

[श्री मूल बन्द डागा]

फोर्सफुल नहीं है तो इसकी स्टैट्यूटरी बँकिंग क्या है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ आपका इस तरह की इस्टीमेशन जो काम करती है उनके पास पब्लिशमेंट की क्या पॉर्स होती है ? उनके पास यह पावर रहना बहुत जरूरी होता है। धारने जो प्रेस कौंसिल के लिए एडिक्स और मारन्स रखे हैं उनको कैसे मैनटेन किया जायेगा ? दूसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इसमें जो जर्नलिस्ट्स होते हैं, एडिटर्स होते हैं उनमें बहुसंख्य किसका होना चाहिए ? मैं समझता हूँ बहुमत जर्नलिस्ट्स का होना चाहिए। मैं पूछना हूँ अगर आजादी नहीं रही तो फिर जिन्दगी का मजा दो क्या है। मैं पूछना हूँ यह लोग क्या करते हैं ? यह कुछ लोगों की ही खबरे छापते हैं, उन्हीं की बातों को सुनते हैं लेकिन इस देश के बग़ैर लोगों की बात कौन सुनेगा ? इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रेस कौंसिल का आप इफेक्टिव और फोर्सफुल बनाये ताकि स्वतन्त्र रूप से जनता के जो विचार हैं उनको प्रकट किया जा सके।

SHRI DHARAM BIR SINHA Mr. Chairman, Sir, about *Samachar Bharti* Shri Limaye has raised certain points I can only say this that he himself is aware that various State Government hold 75 per cent of shares in *Samachar Bharti*. Although we know that there have been complaints of serious lapses about *Samachar Bharti*, to which Shri Limaye has made a reference, we could not interfere into the working of it because of the fear of being charged with interfering with it. That is why we have withheld the temptation of action in this regard.

I would definitely seek his cooperation and help, indeed if he also would

be able to persuade Shri Jayaprakash Narain in this connection. We would also try our best to put *Samachar Bharti* on healthy lines.

I would like to say one more thing. I refer to what my friend, Shri Pandey said in regard to the newspapers and bias in political reporting. All I can say is that my party the Congress Party or for that matter, this Government has had no mercy. We ourselves have suffered more from political bias against us from the newspapers. Not only to-day but even during the last three to four years. The problems within my party and the Government are magnified hundred times even thousand times in the newspapers. That is all what I have to say.

MR CHAIRMAN अब मैं इस बिल का मजरी के लिए पेश करूँगा।

मकाल यह है .

'That the Bill be passed'

The motion was adopted.

1649 hrs

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE DIS-
APPROVAL OF INDIAN IRON
AND STEEL COMPANY (TAK-
ING OVER OF MANAGEMENT)
AMENDMENT ORDINANCE.

AND

INDIAN IRON AND STEEL COM-
PANY (TAKING OVER OF MA-
NAGEMENT) AMENDMENT
BILL

MR. CHAIRMAN.

अब धारम बिर सिंह स्टील कम्पनी में सम्बन्धित एडिमेंस जिन पर श्री मधु निमये का स्टैट्यूटरी रेजोल्यूशन है, गौर किया जायेगा।

श्री मधु सिलये ।

श्री मधु सिलये (बाका) : मैं
प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि:

"This House disapproves of the Indian Iron and Steel Company (Taking over of Management) Amendment Ordinance, 1974 (Ordinance No. 4 of 1974, promulgated by the President on the 28th June, 1974"

सभापति महोदय, यह अध्यादेश इस बात का प्रमाण है कि सरकार कभी लम्बान की दृष्टि में चीजों पर नहीं सोचती । जब इंडियन आयरन ऐंड स्टील कम्पनी के इलजाम को सरकार ने अपने हाथ में लिया तो सरकार का यह अनुमान था कि दो साल के अन्दर कम्पनी को हम लोग ठीक ठाक करेंगे । हालांकि जब इन्होंने इस कम्पनी के मैनेजमेंट को लिया तब जो उत्पादन की शक्ति थी उसका केवल 27 प्रतिशत मात्र उत्पादन हो रहा था । तो इनका उत्पादन गिरने के बाद सरकार को यह मान कर चलना चाहिये था कि इस कारखाने को ठीक करने में बहुत समय लगेगा । लेकिन यह दो साल का विधेयक लेकर आये हैं और इस का नतीजा हुआ कि जब यह दो साल की मियाद 14 जलाई, को खत्म होने की स्थिति उत्पन्न हो गई थी तो इन की नींद खुली और चूँकि संसद उस समय रीसेस में थी, इन्हीं ने अध्यादेश के जरिये इस की मियाद को और तीन साल बढ़ाया । तो मैं मंत्री महोदय, से सब से पहले इस बान का खुलासा चाहता हूँ कि जब बजट सूख चल रहा था तो क्या मैनेजमेंट ने या इस्पात

मंत्रालय के लोगों ने मजी जी को यह जानकारी नहीं दी थी कि इंडियन आयरन और स्टील का मामला अभी तक ठीक नहीं हुआ है, उस में और समय लगेगा ? अगर उन को जानकारी दी गई थी तो क्या बजट है कि बजट सब में हो इस विधेयक को ले कर यह सदन के सामने नहीं आये ? हर हालत में मैंने ऐसा लगता है कि सरकार की कोई दीर्घ-कालीन नीति नहीं हॉती है । तो मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ, मेरे शब्दों को नोट कीजिये कि तीन साल में भी यह मामला ठीक नहीं होने वाला है और फिर नया विधेयक या अध्यादेश ले कर आप को संसद के सामने आना होगा । नतीजतन में नहीं आता जब इस को आप हाथ में ले ही रहे हैं तो अब वापस देने की बात न मोचिये प्राइवेट लोगों के हाथ में । इस का हमेशा के लिये लेजिस्लेट और हमेशा के लिये यह मामला आप खत्म कर दीजिये ।

सभापति जी, अध्यादेश के साथ और इस विधेयक के साथ दो साल के इन के काय का रिव्यू सदन के सामने रखना चाहिये था उनका कहना चाहिये था कि दो साल में इस को सुधारने के लिये क्या किया ? पैदावार बढ़ाने के लिये क्या किया ? जो व्यवस्थापक और मजदूरों के रिश्ते होते हैं उन को सुधारने के लिये क्या किया ? कम्पनी की आर्थिक और वित्तीय स्थिति को सुधारने के लिये क्या किया, आधुनिकीकरण के लिये क्या किया ? इस की सारी जानकारी सदन को देनी चाहिये थी ।

