरकार बार बार विश्वास दिला रही है कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर सस्ती कारें बनेंगी जिनकी कीमत 5, 6 हजार तक होगी और जो दरम्याने तबके के लोगों को मिल सकेंगी। बड़ी कारों तो सिर्फ बड़े लोगों के लिए हैं, उद्योग पतियों के लिए हैं, सरमाएदारों के लिए हैं, वही उन को इस्तेमाल कर सकते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस देश के अन्दर कारों की कीमत ज्यादा क्यों है? यह बात बुनियादी है और सभी वस्तुओं पर लागू होती है। इस देश के अन्दर सरकार का कर, उद्योगपतियों का मुनाफा और उसके ऊपर सरकार और उद्योगपतियों की, दोनों की, फिजूलखर्चियाँ, ये तीनों चीजें इसके महंगे होने का मुख्य कारण हैं।

अब आप कार को लीजिए। कारखाने वालों ने उन के नाम ऐसे रखे हैं जैसे कि उनका कोई ताल्लुक इस देश से नहीं हो। अंग्रेजी नाम रखे हैं, जैसे एम्ब्रैसेडर, फियट, स्टैंडर्ड। क्या ये हिन्दुस्तान जैसे नाम हैं? ऐसा मालूम होता है कि ये विदेशी कारें हैं और विदेशी लोगों के लिए हैं। तो सरकार और उद्योगपतियों की यह जर्नियत है।

खर, ताँ में आपकी खिदमत में अर्ज कर रहा था कि इन कारों की कीमत इतनी ज्यादा क्यों है। एम्ब्रैसेडर की बाजारी कीमत 17 हजार के करीब है और फियट की 14 हजार के करीब। यत्तो सरकार का दाम है। लेकिन अगर काले बाजार

में जाओ तो एम्ब्रैसेडर का दाम है 19 या 20 हजार और फियट का 20 और 21 हजार। काले बाजार का मामला बहुत टेड़ा है।

अब आप लागत पर आइए। जहाँ तक फियट का ताल्लुक है 33 परसेंट तो उसकी लागत है, बाकी 25 या 30 परसेंट सरकार का कर है और बाकी सरमाएदार का मुनाफा है। और फिजूल खर्च है। इसी तरह से आप देखेंगे कि एम्ब्रैसेडर की असल लागत 8 हजार है और 9 हजार के करीब मुनाफा और सरकार का कर है। इस 9 हजार में सरकार का कर पाँच हजार है। तो इन कारों की सब से अधिक जो लागत है वह सरकार, सेठ के कर की है और दूसरी लागत जो है वह उद्योगपति की है और तीसरी लागत जो है वह उन लोगों की है जिनको सुविधा मिली हुई है। कुछ खास कायदे कानूनों के मातहत कुछ खास आदमियों को ये कारें मिल जाती हैं। और वे उनको काले बाजार में बेचते हैं और इन पर दो, तीन, पाँच, छः, सात हजार तक मुनाफा कर लेते हैं। और लालच का यह समन्दर बढ़ता ही जाता है। और मुझे तो कते हुए शर्म आती है कि हमारे लोक-सभा के, पार्लियामेंट के मेबर, भी ऐसे देखने में आए हैं कि फियट कारें खरीद लीं और उन को 6-7 हजार के मुनाफे से ब्लैक में दे दी। यानी ऐसा अघः पतन हमारे स्वयं अपने लोगों में भी है। इसी तरीके से स्कूटर्स में 1000 से लेकर 1500 रुपये तक बनते हैं। मेरा कहना यह है कि आज कारों और स्कूटर्स आदि में जा भारी ब्लैक चल रहा है और इस तरह से नाजायज तौर से भारी मुनाफा कमाया जा रहा है इस व्यापक पतन का तह में हर्ष जाना पड़ेगा। यह पतन और भ्रष्टाचार ऊपर से लेकर नीचे तक सभी स्तरों पर चल रहा है। इस उद्योग पर कुछ ही लोगों

[श्री बागड़ी]

की मानोपली है और कब्जा है । हिन्दुस्तान के कुछ ही उद्योगपति इस सारे वाणिज्य के ऊपर और इस सारे घड़े के ऊपर मुनाफ़ा उठाते हैं । इस भारी लूट के ऊपर काले नाग बने बैठे हैं । आज हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर भारत सरकार सस्ती कार नहीं मूहैया कर सकी उसका एक मुख्य कारण यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर यह कारों का उद्योग, यह एम्बैसेडर कार जहाँ बनती है वह कुछ ऐसे उद्योगपतियों का है, जो कि सरकार से ऊपर माने जाते हैं या यह कहिये कि सरकारी मंत्रियों से उनको मदद मिलती है । वह उद्योगपति इतने शक्तिशाली हैं कि सरकार उन के ऊपर हाथ नहीं डालती है, अगर कोई उन की जगह पर कमजोर व्यक्ति होता तो सरकार हाथ डाल देती । कमजोर लोगों को इस सरकार द्वारा किस तरीके से ऋण किया जाता है यह जनता में आम चर्चा का विषय बना हुआ है । यह बात काफ़ी लोगों से मुनी गई है कि किस तरीके से एक आदमी, श्री भटनागर नाम के आदमी जिसका कि पचास लाख रुपये का सोडा एंश का इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंस था उसका वह लाइसेंस कौसिल कर के इसी सरकार के एक मंत्री महोदय ने अपने लड़के की कम्पनी को दे दिया

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य यह जानते हैं कि लोक-सभा के कायदे में दिया हुआ है कि अगर किसी खास व्यक्ति का नाम लेकर उसकी यहाँ पर कोई माननीय सदस्य चर्चा चलाना चाहता है तो उसका उसे पहले नोटिस देना चाहिए ताकि सम्बन्धित मंत्री जी उस के लिए तैयार हो जायें । इसलिए माननीय सदस्य बिना पूर्व नोटिस दिये हुए किसी व्यक्ति विशेष जो कि जबाब न दे सकता हो, उसका मामला यहाँ इस सदन में नहीं उठा सकते हैं ।

श्री बागड़ी : खर्र जाने दीजिये । मेरे कहने का मतलब यह था कि सनभ्रत और मंत्री का एक रिश्ता हो जाता है तब उस के अन्दर भ्रष्टाचार जरूर कदम रखता है । अब यह जो मैं ने मामला बतलाया इस में उन मंत्री जी का थोड़ा बहुत सम्बन्ध था । अगर आप ऐतराज करते हैं तो मैं उन का नाम नहीं लूंगा लेकिन यह बात सब के सामने आ चुकी है कि किस तरह से मंत्री जी ने एक नाजायज़ काम किया था । यह ठीक है कि लोग उन के मुँह के सामने इस बात की चर्चा नहीं करते लेकिन पीछे आम चर्चा करते हैं कि किस तरीके से उन्होंने उस कमजोर व्यक्ति भटनागर को ऋण किया और किस तरीके से उसका लाइसेंस मसूख कर के अपने बेटे टी० टी० एंड कम्पनी को वह इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंस दे दिया ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य फि वही कर रहे हैं ।

श्री बागड़ी : अच्छा मैं नाम नहीं लेता । अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप की खिदमत में यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि आज किस तरीके से कारों की कीमतों में लूट हो रही है और सरकार इस लूट और चल रहे बजैक के लिए कुछ कर नहीं पाती है क्योंकि सरकार के बजैर लोग और अन्य कर्मचारी खुद ऐसे काम करते हैं । चूँकि व उद्योगपतियों से दबे रहते हैं इसलिए सरकार 5 या 6 हजार की लागत की सस्ती कारें बनाने के लिए कारखाना नहीं लगाती है क्योंकि इस से उन के मुनाफ़े पर चोट पड़ती है । अगर सरकार सस्ती कारों का निर्माण करे और पांच, छे हजार की कारें वह तैयार कर के मिडिल क्लास के दरमियाने तबके के आदमियों को मुलभ करे तो जहाँ आज चल रही भारी लूट और बजैक जो कि कारों के सिलसिले में चल रहा है वह मिटेगा वहाँ इस से सरकार की स्वयं अपने सैक्टर में भी फिजूल खर्ची मिटेगी । सरकार के वह अफसरान और

अन्य टेकनिकल और वैज्ञानिक लोग जिनको कि अपने काम के सिलसिले में इधर, उधर दौड़भाग करनी पड़ती है और शासन को उन्हें कार की सुविधा उपलब्ध करानी होती है अगर इस तरह की सस्ती कारों का सरकार निर्माण कर ले तो उसके खर्च में भी भारी कमी हो जायेगी। जाहिर है कि अगर सरकार कोई इस तरह की पांच या छह हजार तक की सस्ती कार बना कर रख दे तो फिर यह एम्बेसेडर और फिफ्ट को लेकर जाँच निकलता है, वह अन्त में जाएगा लेकिन चूँकि सरकार के उन उद्योगपति मित्रों का इस से घंघा बन्द हो जायेगा और उन के मुनाफ़े पर चोट लगेगी इसलिए वह काम शुरू नहीं किया जाता है।

मैं आपकी खिदमत में अर्ज कर रहा था कि सरकार को इस के लिए कदम उठाना पड़ेगा। आज अपने देश के अन्दर आठ हजार में से एक गावामी के पास कार है। इस से ज्यादा के पास कार नहीं है। सरकार सस्ती कारें बनाने के लिए कारखाना बनाये जिस से कि ग्राम लोगों को पांच, छह हजार के अन्दर कार मिल सके। इस से दो फायदे होंगे। एक तो यह कि आज केवल कुछ उद्योगपतियों द्वारा ही जो साग मुसफ़ा कमाया जाता है और जिनकी कि खाहिश हिन्दुस्तान के उद्योगों को बढ़ाने की और फैलाने की न हो कर सिर्फ जो अपना मुनाफ़ा ही बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, उनका मुनाफ़ा इस काम के करने से कम होना और उद्योग इस देश के अन्दर ज्यादा फैलेंगे। दूसरा फायदा इसका यह होगा कि इससे काला बाजार कम होगा और इस देश के अन्दर नीतिकता बढ़ेगी। इस के अलावा इस देश के अन्दर जो टैक्सों की चोरी होती है, कारों के और अन्य कारखानेदारों को चूँकि कुछ सामान अपनी महंगा खरीबना पड़ता है और उसके बाद उनके द्वारा टैक्सों की

चोरी होती है और फौरन एक्सचेंज के मामले में काफी एक गड़बड़ होती है अगर सरकार मुकाबले के अन्दर कारखाने खोल कर सस्ती जनता कारें बनाने का काम शुरू कर दे तो जहाँ मिडिल क्लास को हम सस्ती कारें दे सकेंगे वहाँ यह ब्लैक और टैक्सों की चोरी भी बहुत हद तक बन्द हो सकती है। वैसे भूखी जनता को जब अपना पेट भरने के लिए रोटी मयस्सर न हो तो कार का सवाल तो उम के लिए उठता ही कहाँ है ?

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप जनता में आते हैं या मिडिल क्लास में आते हैं ?

श्री बागड़ी : वह तो उधर उन की तरफ ध्यान आ जाता है इसलिए यह कार की बात कही।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बागड़ी जी मुझे छोड़ कर उधर क्यों चले गये ?

