

15.50 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: PRIVATISATION OF CPUs....contd.

Title: Further discussion on the resolution urging the Government to review its policy of privatising Central Public Sector Undertakings in the country, especially the Cochin Shipyards Limited, Fertilisers and Chemicals Travancore Limited and Hindustan Newsprint Limited in Kerala moved by Shri Suresh Kurup on 14th August, 2003. (Discussion not concluded and debate adjourned to the first day allotted to the Private Members' Resolutions in the next session)

Now, the House will take up Item No. 23. Shri Suresh Kurup was on his legs. He can continue his speech.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA (MAVELIKARA): There is no Minister for Disinvestment present in the House.
...(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP (KOTTAYAM): Who is there? There is no Minister. Where is the Minister? ...(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (SHRI SU THIRUNAVUKKARASAR): The hon. Union Minister has gone abroad. He is in Geneva to attend an international conference. He has already written to the hon. Speaker. ...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yes, he has written.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Is the Minister capable of replying to my queries? ...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yes he is capable of.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Is there any Deputy Minister for Disinvestment? ...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is no Deputy Minister here. It is only a two-tier system here. It is only the Minister of State and not the Deputy Minister.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA : Shri Thirunavukkarasar is an able Minister, but he is not dealing with the Ministry of Disinvestment. That is the question. ...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is, since he has been already authorised,

how do you under-estimate his performance before he gives a reply?

...(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP : I have nothing against the hon. Minister. But, as we all know, there is no Minister of State in the Ministry of Disinvestment. So, I do not think the queries raised by us can be answered by the hon. Minister. ...(Interruptions) I am not saying anything personal against him. ...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Suresh Kurup, you are a very senior Member. So, do not pass any aspersion to his performance here. This is not fair on your part.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP : I have nothing against him. I am not raising any allegation against the concerned Minister who is here to reply to our queries. ...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The concerned Minister has written to the hon. Speaker. Hon. Speaker has said, 'yes'.

The Minister whom he has authorised can act on his behalf.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Even the Cabinet Minister, Shri Arun Shourie, is not capable of replying to the queries raised here. I do not know whether he can reply to our queries. It is an important matter. â€ (Interruptions)

DR. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (SOUTH DELHI): It will be decided by the Government. How can he decide about the capability of the Minister? ...(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP : I said, I have nothing against the Minister. It is nothing personal or anything like that. ...(Interruptions)

Is there any State Minister in the Ministry of Disinvestment? ...(Interruptions)

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA : But he is not dealing with the Ministry of Disinvestment. ...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It does not matter. He can deal with it now. He has already been authorised. Do you think without preparation he will come here? He has already prepared. He is very much here.

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Suresh Kurup, you were on your legs. You can continue your speech, if you want.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Sir, he is nowhere connected with the Ministry of Disinvestment. This is a very sorry state of affairs. â€ (Interruptions)

SHRI SU THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: Shri Suresh Kurup, please take your seat. It is correct that there is no Minister of State in the Ministry of Disinvestment and it is only the Cabinet Minister who is in-charge. Shri Arun Shourie is our Cabinet Minister. He has gone abroad for attending an international conference in Geneva. Since this matter has been partly heard, you have listed this matter today. If the hon. Minister is satisfied with me, we can go on with his argument. I am ready to respond to him. ...(Interruptions) I am ready to answer him. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Will he give an assurance that HNL will not be privatised? ...(Interruptions)

DR. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA : How can he? Even Shri Arun Shourie cannot give an assurance like that. ...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is a decision to be taken by the Cabinet or the Government. If a decision has already been taken by the Government he will say yes; otherwise he will say no.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP : I have great respect for my hon. friend, but he is not dealing with Disinvestment. He is nowhere connected with it. ...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has already been authorised by the hon. Minister and the hon. Speaker has accepted it.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Sir, if you are satisfied, then it is all right. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI SU THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: Since it was partly heard in the last Session, as per the schedule it has been listed in today's business. If it is not listed today, then it will not come in this Session and it will come only in the next Session. On next Friday, Private Members' Bills will be taken up and there is no Session on subsequent Friday. Hence, this Resolution will only come in the next Session.

Sir, since it is listed here for today, I have also come prepared to respond to the debate. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Please do not take it in a personal way. I have great respect for you.

SHRI SU THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: Sir, I want to make a suggestion. ...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The House is becoming really impatient. Nobody is prepared to hear anybody. It is unfortunate.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Sir, just now we have witnessed that the hon. Prime Minister has authorised another Minister to reply and no one was satisfied. ...*(Interruptions)* No other Minister in this Cabinet knows as to what is going on in this Ministry of Disinvestment. Does anybody know? Nobody knows. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Suresh Kurup, please take your seat. Please hear the hon. Minister.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Nobody knows about it. The Minister is considering it as his private fiefdom. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Suresh Kurup, I will allow you to speak. Let the hon. Minister complete his point.

SHRI SU THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: Sir, what I am suggesting is that if the hon. Member wants to hear the reply from the Union Minister who is in charge of the Ministry of Disinvestment, then it can be taken up on some other day when he is available here. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SURESH KURUP : No, it is my right to move this now. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SU THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: Sir, I will give another option. The hon. Member can go ahead with his argument. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SURESH KURUP : You are not supposed to tamper with the right of a Member. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SU THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: He can go ahead with the argument and the reply can be given by the hon. Minister when he comes back. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA : Sir, you start the discussion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He is not prepared to speak.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Sir, I am prepared to speak. ...*(Interruptions)*

श्री रामजीलाल सुमन (फिरोजाबाद) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं विनम्रता से निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि अध्यक्ष महोदय ने व्यवस्था दी थी कि विनिवेश मंत्री यहां नहीं हैं, उनकी जगह राज्य मंत्री को नामजद किया है। सब से पहला सवाल बहस की सार्थकता का है कि जब कैबिनेट मंत्री यहां नहीं हैं और जो राज्य मंत्री हैं, उनका इस विषय से संबंध नहीं है, चर्चा की सार्थकता नहीं रहती। यदि कैबिनेट मंत्री यहां होते तो चर्चा का महत्व रहता। विषय की गंभीरता को देखते हुये उतना माकूल जवाब नहीं आ पायेगा, जितना आना चाहिये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : यह हाउस की परम्परा रही है कि यदि संबंधित मंत्री न हों तो दूसरे मिनिस्टर अथोराइज किये जाते हैं और वे यहां बहस का उत्तर देते हैं। आपको मालूम है क्योंकि आप एक सीनियर मੈम्बर हैं। चर्चा शुरु की जाये।

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Sir, I would like to repeat that I have nothing against the hon. Minister of State replying or Shri Arun Shourie authorising him for replying to this debate. But, Sir, as everybody in this House knows, even the Cabinet Ministers do not know what is happening in the Disinvestment Ministry. Shri Ram Naik was totally unaware of what was happening in the oil ministry and only when the Supreme Court intervened, the Government could be stopped in its venture.

We have witnessed just now that the hon. Prime Minister has authorised another important Minister to reply; but no one was satisfied. You ask any Cabinet Minister as to what is going on in the Ministry of Disinvestment. They may not be able to reply. That is why I am raising this point here. Anyway, I will continue now. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SU THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: Please give me one minute. Sir, I have given some alternative suggestions to him. ...*(Interruptions)* Let me complete.

श्री रामजीलाल सुमन : जहां तक विनिवेश मंत्रालय का संबंध है, विनिवेश का सवाल दूसरे राज्य मंत्री पर छोड़ दिया जाये, यह कैसे हो सकता है। एक कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर का दूसरे कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर से सामंजस्य नहीं है, एक-दूसरे के बारे में कंट्रोवर्सियल बातें करते हैं। इतना गम्भीर विषय हो, फिर भी एक दूसरे मिनिस्टर के डिफेंड वर्रन्स हों, चर्चा की सार्थकता कहां रह जाती है? मैं राज्य मंत्री जी का सम्मान करता हूं। चर्चा के लिये यह बिलकुल उचित नहीं है कि जिस विभाग का मंत्री यहां नहीं है, राज्य मंत्री इस गंभीर मुद्दे पर ठीक जवाब दे पायेंगे या नहीं? जब श्री अरुण शोरी जी यहां नहीं हैं तो चर्चा का कोई ज्यादा महत्व नहीं है।

SHRI SU THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: That is the suggestion that I am telling you. I have already spoken to the hon. Speaker also. If the hon. Member is interested he can carry on with his argument and I am ready to respond.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : I am very much interested.

SHRI SU THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: Otherwise, he can continue and the reply can be by the concerned Minister after his arrival, if the hon. Member is interested to listen to him. This is the second time that this is partly heard. It can be heard in the next Session also. As per rules, there is no bar.

16.00 hrs.

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA : Sir, a decision can be taken in this regard. Let him start his speech so that others may also take part in it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Ramesh, who is preventing him?

SHRI SU THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: If he is ready to listen to me, I am ready to answer.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Thirunavukkarasar, please take your seat. Let Shri Kurup continue.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Sir, last week, the representatives of the Hindustan Newsprint Limited and we, Members of Parliament, met the Industries Minister and he said that he was totally helpless and was not aware whether it would be privatised or not. That is why, I am saying that it is such an important discussion which we are raising. I think, the Disinvestment Minister should answer the queries raised by the Members.

