

course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1971, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Industrial Development, Internal Trade and Company Affairs'."

**DEMAND NO. 123—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, INTERNAL TRADE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,35,17,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1971, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Industrial Development, Internal Trade and Company Affairs'."

17.37 hrs.

**MINISTRY OF STEEL AND HEAVY ENGINEERING**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand Nos. 82, 83 and 132 relating to the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering for which 4 hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members present in the House who are desirous of moving their cut motions may send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating the serial numbers of the cut motions they would like to move.

**DEMAND NO. 82—MINISTRY OF STEEL AND HEAVY ENGINEERING**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 21,95,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1971, in respect of 'Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering'."

**DEMAND NO. 83—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF STEEL AND HEAVY ENGINEERING**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 81,62,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st March, 1971, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering'."

**DEMAND NO. 132—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF STEEL AND HEAVY ENGINEERING**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 73,35,63,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st March, 1971, in respect of 'Capital outlay of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering'."

Hon. Members may now move the Cut Motions.

SHRI YASHPAL SINGH (Dehra Dun) : I beg to move :

"That the Demand under the Head 'Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to check the steep rise in the prices of steel (1)].

"That the Demand under the Head 'Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to encourage the absorption of Indian engineers in the management of the various plants (2)].

"That the Demand under the Head 'Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to encourage Indian consultancy firms in the erection of Bokaro Steel Plant (3)].

SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA (Madhubani) : I beg to move :

"That the Demand under the Head 'Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to nationalise the Tata Iron and Steel Company, Ltd. (15)].

SHRI BENI SHANKER SHARMA (Banka) : I beg to move :

"That the Demand under the Head 'Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Non utilisation of the full capacity of H.E.C. Ranchi (22)].

"That the Demand under the Head 'Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Supply of out-dated and old machinery and plant for the Bokaro Steel Plant (23)].

**[SHRI BENI SHANKER SHARMA]**

"That the Demand under the Head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to ensure proper and regular supply of steel to the actual users at fixed prices (24)].

"That the Demand under the Head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced to Re. 1."

[Faulty system of sale and distribution of the steel produced in the public sector concerns (25)].

"That the Demand under the Head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to utilise the full capacity of the existing steel plants (26)].

"That the Demand under the Head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to bring down the price of steel to help and encourage the manufacture of engineering goods (27)].

"That the Demand under the Head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to improve labour-management relations in all the steel factories, so as to ensure regular and unhampered production to meet the country's urgent demands (28)].

"That the Demand under the Head 'Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to arrange for industrial truce at least for five years in all our steel factories, so that production is not hampered due to discontent amongst the labour resulting in strikes, lock-outs and other disturbances. (29)]

**SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA (Cuttack) :** I beg to move :

"That the Demand under the Head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Continuous loss sustained by the public sector steel plants (31)].

"That the Demand under the Head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Partisan attitude in selecting officers of Hindustan Steel Ltd. (32)].

"That the Demand under the Head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Inability to maintain cooperative relation with the employees in the steel plants in public sector (33)].

"That the Demand under the Head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to boost steel production (34)].

**SHRI BENI SHANKER SHARMA :** I beg to move :

"That the Demand under the Head 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to establish more units either in private or in public sector to manufacture pig iron from iron ore (35)].

"That the Demand under the Head 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Stationing of Industrial Security Force at vulnerable points in all the factories under the Ministry to prevent damages to the machinery and plant and consequent heavy losses resulting from anti-national activities of a class or group of labourers. (36)]

**SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA :** I beg to move :

"That the Demand under the Head 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to follow a consistent policy regarding subsidy (37)].

"That the Demand under the Head 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to stabilize steel price (38)].

"That the Demand under the Head 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Inordinate delay in completing the Bokaro plant (39)].

"That the Demand under the Head Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Ever increasing cost of the Bokaro Steel Plant (40)].

"That the Demand under the Head Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Wastage and corruption in the Rourkela Steel Plant (41)].

"That the Demand under the Head Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Active political role of the officers of the Rourkela Steel Plant (42)].

SHRI SRADHAKAR SUPAKAR (Sambalpur) : I beg to move :

"That the Demand under the head Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Rising price of iron and steel (43)].

"That the Demand under the head Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Non-availability of iron and steel at reasonable price to the consumers (44)].

"That the Demand under the head Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Delay in the execution and the mounting cost of Bokaro Steel Plant (45)].

"That the Demand under the head Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Heavy loss and inefficiency in the Mining and Allied Machinery Corporation (46)].

"That the Demand under the head Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Recurring loss in the public sector steel projects (47)].