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं क्या करूँ ? वह मेरी तरफ आ गये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : फिर भी आप मेरी ही तरफ रहिये।

श्री बागड़ी : खैर, मैं आप की खिदमत में अर्ज कर रहा था कि इस बुनियाद को हमें बदलना पड़ेगा और यह देखना होगा कि लागत मूल्य से ड्योड़ा दाम किसी भी चीज पर न हो। जब तक सरकार बड़े-बड़े मुनाफा खोरों, पूँजीपतियों और उद्योगपतियों पर रोक नहीं लगायेगी, प्रकृश नहीं लगायेगी तब तक इस देश में औद्योगीकरण नहीं हो सकेगा और देश में छोटे, छोटे उद्योग विकसित नहीं हो सकेंगे। वह तभी हो सकेगा जब सरकार स्वयं अपने ऊपर भी नियंत्रण लगाये। वह यह न करे कि 17000 की एम्बेसेडर की कीमत में सरकार 5000 ले ले, फीएट जिसकी कि कीमत 14000 हो उस के अन्दर माड़े 4500 रुपया सरकार का टैक्स बला जाय। जो सरकार इतने लुटेरे किस्म के टैक्स उनसे वसूल कर रही हो वह मुनाफाखोरों को कैसे

[श्री बागड़ी]

रोक सकती है ? सरकार और इन बड़े बड़े चंद उद्योगपतियों द्वारा दुहरी लूट चल रही है। एक तरफ तो ये उद्योगपति 20-25 फीसदी मुनाफा खाते हैं दूसरी तरफ सरकार इनसे 30 सैंकड़ा टैक्स वमूल करती है। दूसरी तरफ कालेबाजार वाले 33 प्रतिशत तक की ब्रैकरमाकॉटिंग कर रहे हैं। इसलिए यह एम्प्लेडर और फोरेट कारों के मामले में जो चोरबाजारी और लूट चल रही है उसे सरकार को तत्काल रोकना चाहिए और वह सरकार द्वारा स्वयं सस्ती कारों का निर्माण कार्य आरम्भ करके ही हो सकेगा। इस के अलावा मैं सरकार को एक यह भी सुझाव दूंगा कि कम से कम अपने इस सदन की पवित्रता को कायम रखने के लिए यह जरूरी है कि जिन लोगों ने गाड़ियां खरीदी हैं या बेची हैं, दो, दो और चार, चार और पांच, पांच हजार के ब्लैक के अन्दर बेची हैं, स्कटर्स को बेच कर 1000 हजार और डेढ़ डेढ़ हजार रुपया तक ब्लैक में कमाया है, सरकार को उन्हें उन पर रोक लगानी चाहिए। सरकार को यह पता लग ही सकता है कि कहां से वे लाये, किस के हाथ बेची और अब वह चीज कहां चली गई। अगर इस तरह का सरकार एक आदर्श उपस्थित करे तो जनता पर इसका बड़ा अच्छा प्रभाव पड़ेगा और देश में जो ब्लैक और स्मगलिंग चलती है व मिट सकती है।

इस के साथ ही साथ मैं यह अर्थ कहेगा कि इस मोनोपोली को तोड़ने के लिए आज जो बिड़ला बन्धुओं की मोनोपोली है, जब तक यह मोनोपोली नहीं टूटेगी तब तक देश के उद्योग का काम ठीक से नहीं चल पायेगा। हर जगह इन की मोनोपोली है, इनके द्वारा काफी विदेशी मुद्रा की भी गड़बड़ होती है और अगर सरकार उनको पकड़ना चाहे तो कोई बचने वाला नहीं है। वे कोई भी दुष्कर्म क्यों न करें सरकार द्वारा उन पर कोई रोक नहीं लगाई जाती है।

अन्त में मैं फिर एक बार आप की मार्फत मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करूंगा कि सस्ते दामों की कारें मुहैया करने के लिए वे और उन की सरकार जल्दी से जल्दी उपयुक्त कदम उठाये।

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, for the last seven years our ears have been jarred by the sermon of the Government that they are giving their due consideration to the manufacture of a people's car or a small-priced car. The last we heard from the Government was on the 27th November, 1964 when in reply to a question the Government stated that the main possibility of achieving substantial economy in production is to maximise the scale of production. We entirely agree with this. But what steps have been taken in this regard? Government have suggested that the various car-manufacturing units are to be integrated, or in the alternative one of the three has to be expanded, so that the production capacity may be increased and ultimately there will be a price reduction.

At the same time the Government have said that the reply from the various manufacturing concerns is not encouraging; they are not prepared either to integrate themselves or to reduce the price, and at best they can reduce it by Rs. 750 if the capacity is stepped up to fifty thousand.

Further, they have stated that they are going to investigate the rise in the high price.

I beg to submit that the Government cannot fool all the people for all the time. They have been hoodwinking the people by this statement that they have been looking into the price structure and that fresh negotiations are taking place, and at this delicate moment they are not in a position to spell out what they are doing with indigenous and foreign manufacturers.

Sir, the country has been tired of this talk. It is an admitted fact that there is a shortage of cars; and, as pointed out by the previous speaker, it is a regular racket in the market. We all know the long waiting list in the car shops, and we all know how priorities are sold at five thousand rupees.

Whereas every third man in the United States possesses a car and every fifth man in Australia possesses a car, in this country eight thousand people possess one car. And that too is the privilege only of very few persons.

Even though people are prepared to pay for the car, they cannot get it because there has been a shortage, and all the controls have been there just to help a few individuals. Though there has been control of production, price and distribution, the racket is there, and we all know it, and the Government knows it, because the demand for vehicles is more than the supply.

We know how much profit the STC has been making over the sale of cars. In reply to a question, the hon. Minister stated that a second-hand Chevrolet car is being sold by the State Trading Corporation, the public sector, for Rs. 80,000. Just imagine, Sir, these are the persons who are responsible for reducing the purchasing power of our rupee.

No attempt has been made so far to increase the supply, even though the Jha Committee has made a specific recommendation that things would improve if the controls go and if competitive conditions prevail. But I am afraid nothing has been done in that regard.

Even though the Jha Committee in 1960 made the recommendation that Fiat cars should be sold at Rs. 9,282, Standard at Rs. 9,500 and Hindustan at Rs. 11,000, in the market today, on the road, they cost, Rs. 14,000 for Fiat, Rs. 14,600 for Standard and nearly Rs. 17,000 for Hindustan. We know what the Hindustan car is. In

the first week it starts rattling and it has absolutely no re-sale value. (An Hon. Member: Junk). Are we supposed to pay for this car such a huge amount? These are mere junk. Should the Government be a silent spectator to this?

I beg to submit that if the Government are really sincere about it, they should go in for the production of a cheap car. In this regard the Pande Committee has submitted a report, though it never saw the light of day. We do not know what happened. But we learn that they have made a specific recommendation by adopting which we could easily have a car for five thousand rupees.

In this connection I would like to draw the attention of the Government to their Resolution of 6th September, 1960. In that Resolution Government has stated that in case the Expert Committee consider a low-cost car feasible in the price range indicated, the project will be taken up in the public sector. The Expert Committee found it feasible and made their recommendation, but the Government backed out. I would like to know why the public sector backed out. If they are not prepared to deliver the goods they should leave it to other people who can manage the show and deliver the car. And they are prepared to produce the same car.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): In that case the public sector will have to go.

Shri P. K. Deo: I will say, let them produce. But why did they back out? If there was any foreign-exchange difficulty, Messrs. Renault of France offered to solve this difficulty in a very big way. The Renault-Dauphin, which is a four-seater car, has been tested by the Defence Ministry in Ahmednagar and it has been proved to be satisfactory, economical and suitable for Indian conditions. And it would be 600 lbs. lighter than our Fiat car. That means less consumption of steel. This Renault-Dauphin would be weighing

[Shri P. K. Deo]

11,00 lbs. while the Fiat weights 1,760 lbs. And the price would be Rs. 5,100, and production would be at the level of 50,000 cars. They further stated that the foreign-exchange requirement would be to the tune of Rs. 9.88 crores, of which only Rs. 4 crores was needed in the Third Plan period. They further assured that 11 per cent of the production would be available for export; they guaranteed an export of 11 per cent of the production of this Renault car. And they were prepared to give the credit for the foreign components for fifteen years, and the payment to start after five years.

In the Third Plan period we see that Rs. 20 crores of foreign exchange is being earmarked for the expansion of our existing car factories. If instead of this, this new project had been taken up we would have got a much cheaper car.

Further, the taxation policy of the Government is responsible for this high price which the poor car purchaser has to pay through his nose. So far as the Fiat car is concerned, a pamphlet circulated to us by the Fiat concern shows that 39.71 per cent (nearly 40 per cent) of the price is for the payment of the various taxes.

Shri Ranga: Plus sales-tax.

Shri P. K. Deo: If you compare the actual ex-factory price of this car with the actual price for the purchaser, you will see that it varies so much. The price of the car is very much, because the policy of our Government is wrong. In this regard I beg to submit that if this Renault manufacture had been taken up in right earnest, we would have by now earned a good deal of foreign exchange, and Government would have also gained in the shape of sales-tax and collected more taxes as a result of larger consumption of petrol, tyres, etc.

Lastly, I wish to say this. This country needs a cheap car, whether it is in the public sector or in the private sector. And unless and until that is done, I charge the Government of betraying the interests of the country and the people.

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): Sir, the hon. Member who opened the debate from the Socialist party, if he had read the report of Shri L. K. Jha, would have discussed it with a dispassionate outlook. Banning words like "looting", "black-marketing" and "robbing", all these won't be substitutes for any portion of the car or an answer for any of its parts.

13 hrs.

The real problem today in India is that the demand in India for cars is only of the order of about forty thousand. The international expert opinion is that unless we are able to manufacture about a lakh of cars in a single plant it won't work out economically, and the car would not be cheap. The real position today is that we are manufacturing about 23,000 cars whereas the demand is somewhere about 40,000 cars. Therefore, even if the whole demand is met, we shall not be able to have a plant of international standards with which we can manufacture a car, cheap and efficient. That is the inherent lacuna in the situation in India.

My hon. friend Shri P. K. Deo had made a great point in regard to Renault. Two or three weeks ago, I happened to read in the American magazine *Time* that acres of this Renault car are lying unsold in France...

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Acres of cars?

Shri Hanumanthaiya: They are parked in acres. Thousands of cars are parked in acres of land; they remain unsold because they are not competitive enough in price and equipment with other European productions.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Were they new cars or junk?

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Therefore, we have to be very careful when we select the car for manufacture here.

The idea of manufacturing a cheap car for the common man is a contradiction in terms. If we take the per capita income in India, we find that it is so low, and, therefore, a car is a luxury, because very few people can afford it.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): Because it is so expensive. Even food-grains have become a luxury now.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Even if the price of the car is Rs. 10,000 instead of Rs. 17,000, as my hon. friend knows, one has to spend about Rs. 300 to 400 a month on the maintenance of the car. Unless a person's income is about Rs. 2000 p.m., in these days of inflation, he will not be able to maintain a car. It is not as though if a car is purchased at Rs. 10,000, it can be run on water and air.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Who is responsible for this inflation?

Shri Hanumanthaiya: The maintenance of the car must also be taken into consideration before you sponsor the idea of a cheap car for a middle class man or a common man. As things stand today, as our economic progress stands today, a car can be purchased and used by only that set of people whose income is in the higher strata.

Apart from that, the real mistake committed in India was to have made three or four sets of people to produce the car. Even if we had combined all these into one plant and produced cars, our demand would have been somewhere about half a lakh, whereas a plant for one lakh cars is required in order to make it efficient and economical. But it is not the monopoly now....