[श्री मधु लियरे]

जब आयरन और स्टील कम्पनी निजी क्षेत्र में थी तो सब से बड़ी सिकाबल जो मेरे पास आती थी वह स्टील के बारे में थी। कहा जाता था कि जो स्टील को बेचा जाता है उसमें बड़े पैमाने पर चोरी हो रही है। तो स्टील को बेचने के बारे में कौन भी नहीं प्रणालिया, सरकारी क्षेत्र में कारखाना आने के बाद चालू की गई है, उस की जानकारी मंत्री को देनी चाहिये। लेकिन मैं ने यह सुना है कि कम्पनी वाले पहले सोचने थे कि स्टील को बेचने से 80 लाख रु० मिलेगा, लेकिन जब अधिगणन किया गया तो 1 करोड़ 41 लाख रु० प्राप्त हुआ। और जब हमरे लौट का अधिगणन किया गया तो उस में 1 करोड़ 55 लाख रु० प्राप्त हुआ। तो हम से साफ है कि अधिगणन के अग्ये अधिक आमदनी प्राप्त की हो रही है। तो इस अधिगणन प्रणाली को सुधारने के लिये और क्या कदम उठाये जा सकते हैं इस के बारे में भी मदन को विश्वास में लेना चाहिये क्योंकि इन में लाखों रु० का खोटाया हमेशा होता रहा है, और उम की मही जानकारी हम को मिलनी चाहिये। केवल कम्पनी सरकारी मैनैजमेंट में आने में स्थिति सुधरनी है, ऐसी बात नहीं है। क्या मंत्री महोदय इस बात में इन्कार कर सकते हैं कि करबेला, झिलाई और दुर्गापुर में जो अच्छा स्टील या अच्छे स्टील प्रोडक्ट बनते हैं उन को इन्फ्रीयर बेचित कर के माल निकासता जाता है और वही माल जैक में बेचा जाता है। तो क्या आई० एस० को०

में भी इस तरह के काम इन दिनों में चल रहे हैं? क्या इस को रोकने का प्रयास किया जा रहा है?

जहां आई० एस० को० में पैदावार बढ़ाने की आवश्यकता है, उसका उपयोग भी ठीक होना चाहिये। आज सबेरे ही सवाल उठा था कि इन्फ्राट एक ऐसी चीज है कि जिस की हमारे अधिधिकारण के लिये, हमारे ऊपर की पैदावार के लिये बड़ी आवश्यकता है और उम का इन्फेमान ठीक ढंग ऐसे करना चाहिये। गलन कामों के लिये इन्फेमाच नहीं होना चाहिये। इस के बारे में अगर मेरे साथी दृष्टते बोचेंगे तो मर्ने वह जो प्रश्न उठाना चाहते थे उम की तफसिल प्राप्त के मामले में करेंगे। लेकिन मंत्री महोदय ने पहले भी मैं ने पूछा था आज बम्बई जैसे शहर में 20, 25, 30 मजिल की जो इन्फ्राधिकार्य बन रही है उम में सीमेंट और स्टील का बड़े पैमाने पर दुरुपयोग होता है और मैं नहीं समझता, राष्ट्रीय हित में, ऐसे कामों का बरौयता मिलनी चाहिये। मंत्री महोदय ने पिछली बार मुझ से कहा कि इस के दर विचार किया जा रहा है। तो मैं आशा करता हूँ कि जहां वह आई० एस० को० में वह पैदावार बढ़ाने की बात कहेंगे साथ साथ जो स्टील पैदा होगा सरकारी क्षेत्र में उसका जो इन्फेमान है वह मही ढंग में और राष्ट्रीय हित को दृष्टि से जो आवश्यकता है उन्ही कामों के लिये होगा इस की ओर भी वह ध्यान देंगे, ऐसी मैं आशा करता हूँ।

तो उदाहरण मेरे मामले में है बम्बई में जो बैंक के रिप्लेमेंशन की योजना

है जिस को मैं यहाँ कई बार उठा चुका हूँ। इस स्कीम के तहत जो केन्द्र की जमीन है उस की बोरी कर के घोर बड़े-छोटे लोगों को वह बेच कर यह भट्टालिकाये खड़ी की जा रही है। अभी अभी जो 16 प्लॉट्स बेचे गये हैं उस में 2 करोड़ ९० लाख की रिश्वत दी गई। उस को तो आप रोक नहीं सकते हैं, बल्कि मंत्री को कोई दिलचस्पी नहीं है। लेकिन यदि आप यह नियम बनाते हैं कि भूमि भट्टालिकाओं के लिये एक किलो भी स्टील नहीं मिलेगी तो यह जो रिश्वत घोर बोरी का मामला है यह सब खत्म हो जायगा। नो ग्राज में मंत्री महोदय में चाहता हूँ कि इस के बारे में सरकार ने नोर्न का वह ऐलान करे कि उत्पादन बढ़ाने का एक काम है और जो पैदावार है उस का मही इन्फ्लेमन यंत्र द्वारा काम है।

अब दूसरा मवाल मोटर कारखाने का है। यह बैबी इंडस्ट्री में यह आता है आप के मजालय में नहीं है माल्टी लिमिटेड का ५०,०००. (कुछ सदस्यों के हमने पर) आप लोगों को जाना है या माल्टी का नाम लेने ही या नो हमी जानी है या क्रोध आता है। आई० आई० एम० को० में पैदावार बढ़ाने का काम हम को करना है, लेकिन साथ साथ चूँकि पैदावार बढ़ाने की प्रक्रिया पर कुछ न कुछ लिमिटेशनस आ ही जाने हैं इसलिए स्टील के इन्फ्लेमन के बारे में भी हम को सोचना चाहिये। माल्टी लिमिटेड को पचास हजार मोटर गाड़ियाँ बनाने का लाइसेंस दिया गया है। क्या आप यह सोचते हैं कि इस के लिये जो स्टील कोटा

दिया जाएगा वह इस्पात का सदुपयोग होगा? इसके बारे में आपको, मन्त्रालय महोदय, सरकार के ऊपर स्ट्रिक्चर्ड पाम करने चाहिये। आपत्कालीन स्थिति में इस तरह इस्पात का दुरुपयोग करना कहा नक उचित और मुनासिब है? इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि महा मंत्री महोदय इस्पात के उत्पादन का मजाल रखें वहाँ बितरण के बारे में भी कोई कड़ी व्यवस्था करें।

