

Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 14th March, 1973."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Twenty-fourth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 14th March, 1973."

The motion was adopted.

15.30 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: NATIONALISATION OF FOREIGN OIL COMPANIES AND OTHER VITAL INDUSTRIES—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We continue the discussion on the Resolution by Shri H. N. Mukerjee. He has already taken fifteen minutes. He will continue his speech.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta—North-East): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, on the last occasion moving my Resolution on the nationalisation of foreign oil companies and other vital industries, I had referred to Government's fighting shy of countering monopoly interests—foreign as well as Indian in this country. And this peculiar preference for soft options is seen most calamitously in the case of foreign oil companies because they have been for years now a dreaded international menace to the cause of freedom particularly of the developing countries.

Last time I tried to show with some figures how they impose a heavy drain on our economy and especially on our foreign exchange position. I tried to show how they blackmail us over prices and; of course, they generally behave as they were sovereign States on Indian soil. They have further the grass to buy up stooges in high gov-

ernment and other places—and to our shame, in this country there are people who are ready to do their bidding.

15.36 hrs.

[SHRI S. A. KADER in the Chair]

As I finished last time, I was speaking of the shabby and planned scuttling of Shri K. D. Malaviya's efforts to free ourselves of foreign oil shackles I was referring to such things as the recurring Bechtel scandals and the hurdles which are deliberately and plan-fully and mischievously placed in the way of the Takru Commission. If I intended to be cantankerous, I could even bring in the names of certain civil servants who have sometimes figured here already over privilege motions and that sort of thing, civil servants who appear to have sold themselves to the foreign devil who can oil their palms a great deal more than the country's exchequer can afford.

Sir, thanks to this apparently in-cradicable deficiency of the Government, even the public sector in oil, as my friend, Shri Barooah, should know very well, bristles with pitiful people who pass for experts since they once used to eat the salt of these very foreign companies.

It is not surprising that these foreign interests continue to ignore government directives and drastically reduce employment. I have here a whole file in regard to job security in foreign oil companies, which is a recurrent theme of discontent in this House. They go on drastically reducing employment, specially in the eastern States where thousands of employees are thrown off—they get their services terminated through all sorts of crooked methods. Then the foreign oil companies hand over much of their work to contractors who do their bidding. They do such things as the installation of a computer in spite of the protest of the employees in Bombay. And they do-

[Shri H. N. Mukherjee]

all this with a view to pressurising Government and showing their complete indifference to the requirements of the Indian economy. They are like a gangrene in our body-politic and they call for rooting out with hot iron, and we can do it in civilised fashion by nationalising these foreign oil resources.

In order to continue their stranglehold over this country, the oil companies have lately been making all sorts of proposals to the Government, including equity participation. They are encouraged by Government's rather sheepish attitude to be seen, for example, in the recent idea of throwing open the offshore areas for foreign oil monopolists. The argument presumably is that we have oil shortage and we must make it up and, therefore, let the Japanese or the Americans or the Rhodesians or anybody else, for that matter, dig it up and do it for us, provided they concede theoretically a nominal ownership. This is the pseudo-planners' line which even today in Shri Barooah's regime appears to pass muster. This is the kind of thing about which I hope Shri Barooah, when he replies, would try to give the House some satisfaction.

If we proceed in this fashion, if we do not check our ways, we shall be opening up our entire continental shelf to these wicked foreign interests. And naturally today a dozen or more companies are reported to be in the queue, to the delight of the tin-gods of Shri Barooah's Ministry.

When one sees these things, one might even have a feeling that poor, old Asoka Mehta was perhaps only an infant in this business of opening India's womb to economic penetration by foreign interests.

In the last few weeks, however, good news has come of oil cartels having to bow to Iraq's takeover legislation—Iraq which today is our

nearest friend in the Arab world. And this should remind us that these international oil companies need not continue to be the link between the producing and the consuming nations.

In this regard, as I said last time, the attention of the External Affairs Ministry in particular, ought to be directed, and in co-operation with the Petroleum and Chemicals Ministry and other relevant Ministries, we should try to get into direct association of whatever sort is feasible with the oil producing countries.

Recently also, we have seen some very heartening reports. The leading Soviet oil expert, who is known all over the world, Professor N. A. Kalinin, whose report in 1956 on India's oil prospects put this country on the oil map of the world gave an interview, and then he wrote a magazine article which is being distributed by some news agencies in which he says that in this country we do have enough resources which we can work up in pretty quick time. I am quoting from his report:

"A new reassuring geological, geophysical assessment has appeared in Assam, Gujarat, Punjab, West Bengal, Tripura and especially in the littoral of the Arabian Sea, and there is no ground to doubt that the mineral wealth of India is adequate to meet the requirements of the country."

I find that this is also in accord with what is said in a book like *Oil and World Power* by Peter R O'dell or the authoritative book, *The Political Economy of International Oil and the Under-developed Countries*, written by Michael Tanzer. Those also make the point that in India, if a real effort is made we can in very quick time almost be self-sufficient in regard to the production of oil. It may be a tall order apparently but if we do make a serious effort we can make a real, genuine advance in that direction.

This book by Tanzer—I want to refer to particularly I do not have much time, the *Political Economy of International Oil and the Under-developed countries*, should be studied very carefully in Mr. Borooah's Ministry. He is recognised as one of the most important writers on this subject in any country in the world today, and incidentally he was recently in this country and he gave an interview to the *Economic Times* which was reported on the 30th January, 1973. and in this interview. Dr. Tanzer said that India should nationalise all foreign oil companies and should pay no compensation which they do not deserve since they have already pumped away mammoth profits. He said again that India should look to the example set by the Chilean Government in regard to the International Copper Company. New winds are blowing from Paris to Chile and all over the world, and I hope something of that infection is caught in the Petroleum Ministry and we go ahead in the direction that we should.

I know that what we lack in this country in respect of this particular issue is not the means but the will to do it. If Government relies on private foreign investments, especially of the wily and enormously resourceful oil barons for developing the key areas of the economy, in spite of the industrial policy resolution of 1956, it would be selling out our people's birthright for a mess of pottage. Government may try to make it appear attractive in the short run. They may try to make it attractive in the short run by having some arrangements with foreign companies and work up some oil that would be good enough for our purposes, but its long term implications are absolutely disastrous. More than half of our people live below the poverty line and the devil alone knows what torture that means from day to day. We hear of *Garibi Hatao* today, but long ago, in the Mahabharata it had been said that poverty was like

pariyaya maranam, death by degrees.

पतितब्रह्मणो तत् परमं दुःखमस्तीति ।

दारिद्र्यमिति यत् प्रोक्तम् पयाये भरणमृहितम्

"Poverty is worse even than the death of a husband or a son, because it is nothing more or less than death by degrees."

Every year in the eastern region of our country from where my friend Mr. Borooah comes, like I do, according to the Government Statement in this House 14,000 children, infants between the ages of 1 and 5, become blind because of lack of nutrition. Is it imagined that we can lift our country out of this absolute morass without genuinely deep-ranging programmes of reconstruction? Is it believed that merely by tinkering with this or that kind of economic policy we are going ahead with tackling the problem of poverty, or is it imagined that some sort of expression like socialist planning or *garibi hatao* recited from time to time would just do the trick? This country has to wake out of its present deep stupor to mass awareness and activity. And if the Government means business—I have my doubts—the Government should take the initiative, having the massive support it claims to have a massive programme and it should take the initiative in rousing popular enthusiasm in order that the country might be reconstructed.

That is why I am asking for the introduction of genuinely and truly basic policies of change and implementation of them. It is with this idea of genuinely basic transformation of our economy that I commend this resolution to the House. I say again that I have no illusions about Government's reaction but I do hope that the Government would take, even from a pragmatic point of view, the stand that we are going to begin the process of nationalisation of the foreign oil

[Shri H. N. Mukherjee]

interests, lock, stock and barrel. There is going to be no shilly-shallying in that. That is why I have categorically worded my resolution. From the amendments which have come forward I can sense something of the support which I can claim for it but that will be for later. In the meantime I commend this resolution to the House because I do want Government to begin at least a process of basic economic reconstruction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved:

"This House is of the opinion that Foreign Oil Companies and other vital industries under the control of the 75 monopoly houses be nationalised."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I call upon other hon. Members, how much time will the hon. Minister take?

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (SHRI D. K. BOROOAH): Twenty minutes will do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Out of two hours for this Resolution, about half an hour has been taken by the hon. Mover and we need 20—25 minutes for the hon. Minister. We have the balance. I have five speakers on my list and those who move amendments also may like to speak. Amendments to be moved.

SHRI M. C. DAGA (Pali): Sir, I beg to move:

That in the resolution—

omit "and other vital industries under the control of the 75 monopoly houses" (1)

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur):

Sir, I beg to move:

That in the resolution,—

for "vital industries under the control of" substitute—

"key industries owned and controlled by" (2)

That in the resolution,—

add at the end—

"latest by 31st December, 1973"
(3).

Before I began to speak, I must congratulate you on your appointment as Chairman, I was not here on that day. I must thank my hon. friend Shri Mukerjee for moving this resolution at an opportune movement. The mines have been taken over by the Government and a very vocal section of the ruling party says that the key industries should be nationalised and foreign oil companies should be taken over by the Government. I fully agree with what Shri Mukerjee has said. Shri Malaviya took over at the time of the late lamented Pandit Nehru and went head; he was half way through when he was sent out. Similarly Dr. Trigunna Sen was putting pressure on foreign oil companies, oil cartels to reduce the prices but then he was also sent out of the Cabinet. Mr. Gokhale was in charge of this Ministry and also of the Law Ministry and now we have our friend Shri D. K. Borooah who is known for his progressive outlook. This ministry which is known as the Petro Chemicals Ministry is slippery Ministry; I want to warn him. I am sure that he will try to know what is in it and how is it that the Government has not been able to give clearcut decision about it. I am sure he will be able to pressurise his own colleagues and tell them that time is fast approaching or it has almost come when these foreign oil companies should be taken over.

Sir, my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee has rightly advocated the case. He has mentioned how the monopoly houses have grown in this country, how Tatas, Birlas and also foreign monopolists who were controlling the economy of our country repatriated their profits. I do not want to quote those once again but I would request the hon. Minister to kindly consider whether the attitude of these

oil magnates would be tolerated by any Government which had any self-respect. They dictate their own terms. Prof. Mukerjee has said—fantastic terms were given to these foreign tycoons and it is quoted in the Estimates Committee's words—

'among various assurances and concessions, the following two are very important:

Rights of the oil companies regarding import of crude oil and pricing of the Petroleum products on the basis of import parity.'

I am sure that this House will join, with the exception of those who believe in keeping the monopoly houses alive—except Jan Sangh party, other parties will join us or support the Resolution of the hon. member—Shri H. N. Mukerjee and the Government will have no hesitation in giving a definite answer to this.