Shri Ranga: It is a monopoly. What else is it?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): We are glad to hear this from Shri Ranga.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Steel and Mines (Shri P. C. Sethi): It is not one million, but it is one lakh.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: 'Monopoly' is, not the right term to use, because there are three of them. If one firm had been entrusted with the production, then I could have understood the use of the word 'monopoly'. When there are three or four firms in the market in a competitive spirit....

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Where is the competition?

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Sir, you have to extend time to me because so many questions are being asked.

Mr. Speaker: There will be no extension at all.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: But how am I to answer these questions?

Mr. Speaker: If he continues to address me, he would not mind what comes from the other Members. He might just close his two ears and turn his eyes towards me and speak.

Shri Daji: The Minister will answer, I suppose.

Mr. Speaker: Other Members also will answer.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: The real mistake was done when we allowed three or four manufacturers to be in the field. That was the inherent mistake committed in India. It is not my opinion alone, but it is the opinion of the Jha Committee also which consisted of eminent men in the field who knew something about it. Anybody who wants to apply his mind seriously to this problem has to study this report. Even though this report is about four years old, still in many important respects, it is as modern as it could be.

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

13.35 hrs.

[SHRI KHADILKAR in the Chair]

I would, therefore, request Government not to commit the mistake of multiplying the manufacturers in India thereby allowing the units to become smaller and smaller and consequently more and more uneconomic. In that case the cost of production will go high.

I am not concerned today with blaming any particular sector, whether it was the Government or the car manufacturers or the producers of ancillary parts. In fact, it is the manufacturers of the ancillary parts who are to blame most. They have not maintained the standards, and the quality of their products is very bad. The protection given to them by Government is being misused. If there were a machinery to control the quality of these ancillary parts, probably we would have had better cars.

I agree with non Members that the present type of cars which we are having, whether it be Fiat or Ambassador or Standard, is at least 20 years old in design and equipment. We are supposed to have planned for what is called modern progress. If planning means anything, and if we have to judge our planning performance sector-wise, then these cars that are going on the street will show that our planning has got many failures to its credit.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: To its debit.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: The cars that are running on the street now are a disgrace to the modern mind. These cars have to be made better and more efficient. They must at least look as good as any other cars made in the West.

Here is a case where it is not the manufacturer alone that could be

held responsible, much as I would like it because they say that the foreign exchange policy of Government, and the restrictions and other things that Government impose etc. come in the way of their manufacturing a better and cheaper car. But Government say that the manufacturers have not been playing fair. So far as the consumers are concerned, as Shri Bagri has said, they are blaming both the Government and the manufacturers. I am not interested in blaming anybody today. We have to evolve a policy today in consultation with all the interests concerned; the consumers, the Government and the manufacturers; they must summon their very best and see that a car is manufactured which gets not only approval but approbation from the consumers in India. The present cars, as long as they run on the road, are a running disgrace to the efficiency and the acumen not only of the manufacturers but of the Government. All the three manufacturers have to be summoned, and Government must sit with them and they must cut fresh ground and see whether their patriotism and their sense of modernism would be able to manufacture a better and a cheaper car. It is not a question of apportioning blame at all. Often what we do is that we remain content with blaming one or other of the car manufacturers, and the result is that the *status quo* continues in regard to the production as well as quality of the car. What this House or this country is interested in seeing is that a good car should be on the road. It is the unanimous opinion not only of this House but of everyone who uses a car or who sees a car also, that the cars on the road today, manufactured in India, are a disgrace to our nation.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Mr. Chairman, what we are discussing today is a classic example of vacillation and bad planning on the part of Government in relation to this sector. Government know very

well that there is a demand for a small or cheap car and that is proved by seeing the waiting list of those wanting a car. A man has to wait for 3-4 years to get a car. Government also know that the automobile manufacturers have failed to produce a car at reasonable price. I am not an expert in this field who can say that the price could be brought down to a particular extent, but there are experts who have opined to what extent the price could be reduced. Therefore, Government should have taken note of this, now that the automobile manufacturers have failed to produce a car at a reasonable price.

It is also known that these manufacturers have good profits, if not abnormal profits. There is scope for reduction in price but it is not being done because they are manipulating it to their own advantage for their own big profits. Today it is essential for Government to have effective, even stringent, control. Because the manufacturers have failed to bring down the price, they should be asked to adopt the policy of merger. Shri Subramaniam said that they gave a chance to the manufacturers to come together and find out a solution whereby they could co-operate, merge and produce a car at a reduced price. The Minister said the other day that the response to this was not encouraging. Then we asked the Minister how long he was going to wait. We are sorry that on such occasions when we are agitated and express our views strongly and with emphasis, it is not realised that it is not a personal criticism but criticism of Government's policy. The Minister himself said that they have failed to bring down the price and they have not agreed to co-operative merger. Now I do not know at what stage we are.

In view of the fact that these units have proved that they are uneconomic, inefficient and incompetent, a strong case has been built up for Government to act. It is Government's own argument that it is

essential that these units should be forced to accept co-operative merger and there should be enforced quality and price control.

Shri P. K. Deo of the Swatantra Party himself referred to the Ambassador car as the 'wretched Ambassador'. I am quoting him; otherwise, if I were to use this expression myself, I would be dubbed a fellow traveller. But this has come from the Swatantra Party, the big supporter of that firm's policy. He said that the wretched Ambassador is a standing disgrace and shame to this country in the name of producing a car. We all support that contention. At least in this respect, the extreme right and the extreme left agree. (Interruption). Shri Patel may not agree because he goes walking. But then there is no doubt about this car being the 'wretched Ambassador'.

Shri Kapur Singh: What justification is there for the hon. Member to say that my party is the biggest supporter of a particular firm? What have we got to do with that firm?

Mr. Chairman: He has not said that.

Shri Kapur Singh: He has.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: The justification is that the Congress party does not behave that way. We said once about them and they have nothing else to say except that we are also like that. That is the only justification.

Apart from this, what they are doing, what the Swatantra Party is doing, is absolutely medieval or even worse; their policies are antiquated, old and medieval at least in the economic sphere; I do not know about other fields.

I now close the first part of my speech with this observation that the Government should make the three manufacturers adopt a policy of co-operative merger, conversion into an economic unit and production of a car whose price and quality are controlled.

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

Now I come to the next part—about a people's car. Unfortunately, the facts are not known to everybody. But there are some about which our friends of the Swatantra Party gave some indication, excepting one or two mistakes, which might be used by the Minister against us. Messrs. Renault gave a very nice idea to Government to start a people's car project in the public sector. They said they are prepared to produce such a car in the public sector at a cheap price; incidentally—this would also solve the foreign exchange problem in a big way—they said that they also agree to guarantee 11 per cent export. This is what my hon. friend of the Swatantra Party said. In this, he was slightly wrong, because I have got an extract of the letter of the company in which they agreed that they were prepared to take a part of the manufacture for foreign export.

The Pande Committee was appointed to go into the report of the Jha Committee. In spite of the pressure exercised on them, the Pande Committee said that it is feasible to have a people's car in the public sector, keeping in view the economic and other conditions. I would like to ask Government why the Pande Committee report has not seen the light of day. Let them produce that report before us. I have read some chapters of it; somebody gave them to me and I read them. Is it not a fact that the Pande Committee report, which was submitted on 29 May 1961, said that a people's car in the public sector is a feasible proposition? Is it not a fact that this report was considered by the Secretaries. Government could say that they were not agreed on that, but is it not a fact that tacit approval was given by the Secretaries. Government say that the Secretaries did not agree. But they did not disagree also. Government say that they postponed consideration of the matter. But so far as we know, all the Secretaries, including the Finance

Secretary, tacitly gave their approval to the feasibility of the proposition. Then the Planning Commission discussed the matter on 25-9-1961, Shri T. N. Singh was then possibly there. I know what he feels about the public sector and what battles he had to fight in the Commission to uphold that sector, against the pressures of the private sector. I now call upon the Minister to have courage and shake off these pressures, reopen the entire issue and see that the great injustice that has been done is rectified and have this project in the public sector and see that there may not be more 'Birlas' to kill this industry in the public sector.

I want to know if the Pande Committee's report was considered by the Secretaries on 29-7-1961 and if it was not discussed in the Planning Commission on 25-9-1961. Is it not a fact that the matter has been examined from all angles, including the foreign exchange angle? If the difficulties regarding foreign exchange were very great, how is it that when the Pande Committee was appointed to examine it, Government issued a statement, on 6 September 1960, that if a small car project was feasible it would be taken up. Was the foreign exchange position much better then than it was afterwards? When this expert committee went into this question, when the Government themselves announced that if a small car project was feasible they would take it up, was the foreign exchange position much better than it was afterwards? Under the pressure of these three people, these three big magnates who are producing cars in this country, the three musketeers in the automobile sector, the big friends have dropped this proposal.

Why did they drop this? The officers and the politicians have nothing to worry about a small car. I know that the late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru wrote to the Chief Ministers pointing out that the use of staff cars had increased. These

gentlemen have nothing to do except to use the staff car, and they do not have to worry very much about their own car. Therefore, the people's car will never see the light of day, unless each of them is forced to have his own car, and understand where the shoe pinches.

So, I would say that this people's car which was offered by the French team to India, who said that they were prepared to produce the car within 21 months of the land being given, to sell the car within 24 months of the official starting, to guarantee a good percentage of the production for exports, and to make foreign exchange available on a barter system by purchasing goods from India, should have been allowed to come. That not having been done, these three people must be forced to have a co-operative merger; and, Government should itself come forward with a small car project and see that it is sold at a reasonable price.

Mr. Chairman: Dr. Lohia. May I request him to conclude his remarks in nine minutes?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद):
मैं इससे भी कम वक्त में खरम कर दूंगा।

सभापति महोदय, अब एक ऐसे आदमी की दृष्टि की सुनिए कि जो चाहता है कि उसके गाड़ी हो और उसके सभी देशवासियों के पास हो, लेकिन जिस के गाड़ी नहीं है और जो जानता है कि उसकी जिन्दगी में उसके कभी होगी भी नहीं। तो ऐसे आदमी की दृष्टि से एक बात बिल्कुल साफ है कि आज जब अमरीका में दो तीन आदमियों पर एक गाड़ी है, यूरोप में पांच दस पर एक गाड़ी है, हमारे देश में कहा गया कि आठ हजार पर एक गाड़ी है। लेकिन यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आया, मेरे खयाल में इस देश में हजार या दो हजार पर एक गाड़ी होगी

और उन्होंने जो बताया है वह शायद वार्षिक उत्पादन के बारे में बताया है। लेकिन वहाँ तो मैं सब गाड़ियों की चर्चा करना चाहता हूँ।

श्री हिमन्तः लहक (गोडा) : बेलगाड़ी।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं प्रभुश्याल जी से पूछता हूँ कि कलकत्ते में कितनी गाड़ियाँ हैं। वहाँ आठ हजार में एक हो सकती है लेकिन देश में नहीं। आठ हजार के हिसाब से कितनी संख्या आती है? आप लोग इतनी गलती करके फंमला करने बैठ जाते हैं और सारी बहस को बिगाड़ देते हैं। हाँ कलकत्ते में आठ हजार में एक गाड़ी निकल जायेगी।

