

Title: Discussion regarding disinvestment of Public Sector Undertakings.

1609 hours

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): Sir, at the outset, I would like to state that this is for the second time that I am initiating a discussion on the Disinvestment Policy, rather the outright sale of our public sector undertakings. The concept of public sector was adopted after the Government of India adopted the Industrial Policy Resolution in 1948. Then again, after it adopted the Industrial Policy Resolution in 1956.

(d3/1610/spr-hcb)

Since then, in our country the edifice of public sector has been built up. In the name of disinvestment, in the name of distress sale, the Government of India is dismantling and demolishing the public sector undertakings. These public sector undertakings have contributed towards our industrial development. When we achieved Independence, at that point of time, the industrialists in our country were not in a position to build up heavy industries. Then, the Government had to decide that some of the sectors would be under the public sector. Then, we have seen that in our country the Steel Authority of India came up, a number of oil companies came up, and heavy industries under the public sector also came up. They have contributed towards the economic independence of our country.

Today, after 53 years of our Independence, if we say that these public sector undertakings are burden in our country, they are drain in our country, it is not correct. During these 53 years, the total amount invested in public sector is about Rs.2 lakh crore. But out of this, what is the contribution of the Government? The budgetary support is only Rs.27,000 crore, and the rest is internal resources and the loans taken by the public sector undertakings. These PSUs are now being maligned. What are the contributions of these PSUs? The policy of reforms was adopted in 1991. In 1991, the form of dividend, corporate tax, excise duty, customs duty and other duties contributed to the Central Exchequer Rs.9520 crore; in 1991-92, Rs.19,721 crore; in 1992-93, Rs.22,449 crore; in 1993-94, Rs.22,988; in 1994-95, Rs.27,472 crore; in 1995-96, Rs.30,878 crore; 1996-97, Rs.37,447 crore.

(e3/1615/ksp/rpm)

The total amount contributed by the public sector undertakings was Rs.1,80,505 crore. So, these Central public sector undertakings have contributed about Rs.2 lakh crore to the Central Government. In spite of that, they are being maligned as they are a drain or a burden on the economy. If the share are disinvested or sold at throwaway prices, what will be the impact on our return?

Sir, in 1992, the interest expenditure which was saved after the shares were invested, it was Rs.263.40 crore. But the return foregone was Rs.266.78 crore. So, what was saved in that particular year was less than what was foregone as return. In 1993, the interest expenditure saved was Rs.436 crore and the return foregone was Rs.394.88 crore. In 1994, the interest expenditure saved was Rs.436.97 crore and the return foregone was Rs.470.17 crore. In 1995, the interest expenditure saved was Rs.892.12 crore and the return foregone was Rs.976.27 crore. In 1996, the interest expenditure saved was Rs.908.90 crore and the return foregone was Rs.1,415.18 crore. In 1997, the interest expenditure saved was Rs.946.43 crore and the return foregone was Rs.1,783.91 crore.

Sir, as per the survey of public sector enterprises, although the investment is Rs.2,30,000 crore in the public sector undertakings since inception, the combined equity of the Central public sector undertakings was Rs.77.66 crore in the year 1998-99 and the amount the Government of India held in that particular year was Rs.64.68 crore. Thus, the bulk of the remaining amount made up of loans was to the tune of Rs.1,49,779 crore. So, what is being stated by the Government that a huge amount is blocked in our 243 public sector undertakings is not correct. But if we see the amount blocked in the private sector, it is much more than what is blocked in all these Central public sector undertakings. The amount blocked like that is not less than Rs.62,000 crore. If we add the amount which is there as non-performing asset, it comes to Rs.58,000 crore.

(f3/1620/ss/rjs)

Thus, the amount blocked in public sector undertakings is much less than what is there in the hands of the private sector. In spite of that, the public sector undertakings are being maligned. It is being said that they are a drain on the economy. And because of that, the shares of the public sector undertakings should be sold out at throw-away prices. But the Government is saying that they are following the policy adopted by the earlier Government in 1990. They are following the policy of the Congress Government as well as of the United Front Government.

I would like to refer to an article written by the 'Father of the Reforms', Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao. It appeared in the *Times of India* of 5th March, 2000. Do not sell the house to pay the grocer's bill. Here I would quote what Shri

Narasimha Rao has said:

"To put it bluntly, the sale is certainly not the next generation of disinvestment. Let us not dilute ourselves. Sale is expropriation of the nation, pure and simple. "

This is what the Father of the Reforms has stated.

Now, I have got with me the 'Common Minimum Programme' of the United Front Government. What has been stated by the United Front Government in that Programme? In regard to public sector, the United Front Government will help to make the public sector strong and competitive. In a competitive and technology driven economy, there is no room for monopolies and inefficiency.

Regarding disinvestment, the question of withdrawing public sector from non-core and non-strategic areas will be carefully examined. As a part of such efforts, revenues will be earmarked to create an investment fund which will be used to strengthen other public sector enterprises. Then, efforts will be made to rehabilitate and revive sick industries to protect the interests of the workers.

Shri Murasoli Maran had been a Minister of Industry in the United Front Government. Now, he is the Minister of Commerce and Industry. When this question was raised in Parliament, he stated:

"I want to make it very clear that we are not doing privatisation at all. I know it very well that privatisation, as it happened in the erstwhile Soviet Union or East European countries, is unthinkable in the near future in India."

(g3/1625/rs/hng)

1625 hours (Dr. Laxminarayan Pandeya *in the Chair*)

"So, we should make them more effective. What we are doing is a limited exercise of disinvestment. "

I would like to know whether this Government is following the same policy. What they repeatedly said is that they were following the policy of the previous Government.

In the other House, in reply to a question whether the Government have decided to disinvest the share of profit making central public sector enterprises, the reply given was that the disinvestment is carried out by the Government in accordance with its declared disinvestment policy. What is the declared disinvestment policy? There is no separate policy for disinvestment of profit making central public sector enterprises.

What was stated by the former Industry Minister of the United Front Government was that 'we are not doing privatisation at all. What we are doing is a limited exercise of disinvestment.' I want to know this from the hon. Minister of Disinvestment. Now, he is the sole authority. He will decide about the petroleum companies. He will decide about the public sector undertakings under other Ministries. A post has been created in the Cabinet to sell out our public sector undertakings. A post has been created to handover our *Navratnas* to the multinational companies. A post has been created to handover our *Navratnas* to the monopoly industrialists...(*Interruptions*)

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA (CONTAI): China is also doing that.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): I would request him not to refer to China. Are they doing what China is doing? China has not retrenched a single worker. I would like to know what their Government is doing.

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA (CONTAI): I am talking about the multinationals there.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): They have not opened our doors.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA): Shri Acharia, please address the Chair.

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT (AJMER): What has happened to Russia?

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): Sir, I would like to know what is their declared policy. The Disinvestment Commission was founded during the United Front Government. That was incorporated in its Common Minimum Programme.

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA (GUNA): No country has opened its doors.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): China has not opened its doors like them.

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA (GUNA): China has restricted itself into special economic zones.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): I have visited China with a delegation in 1993 where our present Prime Minister was also with the delegation. The former Prime Minister was...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair, Shri Acharia.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): I would like to know what is the declared policy. Is there any transparency? There is no transparency.

(h3/1630/lh-sb)

It was stated in the Common Minimum Programme that there would be transparency in regard to the functioning of the Disinvestment Commission and Parliament would be able to know as to what is going on. Is there any transparency? There is no transparency in their functioning. What is the present policy of the Government? I want to know whether the same policy, which was there at the time of the earlier Government, is being pursued.

Now, I will tell you as to how Parliament is also being bypassed. Sir, 112 Members of Parliament belonging to various political parties -- Congress, Left Group, Samajwadi Party, AIADMK, RPI, RJD, and other Opposition parties -- have submitted a Memorandum to the Prime Minister. We are yet to receive a reply to our Memorandum. 112 Members belonging to several parties have expressed their apprehension and wanted to know how the share is evaluated.

There is a classic case of IPCL, Indian Petro Chemical Corporation. IPCL is one of the *navratnas*. Now, there was an advertisement. There were four bidders. IOC is one of the public sector undertakings. It was also one of the bidders. I will tell as to how the share has been evaluated. What has been decided is that 25 per cent of the share of IPCL would be disinvested to a strategic partner, the share value should be not less than Rs.500. But in the case of IPCL, what has been decided is that the share value would be Rs.125. I want to know as to how the Ministry of Disinvestment have come to a conclusion that the share value should be Rs.125 only.

Sir, by disinvesting 25 per cent of the share, there is a proposal to hand over the management of the company also to Reliance company. The Government is interested to hand over one of the giant public sector undertakings and one of the *navratnas* to Reliance. What has been stated by the Disinvestment Commission is this. It is given in page 24 of its Report, Seventh Report, on disinvestment of IPCL. It says:

(j3/1635/mmn-har)

"Every care should be taken while pre-qualifying the bidders to ensure that strategic sale does not lead to market dominance by a single player."

But here Reliance has been selected as one of the prospective strategic partners for the purpose of disinvestment of management control. What will happen? What will happen to the price? When Disinvestment Commission has categorically stated that this should not lead to market dominance by a single player, what the Government of India is doing? It is doing in the opposite direction. Why? Why the value of the share has been reduced? What is the motive behind taking decisions to hand over the ownership of the company to Reliance? The Minister will clarify this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA): Shri Basu Deb Acharya, many Members have to participate. You have already taken more than 25 minutes.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): I know, Sir, but this is a very important subject. I am initiating the debate. I will take more time. I should get at least 45 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How much time will you take?

SHRI SURESH KURUP (KOTTAYAM): He should be given sufficient time.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): I need sufficient time. I have many more points.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be brief and conclude.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): I am not repeating.

SHRI SAHIB SINGH (OUTER DELHI): You have repeated the point regarding *Navratna*.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): No, I am not repeating. You have not heard me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): Why is the ownership being changed? Why, out of 243 Public Sector Undertakings, 107 are incurring losses? These 107 Public Sector Undertakings are not PSUs from the inception. All these Undertakings were taken over units. So, they were all under the private sector. When the owners of the companies closed down the units, the Government of India took over them to save the workers. The industry was taken over and it was nationalised. But after nationalisation, what was to be done, that was not done. No modernisation was done. No investment was made. As a result of that, these Undertakings are incurring losses. But, there are a number of PSUs about which I have already mentioned that they have contributed to the Government exchequer as dividend and as corporate taxes. That amount is not less. They have paid a dividend of more than Rs.46,000 crore. Also, their performance is not bad. If we go unit by unit, their performance is not bad. How much money is required? What is the purpose of disinvestment? What we were told was that there was no money, no fund to make our PSUs viable. Fund is required to make the PSUs viable.

(k3/1640/dva/skb)

The Government have got more than Rs.19,000 crore out of the disinvestment of these shares. More than Rs.19,000 crore! We would like to know how much has been spent for the revival of the PSUs, how much has been spent for the social sector, and how much for health and education. The Government or the Minister should give us this figure. He may say that his job is to sell.

उसे बेचारे को बेचने के लिये मंत्री बनाया गया है। उनका काम नहीं है कि जो पैसा आयेगा वह पैसा कैसे इस्तेमाल होगा।

His job is to sell! His job is to sell, as a distress sale. The Prime Minister said that this was not a distress sale. Why is this not a distress sale? The hon. Minister of Finance announced that the Government of India needs Rs.10,000 crore during the year 2000-2001. He wants Rs.10,000 crore to meet the fiscal deficit. The financial target has been fixed. Once a financial target is fixed, when the big bull and the foreign multi-national companies know that the Government is in dire need of Rs.10,000 crore, then the share or the value or the price of the share will naturally come down.

Sir, you will be surprised to know that the Modern Foods Company has been sold out. It is not disinvestment. The entire Company has been sold out, including the land, machinery and the plants. It is a multi-national company. Shri Nitish Kumar may know it. He is a supporter of the disinvestment policy of this Government.

Then the Hindustan Lever Limited has been sold. At what price? For Rs.105 core! The total value is Rs.2,000 crore.

Who has given the right to this Government – Shri Arun Shourie? – to sell out our property, the property of millions and millions of Indians at a throw away price? I do not know why Shri George Fernandes is silent today! He has not protested when Lafarze, a giant multi-national company in the cement sector has come and is grabbing our own indigenous industries.

The Cement Corporation of India is now at the verge of closure. Our cement production is much more than our demand. Do we not have any technology to manufacture cement? Shri George Fernandes may know that we have the technology. Then, why has he allowed Lafarze? He had kicked out Coca Cola in 1977. Now he has become a great supporter of Pepsi! He is allowing them. He is allowing Lafarze. It is a multi-national company. Maybe, it is in the private sector.

(13/1645/tkd-bks)

What is happening to our indigenous cement industry? LAFARZE has already purchased the Tata cement. Why should we allow multinational company to come here and manufacture cement? ...(*Interruptions*) We have our own technology. What new technology are they bringing? We would like to know how much has been spent in the social sector.

Now, I would like to know whether the private sector is more efficient than the public sector. It is not at all. So, we have a Report prepared by the BIFR. It is mentioned that out of 243 PSUs, 60 PSUs have been referred to the BIFR. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA): Shri Basu Deb Acharia, please conclude now.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): What is the percentage? ...(*Interruptions*) Sir, I have not yet touched the workers' issue. I have to say so many things about the workers. The jobs of the workers are at stake. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Basu Deb Acharia, you have already taken 40 minutes.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Sir, let him come to the workers' cause.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): I can manage my time. ...(*Interruptions*) I am talking of large private sector companies. Out of 11,785 companies, 2,885 companies are sick and have been referred to the BIFR. So, the percentage of the sick private sector companies is not less than the public sector companies. So, how can the Government say that the private sector companies are better managed than the public sector companies? They need efficient management. They want a global player. They want level-playing field. They are saying so many things like global player, etc. Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited has a global player. Now, you have disinvested IOC. You will not allow IOC to purchase the shares of IPCL, another public sector company. Your choice is Reliance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Basu Deb Acharia, please conclude now.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): The number of workers involved in these sick public sector companies is about five lakhs and the number of workers involved in the private sector is about seven lakhs.

Sir, in the National Agenda for Governance, the NDA Government has stated that workers and management will be equal partner. How are you treating the workers? How many have lost their jobs? The Central PSUs had cut, over a large number of jobs in two years, that is, from 1997 to 1999.

(m3/1650/pb-hcb)

Within two years, more than one lakh workers have lost their jobs....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): It is not because of disinvestment. It is because of VSSâ€.(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA): Shri Basu Dab Acharia, please conclude now.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): What is VRS and what is VSS? They have changed the nomenclature from Voluntary Retirement Scheme to Voluntary Separation Scheme....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): Sir, this subject is in no way related to disinvestment. How can he club it with disinvestment?...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now, Shri Basu Deb Acharia.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): Yes, I am concluding, Sir, but he is disturbing me.

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): Sir, he is misguiding our youngsters by giving some wrong calculation with the wrong subject...(*Interruptions*) The subject is disinvestment, not unemployment, and he is giving some information which is not relevant at all.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): Sir, the Government should tell us whether they are sincere to make our PSUs viable and whether they are sincere to revive our PSUs. They are not sincere. An Expert Committee was appointed to examine the viability of six sick Central public sector undertakings, of which, four are located in the State of West Bengal. I have gone through all the reports of the Expert Committee. They have prepared separate reports on each of these six units. Nowhere has this Expert Committee recommended for the closure of these six PSUs. Rather they have recommended that the Government should explore other possibilities – clean-slated Balance Sheets, joint ventures or workers' co-operatives. Without exploring other possibilities, how did the Government take decision to close down these six public sector undertakings? What was the main theme behind our Industrial Policy Declaration and the Industrial Policy which we adopted in 1966? It was the policy of self-reliance. Has that policy of self-reliance been given a go-bye by this Government?...(*Interruptions*)

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA (CONTAI): Another policy was formulated in 1991.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): I have seen that policy. I have already quoted from Shri Narasimha Rao's article.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Basu Deb Acharia, please conclude now. This is too much. I am calling Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): So, Sir, the policy of self-reliance has been given a go-bye. The disinvestment, the outright sale of public sector undertakings at throw away prices, is against the national interests of our country. They are selling out the property of our country. Who has given them the right to sell out the property of our country? After taking over this Department, the new Minister announced that there would not be any White Paper. We want that a White Paper should be published and no decision should be taken at the back of the Parliament. The Parliament should be taken into confidence. There should be transparency. We must know what they are doing with the money they have got out of disinvestment. I oppose the disinvestment of shares of our profitable companies. They are selling out the shares of our profitable companies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is too much, Shri Basu Deb Acharia. Kindly take your seat now.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): So, Sir, I oppose it and demand that the Government should review its policy and not sell out the shares of the public sector undertakings at throw away prices. Thank you, Sir. (ends)

(n3/1655/krr/rpm)

1655 hours

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to begin by congratulating my classmate Shri Arun Shourie on being entrusted with the key responsibility for the Central component of the Government's economic programme.

The NDA Government and the BJP in particular likes to portray its economic policies as carrying through the reform process initiated by Dr. Manmohan Singh. That, I submit, is a dangerous distortion. Nothing illustrates this better than the yawning gap between the Congress and the BJP in their respective approaches to dis-investment. No doubt, the Congress regards dis-investment as part of the economic reforms process – but certainly not as the heart of the matter. To illustrate, the word 'dis-investment' does not appear in the Pachmarhi Declaration of September, 1998 nor in the opening speech nor in the closing remarks of the Congress President. The Congress manifesto for the 1999 election does not contain a section on dis-investment. Dis-investment is mentioned only in the context of a strategic re-definition of the role and scope of the public sector as also fleetingly in regard to the need to revive capital markets and offer : "new investment opportunities for the Indian people" – not, mind you, the Indian companies or the foreign nationals. The expression used is 'the Indian people'.

For the BJP and the NDA, however, dis-investment has emerged as the central plank of their platform of reforms. A new Department has been invented for this purpose and two of the brightest of their new crop of Ministers have been successively placed in charge of selling the *dahej* to pay the *chowkidar*. What is worse, they have embarked on a dis-investment programme without putting in place a dis-investment policy.

The hon. Minister will claim that they do indeed have a policy and have repeatedly stated, in answers to Parliament questions and during discussions in the House, namely : "In the generality of cases it is the Government's policy to reduce Government's share of public sector equity but no more than 26 per cent except in the case of strategic industries". This is not a policy. This is a *fatwa*.

Before embarking on a policy that will deprive the nation of national control, over Rs. 65,000 crore of national equity, Rs. 2.5 lakh crore of national investment and some Rs. 10 lakh crore to Rs. 15 lakh crore of national assets, surely this Parliament has a right to a White Paper which sets out the rationale for the wholesale auction of national wealth. We need a Paper, a White Paper, which answers at least 13 basic questions. They are :

1. Which are the sectors in which the Government regards a continuing public sector presence as essential and which as inessential?
2. Which are the public units that should be run on purely commercial lines and which, in the larger interest, should be given specific social objectives and judged on criteria other than purely mercenary?
3. How should strategic industries be defined – as those which are of strategic significance to national security such as atomic energy or those which are of strategic significance to the national economy?
4. What constitutes a core industry – an enterprise which is engaged in economic infrastructure or also one which is crucial to social infrastructure, a key component, for example, of the food security programme or poverty alleviation?

(o3/1700/san-rjs)

5. Our manufacturing PSUs to be treated on par with those in the service sector. Where do section 25 companies fit into the overall strategy for disinvestment?
6. Should a distinction be made between the PSUs that pioneered new fields of industrialisation or new horizons of technology or new geographic areas of developments and the PSUs which resulted from the failure of the private sector to run their enterprises?

For example, almost all the units of the National Textiles Corporation monuments to the abject failure of the fat cats of the private sector on whom this Government relies to run their own private business. After all, more than half the PSUs referred to the BIFR – 35 out of 67 – are private sector enterprises raked into bankruptcy by their private owners. Why does the Minister think that if you are in the private sector, if you are born too well, if you emerge along the echelons of the private sector, you are necessarily brighter than somebody like me who was not born too well and made on his own to the Foreign Service. I want to know this. In glaring contrast to what has happened, for instance, in the textile sector where more than half the PSUs are profit-making and three-fourth of the PSUs with whom their Government had signed Memoranda of Understanding had been rated by their Government as excellent or very good. Forty two out of 77 or so PSUs which had been so rated had been put down as excellent. What is it that makes PSUs such a bad thing?

On what criteria should management control be transferred and under what circumstances would the transfer of ownership be permitted?

This refers to 74 per cent, 49 per cent, 26 per cent, 25 per cent. These are the percentages by which ordinary mortals are confused by people like Dr. Nitish Sengupta.

In what extreme conditions should the Government relinquish both ownership and management? Where does national honour – for example, with regard to national airlines – fit into the Government scheme of things?

What objective criteria – I underline the word 'objective' - should be put in place to determine whether a given unit should or should not be disinvested, whether PSUs with multiple units should be disinvested as one composite corporate or first desegregated and then considered for disinvestment unit-wise.

For example, you have got the fertiliser field in which the NFL, which is the one they are targeting, is the only profitable one in the public sector, but as the Minister has pointed out three of the four units are loss-making. Then, why do they want to get rid of the NFL? They should desegregate it into separate units and then decide what they will do with the loss-making units and the profit-making units. Take the case of SAIL where two of the units are doing extremely well while some of the other units are not. The Board there has decided that they will desegregate it and deal with it separately. So, I am asking a question on what criteria the Government would do it and decide which PSUs should be divested to the general public - I am referring to our manifesto where we talked of its being owned by the Indian people, by broadly-based ownership – or to mutual funds or to financial institutions as we provided for in the 1991 Industrial Policy Resolution and which should be put up for strategic sale. What criteria will they use to determine in which category it should fall?

(p3/1705/sh-nsh)

Of course, on what criteria will you decide which are the units which should be rehabilitated, revived, restructured? Finally, which are the ones that should be sold as irretrievable junk? Should this not be a matter of pre-determined policy rather than *ad hoc* case by case decisions by the executive?

Should not one distinguish between profit-making and loss-making PSUs?

Sir, the Government have informed this House through their reply to Question No. 351, dated 25th February, posed by Thiru P. Kumarasamy Avargal, that Government have no separate policy with regard to loss-making units. My friend, Shri Basu Deb Acharia, has just quoted another reply of yours where you say that you have no separate policy with regard to profit-making units. I want to know, why. Why do you not have a separate policy for profit-making units and a separate policy for loss-making units? Related to this, the other key subsidiary question is, what is a loss-making enterprise -- SAIL which lost Rs. 1600 crore in 1998-99 or SAIL which earned a profit of Rs. 1300 crore in 1995-96? Which is a loss-making unit? What about Bhilai and Bokaro which made profits last year, and other subsidiary units of SAIL which made losses? How are you going to distinguish these two?

Coming to the *Navratnas*, whether it is *maxi-Navratnas* or *mini-Navratnas*, should they and should they not be

exempted from disinvestment? If you think that they should be included, why should they be included? If you think, nevertheless, they must be included, then to what extent? Should this not be put out as a matter of priority?

Sir, there has been disinvestment in ten out of eleven *Navratnas*, and eight of these *Navratnas* figure in the list of the ten top profit-making public sector enterprises. Is this the right direction for disinvestment to take?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): In which year was it done? Was it not done between 1991 and 1996?

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): I will explain the difference to you, if you say Jaitley is incapable of understanding the difference between disinvestment policy in 1991-96 and now. I now understand why the Prime Minister sacked him. He clearly does not understand the policy.

What should be the modalities of disinvestment for different categories of PSUs? Why should disinvestment proposals not come from the Boards of PSUs based on commercial as distinct from political considerations, and to what extent should disinvestment be the domain of the Disinvestment Commission? Should this Commission be given statutory status? Should disinvestment be a matter exclusively for the executive or should Parliament, through the appropriate Committee, have a say in processing disinvestment proposals?

What should be done with the proceeds of disinvestment? Should they be poured into the sink called the Consolidated Fund of India or should the proceeds be credited to a separate disinvestment fund as recommended by the Disinvestment Commission, and earmarked for specific purposes such as the revival and restructuring of public sector units, infrastructure investment, social sector expenditure, poverty alleviation programmes? If so, in what order of priority and in what proportion?

What steps need to be taken urgently and as a matter of high national priority to render public sector undertakings functionally autonomous?

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA (GUNA): There is a great degree of restlessness in the Treasury Benches.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): What change would this involve in regard to accountability to the C&AG, the CVC, the CBI, the Government and the Parliament, if this were done? In short, what steps can we take to end the Joint-Secretary *Raj* and drastically reduce the number of Ministers holding charge of public enterprises? If we were to do this, what consequential constitutional or legal changes would this entail, in particular, to article 12 of the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court?

(q3/1710/rsg-mkg)

We do not seek *ad hoc* answers to this question. We want a policy. A disinvestment programme without a Disinvestment Policy is an invitation to suspicion of your motives, suspicion of your intentions and suspicion of your overt and covert goals.

The Government is only harming its own reputation and its own image by *ad hoc* policy pronouncements and *ad hoc* decisions. This is a Government that claims to be wedded to transparency. We are about to resume the debate on the Freedom of Information Bill. But it is completely opaque when it comes to selling the family silver.

They inherited a Disinvestment Commission. It is now nine months since that Disinvestment Commission's term ended. It is long enough to produce a baby but not long enough for this incompetent Government to be able to name a replacement. Is this just a happenstance? Or, is it a deliberate ploy? That is what I want to know because this Government has no policy. It suddenly adds qualifications to its policy pronouncements.

The former Minister of Disinvestment, King Arun I, first tells the Upper House that the revival and restructuring of public sector enterprises is the first objective of the Disinvestment Policy. If so, why in his many replies to questions in this and the other House did he stick to the Yashwant Sinha *fatwa*? He also says that fiscal deficit has nothing to do with disinvestment. So, why are the proceeds of disinvestment being credited to the Consolidated Fund of India, instead of a Disinvestment Fund, on the pattern of earmarking the diesel and kerosene cess for the *Pradhan Mantri Gramodyog Yojana*?

As for the new Minister of Disinvestment, King Arun II, he has told the Rajya Sabha that in addition to the Sinha *fatwa* – or, should I call it the sinful *fatwa* – there are two considerations. 'Considerations' is his word in quotes. They are the need for the public sector presence to counter concentration of power in the private hands and regulatory mechanisms to protect the interest of consumers. It is very good. Why then were these 'considerations' not mentioned in the reply to Lok Sabha Question No.1369 of 3rd March posed by Thiru P.D. Elangovan Avargal? It

is because they have no policy and invent words when they are cornered.

We must have a White Paper to facilitate an informed and unprejudiced discussion on the new strategic orientation of the public sector in the era of economic reforms. It is in the light of a discussion on the White Paper in this House and in the country at large that a policy must be formulated on the basis of a wide national consensus. Till then, I would request the Government to put a temporary stop to what is widely perceived as the loot of national treasure in the name of disinvestment.

You might as well ask why successive Governments from Shri Chandra Shekhar's to Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao's did not produce a White Paper before embarking on disinvestment. As regards Shri Chandra Shekhar, you do not have to ask me. You can ask the chameleon-like Minister of Finance who indifferently serves socialism as well as saffron. But as for the Congress Government, the Industrial Policy Resolution, 1991 clearly spelt out disinvestment as a matter of disinvesting no more than 20 per cent of Government holdings in selected PSUs and that too only to financial institutions and mutual funds with the explicit objective of raising a limited quantity of budgetary resources.

The successor Government set up an independent Disinvestment Commission. I am glad Shri Basu Deb Acharia referred to Minister Murasoli Maran. I am referring, of course, to the NF-UF Maran and not the NDA Maran. Minister Murasoli Maran assured Parliament that there was no question of any change of ownership. In total discontinuity with the policies of the past, this Government has drastically altered the scope, content, role and objectives of disinvestment. They have converted disinvestment into a central plank of their reforms platform. But without either a White Paper or a policy statement, this is unacceptable. In the absence of a clear-cut policy on disinvestment, all we can go by is development on the ground.

(r3/1715/vp/jr)

Sir, do I have to conclude my speech in ten minutes?

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA): No. You have taken 20 minutes.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Sir, please give me another ten minutes and I will conclude.

Sir, putting together what we have seen, it seems that the Government have unleashed an ideological assault on the public sector, in pursuance of right-wing economic theories that have little bearing on our social and political realities or larger national goals.

We are told that the public sector is an unbearable burden on the public exchequer. I fail to see how. I have brought with me the latest Public Enterprises Survey, 1998-99, Volume I. Total Government subscribed equity in the public sector is Rs. 65,000 crore. PSU dividend payments amount to about Rs. 4,000 crore or Rs. 5,000 crore. The PSU contributions to the Central Exchequer by way of interests, taxes and duties add up to Rs. 42,000 crore, a gross annual return of Rs. 47,000 crore, on a cumulative equity contribution of Rs. 65,000 crore. Is this an unbearable burden?

Sir, I draw the attention of the House and the Minister to the following points at pages 6 and 7 of this Survey. It says:

1. Public Sector Enterprises, as a whole, have earned a return on investment, defined as the ratio of profit before interest and tax (PBIT) to capital employed (CE), that is, PBIT to CE, of 14.5 per cent. In the private sector, in the same year, Gujarat Ambuja is lower at 12.3 per cent, Bayer at 8.7 per cent and Zuari Fertiliser at 7.4 per cent. Our public sector's Rashtriya Chemicals and Fertiliser has beaten Zuari Fertiliser by 6.5 per cent.
2. Return on net worth for PSUs, as a whole, that is, net profit to net worth – according to this Survey – was around nine per cent in 1998-99. In the same year, the returns on net worth for Escorts in the automobile sector amounted to only 5.7 per cent, ITC in hotels no more than 5.6 per cent, ACC in cement just 4.6 per cent and SPIC in fertiliser a mere 2.5 per cent. As far the Birlas, in Hindustan Motors, they lost 11.55 per cent and in cement, a whopping 36.2 per cent, while the return on net worth for Essar Steel was a mind-boggling minus 43.5 per cent, which is double the negative return recorded by SAIL. What makes the Minister believe in the inherent superiority of the private sector?

Between the previous year and 1998-99 – these were the two years of the NDA Government – the PSE dividends have gone up by 37 per cent; PSE contributions to the Central Exchequer have risen by 11 per cent; PSE net worth has increased by 9.9 per cent. Every one of these figures is taken from their own report.

Let me hasten to add, however, that none of these returns would amount to much, if budgetary support to the public

sector were consuming a significant proportion of Government expenditure. But in this year's Budget, that is, 2000-2001, out of a total plan outlay of Rs. 88,000 crore, budgetary support to the public sector, excluding power and roads, amounts to only – as far as I have been able to calculate – Rs. 1,100 crore with loans amounting to about Rs. 900 crore. Putting them together, it is Rs. 2,000 crore in all. How much is it? It is 2.5 per cent of the Central plan outlay. Is this unbearable?

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA): You may please conclude now.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Even if you add infrastructure expenditure on power and roads, the budgetary support to the public sector – both equity and loans – is under five per cent of development expenditure.

Sir, I bow to the discipline of the House. I anticipated that the Minister would be permitted to speak for an hour and a quarter in the other House and I am doubtless that he would take all the time that he wishes and you would prevent me from speaking for more than 20 minutes. So, I have prepared my speech in writing. I seek your permission to place it on the Table of the House and to give a copy of it to the Minister ...(*Interruptions*)

(s3/1720/rbn)

This is extremely unfair on me....(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA): This is not unfair.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Sir, I am only attempting to deal with the substance. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI (RAIGANJ): Sir, all our Members are withdrawing....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, is it not a fact that no single factor has contributed more to what public sector owes than the drastic scaling down of Government's Budget allocation? ...(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS AND PUBLIC GRIEVANCES OF THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS, AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DISINVESTMENT (SHRI ARUN SHOURIE): Sir, very important points are being made. Earlier, Shri Basu Deb Acharia raised some important points. Now, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar is raising important points. So, I would plead with you that we should relax this two hours' time. If it is possible, we can continue it on some other day so that we can take up the Freedom of Information Bill.

1721 hours (Mr. Deputy-Speaker *in the Chair*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Sir, the hon. Minister wants me to continue....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE): It is because I am sure that Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar would like to hear me. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Time allotted for this is only two hours.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI (RAIGANJ): Sir, you please allow Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar to speak. As long as he is allowed to speak, we do not mind even if no time is left for other Congress Members....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Sir, I have covered three-fourth of the points. I will just rush through the rest....(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS (SHRI RAM NAIK): Sir, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar said that he wanted to place the rest of the speech on the Table of the House. That is what he had suggested. But I saw his speech outside which was distributed to the Members before he completed his speech here. It is not a right thing to do. I thought I should draw your attention to this....(*Interruptions*) I have seen his speech outside which has been

circulated to the Press. It is not a good parliamentary practice....(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Hon. Members, we are running short of time.

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Hon. Members, I am on my legs.

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record except Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar's speech.

(Interruptions) ...(Not recorded)

(t3/1725/rk-hng)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): There is no single factor that has contributed more to public sector woes than the drastic scaling down since Congress demitted office of Budget allocations for Government investments, both in comparison to Plan targets – your own Plan targets – and in terms of actual expenditure – your expenditure – as a proportion of Budget allocations – your Budget allocations.