Sir, I have one more amendment i.e. 'latest by the 31st December, 1973'. I want an operative clause—it should be taken over and it should be nationalised—but when? Because the reply will be given by the Government that we are wedded to Socialism, we talk of Socialism, we are trying to practise socialism also and naturally we would do it; why do you not have faith in us?

We see that Industrial Policy Resolution is also having a different deviation and shape. I think 31st December 1973 may be put. It is only March now and I am prepared to accept an amendment to the clause if he says 1st April, 1974, even then I am ready to accept. Let him move an amendment. There should be a time limit so that the country knows that Government is prepared to do so. Their ownership should be taken away by the Government.

3864 L.S.—11

I once again congratulate hon. member—Shri H. N. Mukerjee, for moving this Resolution.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD (Bhagalpur): Sir, I would start by quoting what Mr. P. C. Sethi, the then Minister had to say about this in the Rajya Sabha:

"While all the implications of nationalising the foreign private oil companies in India were examined 'very seriously', negotiations are in progress with them for removing some irksome provisions in the existing refinery agreements."

Mr. H. R. Gokhale, the predecessor of the hon. Minister, told the Consultative Committee of Parliament on 29th May, 1972 that a final decision will be taken only after the official study was over. Sir, at no point of time has Government ever given the inkling that they are not thinking of nationalisation. Why do we say that there should be nationalisation immediately? Does the Government of India still need facts and figures about the commissions and omissions of these three western oil companies—Burmah-Shell, Caltext and Esso, who have looted the country? Facts and figures will speak for themselves as to how they have made loot in the country. They have made huge profits in this country but they have not been sincere. In 1965 during the Indo-Pakistan conflict when Government wanted them to have more of capacity to produce petroleum products, they did not agree. Very recently, during the Bangladesh crisis, when they were asked to have more capacity they did not and they refused to market the products imported from the rupee currency countries. In this country where they have been brought up, with a minor investment of Rs. 62 crores, they have repatriated profits in thousand of crores. But they would never care as to what the interests of this country are.

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

We know how important oil is for our industry, transport and for everything we need. I do not want to arouse the Dulles phobia, that ghost which had been laid to rest for long, how when Pakistan committed aggression on Jammu and Kashmir, Dulles threatened us saying, "We shall stop the oil and see how you fight the freedom battle in that part of the country". The British manoeuvre, that sweet charming Mountbatten saying "On 1st January you must announce the cease-fire" is another story of our senior partner in the Commonwealth.

In spite of the big profits they are getting from our country, every day they dictate us terms. Their investment of Rs. 62 crores is very minor compared to our investment of Rs. 300 and odd crores in our two important refineries. Yet, they dictate terms saying, "We shall get crude from this source and not from that" because these international cartels of oil have got their own secrets in hiking up and down the prices. In this country, we have the privilege to have one man who is among the five oil experts of the world. I had been to the middle-east countries not once but many times and I have always been told, "You have got one expert in your country and that is Mr. K. D. Malaviya". What is the use to which we are putting this great expert? I may be wrong, but I think I am right in saying that since Malaviyaji left,—he was the man who put this country on the oil map of the world and enabled us to fight the neo imperialists and old imperialists—since he left, this department has not done anything much to their credit. I know the minister will confront me with figures of increasing investment and production of petroleum products. In terms of output they may say that the country has advanced, but if we consider the potential we have gone backwards and not forward. I hope Shri Malaviya has returned to Delhi from the Bombay hospital. This country is grateful to him for his service

to the cause of the oil industry. We know how the oil prices are manoeuvred, hiked up by the international cartels and how they pressurize the government to increase the prices. These companies dictate terms to us. They want to import crude. Then they want expansion of refineries only for huge profits. Even though they get profits manifold, they are not interested in the least in the development of the country in which they are reaping huge profits.

16 hrs.

During the last fourteen years, these three companies, Burmah-Shell, Caltex and ESSO, have earned a profit of Rs. 1,048 crores. Their dividend has been as much as 40 per cent, probably the highest in the country. Among the foreign companies that we have in this country, among the 201 giant foreign companies mentioned by the Economic Times, these three companies earn the highest profits. I wish I had enough time to refer to all those companies also. I must thank Professor Hiren Mukerjee, my dearest friend from 1952, for bringing this Resolution and giving me a chance to speak on this subject. I wish he had separated the oil companies from the 75 monopoly houses. The other monopoly houses could be taken up separately. I have revealing facts on how these monopoly houses, both national and international, Tatas, Birlas, Goenkas, Mafatlals and so on have plundered our economy. But I would not like to quote them here.

So far as these three companies are concerned, they are declaring the highest dividend, as much as 40 per cent. They are now showing declining assets and repatriating everything, including reserves. Our Ministers and officers will say that they cannot do anything because they have no power. Has not Parliament given them any power to put a stop to it? By an accident I was in the Labour Ministry for four years. Shri Kulkarni and

other labour leaders came and told me how these three oil companies are looting our economy and retrenching Indian employees. As the Labour Minister I tried my best but then the administration is a big elephant and it does not move fast. If one works in the Labour Ministry, their octopus tentacles in the other Ministries see that you are not able to move. These companies are driving out Indian employees by tempting them with big compensation. They are provided with big rooms where they sit from morning to evening without doing any work. Then they try to get a confession from them that they want to retire.

When they are making huge profits they say that their assets are declining. They declare incredibly high dividends repatriate capital and yet say that their capital is declining. These three Companies, Burmah Shell, Caltex and Esso, have already got back two and a half times an amount equivalent to their paid-up share capital in this country. In 1970-71, it was Rs. 62.8 crores. But, with regard to our public sector refineries, only two have something like Rs. 380 crores in 1970-71. About 60 to 70 per cent of the free world mineral oil products, refining and marketing, are controlled by 8 international oil companies, of which, 5 are Americans and three of them have the privilege of serving us. I have already mentioned about the nice service they are rendering. They had a gross return of 24.2 per cent of their total capital in 1970-71. It is estimated that out of the 201 industrial giants in this country, Burmah Shell has the highest remittance from this country.

I would now come to the last part of the debate. You have rung the bell. I wish I could give more information about these notorious companies and the manner in which they have served the country. They have swelled their vaults and wallets. They have swelled their pockets. They are the greatest robbers in this country.

Is the Government still thinking in terms of those three alternatives? The first alternative is holding of majority shares. I hope Mr. Borooah, his Ministry and the Government have already understood what is meant by holding of majority shares in these companies. The second alternative is revision of agreements. I do not know what they are doing. I think Shri Raja Kulkarni will be able to say much about it. They made our employees, big and small people, sit in the ante-rooms and forced them to sign agreements. The last alternative is nationalisation. It is the only answer. I would request Mr. Borooah, that he should lose no time in taking over these companies. This should be decided here and now. Nationalisation is a must. Unless we do this, the huge profits that are being taken out of this country, the depletion of assets and the retrenchment of officers will put this country in a difficult situation.

I recommend this resolution and I would request the Minister to take a decision. Nationalisation is needed most in the country. It is a much more significant step than the general insurance take over. It will be a much more significant effort than the other measures, policies and decisions that we have taken in this country after the massive mandate of 1971. Let that massive mandate give courage to the Ministry to take over these oil companies. Also, in view of the latest attitude of the Nixon Administration, we must force these oil companies of America to wind up their affairs here and now.

श्री महा दीपक सिंह शास्त्री (कासगंज) :
सभापति महोदय, श्री हीरेन मुकर्जी द्वारा विदेशी तेल कम्पनीयों और 75 एकाधिकारी गृहों के नियन्त्रणाधीन अन्य महत्वपूर्ण उद्योगों के राष्ट्रीयकरण के सम्बन्ध में जो संकल्प इस सदन के सामने आया है, मैं उसका विरोध तो नहीं करता परन्तु समर्थन भी नहीं करना चाहता हूँ बल्कि अपने

[श्री महावीर सिंह शास्त्री]

विचारों को ही आपके द्वारा सदन तक पहुंचाना चाहता हूं। पहले भी इस सम्बन्ध में इस सदन में चर्चायें हो चुकी हैं। जहां तक देश की सम्पदा का सवाल है, देश की सम्पदा देश में रहें जिससे राष्ट्र और समाज का विकास हो, यह कोई बुरी बात नहीं है लेकिन ऐसा लगता है कि जब हम जनता की तरफ देखते हैं या प्रैक्टिकल में जब इसको देखते हैं तो फल इसके प्रतिकूल ही हमको लगता है। जनता की भावनायें इस योजना के साथ साथ उतना आदर नहीं करती जितना कि करना चाहिए क्योंकि हमने देखा है कि जो जो योजनायें जनता और देश के लाभ के लिए बनाई जाती हैं उनसे पूर्णतया लाभ उस जनता को नहीं मिल पाता जितना कि उसे मिलना चाहिए अभी तक जिन जिन वस्तुओं का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ उसका फल हमारे अनुकूल या जनता के अनुकूल उतना नहीं मिला जितना कि मिलना चाहिए था। कोयले के राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात चली और हमने देखा कि राष्ट्रीयकरण होने से पूर्व कोयला बाजारों से गायब हो गया। कोयला गायब ही नहीं हुआ बल्कि उसकी कीमतों में भी वृद्धि हो गई। इस प्रकार हम चाहते तो हैं जनता के आराम की बात लेकिन फल उसके प्रतिकूल निकलता है। इसलिए जनता ने भले ही राष्ट्रीयकरण का विरोध न किया हो लेकिन जनता ने असंतोष इस पर अवश्य प्रगट किया है।

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair]

माननीय सभापति जी, हमने देखा है कि जिन बड़े बड़े उद्योगों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ उनका लाभ भी हमको नहीं मिला है। जहां तक उन उद्योग धंधों का सवाल है, अभी तक उनमें घाटा ही हुआ है। एक बात मैं और बताना चाहत हूं अब से पहले बैंको का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ और वह इस बात को लेकर हुआ कि बैंकों के द्वारा, जो हमारे खेतिहर मजदूर और छोटे तबके के आदमी हैं उनको बैंकों से पर्याप्त मात्रा में