खैर, तो ऐसी स्थिति में हमें सब से पहले वह देख लेना है कि यह गाड़ी वाला सवाल सिर्फ हजार वा दो हजार में से एक का है, और हम चाहे जितनी यहाँ पर जनता की गाड़ी की चर्चा करें, लेकिन वह कभी भी योजना के आधार पर पांच सौ में एक या हजार में एक से ज्यादा आगे बढ़ने वाला नहीं है। जिस तरह से कि योजना अब तक चल रही है उसका देखते हुए। लेकिन फिर भी इस छोटे दायरे में जिस में बहस चल रही है, वह जनता का दायरा नहीं है। वह खाली रहता है पांच सौ में से एक का दायरा।

इसमें मुझे पहली बात यह कहनी है कि जैसे और वस्तुओं में वैसे ही इसमें भी, कार और मुनाफे का अंश लागत से कुछ ज्यादा ही पड़ जाया करता है। 25 या 30 या 35 प्रति शत सरकार कर के रूप में ले लेती है और 20 या 25 प्रति शत मुनाफे का अंश हो जाता है। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारा ध्यान इस बात पर जाये कि जो कुछ हम खरीदते हैं उसमें लागत का अंश मुश्किल से 40 प्रति शत पड़ता है और 60 प्रति शत ऊपर वाला चला जाता है।

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

श्रीर चीजें मैं छोड़े देता हूँ कि किस तरह से चोर बाजारी वगैरह चलती है गाड़ी को ले कर के, लेकिन उससे कुछ नतीजे निकालना जरूरी होगा।

चोरबाजारी की बात करते हुए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक तरफ तो जो यहां गाड़ी बनाने वाले लोग हैं वह चोरबाजारी कर रहे हैं, वह या उनके व्यापारी, और सरकार खुद विदेशी गाड़ियों में बहुत जबरदस्त चोरबाजारी कर रही है। सरकार को इस्तेमाल की हुई गाड़ी का खरीदने के दाम से ज्यादा बचने का क्या हक रह जाता है? सरकार किसी विदेशी से 15 हजार में गाड़ी खरीदती है, दो तीन बरस के बाद इस्तेमाल की हुई उस गाड़ी को 70-80 हजार तक में बच देती है। शायद दुनिया के किसी और देश में ऐसा नहीं हो सकता कि इस्तेमाल की हुई गाड़ी को उसके खरीद के दाम से ज्यादा पर बेचा जा सके।

जब यह चोरबाजारी इस योजना के अन्दर चलायी जा रही है, तो हमें उसके ऊपर कुछ सोचना पड़ेगा कि आखिर में यह सारी योजना जो 15 साल से चलायी जा रही है किस आधार की है। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि इस योजना को इस तरह बनाया गया है कि केन्द्र में सारी मलाई इकट्ठी हो जाए और बाकी किनारे से सब चीजें खत्म होते होते केन्द्र में जा कर जम जाएं। तो यह योजना हजार में एक या दो हजार में एक के लिए है। और इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि जनता को इस योजना का कुछ फायदा मिल नहीं पाता।

इस सिलसिले में जहां गाड़ी की चर्चा हो रही है, मैं दृष्टान्त नहीं देना चाहता, लेकिन मेरी जब मैं एक चिट्ठी है, ऐसे लोगों की जो बिना खाए मरे। उनके नाम मेरे पास हैं, कहें तो उनके नाम पढ़ कर

मुनाऊं। यह है योजना और फिर दूसरी तरफ यह कैसे सम्भव हो सकता है कि वे लोग जो अपने को समाजवादी कहते हैं, क्रान्तिकारी कहते हैं, वह यहां जनता की गाड़ी के नाम पर वह अंग्रेजी शब्द को दुहराते हैं और वाक्सवैगन का नाम लेते हैं—इस हजार में से एक की चर्चा को इतना ज्यादा चलाते हैं कि योजना के आधार को बदल देते हैं। यह योजना कहीं सड़ गई है। कहीं इसका मामला बिगड़ा हुआ है। उसको पकड़ना चाहिये। यों उस सड़ी हुई योजना के भीतर रह कर आप गाड़ी का मामला देखें तो बिल्कुल साफ बात है कि जो पूंजी हमारे यहां लगी हुई है उसका पूरा इस्तेमाल नहीं हो पाता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह एक बड़ा कारण है गाड़ियों के ऊंचे दाम होने का। लोग कारखाने में काफी पूंजी लगा देते हैं और सोचते हैं कि हम काफी गाड़ियां बना पाएंगे। लेकिन वे उतनी गाड़ियां पैदा नहीं कर पा रहे, और कारखाने कायम हो गये हैं। और यह बात सिर्फ गाड़ी के बारे में ही नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में सभी उद्योग धंधों में पूंजी ज्यादा लगी हुई है और उसका इस्तेमाल कम हो रहा है। इस प्रश्न की तरफ ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये। और इसी लिए सदस्यों ने यहां बहुत कुछ कहा है।

मुझे शर्म लगती है जनता की गाड़ी बनाने की बात कहते हुए। लेकिन अगर आप यह पाप कर ही रहे हैं तो मैं कहूंगा—हालांकि मेरे दिमाग में सदेह है इस वक्त, क्योंकि एक विरधी होने के कारण मेरे लिए यह सम्भव नहीं है कि दो तीन बिकल्प सामने होते हुए निश्चित रूप से किसी एक के बारे में राय दे दूँ। हां अगर सरकार के सारे कागज मुझे मिल जाएं तो मैं सलाह दे सकता हूँ कि उनको क्या करना चाहिये, लेकिन उनको मेरी सलाह की जरूरत नहीं है। लेकिन यकायक मेरे दिमाग में यह

त आती है कि ये गाड़ियां बनाना बिल्कुल नद हो जाना चाहिये, और जो विदेशी लोग यहां आते हैं जब वे यहां से जाने लगे तो अपनी गाड़ियां वापस ले जाएं उनको यहां बेच न पाएं। मेरी सिफारिश है कि 15-20 बरस तक ये चार पांच सवारी की गाड़ियां बनाना बन्द कर दिया जाए। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि मोटर गाड़ी बनाने के कारखाने बन्द कर दिये जाएं।

हमारे प्रभुदयाल जी ने कहा कि बैल गाड़ी बनायी जाए। अगर ऐसा होता तो बहुत अच्छा होता उनकी जिन्दगी के लिए और मेरी जिन्दगी के लिए भी। लेकिन अभी चर्चा उसकी नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूं कि आप बसें बनाएं, ट्रक बनाएं और कुछ हद तक टैक्सियां बनाएं। मेरी यह सिफारिश 15-20 बरस के लिए है।

जब मैं देखता हूं कि एक एक घंटे दो दो घंटे हजारों सैकड़ों लोग खड़े हैं अपनी बस को पकड़ने के लिए तो मुझे शर्म आती है अपने ऊपर, इस लोक सभा के ऊपर और इस सरकार के ऊपर। मैं सोचने लगता हूं कि आखिर यह सब क्या हो रहा है। तो सबसे पहली बात मैं यह कता हूं कि इन विकल्पों में से किसी को मोचना चाहिये। पूजा बंद रह के इस्तेमाल की बात तो मैंने कह दी। लेकिन मैं यह फिर कहना चाहता हूं कि कर और मुनाफे को किसी तरीके से कम करवाइए वरना इस गाड़ी के दल दल में आप चाणक्यपुरी के शिखर खड़े करने रहेंगे। लोगों की भुखमरी के ऊपर, मोटर गाड़ी की चर्चा को चलाएंगे। और आप कहेंगे जनता की गाड़ी। और भागवत झा आजाद जैसे आदमी भी जनता की गाड़ी का जिक्र कर देते हैं इस गलतफहमी में गो कि वह वाम-पन्थी है।

बस मुझे इतना ही कहना था।

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Mr. Chairman, the last speaker, Dr. Lohia has at least been consistent in his ap-

proach. I do not know how the Government would be able to reconcile its present policy of having private cars as they are having them today and not acceding to the request for a cheaper car because if we are having the cars and if it is for a particular class then certainly there is a very strong case which is so obvious and which could be made out according to certain philosophy to which the Government subscribes. If we are not to make any cars, I fully support what Dr. Lohia said; it was done in SSR for some time and they were having only public transport, buses or taxis. If that is so, nobody would have any grievance.

But let us examine the proposal that is now before us the project for a small car and cheap car. I think the Government owes an explanation to this House and to the country on this particular use. Information doled out in reply to question in this House time to time has satisfied nobody in this House and therefore there is the discussion on this question today, marked urgent.

I would like to remind the House of the history of this project. Our present Prime Minister, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, when he was the Minister of Commerce and Industry first made a statement on this subject on 3-6-1959. In a Press Conference at Srinagar he is reported to have said that it was his hope that a 99 per cent Indian-manufactured car would be in the market in the near future. I would like to remind him now of that statement. What has happened since 1959 to this day? I want to know whether he stands by that statement or he has some satisfactory explanation to offer to this House. Thereafter, a committee was appointed, as was very rightly pointed out by my friend Mr. Azad, The Pandey Committee was a committee of experts. That report has not seen the light of the day but I understand with only one dissenting note from one member, Mr. Gupta, the committee confirmed the feasibility of a janta car to which, my friend has legi-

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

timately objected—a cheap car at a lower cost of Rs. 5000-6500. That committee had gone into further details and indicated where the factory should be located. I do not know what has happened to that report.

Then again Mr. Manubhai gave a definite, clear and categorical assurance to this House that the project will not be given up and he tried to dispel the apprehensions of those people in the private sector that it would not affect their present production programme. I do not know what explanation Government has in this matter. If it was their philosophy or a major policy decision. I would agree with my friend Dr. Lohia. If you say: well, it is not important only a few people are concerned. It is not the problem of foreign exchange as even now you are spending Rs. 20 crores. But you are not having a competitive market as my esteemed friend Mr. Hanumanthaiya said; he always takes a realistic view. I do not know how he was carried away; he was contradicted by Mr. Ranga who always supports the private sector, by saying that there are three monopolies. Where is the competition today? The entire industry in this country has a completely protected market. It is the common man who has to pay through his nose. There is a protected market and the entire benefit goes to a few industrialists and therefore there is the Monopoly Commission. That is the justification for it.

I think, Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend Mr. Azad has very clearly indicated that it was not the question of foreign exchange. There is a reasonable apprehension and suspicion in the minds of the people that it is the vested interests that are responsible for sabotaging this project in the public sector and it is up to the Government, for the honour of the Government and of the Congress Party, to give a clear explanation on this subject and to assure the House that they have not succumbed to these vested interests and are not prepared to succumb to those interests and that

they have the people's interest in their mind. I do not mind if you did not have a project. But I do not want my Government and my Party to be accused of such an attitude in this matter.

The other day, I put a question to my friend Mr. Subramaniam who was then making a futile exercise according to me, to bring together all these three and to have a common production programme. I asked him a question; if the House will remember it was: Have you yourself examined the technical feasibility of such an idea? He said that he had not done it. Then I said: If you did not even examine the technical feasibility of it what is the sense in putting it up to the automobile industry? To my mind it is only dilly-dallaying and marking time and nothing else. Let us be clear in our minds. Nothing like this can bring all the three companies together for a common production programme. That is not possible. That is not feasible. If it is not feasible, I would like the hon. Minister to explain to this House what is the use of putting it up to the private industry and taking the time of the House and shutting our mouth for a shortwhile. There is one suggestion which I want to give. There is the foreign exchange that is being spent.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I will finish in two minutes if that is possible. Otherwise, I will wind up. The only feasible thing to my mind is this. I think we can still have offers which will not require foreign exchange, even if our foreign exchange position is as it continues to be. Now that we are having so many schemes and also exporting our steel products, I have no reason why we should not be able to earn out of our exports; we must create a market for our exports and that must be attended to. If nothing else can be done, I wish that we take over one of the most modern and best of the private sector projects; take it

over in the public sector and expand it and have a proper plan.