17 hrs

इस्पात के जो कारखाने हैं उनके बारे में आप जानते हैं कि कुछ नों भार्जजिक कम्पनियों के लिए और अन्य कामों के लिए इस्पात का बितरण होता है—25-30 परसेंट इस्पात चाहे वह भिन्दाई का हो, दुर्गापुर का हो, राउडकेला का हो 'या इमको' में बनने वाला हो। क्या यह सही सही है कि 25-30 परसेंट आप प्रोड्युक्ट ट्रेड को देने हैं? क्या यह भी सही नहीं है कि कई बार आपका मैनेजमेन्ट और रेल मजालय दोनों मिल जाते हैं आपस में और कर्जों नामों के ऊपर स्टील एलाट कर दिया जाता है, कभी कभी स्टील एलाट किया जाता है बम्बई के पने पर और वह रस्ते में ही उतार लिया जाता है और सारा बलैकमार्किट में चला जाता है? 'इमको' के अन्दर जो बितरण व्यवस्था है क्या उसके ऊपर आपकी निगरानी है और क्या ऐसे कामों के लिए स्टील चला नहीं जाता है? इसका प्राप्ते क्या इन्जाम किया है? कापडिया ग्रुप की अकसर हमारे प्रिय राजन दास मुंशी मेरे साथ खर्चा किया करते हैं। कुछ साल पहले

[श्री मधु सिमये]

की यह बात है। उनको ड्रम और बैरल बनाने के लिए स्टील शीट्स का कोटा दिया गया। आज भी उनको कोटा मिलता होगा। 'इसको' से भी मिलता होगा। इसका खुलासा मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप करें। क्या यह सही नहीं है कि ड्रम और बैरल बनाने के बजाय यह इम्पात की बाढ़ें ये लोग ब्लैकमार्किट में बेच डालते हैं। इस पर दो तीन सौ प्रतिशत का प्रिमियम चल रहा है। इसी तरह से मसैय के बारे में आप कड़ाई करते। इम्पात के वितरण के बारे में कड़ाई करते, इम्पात के यूज के बारे में, एड-यूज के बारे में भी कड़ाई करने।

'इसको' की जो कम्पनी है उस में इस वक्त नियुक्तियों को लेकर बहुत विवाद खड़ा हो गया है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या 'इसको' के सरकार के हाथ में आने के बाद कोई नई रिक्तमेट पालिसी अपनाई गई है क्योंकि जब निजी क्षेत्र में 'इसको' कम्पनी थी उस वक्त कहा जाता है कि इस में नौकरी देने के लिए पांच छः हजार रुपये रिश्शन का लिया जाना था। क्या सरकारी क्षेत्र में आने के बाद जो नई रिक्तमेट पालिसी आगे चालू की है क्या उसके तहत इस तरह के गलत काम बन्द हो गए हैं? अगर बन्द नहीं हुए हैं तो क्या इन्वैस्टीगेशन एजेंसीज की मदद से इनको दण्ड करने का आपने बार्ट प्रयास किया? इसने बारे में भी खनामा होना चाहिए।

इसको कम्पनी में कंट्रैक्ट सिस्टम की एक बहुत खतरनाक व्यवस्था थी जिस के चलते जो कंट्रैक्ट लेबर रहती थी उनको ठीक मजदूरी वगैरह नहीं दी जाती थी। आप इसको तीन साल के लिए अपने हाथ में ले रहे हैं। मैं तो चाहता हूँ कि हमेशा के लिए लें। इस कंट्रैक्ट प्रणाली को आप समाप्त करें। अगर मजदूरों को सही मजदूरी मिलेगी, उनका मन्थयोग प्राप्त करने की कोई व्यवस्था आपने की तो आपका उत्पादन भी बढ़ेगा और लेबर भी मन्तुष्ट होगी। बिना मजदूरों का दिनी मन्थयोग प्राप्त किए उत्पादन बढ़ाने की जो जिम्मेदारी आपने ली है उस जिम्मेदारी को आप पूरा नहीं कर पाएंगे।

चेयरमैन की नियुक्ति के बारे में बहुत झगडा चल रहा है। मेरी यह राय है कि नियुक्तियों और ट्रान्स्फर वगैरह के बारे में हम लोगों को दखल नहीं देना चाहिये। अगर किसी व्यक्ति का आप किसी विदेशी कम्पनी को छोड़ कर सरकारी क्षेत्र की मदद करने के लिए बुलाने हैं तो आपको उसका गोच ममन कर बुलाना चाहिये और बुलाने के बाद उसके साथ दुर्व्यवहार नहीं करना चाहिए। अगर आपको लगता है कि वह आदमी उपयोग है, नावायव है तो क्यों आप उसको बुलाने हैं। लेकिन जब शक दे कर बुलाने हैं तो उनकी टेन्ट का, गुण वत्ता का पूरा पूरा आपको इन्वेस्टिगेशन करना चाहिये। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मैनेज के आधार पर, विद्वानों के आधार पर चयन होना चाहिए, नियुक्तियां होनी चाहिए। लेकिन

मैं जानता हूँ कि पैरवी के आधार पर वह सरकार चलती है, इनप्लान्ड पेइजिंग के आधार पर चलती है और इस में खजानो नरह के प्रेजर्ज मंत्रालय के ऊपर आने है। इन तमाम चीजों को बन्द करने के पक्ष में हूँ। एक बात सिद्धान्त के तौर पर कहना चाहता हूँ, किसी व्यक्ति की चर्चा नहीं करना चाहता। आज सरकारी क्षेत्र के लिये अच्छे लोग नहीं मिल रहे हैं। दूसरी बात यह है कि सरकार में यह अवृत्ति है कि यह नियम नहीं लेना चाहती है और वह इसलिये कि नियम लेने में जिम्मेदारी आती है और आज जिम्मेदारी कोई लेना नहीं चाहता है। जिम्मेदारी का सिद्धान्त जब तक आप सरकार में और खास कर पब्लिक एंटरप्राइज में जारी नहीं करेंगे, सुधार नहीं आयेगा। अच्छा काम किया तो उसका उसको फल नहीं देंगे, शाबाश नहीं कहेंगे और गलत किया तो उसके लिये दोष नहीं देंगे उसको, अब तक काम सुचारु ढंग से नहीं चल सकेगा। इस में डडा चलता है। सरकार में—उसको फायर किया जाता है। लेकिन हमारे यहां अयोग्य व्यक्ति को प्रमोशन दी जाती है, ही इस किस्म अपस्टेयज। यह हम लोगों की नीति है। इसमें कुछ नहीं होगा। पब्लिक एंटरप्राइज की जो खराब हालत है इसमें परमनल पालिसी बहुत महत्व रखती है। इस वाक्य बहुत सोच कर आप मिलेकशन करें। मुझे याद है बहुत साल पहले—यह एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सर्विस वर्ग रह तो आती बात है—हमारे बल में श्री अच्युत पटवर्धन आदि लोग जब हुआ करने थे तो उसी समय सरकार