The other argument for the Government's flight from the public sector is that the public sector is inherently incapable of making itself efficient. The expression is not mine. It was used by the Hon. Minister, Shri Shourie in Rajya Sabha. Does the record bear this out? If the public sector is inherently inefficient, how is it that in 18 successive public global tenders, without resort to price preferences, BHEL – Shri George Fernandes's creation and I salute him for that – has without fail beaten multinational giants, like ABB, Seimens and GEC Alstom? Is not IOC the only Fortune 500 company from India? Did not the same SAIL which made a loss of Rs.1600 crore under the NDA Government, make a profit of Rs.1300 crore in the last year of the last Congress Government? What is so inherent about public sector inefficiency when 60 per cent of all PSUs are able to turn a profit, modest it is true in some cases and large only in a few? But when it come to losses also, public sector losses are modest in most cases and large only in a few. DRDO and ISRO are among the most outstanding of their kind in the world. GAIL has never been beaten by British Gas, and Shri Ram Naik will confirm that to be, yet he, shamefully begged British Gas to buy into GAIL. NTPC has secured the largest loan the World Bank has ever given to any corporate entity anywhere in the world and the Power Finance Corporation headed by the Chairman of the Standing Committee for Public Enterprises raised millions of dollars in the international money market when neither their competitors Tatas, nor their competitors Ambanis were able to do so. So, why does this Government not listen to its own executives? Why have they not included a single public sector executive in the Prime Minister's Council on Trade and Industry? It is only because they viscerally hate the public sector. That is prejudice. It is not policy.

If we concentrate on the 10 most profitable public sector undertakings, each of these ratios, to measure performance and profit, rises or improves dramatically. I draw the Minister's attention to Table 1.15 at page 18 and Table 1.16 on the next page of his Government's own document. Curiously, of the 10 most profitable public sector units, the Government has disinvested or proposes to disinvest, its holdings in as many as eight. But at the same time, of the ten top loss-making units cited at Table 1.16, only three or four are being disinvested. This is ridiculous. The Government are selling off the best and hanging on to the worst. Why? What is the compulsion to kill the goose that is laying the golden egg?

The Government says, 'it needs the resources'. We asked, resources for what? Is it to fund the fiscal deficit? 'Not at all', replies the Government. Why cannot you be honest? We were. If it were not to fund the deficit, why do you have an annual target? The fiscal deficit at the end of this financial year would be 10 per cent higher if you fail to disinvest Rs.10,000 crore this year. That is why they are disinvesting and that is why we describe it as selling the *mangalsutra* to pay the *bawarchi*.

The Disinvestment Commission has recommended that 10 per cent of the proceeds be earmarked for the revival and restructuring of public enterprises. On being asked whether this recommendation has been followed, the hon. Minister Shri Arun Jaitley resorts to sleight of hand. I refer to Question No.1490 of 3rd March put by S/Shri Dasmunsi and Pawan Kumar Bansal.

(u3/1730/rc/sb)

"Ten per cent of last year's proceeds is lower than 10 per cent of this year's budgetary support, and so the recommendation is being implemented. "

Does he mean to say that in the absence of disinvestment, budgetary support to the public sector would have been

nil?

He also told that rather than lock up Government money in business, would it not mean more sense to redeploy this money in the social sector. Sir, I have no hesitation in saying that I would much rather see a good deal of this investment in education, health, employment programmes, poverty alleviation that locked up in Bharat Leather or National Bicycles. But what is the connection between disinvestment and the social sectors? None at all, as at present. If the Finance Minister were to assure this House that of the Rs.10,000 crore he proposes to raise this year through disinvestment, in his supplementary demands so many thousand crore will go to the food subsidy under the PDS, so many thousand crores to SC housing, so many thousand crore to Ashram schools for tribal children, so many thousand crore for cooked mid-day meals, so many crore for women's self-help groups, so many for sanitation, so much for waste land development, so much for minor irrigation, and so much for budgetary support to the public sector, I would be the first to applaud. But that is not how it happens. The Government sells the sweat of the nation's brow for a song and no one knows where the money has gone. Except that everyone knows the money has actually gone to fund the fiscal deficit.

So, we are prepared to consider a reorientation of the Government's national assets. But we are not prepared to assist at a distress sale. The fiscal deficit is pushing the Government into making distress sales. The very announcement of a disinvestment target makes for a buyer's market lowering the value of the product put up for sale. The emphasis on "big ticket disinvestment" is tantamount to an invitation to the richest in the land, and their MNC friends abroad, to establish formal or informal cartels to corner the market. What is worse, in particular cases disinvestment could lead to monopolistic or oligopolistic situations. It is thus inexplicable that such an outstanding PSU as IPCL has been put on the chopping block in the full knowledge that the most likely buyer is a private sector giant. At least one of our two Aruns, I know, is familiar with a plutocrat's remark, "You cannot meet me at night and not stand by me in the morning".

I know what is the relationship between several of you and these people to whom the sales are being made.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, it is insinuation. The Member should substantiate it because there are only two Aruns and he should tell us what relationship he is referring to with the prospective buyer.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Sir, I did not say, "two Aruns". Please look at the records. I did not say, "two Aruns".

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: You said this.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): I said that one of the two Aruns knows about this remark....(*Interruptions*). You are the two most honest and therefore two of the dumbest-Ministers on your Treasury Benches. Therefore, all sorts of things that happen behind your back, that you do not know about. So, you do not get into this.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: There are many things that do not happen and you contrive and imagine that they happen.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): I withdraw my remark about their contacts with the private sector. I do not think them necessary for me to say.

Sir, our Minister of Disinvestment told the Rajya Sabha that the National Bicycle Corporation has sales of Rs.27 lakhs and accumulated losses of Rs.56 crore. That is precisely why no one has objected to his selling it. Begin with the loss-making units. But sell them for their real worth. The hon. Minister has sneered at the balance sheets of the NTC companies. But if he sells their assets not as textiles companies but for urban development what is the market value of their assets?

(w3/1735/kvj/har)

It is thousands and thousands of crores. Why has this not happened? Ask the Minister for Heavy Industries who, as Chief Minister of Maharashtra, refused to permit a change of land use. Who then is responsible for the condition of the NTC? Is it the alleged inherent inefficiency of the public sector or the political machinations of my friends over there? Does the Minister not appreciate that the NTC is a graveyard of private sector not of public sector failure and the failure to implement the NTC revival package is proof for Government inefficiency and not the inherent public sector inability?

I find it shocking that the Minister Shri Arun Shourie should draw the attention to the net worth of Modern Foods having been a mere Rs.28 crore. Why then did the Hindustan Levers cough up Rs.105 crore to buy a net worth that is a third of their investment? Is it out of the goodness of their hearts or is it because they have re-evaluated the replacement value of the physical and commercial assets of different unit of the Modern Foods as being above

Rs.1000 crore? Shri Arun Shourie is a genius of comparing oranges with apples. He not only takes one year's sales and compares it into decades of accumulated losses, he also persistently confuses the net worth, which is equity plus reserves, with real worth of the physical assets and commercial goodwill passing into the ownership of management control of a private party - domestic or multinational - which has made no contribution to the building of the assets.

So, we have no objection to additionality. Let the private sector and the MNCs enter areas reserved hitherto for the public sector and let the public sector compete with the private sector. Why should acquisition be preferred to additionality? A Minister who believes the public sector is inherently inefficient is clearly not a Minister to be trusted with the public sector. He says in the Rajya Sabha that he decided when doing his doctoral thesis with some ghastly American University in the 1960s that socialism was evil. His prejudices as an academic are now coming to the fore. This Minister has no faith in *Swadeshi*, *Swabhiman* and *Swavalamban*. He is a worshipper of 'False Gods' and that is why I view his stewardship of the Department of Disinvestment with such lively apprehension.

We demand a White Paper in which the Government is free to substantiate the Minister's claim that public sector undertakings are inherently inefficient. But we are not prepared to accept the Minister's bold assertion. We need to see his arguments set out in detail and we wish to give ourselves the opportunity of refuting them. If he has the courage of conviction and if his Government has the courage of conviction - he has the courage of conviction, but does his 27 party Government have the courage of conviction? - this Government will accept this challenge. Until then call a halt to this squandering of the people's wealth in this mindless pursuit of disinvestment.

(ends)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now hon. Minister Shri Arun Jaitley will intervene in the debate.

1738 hours

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, I am extremely grateful to you for having permitted me to intervene in this debate.

We have just had the privilege of listening to a very powerful speech by my friend Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar. Of course, I did not have the privilege to study with him, but I certainly had the privilege of admiring his choice of words. He raised thirteen questions. He referred to my friend Shri Arun Shourie as a genius who confuses apples for oranges. But a confused genius would always confuse them as being one. For these thirteen questions that he raised the answers are so obvious that these are perhaps the thirteen causes for the confusion in my friend's mind.

He asked Shri Arun Shourie towards the end of his speech whether he has the courage of conviction to own up to what he thought was the Government's wrong policy.

(x3/1740/ru-skb)

But if I applied every word of what Mr. Mani Shankar Aiyar has argued to what the Government between 1991-96 did, I would only request him to have the courage of conviction to denounce each of the events that happened in relation to disinvestment during that period. In fact, we have privatised one unit, taken a decision with regard to 19 others and a large part of the comments which is being made by enlightened opinion against us is, why are you not going in for a big ticket investment, why are you taking up substantially the loss-making units, some medium level units and not going in for big ticket investment? In fact, this is the criticism which the economists are making in newspapers. This is the criticism which several editorials have made against us. We are going about it in a more systematic manner.

Shri Aiyar was very critical of why profit-making unit should be disinvested, and why should the *navaratnas* should be touched. Yes, if the shares of the profit making units and *navaratnas* were disinvested - 39 of them and a large number of which were profit-making units in the *navaratnas* - it certainly did happen not only during 1991-96 but also from 1996-98. And I must today confess that with the wisdom of hind sight, I am certainly not going to be critical of the policy of the Government at that time. I think when the Finance Minister, in 1991, initiated the policy, there was a particular attachment which each one of us in India had to a public sector undertaking.

As Shri Acharia and Shri Aiyar have said, there was a time when not only economic contribution was certainly required but there was an immense social contribution made at a time when there was very little of the private sector and very little of it prepared to make an investment in certain areas. At that time, the public sector did have a role but today, except in certain areas, it is functioning in all those areas where the private sector has come in a big way and has come in as a competitor. There were several larger economic questions which Shri Aiyar has raised to which I shall certainly endeavour to deal with in the course of my response to what he has said. I am sure Shri

Shourie, when he would reply to the entire debate, would deal with them at length. But let us be very clear about disinvestment in this country and Shri Aiyar is right on it. He charged me for being confused between disinvestment and privatisation. I can assure him that I have absolutely no confusion of this kind in my mind. Disinvestment in this country started even during the Interim Budget which was presented by Shri Chandra Shekhar. He is today very critical of setting targets in the Budget. But every Budget presented by the Congress Party from 1991-96 had a target defined in the Budget itself. Now, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar argues, "Well, if you fix targets in the Budget, it is an invitation for a distress sale and it is an invitation for cartelisation." I am afraid that these are not economically sound arguments. These are only arguments of convenience when stands change merely because you happen to sit on the benches on the other side. But this certainly cannot be.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): In the five Budgets presented by us, it was within the policy framework of no more than 20 per cent of disinvestment, no question of relinquishing either managerial control or ownership control and the targets we set were modest and specifically aimed at raising budgetary resources. I do not think we should confuse our policy with yours. You are mixing up oranges with apples.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: It is not a question of the policy between Congress Governments and the present Government being identical. There has been a conscious evolution of the policy which has taken place and before I come to the good economic reason as to why a conscious evolution of the policy has taken place, let me mention that disinvestment not only found a mention in Shri Chandra Shekhar's Budget but also found a mention in every Congress Budget. His Budget very clearly says that it had been decided that the Government would disinvest upto 20 per cent of its equity in selected public sector undertakings. It found a mention in every Congress Budget also.

(y3/1745/brv-bks)

Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar is right when he says that it was limited to 20 per cent. Today, there are sound economic reasons for it. When you analyse that, you will realise the amount of money that we lost without a corresponding advantage by that process of piecemeal disinvestment taking place. It also did find a mention in the Common Minimum Programme which was followed by the United Front Government. Even the Left parties were signatories to the Common Minimum Programme. In fact, during the United Front Government which they supported, it was there....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): We had, on the floor of the House, objected to certain measures with regard to Insurance and all those things even when there was the United Front Government. That is on record.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: I am grateful for that intervention. You objected on the floor of the House. But some of you were even a part of the Cabinet which decided upon disinvestment and the only disinvestment that you did was not of a single loss-making unit. The only disinvestment you did was of the *Navratnas*. The disinvestment was made in respect of VSNL, MTNL and the decisions with regard to the Gas Authority of India Limited were only taken between the period 1996 and 1998....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): What is the percentage? It was only five per cent....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: I shall now come to the new argument which has been developed that the difference between you and us is that we wanted a five per cent or ten per cent or 15 per cent piecemeal disinvestment but you are going in for privatisation as such. That, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar says, is the fundamental difference. I agree with Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar that that is the fundamental difference between their policy and our policy. I shall substantiate the reasons and make good why our policy is a more correct policy under the circumstances.

Sir, we have all seen the valuations of the public sector shares on the stock market. When you disinvest in piecemeal, what is the advantage that you achieve? In fact, every criticism that Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar has made of the Disinvestment Policy as also the criticism made by Shri Basu Deb Acharia is in fact available when you make a piecemeal disinvestment. The valuation of the public sector shares in the market is not very high. Let me give you an illustration.

The Indian Oil Company, as you said, is one of the Fortune 500 companies. In fact, it is the only Indian company which is a part of the Fortune 500 companies. It is a company in profit. The Government – my senior colleague Shri Ram Naik is here – has taken a decision with regard to the importance of the Indian Oil Company and, therefore, the Indian Oil Company today is a company in the public sector. But the Indian Oil Company, a company in the public sector, a profit-making company, a company which is a Fortune 500 company, when its share was listed on the stock market, how much did it fetch?...*(Interruptions)*

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इन्होंने श्री राम नाइक जी का उल्लेख किया है, यह उनके विचारों को लागू क्यों नहीं करते हैं।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Do not make this running commentary. You please hear him.

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record.

(Interruptions) ...(Not recorded)

श्री अरुण जेटली : आप तर्क की बात सुन लीजिए, हमें प्रसन्नता होगी। श्री राम नाइक जी का और सरकार का जो स्टैंड है, उसके संबंध में भी मैं कुछ कहूंगा।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Akilesh, please take your seat.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: The Indian Oil Company, a Fortune 500 company, a record profit-making company, a company of which we are all proud, a company whose public character is being maintained for good reasons, was listed on the stock-exchange at a share value which is even less than the book value. I am just giving it as an illustration. During the period 1991-96 and thereafter, when efforts have been made to disinvest in five per cent and 10 per cent, what you have got as a valuation of the public sector shares is really not a very high value. Even in the case of the shares of the public sector undertakings, the *Navratnas*, which were disinvested, you never got a very high value. When the book value was Rs.350, you got a valuation in the market of about Rs.437 or so per share. When you disinvest in small lots, the investor always asks the question: "Should I invest in the IT shares? Should I invest in some lucrative blue-chip companies? Or, Should I invest in a company which has a minority share of three per cent or which has a few thousand or a few lakh shares in a public sector? We followed that policy. We never got the best value. The monies which came in are not monies which were being used for a larger purpose.

(z3/1750/spr-hcb)

But the object of that disinvestment was only to disinvest few shares, get the monies into the Central Budget, and probably Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar's criticism would be right to the 1991-98 policy that this money could have been used for bridging the budgetary gap. But today the policy is different. When you go in for a privatisation, in a privatisation process, you are not only selling the shares of a company when you are satisfied that the existence of this company in the public sector is not required, you are trying to bring in a new management, the new management have the prospect of inducting more capital, inducting new technologies, and therefore, the valuations that you get are far higher. Therefore, the only illustration which you have, when you confused between apples and oranges, a blue-chip company like Indian Oil at the big value of Rs.350 could get us only Rs.437 by the 1991-96 policy, which we have continued for sometime but a loss-making company like Modern Foods, by a strategic sale process, a Rs.1000 share, in a strategic sale, in a loss-making unit, could fetch us Rs.11,490 per year. ...(Interruptions) Therefore, well, I clear that confusion also. Therefore, even in a loss-making company, through a strategic sale process, the valuations we got are much higher. That is the second advantage. ...(Interruptions) I would like to complete. ...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Are you yielding, Shri Arun Jaitley?

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: I am not yielding, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Then, it will not go on record.

(Interruptions) ...(Not recorded)

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Allow me to please complete. ...(Interruptions) You would certainly have questions which Shri Arun Shourie would respond to. ...(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS AND PUBLIC GRIEVANCES OF THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS, AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DISINVESTMENT (SHRI ARUN SHOURIE): I would respond to evaluation precisely.....(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is going on here? Nothing will go on record, both the remarks of the hon. Member and the hon. Minister.

(Interruptions) ...(Not recorded)

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: My colleague and myself certainly feel that this is a very important aspect because I am convinced that there is some confusion which requires to be removed. Therefore, the experience has been that

when.. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Rupchand Pal, you are a senior Member. Why are you interrupting like that?

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Sir, he is debating the whole question. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Hon. Minister has not even replied, why are you interrupting him?

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Sir, the hon. Minister has the capability to do it. ...(*Interruptions*) Why not the hon. Minister debate the wholeâ€¦; ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record.

(*Interruptions*) ...(*Not recorded*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Kharabela Swain, now you are creating the problem. Please resume your seat.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Therefore, this process of disinvesting only in small lots did not lead to the Government getting the best values. I am certainly not making an allegation against anybody because I would still give credit to the Government in 1991 that they had to make a beginning. It was trial method. They started a particular methodology, and that methodology, in fact, initiated the whole process. But today with ten years of experience behind us the piecemeal disinvestment did not get us the best values. It did not bring in any element of change in professionalism, in the functioning of the PSUs, and the monies which were received.

Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar is right that that monies were essentially used for the purpose of bridging budgetary gap. As against this, the advantages of a privatisation process certainly are that you get much higher values, the Government gets the best returns, you are able to bring in a management which is trying to revive units which are not doing so well, the management will certainly bring in more capital, better technology. The only other alternative you have to bring in more capital is to tax the people of India and say, well, I have a loss-making unit in front of me, I went into the business of textiles - the NTC example which he gave - or I went into the business of bakeries. We have suffered huge losses there. We are now going to tax the people of India so that the Government can do the business of manufacturing textile or manufacturing bread, and once we get into those businesses we come back year after year - that is why Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar very clearly said - please give them grants, come up in every Budget and say, well, we are sorry, we suffered losses in that area. So, this year we are again going to impose a few more taxes on you in order to do business.

(a4/1755/ksp/rpm)

Therefore, our experience has been that strategic sales from the interest of the economy, from the interest of the Exchequer and from the overall interest of the unit itself is a better alternative. But this is not a principle to be applied in all cases and there lies a very important distinction. There may be some units where you may feel that the presence of the unit in the public sector may not be required, but the character of the unit is such that we do not intend to hand it over to one particular strategic partner. So, in such units, we may go in for a process of retail sales to the market. We may, perhaps, get a little less value. But there would be a larger public interest and the larger public interest would be that even though we are getting a much lesser value, we are not in the process of creating a private sector monopoly. The public character of this unit is retained, the shares are held by lakhs and lakhs of people in the Stock Market and there is a professional management on top. There would be some such units. In fact, the Disinvestment Commission itself, out of the cases recommended to it, in the 58 reports that it has given to the Government, said:

"29 out of those 58 would be strategic sales, 8 would be trade sales, 5 would be offer of shares."

There was another set of 11 where they said that no disinvestment is required for the present moment itself.

Therefore, we have seen the virtues of a policy, which we have tried in the past. We realised that the intention really is not to sell 5 per cent and 8 per cent shares. In fact, I noticed in the Rajya Sabha, a Congress Member, with some experience of business, precisely giving the same argument, which I was giving and said: "please take caution". ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): It is because he is in business.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Yes; he understands business more than some of us.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There must be some difference between intervening in the debate and replying to the debate. Therefore, I request you to confine your speech within a certain limit.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, I shall only deal with a few more issues, which have been raised.

I have just mentioned that on fundamentals our attitudes cannot change merely depending on which side we are sitting in this House. We have had a Government between 1991 and 1996 and a subsequent Government, which initiated the process. Let us look at what is happening in the States. ...*(Interruptions)* There are Governments of different political parties in every State. Why is the Rajasthan Government going ahead and thinking of privatising the Rajasthan State Electricity Board? Why is the Chief Minister of Karnataka going in for the privatisation process? Why is the Andhra Pradesh Government doing it? The Government of Delhi is trying to privatise the Electricity Board. The States of Haryana and Punjab have appointed a Disinvestment Commission in their respective States. The Government of Assam is thinking of it. Even in West Bengal ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): No disinvestment is taking place in West Bengal. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): What about the transparency of your disinvestment process? What is the *modus operandi*? ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: We are certainly going to deal with that.

Sir, I reiterate that even the Government of West Bengal is realising some virtues of this and I read in the newspapers that in one of the State Government's hotels they are thinking of bringing in a strategic partner. Shri Dasmunsi, who is hailing from that State, is nodding his head.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI (RAIGANJ): The liberalisation process in West Bengal is on for the last few years, but nothing has taken shape yet.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, I think, you will have to conclude now.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, I will take five or six minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yes.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, this brings us to a fundamental question and I am glad that in some measure or the other this fundamental is not being opposed. Today, the argument only is: "yes, if you want to disinvest, please disinvest the loss making ones; do not disinvest the profit making ones." What is the methodology that you are going to follow? What are the steps that you are going to take in order to invest this resource that you are generating? The 14th point that Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar did not raise in his 13, which is of extreme importance, at least to us, if not to him, is: what do you do to protect the workers' interests? I thought that should have been the first point in his 13 points. Unfortunately, he was silent on that particular issue.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Shri Basu Deb Acharia had already raised that point.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: As far as the process is concerned, the process is very clear.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Give us a White Paper.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Well; the opposition to disinvestment cannot be that unless you have a White Paper you cannot disinvest.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Give us a policy and we will consider that. The fundamental point is, give us a policy.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, we are very clear about our policy. I am sure, if he yields, in the next five minutes let me make an endeavour to make him also clear about the policy.

(b4/1800/ss/rjs)

The policy of the Government is very clear. The policy is in the same language just as Dr. Manmohan Singh enshrined the policy in the 1990-91 Budget, and just as the Congress Government policy was in the industrial

policy statement. In the three successive Budgets which Shri Yashwant Sinha has announced, each year, he has been announcing a policy in a separate chapter on disinvestment. He categorically stated last year that the policy of the Government is in generality of cases. Except the strategic areas, we come down to 26 per cent. In some cases, we can even come down. Even in the non-strategic areas, we will keep the public sector alive. We will keep the public sector where the countervailing presence of the public sector is required in the overall interest of the national economy. That is to say that there may be a danger of creation of private sector monopolies in the private sector, we keep the public sector. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): You cannot convince your Ministers - Minister of Heavy Industries and Minister of Petroleum. You cannot convince your partner, Shri Vaiko.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Please do not worry about any of us. We are very clear about the policy. I am quite certain about the issues which have been raised. Even you have slowly started realising the wisdom of the policy. Now, you say: "My opposition is only confined to the private sector and not to the loss-making." ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Please give us the policy. We know what it is. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No, no; we cannot indulge in this luxury of wasting time.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Fifteen more Members are there. We will have to complete the debate today.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI (RAIGANJ): Sir, the BJP has officially acknowledged that they have no policy of disinvestment till date.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: I did not realise that we had appointed somebody else as our spokesman on our policy.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI (RAIGANJ): Your spokesman said that you have no policy. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, if interruptions are there, I will not be able to complete it. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Why are you interfering?

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is not yielding. You are a senior Member.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): I am not interfering. ...(*Interruptions*) Sir, the Minister for Disinvestment has agreed to continue the discussion for the other day also to have a serious, thorough and analytical discussion on it. Therefore, do not put some cap on the time. That is my request. It is a very serious matter. All of a sudden, the discussion under Rule 193 has been accepted. The Government was not discussing the matter. ...(*Interruptions*)

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप इस चर्चा को कल तक जारी रखिए। ₹ (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It has been decided in the Business Advisory Committee that this subject will be completed today itself.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): No, we did not agree. ...(*Interruptions*) We all hear from the newspapers. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): It will run up to 8 o'clock - a minimum of four hours.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It was originally allotted two hours. We have completed two hours. Fifteen Members are there to speak. Is it the pleasure of the House to extend the time?

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): Sir, the Minister for Disinvestment has agreed to continue the discussion even for the next day.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN): Even next Session!

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): That will not end the matter. Here everything will not end. The people will rise. ...(*Interruptions*)

Do not comment in that manner. I am referring to the proceedings.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let me take the consent of the House. Fifteen Members are there to speak. The Minister has to give the reply. Is it the pleasure of the House to sit till completion of the debate?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The time of the House is extended.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: A question was raised about the methodology of the whole process. If shares are disinvested in a retail sale in the market, there are established practices by which it is done. There is a book-building method by which retail sales take place. I have examined that every retail sale which has taken place in this country from 1991 has followed the established market practice.

As far as strategic sales are concerned, you appoint your advisors, you assess the market and the selection of the partner is always by a transparent bidding process.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): There is no transparency.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: This is the first time I have come across an argument. Yes, you came out with the tender. You came out with the bidding process. You selected the highest price and also the best partner in that process. Is that bidding process not a transparent process?

(c4/1805/rs/nsh)

The two are absolutely contradictory. There is not a single transaction which has taken place, nor is it taking place...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Would the hon. Minister please explain the experience of GAIL and the book building process?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Pal, the hon. Minister will give his reply. We cannot proceed with these running commentaries.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, we have discussed GAIL and it has a book building process...(*Interruptions*) The price you got in GAIL was higher than the market price. It was by a transparent bidding process...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We have to finish it by 8 p.m. Let him ask the question when the hon. Minister replies.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is not replying, he is intervening.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, please conclude now.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, a question which has not been raised by my friend, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, we have very clearly announced. This Government is very clear about the interest of the workmen. In every transaction, utmost care is taken that the interest of the workmen is going to be protected. In fact, it is for the first time that in the disinvestment processes, we have come out with Employees Stock Option Scheme where we are going to share the corporate wealth of an enterprise with the employees or the workmen as help in building up with those workmen. As a result of which we have had announcement in cases where trade unions have even issued statements supporting the effort to privatise some of the large undertakings. This is for first time in the country that such a situation is taking place....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): All trade unions have opposed it.

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.) : मान्यवर, इसे कल तक जारी रखिए। ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): There was a strike for three days against the disinvestment policy of the Government...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can seek all these clarifications when the hon. Minister replies.

...(Interruptions)

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.) : ये सदन के समक्ष गलत तर्क प्रस्तुत कर रहे हैं। इनका मजदूरों से कुछ लेना-देना नहीं है। ... (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is just intervening and not replying.

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, please conclude now. You can give your own views.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, there are only two more points... (Interruptions)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): Sir, why is he misleading the House? ... (Interruptions)

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.) : ये मजदूर संगठनों के विय में जो कह रहे हैं, वह गलत ब्यानी कर रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान) सरकार के घटक दलों में भी इस पर विरोध है। ... (व्यवधान)

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (CANARA): Sir, he is replying to all the points that have been raised by Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar... (Interruptions)

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Well in a debate one certainly answers a speaker like Shri Aiyar. If Shrimati Alva had debated before him, I would have been answering her... (Interruptions)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जरा आराम से सुनिए तब पता लगेगा कि क्या है।

... (व्यवधान)

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, I have just two or three small points more. An issue was raised as to why you have, in the last nine months, not appointed the Disinvestment Commission? The Disinvestment Commission has given 58 recommendations. The Disinvestment Commission is a professional body which studies every company and then make very valuable detailed recommendations. This become an important basis for a Government to take a decision. But today out of the 58 companies, decisions with regard to 19 or 20 have been taken. These decisions are going to take time to implement. Certainly, a Disinvestment Commission would be required. But a Disinvestment Commission would be required after the last recommendations have been implemented and put into the process of implementation.

Sir, a question was also raised that there is a large private sector which is also doing badly. They are right, 'if there is somebody in the private sector who is also doing badly and therefore, why do you only say that we go ahead and disinvest the public sector in the whole process?' There is a fundamental distinction. That distinction is that the private sector, by whichever process, will take care of itself, whether by virtue of more investment, getting out its reserves, borrowing from banks and try and revive itself... (Interruptions)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): According to Swaraj Paul's observation, 'there is no private sector'. The private sector is having money from the financial institutions.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN): But he needed Swaraj Paul to tell him that... (Interruptions)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Yes, their friend.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: But, there is a fundamental distinction and that, Shri Aiyar, is a distinction between apples and oranges. When the private sector does badly, it is not the taxpayers of India who pay for its performances... (Interruptions)

(d4/1810/lh-mkg)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): There are Rs.54,000 crore of NPAs. Are we not paying for it? There are Rs.62,000 crore of unpaid taxes. Are we not paying for it? You are handing over the public sector to the failed private sector. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: It is today the tax-payers' money and the Government makes a conscious choice as to what are the areas in which disinvestment is going to be put. Are we going to invest the tax-payers' money in businesses where a private sector investment is available or are we going to use it in the social sector, which is the declared

policy of this Government? ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): The provision in regard to education is going down and down. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (CANARA): What about Rs.56,000 crore of NPA? It is your own figures? ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: The last argument which you have raised is this. The 13th question which you have raised was, what do we do with regard to the national honour which is involved? You are right. When these businesses are being run, and some of them, as you said, are the national carrier, there is the Indian flag affixed on them, there is certainly a very important element of national honour, which is involved. It is precisely for that reason that an effort is to be made to see that the national honour is not compromised with, they come out with the best services, best facilities available to their consumers, and are not run as inefficient organisations. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): I do not think that Shri Sharad Yadav agrees with you. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Well, certainly the Government is very clear about its policy. You did not have to worry about that. You please start worrying about what you did between 1991 and 1996, and you will certainly get a response from some of your colleagues on that.

I must say that the object of the disinvestment process is to make sure that the tax-payers' money is utilised for the best possible purpose in the social sector for the purposes of repaying its past debts and also for the purpose of reconstructing the public sector. Sir, the object of the disinvestment process ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is this? There is a lot of noise in the House. Please hear him.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Basudeb Acharia, you may not agree with him. You must hear him.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, the object of the whole process is to ensure that the interest of the economy is best served, the interest of the units are best served, the economy is strengthened, and those units are revived. Some of them are sick. Some of them are moving towards sickness. We try and ensure that the best possible efficiency comes into the process. This particular process is an inherent part of the second generation reforms. This is not the first time that this august House is discussing it. The Finance Minister, in his three consecutive Budgets, had made the policy very clear. There is no question of the Government going back on this policy in any way.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am extremely grateful to you for having given me this opportunity to intervene.

(ends)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI (RAIGANJ): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we have just heard a sad news, through the newspaper sources, that a few journalists and photographers have been killed in a blast in Srinagar today. We want that this House should be informed by the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, who is here now, as to what had exactly happened before the House rises for the day today.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs may get the information.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN): Now that the Chair has directed, we will inform the House before the House rises for the day. Again I assure the hon. Members that we will inform you about this.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, Shri Tarit Baran Topdar.

1814 hours

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): Sir, regarding disinvestment of public enterprises, the former Disinvestment Minister has clearly mentioned in an unambiguous term -- there is no ambiguity in me -- that the public sector enterprises are going to be disinvested in the interest of the large and larger private industries and industrial houses.

(e4/1815/mmn-jr)

After Independence and partition of the country, for the growth of our economy, for the growth of industrial output

and to match with the agricultural development, the Public Sector had to play a dominant role. It was clearly stated in various industrial policy statements from 1948 to 1987. In 1999, a clear and a distinctive departure came about – it started earlier – when the idea of a welfare concept of State was given a go bye, when the idea of social responsibility of Public Sector Enterprises, other Government sectors including the Railways, was given a go bye. It was clear to me. At least, even now it is clear to me that the dynamics of the economy of our country, which was based on capitalist development, is destined to come into this stage. It was the State capitalism which developed. The capital was in the hands of the State but it served the capitalists and big industrial houses of this country. At that time, they had no power; they had no capital; and they had no money to build up this empire. The toiling masses, common men and all the people of the country have contributed to the exchequer. From and out of this fund, these Public Sector Enterprises were built up. Now, at the expense of the public exchequer, at the cost of the public money, at this stage again in the interest of the capitalists, these are going to be handed over to them simply. The price that is being determined is not corroborative with the real values of the assets. No re-valuation is being made and nothing is being done in this regard.

The Public Sector Enterprises are of different types. Some of the Public Sector Enterprises were built up, as Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar has said, really on the graveyard of the private sector. Those too attained a commanding height at a certain stage of development of our economy, and served the common men in different ways. We can exemplify by one such giant Public Sector Enterprise, namely, NTC. A revival package was drawn up during the Congress regime. There is no doubt that they initiated the process.

