

[श्री मनोहर लाल]

नीति है वह बहुत ही अच्छी नीति है। इस का हम स्वागत करते हैं और हम बताना चाहते हैं कि जहाँ पहले 108 चीजे छोटे उद्योगों के लिए थी अब उनमें 504 चीजे आ गयी हैं। इतना हाँते हुए भी हम चाहते हैं कि इस तरफ विशेष ध्यान देना चाहिए ताकि हमारे छोटे उद्योग घबरे पनप सकें और गाँवों का आर्थिक विकास ठीक से हो सके। अभी तक छोटे उद्योग वाले द्विविधा में पड़े हुए थे कि छोटे उद्योगों की सूची में क्या आयेगा, बड़े उद्योगों की सूची में क्या आयेगा। अब यह द्विविधा समाप्त हुई है। इन शब्दों के साथ हम इसका समर्थन करते हैं।

14 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. SOVIET PRIME MINISTER'S RECENT VISIT TO INDIA

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, as the House is aware, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of USSR, His Excellency Mr. A. N. Kosygin paid an official visit to India from March, 9 to 15, 1979. Since his last visit to India in 1968, there had been several changes in the face of Indian economy and agriculture. We therefore thought that it would be appropriate for us to acquaint him with the pace and quality of Indian development. His programme accordingly included three days of stay in Delhi and two days for visits to outside places. He visited the Heavy Engineering Corporation plant in Ranchi, spent some time at Anand visiting a typical Indian village, the Amul Dairy plant and the National Dairy Development Board. He also visited the Hindustan Machine Tools plant and the Indian Space Research Organisation Centre at Bangalore. Wherever he went he showed keen appreciation of the institutions he visited and the warmth of his reception.

During his stay in Delhi, he had several long discussions with me and with the Deputy Prime Minister (Finance) and Deputy Prime Minister (Defence), the Minister of External Affairs, and the Minister of Industry. We had

two plenary meetings with some members of our Government and the senior members of his delegation. The joint communique a copy of which is placed on the Table of the House, gives a summary on the important points arising out of the various discussions. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-4157A/79]. Since the communique contains the important conclusions we reached during our discussions I am refraining from repeating them here.

Indo-Soviet relations are a vivid demonstration of how two countries different in their socio-economic structures can work together for bilateral advantage and on the basis of Panchsheel Cooperation between our two countries has gathered new momentum and constitutes an important factor for peace and stability in Asia, indeed in the world.

Soviet Union recognises the validity of India's policy of non-alignment which is reflected in our independence of judgment and action. We on our part recognise what Soviet Union has done to ensure detente and promoting cooperation in Europe. We would like to see this process of detente extended to other parts of the globe. It was therefore natural that we viewed with some concern the disturbed situation in South East Asia also in our West. We agreed that the people of a country should be allowed to develop themselves without outside interference, in a manner of their choice and in a way suited to their own genius. We also agreed that relations between countries must be governed on basic principles such as respect for territorial integrity, sovereignty and non-use of force. We recognised that for peace and stability in Asia it was necessary for all countries in the region to cooperate with each other for mutual benefit and on the basis of equality and respect for sovereignty.

I am very happy to say that there was a very wide ranging similarity of views between our two countries. As the House is aware, the mutually beneficial cooperation between India

and the Soviet Union extends to a very large number of fields. It is a happy tradition in Indo-Soviet relations that the leaders of the two countries periodically meet an exchange views on a number of subjects covering both bilateral relations and the international situation. The present visit has once again demonstrated the great value of such contracts since they serve to bring the two countries even closer together. We are confident that as a result of the discussions held during this visit, Indo-Soviet cooperation will receive a further impetus and the degree of understanding which prevails between us will grow as time goes by.

14.06 hrs.

INDUSTRIES (DEVELOPMENT AND  
REGULATION) AMENDMENT BILL—  
Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: We continue with the earlier debate.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill introduced by Mr. George Fernandes has very limited scope but at the same time the important issue remains to be solved. Of course, the hon. Minister has been very keen to avail himself of every opportunity to speak in the House. It is quite welcome. He is now speaking of including within the scope of the power of the Government to take over a few items like pressure cooker, cutlery, etc. He is just marking utterances of taking over of many industries. Sir, instead of taking over, he is only making utterances of taking over. If the Government's intention is to take over these industries, they have to do it in a proper manner. I am not surprised at the utterances of Shri George Fernandes, because once he said that drinking water was not available in his constituency whereas the previous Congress Government had gone on constructing five-star hotels in India. I would like to tell this House that Shri George Fernandes has spent more

than Rupees six lakhs for going abroad. For what? He could have remained in India, done some home work for the industrial development of this country and this amount he could have saved and spent in his constituency Muzaffarpur for giving drinking water. I have no objection to his going abroad; a Minister may have to go abroad, but I am objecting to his double talk. I am objecting to this sort of hypocrisy. When I was speaking earlier, Mr Deputy-Speaker asked me why I was mentioning about the pomp and glory for Mr. George Fernandes. We know the pomp and glory was in old Roman style of many demagogues like Julius Caesar, Mark Antony and Brutus. That is why, I said when you speak and make some utterances, there must be some validity about them. Shri George Fernandes speaks of take-over of TISCO. I have no quarrel with him. Let him take it over, but later the Prime Minister said that it was his private opinion. Every Minister has two opinions, one is public and the other is private opinion. I do not know, how the country will be run by the private opinion of these Ministers. One private opinion of the Prime Minister has cost many lives and another private opinion of Shri George Fernandes is creating lot of trouble and flutter in the industrial sector. I do not know what will happen in this country

The point that I am making is that. What is the purpose of the Ministers expressing their private opinion in public and their public opinion in private? If the Government is serious in taking over certain industries in the national interest, go ahead; we will support you. We are fully with you in any kind of social measure which benefits the society, but it is no use making utterances to frighten somebody with vengeance for something, for ulterior motive. This only Shri George Fernandes can explain.

TISCO is the classic case; not only that. Shri George Fernandes has been speaking of take-over of some other