Sir, as you are well aware, many times this issue of privatisation is raised in this House and discussed threadbare, but to none of the queries raised in this House by the Members from this side and that side the Minister was capable of replying. Privatisation has become the centrepiece of BJP's economic policy. So, they are bent upon privatising, disinvesting every public sector enterprises. When the major oil companies, HPCL and BPCL, were about to be privatised, it was pointed out inside this House repeatedly that since it was nationalised by an Act of Parliament, the Government should come before this House for privatising these enterprises, but they were not ready to listen. When the Supreme Court intervened and said that Government should come before this House, Sir, you know what the Minister said. He said 'it is a great setback.' In this democratic set up, a Cabinet Minister says that coming before Parliament and seeking the sanction of this august House is a great setback. How can he say that? So, whether it was criticism inside the House, criticism by the Supreme Court or struggle by the masses outside the House, nothing has prevented this Government from going ahead with privatisation. They have answered, but they are not capable of answering any of the queries raised by the Members.

16.03 hrs. (Dr. Laxminarayan Pandeya *in the Chair*)

They do not say why profit-making undertakings are being privatised. They do not say clearly what they are going to do with the money they will fetch. To them, nothing is a strategic industry and everything is in the non-strategic sector. Whatever be the industry, whatever be the importance of the industry, they are bent upon privatising it. Sir, they say that privatisation is panacea for all ills of our economy.

Take for example, Hindustan Newsprint Limited. Sir, as you know, there are very few Central public sector undertakings in Kerala and this is the only Central public sector undertaking in my constituency. Right from the beginning, this establishment is making profits. This is the only newsprint factory in India which could export its newsprint outside the country. No other newsprint factory was capable of doing it. Now, Sir, a new de-inking plant has started there. The hon. Speaker, while he was Industries Minister, came all the way to Kerala, all the way to the factory and inaugurated a de-inking plant so that newspapers can again be converted into pulp and used as raw material for the factory and it can face the situation when raw material crunch occurs.

So, more than one thousand workers are there who are working as contract workers. Nearabout 10,000 people are living there who are connected with the allied establishments.

Sir, the Government of Kerala had taken great pains to establish this factory in Kerala. Nearly 687 acres of land was acquired for it, and the Government of Kerala paid the money. Close to 3,800 hectares of forest land was given to this factory for the production of its raw material. Whenever there was a problem in this factory, the Kerala Government used to intervene.

I remember in 1987 -- I was a Member of this House -- there was a serious problem regarding raw material, and the factory was asking for additional land. I was the person representing that constituency. Hence, I accompanied the then General Manager and the Trade Union representatives to meet the then Chief Minister of Kerala Shri E. K. Nayanar. Let me tell you that he did not hesitate even for one moment to allocate additional land for the factory, and the Kerala Government did this only because this was a Public Sector Undertaking. Do you know what was the undertaking given by the Government of Kerala when a case came in the Kerala High Court regarding allocation of forest land to this factory? The Government of Kerala said that they are giving this land to the Hindustan Newsprint Limited only because this is a Public Sector Undertaking.

Sir, my question is this. How can they privatise this factory without consulting the Government of Kerala, and without getting the sanction of the Government of Kerala? What is the guarantee that after this factory is privatised the forest land will be given to the private concern? The Government of Kerala consented to give this land only because this was a major Central Public Sector Undertaking. They wanted that this concern should come into

Kerala. And without taking all these things into consideration they are going to disinvest 74 per cent of the Hindustan Newsprint Limited.

There is a great struggle going on in Kerala. The workers were on strike and those bidders who came to the factory could not enter the factory. There is going to be a '*hartal*' in the district. A big resistance would be there against this privatisation if the Government does not take note of these things.

Sir, no private party can enter the factory, own this factory, and run this factory. I am quite sure about it. What will happen to the workers? What will be the fate of reservation in the factory? The Government is not answering any of these questions. They are going ahead with privatisation, and they have decided that Hindustan Newsprint Limited should be privatised. In fact, I had raised this discussion to make this House aware about the great struggle that is going on in my district against the privatisation of this factory.

Sir, you may be aware of the issue concerning FACT. It is one of the major Central Public Sector Undertakings in Kerala. It was a Private Sector Undertaking established in 1946. Later it was nationalised by the Government. Now, the Government has decided, as usual, that FACT should be privatised. Sir, repeatedly the Trade Union Representatives, the then Chief Minister and now the Cooperative Minister along with Members of Parliament from Kerala came to Delhi and met the hon. Prime Minister, the Disinvestment Minister, etc. The Government of Kerala is ready to take over the factory in the Cooperative Sector, and keep it in the Cooperative Sector.

However, the Disinvestment Minister is not ready to give a satisfactory reply. There are more than 5,000 workers in FACT, and this factory owns 2,500 acres of land in the suburb of the Cochin city. It has got its network all over India. This factory played a leading role in supplying fertilisers to the farmers of our country, which helped our Green Revolution. The High Court of Kerala, through an order, directed the management to start an Ammonia Plant and this made the factory to go into losses. Now, the Unions and also the management have given specific proposals to the Central Government. We all met the Prime Minister twice, and the Disinvestment Minister several times, but neither the Prime Minister nor the Disinvestment Minister is ready to hear any of these proposals. It is the collective concern of the people of Kerala and it is the concern of the Government of Kerala that FACT should not be privatised; FACT should not go into private hands.

Another thing that I have mentioned in the Resolution is about the Cochin Shipyard. There is a history behind the establishment of this Shipyard in Kerala. In 1965, when the Central Government tried to shift the location of the Shipyard from Kerala, there was a big agitation. At that time, Comrade Gopalan was the Leader of the Opposition. Under his leadership, all the political parties united and there was a big agitation for establishing this Shipyard in Kerala. Then only, the Central Government relented and the Shipyard was established there. Right from the beginning, it is running on profits and it is still running on profits. This is a prestigious undertaking in Kerala. They are thinking of privatising it.

There are only a handful of Central Public Sector Enterprises in Kerala. Out of them, the three major concerns are the FACT, Hindustan Newsprint Limited and the Cochin Shipyard. I would like to say that the people of Kerala would not allow this Government to privatise these concerns, which are a part of Kerala. These concerns were built up with the money that the people of Kerala have paid. The Kerala Government has contributed tremendously for the establishment of these factories and for the running of these factories. Whenever there was a crisis, the Government of Kerala intervened. Regarding Hindustan Newsprint Limited, the Chief Minister has represented to the Government of India that it should not be privatised.

My point is that they are not consulting the Government of Kerala; they are not seeking the opinion of the Government of Kerala, in spite of the great contribution that the State Government has made for the establishment and running of these factories. If they are not ready to listen to the public opinion and the opinion of the Kerala Government, there will be a great resistance and it will be difficult for any private party to come to Kerala, and to own and run these factories. This is all that I want to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I now call Shri Ramesh Chennithala.

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHARY (BERHAMPORE, WEST BENGAL): Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is a very serious issue which is being discussed here, but there is no competent authority, I presume, to respond to the discussion. It is a very sensitive issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have already called the name of Shri Ramesh Chennithala, please sit down.

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHARY : Sir, it is a very serious subject, but neither the Members nor the Ministers are here. What is the use of raising the issue here?

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA : We have already raised that issue.

PROF. A.K. PREMAJAM (BADAGARA): We want to take part in the discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is a very serious issue concerning the State of Kerala.

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHARY : The whole thing has been diluted because of the negligence of the Government.

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Resolution moved by my hon. Colleague Shri Suresh Kurup. This is a very serious issue which has created a consensus among the different political parties and groups in the State of Kerala.

The Disinvestment Minister, Shri Arun Shourie is not here in the House today. I hope our learned friend and colleague Shri Thirunavukkarasar, who has proved himself to be an able administrator in the State of Tamil Nadu, will convey to the Minister the feelings of the Members of this august House in general and the Members from Kerala in particular because this is a very serious and important matter.

The issue of disinvestment has been discussed by this august House more than 14-15 times. Every time the Members of Parliament have raised very important issues and queries before this Government. Unfortunately, the Disinvestment Minister and the Government could not satisfy the Members who participated in the discussions.

India after Independence, moved to a planned economy. Public sector undertakings were considered to be the backbone of our economy. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of India, called them the temples of modern India. The order of the day now is selling out the PSUs and winding them up. Without any direction or without any kind of thinking, these public sector undertakings were closed down indiscriminately. Because of this, the industrial development has been affected very seriously.

We are not aware as to how this Government is selecting the various public sector undertakings for the purpose of disinvestment. What is the criterion that the Government is following for selecting these public sector undertakings? I am sorry to say that the Government of India has no clear-cut policy on disinvestment. There is no transparency in the process of disinvestment. Nobody knows what the Government is going to do with the money that is collected through the process of disinvestment.