(f4/l820/dva/assa)

But during that period, during the period of disinvestment when it started, during the period of de-nationalisation, we could come to a point with trade unions, MPs, Ministers, there was a committee, and we could come to a point where we nationalised – this Parliament nationalised – 15 public sector undertakings, taken-over units, under NTC. Fifteen were nationalised at that time!

Therefore, what I find here is, that the Congress Government started a process when Shri Arun Jaitley said – he is not here now – said that they were the exponents of that process, that they are continuing that process and that only within four years they have decided from 20 per cent to 100 per cent. The speed is so high that within four years they have completed the maximum limit from 20 per cent to 100 per cent. But I remember – you also may remember – that they were on this side at that time, they used to oppose it along with us.

Therefore, the politics of position, either this side or that side, the aspersions that has been thrown upon the Congress Party is there. I do not know whether they will object to it or not. I find that there is no difference. Now they are on that side. They have given a high speed to it. And within four years, 20 per cent has turned into 100 per cent! And not only that: they are selling out the core sector – the idea of core sector has gone – the highly profitable, the highly profit-earning companies as well. Many points have been made in this regard. I do not want to repeat. I give some examples of the experience of disinvestment in England from an article "The Contrast today between India and Britain: The attitude towards the privatisation of public sector enterprises could not be sharper."

" Privatisation is now seen by many sensible Britons as a big mistake, indeed a monumental era. British Airways, a long tom-tommed a privatisation's greatest success story is in dire trouble and hunting for trouble.

British Telecom tariffs are among the highest in Europe, Britain's privatised water supply is so costly that many people prefer to disconnect altogether. This has created health problems in poor areas.

Even worst is Britain's transport infrastructure. Broken up into small private divisions, the once first rate British Rail system now has appalling maintenance standards. One result of this was the recent Paddington accident, one of the Europe's worst.

Today the trade mark red London double-decker bus, rarely runs on time. The bus network has been parcelled out into small fragments owned by companies more interested in cutting jobs and raising fares than in providing a semi-reliable service."

And our Minister in the course of his intervention – I do not know whether it was half a reply to the debate – said that the private companies whether they are either in profit or loss, do not tax the people. What is the conception of the economy, I do not know. Every process of manufacture, trade and marketing will be taxing directly or indirectly the people in our country.

(g4/1825/tkd-hng)

This is the economic system where we are now.

A recent CMIE study found that PSUs use capital more efficiently than private companies. It has been mentioned by IROs.

In the first part of disinvestment, that is, in 1991-92, the C&AG estimated that public loss was about Rs. 3,342 crore in under-valued PSU shares sold in that year. ...(*Interruptions*) I am not bailing them out. In subsequent years, till date, what is the opinion and observation of the C&AG regarding the valuation of the shares that were being sold? ...(*Interruptions*)

The hon. Minister has said that economists and newspaper men are criticising. They are telling to hurry up, do hurriedly and sell everything. Why are you not selling? We have seen articles of different economists in the newspapers. There are dissenting voices also; dissension is there even in the Ministry and even in the Cabinet. I have also raised this point that Minister for Disinvestment should not be someone short of Prime Minister. He is deciding about disinvestment of airlines, textiles, heavy industries, chemical industries, etc.

Sir, when we meet in the Consultative Committees or in any other Parliamentary Committees, then the Secretaries and other people give information in a very rationed manner. The amount of ration is very low. They supply less information.

Sir, Secretary in the Ministry of Disinvestment has told before the Press that if the public sector enterprises are totally sold according to their policies, then Rs. 8 lakh crore will be fetched in the Government exchequer. It is all right. The Government may think over this point and come forward with a discussion here. We are here and we see from the newspapers only that this decision has been taken and that decision has been taken.

(h4/1830/pb-sb)

At the time of taking over the NTC, NJMC and various other organisations, there were enactments made in this House, but now, when disinvestment is being made, the House is not taken into confidence. We are not discussing the matter. We are not deciding. The Budget has been passed. Only in the Budgetary Speech, something has been mentioned in this regard and the process is going on. I mention this point because in the earlier days when rules were framed, we did not foresee that such type of a situation will arise. We have been deciding on investment; we have not been deciding on disinvestment. Therefore, this is a new situation, and in this new situation, a new policy has to be adopted on how the Parliament will have to be taken into confidence.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, please conclude, otherwise, we will not be in a position to conclude the discussion.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): I am concluding, Sir.

It has been said that disinvestment will help India to avoid debt trap. I am referring to the Secretary's remarks here. He has said:

"India is heading towards a typical debt trap which could be avoided with disinvestment of public sector undertakings, from which it could recover at least Rupees Seven lakh crore."

1831 hrs. (Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh *in the Chair*)

In the Union Budget of 2000-01, the interest payments are 50 per cent of the revenue receipts expected. Fifty per cent of the revenue earning will be paid just towards payment of interest on debt. This is the situation. This is leading towards a typical debt trap that could be avoided with disinvestment. This is what the Secretary has said. But nothing was said on the floor of the Parliament nor in any of the Committees where we do meet all these officers. Even when asked, they bypass, giving some obscure answer. This is a very new situation which we could not conceive of 15, 20 or even more years ago.

In the Budget Speech, the Finance Minister has said that about one-tenth of the anticipated receipts will be used for retiring Government debts and the rest for expenditure in the social sector and for restructuring of public sector enterprises. If there is no White Paper, if there is no clear-cut policy and report on the action taken on that policy, how can this be assessed? And if the policy and the action taken on that policy is not assessed by the Parliament, then what is the use of it?

I want to conclude with the point that at this juncture that the Government is out to hand over all the properties, assets and everything that the country has earned. The country has travelled a long distance for earning these assets and these are going to be handed over to private owners.

(j4/1835/krr/har)

I can show that, since inception, straightaway from the Budget money goes to the business houses in different ways. This money goes directly from the Budget to the big landowners in the name of farmers. We must distinguish between cultivators and non-cultivators. We must distinguish between peasantry and landowners. There is no distinction. Five per cent of the rural population own 45 per cent of the land. ...*(Interruptions)*

45 प्रतिशत जमीन 5 प्रतिशत लोगों के हाथ में है। आप समझ जाइये कि 45 प्रतिशत आप जो सब्सिडी देते हैं, जो पैसा देते हैं चाहे वह बिजली में हो, पानी में हो या दूसरी चीजों में हो, यह 45 प्रतिशत पांच प्रतिशत लोगों के हाथ में जाता है।

This is how, directly and indirectly, the Government exchequer is paying to the big industrial houses and the big landowners. This policy is being continuously pursued. We are raising the voice of protest in this Parliament. We want that the dissenting parties and the dissenting Ministers and the Congress Party – which is re-thinking over their policies – will come together and join and defeat this process. If it is not defeated in this Parliament, it will be defeated outside the Parliament, before the people.

Thank you.

(ends)

(FOR THE REST OF THE PROCEEDINGS,
PLEASE SEE THE SUPPLEMENT.)

1836 बजे

श्री किरीट सोमैया (मुम्बई उत्तर पूर्व) : सम्माननीय स्भापति जी, एनडीए सरकार की डिस-इंवेस्टमेंट नीति के समर्थन में बोलने के लिए मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं अपने एक सहयोगी से पूछ रहा था कि ऐसा कौनसा प्राणी होता है जो सीज़न के हिसाब से अपना रंग बदलता है। उन्होंने कहा कि उसको हिंदी में गिरगिट कहते हैं। ऐसे ही कांग्रेस भी अपना रंग बदलने लगी है।*(व्यवधान)*

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.) : यह आप पर पूरी तरह से लागू होता है।*(व्यवधान)*

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Immediately after the Congress had announced its liberalisation policy, hon. Minister Shri L.K. Advani has said in Washington that the Congress had hijacked BJP's economic liberalisation policy. ...*(Interruptions)*

श्री किरीट सोमैया (मुम्बई उत्तर पूर्व) : स्भापति जी, मुझे लग रहा है कि 90 के दशक के पहले की कांग्रेस में और 2000 की कांग्रेस में तथा 21वीं सदी की कांग्रेस में कुछ अंतर दिखाई दे रहा है। सन् 1998 में भी उन्होंने बहुत प्रयत्न किया लेकिन उनकी सीटें कम होती गयीं।*(व्यवधान)* उनकी सीटों का डिसइंवेस्टमेंट हो गया। कांग्रेस की सीटें 401 से घटकर 100 पर आ गयी हैं और उन्हें डर यह लग रहा है कि 21वीं सदी में जब पहला चुनाव होगा तो तब शायद वे डबल फिगर में भी न पहुंच पायें। चुनाव स्टंट के नाते 1990 की उनकी डिसइंवेस्टमेंट की नीति और अब की उनकी नीति में अंतर हो सकता है और यह हर पार्टी का अधिकार है। लेकिन जब पार्टी अपना रंग बदलती है तो किसी की बलि भी चढ़ाती है। हमारे मुम्बई में उसको "बलि का बकरा" कहा जाता है। पार्टी बलिदान से पहले उसको बहुत खिलाती है, पिलाती है।

(अध्यक्षपीठ के आदेशानुसार कार्यवाही-वृत्तान्त से निकाल दिया गया।)

(k4/1840/skb-san)

. काश, श्री अय्यर जी को जो अभी ब्रह्म ज्ञान हुआ है, वह 1991 से लेकर 1995 तक हुआ होता तो जो छोटे इन्वैस्टर्स हैं, जो मिडिल क्लास इन्वैस्टर्स हैं, उनके 3-4-5 हजार करोड़ रुपये आपके कारण बच जाते।

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (PONNANI): MR. Chairman Sir, the Leader of the Opposition is a parliamentary institution and therefore, the words of defamation used for him are unparliamentary. You can consider it later on and if you think that I am right, they should be expunged.

स्भापति महोदय (डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह) : ठीक है, इसे एक्सपंज किया जाये।

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Sir, there is nothing defamatory. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): When they used such words in their speech, we digested them. Now, why can they not digest? ...*(Interruptions)*

किरीट सोमैया (मुम्बई उत्तर पूर्व): मैं अय्यर जी को वह पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ जो डा. मनमोहन सिंह जी का वाक्य था और जिसे आपने पढ़ा था।

"to encourage wider public participation and promote greater accountability, up to 20 per cent of Government equity in selected public sector undertakings would be offered to mutual funds and investment institutions in public sector."

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Is the private sector mentioned? Is the multinational mentioned? Is the strategic sale mentioned? Is the ownership control being transferred? Is the management control being transferred?

पढ़िये, मगर दोबारा पढ़िये और समझिये। उसके बाद हमें पढ़कर सुनाइये।

श्री किरिट सोमैया (मुम्बई उत्तर पूर्व): अगर आपको इतना ही सुनना है तो आगे कहूंगा कि खुद आपने अपने पैरों पर कुल्हाड़ी मारी है। मैं डा. मनमोहन सिंह का वही वाक्य पढ़ रहा हूँ '20 per cent selected investment in public sector financial institutions and mutual funds'.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): It is for wider public participation, but not for Ambani's participation.

श्री किरिट सोमैया (मुम्बई उत्तर पूर्व): और आगे क्या सुनाऊं? आपने स्युचुअल फंड पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स और फाइनेंशियल इंस्टीट्यूशन्स को पैसा बेचा, जो शेयर्स बेचे, आप 1991 से लेकर 1995 तक की हिस्ट्री देखिये तो मालूम होगा कि आपने पांच हजार करोड़ रुपया डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट किया, वह पब्लिक में नहीं किया, आपने बाहर मार्किट में शेयर्स नहीं खरीदे। You sold this 20 per cent equity to the Unit Trust of India. उसमें यू.टी.आई. को 3500 करोड़ रुपये का घाटा हुआ। 1991 से 1995 तक यू.टी.आई. ने पब्लिक सैक्टर में डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट किया और उससे सरकार मारी गई। सरकार ने 3500 करोड़ रुपया देकर बेल आउट किया और आपने जो शेयर्स ट्रांसफर किये, उसके कारण हुआ। It was a total window-dressing and cheating. आपने लोगों की आंखों में धूल झांकी है। आपने हायर रेट्स पर यू.टी.आई. को बेचे। यू.टी.आई. कुछ नहीं कह सकता था। यू.टी.आई. में किसका पैसा है? इसमें स्माल इन्वेस्टर्स का दो करोड़ पचास लाख रुपया है। आज यू.टी.आई.-64 नीचे आई तो आपकी सरकार के कारण आई। और आप श्री अरुण जेटली से पूछ रहे थे। He was asking to publish the White Paper. श्री अरुण शौरी व्हाइट या रेड पेपर पब्लिश करें, उसमें काले कारनामे तो आप लोगों की सरकार के ही होंगे।

श्री रूप चन्द पाल (हुगली): आपका स्वदेशी जागरण मंच बोल रहा है, वह सरकार को निकाल दीजिये।

श्री किरिट सोमैया (मुम्बई उत्तर पूर्व): मैंने यह कहा है कि व्हाइट पेपर हो या रेड पेपर हो, उसमें आप दोनों के समय की सरकारों के काले कारनामे होंगे।

(14/1845/sh-bks)

"In July 1991, the Government, in order to improve portfolio and performance of public sector enterprises, announced a new Industrial Policy which contained major decisions in respect of the public sector. These decisions included the reduction in the list of industries reserved for the public sector from 17 to 4 areas."

This Disinvestment Policy is a good policy, and I support it.

क्योंकि मेरा स्पष्ट कहना है कि 17 में से चार खराब हैं। ठीक है, 1970 में कोई कम्प्लेन रही होगी। मैं 1970 और 1980 के डीटेल में नहीं पढ़ना चाहता। उस समय नेशनलाइजेशन हुआ, जो आपने शुरू किया। मैंने कांग्रेस को यह नहीं पूछा कि 17 पब्लिक सैक्टर इंडस्ट्रीज थीं और फिर बाद में चार हो गयीं, उसमें से स्ट्रेटिजिक कौन सी है और कोर सैक्टर कौन सी हैं। You have asked 13 questions, and the Minister will reply to them. You wanted to differentiate the public sector in terms of core sector, strategic sector and so on.

This is meant for the people, the common man on the street, who are living below the poverty line. Now, you are talking about 'below poverty line' people; you are talking about socialistic economy. जो झोपड़-पट्टी में रहते हैं, झुग्गियों में रहते हैं, वे मारुति कार यूज करते हैं। क्या मारुति फैक्ट्री माननीय अरुण शौरी जी ने लगाई? Was it done out of compulsion or was it considered as a strategic sector? In Maruti Udyog, the Government of India does not have 51 per cent of shares. You have started the globalisation. What sort of globalisation is this? You have given 50 per cent of the shares to Suzuki, and 50 per cent to the Government of India. Could you not have retained 51 per cent? क्या मारुति कार आम आदमी के लिए है? आप डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट की बात करते हैं। आपके 24 में से 23 होटल्स आज लॉसेज में जा रहे हैं। जो सैन्टूर फाइव स्टार होटल्स बने हैं, Are these for tourism development? What kind of tourism development are we talking about? कोई राजस्थान के जंगल में या उत्तर प्रदेश में वाराणसी के पास छोटी धर्मशाला बनाये तो मैं समझ सकता हूँ और उसके लिए सरकार अपने बजट में से पैसा रखे, मैं उसे सपोर्ट करूंगा। लेकिन मुम्बई एयरपोर्ट के सामने जुहु के सामने सैन्टूर होटल बनते हैं और उसमें जो लॉसेज होते हैं वे आम आदमी की खीसे में से जाते हैं, क्या आप उस पालिसी को जारी रखेंगे। जो लॉसेज पब्लिक सैक्टर में होता है वह किसके खीसे में से जाता है। What do we mean by 'Government of India'? The Government of India, in other words, represents one hundred crore people. वह टैक्स पेयर्स का पैसा है। अगर टैक्स पेयर्स का पैसा मारुति के कारखाने में लगाने की बजाय जहां बाढ़ आती है, उन बाढ़ों को रोकने के लिए, वहां डैम्स बनाने के लिए यूज करते तो वहां नुकसान कम होता। We have to define this strategic sector. I am only asking you to think ahead. What is a profit-making unit? You were discussing about profit-making public sector units. आज वे 117 हो गये। 237 में से 106 लॉस करते गये। ये 106 तब लॉस नहीं कर रहे थे। 10-15 साल पहले ये काफी प्रोफिट में रहे होंगे। Due to urbanisation and by allowing private industries in that, due to the ending of monopolistic economy, they were making losses. इसमें आपका या किसी का दोष नहीं है। मैं वास्तव में सदन से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह नाटकबाजी छोड़ो, बनातवाला जी नाटकबाजी शब्द के अर्थ पर मत जाइये। छोड़ो ये सब बातें कि आपकी सरकार होगी या यह सरकार होगी। जो दो लाख पचास हजार करोड़ रुपये का इन्वेस्टमेंट लगा है, उसका रेट ऑफ रिटर्न अगर आप जानना चाहें तो मैं आपको पढ़कर सुना सकता हूँ। आपको बहुत स्टेटिस्टिकली फीगर्स मिल सकती हैं। The figure varies from one per cent to six per cent. Everybody is giving different figures. What is the rate of return that we are getting? Somebody says, it is one per cent; somebody else says, it is two per cent or 4 per cent. उसमें से जो आपके मोनोपोलिस्टिक

पी.एस.यू.ज. हैं, ऑयल पी.एस.यू.ज. हैं, वे निकाल दीजिए, यह दो परसेन्ट से भी नीचे आ जायेगा। आपको श्री अरुण शौरी जी एक्जेक्ट फीर्स देंगे, ऑयल पी.एस.यू.ज. क्या होते हैं। माननीय राम नाइक जी यहां बैठे हैं, 2002 में आपके ऑयल पी.एस.यू. के पेट्रोल पम्प बाहर बिकने लगेंगे।

(m4/1850/snb-hcb)

How will you stop them? When the Reliance and other private industries would come in, how would we stop them? Are we able to prevent private persons from entering into the telecom market? आप मुम्बई आइए। बंगलौर, इंदौर में शुरू हो चुका है और वहां यूजर्स टैलिकॉम आ गया है। एम.टी.एन.एल. की वैल्यू डाउन होने लगी है। आटोमैटिकली होगी। मुम्बई में कस्टर के घर में आकर लगा जाते हैं। हम कहते हैं कि हमें नया नम्बर नहीं चाहिए। **You only make out-going calls.** इनकमिंग में एम.टी.एन.एल. को पैसा नहीं मिलता है जो करने वाला देता है। वह कहता है कि इनकमिंग के लिए एम.टी.एन.एल. का बॉक्स यूज करो और आउटगोइंग के लिए मेरा यूज करो। **They are concentrating only on big customers.** आपने आज गेटवे खोल दिये। क्या होगा वी.एस.एन.एल. का, क्या होगा वी.सी.एस.एन.एल. का? एम.टी.एन.एल. होगा, वी.एस.एन.एल. होगा, वी.पी.सी.एल. होगा, आई.ओ.सी. होगा **After five years they are going to become NTCs.** यह दीवार पर लिखा है जिसको पढ़ने की हिम्मत हमें करनी चाहिए। **We are the leaders of the country.** आज देश हमको अलग दृष्टि से देखता है। भूल जाइए समाजवादी, कांग्रेस, कम्युनिस्ट, बीजेपी, बीजेडी, शिवसेना, एन.डी.ए. लेकिन हमें सोचना होगा। अगर हम नहीं सोचेंगे और इसी प्रकार का वाद-विवाद वितंडावाद करते रहेंगे तो हर साल नयी-नयी सिक यूनिट्स बनती जाएंगी और आज जो घाटा इतना होता है जो मैंने बताया ऑइल सेक्टर निकाल दीजिए और उसके बाद 10-15 मेजर प्रॉफिट मेकिंग यूनिट्स निकाल दीजिए पावर सेक्टर की **It goes in minus.** पावर सेक्टर का हम क्या कर रहे हैं? **What is happening in the power sector.** हम पावर सेक्टर में जनरेशन का प्राइवेटाइजेशन कर रहे हैं लेकिन हम ध्यान में नहीं रखते हैं कि बहुत बड़ी गलती हम समाज के साथ, देश के साथ और आर्थिक नीति के साथ कर रहे हैं, खिलवाड़ कर रहे हैं। **It is because when it was recommended that power generation must go with distribution,** डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन में कोई प्राइवेट सेक्टर आने को तैयार नहीं है क्योंकि बिल की वसूली कौन करेगा? ऐसे वसूल करने की शक्ति नहीं है। पावर की चोरी होती है, माफिया होते हैं, बिल वसूल नहीं कर सकते हैं। **Losses are in the distribution.** हरेक स्टेट में किस-किस की सरकार है? हर पार्टी की सरकार है। हम वहां पावर जनरेशन का प्राइवेटाइजेशन कर रहे हैं, डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन का नहीं कर रहे हैं। डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन का लॉस हमारे सिर पर आ रहा है और यह जो प्राइवेट कंपनीज आने वाली हैं **Who has started globalisation?** 1991 से 1995 तक हरेक कंपनी को टैक्स की जो छूट दी है वह मैं आपको बताऊंगा तो आपको ताज्जुब होगा। मैं फ़ॉरेन टैलिविजन कंपनीज और इंडियन टैलिविजन कंपनीज के बारे में बताता हूँ। **Indian television companies have to pay 38 per cent income tax and the foreign television companies have to pay just 4.5 per cent income tax.** यह एन.डी.ए. की सरकार ने नहीं किया है, यह पहले की सरकार ने किया है। लेकिन मैं आरोपबाजी नहीं करना चाहता हूँ और आपको कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह ग्लोबलाइजेशन बहुत अच्छे इकोनॉमिस्ट ने किया है, आप मत बुलवाइए कि आपकी सरकार में हुआ है, आप उस बात को छोड़ दीजिए। मैं आरोपबाजी नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। मुझे एक बहुत अच्छे इकोनॉमिस्ट ने कहा है कि हम सुबह उठकर पहले क्या करते हैं। सबसे पहले हम नाश्ता नहीं करते हैं। पहले हम मुंह धोते हैं, ब्रश करते हैं, उसके बाद लैट्रीन जाते हैं, उसके बाद हम स्नान करते हैं और उसके पश्चात् नाश्ता करते हैं। **What should we have done?** हमने अपने पी.एस.यू.ज. का मोनोपॉलिस्टिक नेचर तैयार किया। उसके कारण ऐफिशियेन्सी, अकाउंटैबिलिटी ही नहीं है। 11 बजे के बाद 11.25 बजे भी कोई आता है **Are we able to tell?** वहां पर कोई मंत्रालय में या पी.एस.यू. में जाकर बोले कि क्यों लेट आया है और छः बजे के बदले पौने छः बजे जाता है तो **We cannot do anything.** यह 25-30 साल का सिस्टम है। वहां पर मोनोपॉलिस्टिक नेचर तैयार किया है। ऐफिशियेन्सी का स्वाल ही नहीं है, अकाउंटैबिलिटी का प्रश्न ही नहीं है और हमने क्या किया? हमने ट्रेड में ग्लोबलाइजेशन कर दिया। एक बाजू वी.एस.एन.एल. के सामने बड़ी ग्लोबल कंपनियां होंगी और दूसरी तरफ हमारा 30 साल पुराना मोनोपॉलिस्टिक कल्चर। तो कहां तक टिक पाएगा?

(n4/1855/rpm/kmr)

स्भापति महोदय, मैं इनसे कहूंगा कि न्वरलन यूनिटों से और आगे जाकर स्टडी कीजिए। **All of them are earning profits only due to their monopoly in the market.** दूसरी जो वे मांग कर रहे थे (व्यवधान)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): How can you say that? I will give you the example of BHEL.

SHRI KIRIT SOMAIYA (MUMBAI NORTH EAST): It is a fact. I am telling you. हमें पहले पी.एस.यू.ज. का कारपोरेटाइजेशन करना चाहिए। उसके बाद प्राइवेटाइजेशन करना चाहिए और प्राइवेटाइजेशन के बाद ग्लोबलाइजेशन और डिस्इन्वैस्टमेंट करना चाहिए, लेकिन हमने पहले क्या किया, वहीं जो मैंने पहले कहा, स्नान किया, उसके बाद लैट्रीन गए और फिर ब्रश कर रहे हैं। मैं वास्तव में आंकों में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ, वरना जितने फीर्स आपने पेश किए हैं मैं उससे 10 गुने फीर्ग दे सकता हूँ। गुजराती में जो कहावत है मैं उसे आपके सामने सुनाना चाहता हूँ। उसका अभिप्राय यह है कि राजा का काम व्यापार करना नहीं है। **How will we be able to save our economy?** जब राजा ही व्यापार करने बैठ जाए, तो प्रशासन और शासन कौन करेगा (व्यवधान)

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.) : तभी देश भिखारी हो रहा है (व्यवधान)

श्री किरिट सोमैया (मुम्बई उत्तर पूर्व) : देश भिखारी नहीं हो रहा है। मैं आपको वास्तविकता बताता हूँ। जो टोटल इन्वैस्टमेंट हुआ वह 18 हजार करोड़ रुपए का हुआ। उसमें से यश्वन्त सिन्हा जी ने 1998 से डिस्इन्वैस्टमेंट शुरू किया। 5300 करोड़ रुपए के अभी तक के डिस्इन्वैस्टमेंट में से केवल 700-800 करोड़ रुपए का बाहर हुआ और बाकी 4000 करोड़ का पी.एस.यू.ज. में, ऑयल सेक्टर वगैरह में हुआ है। यानी अपने ही देश के अंदर हुआ है। 1992 में दो-ढाई हजार करोड़ रुपए का हुआ जिसमें से कुछ इंस्टीट्यूशन्स के पास गया और 2 हजार या 2200 में से बहुत कम एन.डी.ए. की सरकार ने किया। बाकी सब जितना भी किया वह पहले की सरकारों ने किया, लेकिन मैं उनके ऊपर आक्षेप नहीं करना चाहता और न कोई आरोप लगाना चाहता हूँ। अभी शेयर बेचे गए। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यूनिट ट्रस्ट आफ इंडिया को क्यों बेचे। आपने जो काम किया है वह तो ऐसा है जैसे कोई आदमी अपने घर का पूरा गहना और सब कुछ बेच दे। **It is not our business. It is not the business of the Government to do business.** आपने स्माल यूनिट्स का पैसा डबल किया। मैं दूसरी बात कहना चाहता हूँ-

What have you scored? You think about what has happened in shares. We have opened up radio and TV. Now we are going in for open sky policy. आल इंडिया रेडियो पर 500 करोड़ रुपए साल का खर्च है। **What is their earning? It is Rs.90 crore.** स्ट्रैटेजिक सेक्टर है। हमने इस बार एफ.एम. रेडियो के लाइसेंस बेचे। ओपन बिडिंग हुई। **Do you know how much the Government has earned?** एक साल के 430 करोड़ रुपए सरकार को मिले। जब आर्थिक प्रगति होगी तभी देश का विकास होगा और तभी काम बनेगा। **These are facts.** अब आप देखें 430 करोड़ रुपए की रायल्टी दी है और जो 90 करोड़ की इन्कम है वह भी 10 करोड़ रुपए हो जाएगी। **Everything is there.** मैं आपके सामने एक म्युचुअल फंड का आंकड़ा बताता चाहता हूँ। 1995-96 तक गवर्नमेंट इस क्षेत्र में यूनिट ट्रस्ट ऑफ इंडिया की मौनोपौली थी। उसने 1995-96 में 5900 करोड़ रुपए इकट्ठे

किए। दूसरी ओर म्युचुअल फंड की आई.डी.बी.आई. या आई.सी.आई.सी.आई. आदि दूसरी कंपनियों ने They have collected Rs.296 crore- केवल 296 करोड़ रुपए इकट्ठे किए।

1836 बजे

श्री किरीट सोमैया (मुम्बई उत्तर पूर्व) : सम्माननीय स्भापति जी, एनडीए सरकार की डिस-इंवेस्टमेंट नीति के समर्थन में बोलने के लिए मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं अपने एक सहयोगी से पूछ रहा था कि ऐसा कौनसा प्राणी होता है जो सीज़न के हिसाब से अपना रंग बदलता है। उन्होंने कहा कि उसको हिंदी में गिरगिट कहते हैं। ऐसे ही कांग्रेस भी अपना रंग बदलने लगी है। (व्यवधान)

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.) : यह आप पर पूरी तरह से लागू होता है। (व्यवधान)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Immediately after the Congress had announced its liberalisation policy, hon. Minister Shri L.K. Advani has said in Washington that the Congress had hijacked BJP's economic liberalisation policy. ... (Interruptions)

श्री किरीट सोमैया (मुम्बई उत्तर पूर्व) : स्भापति जी, मुझे लग रहा है कि 90 के दशक के पहले की कांग्रेस में और 2000 की कांग्रेस में तथा 21वीं सदी की कांग्रेस में कुछ अंतर दिखाई दे रहा है। सन् 1998 में भी उन्होंने बहुत प्रयत्न किया लेकिन उनकी सीटें कम होती गयीं। (व्यवधान) उनकी सीटों का डिसइंवेस्टमेंट हो गया। कांग्रेस की सीटें 401 से घटकर 100 पर आ गयी हैं और उन्हें डर यह लग रहा है कि 21वीं सदी में जब पहला चुनाव होगा तो तब शायद वे डबल फिगर में भी न पहुंच पायें। चुनाव स्टंट के नाते 1990 की उनकी डिसइंवेस्टमेंट की नीति और अब की उनकी नीति में अंतर हो सकता है और यह हर पार्टी का अधिकार है। लेकिन जब पार्टी अपना रंग बदलती है तो किसी की बलि भी चढ़ाती है। हमारे मुम्बई में उसको "बलि का बकरा" कहा जाता है। पार्टी बलिदान से पहले उसको बहुत खिलाती है, पिलाती है।

(अध्यक्षपीठ के आदेशानुसार कार्यवाही-वृत्तान्त से निकाल दिया गया।)

(k4/1840/skb-san)

. काश, श्री अय्यर जी को जो अभी ब्रह्म ज्ञान हुआ है, वह 1991 से लेकर 1995 तक हुआ होता तो जो छोटे इन्वेस्टर्स हैं, जो मिडिल क्लास इन्वेस्टर्स हैं, उनके 3-4-5 हजार करोड़ रुपये आपके कारण बच जाते।

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (PONNANI): MR. Chairman Sir, the Leader of the Opposition is a parliamentary institution and therefore, the words of defamation used for him are unparliamentary. You can consider it later on and if you think that I am right, they should be expunged.

स्भापति महोदय (डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह) : ठीक है, इसे एक्सपंज किया जाये।

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Sir, there is nothing defamatory. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): When they used such words in their speech, we digested them. Now, why can they not digest? ... (Interruptions)

किरीट सोमैया (मुम्बई उत्तर पूर्व): मैं अय्यर जी को वह पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ जो डा. मनमोहन सिंह जी का वाक्य था और जिसे आपने पढ़ा था।

"to encourage wider public participation and promote greater accountability, up to 20 per cent of Government equity in selected public sector undertakings would be offered to mutual funds and investment institutions in public sector. "

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Is the private sector mentioned? Is the multinational mentioned? Is the strategic sale mentioned? Is the ownership control being transferred? Is the management control being transferred?

पढ़िये, मगर दोबारा पढ़िये और समझिये। उसके बाद हमें पढ़कर सुनाइये।

श्री किरीट सोमैया (मुम्बई उत्तर पूर्व): अगर आपको इतना ही सुनना है तो आगे कहूंगा कि खुद आपने अपने पैरों पर कुल्हाड़ी मारी है। मैं डा. मनमोहन सिंह का वही वाक्य पढ़ रहा हूँ '20 per cent selected investment in public sector financial institutions and mutual funds'.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): It is for wider public participation, but not for Ambani's participation.

श्री किरीट सोमैया (मुम्बई उत्तर पूर्व): और आगे क्या सुनाऊँ? आपने म्युचुअल फंड पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स और फाइनेंशियल इंस्टीट्यूशन्स को पैसा बेचा, जो शेयर्स बेचे, आप 1991 से लेकर 1995 तक की हिस्ट्री देखिये तो मालूम होगा कि आपने पांच हजार करोड़ रुपया डिसइंवेस्टमेंट किया, वह पब्लिक में नहीं किया, आपने बाहर मार्केट में शेयर्स नहीं खरीदे। You sold this 20 per cent equity to the Unit Trust of India. उसमें यू.टी.आई. को 3500 करोड़ रुपये का घाटा हुआ। 1991 से 1995 तक यू.टी.आई. ने पब्लिक सैक्टर में डिसइंवेस्टमेंट किया और उससे सरकार मारी गई। सरकार ने 3500 करोड़ रुपया देकर बेल आउट किया और आपने जो शेयर्स ट्रांसफर किये, उसके कारण हुआ। It was a total window-dressing and cheating. आपने लोगों की आंखों में धूल झाँकी है। आपने हायर रेट्स पर यू.टी.आई. को बेचे। यू.टी.आई. कुछ नहीं कह सकता था। यू.टी.आई. में किसका पैसा है? इसमें स्माल इन्वेस्टर्स का दो करोड़ पचास लाख रुपया है। आज यू.टी.आई.-64 नीचे आई तो आपकी सरकार के कारण आई। और आप श्री अरुण जेटली से पूछ रहे थे। He was asking to publish

the White Paper. श्री अरुण शौरी व्हाइट या रेड पेपर पब्लिश करें, उसमें काले कारनामे तो आप लोगों की सरकार के ही होंगे।

श्री रूप चन्द पाल (हुगली): आपका स्वदेशी जागरण मंच बोल रहा है, वह सरकुलर तो निकाल दीजिये.