I am not going very much to the left. This is nothing of any socialist idea. I do not know how an impression has gathered in this country that we have taken very revolutionary socialist steps. Even a country like France has nationalised a large number of industries, and Reynolds, which was mentioned here, is one of those automobile industries which the Government of France had nationalised and keeps it in the public sector. I think you should certainly take it over, and with very little investment, we would be able to give to this country what has been a demand for a long time, and it would be only responding to the wishes of this House and to the wishes of the people in this country.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Rameshwar Tantia. May I request hon. Members that they should try to conclude their remarks in five minutes so that I could accommodate more Members?

Shri Rameshwar Tantia (Sikar): How can I finish in five minutes? You have given everybody ten minutes, and why is there this discrimination in my case only?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: (Kanpur): May I submit that at least those who have tabled this motion should be given 10 minutes each?

श्री रामेश्वर टांटिया : सभापति महोदय, इस समय सदन की उपस्थिति को देख कर यह पता चलता है कि छोटी गाड़ी में या गाड़ी में माननीय सदस्य बहुत इन्टे-स्टिड हैं।

छ: या सात बरस पहले सरकार ने इस सदन में कहा था कि हम छोटी गाड़ी बहुत जल्दी बनाने जा रहे हैं। उन्होंने यह भी कहा था कि हम लगभग छ: हजार रुपये में गाड़ी देंगे। आज छ: सात बरस हो गए, लेकिन अभी तक तो उस गाड़ी के सम्बन्ध में क्या तरक्की हुई है, यह भी

पता नहीं है। परन्तु आज आसार ऐसे नजर आते हैं कि आने वाले छ: वर्षों में तो वह गाड़ी नहीं बनने जा रही है। जैसा कि अभी कहा गया है, गाड़ी पर चार पांच हजार रुपये के टैक्स हैं, तो फिर समझ में नहीं आता कि सरकार छ: हजार में गाड़ी कैसे दे सकेगी।

अभी एक माननीय सदस्य ने इस बात का जिक्र किया है कि स्टेट ट्रेडिंग कार्पोरेशन जो पुरानी गाड़ियां बेचती है, वे सत्तर अस्सी हजार रुपये तक बेची जाती हैं, मंत्रियों को पहले यह अधिकार है कि अगर वे चाहें, तो वे उन में से कोई गाड़ी ले सकते हैं। जब तक मंत्रियों को बड़ी बड़ी गाड़ियां लेने की यह सुविधा रहेगी, तब तक छोटी गाड़ियां इस देश में नहीं बनने वाली हैं। (Interruptions) जैसा कि माननीय सदस्य श्री भागवत झा आजाद ने कहा है, अगर मंत्रियों के लिए यह तय हो जाये कि वे छोटी गाड़ियां ही ले सकें और स्टेट ट्रेडिंग कार्पोरेशन द्वारा बेची गई बड़ी गाड़ियां न ले सकें, तभी यहां पर छोटी गाड़ियां बन पायेंगी। (Interruptions)

अमरीका और दूसरे देशों की बात यहां पर कही गई है। उन देशों में प्रति तीन व्यक्ति या प्रति नौ व्यक्ति एक कार है, जब कि भारतवर्ष में आठ हजार लोगों के पीछे एक कार है। आज कार कोई आराम या एयाशी की चीज नहीं रह गई है, बल्कि आज वह एक जरूरत की चीज बन गई है। आज सदस्यों, डाक्टरों और प्रोफेसरों आदि को कार की जरूरत है। हमारी धारणा यह थी कि सरकार दो तीन बरस में छ: हजार रुपये में कार देगी। हम लीग उस आशा में बैठ हुए थे। परन्तु आज आसार ये हैं कि वह गाड़ी नहीं आने वाली है, नहीं आने वाली है।

[श्री रामेश्वर टांटिया]

हम चाहते हैं कि चा प्राईवेट सेक्टर में हो और चाहे पब्लिक सेक्टर में हो, छोटी या कम कीमत की कार का निर्माण किया जाना चाहिये। माननीय सदस्य, डा० लोहिया ने कहा है कि चूंकि पब्लिक सेक्टर के पास बहुत काम है, उसको खाद्य के कारखाने खोलने हैं, जो कि कारों से ज्यादा जरूरी हैं, इसलिये कारों के कारखाने नहीं बनाए जाने चाहिये। मेरी भी यही राय है कि खाद के कारखानों को प्राथमिकता दी जानी चाहिये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : बम बनाओ, ट्रक बनाओ।

श्री रामेश्वर टांटिया : आप देखिए कि ग्यारह बजे सुबह और पांच बजे शाम को बस के लिए बड़ी लम्बी क्यू लगी रहती है और एक दो घंटे इन्तजार करने के बाद भी बस में सीट नहीं मिलती है। इस लिये यह जरूरी है कि चाहे किसी भी सेक्टर में हो, बसों और कारों का उत्पादन बढ़ाना चाहिये। पिछले सात बरस में कारों का उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ा है—वही बीस हजार का बीस हजार है।

हम लोग अस्सी प्रतिशत मोटर के पुर्जे भारत में बनाते हैं और बीस प्रतिशत बाहर से मंगाते हैं, लेकिन अगर सरकार उन बीस प्रतिशत फ़ारेन काम्पोनेंट्स के लिए भी ठीक समय पर लाइसेंस न दे, तो उत्पादन कैसे बढ़ सकता है? अगर हम यहां पर पांच हजार चरमें के फ़्रेम प्रतिदिन बनाते हैं, परन्तु जो शीशे लगते हैं, वे बलायत से आते हैं और उन के लिए सरकार केवल एक हजार का ही लाइसेंस देगी, तो चार हजार फ़्रेम ऐसे ही रखे रहेंगे। इस लिये सरकार को एक क्लियर-कट पालिसी बनानी चाहिये कि हम को इतनी गाड़ियां चाहिये और उन के लिए जितने बाहर के पुर्जे जरूरी हों, उन को समय से लाइसेंस दिया जाये।

छोटी गाड़ी या कम कीमत की गाड़ी के प्रश्न को बहुत लम्बे समय तक उलझाना नहीं चाहिये। या तो सरकार को कहना चाहिये कि हम इस समय छोटी गाड़ी नहीं बनायेंगे, कोई भी छोटी गाड़ी नहीं आने वाली है। अगर उस का विचार छोटी गाड़ी के निर्माण का है, तो उस को इस तरह से एक, दो, तीन बरस की बात न कर के अभी जो कारखाने हैं, उनको कह देना चाहिये कि इस दाम में गाड़ी बेचनी पड़ेगी। उस मूरत में सरकार को अपने कर भी घटाने पड़ेंगे। अगर एक गाड़ी पर चार पांच हजार रुपये के टैक्स होंगे, तो सरकार या कारखाने वालों के पास कोई अल्लाहदीन का चिराग नहीं है कि वे छः हजार रुपये में गाड़ी दे सकें। सरकार को अपने कर भी घटाने पड़ेंगे और कारखाने वालों से भी यह कहना होगा कि कम नफ़े पर गाड़ी बेचो।

श्री शिव नारायण (वांसी) : हम शरीबों के रिप्रेजेंटेटिव हैं। हम को भी टाइम मिलना चाहिये।

सभापति महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर।

श्री रामेश्वर टांटिया : यहां पर काले बाजार की बात भी कही गई है। पता नहीं कि कारखाने वाले काला बाजार करते हैं या नहीं। मेरी समझ में वे नहीं कर सकते हैं। लेकिन माननीय सदस्य, श्री बागड़ी, ने यह बात ग़लत कहा है कि संसद् सदस्य भी तीन, चार, पांच हजार ले कर गाड़ी बेच देते हैं। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह भी संसद्-सदस्य हैं। अगर वह संसद्-सदस्यों पर इस प्रकार का आरोप लगाते हैं, तो मैं नभ्रतापूर्वक उस का विरोध करूंगा। अगर उन के पास दलील है, तो वह दें।

श्री बागड़ी : मेरे पास है।

श्री रामेश्वर टाटिया : अगर उनके पास कोई फ़ैक्ट्स हैं, तो उनको हाउस के पटल पर नाम रखने चाहिये ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : अगर कोई कहेगा, तो रख दिये जायेंगे ।

श्री रामेश्वर टाटिया : मेरा आखिरी निवेदन यह है कि मंत्रियों को स्टेट ट्रेडिंग कॉर्पोरेशन में जो बड़ी गाड़ियां मिलती हैं...

रेलवे मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (डा० राम मुभा सिंह) : यह विष्कुल गलत है । किसी मंत्री के पास बड़ी गाड़ी नहीं है । ये गवर्नमेंट की गाड़ियां हैं ।
(Interruptions)

श्री रामेश्वर टाटिया : मेरा मतलब भी उन गाड़ियों से है, जो कि गवर्नमेंट की तरफसे मंत्रियों को मिलती हैं । जब तक उन को छोटी गाड़ियां नहीं दी जायेंगी, तब तक इस देश में छोटी गाड़ियां नहीं बनने वाली हैं, जो कि इस देश की जनता की मांग है । मेरा निवेदन है कि चाहे प्राइवेट सेक्टर में हो और चाहे पब्लिक सेक्टर में, छोटी गाड़ियां बनाई जानी चाहिये और जल्दी बनाई जानी चाहिए ।

श्री बड़ (खारगोन) : माननीय सभा-पति महोदय, आज हाउस के सामने कार का सवाल है । चूंकि हमारे पास कार नहीं है, इसलिये हम बेकार हैं । पन्द्रह हजार कार बनाने का जो शासन का लक्ष्य है, वह कब साकार होगा, यह पता नहीं है । वर्तमान फिगर में मालूम होता है कि पांच हजार प्रति मास अर्थात् साठ हजार प्रति वर्ष की मांग है । जब सरकार इतनी कारें तैयार नहीं कर सकती, तो मैं माननीय सदस्य, डा० लोहिया, की इस बात से सहमत हूं कि अगर कार न बना कर मात्र बाहक टुक तैयार किये जायें, तो अच्छा होगा ।

हिन्दुस्तान में दो तरह के लोग हैं—एक तो शहरों में रहने वाले हैं, जो कार वाले हैं

और एक गांवों में रहने वाले हैं । जो बेकार हैं, जिनके पास कार नहीं है । मैं समझता हूं कि ऐसे वक्त में शासन को यह सोचना चाहिए कि क्या केवल तीन पूंजीपतियों को ठेका देकर अपना और पूंजीपतियों का पैसा इसमें डालना उचित है । महाराष्ट्र के उद्योग मंत्री ने कहा है, जिसके बारे में राज्य सभा में प्रश्न पूछे गए थे कि हिन्दुस्तान में पांच हजार रुपये में कार तैयार हो सकती है, जिसमें केवल हिन्दुस्तान के पुर्जों का उपयोग होगा । हमारे मित्रों ने कहा है कि पांच हजार में कार तैयार नहीं हो सकती है, लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि पांच हजार में कार तैयार हो सकती है । इस समय सरकार 5140 रुपये अर्थात् 33 परसेंट टैक्स लेती है और पांच हजार रुपये उत्पादन व्यय है अगर सौलह हजार में 5140 रुपये टैक्स के निकाल दिये जायें, तो यहां पर ग्यारह हजार में कार तैयार हो सकती है । सरकार ने जो टैक्स अधिक लगा रखा है, इस पर भी उसको विचार करना चाहिये । यदि सरकार दरअसल में पैसा पूंजीपतियों से लेना चाहती है तो छोटी कार भी सरकार को निकालनी चाहिये ताकि जो मिडिल क्लास के लोग हैं, जो छोटे लोग हैं, उनको भी कार सुलभ हो सके ।