में कर्जा मिलेगा और इसके द्वारा हमारे समाज का उद्धार होगा लेकिन हुआ क्या? हम देखते हैं कि जो बड़े बड़े मिल मालिक हैं, उद्योगपति हैं उन्होंने ही बैंको के राष्ट्रीयकरण का फायदा उठाया लेकिन उन छोटे किसानों तक, उन खेतिहर मजदूरों तक जिनको आराम मिलना चाहिए था, कोई आराम नहीं मिला। वही कहावत हुई कि आसमान से गिरे तो खजूर में अटकें। सरकार ने चाहा कि राष्ट्रीयकरण के द्वारा गरीब किसानों को लाभान्वित किया जाये लेकिन हुआ क्या? उन योजनाओं का लाभ गरीब जनता तक नहीं पहुंचा। तो आवश्यक बात यह है कि देश की जनता में राष्ट्रीय भावना जाग्रत हो, राष्ट्रीय भावना से जनता का हित हो, इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार को अपने लक्ष्य में सफलता प्राप्त नहीं हुई है। दूसरे शब्दों में हम इसको असफलता ही कहेंगे। यदि राष्ट्रीयकरण की घोषणा करके देश के आर्थिक असंतुलन को ठीक न किया जाये, यदि समाज का विकास उससे होना सम्भव न हो तो मैं समझता हूं इससे गरीबी बेरोजगारी की बीमारी और भी बढ़ती चली जायेगी। जब हम बड़े उद्योग धंधों को अपने हाथ में लेते हैं तो उसका कुप्रभाव छोटे उद्योग धंधों पर भी पड़ता है। यह कुप्रभाव न पड़े इस के लिये सरकार को प्रभावकारी कदम उठाने चाहिए। इस सम्बन्ध में भी आपको कोई योजना बनानी पड़ेगी और ध्यान देना होगा कि छोटे छोटे उद्योग धंधों पर उसका कुप्रभाव न पड़े। अभी तक जो आपकी नीति रही है, उसका उलटा ही परिणाम निकला है। जहां तक तेल कम्पनियों के राष्ट्रीयकरण का सवाल है, तेल आज के युग की अति आवश्यक वस्तुओं में से एक है। इस वास्ते उसका उत्पादन बड़े पैमाने पर होना चाहिये और राष्ट्र को उससे लाभ होना चाहिये। उसकी वितरण प्रणाली को भी आप एक अच्छा रूप दें। इस वास्ते जहां तक विदेशी तेल कम्पनियों के शेयरों का सवाल है उनको सरकार अपने

अधिकार में ले ले तो इस में कोई बुराई की बात नहीं है। सरकार को सभी बड़े उद्योग-धंधों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करना चाहिए। ऐसा अगर किया गया तो यह एक अच्छी बात होगी। हमने देखा है कि 75 बड़े बड़े विजिनैस हाउसिस ऐसे हैं जो एकाधिकार स्थापित किए हुए हैं। वहाँ पर पूँजीपतियों का एकाधिकार है सरकार को उस और भी ध्यान देना होगा मैं आपके सामने पांच छः सुझाव रखना चाहता हूँ। पहला यह है कि 75 जो बड़े बड़े उद्योग धंधे हैं जिन पर उद्योगपतियों का एकाधिकार है, सरकार उनको तुरन्त समाप्त कर दे।

हम एक तरफ छोटे छोटे उद्योग धंधों का विकास करना चाहते हैं और दूसरी तरफ बड़े उद्योग धंधों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करना चाहते हैं। क्या सरकार ने इस बात पर विचार किया है —

श्री मूल चन्द डागा : यह क्या जन संघ की नीति है ?

श्री महावीर सिंह शास्त्री : आप खामोश रहें। बाद में जो कहना है कह लें। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार दोनों का कार्य क्षेत्र निर्धारित कर दे। जो वस्तु छोटे उद्योग धंधों के अन्दर पैदा की जाए, जो माल वहाँ बनाया जाए, वह बड़े उद्योग धंधों के अन्दर न बनाया जाए। स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज के डिबेलैपमेंट का जो लक्ष्य हमने अपनाया है, उसको हमको पूरा करना होगा और ऐसा तभी हो सकेगा यदि हमने उनको बढ़ावा दिया।

महंगाई न बढ़े इसको भी हमें देखना होगा जिस बीज का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाता है देखने में आया है उसके दाम बढ़ जाते हैं, असन्तुलन पैदा हो जाता है और बेरोजगारी भी बढ़ती है और मजदूरों में भी असन्तोष फैलता है, इस वास्ते भी और भी सरकार को ध्यान देना पड़ेगा।

राष्ट्रीयकरण का हम विरोध नहीं करना चाहते। लेकिन सरकारों-करण का हम विरोध करना चाहते हैं। राष्ट्रीयकरण की आड़ में सरकारों-करण नहीं होना चाहिए। यदि राष्ट्र की कोई योजना जनता के हित के लिए निकलती है तो वह जनता तक पहुँचनी चाहिये और सरकारों तंत्र तक ही उसका लाभ सीमित नहीं रहना चाहिए परन्तु राष्ट्रीयकरण की आड़ में सरकारी तंत्र पनप रहा है।

हमने राजनीतिक क्षेत्र में विदेशी दासता से मुक्ति पाई है, इसमें कोई शक नहीं है। आर्थिक क्षेत्र में भी उनके प्रभुत्व और दबाव से हम मुक्त हो सके, इसके लिए भी सरकार को प्रभावकारी कदम उठाने चाहिये।

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY (Nizamabad): Mr. Chairman, I carefully listened to the speeches of Shri H. N. Mukerjee and Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, two senior Members of this House, and I agree with them in respect of nationalisation of these oil companies. We had an agreement with these oil companies in 1951-52 for 15 years and 25 years, and on expiry of the period of agreement, we have to nationalise them. The amount that they are sending by way of dividends to their countries is too much. I do not know how our Government is allowing 40 per cent dividends to be repatriated to their countries. After the introduction of the Company Law in our country, no company is allowed to pay more than 18 per cent dividend, and several companies have restricted declaration of dividend only to 12 per cent. I do not know why this Government has allowed 40 per cent dividends to be sent out.

Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad said that all Indians were either being removed from services or being forced to retire. I am going to dispute this. I have not got the knowledge about the whole of

[Shri M. Ram Gopal Reddy]

India, but, definitely, I have got the knowledge about my own State, namely, Andhra Pradesh. There, the Indian officers are being very well treated and are being extended all the respect and courtesy. I do not know from where he gathered this information. If he thinks that this information is correct, I request the Government to appoint a committee of inquiry so that it may go into all these aspects.

The learned Professor, while speaking about foreign oil companies, has brought 75 monopoly houses in the picture, and he has said that, within two or five years, the assets of Tatas and Birlas have gone up by Rs. 100 crores. Here I want to know whether this amount is invested in industries or kept in cash, whether labour is employed or not, whether labour is paid wages as per the Wage Board's recommendations or not, whether these companies are paying the excise duty or not, whether these companies are paying sales tax or not, whether these companies are paying income tax or not and whether they are paying the Provident Fund of the employees or not. If these companies are just following all the rules and regulations of the Government, I want to know, how are they making money? If they are making money, even after abiding by the rules and regulations of the country, we have to give all credit to them. We need have no objection when they are making money. But they are not just wasting their money in horse races or some other unproductive activities, but they are investing that money to create further employment potential.

Now, the learned professor wants that all these monopoly houses should be nationalised. I want to know—for what purpose? Can he manage these companies better than these people? Will the professor be able to make more profits and create more assets? I want to know? Will he pay more income tax and other taxes to the

Government. Our Indiraji's Government has, of course, embarked upon nationalisation of some industries, but it does not mean that we are going to nationalise everything. After-all, nationalisation is not going to bring any prosperity. Wherever any concern is not being properly managed and wherever there is loot, only such companies are definitely going to be nationalised and taken over by the Government and that we have done. But those companies which are being managed well and show good results and are employing people and are paying dividend, gratuity and bonus and everything, whatever Parliament passes—I do not know where is the reason of taking over such companies. If only on account of some spite, we are going to do something, that is not patriotism. The only patriotic thing is to increase the production of the country, to create more potential for employment and to pay good amounts to the Government's coffers—that should be the criterion and no telling day-in and day-out that we are going to nationalise this and that. Whether we can manage that well or not that we have to see. Our Government is committed to a mixed economy. In mixed economy, if you are going to do away all the private people, why not have State monopoly? Of course, that is the Communist philosophy and if he says that this is the policy of the Communist Party, then I can understand. But if he is going to thrust it on the Congress Government, we are not going to accept that.

If we want to see our country prosper, we should allow the private sector to grow and grow within limits and after paying every tax to the Government and giving every facility to the labour and providing the labour housing, medical, educational and other facilities. If any private concern is making money in spite of that we should not grudge it.

Moreover, all the money these seventy five monopoly houses have got, they are investing in further factories which the Government cannot

do. The Government cannot do everything and that is why it has been wisely decided that we should have a mixed economy. And in a mixed economy—of course, some people may say that being a Congressman, I am talking like that. Sir, neither have I been an industrialist nor am I a big monopolist. I am a small ryot having 30 acres of land and I am straight coming from the village to Parliament here. I see, Sir, it has become a fashion to go on asking day in and day out for nationalisation of everything. I do not know what these people are going to do.

That is why I express my disapproval of nationalisation of any business concern that is run on sound lines and for the benefit of the country and these foreign companies, when they go out, we have to bring them under an autonomous body and a corporation.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Ausgram): I would like to speak in Bengali which is now an international language.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is it an international language?

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER: Yes, surely. Sir, on behalf of my party, the CPI(M) I extend my full support to this resolution of Prof. Hiren Mukherjee for the nationalisation of the Foreign Oil Companies and the 75 Monopoly Houses. You are aware, Sir, that these Foreign Oil Companies have repatriated Rs. 1040 crores of rupees to their parent countries during the last 14 years. You also know, Sir, that every year these foreign companies are taking away about 24 times their capital investment to their own countries by way of profits through exploitation of our country. They are further eating away their capital assets by 3 per cent every

year. Sir, during the crisis of 1972 these companies blackmailed our country and deprived us of foreign exchange to the tune of 44 crores of rupees. Apart from that Sir, these foreign oil companies like Burmah Shell, ESSO etc. are also cheating the people of this country in the matter of cooking gas. The content of Gas in the cylinders is being gradually reduced. Moreover, Sir, these companies are now diverting their investment to other fields like the production of carpolish and spark plugs etc. I will further point out that these companies have not yet indianised their top executive posts. All the top and medium executive posts in these companies are still being manned by people from their own countries. Sir, all these things have been pointed by the mover of this resolution, viz. hon. Shri Hiren Mukherjee and other speakers like Shri S. M. Banerjee etc. Only Shri Ram Gopal Reddy has sung a different tune. We know Sir, that oil is an essential item in various fields of activity. We need diesel oil for running our trains. The goods trains are hauled by diesel engines. They have a vital role in the defence of the country. Therefore if we are dependent on these foreign companies for our requirements of petrol and petroleum products, we are greatly handicapped. They dictate their terms to us and always try to gain advantage at our cost. The foreign capitalist countries who supply us with crude oil, always try to impose their policies on us. This has been our bitter experience in the past. We are often blackmailed by them. Therefore it is quite imperative and we are duty bound to nationalise these foreign oil companies at the earliest. Now, Sir, I will speak about the 75 capitalist monopoly houses existing in our country. These monopoly houses should also be nationalised forthwith. The Government had been waxing eloquent about the 'Garibi Hatao' and about ushering in socialism etc. But Sir, we have witnessed the progress of several five year plans. The 4th Five Year Plan will come to an end in 1974 and

*The Original speech was delivered in Bengali.