श्री किरीट सोमैया (मुम्बई उत्तर पूर्व): मैंने यह कहा है कि व्हाइट पेपर हो या रेड पेपर हो, उसमें आप दोनों के समय की सरकारों के काले कारनामे होंगे।

(l4/1845/sh-bks)

"In July 1991, the Government, in order to improve portfolio and performance of public sector enterprises, announced a new Industrial Policy which contained major decisions in respect of the public sector. These decisions included the reduction in the list of industries reserved for the public sector from 17 to 4 areas."

This Disinvestment Policy is a good policy, and I support it.

क्योंकि मेरा स्पष्ट कहना है कि 17 में से चार खराब हैं। ठीक है, 1970 में कोई कम्प्लेशन रही होगी। मैं 1970 और 1980 के डीटेल में नहीं पढ़ना चाहता। उस समय नेशनलाइजेशन हुआ, जो आपने शुरू किया। मैंने कांग्रेस को यह नहीं पूछा कि 17 पब्लिक सेक्टर इंडस्ट्रीज थीं और फिर बाद में चार हो गयीं, उसमें से स्ट्रेटिजिक कौन सी है और कोर सेक्टर कौन सी हैं। You have asked 13 questions, and the Minister will reply to them. You wanted to differentiate the public sector in terms of core sector, strategic sector and so on.

This is meant for the people, the common man on the street, who are living below the poverty line. Now, you are talking about 'below poverty line' people; you are talking about socialistic economy. जो झोंपड़-पट्टी में रहते हैं, झुग्गियों में रहते हैं, वे मारुति कार यूज करते हैं। क्या मारुति फैक्ट्री माननीय अरुण शौरी जी ने लगाई? Was it done out of compulsion or was it considered as a strategic sector? In Maruti Udyog, the Government of India does not have 51 per cent of shares. You have started the globalisation. What sort of globalisation is this? You have given 50 per cent of the shares to Suzuki, and 50 per cent to the Government of India. Could you not have retained 51 per cent? क्या मारुति कार आम आदमी के लिए है? आप डिसइन्वैस्टमेंट की बात करते हैं। आपके 24 में से 23 होटल्स आज लॉसेज में जा रहे हैं। जो सैन्टूर फाइव स्टार होटल्स बने हैं, Are these for tourism development? What kind of tourism development are we talking about? कोई राजस्थान के जंगल में या उत्तर प्रदेश में वाराणसी के पास छोटी धर्मशाला बनाये तो मैं समझ सकता हूँ और उसके लिए सरकार अपने बजट में से पैसा रखे, मैं उसे सपोर्ट करूंगा। लेकिन मुम्बई एयरपोर्ट के सामने जुहू के सामने सैन्टूर होटल बनते हैं और उसमें जो लॉसेज होते हैं वे आम आदमी की खीसे में से जाते हैं, क्या आप उस पालिसी को जारी रखेंगे। जो लॉसेज पब्लिक सेक्टर में होता है वह किसके खीसे में से जाता है। What do we mean by 'Government of India'? The Government of India, in other words, represents one hundred crore people. वह टैक्स पेयर्स का पैसा है। अगर टैक्स पेयर्स का पैसा मारुति के कारखाने में लगाने की बजाय जहां बाढ़ आती है, उन बाढ़ों को रोकने के लिए, वहां डैम्स बनाने के लिए यूज करते तो वहां नुकसान कम होता। We have to define this strategic sector. I am only asking you to think ahead. What is a profit-making unit? You were discussing about profit-making public sector units. आज वे 117 हो गये। 237 में से 106 लॉस करते गये। ये 106 तब लॉस नहीं कर रहे थे। 10-15 साल पहले ये काफी प्रोफिट में रहे होंगे। Due to urbanisation and by allowing private industries in that, due to the ending of monopolistic economy, they were making losses. इसमें आपका या किसी का दोष नहीं है। मैं वास्तव में सदन से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह नाटकबाजी छोड़ो, बनातवाला जी नाटकबाजी शब्द के अर्थ पर मत जाइये। छोड़ो ये सब बातें कि आपकी सरकार होगी या यह सरकार होगी। जो दो लाख पचास हजार करोड़ रुपये का इन्वैस्टमेंट लगा है, उसका रेट ऑफ रिटर्न अगर आप जानना चाहें तो मैं आपको पढ़कर सुना सकता हूँ। आपको बहुत स्टेडिस्टिकली फीगर्स मिल सकती हैं। The figure varies from one per cent to six per cent. Everybody is giving different figures. What is the rate of return that we are getting? Somebody says, it is one per cent; somebody else says, it is two per cent or 4 per cent. उसमें से जो आपके मोनोपोलिस्टिक पी.एस.यूज. हैं, ऑयल पी.एस.यूज. हैं, वे निकाल दीजिए, यह दो परसेन्ट से भी नीचे आ जायेगा। आपको श्री अरुण शौरी जी एक्जैक्ट फीगर्स देंगे, ऑयल पी.एस.यूज. क्या होते हैं। माननीय राम नाइक जी यहां बैठे हैं, 2002 में आपके ऑयल पी.एस.यू. के पेट्रोल पम्प बाहर बिकने लगेंगे।

(m4/1850/snb-hcb)

How will you stop them? When the Reliance and other private industries would come in, how would we stop them? Are we able to prevent private persons from entering into the telecom market? आप मुम्बई आइए। बंगलौर, इंदौर में शुरू हो चुका है और वहां यूजर्स टैलिकॉम आ गया है। एम.टी.एन.एल. की वैल्यू डाउन होने लगी है। आटोमैटिकली होगी। मुम्बई में कस्टमर के घर में आकर लगा जाते हैं। हम कहते हैं कि हमें न्याय नम्बर नहीं चाहिए। You only make out-going calls. इनकर्मिंग में एम.टी.एन.एल. को पैसा नहीं मिलता है जो करने वाला देता है। वह कहता है कि इनकर्मिंग के लिए एम.टी.एन.एल. का बॉक्स यूज करो और आउटगोइंग के लिए मेरा यूज करो। They are concentrating only on big customers. आपने आज गेटवे खोल दिये। क्या होगा वी.एस.एन.एल. का, क्या होगा वी.सी.एस.एन.एल. का? एम.टी.एन.एल. होगा, वी.एस.एन.एल. होगा, वी.पी.सी.एल. होगा, आई.ओ.सी. होगा After five years they are going to become NTCs यह दीवार पर लिखा है जिसको पढ़ने की हिम्मत हमें करनी चाहिए। We are the leaders of the country. आज देश हमको अलग दृष्टि से देखता है। भूल जाइए समाजवादी, कांग्रेस, कम्युनिस्ट, बीजेपी, बीजेडी, शिवसेना, एन.डी.ए. लेकिन हमें सोचना होगा। अगर हम नहीं सोचेंगे और इसी प्रकार का वाद-विवाद वितंडवाद करते रहेंगे तो हर साल नयी-नयी सिक यूनिट्स बनती जाएंगी और आज जो घाटा इतना होता है जो मैंने बताया ऑइल सेक्टर निकाल दीजिए और उसके बाद 10-15 मेजर प्रॉफिट मेकिंग यूनिट्स निकाल दीजिए पावर सेक्टर की It goes in minus. पावर सेक्टर का हम क्या कर रहे हैं? What is happening in the power sector. हम पावर सेक्टर में जनरेशन का प्राइवेटाइजेशन कर रहे हैं लेकिन हम ध्यान में नहीं रखते हैं कि बहुत बड़ी गलती हम समाज के साथ, देश के साथ और आर्थिक नीति के साथ कर रहे हैं, खिलवाड़ कर रहे हैं। It is because when it was recommended that power generation must go with distribution, डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन में कोई प्राइवेट सेक्टर आने को तैयार नहीं है क्योंकि बिल की वसूली कौन करेगा? पैसे वसूल करने की शक्ति नहीं है। पावर की चोरी होती है, माफिया होते हैं, बिल वसूल नहीं कर सकते हैं। Losses are in the distribution. हरेक स्टेट में किस-किस की सरकार है? हर पार्टी की सरकार है। हम वहां पावर जनरेशन का प्राइवेटाइजेशन कर रहे हैं, डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन का नहीं कर रहे हैं। डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन का लॉस हमारे सिर पर आ रहा है और यह जो प्राइवेट कंपनीज आने वाली हैं Who has started

globalisation? 1991 से 1995 तक हरेक कंपनी को टैक्स की जो छूट दी है वह मैं आपको बताऊंगा तो आपको ताज्जुब होगा। मैं फॉरेन टैलिविजन कंपनीज और इंडियन टैलिविजन कंपनीज के बारे में बताता हूँ। **Indian television companies have to pay 38 per cent income tax and the foreign television companies have to pay just 4.5 per cent income tax.** यह एन.डी.ए. की सरकार ने नहीं किया है, यह पहले की सरकार ने किया है। लेकिन मैं आरोपबाजी नहीं करना चाहता हूँ और आपको कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह ग्लोबलाइजेशन बहुत अच्छे इकोनॉमिस्ट ने किया है, आप मत बुलवाइए कि आपकी सरकार में हुआ है, आप उस बात को छोड़ दीजिए। मैं आरोपबाजी नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। मुझे एक बहुत अच्छे इकोनॉमिस्ट ने कहा है कि हम सुबह उठकर पहले क्या करते हैं। सबसे पहले हम नाश्ता नहीं करते हैं। पहले हम मुंह धोते हैं, ब्रश करते हैं, उसके बाद लैट्रीन जाते हैं, उसके बाद हम स्नान करते हैं और उसके पश्चात् नाश्ता करते हैं। **What should we have done?** हमने अपने पी.एस.यूज का मोनोपलिस्टिक नेचर तैयार किया। उसके कारण ऐफिशियेन्सी, अकाउंटैबिलिटी ही नहीं है। 11 बजे के बाद 11.25 बजे भी कोई आता है **Are we able to tell?** वहां पर कोई मंत्रालय में या पी.एस.यू. में जाकर बोले कि क्यों लेट आया है और छः बजे के बदले पौने छः बजे जाता है तो **We cannot do anything.** यह 25-30 साल का सिस्टम है। वहां पर मोनोपलिस्टिक नेचर तैयार किया है। ऐफिशियेन्सी का स्वाल ही नहीं है, अकाउंटैबिलिटी का प्रश्न ही नहीं है और हमने क्या किया? हमने ट्रेड में ग्लोबलाइजेशन कर दिया। एक बाजू, वी.एस.एन.एल. के सामने बड़ी ग्लोबल कंपनियां होंगी और दूसरी तरफ हमारा 30 साल पुराना मोनोपलिस्टिक कल्चर। तो कहां तक टिक पाएगा?

(n4/1855/rpm/kmr)

सभापति महोदय, मैं इनसे कहूंगा कि नवरत्न यूनिटों से और आगे जाकर स्टडी कीजिए। **All of them are earning profits only due to their monopoly in the market.** दूसरी जो वे मांग कर रहे थे **!** (व्यवधान)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): How can you say that? I will give you the example of BHEL.

SHRI KIRIT SOMAIYA (MUMBAI NORTH EAST): It is a fact. I am telling you. हमें पहले पी.एस.यूज. का कारपोरेटाइजेशन करना चाहिए। उसके बाद प्राइवेटाइजेशन करना चाहिए और प्राइवेटाइजेशन के बाद ग्लोबलाइजेशन और डिसइन्वैस्टमेंट करना चाहिए, लेकिन हमने पहले क्या किया, वहीं जो मैंने पहले कहा, स्नान किया, उसके बाद लैट्रीन गए और फिर ब्रश कर रहे हैं। मैं वास्तव में आंकड़ों में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ, वरना जितने फिगर्स आपने पेश किए हैं मैं उससे 10 गुने फिगर दे सकता हूँ। गुजराती में जो कहावत है मैं उसे आपके सामने सुनाना चाहता हूँ। उसका अभिप्राय यह है कि राजा का काम व्यापार करना नहीं है। **How will we be able to save our economy?** जब राजा ही व्यापार करने बैठ जाए, तो प्रशासन और शासन कौन करेगा **!** (व्यवधान)

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.): तभी देश भिखारी हो रहा है **!** (व्यवधान)

श्री किरिट सोमैया (मुंबई उत्तर पूर्व): देश भिखारी नहीं हो रहा है। मैं आपको वास्तविकता बताता हूँ। जो टोटल इन्वैस्टमेंट हुआ वह 18 हजार करोड़ रुपए का हुआ। उसमें से यशवन्त सिन्हा जी ने 1998 से डिसइन्वैस्टमेंट शुरू किया। 5300 करोड़ रुपए के अभी तक के डिसइन्वैस्टमेंट में से केवल 700-800 करोड़ रुपए का बाहर हुआ और बाकी 4000 करोड़ का पी.एस.यूज. में, ऑयल, सैक्टर वगैरह में हुआ है। यानी अपने ही देश के अंदर हुआ है। 1992 में दो-ढाई हजार करोड़ रुपए का हुआ जिसमें से कुछ इंस्टीट्यूशन्स के पास गया और 2 हजार या 2200 में से बहुत कम एन.डी.ए. की सरकार ने किया। बाकी सब जितना भी किया वह पहले की सरकारों ने किया, लेकिन मैं उनके ऊपर आक्षेप नहीं करना चाहता और न कोई आरोप लगाना चाहता हूँ। अभी शेर बेचे गए। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यूनिट ट्रस्ट आफ इंडिया को क्यों बेचे। आपने जो काम किया है वह तो ऐसा है जैसे कोई आदमी अपने घर का पूरा गहना और सब कुछ बेच दे। **It is not our business. It is not the business of the Government to do business.** आपने स्माल यूनिट्स का पैसा डबल किया। मैं दूसरी बात कहना चाहता हूँ-

What have you scored? You think about what has happened in shares. We have opened up radio and TV. Now we are going in for open sky policy. आल इंडिया रेडियो पर 500 करोड़ रुपए साल का खर्च है। **What is their earning? It is Rs.90 crore.** स्ट्रैटेजिक सैक्टर है। हमने इस बार एफ.एम. रेडियो के लाइसेंस बेचे। ओपन बिडिंग हुई। **Do you know how much the Government has earned?** एक साल के 430 करोड़ रुपए सरकार को मिले। जब आर्थिक प्रगति होगी तभी देश का विकास होगा और तभी काम बनेगा। **These are facts.** अब आप देखें 430 करोड़ रुपए की रायल्टी दी है और जो 90 करोड़ की इन्कम है वह भी 10 करोड़ रुपए हो जाएगी। **Everything is there.** मैं आपके सामने एक म्युचुअल फंड का आंकड़ा बताता चाहता हूँ। 1995-96 तक गवर्नमेंट इस क्षेत्र में यूनिट ट्रस्ट ऑफ इंडिया की मौनोपली थी। उसने 1995-96 में 5900 करोड़ रुपए इकट्ठे किए। दूसरी ओर म्युचुअल फंड की आई.डी.बी.आई. या आई.सी.आई.सी.आई. आदि दूसरी कंपनियों ने **They have collected Rs.296 crore-** केवल 296 करोड़ रुपए इकट्ठे किए।

(o4/1900/kkd/rjs)

How much the private mutual fund can collect? Rs. 312 crore. 1995-96 में 6,508 करोड़ रुपये में से 312 करोड़ रुपये प्राइवेट म्युचुअल फंड ने किये। यह कितने परसेंट है, वह आप पता लगा सकते हैं। **What has happened. You know in 1999-00** में जो सेविंग थी, उससे फायदा भी होने वाला है। मैं दोनों बातें रख रहा हूँ। एक तो गवर्नमेंट पी.एस.यूज. को सोचना पड़ेगा। 1999-2000 में यूनिट ट्रस्ट और गवर्नमेंट म्युचुअल फंड की 96 परसेंट मोनोपली थी। **During 1999-00 it had come down to just 23 per cent.** आंकड़ें सुनें तो आपको आश्चर्य होगा

During 1999-00, the Mutual Fund could collect Rs. 61,221 crore. चार साल में हम दस टाइम उमर गये। यूनिट ट्रस्ट का टोटल क्लैकशन 13,698 करोड़ रुपये है। गवर्नमेंट के बाकी म्युचुअल फंड 3,817 करोड़ रुपये के हैं और प्राइवेट म्युचुअल फंड 43,706 करोड़ रुपये के है। अब क्या होगा, यह मैं आपको बताता हूँ। इसमें इन्होंने पी.एस.यूज. की लिस्ट में एफ.आई.आई. एफ.आई.ओ. लिया नहीं है। यूनिट ट्रस्ट से लेकर यह भी सिक होने वाला है। यूनिट 64 तो सिक हो गयी है। साढ़े तीन हजार रुपये लॉस्ट ईयर दिये क्योंकि **With the private mutual fund, you would not be able to compete.** इसके लिए मेरी प्रार्थना यही है कि सरकार को इसमें थोड़ी और गति बढ़ानी चाहिए। मैं अनेक ऐसे उदाहरण दे सकता हूँ। मेरी प्रार्थना यही है कि अभी भी थोड़ा समय है। ग्लोबलाइजेशन के पहले जो भी सैक्शन रह गये हैं, वहां पहले कारपोरेटाइजेशन करो। अभी डिपार्टमेंट ऑफ टेलीकम्युनिकेशन हैं। हम बाहर लाइसेंस दे देते हैं। डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. एग्रीमेंट पर माननीय प्रणव मुखर्जी ने साईन किये हैं। 2005 में वर्ल्ड की टेलीफोन सर्विसेस यहां आने लगेंगी और यहां आकर कुछ सिगनल डालने की जरूरत नहीं है क्योंकि सेटेलाइट है। वे डायरेक्ट सिगनल देंगी। आप इंटरनेट से डायरेक्ट अमरीका फोन कर पायेंगे। **Within Mumbai and Delhi, there would not be any STC charges.** एम.टी.एन.एल. और वी.एस.एन.एल. का क्या होगा? **Let us think about it.** हम कभी न कभी इस प्रकार का विचार करें।

मैं एक बात कहकर अपना विषय समाप्त करने वाला हूँ। मेरा अंतिम मुद्दा है कि डिसइन्वैस्टमेंट का जो प्रॉसेस स्टार्ट हुआ है, उसका सबसे महत्वपूर्ण कारण यह है कि

सालों तक जो लॉस मेकिंग यूनिट्स हैं या जो सो-कालड प्राफेट मेकिंग यूनिट हैं, उनकी मोनोपली समाप्त होने के बाद वे भी लॉस मेकिंग यूनिट होने वाली हैं। इनमें 19 लाख वर्कर्स हैं। इन वर्कर्स पर हम कितने लाख रुपये खर्च करेंगे? हर साल उनकी पगार हम आम बजट में से देंगे। वह पैसा उनके बजाए डेवलपमेंट एक्टिविटीज, इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर डेवलपमेंट, नये पावर प्रोजेक्ट लगाने के लिए, नये इरीगेशन प्रोजेक्ट लगाने के लिए, नये रास्ते बनाने के लिए यूज कर सकते हैं या नहीं? डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट की जो भूमिका है, उसकी नीति है, मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि उसे इस दृष्टि से देखना चाहिए। इसमें बैंक काउंट नहीं किये हैं। बैंक्स की स्थिति देखना चाहें तो उनकी इससे भी नाजुक हालत है। अभी इस साल जो पब्लिक इश्यूज आये और अभी तक जो पब्लिक इश्यूज आते थे, I will tell you the figures also. Till 1996-97. जो पब्लिक इश्यूज आते थे उसमें 92 परसेंट क्लैक्शन पी.एस.यू. का बैंक के थ्रू होता था। What happened during 1999-00? Out of the total collection of Rs. 33,435 crore the bank accounted for only 31 per cent. हमने ग्लोबलाइजेशन पहले कर दिया है। How much globalisation is there? What has happened? Out of Rs. 33,435 crore collection, the foreign banks collected Rs. 9,233 crore.

(p4/1905/nsh-rsg)

जो पब्लिक ईशू आता है, पैसा हमारा ही कलैक्ट हुआ है, इसका सब प्रॉफिट 25 प्रतिशत फौरेन बैंक को गया। पी.एस.यू. बैंक कहां आ रहे हैं। आज तीन बैंक सिक हुए हैं। माननीय अरुण जेटली जी ने कर्नाटक का उदाहरण दिया। महाराष्ट्र सरकार के फाईनैस मिनिस्टर की स्टेटमेंट है। बी.जे.पी. और शिव सेना सिर्फ वहां चार-साढ़े चार साल थी बाकी वही है। वहां के पी.एस.यू. की क्या हालत है।

"An accumulated loss of Rs.248 crore as against the paid up capital of Rs.78 crore."

वे भी अभी निर्णय लेने लगे हैं कि इसका क्या करना चाहिए। स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के पी.एस.यू. का आपने टोटल नहीं लगाया। उसमें अगर उनका लौस काउंट होगा, सिर्फ कर्नाटक का बताता हूं।

"There are two thousand PSUs, over 75 per cent of which are incurring regular losses with an investment of over Rs.4,50,000 crore. Only Karnataka alone has 78 PSUs with an investment of Rs.16,124 crore. Fifty-one out of these have accumulated losses worth Rs.2,236 crore."

मेरी प्रार्थना है कि कभी तो हम इस विषय पर और अधिक गंभीरता से विचार करें क्योंकि यहां पर हम होंगे, वहां पर आप होंगे। वहां पर आप डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट का प्रॉसेस स्टार्ट करते हैं। जो पार्टी वहां रूलिंग में नहीं है, वह इस प्रकार की जन-भावना भड़काने का प्रयत्न करती है। कहीं पर आप रूलिंग में हैं, कहीं पर आप औपोजीशन में हैं। लेकिन देश ने हम पर जिम्मेदारी सौंपी है। हमने भूतकाल में क्या किया, मैं उस पर उंगली नहीं उठाना चाहता लेकिन भविष्य में आने वाली पीढ़ी पूछेगी कि अख्यर जी, रूप चन्द पाल जी, गीते जी, आप लोक सभा में बैठे थे, आप लोग जिम्मेदार थे, आपने साढ़े चार लाख करोड़ रुपये स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के पी.एस.यू. और ढाई लाख करोड़ रुपये के गवर्नमेंट ऑफ इंडिया के पी.एस.यू. यानी सात लाख करोड़ रुपये के पी.एस.यू. में बैंक और फाईनैशियल इंस्टीट्यूशन्स काउंट नहीं किए। सात लाख करोड़ रुपये के पी.एस.यू. की वैल्यू सत्तर हजार करोड़ हो गई - आप क्या करते रहे।

मैं यही विनती करता हूं कि हम सब साथ मिल कर इस डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट नीति को पौजीटिव दृष्टिकोण से देखें। धन्यवाद। (इति)

1908 बजे

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.) : माननीय सभापति महोदय, सार्वभौमीकरण के इस दौर में विश्व के सभी राष्ट्र अपने-अपने हितों को देखते हुए अपने कार्य साधन जुटा रहे हैं। सार्वभौमीकरण की प्रक्रिया जटिल एवं बहुआयामी है। इस प्रक्रिया के अन्तर्गत हमें देखना होता है कि किस प्रक्रिया के किस पहलू को अपनाने से हमारे देश का सर्वाधिक लाभ होगा। विश्व में जो राष्ट्र आर्थिक रूप से शक्तिशाली हैं और औद्योगिक रूप से सम्पन्न हैं, वे विश्व में अन्य जगहों में अपनी उत्पादित वस्तु के लिए बाजार की तलाश में हैं। जो राष्ट्र जन-संसाधनों से परिपूर्ण हैं, वे जन-बाहुल्यता के आधार पर उद्योगों के लिए और अपने जन-संसाधनों के निर्यात के लिए जगह तलाश करके विश्व के अग्रणी राष्ट्रों में अपना स्थान बनाने का कार्य कर रहे हैं। लेकिन हमारे देश का सबसे दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण पक्ष यह है कि हमारा देश लगातार दस वर्षों से सार्वभौमीकरण का पाश्चात्य अंधानुकरण करने के पश्चात् भी आज तक यह तथ्य नहीं कर पाया कि हम किस पहलू को अपना कर देश को विश्व के मानचित्र पर प्रतिष्ठापित करने का कार्य करें।

(q4/1910/mkg/vp)

आज उसका नतीजा यह है कि सरकार की गलत नीतियों के कारण समाज का वह वर्ग प्रभावित हुआ है, आज देश का किसान, जो इस देश की जनसंख्या का 70 प्रतिशत है, सरकार की इन्हीं गलत नीतियों के कारण खाद, बीज और पानी के लिए तरस रहा है। उसे बिजली प्राप्त नहीं हो रही है, जो बुनियादी सुविधाएं इस देश के किसान को प्राप्त होनी चाहिए, वे देश की 54 साल की आजादी के बाद भी आज देश के किसान को प्राप्त नहीं हो रही हैं। इस देश का नौजवान बेकारी और बेरोजगारी की समस्या से जूझ रहा है। आज इस नीति का कहीं कोई लाभ देश के अन्दर बेरोजगारी को दूर करने में अब तक सफल सिद्ध नहीं हुआ है। आज सार्वजनिक उपक्रमों में विनिवेश एक महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है। निजीकरण के पक्ष में यह तर्क दिया जा रहा है कि जो सार्वजनिक उपक्रम घाटे में हैं, उन सार्वजनिक उपक्रमों में विनिवेश की प्रक्रिया अपनाई जानी चाहिए। निश्चित तौर पर जो उपक्रम घाटे में जा रहे हैं, वहां विनिवेश की प्रक्रिया अपनाई जानी चाहिए। लेकिन जो उपक्रम लाभ में चल रहे हैं, यदि उन्हें भी हम निजी क्षेत्रों में सौंपने का काम करेंगे, उनका भी निजीकरण करने का काम करेंगे तो निश्चित तौर पर देश रसातल में जायेगा।

आज रूस की जो आर्थिक स्थिति है, हंगरी की जो आर्थिक स्थिति है, इस अंधानुकरण और निजीकरण का ही परिणाम है। हंगरी के अन्दर तीन वर्षों तक जब विनिवेश की प्रक्रिया चलती रही तो आर्थिक स्थिति अच्छी रही, लेकिन जब मुनाफा दूसरे देशों में जाने लगा तो हंगरी की स्थिति कैसी है, यह आज सर्वविदित है। आज सरकार में बैठे हुए लोग इस खुशफहमी के शिकार हैं कि वे विनिवेश की प्रक्रिया को अपनाकर बजटीय घाटे को पूरा करने का काम करेंगे। आज बजटीय घाटे को पूरा करने के लिए विभिन्न सरकारों के द्वारा जो विनिवेश की प्रक्रिया अपनाई गई। विनिवेश की प्रक्रिया के अन्तर्गत आज तक जो इन्होंने लक्ष्य निर्धारित किये थे, उन लक्ष्यों को प्राप्त नहीं कर सके। इस सरकार में बैठे हुए लोगों ने सार्वजनिक उपक्रमों को आजाद हिन्दुस्तान का मंदिर कहा था। इन्होंने आजाद हिन्दुस्तान के मंदिरों को एक-एक करके जिस तरह से ध्वस्त करना शुरू कर दिया है, यह कोई नई बात नहीं है। मंदिरों को, धार्मिक प्रतिष्ठानों को गिराना भारतीय जनता पार्टी और इनकी सरकार के लोगों की आदत बन चुकी है। हम यह कहना चाहते हैं कि आज जिस तरह से यह सरकार विनिवेश की प्रक्रिया को अपना रही है **à€!** (व्यवधान) आपके ही लोगों ने यह कहा था कि ये आजाद हिन्दुस्तान के मंदिर हैं और यह मेरा कहना नहीं है, यह स्वदेशी जागरण मंच, भारतीय जनता पार्टी के जो प्रमुख घटक हैं, राष्ट्रीय स्वयंसेवक संघ के लोगों ने यह बात कही थी और यह अन्तर्विरोध आज राष्ट्रीय जनतांत्रिक गठबंधन के अन्दर उभरकर दिखाई दे रहा है। आदरणीय श्री राम नाईक जी बैठे हुए हैं, माननीय मंत्री श्री अरुण शौरी जी बैठे हुए हैं, अरुण शौरी जी के जो मूल विचार हैं और श्री राम नाईक जी के जो मूल विचार हैं, उन मूल विचारों से विनिवेश की नीति कहीं भी मेल नहीं खाती है। आप इस सच्चाई को स्वीकार करिये। आप सदन के अन्दर दूसरी भाषा बोलते हैं और जब जनता के बीच में जाते हैं तो दूसरी भाषा बोलते

हैं। यह जो दोहरी नीति और दोहरी सोच है, यही इस देश को रसातल में ले जा रही है। अभी हमारे साथी किरीट सोमैया जी ने सार्वजनिक उपक्रमों के अन्तर्गत लगातार कार्यक्षमता के ह्रास की तरफ इशारा किया है। हम यह कहना चाहते हैं कि जो देश का सबसे प्रतिष्ठित मंच यह संसद है, इस संसद के अन्दर आज इन विनिवेश पर जो बहस हो रही है, इस विनिवेश की बहस पर कितने लोग उपस्थित हैं। आज जब हम 11 बजे सदन के अन्दर प्रवेश करते हैं और जब तक सदन समाप्त होता है, कितने लोग इस सदन के अन्दर लगातार उपस्थित रहते हैं। इस पर भी हमको और आपको विचार करना चाहिए। हम समाज का प्रतिबिम्ब हैं। समाज हमसे कुछ नहीं अपेक्षाएं रखता है। जब हम अपने कर्तव्य का निर्वहन नहीं करते, जब हम अपने दायित्व का निर्वहन नहीं करते तो उन सार्वजनिक उपक्रमों के अपने कर्मचारियों से यदि हम यह अपेक्षा करें कि वे 10 बजे से पांच बजे तक अपनी ड्यूटी निभाने का काम करेंगे तो यह बेमानी बात है। पहले देश के प्रधान मंत्री को, केन्द्रीय मंत्रीगण को और सम्माननीय संसद सदस्यों को अपने कर्तव्य और दायित्व का निर्वहन सही तरीके से करना चाहिए। अगर हम अपने कर्तव्य और दायित्व का ईमानदारी से निर्वहन करेंगे तो हम यह अपेक्षा करेंगे कि देश का प्रत्येक नागरिक अपने कर्तव्य और दायित्व का निर्वहन करने का कार्य करेगा।

आज देश में जितने भी सरकारी उपक्रम हैं, जो स्वतंत्र भारत के मंदिर इसी सरकार के द्वारा, इनकी सरकार के पुरोधों के द्वारा घोषित किये जा चुके हैं, वे एक-एक करके ध्वस्त किये जा रहे हैं।

(r4/1915/jr-rk)

वस्तुस्थिति यह है कि विनिवेश के नाम पर भूमंडलीकरण की तर्ज पर लाम्बांश देने वाले और घाटे में चलने वाले दोनों ही उपक्रमों को बंद करने का प्रयास किया जा रहा है। मैं एम.एम.टी.सी. और एस.टी.सी. का उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ, जिन्होंने देश और विदेश में काफी नाम कमाया है और जिनके सम्बन्ध में मैं व्यक्तिगत तौर पर जानता हूँ। उन उपक्रमों में 100 प्रतिशत विनिवेश का निर्णय सरकार द्वारा लिया गया है, जो मेरी जानकारी है, हो सकता है वह गलत हो। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ इस तरह से उन कर्मचारियों के भविष्य पर क्या असर पड़ रहा है जिन्होंने 30-35 साल तक उस सार्वजनिक उपक्रम की सेवा करने का लक्ष्य लेकर नौकरी सम्भाली थी। आज जिनकी सेवा को मात्र 10-15 साल हुए हैं, उनको स्वेच्छिक अनिवार्यता के नाम पर रिटायर करने का काम किया जा रहा है। उनके भविष्य को अंधकारमय बनाया जा रहा है। विनिवेश की प्रक्रिया देशहित में हो, उस तक इसको अपनाएँ तो हम सहमत हैं, लेकिन जबर्दस्ती उसको आगे बढ़ा कर उन लाखों कर्मचारियों के भविष्य को अंधकारमय बना कर देश का भविष्य बनाना चाहते हैं, मैं समझता हूँ आपकी यह सोच बेमानी है, देशहित में नहीं है और राष्ट्रविरोधी कदम है। जो लोग जबर्दस्ती रिटायर किए जा रहे हैं, जो सार्वजनिक उपक्रम लाभ में हैं, उनको भी जबर्दस्ती बंद करने की आपकी जो नीति है, यह नीति राष्ट्रविरोधी है। कम से कम इस नीति का देशहित में परित्याग करें। जहां आवश्यक है, विनिवेश एकदम आवश्यक है, वहां इसको अपनाएँ तो हमारा कोई विरोध नहीं है।

आज एस.टी.सी. और एम.एम.टी.सी. के कर्मचारियों की छंटनी करके जिस प्रक्रिया का अनुपालन कर रहे हैं, इससे देश के लाखों सरकारी कर्मचारियों के भविष्य का प्रश्न आपके सामने खड़ा हो सकता है। मेरा सुझाव है कि आप मासिक भत्ता योजना शुरू करें। 10-15 साल तक जो लोग नौकरी कर चुके हैं, आज आप जबर्दस्ती उनको रिटायर कर रहे हैं, कुछ तथाकथित धन देकर, उससे उनका भविष्य सुरक्षित नहीं रहेगा। आप मासिक भत्ता योजना शुरू कीजिए और इतना दीजिए कि वे अपने परिवार का गुजारा कर सकें। आज जो विनिवेश की प्रक्रिया इस सरकार के द्वारा अपनाई जा रही है, यह राष्ट्रविरोधी कार्य है। यह देश को रसातल में ले जाने का कार्य है। इसलिए मैं सरकार की इस वर्तमान नीति का घोर विरोध करता हूँ।

(इति)

1918 hours

DR. B.B. RAMAIAH (ELURU): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the question of disinvestment, which was started in 1991, was based on the type of economy that we have in our country. This was started mainly to see that the funds of the financial institutions, including banks, are utilised to acquire the shares of the select public enterprises and the amount so realised should also be used for the welfare, health, education as also to help various companies strengthen their labour force by way of VRS.