Earlier, when Dr. Manmohan Singh was the Finance Minister, he clearly spelt out the aims and objectives of the process of disinvestment. The amount which was collected through disinvestment process was meant to be used for the weaker sections of the society. It was meant to be used for the social upliftment programmes and social welfare activities. I am sorry to say that this Government and the Minister of Disinvestment Shri Arun Shourie have not been able to spell out clearly as to how the amount collected through the process of disinvestment be spent.

If the Government is using this money only to make good the budgetary deficit, it is not going to help the millions and millions of the people who are suffering. I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to whether the money which is collected through the process of disinvestment is going to be used for the social welfare activities which are very much needed in this country.

There is no policy perspective in this sector. The net worth of central public sector undertakings was Rs.60,300 crore in 1991-92. It went up to Rs.1,61,000 crore in 1999-2000. The net worth that was four per cent in 1991-92, reached ten per cent in 1995-96, and 9 per cent in 1999-2000.

Sir, the public sector employees constitute 70 per cent of the organised sector employment, out of which around half are Government employees, which account for around a quarter of the GDP. The Central PSUs are only a part of this.

In 2000-01, 31 per cent of the gross investment was done by the public sector. If you look into the whole aspect of disinvestment, disinvestment worth Rs. 30,000 crore was already done, around two-thirds was done by selling shares to the Mutual Funds. Unfortunately, there is no transparency in the whole process. There is no policy perspective in this regard. A lot of complaints are coming up. A lot of criticism was there not only from our side but also from some of the supporting parties of the National Democratic Alliance. They were also airing their differences regarding the policy perspective of this sector.

Sir, even if we succeed in doing disinvestment worth Rs. 10,000 crore every year, it will take more than 10 years to make any major impact in this sector. However, out of so many related issues, there was a discussion about two units in hand. There is no clear-cut policy, there is no perspective in this. The process is going very slow. As a result of this, there is a total confusion seen in this whole process.

So, Sir, there must be a roadmap. The Tenth Plan document does not throw any light on this critical issue.

Regarding transparency, I was mentioning that there were a lot of complaints and criticisms even from the ruling party Members. The Disinvestment Minister himself publicly announced that a political party in the NDA had tried to intervene in the process of disinvestment of a Mumbai-based hotel. We have already witnessed noisy scenes in this august House on this issue. This is not the only isolated case. There are so many other similar cases which attracted criticisms from various quarters not only in this House but also from outside.

So, the whole process of disinvestment should be reviewed. A White Paper should be brought before this House in this regard. This House has to be taken into confidence.

My learned friend, Shri Suresh Kurup very rightly pointed out about the judgement of the Supreme Court on disinvestment of oil companies. It is a major set back to this Government. This judgement of the Supreme Court has opened a new chapter. Definitely, this Government has not taken the House into confidence. And, that is why it is inviting criticisms from various quarters. The Supreme Court has intervened and stayed the whole process. The judgement about disinvestment of BPCL and HPCL should open the eyes of the Government. The Government should ponder over the whole issue. The Government should take stock of the situation. The Government should prepare a roadmap. The Government should take this House into confidence. Unfortunately, even after the judgement of the Supreme Court, the Government has not opened its eyes. They are not opening their ears and they are not trying to understand the gravity of the situation.

Sir, these three public sector undertakings – the Cochin Shipyard Limited, the Fertilisers and Chemicals Travancore Limited and the Hindustan Newsprint Limited – are considered to be the prestigious public sector undertakings in my State of Kerala. These three were selected for disinvestment. Shri Suresh Kurup rightly pointed out about the Hindustan Newsprint Limited. Three times I represented the same Constituency which Shri Suresh Kurup is representing now – Kottayam. This Hindustan Newsprint Limited is one of the best units of the Hindustan Paper Corporation. The Hindustan Paper Corporation has so many units. One is NEPA in your State, Mr. Chairman, Sir. It was once upon a time one of the prestigious public sector undertakings. It is standstill now; it is closed down. Another is Nogaon, in Assam, which has been closed down earlier but now earning profit. Another is in Mysore, which is also closed down. The only unit of HPC which is functioning effectively is HNL, which is a profit-making public sector undertaking.

The Kerala Government has helped this public sector unit; there was an acute shortage of raw material. The Kerala Government has stepped in; they helped HNL. They had provided enough raw materials for the smooth functioning of this mill. Thousands of employees are working in this public sector unit. Every section of the employees are now coming together to rescue this unit.

Earlier also, there was a problem because of piling up of newsprint in this factory. It was because of the indiscriminate import made by the Central Government that this unit suffered; there was a total set back. With all these odds, with the help of the workers and with the help of the State Government, HNL survived and now, the Government is coming forward with disinvestment proposal. It is unfortunate.

All other units are closed down or are defunct and only this unit of HPC is working. I do not understand the logic behind privatising or selling out this unit which is viable, which is profit-making and which is running smoothly. No other unit is earmarked for disinvestment. Why the government is doing it in the case of Neapanagar unit? Why is the Government not doing it in the case of Nogaon Paper Mills? Why the Government is not doing it in the case of Mysore Paper Mills? It is because there would not be any takers for them; they are all defunct; they are closed down.

The only unit which is functioning and which is properly making profit is considered and selected for disinvestment. I would totally agree if the whole HPC is going to be dismantled, which would include all the units of Neapanagar, Nogaon, Mysore and Kerala. Unfortunately, all other units were left out; and only HNL was selected for disinvestment. This is unjust. Due to this, all the trade unions and the State Government of Kerala are coming forward and representing before the Prime Minister and the Minister of Disinvestment, to spare this unit which is a profit-making one.

Secondly, FACT is a gigantic industrial unit which is situated in the heart of Kerala. Shri Kurup has mentioned about this. This organisation is giving employment to more than 5,000 people. This is one of the ancient organisations which is in our State. The Kerala Government supported this organisation. They had given enough land; they had given all support to this organisation, and it was making profits.

As was rightly pointed out, because of the Ammonia Plant, this unit became loss-making. There was no effort from the Government. This is the most important point that I wanted to stress here. There was no attempt from the Central Government to give enough support to this organisation so that it could make profit. There was no package which was given by the Government to make this organisation profitable.

Shri Kurup has rightly made this point regarding HNL. There was a proposal for de-inking unit. If a de-inking unit was started in HNL, it would have become more and more profitable because it would have used the raw materials and there would have been no need to import raw materials or to find it out from other sources. De-inking unit was a viable project and it was not accepted by the Government. FACT was not supported by the Government. I would charge that intentionally the Central Government is making this institution sick. The Government, the banks and other financial institutions are not stepping forward to help this institution. Without any financial support how can this institution survive? Systematically and scientifically the Ministry of Heavy Industry is making this organisation sick. The appointment of Managing Directors of FACT and such other organisations will take months and months so that the organisation is collapsed, becomes sick and the Government can sell it off. This is what is really happening.

Workers' Cooperatives are coming up. I will give you an example. In China, Workers' Cooperatives are coming forward and taking over such undertakings, factories and other small units and are converting them into profit-making units. Why can the Government of India not follow this pattern? When the Workers' Cooperatives are coming forward to take them up, why is the Government of India not accepting it? Take the case of FACT. The State Government of Kerala, the Chief Minister and the union leaders came together to form a cooperative and requested that it should be handed over to them but the Central Government did not agree to it. The irony of the situation is, the Central Government is saying that this cooperative will be considered only as one among the bidders. What does it mean? It means that the Workers' Cooperative Society, supported by the State Government of Kerala will be considered only as one of the private parties coming for the bidding. This is very unfortunate. No responsible Government can take such a stand. No responsible Minister can take such a stand. The workers' cooperative society, private bidder, multinational or a corporate are at different footings. Unfortunately, the whole issue is, the Central Government's attitude towards the workers' cooperative society. If the Central Government does not change its stand towards the workers' cooperative society, then FACT and such other big public sector undertakings will be in the hands of the corporates and multinationals.

Finally, I would say something about the shipyard. People of Kerala are emotionally attached to Cochin Shipyard. I remember the former Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi coming to Cochin and launching the first ship constructed in the Cochin Shipyard. People of Kerala are emotionally attached to it. All the political parties have tried their level best to start a new shipyard in the State of Kerala. How can a shipyard become profitable if no order is placed with it? How many orders were placed with Cochin Shipyard? No order was placed with it. The main purpose of a shipyard is to make ship but if the Government of India is not placing any order with it, how can it become profitable? I would say that systematically and scientifically these organisations are being made sick. The Disinvestment Ministry with prior calculations is selling out these institutions which are being run with the public money or the taxpayers' money. This is unjust.

The State of Kerala should be viewed separately because it has no public investment in any of the sectors. We are backward industrially and economically. We are only a consumer State. Our State has only three or four public sector undertakings. If these public sector units are disinvested, it will affect our economic and industrial development negatively.

Therefore, I support the Resolution and I think the Government would take this aspect into consideration and would shelve this proposal for disinvestment.

PROF. A.K. PREMAJAM (BADAGARA): Hon. Chairman, Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity. I fully support the Resolution moved by Shri Suresh Kurup.

As far as disinvestment policy of this Government is concerned, I must, at the outset, say that it has no direction. What is the logic behind disinvestment of profit-making undertakings while the loss-making undertakings are left outside.