को कहते थे कि इकोनॉमिक मिक्स सर्विस चालू की जाए और उसमें ऐसे सभी लोगों को लें जिनको दो तीन साल का विजिनेस का अनुभव हो, जबानी में उनको ले, फिर उनको ट्रेन आप करें, पहले वे बाहर थोड़ा अनुभव प्राप्त करे, फिर उनको प्रशिक्षण आप दें, बाद में उनको मौका दें और नियंत्रण लेने की नियंत्रण शक्ति आप उनमें पंदा करे। इस तरह की मिलेकशन पालिसी, रिफूटमेंट पालिसी आप अपनायगे तो मेरा ख्याल है कि इसको जो कारोबार है उसमें हम लोग तरक्की कर पायेंगे।

प्यास लगने के बाद कुआ खोदने का काम ही आप आज तक करते आ रहे हैं। दो तीन दिन में सरकार को यही सलाह देता आ रहा हूँ। प्यास लगने के बहुत पहले से ही आपको कुआ खोदना चाहिये। इस बात का आप विचार करें कि प्यास तो इन्सान को लगती है इस वास्ते कुआ भी पहले से ही खोदना चाहिये।

MR CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved.

"This House disapproves of the Indian Iron and Steel Company (Taking over of Management) Amendment Ordinance, 1974 (Ordinance No. 4 of 1974) promulgated by the President on the 28th June 1974."

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA): Sir, I beg to move.

"That the Bill to amend the Indian Iron and Steel Company (Taking over of Management) Act, 1972, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration"

MR CHAIRMAN Motion moved

"That the Bill to amend the Indian Iron and Steel Company (Taking over of Management) Act 1972 as passed by Rajya Sabha be taken into consideration"

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Burdwan) Mr Chairman Sir I consider this to be a very important measure because Indian Iron and Steel Company occupies a place of importance in the steel sector of this country Sir when the late Steel Minister announced the decision to take over the management of this Company he said

'Steel production is an area which is crucial to development and the country could not possibly watch the deteriorating state of affairs in IISCO

and that

The management of IISCO had been unable to halt the steady deterioration of the production prospects apart from bringing about any improvement There has been no recognition on their part of the urgency of implementing schemes for the modernisation of the industry and its expansion"

I fail to understand how all these schemes could be put into effect when the takeover was only for two years Necessarily the Government had to come forward with this Bill to extend the period of take-over I do not know how within even this extended period of three years the condition of this company which was steadily brought to a decline by the previous management could be rectified, with

all the complications and all the capital investment required for modernisation etc I hope the minister will satisfy us whether three years are sufficient to do this Of course, we have never understood why initially it was for two years We have certainly no objection to the extension of the period of management, subject to what I say with regard to its actual day to day management and the policy of management But it was known previously that two years were insufficient during the course of the management Then why did the Government issue an ordinance instead of bringing a Bill in the last session itself? It is rather unfortunate that this Government takes recourse to issuance of ordinances as a matter of course When an ordinance is issued it is incumbent on the Government to give a statement explaining the circumstances which necessitated its promulgation If you go through this statement which has been issued, the main reason given is that it has not been possible to achieve so many things within a period of two years but not a word is mentioned in it to justify any change in the management I wish to emphasise this point In the garb of seeking extension of the period of management, you are changing lock stock and barrel the entire principle of management laid down in the initial Act by the late Shri Mohan Kumaramangalam While suddenly within two years have you changed the very basis of the management? When the initial Act was passed the Custodian Mr Ray, was then Deputy Managing Director of Metal Box and Co a very well known concern in the private sector He was getting a salary of Rs 7500 per month with a lot of perquisites and was entitled to a pension on the basis of his position of Rs 2500 per month on reaching the age of 50 He was only 42 when at the request of the late Steel Minister he joined IISCO It has been admitted in this statement that

"Since the take-over of the management, a number of steps have been

taken to reorganise and streamline the administrative structure, and that substantial progress has been made, but a good deal still remains to be done."

That was when, not even two years have elapsed, or perhaps it has just elapsed.

So from the statement it appears that the management that has been introduced by the first take-over Act has achieved something. So far as the steps taken by the Custodian are concerned, they are in the right direction as appears from the statement issued and circulated by the Ministry. So, how unfair it has been that in the Statement of Objects and Reasons of this Bill which was introduced in the Rajya Sabha it has been stated that the arrangement of having a Custodian and the Advisory Board has not been found to be satisfactory and it was proposed that during the extended period the Board of Management should be constituted to run the management. Nothing has been indicated in the other statement regarding the issue of the Ordinance as to the circumstances, and in what way, the management by the Custodian was unsatisfactory, so far as the Government and the interests of the undertaking are concerned. Here I am not pleading for the Custodian because he has already left the organisation. You say you want to provide good management to these concerns. That is why the management was taken over and you invited these people to make sacrifices and come and run them. Now because of the bureaucratic structure of functioning in Delhi, you throw them away just like that and you do not think of their future. Is this the way you are going to attract good and talented people to these concerns? The basic object of the take-over was good management and proper management. You have not nationalised them; you have taken them over for the purpose of providing better management. Do not forget that. For providing that better

management you invited talented people who were previously associated with good European concerns. Unless they were really talented people, you would not have invited them. Now you cannot treat them like untouchables because they were previously associated with European concerns.

So far as the Custodian and the previous Advisory Board are concerned, there are certain things which have to be noticed. One is that there has been increase in production after the take-over. It is necessary for us to remember that the Indian Iron and Steel undertaking does not consist solely of the plant for production of steel. There are collieries and kulti works which very much form part of the undertakings. Now the functioning of the steel sector has not certainly gone down; it has improved. So, far as the functioning of the kulti works and coal mines are concerned, they are very much better. I am sure the hon. Minister will not deny all these things.