If you look at the investment that is going into the public sector today, it is more than Rs.2,30,000 crore. The main purpose behind the idea of disinvestment was to see that the deficit finance comes down. If we continue to invest in this sector, we would have lost more than Rs.3,50,000 crore. It means, indirectly it affects our deficit finance. The main purpose behind this disinvestment was to see that we put a stop on the policy adopted by the earlier Government. The process was started during the regime of the earlier Government when Dr.Manmohan Singh was the Finance Minister. Irrespective of the Party in power, it is an on-going process. It is a continuous process. We should only see that we go in the right direction, follow right methodology and disinvest only such institutions where it is required. The Disinvestment Commission should assess it properly and then only refer the matter to the Government.

(s4/1920/rc/asa)

On the basis of that the Government should be able to approve the realistic method of approach. Already, 58 companies have been selected. Out of which, 18 to 19 companies have been permitted. In these companies more than 240 public sector units are involved. Some of them are manufacturing units, and some of them are in the service sector. As I mentioned earlier, when disinvestment was started in 1991-92, only Rs.3000 crore was disinvested, in 1992-93, they did only up to Rs.1900 crore, in 1993-94, they did not disinvest anything, in 1994-95, they could disinvest only Rs.800 crore and again in 1995-96, they disinvested Rs.362 crore. In 1996-97, Rs.380 crore, in 1997-98 Rs.902 crore, in 1998-99 about Rs.5000 crore, and in 1999-2000 Rs.1500 crore were disinvested. So, out of a target of Rs.44,000 crore, they could disinvest only up to Rs.18,000 crore. The total amount that they could disinvest in spite of so much efforts, is only to see that the policy which was going on earlier is reversed and to see how we could stop this money from flowing into the sectors where the return is going to be very low. It is also to improve the economy of this country. For this purpose, the money has to be invested

elsewhere. That is the main object of disinvestment. The hon. Members have mentioned many things. I do not want to repeat those things. There may be some lapses and some mistakes somewhere. Those things need to be taken care of. That is why, we need to have the policy of transparency to show how it is going on, what is the system that we should follow in the larger interest of the country and the larger interest of the labour. We have to see where this amount should be utilised. That is the major thing.

Recently, we have seen that they have also taken some decision to bring the Government share in the Hindustan Zinc to 26 per cent, in Shipping Corporation of India – to 40 per cent, in Hindustan Organic Chemicals to 33 per cent, in Hindustan Insecticides to 51 per cent, in MMTC to 51 per cent, in STC to 91.3 per cent and in Sponge Iron to 97.5 per cent. There is no disinvestment in this. There is no disinvestment in IBP. Like that they have taken up a number of analysis on the basis of various institutions. There are some cases where they have also criticised and they want to have some more information on these things. The Ministry has also taken proper care while taking into account the cases of Indian Airlines and Air India. If you continue with the method that is operating, there are the cases where you can also improve on these things. Recently, I have to analyse one of the units of Andrew Yule. They were making losses for the last 10 years. They have privatised it and made a profit of Rs.5 crore in the first year. It is because the unit is good. But the only thing was that they did not have the marketing strategy. So, we need to strengthen each organisation where it is required to be strengthened in the larger interest of the country. They were able to get the world market. The German Company was able to take that unit and was also able to get world market. They are also expanding that unit. It shows that if we have the strength in a particular sector, we may improve. We may have some weaknesses. Today, we can say we are strong in software sector. We can strengthen our country in this sector and improve our economy. We could also increase the entrepreneurship and employment potentialities.

(t4/1925/kvj/hng)

There are some units in the *Navratnas* where weakness and sickness are there. In the selection for disinvestment of these units we should take into consideration their strategic value and should not go in for disinvestment of such units. But there are certain units where the Government can go up to 26 per cent and still keep some sort of its hold on them.

As everyone has said, today disinvestment policy has become a continuing process of every successive Government. There is nothing wrong in the disinvestment policy. But the only point we have to see is the policy that is operating, the methodology that is going in and the transparency that is adopted. Then it should be done in the larger national interest and to safeguard the workers' interest. I see that in a number of cases this amount is used for the VRS. It has really helped strengthen those companies by reducing the unnecessary workforce. Those workers also have got an alternative service. This sort of a policy is very important.

I would not like to go into the case study of each unit as to what happened in each case, who has done what, which Government has done it at what time, etc. For me, the procedure has to be more transparent. If we follow that, I am sure we would avoid the debt trap for our country and we will strengthen our economy.

One hon. Member has cited the China example. They have also done a lot of privatisation and liberalisation. It improved the strength of their economy. Where we need, we should follow them and where we need to stand on our own, we should not act detrimental to our national interest. Our public sector units were the basic supporters of our economy. Now we have to give them a little more freedom as we have done in the case of the Indian Telephone Industry. When they were getting only cost-plus, they used to make profits. But, when they had to compete in the market where people are looking for quality and better type of equipment, they lost. Again, when the management was given an opportunity to select its own partners, to go in for diversification, to opt for the type of collaboration they want, to have freedom with the size of the labour force and other facilities, now they are able to improve themselves. The same is the case with Bharat Electronics. That is why, the policy should be to give them wide freedom and opportunities to improve on their economy so that the common man also gets all the products that they are manufacturing with competitive quality at a reasonable price. Ultimately, what we have to look at is the customer. We should give him the importance that he deserves and with that objective in mind we should strengthen the industrial scenario of this country.

With these words, I feel that disinvestment is an essential thing for us. By taking all precautions, I am sure this Government will take into consideration the fact that transparency is very important.

(ends)

1929 hours

SHRI E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN (SIVAGANGA): Mr. Chairman Sir, as a representative of the common

man, the shareholders and the investors of the country in the Parliament, I am before you just to remind that the people elected us and gave us power to govern the country and manage the properties which were created, the investments which were made and the assets which were built for the past fifty years. It should be managed better by the new Government. That was the reason why the people elected us.

But, here we are actually accepting and confessing that we cannot manage certain things. How will the people accept this failure? They elected us because they thought that we have got the managerial capacity, we have got the administrative capacity, we have got a very powerful executive consisting of people from the Indian Administrative Service and we have got huge Government machinery. In addition, we have got the legislative powers and there is judiciary also. But, with all these powers with us, we are telling the people that we cannot manage these properties.

(u4/1930/ru-sb)

The property which was created for the past 50 years cannot be managed by us. We are becoming insolvent. We are creating a Disinvestment Ministry, an insolvent Ministry, a bankrupt Ministry which cannot control this country. That is the confession that we are making before the common man, before 100 crores of people who have invested their money with us. Kindly remember that in our Constitution, our nation is proclaimed as that of a socialist pattern of society. We have to govern and manage the property which were given to us. We are having a term of five years. Within those five years, how are we going to invest these properties? How are we going to protect the money which have been invested through us as the national property? We are telling them that we cannot manage

it. We are confessing it. The Indian Administrative Service has failed. The bureaucracy has failed. They cannot control it. They cannot give protection through their machinery. We are proving that we cannot give protection. ...*(Interruptions)*

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA (CONTAI): Don't criticise the Indian Administrative Service.

SHRI E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN (SIVAGANGA): Kindly do not interrupt. I am not yielding to you. Formally, you may be in the Indian Administrative Service but we are accepting that the Indian Administrative Service has failed to control now. It has controlled the country for the past 50 years. They controlled the PSUs. Now they say that they cannot control them and that it has to be given to the private enterprises. How can you say like that? The IAS themselves confess that they cannot control it and that disinvestment is the remedy for it. What about us, the politicians? What about the Ministers? The Prime Minister is telling that we cannot control the PSUs. This is the confession that you are making. Why cannot you control it? Hon. Naik is controlling a very powerful Ministry in a perfect way. Why cannot we control it in that way? We can control everything. We have got the managerial capacity. The Indian Administrative Service is having the capacity to govern the country. Then why are you saying that you cannot control it? The period of Shri Rajiv Gandhi was a golden period. You may take the example of 1984-89. Do not take the example of subsequent years. Bureaucrats were trained in that period. They were asked to come up to modernity. They were given training to come up to a modern world of 21st century. Ministers were trained in training camps. All the people were trained. Shri Chandrababu Naidu is following those steps now. We are praising him but not following him at the national level. We have to equip ourselves because the nation has thought that a democratic rule can give more profitability by its own control.

The public sector was the dream of Jawaharlal Nehru. It was because even the peasant's son can get employed there. Nehru thought that a socialist pattern of society is the remedy for a developing country as the private enterprises had not come up to that stage. We cannot copy the Western type of democracy. They are not having anything to control. They are going in for privatisation in everything. Then, are you going to leave education to private sector totally? You are going to leave transport sector to them. You are going to leave agriculture and everything to the private enterprises. Then what is the need for a democratic Government? What is the necessity for a democratic, socialist republic? Therefore, we have to think on these lines.

I want to remind you that in Tamil Nadu, we are having a prestigious public sector enterprise, the Hindustan Photo Films Limited. It is prestigious in Ootacamund. But what happened? The labourers are ready to sacrifice their salaries. They got only 46 per cent of their salaries. They are ready to tighten their own belt. They went to sacrifice their own wages and are ready to give the profit to that industry. Why should you not give that industry to the labourers? You give it to them, you give them a chance for one year. They will show that they can control it. What about the Indian Bank? In Singapore alone, it has got an asset worth Rs.2000 crore. You want to privatise it. The private people will sell it in a minute and take away the money. Insurance companies and all other PSUs are located in each cosmopolitan city. Can an ordinary person in a private company purchase that property now?

(w4/1935/brv-har)

No. They cannot purchase the property because we gave it away. In Connaught Place, the LIC is having its office. The Canara Bank and the Citi Bank are having their office premises on lease basis because they cannot purchase the property. We have purchased the property. We are owning it. Mr. Minister, you say that you cannot control it and therefore you are disinvesting it. The same case is going to happen in the case of the Salem Steel Plant. The BHEL, Trichy is making profit and paying a dividend of Rs.60 crore. You want to sell that also. What will happen finally? We will be left alone. India is the pioneer for the entire Asian countries to show that the socialistic pattern of society is the only remedy for the developing countries. We have done it. Kindly remember the history.

The NDA Government has said, especially the BJP has said that *Swadeshi* is its principle. What is *Swadeshi* according to you? The Indians have managed this and they can manage this. They can control it. They can run the undertakings very well. That is *Swadeshi*. That is the prestige of Indians. Now, you are telling that any company from any nation can come and purchase the property because you are not capable of controlling it. You say that you do not have the managerial capacity to run the undertakings and you are running out of profit. Therefore, you tell them to come and take everything here. What is this? Kindly have the remembrance of the history so that people cannot blame us in future. The property of the nation cannot be dwindled away like this for the sake of getting a few crores of rupees by way of disinvestment. Disinvestment is the acceptance of the Government that you cannot control it and manage it properly. Kindly review this policy because lakhs and lakhs of labourers are living on their wages. Lakhs and lakhs of people are suffering and starving.

1936 hours

(Shri Basu Deb Acharia - *in the Chair*)

They are not earning any wages at all now. They are marching to Parliament Street and holding demonstrations. They are starving. They are making agitation. How many lakhs of people are agitating before Parliament? Kindly remember it. The important point is that poor people have invested their money for the last fifty years.

With these words, I conclude. Thank you.

(ends)

1937 hours

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am standing here in support of the Policy of the NDA Government in respect of disinvestment. But is it the only way to deal with the situation with regard to the public sector? Or, can this Government think of restructuring the public sector? The entire nation is very much grateful to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who introduced the concept of public sector. The public sector undertakings started their units in the rural areas of the entire nation where development took place in those areas, and jobs were made available to the youngsters of our nation. It was a dream of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to give the right to earn bread and butter for the people of this nation. But his ideas and dreams were shattered by the then Congress Government.

I can quote a number of examples. Many hon. Members have given examples in terms of statistics. They used some good English words also and referred to apple and everything. But I am putting a very simple question. No hon. Member in his speech has held anybody responsible for the losses the public sector undertakings are making. The public sector companies were started in respect of the monopoly areas. The licensing system of the then Congress Government forced the public sector undertakings to compete with the private sector and the multinationals. But before giving licences to the other private industries, what was the feature? Which way was this handled? We, the political leaders in this august House and that too the Congress regime, are much more responsible for the losses of the public sector enterprises. The political people were interfering in the day to day activities of the public sector undertakings. Whether any recruitment is necessary or not, the Ministers and the political leaders from the Congress Party were forcing the public sector undertakings to recruit people. Here, I want to quote one example. In the case of IRCON, which is a subsidiary of the Railways, one Minister concerned forced the Chairman or the MD of IRCON saying that he was sending a note and he should recruit about 200 persons immediately.

(x4/1940/ksp/skb)

The Managing Director said: "Sir, I do not have any job for these unskilled labourers, you do not send these labourers to us." He said: "Nothing doing, मेरे छोकरे हैं, उन्हें जॉब मिलना चाहिये। They should get employment whether you have jobs or not. Otherwise, you pack up. You will be transferred for not listening to the Minister." So, the Minister had recommended recruitment of persons without any accountability, without seeing whether the jobs are available or not, without seeing whether the cost of production will go up or not and without seeing whether the public sector undertaking will be able to compete in the market. He had forced the Managing Director to recruit those persons.

Sir, there is a unit of M/s. Richards and Crudas in my constituency. They were supplying certain materials to the Railways. The then Railway Minister of the Congress regime – he is a Member of this House, I do not want to take his name – called the Managing Director of that undertaking and said: "Sorry, I am shifting whatever orders you are getting from the Railways to a private company because you cannot give me commission." ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (CHANDIGARH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, on the basis of what information is he making this allegation? ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): Sir, I have given this in writing to the former Railway Minister. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (CHANDIGARH): Sir, he is making an insinuation. ...(*Interruptions*) What else is this?

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): Sir, these people are responsible for all these things. ...(*Interruptions*) Sir, we have heard them. They have to hear us now. They should not interrupt me. ...(*Interruptions*)

Sir, I would like to say how the dream of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was shattered by these Congress people. This is just a small example of that I am giving you. So, the orders to M/s. Richards and Crudas were stopped like that. When Shri Ram Naik became the Minister of State for Railways, I brought this matter to his notice. ...(*Interruptions*)

श्री पवन कुमार बंसल (चंडीगढ़): आपने मॉडर्न फूड इंडस्ट्रीज को पांच करोड़ रुपये में बेच दिया। ...(*Interruptions*)

प्रो. रसा सिंह रावत (अजमेर): हमने पारदर्शिता रखी है और एन.डी.ए. की सरकार रखती है। ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): Sir, when Shri Ram Naik became the Minister of State for Railways, he rectified this mistake within 20 days and orders were placed, again, to M/s. Richards and Crudas at Baikulla unit. So, this is how that factory was revived. So, these Congress people have spoiled such public undertakings. Whenever they intervened, they intervened in recruitment, they intervened in the purchase of raw materials and they even intervened in the matter of awarding contracts. Above all this, wherever there were outstanding recoveries from these public sector units, they were forcing upon the management not to recover the money. I can give hundreds of such examples. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, when I made an insinuation, Shri Arun Shourie correctly objected and I withdrew my remark. If he cannot substantiate what he is insinuating now, I do not think he can make such remarks. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): Sir, I will substantiate. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Sir, this is the manner in which the Shiv Sena Government performed in Maharashtra. They ran the most corrupt State Government. ...(*Interruptions*) How dare he says this? ...(*Interruptions*) Where is the proof? They ran the most corrupt Government in this country. ...(*Interruptions*) ...(*Expunged as ordered by the Chair*)

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): Sir, I am cautioning this Government also that instead of taking a decision on disinvestment, they should give priority for restructuring these public sector units. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (CHANDIGARH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, if I recollect the words of the hon. Member, he said: "the person who was a Minister is a Member of this House". He said, he is a Member of this House. He has no right to cast aspersions on a sitting Member of this House. ...(*Interruptions*) He cannot make an insinuation like this. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): Sir, I am putting the facts before the House. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Sir, is he entitled to make and substantiate this allegation against a Member of this House? We want a ruling from you on this. ...(*Interruptions*)

प्रो. रसा सिंह रावत (अजमेर): स्थापति महोदय, ये लोग कई सालों तक सत्ता में रहे हैं, इन लोगों ने भ्रष्टाचार किया है...(*Interruptions*)

(y4/1945/ss/bks)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (CHANDIGARH): Let him name the Member. Then, that hon. Member will have a right to reply here.

MR. CHAIRMAN (SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA): If there is anything objectionable—

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): There is nothing objectionable. ...(Interruptions) I have got documents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there is anything objectionable, we will go through it. That will be expunged.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): After Shri Ram Naik, I want to praise Kumari Mamata Banerjee, Minister of Railways. She has gone a step ahead. She has started giving orders for requirements of railways to the public sector undertakings. ...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seats.

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): Kumari Mamata Banerjee has placed an order for the manufacture of wagons with the public sector undertakings by giving 60 per cent more business than what was during the last year.

Apart from that, she has taken another decision last month. There was a global tender. The rate of the PSU was the lowest. The World Bank insisted that they should give it to 'number two'. But Kumari Mamata Banerjee sent her colleagues to the World Bank. They said, "No, we are insisting that you should give it to 'L-2'." That PSU is under BIFR. Kumari Mamata Banerjee flatly refused the financial support from the World Bank. She has now placed the order with the PSU.

Now, she has gone one step further. She has compiled a list of firms from whom the Railways are importing materials. She has sent that list to all the PSUs to ascertain whether they could supply the materials which the Railways are importing so that the imports could be stopped. My appeal to Shri Arun Shourie is to try to restructure these PSUs instead of going in for disinvestment. The PSUs are doing the best job. We have got faith in our bureaucracy. The interference of these people has spoiled the public sector. Our bureaucrats are quite intelligent. They are capable of bringing these public sector undertakings into profits. But they have not allowed them to earn profit because of their vested interests which I am quoting here.

Last week, I had given a letter about Hindustan Organic Chemicals. We had taken a decision about disinvestment. I request you to halt that process for another two months. One unit of the Hindustan Organic Chemicals is located at Kochi. The Cochin Refinery is ready to purchase that unit of the HOC. Because of that, the HOC will get not less than Rs. 600 crore. After getting that amount, the HOC can clear their debt, give a voluntary retirement scheme and can again earn profit. So, my request to you is that disinvestment is not the only solution to bring these PSUs into profit. How can we improve the situation? We have to stop the corrupt practices which were started during their regime. For example, I am giving you the figures for the period 1991-2000 in respect of persons who were enjoying boarding and lodging in five-star hotels. If you check up these figures, 50 per cent of the PSUs which are running in losses can be revived. Will this Government take a decision that a PSU must purchase their requirements from no company other than the PSU? They should not purchase it from a private entrepreneur. Can you make an announcement that whenever an officer or an elected Member goes on tour, he will not stay in a five-star hotel because there are Government rest houses in each district headquarters. Why are they not using those rest houses? There are a number of examples where you can reduce the expenses for competing with the private people in the market. But we are not doing that because of vested interests. Whose money is it? Whenever a public sector undertaking went into losses, they have taken all the steps to reduce those losses and bring that PSU into profit. So, they had done nothing. It is my earnest request to you to try to restructure the PSU. Their interest is in something different. The people are expecting something from the NDA. So, it is my earnest request to you to try to restructure the PSU and stop the corrupt practices. How much money are we spending on Research and Development? We are not spending enough. One Member said that by selling or privatising the PSUs, indirectly, you are accepting your incapacity to run these undertakings.

(z4/1950/rs/hcb)

I would request the hon. Minister not to do that. We are capable. Our Ministers are capable. Like Kumari Mamata Banerjee, if each and every Minister take a decision that they will not place orders to private companies and that they would purchase only from the public sector, these sectors will make profit.

MR. CHAIRMAN (SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA): Now, Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh.

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): Sir, I will take only one minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): So, this issue should not be looked only from the financial angle. It should be given a look of a national issue. Instead of speaking in figures of which shares were purchased at what price, whether it was 6.2 per cent or 4.3 per cent, we are not interested in that, we are interested in giving more jobs to our own people.

In restructuring, if the hon. Minister feels that the wage bill is one of the factors which is more, he can give a financial support for giving Voluntary Retirement Scheme. A number of people are ready to go. But restructure it before taking any decision of disinvestment of any public sector, it is my earnest request from Shiv Sena Party not to make people unemployed; bring some strict measures to stop corruption and malpractices in the public sector, which started in their regime. Again I will say this, because people are expecting something good from NDA Government. Like Kumari Mamata Banerjee and Shri Ram Naik, if they can instruct all the Ministers that they should place the orders with the public sector, the entire picture will change. Instead of सोने का अंडा मिलता है तो मुर्गी मत काटो। एक साल में 10,000 करोड़ रुपये मिलेंगे लेकिन continuous profit which these public sectors are earning, we do not want our Government to be deprived of that, which will be earned for years together. Again, this is my request that first preference should be given to restructuring before disinvestment. After restructuring if it is not possible then only they can think about disinvestment.

(ends)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI (RAIGANJ): Sir, I congratulate him on his speech. But just to keep the record straight, I would like to inform the House that Sir, you are the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Railways and I am a Member of that, so far as wagons are concerned, till date Railways orders are largely in the private sector than the public sector. His information is not correct.

1953 बजे

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) : स्थापित महोदय, डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट पॉलिसी पर बहस चलाई जा रही है। इसमें उस पक्ष के लोगों का जो तर्क हमने सुना और पहले से उनके वित्त मंत्री का बयान था कि फिस्कल डेफिसिट को कम करने के लिए हम डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट कर रहे हैं और 10,000 करोड़ रुपया हम इससे आमदनी करेंगे। एक तर्क उन्होंने दिया कि रुपये की कमी हो गई है तो जो पुरानी संपत्ति है, उसको बेचकर पूरा करेंगे। उनसे हमारा यह सवाल है कि हिस्साबी लोग, ज्ञानी लोग बोल रहे हैं कि 8 लाख रुपये काला धन है। 58,000 करोड़ रुपये एन.पी.ए. है। 52,000 करोड़ रुपये इनकम टैक्स का बकाया है। मतलब यह कि अर्बों-खर्बों रुपये हैं और किरीट सोमैया कह रहे थे कि सरकार का काम है प्रशासन चलाना, व्यापार नहीं करना। प्रशासन से मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि काला धन वसूली के लिए, 52,000 करोड़ रुपया जो बड़े आदमी इनकम टैक्स का रखे हुए हैं, उसकी वसूली के लिए और एन.पी.ए. जिसमें 30,000 करोड़ रुपये सी.आई.आई. का बकाया है, उसके लिए प्रशासनिक क्षमता कहां चली गई, नपुंसकता क्यों आ गई जो गरीब आदमी पर खर्च बढ़ा रहे हैं। गरीब आदमी की तो अनाज से भी सब्सिडी काटो और उसके बाद देश की संपत्ति को बेचकर हम फिस्कल डेफिसिट पूरा करेंगे, यह कौन सा अर्थशास्त्र चला रहे हैं इस देश में? तर्क दे रहे हैं कि हमें 10,000 करोड़ रुपया लाना है तो पुराने जमाने की जो सार्वजनिक संपत्ति है, उसको बेचकर हम पूरा करेंगे। यह कौन सा अर्थशास्त्र है?

(a5/1955/rpm)

स्थापित महोदय, इन्होंने कालाबाजारी पर हमला नहीं किया। काले बाजार में जो अर्बों-खर्बों रुपया है उसको उगाहने का काम नहीं किया। उसको वसूलने का काम नहीं किया। मुझे आप इस प्रकार का कोई एक उदाहरण बता दें। जो 58 हजार करोड़ रुपए एन.पी.ए. का है उसकी वसूली के लिए आपने क्या उपाय किया? कुछ उपाय नहीं किया। 92 हजार करोड़ रुपया इनकम टैक्स का बकाया है, उसको वसूलने के लिए आपने क्या किया, क्या आपमें उसको वसूलने की क्षमता नहीं है, क्या आप उस रुपए को वसूल नहीं कर सकते, क्या सिर्फ एक ही डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट का उपाय बचा है? फिर कहते हैं कि सरकार का काम प्रशासन करना है व्यापार करना नहीं है। क्या सरकार यह नहीं देख रही है कि किस में लाभ है किसमें हानि है और उसको जोड़-जोड़ कर, उसका हिसाब लगा-लगा कर काम कर रही है, तो क्या यह व्यापार करना नहीं है?

स्थापित महोदय, सरकार का काम है वैलफेयर करना। गरीब का भला कैसे हो, यह देखना। जो अपने देश के 100 करोड़ लोग हैं, उनका उत्थान कैसे हो, यह देखना। श्री मणिशंकर अय्यर जी अपने भाषण में अभी बता रहे थे कि प्राइवेट कंपनियों में ज्यादा नुकसान हो रहा है। जैसा अभी परांजपे साहब बोल रहे थे कि पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडरटेकिंग्स में जो कुव्ववस्था है, उसको खत्म कर दीजिए, वे अपने आप फायदे में हो जाएंगी। विद्वान लोग बोल रहे थे कि जो घाटे में है उसका डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट किया जाए, लेकिन डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट करने के लिए कंपनी को घाटे में न डाला जाए। कहीं ऐसा न हो कि डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट करना है इसलिए उसके मैनेजमेंट को बदल दो और उसे घटा पहुंचा कर उसका डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट करो। यह नहीं होना चाहिए। क्या आप इसके लिए तैयार हैं?

स्थापित महोदय, अभी हमारे एक मित्र होटल का उदाहरण दे रहे थे। यह सरकार बड़े-बड़े होटलों को बेचने की बात कर रही है। वे होटल जो दो-तीन पहले तक प्राफिट में चल रहे थे, लाभ कमा रहे थे और अब घाटे में आ गए। वही मैनेजमेंट जो दो-तीन पहले तक लाभ कमा रहा था, वही मैनेजमेंट और वही होटल अब घाटे में जा रहा है। कहीं आपकी यह नीति तो नहीं है कि लाभ में चल रही कंपनियों को घाटे में पहुंचाओ और फिर उनको बेचो। यदि आप ऐसा कर रहे हैं, तो यह इस देश के सामान को बेचने के समान है। यह तो वही बात हुई जैसे कोई दुकानदार अपनी दुकान को ही बेच दे। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि

...(Expunged as ordered by the Chair) आज यह नारा देश के गांवों और गली-गली में लग रहा है।

सभापति महोदय, अभी बसुदेव आचार्य, सी.पी.एम. के माननीय नेता ट्रांसपेरेंसी की बात कह रहे थे। वे ट्रांसपेरेंसी खोज रहे थे। अभी परांजपे साहब भी भाग कर रहे थे, मैं उन दोनों माननीय सदस्यों को बताना चाहता हूँ कि एक योजना चल रही है कि किस पोस्ट पर कौन सा आदमी लगाया जाए और किस कंपनी को कौनसा बड़ा मल्टी नैशनल खरीदेगा। यह सब चल रहा है। मैं आपको सी.सी.आई. का उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। सी.सी.आई. में जो अफसर बहाल हो रहा है, जो मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर बहाल हो रहा है, उसके खिलाफ विजिलेंस ने क्या लिखा है, वह मैं पढ़ देता हूँ। विजिलेंस ने लिखा है-

"After the Departmental Enquiry, he had been warned in award of contract for a canteen at Jammu Airport. He had also demanded money for purchase of computers from M/s.WIPRO. CVO, AAI has given an adverse report vide their letter dated 22.2.2000 addressed to CVC, and has commented that though disciplinary action should have been taken, however, no action has been taken.