[Shri Krishna Chandra Halder]

yet we see that 22 crores of people in our country live below the poverty line as admitted by the Government. I will rather say Sir, that they are on the starvation level. With the progress of our plans we find that crores of young and able bodied people of our country who are eager to work to bring prosperity to the country and to raise the national wealth are not getting any employment opportunities. They are compelled to waste away their life and energy. In the rural areas crores of people are not getting any employment in the farm and fields. It is a great misfortune that in our country where the population is like 55 crores, about 3½ crores young men are unemployed. What a shameful situation: Sir, only through adoption of this resolution, the Government can prove its honesty and sincerity about all the talk of 'Garibi Hatao' and socialism etc. which they had been shouting about all along. This resolution is a test whereby they can prove that they are not simply deceiving and bluffing the people but are serious about establishing socialism in this country. Hon. Member Shri Ram Gopal Reddy advocated in favour of the 75 monopoly houses and vested interests in the name of mixed economy. I will thank Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad of the ruling Congress party who boldly and strongly supported this resolution. Now the question is whether the Government sincerely wants progress in the country. The capitalist countries of the world today want to exploit our country through these monopolists and vested interests and they want to retard our progress then we try to bring about land reforms in our country, they conspire to thwart our efforts. Therefore, the Government's declared policies, where there is room for ample bunglings under the pretext of mixed economy, to protect and safeguard the interests of these monopolists and big business houses, should be radically changed. Unless this is done, you will not be

able to save the country from the evils like deficit financing, inflation and the frightening burden of heavy taxation. The hon. Member Shri Ram Gopal Reddy has asked that if we nationalise the monopoly houses then wherefrom will we get the revenue of income tax etc., and how will our industries grow? Sir, for his information I will tell him that—in 1963-64 the total assets of the 75 monopoly houses amounted to Rs. 2609.9 crores. That went up to Rs. 4032.4 crores in 1967-68 and in 1972-73 their total assets have touched the figure of Rs. 6200 crores. From this we can judge how they are exploiting the country. Every four years their assets are going up by 200 per cent. But Sir, their employment potentialities on the other hand, is going down by 7 per cent every year. Yet the Government has granted 286 new licences to these houses in 1969. In 1970 again, out of 47 licences that were granted by Government, 20 licences went to 20 monopoly houses. In 1971, out of 159 new licences granted, 114 went to these monopolists like Birlas and Tatas. Sir, under the provision of M.R.T.P. Act, if a business house applies for expansion worth 25 lakhs or more, it will come under the restrictions provided for in the Act. In order to circumvent the provisions of this Act they always apply for expansion just short of this amount and in this way corner all the industrial licences. I will therefore, sound a note of warning that if you really want the progress of the country, if you really want to combat the dreadful unemployment in the country, if you want to combat the sickening poverty in the country and if you want to follow an independent economic and foreign policy then you must nationalise these foreign oil companies and the 75 monopoly houses in the country. There is no choice before you. The colossal profits of these companies are being turned into black money and they are piling up in the banks in foreign countries. If you can repatriate all that—money and use it for the development of the country, only then the cherished pro-

gress is possible. Unless you do that, the image of Shrimati Indira Gandhi will be tarnished very soon, and you will not be able to prevent the explosive revolutionary situation in the country in the coming years. You cannot deceive the people any longer. The suffering, and exploited masses will not hesitate to rise in revolt and to shed their blood to snatch their rights and redeem themselves. A bloody revolution is around the corner. With this note of warning, Sir, I again, express my whole hearted support to this resolution.

SHRI RAJA KULKARNI (Bombay—North-East): Mr. Chairman, the Resolution moved by Prof. Mukerjee has two aspects. I wish he accepts the amendment of Shri Daga and separates the two issues, nationalisation of foreign oil companies and nationalisation of the undertakings belonging to the 75 monopoly houses, because this is necessary to focus attention on the burning and urgent issue where the whole country has made out a specific case, a case which has to be taken cognisance of in the context of the country's national oil policy. If all the members of the House unanimously join and tell Government that any delay and indecision on nationalising the foreign oil companies would be harmful to the national policy itself, it would have a decisive effect. If attention is focussed on this by separating the other issue from it, it would be more in the interest of the House. This is my suggestion. I would, therefore, confine my remarks to the question of the nationalisation of the foreign oil companies.

I have through the trade union movement, both at the nation level and at the international level during last 12 years, been in the know of the working of the international oil companies. I have seen their working both in this country and in other Asian countries, in the Middle East countries, in the Latin American countries

as well as at their international headquarters.

I would like to draw the attention of the Petroleum Ministry to the need to revise its opinion about the working of these oil companies in this country on the basis of the recommendations and conclusions of the Price Inquiry Committee which the Ministry itself had appointed during the sixties. Now the time has come when without nationalising these foreign oil companies, the task that the Petroleum Ministry has undertaken, of making the country self-reliant and self-sufficient in petroleum resources would be practically impossible. Since 1971, the Petroleum Ministry has been delaying on this issue, in not taking any decision. In this House, practically on a number of occasions during the last two years, this issue had come in the form of questions, short notice questions, and some discussions also have taken place. But though Government had always been saying that they were not against nationalisation, the reply of the Petroleum Ministry was evasive. The House was told on a number of occasions that Government has got three points under consideration. One is the revision of the refinery agreements, another is equity participation and the third is nationalisation. On every occasion when the question was asked for nationalising the oil companies, Government have been giving a vague reply on all these three points. Employees are disgusted with the oil companies because they followed an anti-labour policy. Reference was made by my predecessor, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, as to how, when he was the Labour Minister, the oil companies worked. They reduced the number of employees on the ground that they had no work. Enquiries were also held, but I am not here demanding nationalisation only on the ground of anti-labour facilities of oil companies.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH): Excuse my intervention; since there is a very large number of

[Sm. Raja Kulkarni]

speakers, may I suggest that the time be extended by two hours?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If that is the pleasure of the House, we can.

What is the pleasure of the House?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes. Extend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By how much?

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: Two hours.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Two hours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then, an extension of time by two hours is granted.

SHRI RAJA KULKARNI: Thank you.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: I want to be allowed to speak again because the time is extended.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Ausgram): I agree with Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad and I want to speak again.

DR. RANEN SEN: Some Members have not given their name; if they know that the time has been extended, they may also wish to participate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If they send their names they will be allowed to speak.

SHRI RAJA KULKARNI: I am supporting the demand for nationalisation of the Burmah-Shell, ESSO and CALTEX not merely on the ground that they have been following an anti-labour policy. My contention has been that their anti-labour policy is part of their anti-national policies, which they have been following during the last so many years. Their continued existence any longer, whether it is in the refineries or in the marketing, is harmful for the national growth for the growth of our economy.

The refinery agreements were entered into about 20 years ago, in 1951, 1952 or 1953, when we had not for-

mulated our national policy on oil. A lot of changes have taken place since the last refinery agreements. Today, the continued existence of these three refinery agreements is an affront to our national pride and our national economic policy. So, we cannot tolerate this national affront by continuing even for a day these refinery agreements. Therefore, we demand that these refinery agreements, even if possible, unilaterally, should be torn up and they should be disregarded completely. They should be set aside. I do not understand, why the Petroleum Ministry has not shown that courage to take such decisions. I do not know what risk they are thinking of in making such an announcement. Probably they think that there would be certain international repercussions. I am coming to that aspect at a later stage—about the so-called international repercussions.

The refinery agreements today are an affront to our national economic growth. Secondly the equity participation proposals which have been submitted by the Esso and the Burma-Shell are nothing short of a sales deal. I am sure they have something up their sleeves. The offer is 76 per cent in ESSO or 51 per cent in the case of Burma Shell. Why do they want a market deal? They know, they cannot exist otherwise. They want to continue to be in the interest of their international parent companies. This selling-out, of shares is also obsolete. The method of share-purchase is not in the interest of our national economy. I shall come to the details later on.

My contention is that the refinery agreements are completely out dated and they have to be set aside immediately. The only alternative that exists is nationalisation outright. But we should also consider difficulties. There is no reason why there should be delay. The Government should consider the changes that have taken place during the last 20 years at the international level as well as in our

own country in respect of the development of the petroleum industry.

As a Member of this House as well as a responsible trade union worker, I have analysed the refinery agreements and have made out a case for nationalisation of these oil companies which I call "phased-out nationalisation." I have submitted concrete proposals to the Petroleum Ministry on 31st August, 1972. The Petroleum Ministry wrote to me that the matter was being examined and it was also taken up for discussion in the Consultative Committee. But apart from discussion the Government has not taken up the issues seriously. In the meanwhile the international situation is slipping out of the control of our Government and the Government is not taking cognisance of that. The more delay, the more difficulties will be created in the way of Government taking drastic and firm decisions.

Government have sent one or two of their officers to take stock of the situation and see whether crude oil was available in the middle east or not. If a decision is to be taken, crude is to be made available at cheaper price. There should be uninterrupted flow of crude on a long term basis. It is not difficult to deal on government to government level on this issue in the Middle-East countries. I want the Government to accept immediately my proposition and declare in this House that the refinery agreements do not exist any longer. All the facilities which have been given to the oil companies for the international trade, protection and other things by way of concessions should be taken away immediately. Similarly legislation should be brought by the Government here immediately declaring its intention to nationalise the oil industry on a certain day, say, after five years in 1979-80. They should also declare that they stand nationalised on that day and till that time they can take over management of these companies. The Government

has got those powers. This intervening period that is four or five years is probably required to strengthen the hands of the Indian Oil Corporation and the Oil and Natural Gas Commission to plant themselves effectively in the international market both for international business in crude as well as in products. This time can also be utilised for negotiating with the oil companies the price of their assets here. Now they have repatriated a lot of funds and they are adopting the policy of disinvestment. In the light of our national policy that only an "amount" is payable and not compensation. In consideration of the profits and other monies they have repatriated Government should dictate the price to be paid to them. But the declaration of nationalisation should be by legislation.

There is no risk of international repercussions. During the last 20 years, 12 countries have nationalised the foreign oil companies and no political wars have taken place on this issue. So, there is not going to be any political tension between America and India on the issue of oil companies. There are other issues to fight about. It is an internationally accepted principle, that every national government has the sovereign right of ownership and management of its natural resources. No country can start a war on this issue. I would, therefore, request that the decision to nationalise foreign oil companies be taken immediately.