As Shri Limaye has also mentioned, during the management of the Custodian and the Advisory Board, for the first time the recruitment policy has been formulated. So far as the sale of scrap was concerned, it was beehive of vested interests. Recruitment was being done without a recruitment policy at the sweet will of persons who were in the old management, some of whom have continued with glorified status. The sale of scrap went up from Rs. 80 lakhs to Rs. 141 crores.

Here I will quote only one instance. Previously the Company's Cinema was being leased at the rate of Rs. 700 per month. Because of the auction held by the Custodian and the Advisory Board, it fetched Rs. 5,500 per month.

There have been several improvements. So far as the functioning of the erstwhile Custodian is concerned, may I place certain facts before the House because we are considering the

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

management also. I would like to quote—I shall indicate the source later on:

"Mr. Ray mainly attempted to set right some of the old, if I may use the word, corrupt practices which undercut the deep-entrenched vested interests and obviously when their interests were injured, they appeared to have entered into a mood of retaliation. . .

Mr. Ray introduced the system of auction, not only of open auction, but of a systematic way of auction which is prevalent and which always takes care of preventing such corruption or possible corruption.

Mr. Ray obviously got into the bad books of such entrenched interests there who used to buy scrap through negotiation and, therefore, it could be one of causes for the tension that grew there and which caused some situation against Mr Ray...."

Then about the system of recruitment, it says:

"Obviously, there was no system of recruitment. They appointed whomsoever they liked. As the House is aware today even in a public sector undertaking it is impossible to appoint anybody ..."

Similarly, various things have been said.

I was quoting our present Steel Minister. This is what he has said only a few days back about the performance of Mr. Ray, the erstwhile Custodian.

How this Custodian and others have been treated by this Government? Unceremoniously, you drive him away. Instead of acknowledging the services he has rendered and the substantial contribution he has made by making personal sacrifices to a considerable

extent, you shabbily treat him. Overnight you issue an Ordinance whereby he becomes an ex-Custodian. This is the way this Government has dealt with this gentleman. Overnight, by operation of this Ordinance, he becomes an ex-Custodian. He loses completely his job. He is not even asked to tender his resignation before this was introduced. This is the way it is being done.

What I am trying to submit is that this is not a way in which you can justify your taking over the management of a concern like this which has a definite position in an important sector, the steel sector, of this country. Some sort of an excuse was given that there was another gentleman who was not pulling on well with the Custodian and, therefore, something had to be done. That was engineered by the bureaucrats in Delhi. It is taken as an excuse for the purpose of finding scapegoats for justifying bad performance of the Ministry at the Centre.

As I said, the present Minister himself has commended the achievements of this concern during the previous management. But, it seems, so far as the management policy is concerned, actually the Minister himself is a silent spectator. His bureaucratic set-up the Secretary, has become more powerful than the Minister himself. He is very much under the influence of his ministerial set up.

I would like to know how will the proposed changes help in the improvement of the management which was progressing on somewhat sound lines. If you had guide-lines to give to the previous management, you could have given the guidelines. By changing lock stock and barrel, the management that was given not even a two-years trial—you commend them and bring forward a set of management—how is it going to achieve better performance in future? I would like to know, how instead of a whole-time Custodian, a part-time Administrator will help in better management of this important

concern. Instead of a whole-time custodian, you have got a parttime administrator, who is also Chairman of the Hindustan Steel Ltd., who is also Chairman, I believe, of the Salem Plant. He can correct me if I am wrong. How can the same man who has to look after so many important undertakings, including an undertaking like the HSL, look after properly the management and the affairs of the Indian Iron and Steel? This is another method of making another scape-goat as they made of the old custodian. They want to make the new administrator another scape-goat, to find excuses to drive him away from the steel sector. I shall come to that as to what is the reason behind the systematic ouster of important and competent people in the steel sector, in the public sector. This is because somebody wants to arrogate to himself all the powers and functions in the steel industry and constituted himself as the overlord.

Everybody knows that in this country as new organisation has been set up, called the Steel Authority of India Ltd., when it was set up, it was said that the proposed holding company would operate as a flexible instrument for the development of the industry, the object of creating this corporate giant was not to enforce rigid control but to bring into existence coordinated thinking and direction for the iron and steel sector; the holding company would give broad directions to the operating units which would have a large measure of autonomy.

So far as this Steel Authority is concerned its Chairman is the present Secretary of the Steel Ministry. What has been the performance of SAIL itself? I am quoting from a well known paper, *The Hindu*; this had appeared a few days back:

"There have been more antics than determined organisational action to improve production on the part of the top brass in SAIL in the past 1½ years. There have been trapeze acts

galore and talk of high aims. But pretty little work has been done to improve the working of the factories on the ground or the coking coal-mines underground."

When the entire complex of the national steel industry was brought under the control of SAIL, it was hoped, that besides ridding the industry of the deadening effects of bureaucracy, it would provide an institutional framework under which an integrated steel programme would be revived as a national enterprise. But the only thing that the SAIL has achieved so far is to obtain or extract, if I may say so, a better price for steel. Now it has become the biggest monolith in this country.

17.29 hrs.

[SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI in the Chair]

I say, the SAIL, under its present management, under the chairmanship of its present Chairman has very little positive achievement to show in its performance. It has tended to be enmeshed in bureaucratic routine and the established grooves. It has encouraged unhealthy competition among the different units. Competition is good but it should be a healthy competition. What is happening is that, so far as the different units are concerned, instead of giving them more and more autonomy, rigid control is being sought to be enforced from the top. So far as SAIL is concerned, it has taken up too much time with the futile and petty exercises to establish alibis for non-performance and failures rather than with mobilising and galvanising the national resources in manpower and material. I am quoting from another newspaper. So far as this SAIL is concerned, the expectation it held out of making profits has been belied. A price-rise was allowed when they could not increase production and when we are talking of inflation in the country, a price-rise in a most important commodity in the country was allowed so as to show that they were making a

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

larger realisation on steel and getting a higher price.