Even CVC, vide their letter dated 17.5.2000, made comments that the Vigilance Profile of that officer is not satisfactory while mentioning about his tainted background. However, he has given him conditional Vigilance Clearance. The pressure on CVC is obvious. It is reported that that officer has a backing of a multi-national firm allegedly with the backing of a NRI who wants to take over the CCI units. "

मतलब यह है कि मल्टी नैशनल कंपनियों अपने हितों का संरक्षण करने वाले अधिकारियों को बहाल करा रही हैं। जो अधिकारी उन कंपनियों को खरीदने में मदद करेंगे, इस बात को ध्यान में रखकर वे अपने अधिकारियों को बहाल करा रही हैं।

सभापति महोदय, मैं यह कागज सदन की टेबल पर प्रस्तुत करने के लिए तैयार हूँ। आप इसकी जांच कराइए। इस बात की छानबीन हो कि उस अधिकारी के बारे में सी.वी.सी. ने क्या लिखा, सी.वी.ओ. ने क्या लिखा और सी.बी.आई. ने क्या लिखा। मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि सी.बी.आई. ने लिखा है कि उनको सेंसिटिव पोस्ट पर मत रखिए, वह तत्काल खतरा पैदा करेंगे और उन्हीं अधिकारी को आप सी.सी.आई. के एम.डी. के पद पर बहाल करना चाहते हैं। उसके पीछे हिन्दूजा और जाने कौन बड़ी-बड़ी कंपनियां हैं, कौन-कौन लोग हैं। यह सब साजिश चल रही है।

(b5/2000/rjs-mmm)

लोग ट्रांसपेरेंसी खोज रहे हैं। इसलिए देश के सामने बहुत बड़ा खतरा है। यह हमारी सम्पत्ति को बेच रहे हैं। अभी तक क्या किया है ? यह कह रहे हैं कि अंडरटेकिंग्स बनाये हैं, तो कहां बनाये हैं। एक भी अंडरटेकिंग नहीं बनाई है। जो पहले की अंडरटेकिंग्स थीं, उनको खत्म कर रहे हैं। यह कहते हैं कि उसको घाटा पहुंचाओ। लाभ वाली अंडरटेकिंग्स को ही बेचने की बात हम सुनते हैं। भेल को बेचने की बात सोच रहे हैं। भेल तो लाभ में चल रही है। **अ.प्र. (व्यवधान)** जब अंडरटेकिंग्स बनाई गई थीं तब हिन्दुस्तान में क्या सपना था ? यह कहते हैं कि इकोनोमिक्स के बारे में सुझाव देने के लिए इन्होंने बड़े-बड़े पूंजीपति रखे हैं। अर्थशास्त्रियों को नहीं पूंजीपतियों को रखे हुए हैं कि फलाना यह है, फलाना वह है आदि बड़े-बड़े लोग इनके सलाहकार हैं। "जेई भनूसीया सेई चटनी और दही के रखवार बिल्ली।" यह सब कहां जायेगा।

अ.प्र. (व्यवधान) जो पूंजीपति लोग हैं, वे परमार्थी नहीं हैं। जो अरबपति हैं, खरबपति हैं, मल्टीनैशनल हैं, वे क्या परमार्थ के लिए यहां आये हैं ? इस 100 करोड़ आबादी को लाभ पहुंचाने के लिए आये हैं या अपने प्राफिट के लिए आये हैं ? क्यों पूंजीपति लगाये हैं ? यह कहते हैं कि इन्वेस्टमेंट होगा।

अब यह तर्क दे रहे हैं कि डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट ठीक है, इसे बेचना ठीक है। ऐसे तर्क कुतर्क दिये जा रहे हैं। इसे कौन अर्थशास्त्री चला रहा है क्योंकि इनकी बातें हमारी समझ में नहीं आती हैं। अभी सुदर्शन साहब भाग कर रहे थे कि हमसे मैनेजमेंट नहीं हो रहा है। आपसे अंडरटेकिंग्स का मैनेजमेंट नहीं हो रहा लेकिन सरकार का मैनेजमेंट आपसे हो रहा है। आप पूंजीपतियों, मल्टीनैशनल कम्पनीज को कहिये कि वे यहां बैठें और राज चलायें और वर्चुअली वह चला ही रहे हैं। ये लोग दिखावटी बैठे हैं। जो पूंजीपति लोग हैं, अरबपति हैं, मल्टीनैशनल कम्पनियां हैं, वे राज चला रही हैं। असल में इन लोगों के हाथ में शासन नहीं है। आप हमें एक भी उदाहरण बता दें कि जनता के हित में इस सरकार ने यह काम किया है। पी.डी.एस. के मामले में इनके सहयोगी दलों ने इन्हें चेताया, इन पर लगाम लगाने की कोशिश की। इन्होंने नौ रुपये गेहूं का भाव किया लेकिन आज वह नहीं बिक रहा है। अब आप पूंजीपति, व्यापारी लोगों के लिए दाम घटाने को तैयार हैं। जनता के नौ रुपये और व्यापारी के सात रुपये, क्या अंधेर ? क्या अनर्गल है ? ऐसे गरीब के दुश्मन ऐसे पूंजीपरस्त, ऐसे मल्टीनैशनल परस्त कहीं नहीं देखे गये। सब हिसाब जोड़कर श्री मणि शंकर अय्यर ने यहां बताया है। सब कागज-पत्र में तो काफी समय लगता है लेकिन मोटे-मोटे सामान्य बुद्धि से हम देख रहे हैं कि यह देश का भविष्य खतरे में पहुंचा रहे हैं। भूतकाल से हमारी जो सम्पत्ति थी, उसको भी बेच रहे हैं। वर्तमान को भी बेच रहे हैं और भविष्य को भी खतरे में पहुंचायेगे। तीनों काल में यह जो नुकसान करेंगे, उसकी क्षतिपूर्ति कभी नहीं होने वाली है। इसलिए डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट करने वालों से आप सावधान रहिये। यह कहते हैं कि कुछ मुनाफा हुआ। सोमैया साहब मुम्बई में किसी कारोबार के कर्ता-धर्ता हैं। जब वह बहस चला रहे थे तब हमें आश्चर्य हो रहा था। वह अपने तर्क में कह रहे थे कि सार्वजनिक सम्पत्ति का प्राफिट है, वह तथाकथित प्राफिट है। यह जो अंडरटेकिंग्स है, उनकी तथाकथित मोनोपली है। इसलिए लाभ है नहीं तो वह लाभ नहीं होगा। इतना बड़ा पब्लिक प्राफिट के दुश्मन हैं। क्या मल्टी नैशनल बाहर से परोपकारी आयेगा ? उसकी मोनोपली नहीं होगी ? मतलब यह कि उसकी मोनोपली चली तो उसका प्राफिट है। अंडरटेकिंग्स के बारे में यह कह रहे हैं कि इस मोनोपली के चलते जो प्राफिट है, वह प्राफिट नहीं है।

(c5/2005/nsh-dva)

सुदर्शन साहब ने बहुत बढ़िया जवाब दिया। इतने आई.ए.एस. काबिल पदाधिकारी, पुराने होशियार लोग, मैनेजीरियल कैपेसिटी रखने वाले, सब कहते हैं कि नहीं होगा, मिसमैनेजमेंट है, इसे बेचने से ही ठीक होगा। गांव में जब परिवार की आर्थिक हालत खराब हो जाती है और उसका पुरातन समाप्त हो जाता है तब वे अपनी सम्पत्ति बेचने की सोचते हैं। अपने बाप-दादा की सम्पत्ति को बेच कर कर्जा अदा करते हैं, खान-पान करते हैं। मैं गांव के साधारण परिवार का उदाहरण दे रहा हूँ। यह हिसाब मैं इस सरकार में देख रहा हूँ। ... (व्यवधान) उन्होंने लालू जी का नाम लिया। लालू जी पर 27 लाख रुपये की सम्पत्ति की इवैल्यूएशन का झगड़ा है। इन्कम टैक्स वाले कहते हैं कि 27 लाख रुपये नहीं 42 लाख रुपये हैं। इसके लिए उन पर मामला चला, वे जेल गए और कानूनी कार्यवाही हो रही है। ... (Expunged as ordered by the Chair) वहां तो हम कानूनी लड़ाई लड़ रहे हैं लेकिन यहां सी.वी.सी. लिखा है, उसका धरना है, हमको जवाब देना पड़ेगा। ... (व्यवधान)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF

STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS AND PUBLIC GRIEVANCES OF THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS, AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DISINVESTMENT (SHRI ARUN SHOURIE): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I do not want to interrupt him at all and I do not share the view that Shri Laloo Yadav's name should be taken. मैं इससे सहमत नहीं हूँ। जब एक केस चला और उसे कोर्ट ने बरी कर दिया, उसके बाद कोई कार्यवाही नहीं हुई। उस तरह आड़वाणी जी पर इल्जाम लगाने की आपके आर्स्यूमेंट में कोई जरूरत नहीं है। जैसे मणि शंकर अय्यर जी ने कहा, वह इल्जाम भी चला जाए। Please remove these words also

डा. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) : हमने क्या कहा है। इन्कम टैक्स का झगड़ा है। इन पर भी डिस्पोजमेंट असेट का मामला चलाने का लिखा गया है। बरी कैसे कर दिया, वह हम जान रहे हैं। कोर्ट ने बरी किया लेकिन उन्होंने फाइनल रूपया लिया या नहीं, इस पर बरी हो गए। उस समय डिस्पोजमेंट असेट का केस फाइनल केस से पहले होना चाहिए, वह क्यों नहीं हुआ। ... (व्यवधान) अभी मैच फिक्सिंग में जो छापामारी हुई, इनकी पार्टी के नेता के यहां गए थे। ... (व्यवधान)

श्री तरित बरण तोपदार (बैरकपुर) : लालू जी का नाम लेकर जो डायवर्शन हुआ है, उसका अंजाम देखिए। ... (व्यवधान)

श्री पवन कुमार बंसल (चंडीगढ़) : इन्होंने जो कहा, उसकी क्या जरूरत थी। ... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय (श्री बसुदेव आचार्य) : रघुवंश जी, नियम के अनुसार जो व्यक्ति इस सदन का सदस्य नहीं है, उसका नाम नहीं लेना चाहिए।

...(Interruptions)

SHRI MOHAN RAWALE (MUMBAI SOUTH CENTRAL): जो व्यक्ति यहां नहीं है, उसका नाम कैसे ले सकते हैं। It should be expunged. His name should be expunged.

â€ (व्यवधान)

2010 hours (Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I was hearing whatever was being said. If any objectionable matter is there, it will be expunged.

(d5/2010/tkd-mkg)

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let me complete. Whatever objectionable matter is there, I will expunge.

Secondly, hon. Minister may note down whatever points he wants to make at the time of reply, he can do so.

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We have no time. We have to finish this debate.

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I seek the cooperation from all the Members. I am on my legs. Shri Vaiko, may I seek your cooperation? I seek the cooperation of everybody.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI (RAIGANJ): Sir, I sincerely comment from the Congress Party. None of the names of Shri L. K. Advani or Shri Laloo Yadav should be taken and should also go into the proceedings. Before these names were taken, equally Congress Party Ministers' name, Congress Party's name, without substance, were also taken. Those should be expunged. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): Sir, no name was mentioned from the Congress Party. Shri Paranjpe did not mention any name. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): He said a Member of this House who was a former Minister of Railways. ... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Topdar, I told you, please do not interrupt now. Shri Paranjpe, Shri Vaiko, what is this? I am telling you that if anything is objectionable, I will expunge it. Why are you worried about it?

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The yardstick will be the same. It is all right. Shri Paranjpe, please do not interrupt.

...(Interruptions)

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम तो डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट पर ही बोल रहे थे, लेकिन ये लोग छेड़ते हैं। (व्यवधान)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप इस तरफ मुंह करके बोलिये।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) : अन्त में माडर्न फूड इंडस्ट्रीज के विया में देश में यह गर्म अफवाह है कि करोड़ों रुपये का लेनदेन करके उसके डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट की बात हो रही है, उसको बेचने की बात हो रही है। उस दिन चन्द्रशेखर जी बोल रहे थे। (व्यवधान)

श्री बसुदेव आचार्य (बांकुरा) : वह बेच दिया।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) : बेच दिया ? डेढ़ दो हजार करोड़ रुपये की तो उसकी जमीन ही है और उसको कुल दाम 130 करोड़ रुपये में बेच दिया।

श्री मणि शंकर अय्यर (मयिलादुतुरई) : 105 करोड़ रुपये के लिए 2000 करोड़ रुपये की चीज बेच डाली।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) : हीरा बेचकर ये लोग कोयले के दाम पा रहे हैं। माडर्न फूड इंडस्ट्रीज को बेचने का काम इन्होंने किया और ट्रांसपेरेंसी खोज रहे हैं। जो पहले बेच लिया, उसका क्या होगा ? इसलिए इसकी उच्चस्तरीय छानबीन होनी चाहिए। (व्यवधान) अब बैठिये न। दस हजार करोड़ रुपये की चीज 135 करोड़ रुपये में बेच दी तो क्या बिना कुछ लिए ही बेच दी ? जब एक दाम की चीज को कम दाम में बेच दिया, शाक पात के दाम में बेच दिया तो इसकी सी.बी.आई. इन्क्वायरी होनी चाहिए। एक चीज को कम दाम में बेचा तो जनता जान जाये कि ये ले देकर बेच रहे हैं और कहते हैं कि डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट की पॉलिसी है या ले देकर बेचने की पॉलिसी है।

श्री प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी (रायगंज) : एक सी.बी.आई. इन्क्वायरी माडर्न फूड इंडस्ट्रीज की भी होनी चाहिए।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) : हो जाये और इसमें ट्रांसपेरेंसी रखिये। कोई लाख रुपये की चीज आप कम दाम में बेचेंगे तो देश के लोग समझेंगे कि इसमें घोटाला है, लोग ले देकर चीजों को बेच रहे हैं। देश की सम्पत्ति को नहीं बेचना है। उसमें अगर मिसमैनेजमेंट है तो उसे ठीक करिये। आई.डी.पी.एल. मुजफ्फरपुर में है, खाद कारखाना बरौनी में है, एक तरफ अंजोर का बन्द है, फर्टिलाइजर फैक्टरी सिंदरी है, जितने अंडरटेकिंग्स हैं, सब का मिसमैनेजमेंट दूर करके उनको चालू करिये, मैनेज करिये, उसके लिए बजट में उपबन्ध बढ़ाना चाहिए। देश की सम्पत्ति को बढ़ाने का काम करना चाहिए, बेचने का काम हरगिज नहीं करना चाहिए। हम इस पॉलिसी का समर्थन किसी हालत में नहीं कर सकते हैं। लेकिन हम देख रहे हैं कि ये लोग मानने वाले नहीं हैं। इन लोगों को देश बेचने की सनक चढ़ी हुई है, इसमें जनता आप लोगों की खबर लेगी और आपको ठीक सजा देगी।

(इति)

(e5/2015/pb-jr)

2015 hours

SHRI V.P. SINGH BADNORE (BHILWARA): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the disinvestment policy of the Government. A lot of discussion has taken place and it is a national debate today whether disinvestment should take place or not, and if it has to take place, how it has to take place and why it has to take place. One should not get emotional. We should see the writings on the wall. The whole world over, every country is going in for privatisation and disinvestment is a part of it. A few days ago, there was an item in the *Economic Times* and the heading was about the Ratan Tata Group. He talked about private sector that in the private sector if you are not competitive, you do not have to be emotional. And what happened? Because the Tata Chemicals was not performing well, Manu Seth had to go. This is one of the biggest reasons for the public sector units which have served their time. There was a time when money was not coming into that sector and we followed the Nehruvian model. At that time it was a good model. But the time has changed and one has to change with the time. One does not have to be emotional about it and one does not have to be subjective about it. One of the biggest reasons is that if I have a public sector unit in my constituency, how do I face my constituency and my constituents? It is a big problem for all of us. What do we tell them? But when they were not performing well, when they were not doing their

job, they had to be blamed for that. How can we go on paying good money, spending good money over bad money or bad investment? And was it the job of the Government to get into a sector where it was not required? What was the reason for getting into the hotel line? What was the reason or the rationale to run buses or the roadways?...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Do you really want the State Roadways Corporations to be run by exploitative private business?

SHRI V.P. SINGH BADNORE (BHILWARA): Of course. Why not? If the bureaucrats had their way, they would have nationalised the taxi service also, and if Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar had to go to the airport and call for a national taxi, and if there was an IAS officer heading that taxi service, he would never had reached the airport. I am citing one example. We did a small study in Rajasthan. We studied the Rajasthan Garage which is run by the Government. When we studied that Garage, we found that the per kilometre cost of the cars available to the IAS officers, Ministers and others, worked out to something like a phenomenal Rs.15 per kilometre.

(f5/2020/krr/asa)

If you get the same car on kilometre basis, you can run a Mercedes Benz car at Rs. 3 or Rs. 4 per kilometre. That is the plight of the public sector. My friend and the senior leader Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar started his speech with a comment. I do not want to put it across to him. He said about selling *dahej* to pay the *chowkidar*. I like that statement. It is a very Doon school sort of statement. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): It is because he was there. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI V.P. SINGH BADNORE (BHILWARA): What it really means is that you do not have the money to pay the *chowkidar* but you want to retain him. But still you do not want to sell off your silver utensils. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): You married my Government. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI V.P. SINGH BADNORE (BHILWARA): Let me put it as to how I look at it. That is exactly how I look at it. He does not have the money to pay the *chowkidar*. But still he does not want to sell his silver. A Mayoite would rather sell his silver and start an enterprise and start having four to five *chowkidars*. That is how we look at it and that is how a Doscoe looks at it. ...(*Interruptions*)

I will also say that in the colonial times most of the business was run by the Government and it started like that.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): It is completely wrong.

SHRI V.P. SINGH BADNORE (BHILWARA): Not only in India but even in Canada, they had the Railway service and everything and they started the hotel service also. It was State-run. But in England, things have changed now. The BOAC was not running in profit. Once it became the British Airways, when it was privatised, it started functioning very well and it started making profits. Air France is not doing well even today for the simple fact that it is one of the biggest airlines. It should be doing much better. Even the Government of France has also decided that they have to dis-invest and then only they will really start making profits. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): What happened to Pan American?

SHRI V.P. SINGH BADNORE (BHILWARA): It is a private airliner.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): It collapsed. What does it prove? ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI V.P. SINGH BADNORE (BHILWARA): Sir, I have not been able to get into the nitty gritty of figures. The buzzword today is competition. One does not have to be emotional. We have to go in for dis-investment.

Thank you.

(ends)

2024 hours

SHRI T.M. SELVAGANPATHI (SALEM): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am extremely grateful to you for having given me this opportunity, though at the fag end of this discussion. The subject which we are dealing here, the deliberation that is going on here is very important and of serious nature and it has its far-reaching consequence on our future economy.

There are two schools of thought. One says : 'You dis-invest' and the other says : 'You do not'. When we say that we should go in for dis-investment or when we take a case where we oppose dis-investment, we should not forget the fact that our public sector units with a capital worth of Rs. 2,04,000 crore is earning a dividend of only Rs. 9,000 crore.

(g5/2025/san-hng)

The profit ratio is very low. That is one anguish of the Government. We should also remember that the public sector units are absorbing the maximum budgetary support and the maximum national savings, thereby creating a wider budgetary deficiency. This is another anguish of the Government. There cannot be two opinions that 60 per cent of our revenue goes to the payment of interest on the public debt.

Sir, it is also a fact that nearly 107 PSUs out of 245 PSUs are running at heavy loss and many of them are thrown to the sick category, waiting for a death knell from the Board for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction, BIFR. Sir, this is what the agony and anguish the hon. Minister, who has taken over as the Minister of Disinvestment, has today. But with all these things in mind, can we go on disinvesting indiscriminately, can we afford to throw nation's assets worth crores of rupees in the hands of the multinational corporations? Sir, when we talk of such a measure by the Government, they jump on to say that it all started in the Congress regime. A regime may come and go, a Government may come and go, Ministers may come and go, but what about the national assets which have been created over the last 50 years?

Sir, when we talk of disinvestment, there is another area also which we all should know about and also understand the subject in deep. These are the industries which started in 1956 with 5 units and with an investment of Rs. 26 crore. They have gone up to 245 units today which paved the way for the take off of the economy of our nation. These are the units which are responsible for the building up of our nation. These are the public sector units which are responsible for the industrialisation of this nation. Can we forget this? Can we ignore this? Sir, you would not disagree with me if I say that the actual equity put in all these 245 units is roughly about Rs. 55,000 crore and the rest belongs to the financial institutions. All these loans have been repaid. Is it not a fact that so many crores of rupees have been repaid by this public sector.

Sir, one should also agree that there was a substantial increase in the gross sale and there was a substantial increase in the net profit. For Rs. 55,000 crore of investment, this sector has earned roughly about Rs. 10,000 crore so far. Sir, the value added in production has also gone up to 25 per cent. The gross internal resources have also increased by 22 per cent.

(h5/2030/sh-sb)

The export earnings increased by 15 per cent because of these public sector units. The contribution to the exchequer by these units is roughly about Rs. 42,000 crore. Can we ignore this? Apart from all these things, these units are feeding 20 lakh families in the country. The indiscriminate disinvestment has resulted in throwing out two lakh workers out of jobs under the VRS. You are tempting them, and they are going out for a song. This is what is happening today. We should not forget the contribution made by these public sector units. Though we have invested Rs. 55,000 crore, and the total value is Rs. 2,01,000 crore, ten major public sector units alone are worth about Rs. 5,00,000 crore today. Can we sell them to the private entrepreneurs? These are the valuable contributions made by the public sector units which we should take into consideration.

We are saying that disinvestment started with a limited purpose. In the Congress regime, it was to the extent of 20 per cent. They say that there should not be any change in the management. Here is a case where we are jumping from piecemeal disinvestment to indiscriminate and large-scale disinvestment. For what purpose, this is our question. Is it to bridge the fiscal deficit which the Government is facing today? Is it to fill up the budgetary gap? The Government should give an answer to this. If they say, 'no, this is not for the purpose of filling up the budgetary gap', then why did the Finance Minister set up a target of Rs. 10,000 crore, which he mentioned in his Budget speech? Is it not a fact that you want Rs. 10,000 crore and, therefore, you are opening everything to the MNCs and selling these shares?

We are not opposing the disinvestment in toto. We are opposing the kind of disinvestment that happened in the case of Gas Authority of India Limited. We are opposing the loss of Rs. 600 crore. I am not attributing any motives. But look at the way in which it was carried out. When the share value was Rs. 150, GAIL was not allowed to sell the shares whereas, when the share value was Rs. 70, it was allowed to sell thereby incurring a loss of Rs. 600 crore to the exchequer. This is the aspect which we are opposing; this is the kind of disinvestment which we are opposing. Therefore, the Government has to spell out its policy in clear and unambiguous terms.

When the first industry was inaugurated by the first Prime Minister of this country, he said that he was not

inaugurating any industry, but he was inaugurating the modern temple of India. We are now demolishing that temple. The Party in power is very good at demolition. The Party in power today is interested in renovating the ancient temples. Please protect this temple of modern India also. I wish to remind them that there are many ways to do this. We should seriously look into all these aspects. We need sincere efforts to do that. It is not a question of whether that Government did it or some other Government did it. There is no point in harping on or saying that it is the brainchild of Congress; there is no point in saying that the United Front Government pursued it under the Common Minimum Programme, and there is no point in saying that you are also following the same thing. There may be a variation in the quality, but we are not talking about it now.

(j5/2035/snb-har)

If you say that here there is a case where you cannot avoid disinvestment, then you spell out your policy. It should be unambiguous.

Today, our question is this. Are all these disinvestment taking place in order to fill up the Budgetary gap? This reminds me of a position where the jewels of your family are sold for the purpose of meeting your day to day expenditure. If you are selling out your land, that gives you livelihood, for the purpose of managing your day to day affair, and if that is a fact, then we do not want this disinvestment.

Sir, why is disinvestment taking place in the *Navratnas*? There are two categories. One is the profit making industries, and second is the loss making industries. Why are you going about only selling the shares of the profit making industries? This is the moot question that nobody has answered. All right, if you are selling the loss making industries for a better purpose, then, what is that purpose? Is it for revamping the sick industries? Is it for revitalising the sick industries? Or, is it for reviving the existing sick industries? You do not do that. But you claim to have acquired Rs. 18,000 crore so far from the proceeds of the sales of these shares? What did you do with this Rs. 18,000 crore? Has it gone to the social sector, as was promised?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude now.

SHRI T.M. SELVAGANPATHI (SALEM): Sir, this is an important matter and I hope you would permit me another two minutes. There are two more important points that I would like to bring to the notice of the Government.

Sir, there is no point in saying that that this Rs. 18,000 crore has gone into the Consolidated Fund of India. Please do not say that. Then, why did you at all have a Disinvestment Commission? The tenure of the Commission has also expired. I do not know as to when this Government would revive the Disinvestment Commission. You revive this Commission with some teeth. What happened to their recommendations? None of the recommendations of the Disinvestment Commission, that had given 12 Reports, has been accepted by this Government. None of the recommendations of the Disinvestment Commission has been taken into consideration. The Commission wanted to create a fund – a Disinvestment Fund. The hon. Finance Minister, on the floor of this House, had promised that the Fund would be created. What happened to that? Therefore, we suspect that your act is not transparent. We suspect your actions because there is no transparency. What happened to this Rs. 18,000 crore? Did it really go to the health sector? Did it really go to the educational sector? Nobody knows. But there is no point in saying that this has gone to the Consolidated Fund of India and thereby it has come to the other sectors. That you say it every time. Why do you not create a corpus? Whatever you disinvest that money should be set apart and that should be utilised only for the purpose of reviving the existing public sector units -- the nations' wealth, the nations' asset. Can you declare that? Please spell out your policy.

Mr. Minister, we know you are an able man. We know your integrity. We know about your farsightedness. If you cannot do it now, you cannot do it any more. If Shri Ram Naik, the hon. Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas is powerful, then he can control disinvestment in his Ministry. If Kumari Mamata Banerjee is powerful, she can control it. But poor Shri Sharad Yadav cannot do it. He has to sell the pride of this nation – the Air India.

Sir, why I am saying this is because you go by the pick and choose method. Why do you do that? There are two important industries in Tamil Nadu. One of them is the Salem Steel Plant, which is in my constituency. My friend here was saying, what do we say to the public?

(k5/2040/kmr/skb)

Once you sell this industry worth Rs.2,500 crore, the only stainless steel industry in the entire India, to the private entrepreneurs, the private entrepreneur will monopolise the entire stainless steel industry in the country. Whom is the Government helping? Why is the Government doing this when there is a way for revival? The Government spent Rs.808 crore only recently for providing a hot rolling mill in the Salem Steel Plant. It now wishes to sell this steel plant, immediately after spending Rs.800 crore on it, while the management wants only Rs.200 crore to make it a full-fledged steel industry. This industry takes the raw material from Durgapur Alloy Steel Plant. This

Government wants to kill the Alloy Steel Plant at Durgapur also. I say this because once the Salem Steel Plant is privatised, the private entrepreneur would not take the raw material from the Durgapur plant. This is how the Government is trying to kill two birds with one shot – kill the Salem Steel Plant and kill the Durgapur Alloy Steel Plant. The Government is adopting this method now to achieve this. Why is the Government doing this? Is the Government not doing this to enable the private sector to monopolise the steel industry? Who advised this? What does the Disinvestment Commission say about this?

The Tamil Nadu Assembly has passed a unanimous resolution asking the Union Government to reconsider this decision. All political parties were party to that resolution. The same issue was raised in this House. Shri Vaiko, whose party is a partner in the NDA Government, is sitting here. DMK is represented here. PMK is represented here. I do not know what they all are doing. Assets worth Rs.2,500 crore are going to be put in the hands of the private entrepreneurs. For what purpose is this being done? This is being done to let the private sector monopolise the industry.

SHRI S.S. PALANIMANICKAM (THANJAVUR): Sir, he is misleading the House.

SHRI T.M. SELVAGANPATHI (SALEM): I am not yielding, Sir. If they have done some good to this industry I would have yielded. They have not done anything. Let me complete please. ...*(Interruptions)* When they are there as partners in power, the people of Tamil Nadu expect them to do some good to the State. If they say that they would not listen to us, fine. We are in the opposition and that's why they are not listening to us.

SHRI S.S. PALANIMANICKAM (THANJAVUR): He is casting aspersions. Sir, it is my privilege to clarify the position.

SHRI T.M. SELVAGANPATHI (SALEM): I am not casting aspersions. Let Shri Palanimanickam not divide the interests of Tamil Nadu in this issue. Everybody is unanimous.

SHRI S.S. PALANIMANICKAM (THANJAVUR): Sir, they have sold the Government shares in SPIC to private entrepreneurs. How can they talk about this now?

SHRI T.M. SELVAGANPATHI (SALEM): Sir, if Shri Palanimanickam is agitated on this, let him answer one question of mine. When the Union Government wanted to sell off the Vizag Steel Plant, Shri Chandrababu Naidu had just put in a word to this Government and the Government got worried and immediately went on record saying that it was holding it back. Why was it done in the case of Andhra Pradesh? It was done because of the numbers.

SHRI S.S. PALANIMANICKAM (THANJAVUR): It is still in process. The Disinvestment Commission has already taken up the issue.

SHRI T.M. SELVAGANPATHI (SALEM): It is done because the Telugu Desam Party has 28 Members in the House. It is very unfortunate for the country.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Selvaganpathi, please conclude now.

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): Sir, Shri Selvaganpathi referred to my name and the DMK, and said that we have compromised. We have not compromised at all. We have raised this issue on the floor of the House. We have expressed our opinion on the issue. We never compromised on this issue. Compromising has always been their monopoly. I do not want to criticise.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): What we are saying is that the unanimous voice of Tamil Nadu is not being heard by this Government whereas the unanimous voice of Andhra Pradesh is being heard by them. We are saying that really for reasons of politics, they should listen to Tamil Nadu if they are going to listen to Andhra Pradesh.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let there be some solidarity here among the Tamilians at least.

SHRI T.M. SELVAGANPATHI (SALEM): I am happy, Sir, that Shri Vaiko is fighting, fighting in the air without yielding any result. If Shri Chandrababu Naidu is able to do it, why cannot we do it?

(15/2045/kkd/bks)

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, what Shri Selvaganapathi was referring to was that the Government of Tamil Nadu or the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu had not approached the Prime Minister or the Central Government to stop these privatisations, like Shri Chandrababu did....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): Sir, the Tamil Nadu Government has taken up the issue with the

Government...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): They have not...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: How do you know that?

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): What is the result? There is no result...(*Interruptions*)â€ They had approached. But they had not taken any agitated approach...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Pandian, you are now spoiling your case.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI C. KUPPUSAMI (MADRAS NORTH): He is giving the wrong information...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): ...(*Expunged as ordered by the Chair*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Sir, it is highly objectionable. Please remove these remarks from the record...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will expunge all the objectionable portions.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): Sarkaria Commission had given its report as to who was guilty. Nobody is talking about it...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Selvaganpathi, please conclude now.

SHRI T.M. SELVAGANPATHI (SALEM): In the sugar deal, Sarkaria Commission had found them guilty...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record.

(*Interruptions*) ...(*Not recorded*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already said that nothing is going on record now.

(*Interruptions*) ...(*Not recorded*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Palanimanickam, why are you wasting your energy? Nothing is going on record.

(*Interruptions*) ...(*Not recorded*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Pandian, let him complete.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Pandian, let your Member conclude now.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please allow him to conclude now.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Palanimanickam, please take your seat.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI T.M. SELVAGANPATHI (SALEM): Whatever I have said is contained in the report of the Sarkaria Commission which is kept in the Library...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Palanimanickam, please.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): It is a fact....(Interruptions)â€¢They did scientific corruption....(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Kuppusamy, please take your seat.

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Pandian, I am on my legs. Please resume your seat.

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Kuppusamy, you also resume your seat.

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Palanimanickam, you please go to your seat.

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Selvaganipathi, please conclude now.

SHRI T.M. SELVAGANPATHI (SALEM): I am concluding, Sir. ...(Interruptions)

(m5/2050/rsg-hcb)

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): Sir, please check the record and see for yourself. I have not made any derogatory remark. ...(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS (SHRI RAM NAIK): In this discussion, again, the name of Shri Karunanidhi has been taken and allegations of corruption have been made. ...(Interruptions) Those names should be expunged from the record....(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please do not mention about those who are not here.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): It is a fact. It is in the Library. ...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Pandian, will you please resume your seat?

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Palanimanickam, please take your seat.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI T.M. SELVAGANAPATHI (SALEM): Sir, I am not side-tracking the issue. ...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Why are you objecting? I only want to create a conducive atmosphere in this House.

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, nothing will go on record except what Shri Selvaganapathi says.

(Interruptions) ...(Not recorded)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Selvaganapathi, you will have to conclude now.

SHRI T.M. SELVAGANAPATHI (SALEM): I will take just one minute. I am on a very important point.

SAIL has been given a time frame of up to March, 2001 for entering into a shareholding agreement. ...(Interruptions) They will have to enter into an agreement with their strategic partners for transfer of assets. I want my friends who have been echoing my voice to please stop it. Otherwise, the entire asset worth Rs.2,500 crore would be lost.

The other issue that I want to raise is about the Hindustan Photo Films Limited. This is the only industry in the entire South-East Asia catering to the needs of Health and Defence Departments. This is such a strategic industry. The

BIFR have already issued a show cause notice that this industry should be wound up. This is a serious issue. There are only six industries in this field in the entire world. The multinational corporations are interested in getting this industry wound up.

I am sorry to say that the workers there are getting only 40 per cent of their salaries. As Shri Natchiappan rightly pointed out, they are giving up even the subsidy in the canteen. They are paying Rs.10 for a *dosa* for which they would otherwise pay Re.1 in order to see that the profits go up. The workers are committed to reviving the industry. The revival package is pending before the Government. The Government should see that it is revived. There are 2,500 workers belonging to Scheduled Tribes who are entirely dependent on this industry for their livelihood. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): All that is required is the building up of a polyester unit.

SHRI T.M. SELVAGANAPATHI (SALEM): If this industry is not revived, the price of the X-rays will be fixed by the MNCs. We have a population of 100 crore in this country. If the MNCs say that the price of an X-ray would be Rs.200 or Rs.500, we will have to pay that. So, please protect this strategic industry. This is very important.

I would request the Government to spell out the policy. Some hon. Members have been demanding a White Paper to be placed. It would be better if we had a White Paper because we can discuss this threadbare and come to a conclusion.

Thank you.

(ends)

(n5/2055/vp/rpm)

2055 hours

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA (CONTAI): Sir, thank you very much for this opportunity though it comes practically at the end of the day. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, you are in the safe company.

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA (CONTAI): I shall be very brief. This is a great opportunity that I have experienced where a lot of pent up emotions, pent up grievances and also prejudices came out during the course of the discussion. The real point is this. Are we going to shed off some of the ideological bagging, which we all seem to carry, and not accept the reality and the fact that change is taking place all the time? It is necessary to make a lot of mid-course corrections some times, leaving our ideological baggage behind and then trying to bring out a dispassionate, academic and objective discussion. It is in this spirit that I approach this subject this evening.

First of all, disinvestment is not an end in itself; it is a means to an end, the end being the restructuring of the public sector enterprises system, their revitalisation, turning them into efficient and turning this vast, critical mass of nearly Rs. 6 lakh crore of investment from being a resource guzzling entity into a surplus generating entity. To the extent that disinvestment can help that process, it is certainly welcome.

But having said so, my friends in the Treasury Benches should not mind and should bear with me, if I am a little bit anti-establishment within the overall framework of establishment. I feel that the decision to create a separate Ministry of Disinvestment in retrospect was not a very wise decision. It is a very wrong signal to everybody around, including trade unions and the working classes that the Government is there to sell off. That was not certainly the message. The process has been on since 1991. It has been endorsed by various Governments, but there was already a Ministry, which was concerned with the public enterprises, that is, the Department of Public Enterprises. Now, what can the Ministry of Disinvestment do? It is like having something without any limbs, without any teeth and without any strings of its own. It has to work through the administrative Ministry.

Now, the point is that if the Minister of Petroleum has some reservation about some aspect of disinvestment, there is little that the Ministry of Disinvestment can do. It cannot do anything. What it has been able to achieve so far will alone show whether it has justified its existence during this time because basically it cannot do any disinvestment without the active support of the administrative Ministry. If that is the position, it is much better that the entire work of disinvestment is left to the administrative Ministry, with the help of the Ministry of Finance and maybe, the Department of Public Enterprises, which controls most of the public sector enterprises. ...(*Interruptions*)

Maybe, the Government has good reasons, but from outside, one does feel that the creation of a separate Ministry

of Disinvestment did give a wrong signal all around, as if the Government is there to sell off all the interests. I do not buy all those arguments about selling off the family silver. There was very little family silver. In any case, when Rs. 6 lakh crore are invested and return is practically negative, if you leave out those monopolistic public sector oil companies, except a few companies like the NTPC and BHEL, there is no company which is making profit.

The essential problem to my mind would be how to subject this entire system to the discipline of the balance sheet and profit and loss statement. If you can do that, a lot of problems will disappear. The other important aspect I should say is that somehow or the other, the workers and the trade unions seem to have been left out altogether in this major process of decision making which concerns their enterprises. It is a gigantic decision, a collective decision, where the Management, the Government, the Ministries and the trade unions concerned should be involved and they should approach the problem as if it is our common, joint problem to solve.