Three central public sector undertakings are mentioned in this Resolution. They are: Cochin Shipyard Limited, Fertilizers and Chemicals Travancore Limited, and Hindustan Newsprint Limited. They are all in the State of Kerala. As far as people of Kerala are concerned, we are morally, economically and emotionally attached to them and are very much concerned about the privatisation or disinvestment of these prestigious undertakings. Already, Shri Kurup, who had spoken earlier, had mentioned in detail the various aspects of these three public sector undertakings.

As far as Hindustan Newsprint Limited of Kerala is concerned, it has been a profit-making undertaking all through its existence. Whenever there was any problem or any issue cropped up regarding this undertaking, the

Government of Kerala had come to the rescue of this establishment. Even now when the Government of India has decided to privatise or disinvest this establishment, the Government of India have not sought any opinion or advice from the Government of Kerala. We do not understand why such a very important decision is taken without consulting or seeking suggestions or advice of the Government of Kerala.

In this connection, I would like to state that while the evaluation work of the public sector undertakings which are to be divested is undertaken, their actual or real value is not taken into account. I will give you the example of BALCO. BALCO has thousands of hectares of prime land. Mr. Chairman, Sir, you will be knowing more about that. Thousands of workers are working there and even a layman would be able to evaluate it correctly. It was having assets worth more than Rs.5000 crore but it was sold at throw away price and that too to a black-listed company. What is the interest of this Government in doing things in this manner? That is why, I said it has no direction. When this new economic policy was initiated by the Congress Government, their Party, which was in Opposition at that time, had opposed it very strongly and ardently.

But when they came to the position of Treasury Benches, they have started loving this policy much speedier than the Congress. More ardently and with greater interest, they are following the New Economic Policy. When the New Economic Policy was introduced, we were made to understand that the developments that are brought about as a result of the New Economic Policy will be brought to all the people. Whether they are rich or poor, the benefits would be brought to the hands of all the people and the major portion of the sale proceeds of disinvestment of the public sector undertakings would be actually utilised for the social sector and social welfare activities. But what is happening now? The Government of India led by the BJP, who had raised the *swaraj* and *swadeshi* slogans, are actually selling all our profit-making undertakings to the multinationals who are foreigners. Here, instead of investing the proceeds of sale in social welfare activities, actually they are trying to build up the budgetary deficiencies with these sale proceeds.

I would like to bring another point as a part of this discussion. At the time of the election in 1999, through their manifesto, they had made promises to the people at large that when they come to power, their Government would actually create ten crores of new employment opportunities. What are they doing now? They are actually making people more and more unemployed. When these public sector undertakings, especially profit-making undertakings, are sold away at throwaway price, what are the bidders going to do with the people employed there? We can see the experience of any number of such institutions particularly that of BALCO. What is taking place inside the establishments now? Once these public sector undertakings are sold to the private entrepreneurs or when they are disinvested, the first decision taken is to cut the size of employment at large. And this is being done in Government service also. After this Government has come, we find one thing. After retirement, some posts become vacant. They have not been filled up and they remain like that for one or two years and then such vacancies cease to exist. Already the Government had made it clear that 10 per cent of employees in the Government service would be cut at the rate of two per cent per year. For five years, it would become ten per cent. Is this the way they are solving the unemployment problem? Unemployment problem is escalating and when the unemployment problem is escalating, the responsibility of any responsible democratic Government is to solve the problem and give more and more opportunities to the unemployed youth in the country. Instead, with this kind of a disinvestment policy, they are actually adding to the very serious and grave unemployment problem.

Now, for argument sake, if I say that if FACT or Hindustan Newsprint Limited or Cochin Shipyard is disinvested, the first step that the bidders, that is, those who are buying the establishment, will do is to drastically reduce the number of persons employed there. This is what will the Government be doing? Will the Government be in a position to do anything in this regard? This is closely associated with that also.

Another point is, this Government is withdrawing from all social welfare activities. Everything is being given to the NGOs and other organisations. There is no co-relation between the promises made to the people at the time of election and what they are actually doing now. They said at the time of election that if they would come to power, they will do such and such things. One promise is to provide ten crore employment opportunities.

Now, they are reducing the already existing employment opportunities. Regarding FACT it is already mentioned that it started incurring loss only very recently, after a court judgement. Even then, in essence, it cannot be called or treated as a loss-making establishment because ammonia plant is there. That is an asset. More than 2,500 hectares of prime land is with the FACT. If this is disinvested, this prime land which belongs to FACT will be grabbed by the company and will be divided into pieces and sold. There is no doubt about that. What about the plant itself? Crores of rupees worth plants are there. Five thousand persons are directly employed in that and many more are indirectly employed. They are all going to lose employment.

There is no doubt that bidders who will get control over these establishments or public sector undertakings will definitely throw all employees out and will bring in new employees. Their policy would be 'hire and fire'. We are already experiencing that. The policy of these bidders would be 'hire and fire'. They will hire people for a short while

and once their aim is achieved, they will throw them away. Thereby, they will be able to increase their profit because they are profit mongers. They have no interest in our country and they have no interest in the welfare of our people.

I do not want to lengthen my speech. My request is that the Government should come forward with an open heart it should review its disinvestment policy.

In fact, I can say, on the basis of the statistics provided by the Government itself, that GDP has not increased much. There is a difference of just 0.01 per cent in GDP between the previous decade, that is, a decade before the new economic policy was introduced and the decade when the new economic policy with liberalisation, privatisation, etc. had been introduced. I am not quoting from my own sources, I am quoting from a reply which has been given to me this week. The difference in the GDP between the decade starting with 1981 to 1991 and the decade between 1991 – when the new economic policy with an element of privatisation was introduced – to 2001 is just 0.01 per cent. Only 0.01 per cent of GDP was added during this period. Where does that additional GDP of 0.01 per cent go? Does it go to the ordinary people who are toiling in the fields and in the factories or who are starving? Does it go to these people? Who gets the benefit? Actually the benefit goes to the multinationals and economically powerful people.

If this Government adopts these types of policies, then I am sure the whole nation will be derailed as far as the economic conditions go. Naturally, it will derail the social welfare activities which India had been able to undertake after Independence. So far, this Government has neglected the social sector.

The Government is just completely shaking off its responsibility. It is just going out of this responsibility. Then, why should there be a Government?

So, under these circumstances, I would very earnestly appeal to the Government and to the hon. Minister who is present here to give specific answers to all the issues which we have raised in this House in this regard on the Resolution. I would also request that this policy should be reviewed. The profit-making undertakings should not be disinvested.

With these words, I conclude.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN (CHIRAYINKIL): Sir, at the very outset, I would like to say that I strongly support the Resolution moved by Shri Suresh Kurup. Before doing that, I have to make some observations with regard to the functioning of the Private Members' Business.

In all the Houses, both in the State Assemblies as well as in Parliament, one day is specifically set for the Private Members' Business. It is as important as the Government Business. Suppose there is a holiday intervening. Then, there is the practice of converting another day into Private Members' Business day. Why? It is because the Private Members' Business is given topmost priority.

Yesterday, we had a function in the Central Hall of Parliament. The Rajya Sabha was celebrating its 200th Session. There was an assessment made by the hon. Chairman of the Rajya Sabha in which he has categorically assessed that the Private Members' Business – the Bills moved and the discussions that took place inside the House – was given so much of importance. He said that so much importance was given to the business transacted in the Upper House with regard to the Private Members' Business. So, it is self-evident that this Business is a part and parcel of the Business of this House. It has an importance as the Government's Business has. But, unfortunately, I see that there is a tendency that the Government is not giving any credence to the Private Members' Business that is transacted in the House. It is an irony of fate that the Government which is very much interested in the privatisation process is not at all interested in giving credence to the Private Members' Business. I do not know the reason for it. One thing is that the first one is profitable and this is not profitable. It may be the reason....(*Interruptions*)

I am not questioning the authority. It is not a question of observing certain rules. They can say that the hon. Minister is present. It is not a question of the presence of a Minister or the absence of another particular Minister. The important thing is the approach of the Executive to the Private Members' Business. If at all

any Minister has any other business, he must cancel the other business and attend to the Business of this House when a particular business pertaining to the subject of that Cabinet Minister is taken into consideration in this House. It is the bounden duty of the Minister in charge of that particular Ministry to be present here. Since they are not attaching any importance to it, nobody is here. Why? Why should we be here? The Government is attaching no importance to this business. If the Government has attached some importance when the Private Members' Business is taken into consideration, if the Cabinet Minister is present, then the other Members will also be present here. Now, it has come to such a stage that the Resolution moved by a Member from Kerala is to be supported by the Members from Kerala only.

There are 545 Members in this House. Kerala is having only 20 Members. It comes to only three per cent of this House. Nobody is interested in this Business. Nobody will come. A Member from Kerala moves a Resolution and mostly another Member from Kerala is supporting it. All the Members from Kerala are here. We have to do it because we cannot lose it. This is the position.

If the Government had taken all these matters seriously, definitely more Members would have been present here. Now, they think that it is only a ritual matter like offering a *pooja* in a temple. We are performing a ritual as if we are doing a *pooja* in a temple.