The wonderful management of SAIL has been that while there is a scarcity of steel in the country for important development projects, there was a glut in stocks of steel with the plants. There could not be any movement. At one point of time five lakhs tonnes of steel piled up in the different plants and with a view to get rid of this stock, it was planned that exports of steel should be allowed now. This is the working of SAIL under which the steel industry is put and of the production which was expected to be only 5.4 million tonnes which is a modest estimate, now the revised estimate is 4.3 million tonnes—please correct me if my figures are wrong—which is lower than the figure of 1972.

So far as the hon. Minister, Shri Malaviya is concerned, he has himself said and I am quoting him as it appeared in the newspapers and I did not find any contradiction:

"The holding companies have become too big. They have to shed some burden and more powers and responsibility would have to be given to individual units."

Now, what has been done is that a new brain-wave has come in SAIL, namely, now to kill the HSL, it is proposed to be split up into three organisations for the management of the three plants at Bhilai, Rourkela and Durgapur. The reason which has been put forward is that the units will become more autonomous as centres for decision-making, it will isolate bad performance from the good one and it will generate a healthy competition among the companies. These are usual arguments which will appear in any management text-book which are never translated into action much less the SAIL has any intention or capacity

to achieve it. It cannot do it. A very curious thing, the reason which is put forward is that the HSL has become a monolith. It is just like the pot causing the kettle black. The SAIL has become a bigger monolith having an enormous control over the entire steel industry including the inputs industry. I am told that now almost the day to day decision in regard to HSL are being taken at Delhi and in fact the headquarters of HSL has been transferred to Delhi because SAIL wants to control the day to day activity and control and management of HSL. It is not a question of giving more autonomy to the units but they want to arrogate more and more powers and they are not given even the minimum autonomy to take decision for the purpose of running the industry. Instead of developing what is known as an industrial culture, the SAIL has brought about and perpetuated a civil service culture in the steel industry in the country. The SAIL has miserably failed in the sphere of developing a federal structure and in this regard, has achieved notoriety in creating muddles in coal, power, transportation and the steel industries.

So far as the Board of Management is being constituted, I would like the hon. Minister to explain to us, as I indicated, how the new change could bring about a better result in the performance, how a part-time administrator could do it better and what was the difficulty in the Advisory Board and the Custodian. I am making it clear, not that you must continue Mr. X or Mr. Y or Mr. Z. I am not on that. I want the hon. Minister to satisfy the country that you have done it for the real benefit of this company and the country, not for satisfying the fads of any particular individual, however powerful he may be. He might occupy an important position in the steel set up on the sectoral set-up that you have created but that cannot be the only sort of justification for tinkering with this

problem. I think the hon. Minister will go into this aspect and try to satisfy us on this point. And, about the new management board constituted, we would like to know whether members are to be given specific jobs, whether they are technically qualified etc. and what sort of activities they will be entrusted with. We would like to know what guidelines will be given from Delhi. Don't bring in SAIL in that. So far as labour representation is concerned, a particular gentleman is selected, I have nothing against him personally. What we wish to point out is only this that you have to find out as to who is true representative of labour. Let not Government decide beforehand who will be the leader, whom they want to represent and all that. Let them introduce a system of finding out either by vote or by ballot who really represents majority of the workers. I am not asking you should select particular union, X or Y or Z or give weightage to particular trade union. What we say is that proper weightage should be there who has majority support. Whatever outstanding problems of workmen are there should be looked into and the contract labour should be abolished. Proper recruitment policy should be there; such a policy should be properly formulated and continued. Jobs should not be given either as a matter of political favour nor should it be left to vagaries of particular individuals however powerful they may be.

We support the Bill in so far as it provides for extension of the period of management but we think that even three years will not be sufficient. You should have sufficient foresight even now. But as far as the Bill seeks to interfere with the previous management we are not satisfied that what is being now introduced will be better. I request the Minister to consider all these points and to see that the management is done properly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The total time allotted is two hours. If the hon. Members keep this in mind, we may be able to accommodate more hon. Members. Mr. Swaran Singh Sokhi.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): We are very much short of time. The Bill has to become an Act and receive the President's assent.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: No more slip.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: It is my duty to mention. I would be grateful if it is passed tomorrow.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Yes.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: It is not so easy, tomorrow is Friday and our official time is limited. I request the cooperation of the House to see that this Bill is passed tomorrow. I will be very grateful indeed for this.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH SOKHI (Jamshedpur): This is an Amendment Bill to amend the taking over of Indian Iron and Steel Company Limited (Taking over of Management) Act, 1972, to which I have given four amendments. Seeing the statement of the Minister, explaining the circumstances which necessitated the promulgation of the Indian Iron and Steel Company Amendment Ordinance 1974, I am really surprised why again the hon'ble Steel Minister has come forward for extension of three years with effect from the 14th July, 1974,—perhaps under pressure from the Secretary of the Steel and Mines Ministry, who has made a mess of the steel plants.

Sir, the Steel Minister has stated recently that the Indian Iron and Steel Co. Ltd., Burnpur was established fifty years ago, that is, some time

[Sardar Swaran Singh Sokhi]

in 1924, which is incorrect. I do not know who gave him this information. Actually the IISCO's Steel Plant at Burnpur was established 10 years later than the Tata Iron and Steel Co. Ltd., in the year 1917 and TISCO at Jamshedpur in 1907.

This is still written on the Gate of the Plant, just opposite Burnpur Railway Station. I think he never cared to visit the Plant through that gate, which is generally used by the workers and labour of the IISCO Plant.

Sir, when the taking over the Management Bill, of Indian Iron and Steel Co., at Burnpur came up for approval of Lok Sabha in 1972, I objected to the taking over of this Plant for two years which is a matter of record and can be ascertained from the proceedings of the House. My point of objection was, why the Government is taking over this Plant only for two years, instead of nationalisation of it straightway in public interest. But, the then Steel Minister did not care to listen to me. I clearly told the House at that time that in two years, the management cannot even repair the machinery of the steel plant, even it may spend any amount of money on it, because I know the Indian Iron and Steel Co. Ltd., since 1948 and is functioning as well since then.

The result is that the Steel Minister, Shri K. D. Malaviya, has come for approval of this august House for extension of three years more on certain grounds which, according to me are baseless. I do not agree with the statement that the takeover of the Steel Plant at Burnpur was only due to deterioration in the condition of the Plant, and replacement over a period of years.