श्री भागीरथ शंकर (झाबुघा) : सभापति महोदय, प्रो० मुकर्जी ने जो प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत किया है मैं उसका समर्थन करना चाहता हूँ। आजादी के 25 साल बाद भी यदि विदेशी कम्पनियाँ हमारे देश से करोड़ों रुपये कमाकर विदेश भेजती रहें तो यह कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है। इन कम्पनियों के तत्काल राष्ट्रीयकरण किये जाने के पक्ष में भी मैं हूँ लेकिन एक बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, जैसा कि हमारे देही साहब ने भी कहा, 'राष्ट्रीयकरण की सभी

[श्री भागीरथ मंवर]

जगह भावाजें लगाई जाती हैं लेकिन राष्ट्रीयकरण के बाद उसकी व्यवस्थाएँ ठीक से नहीं हो पाती हैं। इसीलिए राष्ट्रीयकरण का जो नारा है वह बदनाम होता जा रहा है। मैं कहता हूँ राष्ट्रीयकरण तो होना ही चाहिए लेकिन साथ ही राष्ट्रीयकरण के बाद जो भी कम्पनियाँ हो, चाहे तेल कम्पनियाँ या कोई विदेशी कम्पनियाँ, मुनाफे की बात भी सामने आती है। करोड़ों और अरबों रुपयाँ मुनाफे के रूप में दिया जाता है, यह बात भी अच्छी नहीं है। इसीलिए मैं चाहता हूँ जिन कम्पनियों ने इस देश में करोड़ों रुपयाँ कमाया और अपने देश भेजा, उन्होंने मुनाफे के रूप में काफी पैसा ले लिया, अब यदि उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाये तो मुनाफे देने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहूँगा। हम राष्ट्रीयकरण के लिये साधन जुटाना चाहते हैं लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ शायद राष्ट्रीयकरण के लिये इस प्रकार की भावनाएँ अभी तक पैदा नहीं हुई हैं। कई राष्ट्रीयकरण हमने देखे हैं, यहाँ केन्द्र में और प्रदेशों में भी हुए हैं लेकिन किसी भी चीज का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने के बाद राष्ट्रीय रूप में उसके ऊपर न जनता सोचती है और न हमारी शासकीय मशीनरी सोचती है। इसलिए इस तरह की भावना पैदा की जानी चाहिए और जो प्रस्ताव यहाँ पर प्रस्तुत हुआ है उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ।

श्री मूलचन्द डागा (पाली): सभापति जी, यहाँ पर दो नारे बहुत चलते हैं—एक तो गरीबी हटाओ और दूसरे राष्ट्रीयकरण करो। दोनों नारों का ही जोर है। एक तरफ जो प्रगतिशील लोग हैं वे एक बात कहेंगे कि हर एक चीज को नेशनलाइज करो। आज यहाँ पर जनसंघ के एक अच्छे वक्ता ने एक बात कही कि राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाये तो मैं ने उनसे प्रश्न किया कि आपकी पार्टी की नीति क्या है? उन्होंने कहा मैंने सोचा

कि चलती हवा में मैं भी यह बात कह दूँ। कांग्रेस पार्टी की जो नीति है उसके खिलाफ भी हम लोग कहते हैं। कोई भी पालिसी सरकार की होती है उसके पीछे भावना यह होती है कि लोगों की गरीबी मिटे लेकिन राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दो तो गरीबी हट जायेगी, अगर गरीबी हटाने का यही इलाज है तो यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आई। समाजवाद लाने का तरीका यह नहीं है कि हर चीज का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दिया जाये। हमारी एक नीति होनी चाहिए। (व्यवधान वेस्ट बंगाल में आपने वह काम किया कि) सारी इन्डस्ट्रीज बन्द कर दो। जब वहाँ पर आप लोगों की गवर्नमेंट थी तो लाखों मजदूर बेकार हो गए थे और उत्पादन घट गया था। (व्यवधान)

तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि हर एक चीज का इलाज राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं है। आज सवाल है कि जो विकसित देश हैं उनकी क्या नीति होनी चाहिए। जो अविकसित देश हैं, जो विकसित होना चाहते हैं उन देशों में आगे बढ़ने के लिए उद्योग—धंधे खुलने चाहिए। आज आप कदम उठा रहे हैं। आपने जीवन बीमा का नेशनलाइजेशन किया और आज आपने एक बिल पास किया कि कोल माइन्स का नेशनलाइजेशन किया जाये। आप बड़े तेज कदमों से चलना चाहते हैं लेकिन साथ ही साथ वह कदम मजबूत और टिकाऊ भी होने चाहिए। आप कदम आगे रखिये और मजबूती से उनको आगे बढ़ने दीजिये। आज हम 75 मोनोपली हाउसेज को खत्म करना चाहते हैं। हमने कदम बढ़ा दिये हैं। हम समझते हैं उनके पास अगर सम्पत्ति फैल जाती है, वैभव फैल जाता है तो वह बिखरता है और उससे फिजूलखर्ची और दिखावा होता है। उस दौलत से नुकसान पहुंचता है। लेकिन हमारे पास उसको रोकने के लिए कई साधन हैं—इनकम टैक्स है, सुपर टैक्स है और वेल्थ टैक्स है। आज प्रस्ताव आया है कि हमें विदेशी कम्पनियों का राष्ट्रीयकरण

करना चाहिए। मैं कहूँगा कि इस बारे में हमारी कोई निश्चित नीति होनी चाहिए। हमें विदेशी तेल कम्पनियों के रिकार्ड को भी देखना होगा। एक डिमकशन हो रही थी हमारे लोगों के बारे में जिन्होंने अफ्रीका में जाकर इंडस्ट्रीज लगाई है या लगा रहे हैं। उन पर इसका क्या असर होगा इसको भी हमें देखना होगा। हमें तकनीक ज्ञान की भी जरूरत है इसका भी हमें ध्यान रखना होगा। हमें यह भी सोचना है कि हमने इन कम्पनियों को बुलाया था। क्या हम इसको भूल सकते हैं? जब किसी कम्पनी को हम बुलाते हैं तो उस वक्त कुछ कॉन्ट्रैक्ट होता है और वादे किये जाते हैं। उन वादों से क्या अब हम फिर जाएँ? कोई एग््रीमेंट 1977 में खत्म हो जाएगा और कोई उसके बाद। हम लोगों को निर्णय करना होगा कि क्या हम विदेशी तेल कम्पनियों को हिन्दुस्तान में बिल्कुल नहीं चाहते हैं। हमने फोरन एक्सचेंज रेग्यूलेशन बिल बनाया है। हम लोग इस तरह का कानून बनाए कि हमारा पैसा यहीं रहे, हम लोगों को ज्यादा पैसा बाहर भेजने न दें। वह बिल भी है। हम एक दम से प्रस्ताव ले आते हैं कि जितनी विदेशी तेल कम्पनियाँ है उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिए। आखिर अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में हमारा स्थान क्या है उसका भी हमें ध्यान रखना होगा। हम लोग दूसरों से, विदेशों से नालेज लेना भी चाहते हैं या नहीं चाहते हैं। अगर चाहते हैं कि हमारा वर्ल्ड कम्प्युनिटी में स्थान बना रहे तो ऐसा क्यों कहा जाता है कि 'जहाँ तक बड़ सकने हैं हमको बढ़ना चाहिये'।

17 hrs.

अभी हमने 46 सिक टैक्सटाइल मिलज का नेशनलाइजेशन किया। अभी तक उनका काम ठीक ढंग से नहीं चल रहा था। करोड़ों रुपयों वाली सिक मिलज हमने अपने हाथ में ली है और लेने के बाद वहाँ काम शुरू किया है। लेकिन उन में उत्पादन अभी ठीक भागे

नहीं बढ़ रहा है। कभी कभी मैं सोचता हूँ कि 75 हाउसिस के पीछे कितनी इंडस्ट्रीज हैं। उनमें मजदूरों की संख्या भी लाखों में जुटे हम अपने आर्थिक उत्पादन के कामों भाग हुए हैं। हमने सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न दिया था। सोसाइटी स्थापित करने का नारा दिया था। उसको हम भूल गए। अब हम समाजवाद लाना चाहते हैं। पार्लियामेंट में आ कर हम कहते हैं कि हर बीमारी का राष्ट्रीयकरण ही एक मात्र इलाज है। हर चीज को चाहते हैं कि स्टेट सम्भाल ले। लेकिन जो इंसेंटिव है तब वह कहाँ रहेगा। जो हमारी पालिसी है उस में हम यह नहीं कहते हैं कि प्राइवेट इंडस्ट्रीज का विकास न हो। हम एलान करते हैं कि उद्योगपति अपने उद्योगों को भागे बढ़ावें उनका विकास करें, देश में एम्प्लायमेंट पैदा करें। लेकिन दूसरी तरफ अगर हम उनके सिर पर तलवार लटकावें रखें तो क्या यह उचित है। चन्द रोज पहले आपने प्लेटफार्म से एक बात कही थी जोर से कि पूंजीपतियों तथा उद्योगपतियों तुम को अपने देश के विकास के लिए छुट दी जाती है कि तुम अपने व्यापार को बढ़ाओ, उद्योग को बढ़ाओ। आज हम कहते हैं कि हम तुम्हारा राष्ट्रीयकरण करते हैं। हम प्रस्ताव ला सकते हैं कि हर चीज का राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिए, वकीलों का भी होना चाहिए कि हमारी चिन्ता मिट जाए। कभी कभी जब मैं उनको सुनता हूँ तो समझता हूँ कि उनको देश के प्रति बड़ा लगाव है, प्यार है लेकिन फिर कभी कभी सोचता हूँ तो पता चलता है कि उनकी जबान तो यहाँ है लेकिन मन कहीं दूसरी जगह है। उनकी तो इच्छा है कि काम भागे न बड़े, जमने न पाए, नेहरूजी तथा कांग्रेस की नीति जो है वह न चले लेकिन वह चलेगी। मैसिव मैजोरिटी हमारी प्राई है। हमारे कदम धीरे धीरे लेकिन मजबूती से उठने चाहिए। एक काम पूरा हो जाए उसके बाद दूसरा काम हम करें। आप आकाश को सीधे ही छूना चाहते हैं। एक दम कूदने की आप कोशिश न करें। गिर जायेंगे। देश की आर्थिक हालत आप भ्रष्टी करें। ५.५५

(श्री मूलचन्द डागा)

आप में क्षमता आ गई है या सोम्यता आपकी बढ़ गई है कि 75 बिजिनेस हाउसिस को आप चला सकें अपने हाथ में ले कर। आपने जो नाम कमाया है उस में मैं जाना नहीं चाहता हूँ। हर आदमी को भारत सरकार की नीति प्रति वफादार बनना होगा, उसके अनुसार चलना होगा। लोगों को उकसाने वाली बात नहीं बल्कि एक ही रबर में हमको चाहिए कि हम उस नीति पर चलने के लिए सब को कहें। हमें वह कदम उठाना चाहिए जिससे शोषण खत्म हो, गरीब ऊपर उठे, एम्प्लायमेंट लोगों को मिले। कितने ही करोड़ लोग आज पावर्टी लाइन से नीचे हैं। राष्ट्रीयकरण का नारा कोई रामबाण उसका इलाज नहीं है।