Sir, I do not have any dispute with you. You are perfectly all right. I do not dispute that fact. But the question that I am raising is about the approach of the Executive towards Private Members' Business. The Prime Minister is expected to be here when Government Business is taken up and he has to reply.

Sir, after all, what is parliamentary democracy? As we all know, tolerance is the essence of parliamentary democracy. The Executive must have tolerance to hear the views expressed here. They may not like it, but the essence of parliamentary democracy is that divergent opinions and different kind of opinions must be expressed here. What is the cornerstone of parliamentary democracy? It is openness, plural society and not one view, but divergent views also will have to be taken into consideration with a tolerant approach. Where is the tolerant approach now?

Now, we are discussing a matter which is against the declared policy of the Government. According to them, that policy may be correct, but even then the Government is bound to hear divergent views. The policy decision is taken by the Government and presented here. But they are not interested in hearing the opposite side. So, why should I be here? Why should I waste my energy? Should it become a futile exercise? With all humility I want to ask this question to the Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan, Shri Suresh Kurup has drawn the attention of the Government to this point at the beginning of this debate and now you are also drawing the attention of the Government to the same point.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : Sir, as per rules, they can argue that a Minister is present. If that is the way of doing things, it is all right. I, once again, repeat that if the Executive had taken a serious view of the matter, definitely more Members would have been present here. Now we all know that nobody is interested and nobody is taking a serious view of the matter.

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA : Shri Thirunavukkarasar is a capable Minister.

SHRI SU THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: He is talking about other Members, not about the Minister.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : I do not challenge the ability of the Minister. I have the greatest regard for him and I have the greatest regard for the Labour Minister also who is present here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Deputy-Speaker has disposed of this matter. Kindly proceed ahead now.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : Sir, hereafter, they should make a serious attempt to see that Private Members are not treated in this manner, without any seriousness. The Government should, at least, convince us that they are equally serious about Private Members' Business transacted on every Friday. Today, we are discussing Resolutions. The next Friday, we will be discussing Private Members' Bills. Through these Bills and Resolutions, we are bringing up certain policy matters. We are trying to bring about some social change by bringing up Resolutions like this. That is the purpose for which a Private Member's Bill is introduced here and same is the purpose for which a Private Member's Resolution is introduced. They are introduced here with a specific motive. But, unfortunately, they are not taken into consideration seriously by the Executive. The tendency has gone to such an extent that nobody is interested and nobody takes any serious view of the matters raised here.

Now, the subject of this particular Resolution is a very serious one. We all know that privatisation creates many problems. All the public sector undertakings were instituted and were functioning under a statute.

17.00 hrs.

The State Government as well as the Central Government jointly cooperate in taking over a private undertaking. As Shri Suresh Kurup pointed out, the State Government will be prepared to give even forest land worth crores of rupees. Even properties are surrendered under a Memorandum of Understanding entered into between the State Government and the Central Government for opening a public sector undertaking. When this undertaking is disinvested, nobody takes care of the contribution made by the State Government. Thousands of acres of land worth crores of rupees are lost to the private sector. But who cares? There is no guarantee that the State would get

back the land that was donated free-of-cost when the public sector undertaking was started.

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA : The State Government provided enormous raw materials to the HNL.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : Thousands of acres of forest land were given to the Print Factory near Kottayam. Suppose that is disinvested, who will take care of the forest land? It will go to the private party who bids the highest amount. We will have to understand the very serious situation that is arising from this Act.

Even today, we are discussing the way in which the Indian Airlines is to be disinvested. There is a discussion in the Press about the Indian Airlines and the Air India. There is a dispute. It has been mentioned that the Air India will be able to fly its flights to foreign countries at a cheaper rate. Hitherto they were operating at a higher rate. Now they have come forward that they will operate it at a cheaper rate. Now private airlines have also been allowed to operate foreign flights. The sky is open to all for operation. Nobody can fear. Everybody can operate in the skies within the Indian territory. We will also fly. But nobody is concerned how it will end. The security of the State has not been taken into consideration. Even now that discussion is going on in the Press.

Last time, when privatisation of petroleum products was being discussed, we pointed out that the nationalisation of a petroleum company was done on the basis of a statute passed by this House. In utter disregard of that statute, the Ministry decided to disinvest the entire petroleum business. With what result? The Supreme Court intervened. The process was illegal. You cannot do it without the consent of the Parliament. So, they do not care for the consent of this House in the process of disinvestment. They are not worried. It is not a gift of the Supreme Court. The Supreme court simply pointed out the law passed by the Parliament. The Parliament passed the law for nationalising some foreign companies in India. To nationalise those foreign companies, we had to step in with a Central statute. That fact was not taken into consideration. In their haste of disinvestment process, they have done it. They do not consider about the involvement of the State in all these matters. They are not worried about the interests of the States. They are only concerned about the selling process alone. So, I fear that this will lead to a situation where nobody's position will be safe in India. So, I strongly oppose the policy of the Central Government in the matter of disinvestment.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL (LATUR): Sir, I am speaking for record and I realise that the attendance in the House is very poor. I am not speaking simply to criticise the Government. I do not want to take the pleasure in finding faults with the Government just for the sake of finding faults with them. I am not speaking for the publicity also. But I am speaking because I have a very strong conviction in certain matters.

I think, what I feel should form part of the record so that at some time in future, it may be looked into and then it can be assessed in the correct fashion. If what I say here creates an impact on the Government and helps the Government in taking decisions in correct manner, we would certainly be very happy.

Unfortunately, all important issues are being discussed in the period in which the Private Members' Business is being discussed. The important issues should be discussed in the period, which is available for the Government to discuss the important policy matters. When the Government Business period is there, we quarrel, we rivet our attention on petty matters and when there is nobody in the House, we take up the momentous issues.

The last Friday, we discussed the issue of unemployment, self-employment and as to how we can help the citizens in our country to help themselves to provide employment and self-employment. This time, we are considering again one very important policy matter relating to the privatisation.

I would like to make it very clear at the start itself that the Congress Party is not opposed to the concept of private people or private industry contributing towards the development of the economy of the country. It has to be borne in mind that it was the Congress Party, which allowed the entire agriculture to be in the hands of the private persons. It was the Congress Party, which allowed the entire trading activity to be continued by the private persons.

The small trade, the medium trade and the big trade, imports and exports are also with the private sector. Excepting for MMTC and STC and a few other such trading organisations, the entire trade is in the private hands. The industry is in the private hands. The entire industry – small-scale industry, medium-scale industry, big industry, and the consumer industry – is in private hands. It is only that industry is with the public sector in which the private sector was unwilling to enter into at the initial stages.

When the question of exploring the possibility of drawing oil from the earth was considered, the private sector was not willing and the Government could not have waited for the private sector to develop the intention, the desire and the strength to enter this area. Civil aviation was also in the private sector. When the Government asked the private sector to develop the civil aviation, they had expressed that they were not in a position to spend the money in civil aviation and that is why they would not be able to do that. Only then, the civil aviation industry was nationalised. And when it was nationalised, it was not retained with the Government officers, but it was given under the charge of Shri J.R.D. Tata, who was interested in development of the civil aviation industry.

Aeronautics was developed through the public sector because private sector was not willing to do that. The shipping industry was developed through the public sector because the private sector was not interested in doing that. So, it is only in those areas where the private sector was not interested or where the private sector felt that they could not wait for a long period of time to get the returns out of the investment they were going to make, the public sector units were established. All power generating stations in the country were developed through public sector and not through private sector. There are a few private sector power generating units in India. But, majority of the power generating units in the country were established through public sector. If we had not done that, electricity would not have been available to the farmers, to the industrialists and to the people living in the remote parts of our country. These public sector undertakings did generate electricity, and did give electricity to the people. If they had not done that, this kind of development we find today would not have taken place. Now, if we had waited for the private sector to invest in power generation, we would not have done that.

Sir, in Rajasthan the previous Governments had decided that the power should be generated with the help of the private sector. For 15 years they waited for the private sector to invest in power generation and for 15 years the investment was not done. And not even one single megawatt of electricity was added with all the good intentions of the Government and the Chief Ministers of that time. The policy was wrong. The private sector was not willing to invest and that is why not a single megawatt of electricity was added. When the previous Government, Shri Ashok Gehlot's Government, came there, he very rightly decided – I am sorry for him what he had done was not properly appreciated – that if the private sector was unwilling, the public sector will invest. And he did invest through public sector, and he did establish a capacity to produce nearly 1500 megawatts of electricity within the period within which it was expected to be completed from the date on which the job to establish the power generating units was started, and he saved some money also. Then, at the same time, he said if any private industry is willing to come to Rajasthan to generate power, they would give them the opportunity to do that. But, if they are not going there, they will do it on their own.

Sir, every time, when the power generation question arises in the House, I wanted to ask this question. The 9th Five Year Plan had a target of producing 48,000 megawatts of electricity. And this target was reduced to 28,000 megawatts of electricity. Even this target, which was reduced to 20,000 megawatts of electricity, could not be fulfilled. Why did it not happen? It was because the policy of the Government was to depend upon the investment to be done by the private sector. Once this decision was taken, the Government did not invest in power. Maharashtra Government relied upon ENRON. ENRON power is not available and public sector units are not established.