कार की जो कीमत ज्यादा बढ़ती है, उसके तीन कारण दिये गये हैं । एक तो यह दिया गया है कि विदेशी मुद्रा हमको मिलती नहीं है । इस कारण से इसके दाम अधिक हैं । दूसरा कारण यह बताया गया है कि जो पुर्जे हैं वे बहुत महंगे हैं, इस कारण से भी कार महंगी पड़ती है । तीसरा कारण यह बताया गया है कि उत्पादक एक दूसरे से कोओप्रेट करके उत्पादन करने का प्रयत्न नहीं करते हैं । हमारे भागवत झा आजाद साहब ने कहा है कि यदि ये आपस में कोओप्रेशन करें, मर्ज हो जायें तो उत्पादन भी अधिक हो सकता है और कीमत भी कम हो सकती है । मैं इस चीज पर विश्वास

[श्री बड़े]

नहीं करता हूँ। मल बीमारी जो है, उसको हमें देखना है। क्यों अधिक कीमत देनी पड़ती है, इसको हमें देखना है। इसका कारण यही है कि इन तीन फर्कों को मनी-पोली दे दी गई है। इस मनीपोली को आपको खत्म करना चाहिये। जो आपने कह रखा है कि यही तीनों प्रोड्यूस कर सकते हैं, दूसरे नहीं कर सकते हैं, इसको आपको समाप्त करना चाहिए।

मुना गया है कि पश्चिमी जर्मनी और जापान के कुछ कार निर्माता कोलेबोरेशन में यहाँ कारखाने खोलने का विचार रखते हैं। अगर यह बात सही है और सरकार चाहती है कि वे खोलें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यहीं के लोगों को कारखाने खोलने को आपको अनुमति दे देनी चाहिए। जैसा कि महाराष्ट्र गवर्नमेंट ने कहा है कि सन्ती कार बन सकती है, सरकार को सस्ती कार बनवानी चाहिए। शासन का लक्ष्य अगर यह है कि पापुलर कार बनें, छोटी कार बनें जिसकी बार बार मांग की गई है और जिसका अभी तक कोई सन्तोषजनक उत्तर नहीं मिला है, तो उसके लिये सरकार को गम्भीरता से विचार करना चाहिए और यह कार सुलभ करनी चाहिए।

१९५८ में यह कहा गया था कि कारों के निर्माण में वृद्धि होगी। योजना में भी आपने इसका उल्लेख किया था कि इनके निर्माण में वृद्धि होनी चाहिए। लेकिन आप आज २६,००० कारों बनाते हैं जबकि साल में डिमांड ६०,००० कारों की है। क्यों आप कम इनका निर्माण करते हैं, इसको भी आपको देखना चाहिए और गम्भीरता से निर्माण अधिक करने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिए।

इनक्वायरी कमेटी जो बैठी थी उसने कहा था कि बाहर से पुर्जे आते हैं और उनके लिए इस्पात जो उनको मिलता है वह

इंग्लैण्ड में 650 रुपये प्रति टन मिलता है जबकि भारत में एक हजार या ग्यारह सौ रुपये प्रति टन मिलता है। दरअसल में अगर इतना अधिक फर्क है तो सरकार को इस लक्ष्य को अपने सामने रख कर चलना चाहिये कि इस्पात की कीमत कम हो, कम महंगा इस्पात लोगों को मिले ताकि पुर्जे आदि उनको सस्ते मिलें और कारों की कीमत कम हो। साथ ही साथ उनको विदेशी मुद्रा अधिक सुलभ की जानी चाहिये। जो कारखानेदार हैं उनको भी चाहिये कि वे प्राफिट कम लें। यदि ये उपाय काम में लाये गये तो अभी जो उत्पादन हो रहा है, उसको भी कम कीमत में बेचा जा सकता है। सवाल रंग का है और रोग को पहचान कर उसका इलाज करने का है। रोग केवल यही है कि तीन जनों को केवल आपने उत्पादन करने का और बेचने का अधिकार दे रखा है। इसको खत्म करना चाहिये। दूसरे कारखानेदार जो कार बनाना चाहते हैं जो इस क्षेत्र में आना चाहते हैं, जो इनके कम्पीटीशन में आना चाहते हैं उनको आपको मौका देना चाहिये कि वे कम्पीटीशन में आ सकें। यदि ऐसा किया गया तो कार के दाम कम हो सकते हैं।

कार की तरफ तो आपका लक्ष्य है लेकिन काश्तकार जिस ट्रैक्टर का इस्तेमाल करता है, उसकी ओर भी क्या आपका लक्ष्य है? उसको जिस जिस चीज की जरूरत पड़ती है, क्या उसका भी आपको ध्यान है? उसको बैलगाड़ी की जरूरत पड़ती है, कार की नहीं। क्या बैलगाड़ी की तरफ भी आपका कभी ध्यान गया है? क्या उस पर भी कभी आपने सवारी करके देखा है? क्या क्या उसमें अनुविधायें होती हैं, इसका भी पता आपने लगाया है? पूर्वजों से जिस तरह की बैलगाड़ी उसको मिली थी, वही आज भी चल रही है। उसमें बहुत कम सुधार हुआ है। उसमें कोई परिवर्तन नहीं

या गया है। बैलों को बैलगाड़ी सींचने में आसानी हो, उस पर आसानी से चढ़ा जा सके, आसानी से उस पर से उतरा जा सके, आसानी से उस पर माल चढ़ाया और उतारा जा सके, क्या ऐसे तरीके खोजने का भी आपने यत्न किया है। काश्तकार को सुविधा मिले, इस तरफ शासन का लक्ष्य नहीं है। कार के सवाल से बाहर जा कर मैं यह कह रहा हूँ और यह मैं इसलिये कर रहा हूँ कि यहां बैलगाड़ी का सवाल उठाया गया है। इस और भी आपका ध्यान जाना चाहिये।

अभी कार की कीमत 18,000 रुपये है और इसका ब्लैक भी चलता है। इतनी ऊंची कीमत और ब्लैक का कारण केवल यही है कि जो कारखानेदार हैं उनको एक तो विदेशी मुद्रा नहीं मिलती है, दूसरे पुर्जे सस्ते नहीं मिलते हैं और तीसरे वे प्राफिट भी अधिक लेते हैं। इन सब की ओर आपको ध्यान देना चाहिये। अगर यह नहीं किया जाता है तो महाराष्ट्र गवर्नमेंट ने जो कहा है और जिसके बारे में राज्य सभा में सवाल भी उठाया गया था कि पांच हजार में कार का निर्माण करके वह बता सकती है, उस ओर शासन का ध्यान जाना चाहिये। अगर यह नहीं किया गया तो जनता करेगी और हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाई जो यह कहते हैं और हमारे दाजी साहब जो अभी बोलने वाले हैं, कह देंगे, कि सरकार पूँजीपतियों के हाथ में है। वह बिड़ला का नाम भी इस सन्दर्भ में ले देंगे। इसलिये सरकार को चाहिये कि दूसरे लोगों को कार का निर्माण करने की सुविधा वह दे दे।

Mr. Chairman: Maharajkumar Vijaya Ananda.

Shri Alvares (Panjim): Four of us have given notice of this motion. The Minister also has to reply. Are you going to extend the time, Sir?

13.56 hrs.

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

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We have been demanding this discussion for a long time....

Maharajkumar Vijaya Ananda (Visakhapatnam): Sir, the Minister has taken over this new portfolio and I am sure.... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Let him finish first.

Maharajkumar Vijaya Ananda: I am sure with his zeal and drive, he will give a new orientation to this vexed question which has come up in Parliament many times. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: He may kindly resume his seat. Let me hear Mr. Banerjee. What has been converted into a farce? He says, the whole thing has been converted into a farce. Is it proper for him to say like that?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Are you supposed to hear what we talk here, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Yes; everything reaches me. Even the whispers reach me. Sometimes I might tolerate them, but it is not that every time I can tolerate them. I have only told him that he may wait, so that the hon. Member who is on his legs might finish.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am sorry, Sir; you are in temper.

Mr. Speaker: Again he is saying something that goes against me.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly hear me, Sir. You came just now.

श्री शिव नारायण : बैठो।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am not going to obey you. How can he say like that?

Mr. Speaker: He says "I am not going obey you".

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am going to obey you, Sir, but not him. He says "Bhaito".

क्या वह शरीफ भादमियों की जवान बोल रहे हैं।

Mr. Speaker: I would advise hon. Members—yesterday also I said it—that such interjections and such interruptions should not be made and such words also should not be used. But if it has been done, Members should not be so sensitive. एकने कहा "बैठो" तो दूसरे ने कहा शुरु कर दिया कि सभ्यता के लपज ये हैं उनको खत्म कर लेने दीजिये, फिर मैं आपकी बात भी सुन लूंगा। (*interruption*).

If the House desires to sit longer and continue the discussion, I have absolutely no objection at all. Would it like to sit after 5 ?

Some Hon. Members: Yes Sir.

Some Hon. Members: No sir.

Mr. Speaker: Let us be clear as to what the House wants. Certainly I am prepared to sit after 5 if the Members so desire. I find there are a large number of hon. Members who wish to speak and I wish to accommodate them. But the desire of the House ought to be conveyed in some dignified manner.

Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur): There should be a full discussion on this matter. Many questions on this subject have been asked during the last two years. My suggestion is that either we sit longer or you postpone the discussion to some other day. We must have a full discussion. I also want to have my say on this matter.

Shri Sheo Narain: I propose we sit up to 6 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: When shall we take up the non-official business in that case?

Shri A. P. Jain: I would suggest the discussion may not be concluded today. It must be postponed to another day. At 2-30 non-official business may be taken up and we may not sit after 5. But this debate should not conclude today.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I support it.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I suggest that the non-official business may be taken up an hour later, but this discussion should be finished today, so that we can hear the Minister. I have no objection to the time being extended, but it should conclude today.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot just deprive the non-official Members whose Bills are there on the agenda today. Unless they agree also, I cannot put that off. Therefore, I will have to take that up. The only alternative is that either we carry on for another one hour and take up the non-official business at 15.30 hours or we stop this discussion at 14.30 hours, take up the non-official business and then resume this discussion at 17.00 hours.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): It is better that we take up the non-official business at 15.30 hours.

14 hrs.

Shri S. S. More (Poona): The point here is that it is a frequent occurrence that when you extend the time then we suffer from lack of quorum and the House has to be adjourned. Even yesterday we were on the point of adjourning the House for want of quorum. The same thing will happen to this discussion if we extend the time of the sitting today. So the best course would be to postpone this discussion to some other day so that we can discuss it fully.

Mr. Speaker: Then the Government also has to be consulted because on some other day the Government has to find time to take it up.

Shri A. P. Jain: If it is postponed it will be for the Government to find the time. It may find time immediate-

ly or it may find time on some other day afterwards. But on a matter like this, which has been agitating the mind of everybody, there must be a full discussion.

Mr. Speaker: What does the Government say?

The Minister of Heavy Engineering in the Ministry of Industry and Supply (Shri T. N. Singh): I will have no objection provided the discussion is not postponed to Monday or Tuesday because on those days I have some other engagement.