*DR. RANEN SEN (Barasat): I would like to say a few words on the resolution that has been introduced by Prof. Hiren Mukerjee in this House. Firstly, I felt astonished and ashamed when I heard my friend Shri Daga a little while ago because both of us belong to the very House. From his speech it appeared that if the big monopoly houses were not allowed to function and if their industries were nationalised then the Government's earnings will dwindle and people will not get any employment. He has also said that Government is already finding it difficult to manage the public sector undertakings and now if we also take over the industries and business owned by the 75 monopoly houses then we are sure to be doomed. I had never expected that a member of the political party which profess to introduce socialism in this country can possibly put forward such an argument. I will however hope that other members of the Congress party will put up at least a mild protest against the because in this very House on many occasions many Congress members have said that the root cause of inflation, price rise, and formation of Black money in this country is the control that

the monopoly houses have over the main sources of production. The demand for nationalisation of the sugar industry is now being voiced by many members of the Congress party but I have been voicing this demand since 1962 when I come to this House first. It is not a question whether we must nationalise the industries owned by the 75 monopoly houses now but the real question before us is whether or not we should move in that direction. If we are not to move in that direction then why have you approved the Bill today which Shri Kumaramangalam had introduced in this House for the nationalisation of non-cooking coal mines and viewing thing in this background I feel that, Shri Daga's arguments have no logic. If we are to create national wealth, if we are to check formation of black money, and if we are to contain inflation in the country, then there is no other option than to have a complete control over the business, property and industries of the 75 monopoly houses. It is all the more essential because these industrialists always try to exert their influence on the Government and other political parties. They are also controlling the big newspapers like the Hindustan Times, the Times of India, the Ananda Bazar Patrika and the Amrita Bazar Patrika and through these newspapers they try to influence the public opinion in favour of capitalist economy. Therefore for the creation of better political and economic atmosphere in the country it is necessary to nationalise the industries of the 75 houses as early as possible and the Ministers must give an assurance to the House in this regard.

Secondly, I would like to say something about foreign oil companies. I would not dilate on the subject how these foreign oil companies have been exploiting our country for a long time because much has been spoken by many members of this house on this aspect of this matter. I would like to say that we have seen how these foreign oil companies always try to interfere in the internal and foreign

*The original speech was delivered in Bengali.

policies of the country where they are located. We have seen this happening in Iran, in the Arab countries and it is still going in Chile and in fact the story is the same all over the world. The Government of Chile has nationalised the copper mines owned by the Americans and as a result of this there was a severe counter reaction against that Government from newspapers, we have learnt that the American telephone company in Chile and the oil interests in Chile in connivance with the CIA tried to overthrow the local Government. It has also been proved time and again that these foreign oil companies owned by the American, the British and the Dutch Government have never been friendly to us and therefore not only for economic reasons but also from the political and foreign policy points of view the freedom with which foreign companies are operating in India will have to be curbed and they should be nationalised. A question may however be raised as to whether such an action will in any way affect our plans for prospecting the oil resources of our country. Many of my friends who spoke earlier to me have already made it clear that if the Government have the will and the intention then there are enough resources to ensure that our plans to exploit petroleum resources are not hampered and if necessary, I can say that there will be no dearth of help from friendly foreign countries. These foreign countries are already helping us and if necessary they will also help us in future also and as such we should not suffer from a feeling of helplessness and we should not bank on the help and assistance from the capitalist nations.

Mr. Chairman Sir, all these foreign oil companies during the last 14 years have exploited this country and repatriated Rs. 1040 crores as profits to their own countries. The enormity of the problem can be well realised that during the First Five Year Plan we could make an investment of Rs. 2300 crores for the development of our

country and these foreign oil companies during the last 14 years have repatriated 50 per cent of this amount to their countries by way of profit only. I would like to reiterate that from all points of view it is imperative to nationalise these foreign oil companies and the Government should have no hesitation in this matter. Shri Dev Kanta Borooah has recently taken over the charge of the Ministry and I will hope that he will show courage to deal with this problem and will tell this House as to what the Government proposes to do in this matter. With these words and thanking you Sir, I conclude my speech.

SHRI Y. S. MAHAJAN (Buldana): Mr. Chairman, Sir I quite understand the spirit of the Resolution brought forward by Professor Hiren Mukerjee. It is in keeping with the philosophy of the party to which he belongs. Sir, the Resolution is, like the proverbial curate's egg, good in parts. I wish he had not combined two disparate things in the Resolution. Nationalisation of foreign oil companies and nationalisation of 73 big business houses in the country are two different things. They are not on the same level. And, as far as the first part is concerned, I agree, along with my friends on this side, that it is time we took steps to take over these foreign oil companies.

In 1952-53, when we entered into agreement with them we were in a difficult position. There was production of petroleum only in one well in Assam, at that time. But since then we have developed the Indian Oil Corporation and gradually we have built up a very strong position in the oil field, we can now control 50 per cent of the oil resources. From the latest reactions, it appears, these foreign oil companies have come down a little, they are a little humbled. That is why they have offered 75 per cent equity participation or some other alternatives. They had a monopoly position for many years and they have taken full advantage of that position.

[Y. S. Mahajan.]

Now, my argument is that. Power is the basis of modern industrial life. What water is to agriculture, oil is to industry. We should not rely for the supply of this commodity on foreign oil companies. This is my point. Besides, it is a commodity of strategic importance in war-time. Mr. Hiren Mukerjee has no faith while I have full faith in our Government. I am sure our Government will do the right thing at the right time. Government is seized of this problem. We have placed our points of view quite often in this House and I am sure the Government will respond to our views about it.

About the second part of the Resolution, I wish to say that he had brought this last year also. Sir, we have an industrial policy. We have a large armoury of weapons at our command, to control the industrial enterprises in this country. If you want to start a big industry, you have to start with a letter of intent which is then converted into a licence. You have to come to us for the issue of capital and then for the import licence. Then, again, you have got the Industrial Development and Regulation Act under which if an industry is not run in the interest of the country it can be taken over. We have taken over 146 sick textile mills under this Act.

As for nationalisation, I can assure Prof. Hiren Mukerjee that we, on this side, are committed to Socialism but 'Socialism' cannot be equated with 100 per cent nationalisation. We are prepared to nationalise any industry with open eyes i.e., only when we are sure that it is not run properly, and in the interest of the country and there is concentration of economic power; only when that it is not in the interest of the community to allow it to continue in private hands. These are the principles which are enshrined in our Constitution and these are the principles which are embodied in the MRTP Act. So, we have got a number of weapons in our armoury, to control industry. But, if we are certain that

an industry is run against the interest of the country, we would surely nationalise it. I accept the first part of the Resolution of Prof. Hiren Mukerjee but I cannot accept the second. Sir, after 2 or 3 years of industrial depression production has just come up to 7.1 per cent last year and if we talk of nationalisation now, that is, if we hold the sword of Democles on the heads of industries, it will again cripple industrial production. I do agree with him about the need for social reconstruction of our society. The trouble is, we have faith in our Government, while he has not. With these words Sir, I conclude.

श्री सतपाल कपूर (पटियाला):

सभापति महोदय, मैं प्रोफेसर हीरेन्द्र नाथ मुखर्जी को इस बात के लिए मुबारकबाद देता हूँ कि वह इस हाउस में प्राइवेट मेम्बर के तौर पर एक बहुत अच्छा रेजोल्यूशन लाए। हमारे जो कुछ साथी बोले नेशनलाइजेशन के बारे में और टाइम्स मार्क करने के बारे में उन के ख्याल से मैं इत्फाक नहीं करता। मुझे वह जमाना याद है कि जब 1952 और 53 में इस मुल्क में कंट्रोसवर्सी चली थी कि आया हम तेल के मामले में अपने पैरों पर खड़े हों या तेल के मामले में हम किसी के सहारे रहें, हम खुद अपना तेल निकालें या अपना तेल बाहर से मंगाने का इंतजाम जारी रखें। वह जमान था जब हमारे मोरारजी भाई यहां फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर थे श्री सी० सी० दैसाई फाइनेंस सेक्रेटरी थे और तेल का महकमा श्री के० डी० मालवीय के पास था, मिस्टर खेहरा उस मुहकमा के सेक्रेटरी थे। सवाल था कि हम तेल के मामले में खुद अपने पावों पर खड़े हों या न खड़े हों। उस वक्त पं० के० डी० मालवीय के कहने पर श्री एन० जी० सी० और सारे तेल के काम को अपने तौर पर करने का, रिसर्च करने का और सारा काम अपने तौर पर करने का फैसला किया गया और आने वाले जमाने में हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास में आप के डी० मालवीय का नाम जब देखेंगे तो सुनहरे अक्षरों में उन का नाम आया कि उन्होंने तेल के मामले में हिन्दुस्तान

को अपने पांवों पर खड़े करने की हिम्मत की ।
• आज जब हम बात करते हैं बर्मा शेल, काल-
टेक्स और एस्सो की तो कितना प्राफिट इन्होंने
कमाया है, कितना रुपया इन्होंने लगाया था और
उसके मुकाबिले में कितना प्राफिट आज वह
• काम चुके हैं ! अगर हम इन को इसी तरह
कान्टीन्यू करें तो हम अपने मुल्क को कब तक
भुटाते रहेंगे ? यह सवाल जो है कि पालियामेंट
को यह भ्रष्टियार है या नहीं, तो दुनिया के
• कई देशों में पालियामेंट नहीं है, वहां की गवर्न-
मेंट ने तेल को नेशनलाइज किया, नहर स्वेज को
• नेशनलाइज किया । मिडिल ईस्ट में कहां ये
मामले नहीं उठे और उस में कम्पेंसेशन देने
का क्या सवाल पैदा होता है ? मेरे पास पूरे
घांके नहीं हैं । हमारे पेट्रोलियम मिनिस्टर
भी डी के बरभा साहब इस को देखेंगे । जितना
रुपया बर्मा शेल, कालटेक्स और एस्सो ने
लगाया था उस का कम से कम पन्द्रह बीस
• गुना हम कमा चुके हैं । तो इस पालियामेंट में
अगर कोई कल ऐप्रीमेंट रिन्यू करने की
बात करे तो पालियामेंट वह ऐप्रीमेंट रिन्यू
नहीं करेगी । आज इस मुल्क का माहोल,
जानत का मूड और पालियामेंट के मेम्बरों
का मूड यह है कि ऐप्रीमेंट कोई रिन्यू करने
वाला नहीं है । आप कम्पेंसेशन देना चाहते हैं
उस के लिए भी हम तैयार नहीं हैं । आप को
बगैर किसी कम्पेंसेशन के इन फारेन धायल
कम्पनियों को फोरी तौर पर नेशनलाइज करना
चाहिए, यह हमारी राय है । क्रूड धायल
के मामले में हम ने भरब मुमालिक से बारगेन
करने की कोशिश की है । हमें धमकाया जाता
है, "ग्रंडर प्रेशर किया जाता है कि दुनिया के
जो बड़े मुल्क हैं जिन की मोनोपली है तेल की
वह हमसे नाराज होंगे । तो वह हम से
खुश कब है और जिन मुल्कों ने तेल का नेशन
लाइज किया उनसे खुश कब है ? अगर उन
को भपीज करना है तो फिर यह मुल्क अपने
पैरों पर खड़ा नहीं हो सकता है । या तो आप
इस मुल्क की जनता को खुश कर सकते हैं
या अमेरिका के बड़े बड़े सरमायेदारों को खुश
कर सकते हैं । दोनों को आप एक सांस में खुश