As you know, Sir, any steel plant or any Mill cannot run for half a century or more without proper

maintenance. You cannot even run a bicycle without proper maintenance, even for a year. The Plant has got most up-to-date Blast Furnace, Coke Oven and other Mills, much more modern than TISCO. How TISCO at Jamshedpur is running which was established ten years earlier than IISCO. In that case, why don't you take over Tata Iron and Steel Co. Ltd., at Jamshedpur too when you are going to give money for expansion to TISCO very shortly which is much more older than IISCO and giving more production than this steel plant to their rated capacity.

Sir, it is not that the Plant only runs itself, but there should be proper Management having good labour relations, and not as the bureaucrats are running the public sector plants today.

Sir, after takeover about Rs. 10 crores were spent, but in spite of that, the production has gone down by 50 per cent. Why? I want to know from the hon. Minister and he should give a categorical reply. It is public money you spend. What sort of reorganisation and streamlining you have done after take over. The old corrupt officers are still there, I am told. Why has there been no increase in production? What substantial progress has been made there—whether it is only on paper? Who made the assessment of the entire plant before takeover, because now you have stated in the statement and I quote,

"On actually taking down some of the items of the equipment, the condition was found to be much worse than anticipated."

Such officers who are responsible for such wrong assessment, should be suspended forthwith pending enquiry and should be dismissed.

I hereby again suggest that this plant should be immediately nationalised instead of wasting more time and money on it.

Another point that I have is this. One member of the Management Board should be nominated from amongst the labour. That means "actual worker" who may be an elected member of the only one recognised labour union of the company.

With these words, I support this Bill.

*SHRI E. R. KRISHNAN (Salem): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to express my views on The Indian Iron and Steel Company (Taking over of Management) Amendment Bill, 1974.

Sir, originally the control of management of IISCO was taken over by the Government for a period of two years. It was not unknown to the Government that this two-year period would lapse on 14th July, 1974. During this period, the Government, while administering this undertaking, have come to know the deficiencies in the day-to-day working. In spite of that, the President promulgated an Ordinance only on 28th June, 1974 extending the period of Government's control by three more years. If the Government had brought forward a Bill of this nature during the last Budget Session of this House, which was not impossible for them to do, the Presidential Proclamation could have been avoided. I condemn the Government's way of issuing Presidential Ordinances at the last minute.

I regret that the Government have not, even now, come with a Bill nationalising IISCO. I also wonder from where the Government are getting novel ideas of legislating. Now the Government's two-year control period is over. Since the Government feel that they should control the management of IISCO for a further period, it is being extended by three years. After three years also, if it is felt necessary that the period of control should be extended, it will be extended by two years by a directive and again by two years, if

necessary. However, the total period of control would not be beyond 10 years. This is the substance of Clause 3 of this Amending Bill.

Sir, this Government are committed to the establishment of egalitarian society in the country. I wonder whether the Government are determined to achieve this laudable objective only in this manner.

While replying to the date in the Rajya Sabha, Shri K. D. Malavia enumerated the problems that beset the Government in nationalising IISCO. He has pointed out that there are a large number of shareholders and the Government, at this juncture of unprecedented financial stringency, do not have that much resource to pay to the shareholders. I would like to make a suggestion here. Recently, the Government have enacted a law on compulsory deposit. On the basis of this law, the money that should be given to the shareholders can be put in a compulsory deposit. Taking recourse to this, the Government can nationalise IISCO immediately.

There is also no need to pay any compensation to the erstwhile management of IISCO. Shri K. D. Malavia has himself stated in the Rajya Sabha that at the time of taking over the control of management of IISCO, the unit was a junk. So there is no need to pay any compensation to a junk.

I would like to know what the Government propose to do after 10 years. I want to know this from the hon. Minister because of certain reasonable apprehension. The Government propose to invest a sum Rs. 50 crores for rejuvenating IISCO during this period. Will the Government, after 10 years, hand it over to the erstwhile management or will the Government nationalise it? In case the Government decide to nationalise

[Shri E. R. Krishnan]

it, then they will certainly be confronted with certain problems. After repairing and modernising the unit, after augmenting substantially the production, naturally the value of assets would have gone up. What would the Government do, if the management demanded a huge compensation on the basis of the current value of the assets of the undertaking? Similarly, the value of shares of IISCO would also have picked up considerably. Naturally the Government would have to pay many times more than what they would now pay to the shareholders. If Government decide to hand it over to the erstwhile management, then all the benefits would accrue to the management.

Sir, I would like to know how the Government would solve the problems which are sure to arise later. When I see a Bill of this nature, I begin to feel whether such a legislation is being brought forward by the Government in the interest and general welfare of the common people of our country or in the interest of capitalists and monopoly industrialists of our country. If the Government do not want to waste tax-payers' money, if the Government want to ensure that the core sector steel industry is in the public sector, if the Government want to augment steel production substantially and meet the growing needs of the country—steel is always in short supply—then, the Government must bring forward a Bill in this very session of Lok Sabha for nationalising IISCO.

With these words, I conclude

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola).
I want to make only one point and it is this. Yesterday, we were discussing the Industries (Development and Regulation) (Amendment) Bill asking for extension of time. At that time also it was stated that this policy of piece-meal take-over under some Act and then asking for further extension

was self-defeating, because one cannot make any investments in these undertakings during this period. If one makes any investments, that adds to the assets of the undertaking and increases its value. And tomorrow when you want to nationalise, you will have to pay heavier compensation as in the case of the textile mills, for example. So, I would like to know what protection is there.

Government then say that they cannot give money to the shareholders. As the hon. Minister himself had stated, the value of the shares had come down practically to zero when they had taken it over first. Why did they not think in terms of taking it over completely? The hon. Minister says that the machinery was junk, according to him, and the written down value of the assets must have come down to zero by that time and so also the value of the shares. So, why did they not think in terms of completely taking it over, or what is called, nationalising this concern? They could have prepared a plan, a plan of good management, a plan of investment of capital in machinery and a plan also for having workers' participation and cooperation, a full-fledged plan in short to boost the production which is such a dire necessity in the country today. Why are Government not thinking in these terms? It appears so clear to commonsense that this ought to be done not only in IISCO but in the case of the other undertakings also.

The hon. Minister had asked some of us to go and see Durgapur. We have gone and seen Durgapur also, and we feel that in all our steel mills today, if only we could achieve even 75 per cent of the rated capacity, we shall be saving Rs. 700 crores in terms of foreign exchange. What tremendous things it would mean! I am asking only for 75 per cent of the rated capacity to be achieved. In regard to

whatever coordination they want, the major factor is the labour problem.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: He is not asking for 100 per cent?