Then, how do we develop industries? How do we develop agriculture? How do we develop other activities if the power is not available? The Government is responsible for this.

In the past, they had said that where the private sector is unwilling, the public sector would enter and develop infrastructural facilities. Sir, we have banks and banks in our country. But let me say with all the responsibility at my command that these banks were not giving credit facilities to the agriculturists before the nationalisation of banks. When the banks were nationalised, only a sum of Rs. 200 crore of credit facilities was given to the agriculturists, Rs. 200 crore credit facilities to 70 per cent people in the country, and for the entire agriculture. After the nationalisation of banks, the directions were issued and because the banks were nationalised, those directions were implemented, and today we have a situation in which nearly 70,000 to 80,000 crores of rupees are given as credit facilities to agriculturists. If we had not nationalised the banks, this would not have happened. If this had not happened, we would not have become self-sufficient in foodgrains. Let us not forget it.

Who is going to invest in developing agriculture, irrigation facilities in the country? Is the private sector going to do it? If the private sector is not going to do it and if only 45 per cent of the land in our country is irrigated and the rest of the land is not irrigated, what has to be done? The public sector has to invest. If the public sector of the Government is not investing, we will not have agricultural facilities. I am making all these points to show that we have accepted the principle of mixed economy in which the private sector will have a dominant role to play and the public sector has an important role to play in the areas in which the private sector is not willing to enter. This has to be understood by the Government.

What is the present Government doing? What kind of policy is the Government following? I am sorry to say this, it pains me and I do not want to criticise the Government. If we do not criticise the Government even sitting on these benches, the Government will continue this policy. What kind of policy it is?

You are taking pride in privatising the public sector undertakings. Whose public sector undertakings are they? They do not belong to the Congress Party, nor do they belong to BJP and nor do they belong to the Ministers in the Disinvestment Ministry and the Finance Ministry. Let us understand this. They belong to the people. It was, with the people's money they were established. When the public sector undertakings were established, a lot of time, energy

and efforts were put in to plan, put in to see that the public sector undertakings came up.

You are sitting there and taking pride in putting your signature on a piece of paper and handing over these public sector undertakings to the biggest bidder in the society. Now, you will be able to do this only with respect to 300 or 400 public sector units that you have with yourself. What will you do afterwards? Why do you take pride and why do you think that intelligence is required to put your signature on a piece of paper? You do not have the capacity and efficiency to see that the public sector undertakings, which were established by your predecessors by putting in all the efforts, run properly. You are not able to make them earn profit. You are not able to introduce new technology and new methods of management. You are not able to attract more funds to these public sector undertakings to produce more. This speaks about your inefficiency. If we have to criticise the Government for non-performance, we will criticise the Government for non-performance in this manner.

We have these Public Sector Undertakings handed over to you. You are not able to run them properly. You are not only selling the Public Sector Undertakings which are making losses but also you are taking pride in saying that those which make profits should be disinvested. What is your logic? Because you say that in future if they start incurring losses, you would not be able to sell them. What a logic! What an incapacity! You do not have confidence in yourself that you will make them earn profit. What a logic! Everybody writes about it and we are expected to share about it. Simply, this is the trend you are following.

What is the trend today? The trend today is "I am very sorry to say" that the Government and the Public Sector Undertakings should be given to the private sector. I do not mind this. Even private sector is a national sector. But whom are you giving it? You are giving it to the selected ones. Now, we are very careful in not alleging things against you, but do not think that the people outside are shutting their eyes and not finding out what you are doing and why you are doing. A time may come when you will be made to answer as to why you did this. A time may come when you will be asked to say why you privatised these Public Sector Undertakings and gave it to the private sector. If the private sector companies are not working, then you give it to the foreign companies. Is this the way you would like to develop your economy?

Your policy is that the Public Sector Undertakings need to be given to the private sector, and the private sector companies need to be given to the foreign companies. If the foreign companies want to have a control over your activities, what will you do then? What kind of privatisation are you doing? You are privatising the shipyards. If you privatise the shipyards, you take it that you have lost control over the transport over the oceans. If you are privatising Air India and Indian Airlines, you take it that you have lost control over the skies. You are privatising the banks. You have lost control over the financial institutions, like the IDBI.

I am very happy and I am not finding fault at this point of time with the Finance Minister or the Government for that matter. The IDBI was an institution created to help the private industry in the country, for the development of the industry. It is for giving long-term loan and credit facility to the industry. You are now making it into a bank. When it is made into a bank, it will give money for purchasing cars, houses and such other things. But the funds will not be available for the development of the industry and for the development of the private industry in the name of which all the time you have been talking. Now, how will the private industry develop? I do not understand this. So, you are not only hitting at the banks or the financial institutions, but also you are creating a situation in which the private industry also will not develop. This is not correct.

Then what are you trying to do? You are suggesting that all the nationalised banks in which the Government of India has 51 per cent of the equity should be reduced to 31 per cent. Why are you doing this thing? There are many private banks. Let them increase their activities and go to all parts of the country.

I know that the Ministry of Finance had given directions to all the urban banks saying that 40 per cent of their credit should go to the rural areas and 18 per cent of the credit should be available to the agriculture. This direction of the Ministry of Finance could not be followed. This direction could not create the result which the Government of India wanted to create. You have some Public Sector banks with you. You will be able to tell them that look, here is a section of the society to which the finances are required and you shall have to give the financial facilities. You are not doing it. You are taking pride. Everybody is taking pride by saying that I want to disinvest Rs.10,000 crore worth of Public Sector Undertakings every year. It does not require any intelligence. It does not require any efforts. It requires only insensitivity in the mind, not realising that these Public Sector Undertakings are really built with the money which is given by the people of the country, and you are handing over these Public Sector Undertakings to a few persons.

Now, this kind of insensitivity is not going to help you. People are not going to appreciate it. Those people who are going to get some benefit out of it will appreciate it. They will appreciate it but the common man in the country will not appreciate it. You are not creating jobs, you are not establishing industry, you are not giving money for the industrial development and you are not spending money for developing such other infrastructural facilities like power generation. This will not help you.

That is why, the Government of India has no policy of privatisation. Time and again, we got up on the floor of the House and said from this place that what is your policy. Let us understand. We are not opposed to handing over some public sector undertaking to somebody if it has to be done. But let us understand what is the logic, what is the reason, what is the plan, what is the design behind this kind of activity of ours. They say that we do not have a policy but we will be able to do it. How? I do not understand it. Why are you doing it? Nobody understands it. For instance, Mumbai and Delhi Airports are to be privatised. Why privatise? Is it because the Government of India is not able to do it? May I tell you that this privatisation is for the land and not for anything else? I am not entering into the area of civil aviation.

In Mumbai, JRD Tata himself said that some two lakh hectares of land should be given for establishing international airport on the main land and let it be done by the private sector. Why should it not be done by the private sector? Why should the private sector grab the existing international airports in Mumbai or Delhi? By all means give them the land, give them money and give them the authority to get the technology cooperation from anywhere. But you do not allow them grabbed the existing PSUs. It is not a privatising activity, it is a grabbing activity and it is an exploiting activity. We are opposed to it. Any private person with a bold heart coming forward and saying that "I will do this", let him do that. Do not obstruct him from doing that. But what are you doing? Have you realised the fact that by this kind of disinvestment, you are not adding to any capacity at all? If you are handing over the Cochin Shipyard to private persons, you are not adding to any capacity to the ship building capacity of the country. You are just transferring it to them. Now, if a private man, who is going to take it over, is ready to build new shipyard give him the land, give him money and say that you develop an ultra-modern shipyard yourself. That would be adding to the capacity. You will have this capacity and you will have added to that capacity. If you build international airport at Mumbai or Delhi or Kolkata or Chennai or Bangalore, you would have added to that capacity and you would not have limited their capacity. The private sector's capacity to add to the wealth of the country should be utilised and should not utilised in such a fashion that even the existing capacity can be exploited by anybody.

Now, I come to the issue of turning the IDBI into a bank. You may be there and I may not be there, but you will create a situation in which this bank will not function as the financial institution and the industry will suffer. Why do you not allow the private sector to have their own financial institutions and collect the money and give the money to others? Why should they grab the existing IDBI? Why should they grab this Cochin shipyard? Why should they take over Mumbai or Delhi Airports? Let them develop the capacity. By all means, help them. But here you have no desire, no imagination, no vision as to how the future is going to develop. You are taking pride in handing over the property, which was built by your predecessor, to a few persons in the society at the cost of the majority of the people in the industry, in the trade and the common man also. Now, we are objecting to this.

We are not objecting to the privatisation exercise. I am of the view that any iota of strength which is available with the private individual and which can be used for the development of the economy in the country should be used. You give him the freedom, give him the strength; inspire him to do it. But you are not doing it. You are just transferring the existing assets of the Government to the private persons and to also only a few private persons in the name of strategic purchasers, that means according to you the purchasers who are able to take it over and run it properly. This is not correct. You are not doing justice to the country. This is not good governance. This is the declaration of inefficiency of your governance to the people at large that you are not even able to run the public sector undertakings – those public sector undertakings which you have not developed but which others have developed and handed over to you.