In that process, if the Government has to sell off some portion of its share, there is no harm. But it is absolutely important that the workers' consent should be obtained and they should be involved because otherwise, I am afraid, they would create all kinds of problems and once they start fighting, it will be very difficult to achieve any kind of progress.

Essentially, I feel that we should divide the entire public sector system into two parts – those enterprises which are traditionally profit making and those enterprises which are chronically unviable and which cannot be redeemed really.

(o5/2100/rk-rjs)

There may be one or two cases. A number of cases have been mentioned. I do not think it was correct for Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar to compare Essar Steel with Steel Authority of India. Essar Steel is a totally different system and a lot of more money, costly money, went into its construction rather than steel Authority of India which by and large got much cheaper finance than the recent examples. Then, the Steel industry became the victim of the indiscriminate policy of free import. Many of the public sector enterprises are in a sorry position today because of the policy of permitting import over a number of products for which they were practically assured of some kind of monopolistic positions or shelter market conditions for years to come. Suddenly, they have been exposed to the full competition for which they are not equipped. If you have been carrying a public sector company like a baby on the shoulder all the time, giving public sector purchase preference, price preference, no obligation to return the money that has been invested with interest and all these things, and suddenly if you throw it in the midstream and ask it to swim, it cannot swim. It will sink. It will get drowned or it will be eaten away by sharks. This is precisely what is happening.

Our enterprises are not accustomed to the kind of competition which is taking place, where many of the countries of the former Soviet Union are practically dumping many of their products at a throw-away prices just to help their own foreign exchange position. Similarly, in the last three years with the recession in South East Asia and East Asia, they also dump the Indian market with their products and the result is that our companies have suffered very badly. But, to my mind it is a temporary position. It will certainly improve.

But, essentially, as I said, those which are chronically loss-making, they have become loss-making because the technology might have changed and they may have the outdated technology. The market might have decided that. Each particular enterprise has its own history of why it has gone sick. There is no general history to place the sickness. So, what do you do in this?

Many of them are public sector enterprises today but basically it was the private sector which practically ruined them completely. Then the Government, in a kind of generosity, as it happened in seventies and eighties, took them over which was a wrong policy to my mind retrospectively. The Government of the day should not have taken over any company which was rendered sick by the private sector enterprises. That is what happened to the National Bicycle Corporation. Many of them were just taken over like that just because there was a feeling that they have gone sick because of mis-management. If there was a shade or something under the instrument which looks like instrument or equipment, then all that was needed was that they should be managed properly by the Government with unlimited finance and they will return to sickness. That never happened because as in the case of human lives, industry also has its history. Enterprises also die and when some system is about to die, it is not good to try to preserve it through oxygen cylinder for any length of time. This may only cost the nation further because every time it has to be kept alive by cash loss and that cash is met from the Budget after depriving sectors like let us say, providing drinking water to all our villages, providing elementary education to all our schools. The Government cannot discharge these essential duties there just because of this extreme preoccupation of the industry that we had in the last three or four decades. We want to keep everything alive. So, I am afraid that has to come.

Again, the Government has to take quick decisions. As I said, once it is decided that there are profit-making units, loss-making units, you take them out. If loss-making units cannot be revived, there is no harm if a public sector

collaborator is brought in to provide the technology or finance. I should say that those of our friends who are all the time running down the multinationals should not mind if a multinational is brought in to help revive a particular sick unit which cannot be otherwise revived. If they give, for instance, the buy-back guarantee, it is good. There are many cases in which countries like Mexico and Brazil have solved their problems of public sector sick industry. We do not learn from other countries. A lot of things were said on the question of workers. In a particular system the total number of people in the organised sector is around 30 million of which the Government sector itself has about 22 million or 26 million.

(p5/2105/rc/nsh)

Now, any idea that this enterprise will close down throwing 4000 people out of job, does not sell very much. Firstly, the trade unions will resist. Even the public will not like that idea very much. Therefore, while considering any proposal about reconstruction or disinvestment, we must ensure that nobody loses his job. The Government of Sri Lanka has done this. When Sri Lanka privatised a lot of their public sector industries, those who were given the responsibility were clearly told that within two years there will be no retrenchment and after two years you would have an opportunity to do so. Whom you do not want, you could ask them to go. But it has to be with proper rehabilitation packages. Sir, can we not say that due to reconstruction or disinvestment, nobody will lose his job and that he will be allowed to draw salary by sitting at home until they retire? If you look at the age profile of the people, you will see that the Government will not have to spend very much. It will be much cheaper.

Incidentally, what happened to the much-talked about National Renewal Fund which was created in early '90s. It was created precisely with the idea of providing retraining, and redeployment facilities to all those people who are rendered surplus. But nothing had happened. In the governmental system we have got examples. In the early '50s when food was de-controlled and rationing was abolished, those of you who were alive at that time must be remembering that there were many thousand people employed all over the country who were employed in the Food Department all over the country. But at that time we had a very courageous Minister, Shri Rafi Ahmad Kidwai who took the risk to close it down. But he provided new jobs to everybody by sending them to other Departments. There are still many Departments which are without sufficient manpower. So, why can we not say that nobody will lose his job? A simple announcement could be made that reconstruction or disinvestment does not mean some one losing his job. It could also be said that everybody will be given appropriate opportunities for retraining and redeployment. We should also say that proper Golden Handshake will be given. Otherwise, they can sit at home and draw the salary and allowances until they retire. Sir, the Hindustan Lever closed down their factory in Mumbai a couple of years ago. The Indian Aluminium Company was also closed down a couple of years ago. But there were no murmurs because the management sat with the workers and settled the problem. The Chairman of the Indian Aluminium Company told me what he was asked by a person. A person told him that when some one asked him what does he do? He used to say that he is working in the Indian Aluminium Company. Now, what should he say? There were identity crisis. Then the Chairman said that there will be a room for you with newspapers and whenever he wishes to come there, he can come and spend time as long as he can. The problem was solved. Even in a city like Mumbai, no trade union raised the question that two major companies have been closed down. There is a lesson for the public sector to learn. I am sure if workers are taken into confidence and the matter is settled not on "we" and "you" basis but on "us" basis saying that it is a collective problem and a collective decision is taken by involving the trade unions, certainly it can be solved.

Last point that I wanted to make is that uncertainty should be avoided. There is a lot of uncertainty now. For instance, what is the exact position of Air India and Indian Airlines? It was decided some time ago that they will be merged. I think that should have been a very rationale step. It is because the position of Air India is coming down every day for unknown reasons.

In all the public sector enterprises even in those profitable ones, the Government shareholding must be brought down to 49 per cent. Very often we talk about things which we do not understand. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar told me that people like us confuse with figures of 74, 26 and 51. If it is 51 per cent then it continues to be a Government company. If Air India has to buy a plane it has to go to the Ministry of Finance and then to the Planning Commission. If the Planning Commission has to arbitrate among let us say transport sector and rural employment sector, naturally it will give first priority to the rural development. The, if it is the transport sector, first priority will go to urban transportation rather than civil aviation which in popular mind is still associated with luxury-oriented activity. You take it out of the Government and reduce the Government shareholding to 49 per cent, the Government will have total control. You can have the rest of the share well spread out. The Government will have complete control but it will not be a Government company. To that extent it can go to the market and I can assure you that for buying a plane money is no problem in the world market. Today, the sellers will themselves come and link you up with financial organisations which will give you soft loans very easily.

(q5/2110/kvj/mkg)

But, so long as Air India and Indian Airlines continue to be the Government companies, they suffer from this problem.

To sum up, I should say that we should not have any kind of strong inhibitions about it. We should be pragmatic. We should not try to keep the loss making units. Their assets have to be revalued. If we calculate the assets on the basis of the balance sheets, then I am afraid, there will be enough of resources to pay a good compensation package to the workers who may like to go away. Sell it as a property and not as a company. Sell the assets. There is no question of disinvestment there.

As regards the profit making companies, well, in those monopolistic ones, perhaps it may be better to keep the Government shareholding at 51 per cent. But, in all others the Government shareholding should be progressively brought down to at least 49 per cent. There is no harm in this. Ideally I would prefer that it should be widely spread among the investing public. That will give it a lot, that will boost up the capital share market, give a lot of floating stock in the market and give a lot of money to the Indian shareholding also. There also preference should be given to the employees. This is how Mrs. Margaret Thatcher succeeded in her efforts.

Thank you very much.

(ends)

2112 hours

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (PONNANI): Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, I do not rise in any spirit of confrontation on the question of disinvestment. I rise to emphasize and to stress on the need to exercise due caution in implementing any policy of disinvestment.

Sometimes I begin to wonder whether a transient majority here should have the power to demolish and dismantle the public sector. Whatever may be their fondness for demolitions, I wonder whether this transient majority should have the power to demolish and dismantle structures built up in the past fifty years or whether disinvestment in any particular public enterprise should have the sanction of two-thirds majority of this House. That is a matter of caution. However, apart from that, as I said, caution has to be exercised rather than a mad rush in our policy of disinvestment.

In our fondness for disinvestment, privatisation, liberalisation, globalisation, etc. the paramount considerations of the security of the country and the welfare of the people cannot be compromised. Look at the emerging scenario. I am afraid, it is a little frightening scenario. With privatisation of functions in seaports and airports and the globalisation of our national carriers, where are we leading ourselves to? Allah forbids, if there is a calamity or even a war, these strategic places in the hands of private people or even foreign interests and the Government left with only 26 per cent of holding, I am afraid, it may create a serious situation. We will have to be extremely careful and cautious to see that the welfare of the people is not compromised.

(r5/2115/ru-jr)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, we all know that the public sector enterprises have contributed generously towards the social sector. During 1997-98, their expenditure on township, maintenance, educational, medical and other facilities amounted to Rs.3147 crores. When you go to the private enterprises, you may find that the main consideration is profitability. Competition would increase. Competition may bring efficiency. It may bring in greater profits. But what about social justice? What about the very concept of a welfare state? We have to take care of that particular point.

We have to learn from other nations, from the experiences of other countries. We find that there are countries who went in for disinvestment have suffered. Time does not permit me to catalogue the happenings and developments in all such countries. For example, in Great Britain, the policy of dismantling the public sector enterprises some years ago was commonly referred to as 'Thatcherism'. It was widely criticised as monumental error, blunder and disaster. What did it lead to in Great Britain? It led to skyrocketing of tariffs. For example, there was skyrocketing of telecom tariffs and lastly, water supply was privatised over there.

There was a reference about British Airways. But only one part of the whole thing was presented. Today, British Airways is in difficulties. It is in search of some partner to have necessary finances. Here, I am not in any spirit of confrontation with your policy. I only say to exercise due caution. Our public sector enterprises are performing great social service. What a fine network of the oil companies as regards the supply of petroleum products in every nook and corner of our country! The private enterprises will be governed by considerations of profitability and not with that of social justice, which is to make provision of petroleum products in every nook and corner of the country irrespective of whether that is going to be profitable or not. So, I emphasise due caution in this entire exercise of disinvestment.

Sir, we need a positive attitude towards disinvestment process and this positive attitude lies in treating the entire question of disinvestment as an instrument for restructuring and reforming our public enterprises. Now, this concept would require certain elucidations for which there is no time. But the entire disinvestment should be considered in a positive manner, for restructuring and reforming our public sector enterprises. But then that will need a look at the utilisation of the disinvestment funds. If the disinvestment funds are utilised for your fiscal deficit, then *Allah* forbid, disaster awaits us. The Disinvestment Commission itself has said that there must be a disinvestment fund and it has laid down in various reports that the receipts from this fund should not go to meet the fiscal deficit but it should go in order to restructure and reform our own public sector enterprises.

(s5/2120/brv-asa)

In their 12th Report dated August 1999, the Disinvestment Commission says like this at page 2 and I quote:

"The disinvestment should be a part of a well-thought-out strategy of public sector reform and not made to serve merely as a means of raising revenues for the Budget."

The question that I raise is what happens to the suggestion of the Disinvestment Commission with respect to the Disinvestment Fund as also utilising the Disinvestment Fund for restructuring and reforming our public sector undertakings. If I am not mistaken, in the year 1996, the Government had taken a decision to have the Disinvestment Fund. But I do not think it is operational. I said earlier that I am not here for confrontation. If it is not, please do it immediately. Please do not fritter away the funds for meeting the fiscal deficit alone but utilise it in a proper manner.

The creation of a Disinvestment Fund, and the concept of proper utilisation of the disinvestment receipts, will also guard us against another danger, the danger of disinvestment process degenerating into distress sale. The Budget puts a certain target of Rs.10,000 crore. To meet the target, there would be distress sale; the fiscal deficit would be met and the Budget is not upset. If we have the Disinvestment Fund and if the process of disinvestment does not go for helping the Budget, then, in that case, we will also be in a position to meet this danger properly - the danger of the disinvestment policy degenerating into distress sale. I

am afraid that in the case of Air India, this is the position that is coming up. But, Sir, I see you getting restless. Therefore, I am not getting into the question of Air India. We will, I think, have more opportunities.

There is another aspect where caution is needed and that is proper valuation of the assets of the public enterprises. The Ministry concerned will be able to do it. There has to be some independent agency for that purpose. Proper valuation of the share value must be done. Here also, there was a reference to the Modern Food Industries. It is a widely known thing. Let us have transparency. Mr. Minister, in your own interest, please see that the suspicions in the minds of the public are put at rest. It is said that the value of the prime land in various metropolitan cities is nearly Rs.2000 crore. I do not know about it. I am no expert in that. But that is how the story goes. It is said that Rs.2000 crore worth of property was sold for just Rs.105 crore, a pittance! So, it is necessary that some transparent way must be found out in which there should be certain valuations.

In this connection, I would like to cite one example. I remember how the Income-Tax people are doing it. If I sell away my property at any amount, the Income-Tax people will not agree to it. They will say that they will have their own valuation of my property. They would say like this: "You have said that you have sold it for just this much amount. But we will have our own valuation because we feel that you would have pocketed much more.

Coming to the main point, certain national properties are being sold away. Here is a disinvestment process. There has to be a responsible, independent valuation and a transparent process. That is absolutely necessary.

(t5/2125/ksp/hng)

Sir, on the question of employees, you must not ring the bell. The interests of the employees cannot be sacrificed. A lot has been said about that and I will not repeat all that has been said. But then this is a factor that has to be considered.

Sir, there are various other things like the search for, what is called, strategic partners. What does it mean? I have very little knowledge of these things. But I tried to find out. It meant some big giants in the same industry. If that is so, they are going into cartels and monopolists. Whatever the hon. Minister, Shri Arun Jaitley may say with loud voice, with sound and fury, it is without any argument. So, these cartels and these monopolists will then create such distortions in our policy with very disastrous consequences on the economy of the country.

Therefore, with this note of caution and emphasising the need for a positive policy of disinvestment, which can be a

real, effective instrument for reforming and restructuring of our public enterprises, I take leave of you.

(ends)

2127 hrs

श्री हरीभाऊ शंकर महाले (मालेगांव) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सदन में विचार करने के लिए जो आर्थिक विग्रह आया है, उसका कड़ा विरोध करने के लिए मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ। जब मैं चना डालने से आवाज आता है, लेकिन मुंह में माल डालने से आवाज नहीं आता है। छोटा बाबू थोड़ा भ्रष्टाचार करता है, लेकिन किसान के पास अगर दो हजार का भी ऋण होता है, तो उसको नोटिस जाता है और उसका सारा माल जब्त हो जाता है। मैं चेन्नई गया था। वहां बैंक के लोग बहुत अच्छे हैं। मैंने उनसे मुलाकात की, तो पता लगा कि उन्होंने 20 कोटि रकम छोड़ दी। जिन लोगों की रकम छोड़ी वे किसान नहीं थे, बल्कि बड़े-बड़े उद्योगपति थे। इसलिए मैंने पहले ही कहा कि अगर माल मुंह में जाता है, तो आवाज नहीं होती है और यह भ्रष्टाचार का तरीका है। इतनी रकम एक बैंक में भ्रष्टाचार में है, तो देश में कितने बैंक हैं। मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। मोरारजी पंथ प्रधान थे और किलोस्कर उनके घर ब्याहने आए थे। किलोस्कर ने मुझे कहा कि ये हमारे दुश्मन है, बड़े लोगों के दुश्मन है, क्योंकि लोहे का दाम बढ़ा दिया, यूरिया का दाम बढ़ा दिया। एक बार ऐसा भी हुआ, कैलाशवासी वसन्तदादा पाटिल मुख्यमंत्री थे। मुम्बई के एक कार्यक्रम में हमारे लोगों ने बोल दिया कि मोरारजी भाई वसन्तदादा के खिलाफ बोलेंगे, अलग पार्टियां थीं, लेकिन उन्होंने खिलाफ नहीं बोला। वसन्तदादा ने जो किया, वह ठीक किया। महाराष्ट्र में जब भारतीय जनता पार्टी की सरकार थी, तो उन्होंने भीम प्रतिज्ञा की कि एनरान कम्पनी को समुद्र में डुबो दी जाए, लेकिन डूबी नहीं।

(u5/2130/sb-ss)

महाराष्ट्र में मिली-जुली सरकार आई तो एनरॉन जिन्दा हो गया। इसे 13 दिन की भारत सरकार ने मंजूरी दी। मेरा यह कहना है कि जो राष्ट्र के हित की बात है उसे सरकार करे और जो राष्ट्र के हित में नहीं है उसे कोई भी सरकार न करे।

महोदय, जब 1978 में प्याज का दाम कम हो गया तो मैं श्री मोरारजी भाई के पास गया और उनसे कहा कि जल्दी से जल्दी निर्यात बंदी उठानी चाहिए, उन्होंने निर्यात बंदी उठाई। आज महाराष्ट्र में बहुत अच्छे-अच्छे लोग हैं। वाजपेयी साहब भी बहुत अच्छे हैं। हम उनसे कई बार मिल चुके हैं। उनसे भी कहा था कि प्याज की निर्यात बंदी उठानी चाहिए, लेकिन उन्होंने उठाई नहीं। इसलिए महाराष्ट्र को 150 करोड़ का घाटा हुआ। किसान रोने लगे। अभी भी किसान 100-250 रुपए प्रति किं वटल प्याज बेच रहे हैं। मैं उस समय न विधायक था और न ही संसद सदस्य था, केवल एक सामान्य कार्यकर्ता था। मैं देवेगोड़ा जी के पास गया और उनसे भी प्याज के लिए विनती की। उन्होंने निर्यात बंदी उठाई। अगर निर्यात बंदी उठ जाती तो फॉरेन एक्सचेंज भारत सरकार को मिल जाता और किसान भी सुखी होते और महाराष्ट्र की 150 करोड़ की रकम भी खराब न होती।

अतः मेरी सरकार से प्रार्थना है कि लक्ष्मी, सरस्वती, नीयत और श्रम इकट्ठा करके राष्ट्र के हित को देखा जाए तो राष्ट्र आगे बढ़ेगा। अभी भी समय नहीं गया है, इसलिए अगर इन दो-चार बातों को ध्यान में रखा जाएगा तो देश आगे बढ़ेगा।

(इति)

2133 hours

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Sir, I shall be very brief and I would not repeat it. It is being said that the public sector is inefficient. My first question to the hon. Minister is this. How many from the management side of the public sector undertakings through the process of poaching and other methods have joined the foreign companies and the Indian companies to make them efficient? In the form of R&D, how much has been the contribution of the public sector undertakings to the private sector?

Lastly, the most important argument is that we are badly in need of more resources. We do not have them. What is the FDI inflow? The complaint of CII and FICCI through a representation to the Prime Minister about a month back was that the national savings were being monopolised through the share market and through the portfolio management by the foreign investors, that is, national savings, our money, our technology, our research, our management and through that only, they are going to have the managerial control. What is that? According to the Indian Company Law, by 26 per cent control, they will have the veto power. With the autonomy and the freedom of the public sector undertaking, in which you have divested 26 per cent to a foreign company, they, with our national savings, our management, and our R&D, will have the veto power to control the management, be it in the case of Air India or be it in the case of any other undertaking – insurance and other sectors – where you are just divesting 26 per cent and more.

(w5/2135/rs/har)

Secondly, even after foregoing the equity stake of 26 per cent for foreign equity, it is being interpreted in a different way. It has happened in the case of IRDA. You know what is the interpretation? They interpreted that for the foreign equity in an Indian company, who will be the Indian partner in the insurance industry, this 26 per cent cap will not be applicable. That was the interpretation. I raised it again and again and there was protest all around. I do not know but the hon. Minister will reply as to how such an interpretation is made. This is an insult to this House. This House decided for only 26 per cent of foreign equity and they are interpreting that 26 per cent foreign equity cap will not be applicable for those foreign stakes in the Indian partner of the company. The hon. Minister owes an explanation to this House.

Regarding the willful defaulters, I would like to say that they owe large sums of money to the financial institutions. Will the Government assure that these companies, these individuals will never be allowed to have any stake in the

disinvestment? It so happened that when the CII had said that United Commercial Bank should be commercialised or should be sold out, the employees had said that these were the people who owe to the bank. Ultimately, they had to back out.

Sir, these public sector undertakings have paid in the forms of dividend, corporate taxes, excise duty, customs duty and other duties in 1998-99 to the tune of Rs.46,924 crore. I would like to know will this be compensated through the taxes paid by the Indian companies. I am referring to three companies only. The number one Indian company whose name is there in the Fortune List. They have been enjoying the zero tax privileges. Of late they have been paying the minimum alternate tax. That is ITC. What is due to them in terms of excise duty? It is Rs.800 crore. What were the dues that were paid by the multinational banks to the Income Tax? No payment was made by them and they are being allowed to buy the shares. Will the Government assure that these people, who have not paid their due taxes to the Government and who are defaulters, will never be allowed to buy the Government stake if it is disinvested?

Regarding transparency, I would like to tell what goes by the name of insider trading in the share market. If I had time, I would have given umpteen number of instances. Through insider knowledge they are manipulating the share market, bringing down the share prices of public sector undertakings so that when divested they will buy them at cheaper prices. These manipulation stories are there, but I will not go into the details.

Regarding level playing field, I would like to say that this should be ensured. I am giving only one example of Hindustan Cables Ltd. That was the deemed subsidiary of DoT. They had been making profit, but DoT discontinued to place the orders to them. Ultimately, the Government have decided that this should be in the disinvestment list.

Sir, from State monopoly, the private monopoly is coming. I am giving one concrete example. For IPCL there are two bidders now. One is IPL Chatterjee Sorros and the other is Reliance. If Reliance is given then in the Indian market Reliance will have the monopoly control. From the State monopoly you are going to the private monopoly. How monopoly can be contained?

(x5/2140/lh-skb)

Lastly, the Indian situation is a paradoxical one. There is no private sector. The private sector is heavily dependent on the public financial institutions.

I am just recalling one incident. When Swaraj Paul had come to India in connection with Escorts, while going back he made an historic statement at that point of time that the Indian private sector with their contribution of Rs. 260 crore only had been controlling a corpus of Rs.27,000 crore. Now, it is lakhs of crores of rupees. There is no private sector. It is only dependent on the public sector.

The reverse story is this. Look at the management of public sector. Ratan Tata is on the Board of Reliance. All the big guys in the private sector are in key position of the public sector. ...(*Interruptions*) I will just make an appeal to Shri Vaiko and others, who are partners in the NDA Government that there are Ministers in the Government who have serious reservations about disinvestment. I find, Shri Ram Naik is laughing. He should stand up and oppose. ...(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS (SHRI RAM NAIK): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am not laughing, I am smiling. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Okay. That means, you have corroborated. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Rupchand Pal, there is a difference between laughing and smiling.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Sir, I am concluding now. They should stand up and oppose.

Thank you.

(ends)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, the hon. Minister.

श्री मोहन रावले (मुम्बई दक्षिण मध्य): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सुप्रीम कोर्ट में मामला आया है और उन्होंने गवर्नमेंट की डिस्इन्वैस्टमेंट पालिसी फार मेजर पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडरटेकिंग्स के बारे में क्वैरी की है। मैं उसके बारे में बोलना चाहता हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: After the Minister's Reply, you can seek a clarification.

श्री मोहन रावले (मुम्बई दक्षिण मध्य): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, लेकिन नियम 193 का जवाब देने के बाद कैसे बोल सकता हूँ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : यहां कुछ भी बोल सकते हैं?

श्री मोहन रावले (मुम्बई दक्षिण मध्य): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जस्टिस कृपाल सिंह और जस्टिस डी.पी. माहपात्र ने सोलिसिटर जनरल श्री हरीश सल्वे से पूछा है:

"Whether the Court should not interfere with the Government's policy even if healthy and profit-making PSUs were handed on a platter to a private party. "

आगे भी लिखा है और हाई कोर्ट ने स्वाल पूछा है:

"Government is within its right to try various experiments so long as those experiments are not arbitrary and *mala fide*. "

क्या सरकार इसका प्रीक्शन लेगी? हमारे सहयोगी श्री परांजपे ने भी बताया और मैं एन.टी.सी. के बारे में बोलना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने बताया था.....(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Mohan Rawale, he has spoken about it in detail.

Now, the hon. Minister. There should be no interruptions till he concludes his speech.

2143 hours

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS AND PUBLIC GRIEVANCES OF THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS, AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DISINVESTMENT

(SHRI ARUN SHOURIE): Sir, we have had the most incisive debate, many incisive contributions from my dear college friend, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, Shri Banatwalla's wise counsel for caution, and Shri Kirit Somaiya's figures and understanding of UTI and other things are not to be dismissed as those of a person who does some *dhandha* or controls it but of a person who has great knowledge in these matters. Similarly, there have been constructive suggestions from several quarters, especially, Dr. Nitish Sengupta and others. I shall ensure that they are kept in mind.

Sir, I have pleaded many a time in public and in the other House, where I have had an opportunity to speak on these matters, that I sincerely believe that there is a continuity in Government policy. I am not entering that as a defence that we are only doing things which others did. That is not the purpose but I regard this as one of the signs of maturity of the Indian political class, and those who happen to come into Government from time to time. Since early 1990s, this is the fifth or sixth Government today, the main direction of the Economic Policy has continued in one way. It is not to say that the same policies have continued. On the contrary, the policies have been modified and built upon on the basis of the experience that has gone on, as we proceeded along those policies.

(y5/2145/mmn-bks)

It has always distressed me that we came to create differences where there are none. The proof of this is that whether you say it of this side or of that side, when people are in power—now power is a big word, so let me use the word 'office'—or where we are in office, we, all of us, say one thing and where we are not in office, we say something else. As Shri Arun Jaitley and Shri Kirit Somaiya pointed out, if you see the State Governments today, speaking in general, they are all following the same direction of policies. Yes, there are minor modifications. Well, I do not want to go into individual States so as not to create a controversy. So, that is my point.

I feel that we disable all ourselves; we disable our ability to compete with the rest of the world when we try to nit-pick and find artificial differences when our roles change. I will give you an instance. Shri Arun Jaitley mentioned that the first time this course of disinvestment was proposed in a Budget when Shri Chandra Shekhar was the Prime Minister. It was continued and built upon. It was not a perfidy of any kind. It was a realisation. I will come to why that realisation came about. It was a realisation of one change that had to be brought about in the direction of economic policy. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar and many other friends mentioned that when you set a target of Rs.10,000 crore, you hand over, you announce your compulsion and, therefore, you can be beaten down in prices and other things.

I will just mention to you that the target fixed in 1991-92 Budget was Rs.2,500 crore. It was given. In 1992-93, the target was given of Rs.2,500 crore. In 1993-94, the target given was of Rs.3,500 crore. In 1994-95, the target given

was of Rs.4,000 crore. In 1995-96, the target given was of Rs.7,000 crore and so on. I have the figures right up to now. If we say that that was right but if anybody at the same time gives the target this year or last year, which is a distress sale, then we are scoring a debating point.

In 1993, a Committee was set up with one of the most respectable person in India as its head, an economist, the former Governor of Reserve Bank, Shri Rangarajan. The name of that Committee was "The Committee on the Disinvestment of Shares in Public Sector Enterprises". It was set up in 1993. The United Front Government announced it not only in its programme but also it is the Government which set up the Disinvestment Commission. It referred 72 Public Sector Enterprises to that Disinvestment Commission. The ones that are being considered today are the ones on which the Disinvestment Commission gave its recommendation. I will come to a few of those examples which have been mentioned like Air India, BHEL and others.

The second bunch of Public Sector Enterprises which are before me which I have to process and consider are the ones that have been referred to the Disinvestment Department by none other than the Ministry that you keep quoting as having great differences on disinvestment, that is, the Ministry for Heavy Industries.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): The Minister is not present here.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: The Minister is not here. I am just mentioning the fact that those are the cases that are before me. There are other cases on disinvestment which have been referred by the BIFR. Well, I do not want to elaborate on the process. But none of those persons were perverts. They were doing things as the circumstances induce them and compel them to do.

(z5/2150/dva/hcb)

Secondly, I would mention it, Shri Ramaiah has also just now mentioned it and some other friends have also mentioned it, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar pointed out, he made a very telling point, that the term of the Disinvestment Commission had expired in November, 1999. It has not been re-constituted all this while and Shri Arun Jaitley gave an answer to that, that the work of implementing the recommendations of the Disinvestment Commission is still going on and that it is not necessary to start a new Commission just now when there is such a backlog of the work done by the old Commission.

But I am glad to inform Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar and other friends who have mentioned this fact – other speakers mentioned it – that in fact, the process of re-constituting the Disinvestment Commission has begun and we are already considering the types of persons who should be most honourable, whose integrity should be of the highest order, who should have a particular acumen in these matters from any side for re-constituting the Disinvestment Commission. I have myself personally – I do not mind disclosing this – talked to the Prime Minister on this. He has given me the go ahead. Names will be proposed and considered within the Government. It is not the province of one Minister at all and I will mention that later. The process has started.

Again, Shri Nitish Kumar pointed it out, many of the other friends also pointed it out, very senior elders pointed it out, that consultations with labour and trade unions should be there. It just happens that the trade union leaders are meeting the Prime Minister day after tomorrow on this matter in the morning. I have been told that I must be there also.

In my own case I have said earlier in the other House and reported to this House earlier I have sought about with the most distinguished Leader of the Opposition in the Rajya Sabha, whom I have known for 30 years who has been

a hallmark of integrity, innovation of economic policies. I have sought his time to learn from him on these matters.

I have sought the time of the distinguished Leader of the Opposition in the Lok Sabha and I was to meet her one day, but because this House was deliberating the Bill, I think the first Bill on Jharkhand or one of the States Reorganisation Bills, 2000, she was so kind as to send me messages twice during the evening that she would meet me later.

The next day we were to meet but the next Bill was being considered. The third day she, for very good reasons, had to go to Kashmir and I will await her convenience. It is not a matter of prestige. I sincerely believe, as very distinguished senior speakers have pointed out, that these are matters that are of most concern to the country and it is the duty of persons who have been handed charge of a particular matter on which still so much misunderstanding persists, to reach out everywhere.

Shri Basu Deb Acharia is here. I can report to him. Just yesterday I had a long and instructive session with Shri Dipankar Mukherjee on National Fertiliser itself. He is very knowledgeable on that. He has directed me to two other

experts. I myself met them and we will certainly seek their guidance. So, I make sure that whatever is needed will be done on this point. But hon. Members should take what I say in that spirit. On many matters I find that we are just misinformed and I would mention one or two things.

Shri Banatwalla said it, Shri Nitish Kumar said it and Shri Selvaganapathi said it, and the expression that was used was "The pride of the Nation" and that is Air India. It is true that so many of us have known Air India as a symbol of India. But please see the facts, not as reported by me but by the Disinvestment Commission whose recommendations.

For instance, Shri Banatwalla just read out a passage from it. And he emphasised a very important recommendation on the disinvestment fund.

This was what he said. It was headed by Shri G.V. Ramakrishna. They say, "Air India's share of traffic" – this is in the second set of Reports on page 279 – "only from to and from India, forget from everywhere else, has consistently fallen from almost 50 per cent to about 30 years ago to about 33 per cent in mid-80s to 22 per cent."

(a6/2155/tkd-rpm)

They go on to say that this is because of the inability of the Air India to attract the high yielding first class and business class passengers. There is an increasing competition from international airlines and deterioration of Air India's product over the years. The main causes for the deterioration are the pathetic on-time performance (about 55 per cent) till financial year, 1996, low service quality and limited network on offer. They go on like this. ...*(Interruptions)* Please just let me continue. We are already very late. ...*(Interruptions)* The utilisation of the unutilised routes that the airline had fallen on such bad times that its percentage of utilisation had fallen now on the air routes it was operating to 47 per cent of what it had. It is this Commission which then went on to make several recommendations. Please see the sentence. He said that it is a pride of India. But just see where the pride had fallen, while we were looking elsewhere. At the current level of financial performance, Air India's network will be wiped out within the next two years and is likely to turn into a sick company to be referred to BIFR. Our pride would have been to ensure that an important enterprise like that would not reach that condition.