Mr. Speaker: All right; we can have it on some other day. Let us carry on till 2-30 and then take up non-official business.

Maharajkumar Vijaya Ananda: Sir, the production of cars in this country is less than the demand for vehicles in this country. I think this industry really needs a good shake-up. I also think that with Shri T. N. Singh at the helm of affairs the deep slumber they are having will soon be over.

As regards the manufacture of cars, there is no doubt that the cars manufactured in India are far less in quality than foreign cars. The trouble is, the three makers of cars in India know that in India no other car is available except what the embassies are selling at very high prices. Therefore, they just do not take notice of the public demand. I had an Ambassador car three or four years ago. After doing only 2000 miles its plugs got oiled. I made a complaint to the firm. I wrote several letters to various people. Finally I told them that I was a Member of Parliament. Then they agreed to change the engine. Because I happen to be a Member of Parliament they agreed to do that. Take the case of others. What would be the result? They would be going on writing to the firms concerned and no notice would be taken. Such is the condition of the Ambassador car. They have had sufficient time to make that model a model that would be worth keeping. But, unfortunately, because they are fully aware that

nothing can be done, they cannot be ousted from the position they hold they simply produce cars which are really very very defective, their bodies rattle, they are unserviceable at times and the most you can get out of an Ambassador car is about 30,000 miles and then you have to change the rings and so on.

As far as jeeps are concerned, I have found that they have also deteriorated. Their production has also received an indifferent touch and therefore the jeeps are also very much like the Ambassador car. The only car that is really attractive and in great demand is the Fiat. It is probably the cheaper of the three cars. The Ambassador is selling at Rs. 15,941—exclusive of insurance; the Standard is selling at Rs. 15,486 and the Fiat is selling at Rs. 14,343. Blackmarketing, as usual, plays a very big part. People have to register their names to get a car. For years and years they wait and when they finally get it they are absolutely fed up with getting a car.

Now, I cannot understand why there has been so much delay in coming to some definite understanding on the production of a small car. A small car is a great necessity to the middle-class man. I would suggest that with foreign collaboration this should be taken up very seriously and not merely brought before the House as it has been done in the past. All that happens is, there is a very lively discussion and finally it merges somewhere as in the case of other discussions. I think it is high time that Government took up this matter seriously. I hope with Shri T. N. Singh at the helm of affairs, the Government will take this up and see that within two years we have a small car, say a 10 H.P. car, that car should be water-cooled and not air-cooled, it should have a capacity to take four passengers and a small luggage carrier, it should be economical, it should at least do 50,000 miles before any thing like change of rings takes place and the price should be nothing more.

[Maharaj Kumar Vijaya Ananda]

than Rs. 7000. We had said Rs. 5000 in the past, but due to change of circumstances and everything having gone up in prices, I would say that Rs. 7000 should be the maximum including taxes and the all that the Government would like to take on it. This should be made possible even if it would mean subsidising the industry.

In this connection, there is a report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Automobile Industry. It has said:

"The best way to increase the availability of cars at an economic price would be to enable the existing producers to raise their output to a much higher level. Thereby, not only would the present shortage of cars in general disappear but the second-hand market would have substantial supplies of roomy sturdy cars at economic prices, which would be a better answer to the consumers' needs than the miniature cars developed in Europe in very different conditions of living, road transport, size of family, etc."

Apart from what has been said, I maintain that a small car is a middle-class necessity and the sooner the Government take up this problem the better.

As far as the present production of cars is concerned, I do feel that it requires a good shake-up. The makers must be made to realise that the present supply of cars is defective and is not worth the money that the ordinary man pays for the cars. This question has come up in Parliament before. It seems to have figured again for a lively discussion. But no results have accrued on the discussions that we have had. I would like to suggest that if we are not able to produce small cars within the next two years, let the Government at least reduce the prices of cars in this country. If necessary let the Government cut down the profit that Government is getting over it. The Government can afford it. The Govern-

ment can tax the big millionaires. They have many other ways of getting money to make up this poor man's need. Every man needs a car. Anybody who has got some kind of activity, who goes about to town and does some work, he must have a car. Of course, many hon. friends on the opposite side suggested that there should be bus, lorries and trucks. That may be for transport of goods and for men going to office. There are others who naturally need a car. I think the Government can afford to reduce the price. As I said, if they cannot produce a small car let them at least reduce the price and give the middle man a chance of possessing a car.

With these words, Sir, I resume my seat. I am quite sure that with the new Minister in charge we shall have a different complexion of this.

Mr. Speaker: I have many Members to call. Just now Shri Banerjee has written to me:

"I am leaving today for Calcutta and shall return only on the 9th. I shall feel obliged if I am given at least 8 to 10 minutes today."

I have read it for the information of the House. Simply for the reason that I do not keep any malice, I am prepared to accommodate him as he likes. But it should not be understood that because of his pressure or using that language, I am submitting to him. But I think really it was unfortunate.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Before you say anything further, may I say one thing? I repeat there was some misunderstanding.

Mr. Speaker: Did he not say those words? Now he says there is some misunderstanding. I have heard it myself with my own ears. Should I disbelieve my cars?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I was only speaking to Shri Daji. I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, you were saying that to Shri Daji.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am very sorry.

I am glad to my hon. friend, Shri Bagri has initiated a debate. I think this House was eagerly awaiting a debate on this most controversial question, whether we should help, what we call, the Teen Murthi to produce cars at a price of their own choice or whether we should ask Government to come forward with a scheme, with a project of their own to manufacture cars at a price at which the common people would be able to purchase cars.

I am told that if today you want a Fiat car you have to wait nearly for 7 to 8 years and if you want an Ambassador you can get it within two or three years. If I get a Fiat, I shall never go for Ambassador, because the quality of that car is so bad that there is a saying in the country that when somebody was asked his impression about Ambassador he replied in an Ambassador car everything makes noise except the horn. That is the general impression about Ambassador car. It is said that after an accident it is smashed to pieces like a car of plywood or plastic. That is the history of Ambassador. Yet, there is pressure that preference should be given to Ambassador car. You will find that in almost all the Ministries the cars used are Ambassador, because the manufacturers of Ambassador have pull in the country.

That is one of the reasons why I want the Government to come forward with a project of their own to manufacture small cars. There was a scheme for having the peoples' car, or baby car, or *janata* car. Then the hon. Minister, Shri C. Subramaniam, made an announcement in the House that it has been shelved, which was the turning point in the history of manufacture of small cars. Questions after questions were asked and we are yet to get a satisfactory reply from the treasury benches about this car project.

We were told that they will enter into an agreement and work in a cor-

porate basis and they will try to reduce the price of car. Now the price has gone up. What is the market price today of Ambassador? Rs. 16,000 or 17,000. You will have to pay more. If you want to purchase a Fiat, unless you are prepared to pay Rs. 5,000 or 7,000 more than the fixed price, you will not get it. That is a sad commentary.

Shri P. R. Patel (Patan): Is it paid to the manufacturers?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: If not to the manufacturers, somebody else. I know the manufacturers say that it is due to you, due to the ruling party. So, the fault lies somewhere.

Mr. Speaker: I have made an appeal the other day that after three years of experience here we should at least conform to this practice that every hon. Member should address the Chair. Now, if one hon. Member says "it is due to you" it will be misunderstood as if it was due to me.

An hon. Member: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: The record would show me like that. Hon. Members should, I should not say learn, adopt that practice. We have been here for three years and probably many of us might not be here for the next term. So, the next two years at least we might practice it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I was submitting that it is high time Government have a project of their own. I shall be extremely happy if the Minister makes a bold announcement that they are going ahead with this scheme and no pressure, either from Bombay, or Calcutta or Jamshedpur will influence their judgment.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: What about Madras?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: In Madras there is TVS, it is true. I am not imputing any motives to anyone. I know that Birlas are influential people and they can influence the judgement of the Government.

Shri P. R. Patel: Can an hon. Member refer to somebody by name and say that he influences or brings pressure on Government?

Shri Daji (Indore): Why is the hon. Member so much hurt when the Birlas are attacked?

Shri P. R. Patel: I am not hurt.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Anyhow, you have heard me correctly. That is enough.

Then, Sir, today I am writing to you a letter. Yesterday, I said on the floor of the House something about a particular business house. I was surprised to know that even influential press agencies like PTI have been asked not to publish anything about that business house. I am going to write to you a letter that I want a commission of inquiry to be appointed to go into the question whether anybody can say that what is mentioned in the House should not be given publicity in the newspapers. I am going to write to you about it. It is surprising.

Mr. Speaker: Is he warning me as well?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Not warning, Sir, I am going to write to you.

Mr. Speaker: So, it is a simple intimation that he is writing to me.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am only warning them through you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Now he might continue.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I would, therefore, suggest that a Commission should be appointed, or if the Commission is not appointed, let there be administrators to control the prices and other aspects of automobile production. If they are given a free hand, whether it is this house or that house, they will go on robbing the

people, charging exorbitant prices from the consumer. So, my suggestion is, at the first instance, Government should have their own project, going ahead without caring for anyone. Or, let them nationalise one of these projects, if they so desire. After all, they are said to be moving towards socialism. Secondly, let them appoint an administrator to see the working of these projects. It is high time that we appoint administrators; otherwise there will be no check and control on the automobile industry.

One more point and I am finished. Not only these cars, even in the matter of three-wheelers licences are being given only to one person in this country. I am sorry to mention—I do not want to give his name—that he is one of the Members of this House. Expansion is allowed only to that firm; no licence is given to others. When this country requires more three-wheelers and four-wheelers, when there is such a dearth of production, it is a fact that no licence is given to other people.

With these words, I would request the hon. Minister, Shri T. N. Singh, who really comes from the people, to take strong measures and to curb the powers of these monopolies which are charging anything they like, because they have some political pull with the Government.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Himatsingka has also written to me that he is leaving today.

Shri Daji: I am also leaving; I came all the way to participate in this debate.

Shri Man Sinh P. Patel (Mehsana): Everybody will be leaving the House in the evening.

Mr. Speaker: There are only ten minutes and I can accommodate only one hon. Member.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): One thing is certain that hon. Members who want to leave are

in a minority; the majority of Members want to say. So, we want that you should be kind to the majority.

Shri Daji: If a date could be fixed, we could come back if we wanted to take part in this debate. I came back only to participate in this debate. I am representing a major party.

Mr. Speaker: I will call him when it comes up on the next day. I will see that it is fixed on such a date that Shrimati Mukerjee is also able to take part. Now, Shri Himatsingka. Then I will accommodate Shri Daji as well.

Shri P. C. Borooh (Sibsagar): Shri Banerjee was given a chance because he was going to Calcutta this evening; I am also going to Assam just now; I will be leaving at 4 o'clock. Shri Himatsingka is also there. So, I may be permitted to go now and may be given a chance on the next day.

Mr. Speaker: I will give a chance to Shri Borooh as well next time.

Shri Himatsingka: Sir, I have heard the speeches of hon. Members and I feel that there is still a misconception about the position of car manufacture. There is a good deal of shortage; there is no doubt about that. But what is the cause for it? Is it the fault of the three manufacturers that the supply is not being maintained or is there any other justifiable reason why more cars are not being produced?

The capacity of the three manufacturers is such that even today they can manufacture about 50,000 cars, but about 80 to 90 per cent of the components are made locally and they have to import 10 per cent of the components and certain raw materials. Suppose, they produce 50,000 cars and the components required are supplied only for 10,000 cars; then the supply will be limited to only 10,000 cars.