You are declaring at the top of your voice, from the top of the South Block that 'We are not capable of running it and you have to make it over'. Tomorrow you will say that – 'we are not capable of running this Government, you have to make them; we are not capable of making the laws, you have to take it over; we are capable of running the defence of the country, you have to take it over'. This is what happened in the past. This is exactly what happened in the past. In the past we gave the land, then we gave the treasury and then we gave the defence machinery to the foreigners and that is why you were ruled for 150 years by others. You yourself were handing it over.

If you are handing over the shipyards, if you are handing over the airports, if you are handing over the banks, if you are handing over even the intelligence agencies to the foreign countries, it would be difficult. You should cooperate. I am not against cooperation. I am against handing over. I am against playing a secondary role in this respect. If you do not have control over the ocean, if you do not have control over the space, if you do not have control over your financial institutions, if you do not have control over the agencies, you will not be successful.

Take the case of Hindustan Fertilisers and Chemicals Limited. We have brought about a Green revolution. How could the Green revolution be brought about? The Green revolution was brought about by using new technology, using new kind of fertilisers, using new kind of agricultural practices. If fertiliser is not available, you allow any private person to produce fertilizer. There is no bar. But why are you handing it over? I would not object to this so much as objecting to handing over the Cochin shipyard to others and about other things also.

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA : The workers' cooperative of Cochin Shipyard is ready to take it over and run it. Please permit them. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Yes. ...(*Interruptions*)

What is the guarantee that these things will work? Have you forgotten that the entire textile industry and jute industry were in private hands? The entire textile industry and jute industry were in private hands. The entire textile industry and jute industry did suffer in the past and when it was suffering in the hands of the private persons, it was taken over by the Government and the NTC was created. The same thing is going to happen to the sugar cooperatives also in many parts of the country. What is the guarantee that the private sector will not go sick, the private sector will be able to cope up with the difficulties which that industry will be facing? If you have no guarantee of this kind, why are you doing these things? What is making you to do these things?

We are very careful and we are very responsible in not alleging anything against you. But you know that nobody feels that this is done with a clean conscience. I am not saying against any individual as such. You may not get the returns immediately after the transfers. But you may get returns when you need the returns to manage the elections and if you are managing the elections in this fashion you may get the money; but if the people understand this, you will not get the votes. If you get the votes that will be very temporary because the very basis of this is not correct. You are not doing it in a correct manner. This is not done for good reasons. That is why this is happening.

Unfortunately, when nobody is here, we are talking about it and whatever we say will be lost in the thin air – it may be on the record – and the Government would not be required to respond in any fashion. They would say that they did not hear. The Minister may say 'I do not understand. I am not required to reply to it. Why is the time to be wasted in replying to this kind of an argument? This is not in tune with the present times.' Now, what is not in tune with the present time? The policies which you are trying to adopt, let me tell you, are not the policies which the IMF and the World Bank are wanting you to do. If you attend the discussions in the World Bank and the IMF also, you will find that they are not for this kind of policy. Maybe, you are getting dictates and some suggestions from here and there and you are following them, but if you go there and attend their proceedings also, you will find that this kind of policy is not helping any country. What happened to Mexico? What happened to Brazil? What happened to Argentina? They followed this kind of policy. They have not come out of their economic difficulties.

श्रम मंत्री (डॉ. साहिब सिंह वमा) : शिवराज जी, ये जो आप उदाहरण दे रहे हैं, यह सब आपने ही शुरू किया था और अब इस सारे मामले पर एजीटेटेड हैं। ये आपके ही द्वारा बोए गए बीज हैं।

श्री शिवराज वी. पाटिल : बिल्कुल सही है। यह चुनाव के अंदर बोलने के लिए बहुत अच्छा है। आपने जो सवाल उठाया वह बहुत अच्छा है। मैं उसका जवाब देना चाहूंगा। आपके और हमारे निजीकरण में इतना ही फर्क है कि आप कहते हैं कि एक्सीस्टिंग पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडरटेकिंग्स का विनिवेश करो और हमारा निजीकरण यह कहता है कि लोगों के पास जो भी ताकत है, उस ताकत का इस्तेमाल करके देश की आर्थिक नीति मजबूत बनाने का प्रयत्न करो। उसके अंदर अंतर मत करो। हमने यह नहीं कहा था, हमने तो कहा है कि सिविल एवीएशन में लाना है तो उनको चलाने दो जितने जहाज वे चलाना चाहते हैं और बनाने दो जितने एयरपोर्ट वे प्राइवेट सेक्टर में बनाना चाहते हैं। हमने यह नहीं किया कि जो सरकार के पास है, 300-300 करोड़ रुपए साल का जो प्राफिट दे रही है, उसको हेंडओवर कर दो। हमने यह नहीं किया था कि जो बैंक 200 करोड़ रुपए एग्रीकल्चर का लोन नहीं देता था, वह आज 70,000-80,000 करोड़ रुपए का लोन दे रहा है, उसको भी डी नेशनलाइज करो। प्राइवेट बैंक बनाने के लिए जितनी आपको अनुमति देनी है, वह दो। मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमने एक बार कमेटी में पूछा था कि क्या सरकार ने यह आर्डर निकाला है कि 40 प्रतिशत प्राइवेट बैंक ग्रामीण विकास के लिए, 18 प्रतिशत कृषि के लिये देंगे। इस पर उन्होंने कहा कि हमारे पास ब्रांचेज कहां हैं, हम नहीं दे सकते। आपका निदेश होगा, लेकिन हम फिजीकली उसको फालो नहीं कर सकते, इसलिए हम क्या करें। यह बहुत आसान तरीका है। पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स को कहने के लिए कोई नहीं आया। कोई भी हिमालय के फुटहिल्स एरिया में, सिंधुयारी, विंध्यारी एरिया में या ईस्टर्न-वैस्टर्न कोस्ट में या राजस्थान के रेगिस्तानी एरिया में नहीं जाएगा, क्योंकि वहां प्राफिट नहीं है। वहां सर्विस हो सकती है, लेकिन वहां नुकसान है।

नार्थ-ईस्ट स्टेट्स के लिए वायुदूत चलाया जा रहा था। उसमें दस करोड़ रुपए का नुकसान होता था। इंडियन एयरलाइंस हर साल टैक्स देने के बाद करीब-करीब 300 करोड़ रुपए का नेट प्राफिट दे रहा था। वह बजट में से एक पैसा भी नहीं ले रहा था, लेकिन आप इंडियन एयरलाइंस के निजीकरण की बात कर रहे हैं और वायुदूत आपने बंद कर दिया। मुझे बहुत दुख होता है यह कहते हुए कि वहां के कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि ये हिन्दुस्तानी न हमारे लिए सड़कें बनाते हैं, न रेल चलाते हैं, एक जहाज चल रहा था, वह भी बंद कर दिया। जैसे कि वे हिन्दुस्तानी भाई नहीं हैं, हिन्दुस्तान के बाशिंदे नहीं हैं। यह ध्यान में रखना चाहिए। जिस सरकार को यह मालूम नहीं है कि दस करोड़ रुपए का नुकसान सहन करके वायुदूत चलाना उस एरिये के लिए जरूरी था, क्योंकि वहां भी हमारे भाई रहते हैं, वह पहाड़ी एरिया है, रेल नहीं है, जल्दी सड़क नहीं बन सकती, कोई हवाईजहाज नहीं जा सकता तो उसको तो चालू रखना चाहिए था। यह समझ कर सरकार की तरफ से इस देश को एक रखने के लिए, नार्थ-ईस्ट स्टेट्स ब्रदर्स को एक रखने के लिए आपने अहम कदम उठाया होता, तो हम आपको सही कहते। लेकिन आपने यह नहीं किया और वायुदूत बंद कर दिया। वहां पर प्राइवेट आदमी जाने के लिए तैयार नहीं है, आप उसके साथ कानूनन जबर्दस्ती नहीं कर सकते। लेकिन सरकार के नाते, जनता के प्रतिनिधि होने के नाते आप ऐसा कर सकते थे। दस करोड़ रुपए का नुकसान खास नुकसान नहीं होता है, जबकि इंडियन एयरलाइंस 300 करोड़ रुपए का नेट प्राफिट दे रही थी। इंटरनेशनल एयरपोर्ट अथॉरिटी मुम्बई और दिल्ली की वजह से 150 करोड़ रुपये का लाभ हर र्वा दे रही थी टैक्स देने के बाद, वही लाभ आप दूसरों को दे रहे हैं। आखिर वजह क्या है? मुम्बई और दिल्ली में आप नये एयरपोर्ट बनाइये जैसे आप बंगलौर में बना रहे हैं, तो हर्ज नहीं है। लेकिन आप शिपयार्ड देंगे, कोचीन शिपयार्ड दे देंगे, कलकत्ता का शिपयार्ड दे देंगे, हवाई जहाज बनाने का काम अगर आप बंद कर देंगे तो यह क्या देश को चलाने की पद्धति है। दूसरा कोई इकोनोमिक सोवरेनिटी आपसे लेने के लिए नहीं आ रहा है, आप ही इकोनोमिक सोवरेनिटी का बोझा अपने कंधे पर उठाने में समर्थ नहीं है, ऐसा लग रहा है। आप कह रहे हैं कि हम नहीं चला सकते हैं, इनको दे देंगे। क्या, किसको दे देंगे। वह भी एक ही कुएं में से आया हुआ पानी है दो अलग-अलग बाल्टियों में आया होगा। वे चला सकते हैं तो आप क्यों नहीं चला सकते हैं? मुझे तो बहुत नीचे सिर करके बात करनी पड़ती है जब हम कहते हैं कि हम पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडरटेकिंग्स नहीं चला सकते हैं। अगर पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडरटेकिंग्स नहीं चला सकते हैं तो क्या सरकार चला सकते हैं? आप प्राइवेट में सब कुछ देते ही जा रहे हैं। आपके दिल में भी वही बात होगी, जो मेरे दिल में है, मेरे दिल के लोगों के दिल में है। जैसा हम सोचते हैं वैसा आप भी सोचते होंगे। हम यहां पर आपसे कोई शब्द कहना नहीं चाहते कि आप हमारी बात यहां उठाएं। लेकिन आप अपने दिल से पूछियेगा कि यह जो हो रहा है क्या सही हो रहा है, दूरदृष्टि से देश के लिए क्या यह सही हो रहा है? आपको अपने दिल से उत्तर मिलेगा, नहीं। कुछ ऑफिसर्स लोग भी वही कहते हैं, कुछ मीडिया के लोग भी वही कहते हैं, कुछ मिनिस्टर लोग भी वही कहते हैं। हम प्राइवेटाइजेशन के खिलाफ नहीं है।