Sir, so many good friends have mentioned about BHEL. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): I would like to say something regarding Air India because you passed that item. ...*(Interruptions)* What is the purpose behind the privatisation or disinvestment of airports in Calcutta, Delhi and Mumbai, etc? The air traffic may be little there and so also the Telecom sector. The employees of the Department of Telcom are on strike. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Pandiyan, I told you that after his speech, if any minor clarification is required, I will give you a chance, otherwise there will be no end. He will not be in a position to conclude the debate. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Shri Pandiyan, I will certainly attend to each one of these things. You can ask for an explanation from the House through all means. You were such a distinguished Speaker earlier. You can always haul up persons like me. ...*(Interruptions)*

Sir, we are old co-conspirators. After noting the importance of the BHEL in India and the good work that my friends had pointed out in the case of BHEL, this Commission concluded:

"BHEL depends on foreign technology for almost its entire product profile. Though the company has been successful in assimilating and adapting the technologies to Indian conditions, it would face significant difficulties in terms of developing and commercialising new technology on account of small size of its R&D expenditure."

It is not something that has happened only in one or two years, not in the last ten years.

There are structural problems. It goes on to say what small capacity BHEL has. Hence, Commission recommends that those be classified as a non-core unit. Further, it says:

"Hence the Commission recommends induction of Financial Institutions (FIs) as strategic partners through a disinvestment of 20 per cent of BHEL's equity in their favour. In order to ensure enhanced funding capability in Rupee as well as Foreign Currency to enhance its competitiveness, it is recommended that domestic FIs may be offered equity stake of 10 per cent and foreign private equity funds/FIs including

multilateral institutions (foreign funds) be offered a further equity stake of ten per cent in the company with appropriate role in management to both Indian and foreign partiesâ€¦!"

(b6/2200/pb-rjs)

I am not saying that you have to follow it lavishly.

Shri Basu Deb Acharia pointed to six PSUs in Bengal. Again, I am not saying that a decision has been taken, but I will just report to the House, through you, Sir, that I have the names of the six companies. These are: Mining and Allied Machinery Corporation, National Bicycle Corporation, Tannery and Footwear Corporation, Rehabilitation Industries Corporation, Wayboard India and Bharat Process and Mechanical Engineers. These are the six companies. You will be astonished to know that the total sales of all these six companies in the year ending 31st March, 2000 are Rs.9.66 crore, that is, less than Rs.10 crore...(Interruptions)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): It is because their working capital was not adequate and the work force had been reduced. As a result, there was no production for the last one year. So, how could there be better results?...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Please, let me complete.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): For the last one year there is no production. How could there be any sales?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Okay. In the previous year it was Rs.10.77 crore – not a great improvement! The loss of these six companies last year on a sale of less than Rs.10 crore is Rs.357 crore and their accumulated losses are Rs.2,240 crore! We just do not want to look at the figures at all. Again - please do not take it that I am saying that one firm should be closed; I know that when important Members talk of a firm, they have the first-hand knowledge of their constituencies and of the persons who would be affected by them; So, I am not saying it in a matter of quarrel – Hindustan Photo Films was mentioned by four or five friends. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar supported Shri Selvaganpathi's forceful intervention for Hindustan Photo Films. Its paid up capital is Rs.196 crore and its loss in 1998-99 – in one year – was Rs.310 crore. In the year before that, it was Rs.176 crore. Shri Selvaganpathi said, it is doing very important work. If the multinationals will make X-Ray film, its prices will be jacked up and everybody will have to pay Rs.200 for an X-Ray film. Do we know what the share of Hindustan Photo Films' X-Ray film is in the country, in the market? It is around ten per cent. Its main job today is to import, what are called, jumbo rolls and to slip them into films. It does not even have colour film technology. This is what we have done to what we regard as the temples of India. Not today, over the years, its accumulated losses have become Rs.800 crore. I could go through each one of these items...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): Sir, Hindustan Photo Films is the only prestigious public sector unit in Nilgiri district where four thousand employees, mostly belonging to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Backward Classes are working. So, this unit should be protected.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: That is a very important point and it must be kept foremost in our mind. I am completely with you. Therefore, I will be making a proposal to the House on which we should all work together. One of the very important facts which all of us have missed is just as what Shri Banatwalla was pointing to the Disinvestment Fund. The National Renewal Fund was set up and approved by you. I was quite surprised to learn - I will be completely candid with you – from a study that till 1997, only ten per cent of its funds have been used for re-training.

(c6/2205/krr/nsh)

The rest of the funds have been used for VRS. You are completely right. If we work together and energise the nation like in National Renewal Fund, make sure that our workers are trained and re-trained all the time, this kind of calamitous situation would not have arisen.

At least five hon. Members, including Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh and Shri G.M. Banatwalla, have mentioned just now about Modern Foods. This is another example of how we – if I may use the word, please do not think it is a harsh word, - derailed public discourse by just imaginary figures. Hon. Shri Chandra Shekhar is a person whom I have known since the Emergency days. He says the land value of Modern Foods is Rs. 2,000 crore. He made such telling points from the Public Enterprises Survey of 1998-99. Do you know what is the value that has been put as the net worth of Modern Foods in the same survey of 1996-97?

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): It is Rs. 28 crore.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE : Yes. It was Rs. 28 crore as against Rs. 2,000 crore imagined by Shri Chandra Shekhar.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Please do not compare it. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): This is their asset value. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE : Please give me just one second. I am coming to that. Sir, he is talking of land. I am going to talk on that. Please believe me, I am coming to that point. The gross value of the assets according to the accounts as on 31.3.1999, as per the printed figure, is Rs. 39 crore. *(Interruptions)* I will go through the entire process. Please give me two minutes.

The net assets are Rs. 19 crore. The market value of the land, with unrestricted use, as valued by the Government valuer is put at Rs. 109 crore. Please note that it is with unrestricted use. Hon. Minister Shri Ram Naik, sitting here, knows it and all of you who are from Maharashtra know it. The textile mills in Mumbai can fetch the money for VRS and for many other things and for modernisation and restructuring of the public sector, as Shri G.M. Banatwalla was urging. But it is only when you allow the unrestricted use. If the restrictions continue – like one-third will be done like this, another one-third will be done like that – you will not be able to recover the money that you think you may attribute by looking at the adjacent private plot which already does not require a change in the land use. With this unrestricted use, the Government valuer had put the land cost at Rs. 109 crore and not Rs.2,000 crore or Rs. 1,0000 crore. The valuation of 100 per cent of the equity sales by different methods by the advisers was between Rs. 30 crore and Rs. 70 crore.

Seventy four per cent of the shares were sold for Rs. 105 crore. The partners, M/s. Hindustan Lever Limited, who came in, put in Rs. 20 crore and not only that but the jobs of the employees are safe. The capacity utilisation has increased in these months by 40 per cent and the interim relief – which could not be given by the Government under the existing provisions of law because it was a loss-making unit and hence the Government could not give interim relief – was paid by these people to the same workers.

We can go on through these specific cases. I only plead with you. Please bear with us and look at the facts in each instance. Shri Banatwalla and many other friends have urged and cautioned on the matter of valuation. I absolutely assure the House that there are several, four to five, recognised ways of valuing the companies, of their assets and building of books and others. All of them will be used whenever and whichever one is appropriate.

I will mention one example. It is not always good to go only by land and other assets and so on. Hon. Member Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar and myself have appeared together many times on New Delhi Television. Probably, they do not own any land or assets at all. It is just the talent of the team that Shri Prannoy Roy and Shrimati Radhika Roy have assembled.

(d6/2210/san-mkg)

They have a presence in India. If you go only by assets, you will get no value, but if you go by the business assessment, the business evaluation of that firm, you will get a lot. The market capitalisation of all the software companies in India is so high.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): You should take into account whatever value is higher.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: It could be done. In the case of Modern Foods that is exactly what was done.

In the case of all the software companies, they hardly own anything in terms of assets, but by talent, by goodwill, by brand and by network, you can see their market capitalisation. Where appropriate and whichever method of valuation will yield the highest thing is the one thing that the Government would pursue.

A very peculiar point was made. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar saw in this thing the heart of the Government's reform policy. It was said by Shri Basu Deb Acharia and others whether a Minister will decide how to disinvest. A learned speaker said that the Minister in charge of the Ministry of Disinvestment, which has been created recently, is not short of the Prime Minister. Nothing of that kind is there at all. Every single decision is taken by the Cabinet Committee on Disinvestment. It is presided over by the Prime Minister himself. It has Shri Ram Naik as its member. It has Shri Manohar Joshi, in whom many people seem to see great hope, as its member. It has Shri Jaswant Singh as its member. It has Shri Yashwant Sinha as its member. In every single meeting, apart from these distinguished Ministers, the Minister in whose portfolio that particular firm falls is also a member and attends. Everything is done by discussion and one of the pleasant surprises that I have had, as a newcomer to the Government, is that everything is discussed freely and in mid-meeting, people change their views because they are persuaded and they are persuading others. Then, there are three other levels at which it is processed and after it has been processed, the whole thing goes back to the Cabinet as a whole. No decision on disinvestment by valuation or other criterion is approved, or the strategic partners are selected, till it goes back to the Cabinet.

Sir, I would like to clear up one confusion. As I mentioned, Shri Arun Jaitley has also given many examples of how everybody is building on the policy according to the experience that has been gained in that. There has been one great change and I think, it is not properly appreciated because of the contention which goes on. The Disinvestment Commission, whose recommendations they want us to follow, recommended - as in the Rangarajan Committee - that do not go in for minority sales like 5 per cent or 2 per cent because by doing so, you will not be getting correct value for the assets of the firms. The Disinvestment Commission recommended strategic sales in 37 cases and minority sales in 5 cases. Please remember this. But what has happened in practice is that strategic sale has taken place only in one case and in 39 cases, they have sold minority shares. I am saying this without casting anything on any Government at all. What has been the result? May I make a very important point on the losses that have been inflicted on the financial institutions in India? The extent of the loss is unimaginable. The average price at which the shares of BEL were pumped into the financial institutions was Rs. 142.50 and its present value is Rs. 72.20. The shares of BPCL were pumped into the financial institutions at an average price of Rs. 662.30 and its present value is Rs. 224. The shares of BRPL were pumped into the financial institutions at an average price of Rs. 42 and its present value is Rs. 7.60. The shares of EIL were pumped into the financial institutions at an average price of Rs. 626 and its present value is Rs. 160. The shares of HMT were pumped into the financial institutions at an average price of Rs. 55.30 and its present value is Rs. 7.55.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Does he know the position in regard to Indian companies in the share market, except the ICE companies?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: These are the earlier figures. This is at the highest.

The shares of HPCL were pumped into the financial institutions at an average price of Rs. 824.60 and its present value is Rs. 130.

(e6/2215/sh-mkg)

I can go through the list of 30 such shares.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Which year are you referring to?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: It was as on 12/07/2000. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, I could get the latest figures for you. It was in July, before this particular thing started. The point I was making is, dramatically, from 626, it came down to 75. On whom are you inflicting this loss? This is precisely what the Disinvestment Commission had warned against that 'if you do this, nobody will believe that management will change. You will offload it to other public sector units or to financial institutions, and you will be inflicting a great loss on them.' That is exactly what has happened.

Now, Sir, five to six elements of the current policy have been spelt out many times, and I do not want to go through them. If you want me to spell them out, I will just mention one point because of the shortage of time. Shri Banatwalla and Dr. Nitish Sengupta have said, "You must look upon the funds as funds that are available for restructuring as an important matter." The fact of the matter today is that at that time as we are talking, 14 public sector enterprises are availing of this restructuring package. Twelve of these happen to be precisely in the Ministry that you think is opposing disinvestment, it is part of the whole restructuring process, that is, the Ministry for Heavy Industries. The total outlay on them is Rs. 3,324 crore, and it is not a small amount.

Coming to SAIL, it was mentioned just now that it used to have so much profit and so much loss. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar made a telling comparison between two years. Sir, it had come to such a distressing condition, that is what we should be worried about, that a package had to be devised for it of Rs. 8,500 crore.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): The money was given from the Steel Development Fund and not from the Disinvestment Fund; it is their own Fund.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: In the case of HMT, Rs. 1,000 crore package is being implemented now. So, among the various things, these kinds of packages are there. Restructuring is very much in the Government's mind. It is attending to those cases which have been assessed from various points of view, and if there is any prospect of seeing it go through, that is being attempted.

Sir, Shri Kirit Somaiya and others have explained about things that look profitable today, and how those profits could erode very quickly. The correct figure, if you take away the units which are earning profits because of their monopoly position in India, I do not say so by way of contention, is minus 3.9 per cent. This has to be contrasted with the fact that the Government borrows money at 12 per cent to 14 per cent.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): But it does not come to the public sector, and you only give 2.5 per cent.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: For minus 3.9 per cent return, to give loans and restructuring packages to these very units, you are borrowing at 12 per cent to 14 per cent.

Many friends have said that we should not use this to fill up the fiscal gap. You are right, Sir. The one time when it was used to do nothing but to fill up this type of fiscal gap was when those Rs. 2,500 crore or Rs. 4,000 crore was targeted. It yielded no results.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Did we say so?

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): Mr. Minister, you may kindly explain as to why it was done.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I am referring to 1991-96.

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): When was it utilised? The Minister is making a very valid point....(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Vaiko, that is what I am saying. Why are you interrupting him?

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): I have not interrupted him.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): He is a very brilliant fellow. He does not need your help to explain it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I seek your cooperation because we are coming to an end.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I will make two or three more points and then I will conclude because we are getting late. I do not want to underestimate anything. We all keep saying that fiscal deficit is not important.

(f6/2215/snb-asa)

It was said that no money should be used. I know how carefully the hon. Finance Minister and others speak. It is because whatever they say has great consequences but whatever a person like me says, I hope, does not have that consequence and so, I would be more candid with you.

Sir, the fiscal situation, both of the Centre and the States, is such that you have to use all the devices – as one of my friends here mentioned about the Non-Performing Assets and many other friends spoke about the taxes that are due – including disinvestment for dealing with this fiscal situation. I would like to give you just two figures.

Sir, you take the condition of the States. In the Ninth Five Year Plan, the States' Outlay was supposed to be Rs. 3,50,000/-. Just keep that figure in mind. The States were to give only Rs. 3,800 crore from their own contributions - it was just about one per cent – in the first three years. Do you know, how much contribution did the States make? As against Rs. 3,800 crore, they made a contribution of minus Rs. 80,000 crore. This is their condition.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): You are putting it in a different perspective...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Yes, you are right. I am putting it in a different perspective...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): It is not very relevant here...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: All I am suggesting here is that the aspect of fiscal deficit is not to be brushed aside. The Central finances are in such a condition that half of the total revenue of the Central Government goes in just paying the interest. If you take the interest and the principal together, then it is more than the total revenue of the Government. That is why, raising resources through disinvestment ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): What has it to do with disinvestment?...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Aiyar, you can seek clarifications later on

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Shri Aiyar, I am telling you, it has something to do with disinvestment...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): These people are responsible for this situation...(*Interruptions*) इन्से फिर्स पूछिए।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : फिर्स के बारे में मत कहिएगा। फिर्स के बारे में मालूम है।

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): He is only corroborating...(Interruptions)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, there are about 30 figures to give. But I would just give one more figure.

Sir, in response to Shri Banatwalla's and Dr. Nitish Sengupta's submission, who said that we should have a positive approach and should remember disinvestment as a part of re-structuring or look at it as an instrument of re-structuring, I would like to submit that 14 firms are being revived at this very time at that enormous cost and with that enormous Outlay. Funds have been borrowed at 12 to 14 per cent interest ... (Interruptions) रघुवंश जी, मैं रांची का उदाहरण दे रहा हूँ।

...(Interruptions) Sir, please look at the history of these packages that have been given from time to time. You cannot say that everybody who attempted to revive the firms was a profiteer. The sixth revival package is being implemented in the Heavy Engineering Corporation in Ranchi. The net worth of this Corporation, as a result of all these packages, is Rs. – 638 crore. Its accumulated loss as against its paid up capital of Rs. 439 crore is Rs. 1039 crore. I can give you the list of all these companies...(Interruptions) In the last week I have been able to work on 23 of these packages and they have cost the successive Governments a sum of Rs. 34,000 crore and not a single firm was revived. Not even a single firm was revived.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): It is because of the management.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Many friends said that we should leave the management to the brilliant IAS officers...(Interruptions)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): It is because of the Government policy ...(Interruptions)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: All successive Governments have done ...(Interruptions)

(g6/2225/kmr/hng)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let the Minister complete his speech.

...(Interruptions)

डा. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री जी का असंतोषजनक उत्तर है। देश को बेचे बिना छोड़ेंगे नहीं, ऐसा इनके भाषण से लगता है। हम लोग इसके खिलाफ में सदन से बहिर्गमन करते हैं।

2226 बजे

(तत्पश्चात् डा. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह तथा कुछ अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने सदन से बहिर्गमन किया।)

...(Interruptions)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): Sir, the Minister has not spoken about how the evaluation is being done. He has not referred to IPCL. In protest of the disinvestment policy being pursued by the Government, we walk out of the House.

2226 hours

*(At this stage, Shri Basu Deb Acharia, and
some other hon. Members left the House.)*

...(Interruptions)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Minister has come to the end of his speech but there has been no reference to the White Paper. He has made no reference to the absence of a policy. He has made available a completely selective collection of figures. He is repeating *ad nauseam* what he has said in the Rajya Sabha without taking any account of what any of us has had to say. I am afraid if the Minister wishes to close his ears to the Opposition in this manner, we have no alternative to walk out.

2227 hours

*(At this stage, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar and some other
hon. Members left the House.)*

...(Interruptions)

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ. प्र.) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय मंत्री जी का ब्यान संतोषजनक नहीं है। माननीय मंत्री जी के जो विचार सदन के बाहर हैं, उन विचारों को सदन के अन्दर सरकार के मुखिया के दबाव में नहीं रख रहे हैं। इनकी नीति देश को बेचने की है। राष्ट्र विरोधी कार्य कर रहे हैं। इसके विरोध में हमारी पार्टी सदन से बहिर्गमन करती है।

2228 बजे

(तत्पश्चात् कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह तथा कुछ अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने सदन से बहिर्गमन किया।)

...(Interruptions)

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Minister was answering in a way which is not desirable.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has not completed his speech yet and you are commenting on it.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): The wealth of the nation is being converted into corporate wealth and the Minister has to answer whether the employees of the telecom sector, of the Airport Authority of India and of other organisations, would be thrown out of their jobs or would be absorbed.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I am coming to that, Sir. Let the hon. Member please wait till I complete my speech....(Interruptions)

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): The Minister has said that air traffic is not fetching profits. I put it to the Minister through you, Sir, that the Airports Authority of India is being privatised. Airports at Chennai, Mumbai, Delhi and Calcutta are being disinvested, so also the telecom sector.

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): Sir, if they are not interested in the Minister's speech, let them walk out.

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): I am not going to walk out. I am going to challenge the Minister.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, I am not yielding.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Pandiyan, he is not yielding the floor to you.

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): The Minister has not answered about the Hindustan Photo Films also.

उपभोक्ता मामले और सार्वजनिक वितरण मंत्री (श्री शांता कुमार) : आप पहले मंत्री जी को सुनिए, फिर प्रश्न पूछिए। (व्यवधान)

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): Sir, if the Minister is interrupted like this, how can he complete his reply?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Pandiyan, the Minister is not yielding. Let him complete his speech.

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): Mr. Minister, if you are interested in the welfare of the nation, kindly yield to me.

श्री शांता कुमार : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह गलत बात है।

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: No, I am not yielding.

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): ...(Expunged as ordered by the Chair)

You are interested in divesting all the public sector undertakings.

श्री शांता कुमार : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, पहले मंत्री जी को अपनी बात कहने दीजिए।

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, look at the kind of insinuations the hon. Member is making.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is too much. Shri Pandiyan, I am just telling you to resume your seat.

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): Is it a crime to put a question to the Minister for the sake of the country?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Minister is not yielding. If you are not satisfied you can go out but do not defy the Chair.

(h6/2230/kkd/sb)

...(Interruptions)

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): Are you not yielding?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Yes, I am not yielding.

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): If you are not yielding to a Member, you are yielding to multinationals....(Interruptions)â€|You are yielding to disinvestment policy....(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Pandiyan, if he is not yielding, you cannot accuse him like this.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): I will convey the feelings of myself and my party Anna DMK to the Government...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Pandiyan, please take your seat. I am on my legs.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): If I am not permitted to put my question to the hon. Minister here, where is the forum to put it?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You please allow me to speak. You seem to be even not allowing me to speak.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): That is his nature....(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is your nature, I know.

...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, I think, now you are coming to the end of your speech. I will allow you to conclude your speech first. Then, if Shri Pandiyan has got any question or clarification, I will allow him to put it before you. You may answer it.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Right, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: May I request Shri Pandiyan to resume his seat? After he concludes his speech, you may ask your clarification and he will reply to it.

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): Thank you, Sir.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, I do hope that the insinuation which has been made...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Whatever it may be, if it is objectionable, I will remove it from the records. Now, you conclude.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, his reference during my not yielding that I am, therefore in the hands of multinationals is an unfair insinuation. I hope, you will remove those words from the records.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will examine it and whatever objectionable remarks are there, I will expunge them. Now, you come to your speech, please.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, the point I was making was on the rehabilitation exercises. Since 1992-93, Rs. 34,000 having been spent, you please contrast this with how much has been spent on urban drinking water. You can see how much passion is there for urban drinking water. Shri G.M. Banatwalla had said, "why do you not spend it for such things?' For urban drinking water, Sir, we are spending less than Rs. 100 crore. To go through the pretence of reviving those units, Rs. 34,000 crore have been spent in these years. Now, for drinking water, it is Rs. 100 crore; for rural drinking water, it is Rs.2,200 crore; for primary education, it is Rs. 3,000 crore; for health, it is Rs. 4,5000

crore this year. Why do we not see that if there is enormous drain then haemorrhaging of public funds is stopped. You use them to restructure and make combative and competitive the best of our enterprises, and thereby, use the money for other things.

There are several elements purely stated in the Government's current policy. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar wanted a White Paper. It is not necessary. They have been spelt out in the Budget speeches on successive things. I can spell them out now also only if you direct. Otherwise, it is already 10.30 p.m., and we should now conclude.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Okay, thanks.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, the policy will be transparent. We will implement the recommendations of experts selected impartially and we will consult a wide range of opinion including the union leaders, the Opposition leaders and the persons who are knowledgeable on these matters. We will do our utmost to protect the interests of the workers through VRS and other retraining programmes.

Thank you very much.

(ends)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, you may take down whatever clarifications are made. Then, at the end, you may answer them.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, Shri Pandiyan.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (PONNANI): Sir, I also want to ask a clarification.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yes, I will allow you also.

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we expected the reply from the hon. Minister regarding the absorption of employees of Telcom sector and also the absorption of employees of Airport Authority of India in major airports, namely Delhi, Mumbai, Calcutta and Chennai airports. There is a move to disinvest these major airports and because of that, these employees are on strike.

(j6/2235/rsg-har)

They have been agitating that it should not be privatised. So is the case with the telecom sector. Our people are working in the public sector undertakings. When they are being disinvested, what is the position of these employees? What is the safeguard that you are going to grant to our employees?

There is also the case of Hindustan Photo Films, where about 4,000 to 5,000 employees are working. It is a question of their livelihood. Is there any guarantee that this Government is going to give to those employees? Then, there is also the Salem Steel Plant, about which a reference has already been made.

I could see from the hon. Minister's reply that corporate governance is Central governance but corporate wealth is not the nation's wealth. Instead, the nation's wealth is corporate wealth. Thus a profit-making public sector undertaking by name NMDC is sought to be privatised whereby Nippon Denro and Essar would acquire 26 per cent of the shares and 49 per cent would be the public participation. It has been challenged in the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court has issued a show cause notice asking, 'Though it is a policy, if it is a profit-making company why should it be privatised?' When there is a notice issued by the Supreme Court, how can you disinvest? Can you hereafter disinvest in any profit-making company? ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: There is no stay.

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): But it is a judicial notice.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: They have only asked a question.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, you may please note down the points and give your reply at the end.

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): There is a legal problem. When the Executive failed the people the Judiciary has entered into the arena. The Executive has totally failed. The Central Government has totally failed to protect the employees of the Airports Authority of India and the telecom sector also. They did not stop the privatisation of the Salem Steel Plant and the Hindustan Photo Films Limited. Will the hon. Minister answer my questions? If his reply is acceptable to us, we are ready to hear him.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (PONNANI): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I may not have walked out but there are large areas of dissatisfaction and that sense continues. *Inshah Allah* I will also walk out when you adjourn the House and walk out! But that is a different thing.

There are large areas of dissatisfaction. There is not only the question of not going in for privatisation of the profitable concerns but also among the unprofitable concerns there are those of strategic importance. I need not elaborate upon them.

Secondly, among those unprofitable concerns are those that are almost turning a corner. Just to give one example, there was a reference to Air India. This is only for the purpose of giving an example. Let us see how Air India has turned a corner. We must appreciate if some hard work is going on in some corner. The financial results themselves show that they are on the verge of turning a corner. The 1996-97 financial results show a loss of Rs.297 crore. But they improved it in 1997-98 to a loss of Rs.181 crore. In 1998-99, it was Rs.175 crore and in 1999-2000, the loss was only Rs.75 crore. The losses have been declining.

We must therefore recognise that we should not go in for privatisation of profit-making concerns. Among the loss-making, unprofitable concerns also those of strategic status that I had referred to in my speech have to be exempted. We also have to take care of those that are almost on the verge of turning a corner. Therefore in view of all these, will the Government consider due modifications in its Disinvestment Policy?

श्री मोहन रावले (मुम्बई दक्षिण मध्य): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह सोशल आब्लिंग्शन है कि जिन लोगो को पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडरटेकिंग्स में वेतन नहीं मिलता, वे सरकार के पास वेतन के लिये जा सकते हैं। अगर डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट करने के बाद उनको वेतन, प्राविडेंट फंड नहीं मिला या पेंशन स्कीम इंप्लीमेंट नहीं करेंगे सरकार उस पर क्या कंट्रोल करने वाली है? मैं एन.टी.सी. मिल के बारे में बताना चाहता हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आपको कुछ बताना नहीं, क्लैरिफिकेशन पूछना है और आपको स्पीच नहीं देना है।

श्री मोहन रावले (मुम्बई दक्षिण मध्य): उपाध्यक्ष जी, हमारे आदरणीय सदस्य श्री परांजपे बता रहे थे कि अगर पब्लिक सेक्टर में डील करेंगे तो वह चल सकता है। जैसे एन.टी.सी. मिल है, वहां के लोग कपड़ा निकालते हैं। हमारे राम नाईक जी बैठे हुये हैं, उनकी पेट्रोलियम कम्पनी है या रेलवेज है या सरकार के सेक्टर हैं, अगर वे स्व. एन.टी.सी. मिल से कपड़ा लेंगे तो वह मिल चल सकती है। मेरा दूसरा सवाल यह है कि मैंने सुप्रीम कोर्ट के बारे में एक सवाल उठाया था, उसके बारे में कोई जवाब नहीं दिया। अभी पांडियन जी ने उठाया था...

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : ये जवाब देने के लिये बैठे हैं।

श्री मोहन रावले (मुम्बई दक्षिण मध्य): उपाध्यक्ष जी, पब्लिक सेक्टर हैल्दी नहीं, यदि पब्लिक सेक्टर हैल्दी होंगे...

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप आरोप मत लगाइये।

श्री मोहन रावले (मुम्बई दक्षिण मध्य): मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार क्या प्रीकाशन लेगी जिन्होंने पब्लिक सेक्टर को डुबाने में भ्रष्टाचार किया?

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): Sir, I want him to defer the decision to disinvest HOC. Will he please defer that decision by three months?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: There are four questions which have been asked. I will try to be very specific on those. It would be depending on the firms or the organisations, which have been mentioned by Shri Pandiyani and others, like Telecom, HOC, etc. It will be pretence for me to say that 'X' or 'Y' is going to be done. I will enquire into the record and I will report it to you, on each one of those matters. You can be sure on the general policy that every firm that can be revived, could be revived; and it is the endeavour of the Government to do that.

Secondly, we must also see whether it is making profits today and whether it can be revived or not and what would be its position five years from now. I can explain some cases, but it would take your time to go through each one of those, including the firms in the oil sector, the aviation sector, Hindustan Organics and other companies.

But the general policy is to safeguard the interests of the workers. It is the first charge. Today the proposals of the NTC are being considered because the Supreme Court has actually given an order, saying that unless we go there by the 10th of August with a plan, they would direct the BIFR to close the units. In that case, the workers will have nothing except the severance pay under the Industrial Disputes Act. So, the effort is being made. Shri Manohar Joshi and Shri Rana, the Textiles Minister are to go to the Maharashtra Government to see how land can be unfrozen so that resources can be used; and the first charge of those resources will be the workers interests and dues.

Several proposals for making workers, parties in all these things are also being considered, including what Shri Arun Jaitley mentioned for the first time, that substantial portion of stocks should be sold to employees. In the case of Air India, that is one of the elements that has already been announced.

I assure you that the best way to safeguard jobs is to have vigorous competitive firms. It is our endeavour and disinvestment is exactly a part of that.

The next point is what Shri Banatwalla said. He said that there are many loss making units, but they are strategic units. Again, on that there is a consistent line of policy on identifying strategic industries that is developed since the Rangarajan Committee in 1993. The position today is exactly word to word, as was recommended by the Disinvestment Commission in its report in Volume-I, at page 17.

(I6/2245/rc/bks)

They had listed four areas as areas of strategic industries in which Government should not at this time disinvest. Those are exactly the areas with one modification. That was that an item of atomic energy and minerals they had listed as one of the items that should be taken as strategic sector. It was on the recommendations of the Atomic Energy Department and the industries department that phraseology was changed because they said that you have already opened beach sand work to foreign investment up to 74 per cent. So, it is not necessary to do it that way. But I can give you the definition of strategic industries. They are arms and ammunition, Defence aircraft, warships, allied items of Defence equipment as one category. Second is atomic energy except generation of nuclear power application of radiation and radioisotopes to agriculture, medicine and non-strategic industries and third is the Railways.

In the other cases also of non-strategic units, it has been decided and it has been the announced policy of Government that disinvestment up to 26 per cent or less will not be automatic. Two considerations will be borne in mind. One of them is that whether countervailing presence of the public sector is necessary in that sector to protect consumer interest and to prevent market domination as is the case of IPCL and others that were mentioned. Second consideration is whether there should be a proper regulatory mechanism before the public sector withdraws from it...*(Interruptions)* Sir, as you know corporatisation of various procedures are going through in consultation...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): The departure time of Indian Airlines flight is 7 o'clock and the departure time of private airlines is also 7 o'clock. So, there is a wrongful loss caused to the Indian Airlines daily...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, if we now go into the timings of the aircraft, it will be impossible to conclude...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): Sir, wrongful loss is caused to the Indian Airlines to promote their disinvestment policy. So on behalf of AIADMK Party we condemn the disinvestment policy of the Government. Sir, at the wrongful loss to the Government and wrongful gain to the corporate, we walk out.

2248 hours

(At this stage, Shri P.H. Pandiyan and some other

hon. Members left the House.)

श्री मोहन रवले (मुम्बई दक्षिण मध्य) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक सवाल है।

श्री अरुण शौरी : मैं आपके वेजिज के सवाल पर ही आ रहा हूँ।

श्री मोहन रवले (मुम्बई दक्षिण मध्य) : आप जो कार्यवाही करने वाले हैं, यदि आप उस पर अमल करेंगे तो क्या वह बंधनकारक होगा। मेरा कहने का मतलब है कि क्या आप वर्कर्स के इंटरैक्ट को प्रोटेक्ट करने जा रहे हैं। डिसइन्वैस्टमेंट क्या उन पर बंधनकारक होगा?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप क्या पूछ रहे हैं, आपका सवाल क्या है?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, this will depend on different institutions. We are imagining so many things. In the one case, it has been done and every worker is in the job. He was in a situation where he was in a sick company and he is now the employee of a vigorous marketing and food production company. We do not see that at all.

श्री मोहन रवले (मुम्बई दक्षिण मध्य) : जैसे पी.एस.यू. में वेतन मिलता है, क्या वैसे वेतन वहां नहीं मिलेगा, आप वह कैसे बंधनकारक करेंगे। आप वर्कर्स के इंटरैक्ट कैसे प्रोटेक्ट करेंगे?

श्री अरुण शौरी : मैं आपको उसी का स्पेसिफिक एग्जाम्पल देता हूँ जिसकी आप बात कर रहे हैं।

It will depend upon case to case.

SHRI MOHAN RAWALE (MUMBAI SOUTH CENTRAL): How are you going to protect the interest of the workers? Will there be any binding?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is not allowed. I will not allow this now.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, we are not realising the situation prevailing in the country. The wages are being paid to workers of factories that are closed in the public sector. Sir, do you know the amount of that? It is rupee one thousand crore a year. Is that the way to create jobs or to protect jobs? Every effort is being made in National Textile Company.

Sir, the last question was on the Supreme Court. When the notice is received certainly it will be considered with great respect.

(ends)

2250 hours