The trouble arises because the Government has not been able to give them foreign exchange for components

that are required to be imported or for raw materials that have to be imported. Every car requires 2 tonnes of steel—and it is a special kind of steel—so, for the manufacture of 50,000 cars you will require 1 lakh tonnes of steel. These things have to be considered before we blame the three manufacturers.

They have been asking for more foreign exchange; but that is not being supplied. We have, therefore, really to go into the reason why this backlog is there. All of them are anxious and are in a position to manufacture the required number of cars, provided they get what is required for their manufacture. They cannot manufacture and complete the cars unless the components that have to be imported are supplied to them or unless the raw materials that have to be imported are supplied to them.

As regards price, some hon. Members have themselves stated about Government taxes of Fiat and Ambassador. In the case of the Ambassador Government taxes come to Rs. 5,140 and the cost of material, manufacturing, overhead expenses, wages, depreciation and profit come to Rs. 3,750, indigenous ancillary components cost Rs. 3,600 and distribution charges come to Rs. 1,053. If you increase the number of cars produced, on what item can the cost be saved? If you raise the production to 30,000 or even to 50,000 cars, the tax per car will remain the same; the cost of material, manufacturing and overhead expenses, wages, depreciation will remain the same except that overhead expenses will go down slightly. All other expenses will remain the same. So, if the number is increased, there will be some reduction in the amount of Rs. 3,750 which is the amount for raw material, manufacturing and overhead expenses and all these.

Therefore, I think, the companies have rightly indicated that the cost can go down by about Rs. 750 because the overhead charges are the only

[Shri Himatsingka]

charges that will be affected or slightly some other expenses. But the taxes will not go down; the prices of the raw materials will not be reduced; the wages will not be reduced.

So far as the price is concerned, you know it, Sir, very well and the House also knows it that the price and the profit of the distributors and the manufacturers are all controlled. Government fixes the price and they have to sell at that price. From 1957 onwards there has been no increase in price though there have been increases in the cost of materials and only a slight increase took place in taxes in between and that has been added; otherwise, the price is continuing the same. I quote this fact only to show that the price and everything are being controlled by the Government.

Therefore we ought to look into the real position and find out what the cause of this backlog is. If the Government can supply more foreign exchange and enable them to purchase the raw materials that are required and the components that have to be imported because they have not yet gone to 100 per cent production in India, any number of cars can be produced and this difficulty that is being faced here which is the cause of this question being raised from time to time either in the form of questions and answers or otherwise will stop. Therefore we ought to look into the proposition and try to find out what the real cause is.

Now, look at the other suggestion that is being made about the Government taking up the manufacture of a small car. Has the question been considered that if you increase the capacity of the existing companies perhaps the cost will not exceed Rs. 8 crores to Rs. 10 crores, or maybe Rs. 11 crores, but if you set up a new plant, absolutely fresh, for the manufacture of a new car, the cost will be very much more; it may exceed Rs. 60 crores and the depreciation itself, if you take its life at 10 years, will be about Rs. 6 crores? These questions

have to be considered in an objective way, dispassionately and we should not be led away by prejudice against one person or another or against businessmen, or industrialist or a particular house.

As I mentioned previously, some hon. Members have an allergy to certain names. They will bring in those names but I need not go into that.

Therefore the question has got to be considered from the point of view of what the facts are. The three present manufacturers have got collaboration with the biggest manufacturers in the world and they are the most effective manufacturers in the world. The General Motors and the British Corporation are the collaborators with one of the companies. Similarly, Fiat company and another big company of England are the collaborators for Fiat and another important company of England is the collaborator for Standard. If these big companies cannot enable the production of cheap cars, can any new company help in the manufacture of a small, cheap car? After all, the price of a car depends on the cost of material, taxes etc. Therefore unless the cost of materials is decreased, unless taxes are reduced, you cannot have a cheaper car. While 33 or 35 per cent be the taxes you cannot exclude them from the cost even if you manufacture a small car. The amount of tax will remain the same and it will be impossible for anybody to supply it cheaper. I will give one or two examples. Steel in U.K. costs Rs. 650 per tonne, whereas in India it costs Rs. 1,250 per tonne; wheels per set cost Rs. 48 in England, whereas in India they cost Rs. 142; tyres cost Rs. 257 in England whereas here they cost Rs. 567. These things ought to be examined.

Shri A. P. Jain: It is all your doing.

Shri Himatsingka: Shri Jain says, "It is all wrong".

Mr. Speaker: He did not say, "It is all wrong"; but he says, "It is all

yours doing". He should conclude now.

Shri A. P. Jain: It is all industry's doing.

Shri Daji: Sir, the story of the automobile industry in India is a story of ineptitude and screaming scandal of shameful surrender to big business interests, both Indian and foreign. The speaker just before me said that these three companies were collaborating with very important foreign companies. But I will refer the House to the report of the Jha Committee which has pointed out that Morris sell their raw parts to the Indian concern almost at the same price as a full-fledged Morris car is available in England. That is how the foreign collaborators fleece us. That is how the Indian collaborators, in signing these agreements for a mess of pottage for themselves, have sold away national interests, have bartered away national interests. And the government of the day, the government at that time did not screen the foreign-collaboration agreement as minutely as they ought to have. That is one reason for the high price.

In 1952 Shri Krishnamachari, who was then the Minister of Industries, said that within five years India shall have a full-fledged automobile industry. The five years have run into twelve, and we are not yet getting an automobile industry.

The question is, who permitted these three ill-balanced concerns to come up. Why was it not known then that something between fifty thousand to one lakh of car production would be required before an economy of scale can be reached? Why is it that only today we are wiser? Why was this not known when the permission was given?

Therefore, when the Minister previously in charge of this portfolio,

Mr. Subramaniam, was asked as to when the automobile industry could be cent per cent Indian and can produce economically, he always pleaded helplessness, and in one moment of bravado he said—perhaps that was to silence the Leader, of the Swatantra Party who was sailing in—"I can do so immediately if all these three concerns are taken over by the Government."

And having listed all our grievances against the automobile industry, I do not want to go half hog like my friend Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad or some other friends; I say the only way to have a national automobile industry and an honest car for the poor people is here and now to decide to nationalise these three concerns. Only nationalising these three concerns into one concern run by Government can solve the question of economy of scale. Nothing else can solve it.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: If you nationalise, you have to pay for all the old machinery.

Shri Daji: You can give them twenty years, twenty-five years, or even fifty years bond. Birlas and Tatas who are running it will not be begging with a begger's bowl if you do not give them anything. (*Interruption*).

Whenever we raise the question about cheap car the main stumbling block held out is foreign exchange. Certainly, if we decide to spend ten crores foreign exchange for a car, it is for Government to decide whether the ten crores shall be handed over to Ambassador or Fiat or the ten crores shall be utilised for production of a small car which the middle classes can purchase.

Actually speaking, when the Government of India took this decision to shelve the manufacture of small car in the name of foreign exchange, even

[Shri Daji]

during that period, nine crores were given to Premiers for producing six thousand additional cars; 10.55 crores of foreign exchange was given to Hindustan for producing ten thousand more cars; whereas the scheme of the Pande Committee said that in ten crores we could have had fifty thousand small cars. Therefore, the choice was whether the ten crores should be given to Ambassador or Premier Automobiles for producing six thousand or ten thousand cars, or the ten crores should be taken over by the Government for producing small cars to the tune of fifty thousand. That was the choice. And the Government, in the name of conserving foreign exchange, took a mistaken decision, a misleading decision, and decided that we should better have six thousand more of Fiat instead of fifty thousand of small cars.

And the decision is foisted in the name of socialism. It is not a question of car versus tractors, car versus trucks or car versus buses. If that were so, I would support my friend Dr. Lohia and say, let us stop the production of all cars for a certain number of years. But if it is a matter of choice between a small middle-class man's car and an Ambassador or Fiat which is almost in a jittery condition—the quality control matter also needs to be looked into, but I cannot go into those things as my time is very short—if this is the choice whether we want six thousand more Fiat or we want fifty thousand Government-produced small cars at a cheap price, I think the vote shall inevitably be in favour of fifty thousand small cars as against six thousand more Fiat. And the foreign exchange required will be almost the same.

Why was this decision not taken? In 1960 Government passed a Resolution in September, saying that if a small car is feasible, Government will produce it. In 1962 it was shelved. What happened in between? Two things. One, the general elections, and,

secondly, the mid-term election in Orissa. I make bold to say that for the elections certain important firms made available hundreds of vehicles, with the speedometer disconnected so that the cars could be used during the election campaign and then repolished and sold to the people as new cars. It was in return for this favour shown to the ruling party that the Government's decision was shelved in 1962, and not for conserving foreign exchange. Because, foreign exchange was given all the time; foreign exchange was given to Fiat, to Ambassador and to others.

And even with these uneconomic units, what huge profits are made? The profits of Premier Automobiles, working at an uneconomic level, was Rs. 2.49 crores for one year—net profits. And there is this breast-beating "we are running an uneconomic unit".

I will go further. The Tariff Commission categorically said that the profit for the automobile industry should be 7.5 per cent. All the three concerns are exceeding that limit laid down by the Tariff Commission.

An Hon. Member: By how much?

Shri Daji: It comes to 19 per cent on paid-up and working capital. Therefore, it is not a question of their running at a loss. They are running at more than enough profit. But both the foreign collaborator and the Indian partner together, they collaborate to cheat the treasury, to cheat us in foreign exchange, to cheat the common man and give us something called car which should be better designated as junk.

Now, the persuasion of the Ministry is going to be to make the three co-operate. I do not know what new sector you are going to introduce. There is the co-operative sector, the public sector, the private sector. Now we are trying for a capitalist-cooperative sector or a cooperative-capitalist sector—the three capitalists to have a cooperative society and merge. It

will never happen. Let us not live in a fool's paradise. You may read the Gita or the Bible to them, but they are not going to come together.

If you want a viable, economic automobile industry the only way is to nationalise it, and then we can think of producing a cheaper or small or better car and go forward with better utility models. That is the only choice before Government.

Therefore, the question, the test, is whether this Government which has been returned to power through the money of Premier Automobiles—written in their own balance-sheet, lakhs paid to the Congress fund—this Government which has been returned to power with the money of Premier Automobiles, with the money of Birlas, whether this Government which has made use of them for election purposes, can have the courage of placing national interests above party or capitalist interests. That is the choice. Let the Government take up this challenge and in their reply assure us that the Government can be bigger than big business in India.

Mr. Speaker: This will come up next time when a day will be fixed. Now we take up non-official business.

14.38 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FIFTY-SECOND REPORT

Shri Hem Raj (Kangra): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-second Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 2nd December, 1964."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with

the Fifty-second Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 2nd December, 1964."

The motion was adopted.

14.38½ hrs.

INDIAN PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL*

(Amendment of Section 302)

Maharajkumar Vijaya Ananda (Visakhapatnam): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

Mr. Speaker: The Question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860."

The motion was adopted.

Maharajkumar Vijaya Ananda: I introduce the Bill.

14.38½ hrs.

NATIONAL RIFLE TRAINING SCHEME BILL*

Maharajkumar Vijaya Ananda (Visakhapatnam): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for compulsory training in rifle-shooting to all able-bodied citizens between the ages of twenty and thirty years.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for compulsory training in rifle-shooting to all able-bodied citizens between the ages of twenty and thirty years."

The motion was adopted.

Maharajkumar Vijaya Ananda: I introduce the Bill.