आप एक-एक अंश प्राइवेट आदमी के पास जो शक्ति का है वह उपयोग कीजिए। लेकिन जो इस सिचुएशन को एक्सप्लोइट करना चाहते हैं, इसका नाजायज फायदा लेना चाहते हैं उनको मत आने दीजिए।

मुझे तो दुःख होता है कि इतने बुद्धिमान लोग, जिनके लिए हमारे दिल में आदर की भावना है but you take pride in saying that you disinvested this thing. What did you do? What kind of intelligence efforts were made by you? You were just required to put the signature. आप एक कोओपरेटिव सोसाइटी बनाकर चलाइये, हम मान लेंगे। इतना बनाकर आपको दे दिया और आप उन्हें डिस्मेंटल करने जा रहे हैं और उसमें 5 गाइड फील कर रहे हैं कि I did it.

हमारे पास 300 के करीब पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स हैं। उनको बेचने के बाद क्या करोगे, आप कैसे काम करोगे। आप एनपीए भी वसूल कर लें, तो भी आपको डिस-इंवेस्टमेंट करने की जरूरत नहीं पड़ेगी, टैक्स भी इकट्ठा कर लें तो आपको डिस-इंवेस्टमेंट करने की जरूरत नहीं पड़ेगी। मगर गुड गवर्नंस का नारा देने वाले लोग ऐसी सिचुएशन का निर्माण कर रहे हैं कि टैक्स भी वसूल जल्दी से न हो, एनपीए भी वसूल जल्दी से न हो। टैक्स वसूल करने के लिए अगर चार लैवल की कोर्ट्स हैं तो आप उन्हें पांच लैवल्स की कोर्ट बना रहे हैं। जो काम 10 साल में हो सकता है शायद वह 12-13 सालों में हो। क्या इसी को आप गुड-गवर्नंस कहते हैं, इसी को आप कहते हैं कि देश के हित में काम कर रहे हैं। आपने जो रिपोर्ट दी है - मिड-टर्म असेसमेंट की, उसमें न डेफिसिट कम हुआ है न debt-burden कम हुआ है, न दिया हुआ पैसा खर्च हुआ है, फिर भी आप गुड-गवर्नंस की बात कर रहे हैं। इसी की वजह से आपको पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडरटेकिंग्स को बेचने की नौबत आ रही है। आपके सामने एक ही नुस्खा है जिंदा तिलिस्मात का, एक ही पैनेशिया है कि डिस-इंवेस्टमेंट करो। कितना करोगे डिस-इंवेस्टमेंट? आप 300 पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडरटेकिंग्स डिस-इंवेस्टमेंट करोगे तो आपको 5-6 लाख करोड़ रुपया मिलेगा, उसके बाद क्या आप संसद की बिल्डिंग को बेच दोगे, साउथ-ब्लॉक और नार्थ-ब्लॉक बेच दोगे। पावर नहीं बनाएंगे, एजुकेशन नहीं देंगे, लोगों को नयी तकनीक नहीं देंगे, बैंकों से पैसा नहीं देंगे, प्रोडक्शन नहीं बढ़ाएंगे और डिस-इंवेस्टमेंट करके सरकार चलाएंगे - यह कोई तरीका नहीं है। इसकी भी यहां चर्चा होनी चाहिए। मैं यहां विल्डरनैस में बोल रहा हूँ। इसका कोई मतलब नहीं है लेकिन मैं जानबूझकर यहां बोलकर जा रहा हूँ। यहां चार-पांच लोग बैठे हैं

इसके बाद भी मैं बोल रहा हूँ, क्योंकि अन्य अवसरों में बोलने का मौका नहीं मिलता है। छोटी-छोटी चीजें उठाई जाती हैं। इस अहम मसले पर आज बोलने का मौका मिला है और यह बात रिकार्ड पर रहनी चाहिए, ताकि आगे आने वाले समय में, दुनिया से हमारे जाने के बाद, अगर कोई चर्चा निकालकर देखना चाहे, तो जान सके कि जो बोला था, वह सही था या नहीं।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Minister may reply now.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Sir, we have no objection to the Minister's reply, but he himself had stated that let the Minister of Disinvestment reply to the debate. We can wait for that reply because the Minister may not have the feel of it. After all, he is briefed, he is quite capable and he will certainly reply, but let it come from the heart and let it come from the core of the problem. If he feels like replying, we have no objection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have to decide that.

SHRI SU THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am not insisting that I should reply to the debate. It is left to the House. If you feel that the concerned Cabinet Minister should come because you want to hear from him, then you can do like that.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : This does not mean that we have any objection to your replying to the debate. We just mean that after all you are holding a brief for him. If he replies, it would be better. Let him reply. We are not on small issues, we are on basic issues.

SHRI SU THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: I am leaving it to the House. Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Members who have spoken and participated in the discussion and yourself have to decide this. If you decide like that, you can take it up next time. If you want me to reply, I am ready to reply.

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA : Let the Disinvestment Minister come and give the reply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have started this discussion at 1550 hours. The time is over for this. We have to extend the time for this, if you are going to take it up in the next session.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : It does not matter, Sir. The Minister can reply later on. Since there is hardly ten minutes time, you can either adjourn the House or take up some other resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have to extend the time by half-an-hour so that the Minister can reply.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : We are not objecting to you. Please do not misunderstand us.

SHRI SU THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: What is the decision, Sir? Should I start the reply?

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHARY : Sir, our contention is that he is not concerned with the Ministry and the Minister himself acknowledged that it would be better if the reply could be given by the Minister concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As per rules, it is difficult because if you have to adjourn this debate, then it will come only in the

next Session.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Is there only one Friday and not two?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next Friday, the House will be taking up Private Members' Bills and, therefore, it will have to be taken up in the next Session.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Let it come in the next Session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House can decide it. Is it the pleasure of the House that this debate should be adjourned and taken up in the next Session?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Let it come in the next Session. It can be carried on to the next Session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, I will put the question formally.

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA : Till then, these institutions should not be sold out. महोदय, जवाब से पहले तो ये तीनों संस्थाओं को बेच लेंगे।

17.47 hrs.

Motion Re: Adjournment of Debate

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the debate on the resolution regarding privatisation of Central Public Sector Undertakings by Shri Suresh Kurup be adjourned to the first day allotted to the Private Members' Resolutions in the next Session."

The motion was adopted.- - - -

17.48 hrs.

Motion Under Rule 388

Re: Suspension of Rules 30 and 29

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the provisions of sub-rule (1) of rule 30 and the proviso to rule 29 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in their application to the debate on the resolution regarding privatisation of Central Public Sector Undertakings by Shri Suresh Kurup which has been adjourned today to the first day allotted for Private Members' Resolutions in the next Session, be suspended to enable the Resolution to be set down in the List of Business without Ballot as the first item therein."

The motion was adopted.

DR. SAHIB SINGH VERMA: The reply of the Minister will be given on that day.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, Shri Suresh Chandel to move his Resolution. - - - - Not present.

Shrimati Renuka Chowdhury to move her Resolution. - Not present.

Shri Sunil Khan to move his Resolution. - Not present.

The House stands adjourned to meet on Monday, the 15th of December, 2003 at 11 a.m.

17.50 hrs

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock
on Monday, December 15, 2003/Agrahayana 24, 1925 (Saka).*