नहीं कर सकते । यह तो आप को बगैर
डर के फैसला करना चाहिए ।

जहां तक क्रूड धायल का ताल्लुक है आज
मिडिल ईस्ट के ऐसे मुल्क हैं जिन से आप सीधा
ऐप्रीमेंट कर सकते हैं । आज की वह हालत
नहीं है जो आज से 25 साल पहले की थी ।
हिन्दुस्तान ही नया मुल्क नहीं बढ़ा है सारा
मिडिल ईस्ट नया बढ़ रहा है । वहां के लोगों
से आप बात कर सकते हैं और बाइलेटरल
ऐप्रीमेंट करके उनसे ट्रेड कर सकते हैं । उनका
क्रूड धायल लेसकते हैं और अपनी चीजें
वहां एक्सपोर्ट कर सकते हैं । आप ने स्टेट
ट्रेडिंग कारपोरेशन जैसे बनाया है वैसा ही
एक कारपोरेशन इसके लिए बनाने की जरूरत
है और इस तरह से वहां पर आप काफी कुछ
कर सकते हैं । क्रूड धायल की कोई प्राबलम
नहीं है । कीमत की कुछ बात हो सकती है ।

इस रेजोल्यूशन के दूसरे हिस्से को भी मैं
सपोर्ट करता हूं । हमारे भाइयों ने ही जो हमारी
पार्टी से ही ताल्लुक रखते हैं, कहा कि सरमाये-
दार पैदावार बढ़ाता है, एम्प्लायमेंट देता है ।
मैं उस कांसेप्ट से बिल्कुल ईत्फाक नहीं करता
सरमायेदार पैदावार नहीं बढ़ाता । सर-
मायेदार पैदावार इसलिए करता है कि उससे
उस को मुनाफा हो । कैपिटलिस्ट वह चीज
पैदा करता है जिस से ज्यादा से ज्यादा
मुनाफा हो । कैपिटलिस्ट वह चीज नहीं पैदा
करता है जिससे जनता की जरूरत पूरी हो ।
कैपिटलिस्ट वह चीज पैदा करता है जिस
से उस की जब ज्यादा से ज्यादा भरे ।
कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि हम समाजवाद बनाना
चाहते हैं, हम सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न बनाना चाहते
हैं । कांग्रेस से पैटर्न उड़ चुका है । अब सोशलि-
स्ट समाज की बात है । आप उस समाज की
तरफ बढ़ना भी चाहते हैं और डरते भी हैं ।
नेशनलाइजेशन से भी डरते हैं । क्या कोई
सोशलिस्ट समाज ऐसा होना जिसमें सर-
मायेदार भी हो ? कोई सोशलिस्ट समाज ऐसा
हो सकता है जिस में बिरला और टाटा हों

[श्री शतपाल कपूर]

या तो वह कैपिटलिस्ट एकोनामी होगी या सोशलिस्ट एकोनामी होगी ? इसलिए इस तरह से आप अपने पांवों में कमजोरी खुद पैदा करते हैं। अभी हमने पिछले दिनों क्या देखा ? हिन्दुस्तान की इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोग्रेस तो 7 प्रतिशत बढ़ी और प्राइवेट बड़े बड़े सरमायेदारों का 13 परसेंट दरम्यान बढ़ा। तो इस को आप कैसे कैचअप कर पायेंगे ? सारी एकोनामी को ठीक करने का एक ही तरीका है कि मुल्क में सोशलिस्ट एकोनामी हो तमाम बड़े बड़े जो इस के बिग मोनोपली हाउससेज हैं इन के जितने कारखाने हैं उन सब को टेक ओवर करना चाहिये, मेरो अपना राय तो यह है।

DR. HENRY AUSTIN (Ernakulam): Mr. Chairman, originally I did not really want to participate in this debate, but since I had spent over nearly a decade in the service of oil workers as General Secretary of the Petroleum Workers' Union, I thought of listening to the discussion here. The very enlightening discussion inspired me to add a little from my experience in this field to this discussion.

At one time, it was felt that if we nationalised or if we involved ourselves too much in this oil industry, the whole country would sink under the sea. That was the view held by even some prominent leaders. When those who have studied the problems of the oil industry in depth like Shri K. D. Malaviya pointed out the tremendous possibilities of taking this industry over and providing it an indigenous base, that was discouraged.

But today exports have come forward with promises. Recently a seismic survey was carried out by the ONGC which revealed that in several places in the Arabian sea and in the Bay of Bengal and other places, there are "favourable structures" which make everyone concerned about the economic development of our country happy and hopeful.

One of the Ministers in the Petroleum Ministry—I think it was the Deputy Minister—came forward with a statement in the Rajya Sabha that there is tremendous scope for offshore oil drilling in our country.

Prof. Mukerjee had also placed before the House reports of competent persons including the report of Prof. Kalinin of the Soviet Union, on the tremendous possibilities of oil prospecting in our country. I thought I should also participate in this debate because of the fact that since we have, for the next 25 years, agreements with the oil refineries and foreign companies this give a false sense of security in the matter of oil and that makes our own people not to step into the field making ourselves self-reliant. Just to take the people out of this false sense of security, I thought I should say something in the matter.

As far as the Arabian Sea is concerned, particularly Kerala is concerned, some people who have studied the problem in depth have given me some documents, which show that there is tremendous scope for off-shore drilling in the Arabian Sea particularly on the Kerala coast. I have handed over all those papers to Mr. Gokhale, the then Minister for Petroleum and he has assured on the floor of the House that some steps would be taken. When such possibilities are there, why is it that—I ask—we should still cling on to the foreign companies who, as my friends have already pointed out, have earned as much as Rs. 1,048 crores within a 14-year period ending 1970-71.

The Economic Times had pointed out that as against an investment of about Rs. 62 crores, these three companies have earned a net profit of Rs. 1,048 crores till 1971. I know, through my connection with the trade unions of the oil industry how the foreign oil companies—Burmah-Shell ESSO or CALTEX behave towards their labour; how bloodsucking the agreements they enter into with their

workmen. Even to give one penny or five paise more of increment to the various categories of workers they were unwilling, and these workers destroyed themselves losing their health contracting lung diseases and the statistics in this regard are well known. Sir, Raja Kulkarni will be able to say more on this. In spite of this continuous exploitation, the managements of these foreign oil companies have been so arrogant and so bloodsucking, and as against this situation of exploitation, we find this figure of over Rs. 1,048 crores being knocked away.

May that even if the whole country sinks under the sea, it does not matter because thanks to our own talents in oil Technology, now available we can get out from the sea unhurt, but self-sufficient and wealthy in this field. It only requires self-assurance and determination.

More than the economic aspect of this matter, there is another aspect which is important. This oil industry is vitally linked with our own security. We have, seen, since our Independence, how many times this country has been attacked. At least three attacks were made by Pakistan, and China had attacked us. Now America is again trying to sell armaments to Pakistan. This problem has also to be viewed in the context of the friendship that is being developed between China and America. One of the vital needs of security is to see that we are self-sufficient in this matter of oil. Therefore, our security cannot be tied to these three companies which are part and parcel of international cartels which in turn act in collaboration and in tune with international imperialists. Therefore, it is important that in order that our security is not affected or our to keep it on a firm footing, we have to plunge into this field making ourselves self-sufficient. It is not, Mr. Daga thinks, to exhibit our progressivism that we make this point, but we have a very vital concern in this and we want to see that our security is no longer tied

up with these foreign cartels.

I had occasion to exchange views with people who work in the oil industry, people who are experts and who are technologists and who have given some time to the study of the problems of oil industry. They tell us that we in India have already developed sufficient infra-structures and acquired the necessary know-how to take final steps towards self-sufficiency. A number of experts in oil science and technology have come up now and it is time that we encouraged them. We started doing something on our own when our first refinery at Gauhati was commissioned on 1st January, 1962.

In a short span of time that is, in about a decade, we have been able to invest about Rs. 300 crores in refineries alone, as against Rs. 62 crores of the foreign companies over so many years. Out of this small investment, they had made tons of money and repatriated it against our own policy, and this they have done by way of profit alone. In our national interest, we should not allow these companies to continue to exploit the Indian people and our exchequer.

During the Bangladesh crisis those of us who have observed the activities of the oil companies may remember that when our Government put some pressure on these companies to produce or refine more oil they put all kinds of obstacles. This behaviour of theirs has to be borne in mind by those who have a soft corner for them.

There are only three alternatives to increase the equity shares, or revision of the agreement or abrogation of the agreements for outright nationalisation. I think in the context of what I have highlighted the only alternative is to take it over. One need not worry to much about the international implications. In recent years, even small countries like Cuba and Chile, countries right under the nose of the United States of America have nationalised their oil industry in their national interest. Why not we a big sub continent, who had challenged the

[Dr. Henry Austin],
Seventh Meet, do this? I hope Shri Borooah with his political and other experience who is also an expert in oil..... (Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (SHRI D. K. BOROOAH): I am not an expert. I know only what I do not know and what others also do not know.

DR. HENRY AUSTIN: Any way he would certainly bestow some thought on this matter. It is not just for nationalisation that we want to do it. But because this problem is linked with our economic and national security as well. I therefore congratulate Prof. Mukherjee who has brought this resolution for discussion. I fully support his views.

SHRI SATISH CHANDRA (Bareilly): I have great respect for the mover of the resolution. I have known him for the last 21 years as a man of wisdom, maturity and intellectual attainments and therefore anything that comes from him deserves fullest consideration. I do not, however, understand as to why he thought it proper to mix up the specific issue of nationalisation of oil companies with that of 75 monopoly houses as it is difficult to define them in this context. They do not have any legal entity and exist only as a concept under the monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act. No particular industry is owned solely by a monopoly house. They control a variety of industries. Take for instance the Tata's which is a monopoly house. They control a Steel company and also manufacture Bar soaps and cosmetics. There are numerous companies under monopoly house. One is the subsidiary of the other with further ramifications. Each company is a definite legal entity and has to be dealt with separately when we consider the question of nationalisation. (Interruptions) I understand the suggestion that we nationalise the oil industry, as the resolution is specific in that respect. We can think in terms of oil industry, steel industry, locomotive

industry, soap industry etc. But having been a student of company law, I do not understand, what does the nationalisation of monopoly houses exactly mean because a monopoly house is not a definite entity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The wording of the motion is "other vital industries under the control of the 75 monopoly houses. Of course, "vital industries" have not been defined.