SHRI VASANT SATHI. I am prepared to be satisfied with even 75 per cent today.

The most important factor is participation of labour. It is labour alone which can accomplish the miracle. For heaven's sake, as I have been repeatedly saying, the best thing to have this is by cutting across trade union rivalry. We can do this by asking the employees to forget their bias for this or that union; let us give an opportunity to the employees and ask them to elect their own representatives right from the shop level to the management level. After they come into the management, we must tell them that thereafter their wages or remuneration or bonus would be linked with production. Let us put this responsibility on them and take the employees into confidence and they will be able to accomplish the miracle. No wizard whether in the SAIL or any other place can do this. The only people who can do it are the employees or the workers. So, please for heaven's sake, let the hon. Minister take them into confidence when they want to reorganise the management, and nationalise it as soon as possible.

श्री भोगेन्द्र झा (अमनगर) : यह जो विधेयक धारा है इसमें मुझे बहुत निराशा हुई है। भाषा यह थी और जूना कंसलटेटिव कमेटी में भी एक मत में यह तय हुआ था और सरकार में मफारिज की गई थी कि इसका राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दिया जाए लेकिन बैसा न करके उसी टेक ओवर को धाप और धागे बढ़ा रहे हैं। इसकी वजह से जो कूटियां धंधी हैं, पूंजी लगाने में विवक्षित हैं वे कभी खेती और बाढ़

में जब राष्ट्रीयकरण का सवाल धायेगा और मुआवजा देने का सवाल धायेगा तो उसमें भी दिक्कतें होंगी, अगर यही व्यवस्था रह गई तब यही सरकार रह गई तब। अगर सरकार बदल गई तब दूसरी बात है। इस मामले में समस्या यह कि मौजूदा टेक ओवर को धागे बढ़ाने का जो प्रस्ताव है वह निराशाजनक कदम है और यह काम जो हमने उम्मीद की थी उसके मुताबिक नहीं है।

कुछ दिन पहले तक हमारे देश में जंगल इन्डस्ट्री है उनके प्रकार और उनके धर्म में ये सब थे और धाम तौर में ये पब्लिक। मेकटर के खिनाफ बोलना अपना कर्तव्य समझते थे। लेकिन कपड़ा मिलों की मालाल ही धाप ले। सो में ऊपर जो मिल ली गई है वे सभी बेकार पड़ी थी कोई दो साल में कोई बार साल में और कोई छठ साल में। लेकिन पहले ही साल हमने देखा है कि सरकार द्वारा उन मिलों को धपने हाथ थे लेने ही गडबडी, बदइन्तजामी और छुट्टाचार आदि सबके बावजूद लगभग सभी कपड़ा मिलों ने मुनाफा कमा कर धापको दिया है। चूंकि ये मिलें बेकार पड़ी थी इस मामले में एक राष्ट्रीय क्षति हो रही थी। करोड़पतियों को भी इस कारण में मुनाफा नहीं हो रहा था क्योंकि वे बेकार पड़ी थी। माफ ही धाप यह भी देखें कि पब्लिक मेकटर इंडस्ट्रिय ने पिछले साल के मुकाबले में अपना मुनाफा दो गुना बढ़ाया है। ऐसी अवस्था में—मैं समझता हूं कि—आत्म विश्वास के साथ कदम धागे बढ़ाने की आवश्यकता थी।

[श्री भोवेंद्र शर्मा]

और राष्ट्रीयकरण करने की आवश्यकता थी। लेकिन रास्ते में आप कहते हैं कि कुछ बाधाएँ हैं। मेरा शक है इसमें एक बहुत बड़ी बाधा टिमको की रही है टाटा एक बहुत बड़ी बाधा आपके रास्ते में रहे हैं। टिमको कबाब में हड़्डी के समान है। वहाँ पर टाटा का व्यक्तिगत प्रबन्ध है, उसका व्यक्तिगत मिलकियत है जमशेदपुर में। अब उसके एक और राउंडकेला है दूसरी तरफ बोकारो है तीसरी तरफ दुर्गापुर है। अब चूँकि इन तीनों के बीचोबीच जो व्यक्तिगत प्रबन्ध है उसके चलने जाँ हमें बोझो बहुत खबरे मिलनी है उनके आघात पर हम कह सकते हैं कि पब्लिक मैक्टर के इम्पान कारखानों का लाभदायक तरीके से चल पाना बड़ा कठिन है। कारण यह है कि पब्लिक मैक्टर की ओर में कोई प्राइवेट मैक्टर वाले को कुर्रुट नहीं कर सकता है जब कि प्राइवेट मैक्टर वाला जो है वह अछूट तरीके अपना करके पब्लिक मैक्टर वाले को कुर्रुट कर सकता है। अगर सरकार को टाटा में इतनी ज्यादा महत्त्व है तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरह से आपने एयर इंडिया का चेयरमन टाटा को बना दिया है उसी तरह से स्टील आबोरेस्टी आफ इंडिया का चेयरमन

भी टाटा को बना दें लेकिन टिमको का भी आप राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दें। यह बहुत ही मनासिब बात होगी। व्यक्तिगत दुश्मनी के आघात पर मैं यह बात कह रहा हूँ,—आप ऐसा न मानें।

आप देखें कि कुछ दिन पहले प्रधान मंत्री न कहा था कि कलकत्ता में भाषण देने हुये कि एक बहुत बड़े करोड़पति ने मुझे धमकी दी है कि उनपर अगर हमने मुकदमा नहीं हटाया तो वह हमारे लिए बिहार में मुसीबत में डाल देगे। हम जानते ही हैं कि बिहार में उपद्रव हुये हैं। उस करोड़पति का नाम नहीं लिया था उन्होंने लेकिन मैं से रहा हूँ। बिहार में उपद्रवों के पीछे उसका हाथ था। क्या मानवीय जी तथा भारत सरकार को इस बात का पता नहीं है? श्री राम नाथ गोयनका ने क्या यह धमकी नहीं दी कि बिहार के बाद उत्तर प्रदेश में भी उपद्रव करा...

MR CHAIRMAN: The hon member might stop here and resume his speech tomorrow

The House stands adjourned to meet again at 11 A.M. tomorrow.

18 hrs

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday August 30, 1974/Bhadra 8, 1896 (Saka).