SHRI SATISH CHANDRA: Sir, my view, your view and the movers views may be different.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So long as I am sitting here, I hold no view. I only drew your attention to the wording of the motion.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: In this country, prices of vital necessities of the common man have gone up. There are about a dozen such goods and soap is one of them. These industries should be under the States.

SHRI SATISH CHANDRA: After all, we have accepted certain policies which have developed gradually during the pre-independence period and during 25 years of our independence. We are not working in a vacuum and going by slogans. A certain industrial policy has developed in this country over a long period and we have to proceed accordingly.

Oil is a most vital industry from the point of defence, industrial progress, transport etc. It has a special place in national economy and when we discuss the question of nationalisation of the oil industry, it is a clear concept and we can certainly think about it. Shri Satpal Kapoor referred to developments in the field of oil industry. From 1952 to 1957, the petroleum industry was in fact, under the then Ministry of Production and separate Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals did not exist. When I moved into the Ministry of Production from the Minis-

try of Defence as early as 1955, this subject was being handled by that Ministry. But agreements with foreign oil companies had been signed even earlier. Shri N. R. Pallai, the then Cabinet Secretary had conducted negotiations with the foreign oil companies. Those agreements were arrived at after a great deal of thought. The country had, however, no officer or Minister with any experience of oil industry at that time. That industry had been a close preserve of some very powerful monopolistic cartels abroad in America, England, Netherlands, etc. Therefore, certain mistakes crept in. The vital mistake was that these oil companies were allowed to import crude from their own sources at the so-called prevailing world prices. Probably, the exact word used was Gulf prices. While we thought that the gulf would be the Persian Gulf, it was later interpreted to be the Gulf of Mexico. The biggest mistake that we committed in signing the original agreement was to agree to the Gulf Prices. The oil companies, being monopolistic concerns and huge multinational corporation manipulated Gulf prices as they liked and made fabulous profits.

Another important feature of each agreement was that the oil companies will not be taken over or nationalised during 25 years after commencement of production. This period came into effect from the date of commencement of refining operations i.e., is, about the middle of 50s or late 50s. Many years have now passed and in another six or seven years the stipulated period would be over. If we nationalise the oil companies when that period is over, it could be done within the terms of agreement. If we do it today, it will probably be going back upon the solemn agreements which the Government of India had entered into. If it is absolutely necessary in national interest to do it even today, we could do it. I am not saying that we cannot do it. But it is a matter for consideration by this House and the Government whether such a step has to be

taken today or can be postponed for six or seven years, that is, upto 1979 or 1980. If we regulate the commercial operations of these companies according to our needs and requirements, and take the sting out, then, probably, we can tolerate them for another few years, as we have done for the last so many years. That will not be a wrong approach as nobody will be able to accuse us of going back on our words.

I am not against nationalisation of the oil industry as such. I repeat this because some of my friends taunted me when I started my observations. I claim that I am as good a socialist as they are, if not a better one. I have learnt some lessons on socialism from my childhood days, and I happen to be a bit older than them.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: Are you in favour of, or against, nationalisation?

SHRI SATISH CHANDRA: I am for nationalisation, but we can wait for six years, taking an overall view.

Let us not forget that when the Government negotiated these settlements, India did not have any refinery except a very small unit in Assam at Digboi. Petrol and Petroleum products were being imported from abroad, resulting in a big drain on our meagre foreign exchange resources. We had not discovered any oil except for a few wells in Assam. Crude had to be imported from other countries, even if we established our own refineries. We do not have the technical know-how. Therefore, these agreements were entered into out of dire necessity and the foreign companies were invited to set up their refineries in India. Gradually, during the last several years, and, here I join in the tributes paid to Shri K. D. Malaviya, under whose stewardship, after 1957, serious efforts were made to discover sources of oil within the country. Today, 60 per cent of the refinery capacity in India is controlled by the State and, in the Fifth Plan, it

[Shri Satish Chandra] will go upto 80 per cent. When 80 per cent of the refining capacity is controlled by the Government and the efforts now being made to discover as much oil as possible within the country, either by off-shore drilling or inland drilling prove successful, it would be possible for us to dispense with our dependence on foreign oil companies without any dislocation. To nationalise them today may create some difficulties for us. Let us not forget, if we study the subject deeply, it is not always easy to ensure a steady supply of crude oil for the existing refineries in the public sector. We have to import crude oil even for these refineries by arranging supplies from different places as indigenous sources are not able to meet the full requirements of the refineries controlled by the Government. Let us be practical about it.

श्री सतपाल कपूर : छः साल के बाद
कहाँ से आएगा ।

श्री सतीश चन्द्र : आपको अपना
ढूँटना पड़ेगा । एकदम नहीं होता है ।
सलीमों से भी तेल नहीं आता है, उसको
निकालने के लिए कोशिश करती पड़ती है ।

श्री सतपाल कपूर : तब कम्पेंसेशन
के साथ करना पड़ेगा ।

श्री सतीश चन्द्र : वह तो आपको देना
पड़ेगा । यह नेशनल पालिसी है । जब तक
आप इस पार्टी को छोड़ कर किसी और पार्टी
के मेंबर हो कर न आएँ आपको करना
पड़ेगा । आपका कमिटमेंट है । इसको
आपको निभाना होगा ।

In principle, I am not against the Resolution. But, I think, it would be better to wait for a few years before we take such a step.

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Gauhati): Mr. Chairman. Sir I can assure my hon. friend, Shri Satish Chandra, that when I advocate nationalisation, I will not do it for

the purpose of a slogan. I too agree that nationalisation is not the panacea of all ills. But we should consider whether nationalisation will be conducive to the national interest or not. That is the very test on which we have to judge the Resolution.

He said that he has no idea of 75 monopoly houses because these, are not statutorily defined. May I remind him, that after the Monopoly Restrictive & Trade Practices Act has come into force these 75 monopoly houses have got a statutory recognition. Therefore, these 75 monopoly houses have got a certain statutory definition of its own. While we advocate nationalisation of 75 monopoly houses, we do so because we feel that these 75 monopoly houses have got a stranglehold on our economy today and they do not allow any of our progressive measures to come into operation one way or the other....

SHRI SATISH CHANDRA: These 75 monopoly houses refer to capitalists. They do not refer to industries as such. They refer to men who control these industries, not the industries themselves.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: He is out of date and out of tune with modern India. It is houses, not men. (Interruptions.)

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI: After all, we should not forget that after we got a massive mandate we brought about two Constitutional amendments. One Constitutional amendment was for the purpose of Directive Principles, Article 39(b) and (c), that is, for social equality, we will take property without paying compensation. That Constitutional amendment does not by itself lead to socialism or does not by itself lead to equality. That only removes one of the road-blocks which was in front of us. That did not allow us to achieve our goal. May I ask: Have the Government in any of these cases upto now applied this Constitutional amendment? We have not done so. After all, this Constitutional amendment

must be translated into practice. I do not say that there should be nationalisation of 75 monopoly houses on one fine morning. But you should look from the point of view of national interest and fix priorities to nationalise these houses which I consider, are definitely having a stranglehold on our economy.

One of my hon. friends, Mr. Mahajan said that we had nationalised certain cotton mills and other things. But I would like to tell him that we have taken over only sick children. We have nationalised those cotton mills because the textile industry was not functioning properly. But this Constitutional Amendment was made not for the purpose of taking over sick children but for taking over healthy children without paying compensation. Unfortunately, till now, we have not taken over any one of these healthy children. Though I will not make an omnibus statement that we should nationalise all the 75 houses tomorrow, I would say that, at least in principle, the time has come when we should consider this matter seriously.

About oil, many of the things have already been said. Mr. Satish Chandra has said that it will be bad, we will lose international credibility if we nationalised them today when the agreement is in force. After all, credibility in the international field today has no meaning. We have seen that today in many fields—in political field and other fields. The internal strength of the country is the only credibility which is realised in the international field. We can show to the world our internal strength by nationalising these. (Interruption) After all, we should not forget that these foreign companies have got a stranglehold not only on our economy but also on our officers. While participating in the last years Budget in respect of the Demands for Grants of Petroleum Ministry. I pointed out that many subsequent agreements were definitely against the interest of this

country. Even though it was pointed out at the time when the agreements were executed that these were against our national interest, those points were overruled by certain interested persons in the Ministry itself.

The foreign oil companies have bought—I would not say, all the officers—a number of our officers. That is why after retirement or even when they are in service, we find that their loyalty is in other countries. They immediately shift to other countries, the moment they retire. Therefore, I do not think that, because we will lose international credibility, we should wait for six years.

We should also remember the fact that our talking about nationalisation today will lead these foreign oil companies to repatriate more money to their countries because they will feel that, if they did not repatriate now, ultimately they would not get their dues. Therefore, Sir, I support the move for nationalisation.

I have got great hopes on our new Minister for Petroleum and Chemicals who has been my political guru for a long time. One of the American journalists described him as the 'quickest mind in Asia'. He may not be an expert on oil, but at least he has the quickest mind to judge what is correct, and I feel that, during his tenure, the quickest decisions will be taken which will be to our national interest.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (ग्वालियर):

मेरा इस वादविवाद में भाग लेने का कोई इरादा नहीं था। लेकिन अभी कुछ भाषण सुनकर और सम्मानित कांग्रेस सदस्यों की परस्पर विरोधी बातें सुन कर मुझे कुछ बोलने के लिए प्रेरणा मिली। अभी हमारे कांग्रेसी सदस्य कह रहे थे कि वह राष्ट्रीयकरण को सभी रोगों का रामबाण इलाज नहीं मानते, जहाँ राष्ट्रीय हित में राष्ट्रीयकरण आवश्यक हो, वहाँ किया जाना चाहिए।

[श्रीमन्मन्त्र बिहारी बाजपेयी]

लेकिन एक बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है कि जो सरकार विदेशी सहायता पर निर्भर कर रही है और विदेशों से निरन्तर गठबन्धन करती जा रही है....

सभापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्य अगले दिन अपना भाषण जारी रखें ।

18 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TWENTY-SIXTH REPORT

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-
TARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU

RAMAIAH): I beg to present the Twenty-sixth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the House stands adjourned till 11 a.m. on Tuesday, the 20th March 1973.

18.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, March 20, 1973/Phalgun 29, 1894 (Saka).

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY
DIGITIZED