"That the Demand under the head Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to improve the working of the Heavy Engineering Corporation (48)].

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Patna) : I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to check the sabotage in Heavy Engineering industries. (49)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to make the Heavy Engineering Industry self-sufficient. (50)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to nationalise iron and steel plants of the private sector. (51)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced to Re. 1."

[Increasing the price of steel under pressure from monopolists. (52)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to guarantee market for the goods of Heavy Engineering Industry. (53)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to discontinue the policy of purchasing goods from factories of private sector in place of those of public sector by the Government. (54)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to utilise the capacity of Heavy Engineering Corporation. (55)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to withdraw cases against workers arrested during the last strike of Engineering workers of Jamshedpur and take them back. (56)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to find market for the goods produced by Heavy Engineering Corporation. (57)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

## [SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI]

[Failure to check the irregularities by contractors of Bokaro Steel Plant. (59)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to nationalise Tata Iron and Steel Company factory in Jamshedpur. (59)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Encouragement to R. S. S. and Jana Sangh by some of the high officials of Heavy Engineering Corporation, Ranchi. (60)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to implement the decisions of the Advisory Committee of Heavy Engineering Corporation, Ranchi taken in September, 1969 in regard to the rehabilitation of its Muslim employees. (61)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to take action against the workers who took part in the communal disturbances of 1967 in Heavy Engineering Corporation, Ranchi. (62)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to make suitable arrangements for the rehabilitation of riot affected Muslim employees of the Heavy Engineering Corporation, Ranchi. (63)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to accept the demands of security guards of the Heavy Engineering Corporation, Ranchi. (64)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to implement the decision of the Wage Board in regard to the security guards of Heavy Engineering Corporation, Ranchi from the date of their application. (65)]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The Cut Motions are also now before the House.

SHRI M. N. NAGHOOR (Belgaum) : Sir, I rise to oppose the Demands for Grants to the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Engineering. While discussing these demands, in all fairness we must pay our gratitude and appreciation to the far-sightedness of the Indian planners, who conceived the idea of locating steel plants at the very early stage of our independence. The then Chairman of the Planning Commission and our first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, sought the cooperation of developed countries to help us to locate the steel units in our country and very generously the USA, Soviet Union, U. K. and West Germany not only extended their cooperation but they agreed to be our collaborators and today we have three giant steel units in our country. We have invested on these three steel plants Rs. 1100 crores. During these three plans and the 3 annual plans, we have created a potential of 10 million tonnes of steel. With this investment of huge national resources, it has been our duty also to see that the units that we have been able to establish produce enough wealth for our country. Bhilai steel has a capacity of 2.5 million tonnes. The second plant which came into existence, namely, Rourkela, has a capacity of 1.8 million tonnes. The Durgapur steel unit has a capacity of 1.6 million tonnes. ISCO has a potential of 1 million tonnes and TISCO has a potential of 2 million tonnes. But, unfortunately, after having invested these huge amounts, these steel units which should have produced at least 8 to 9 million tonnes of steel have been producing only 4.8 million tonnes; that is to say, we have not been able to produce even 50 per cent of the capacity that we created when we brought these units into existence, whereas TISCO, which is in the private sector, has been able to give a good account of itself by producing 90 per cent of its potential.

18-40 hrs.

## [SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR in the Chair]

The present demand in our country is of the order of 6 million tonnes, whereas we are producing 4 million tonnes. There is almost a near famine in our country for steel today. Only today morning I read in the press that Shri K K Shah has been struggling hard to negotiate and get steel even for the buildings that are under construction. This has created a great crisis in the country. We had great hopes of these steel plants when we put them up. We were even hoping to export a good quantity of steel and earn foreign exchange.

But today all these hopes have been shattered. Not only that, this has paralysed local industrial development; the development of engineering units, the implements factory, house construction programme and agricultural development programme, all these have come to a standstill.

We are aware that we cannot produce steel overnight. Even when 100 per cent clearance is given to a steel project it will take at least seven years to see that project goes into production. Therefore we have very carefully to look into the future needs of our country and see that whatever proposals or projects are before the government are taken up early for execution.

The shortfall in steel in 1974 is going to be of the order of 3.5 million tonnes of usable steel. Therefore, it is all the more necessary that we should take immediate steps in the matter of the three steel plants which are under active consideration of the government. These three steel plants are at Hospet, Visakhapatnam and Salem. Of course, there is a fourth one at Goa also.

I may submit that the case for Hospet has been cleared by the various committees that were appointed and they have stated that the Hospet steel plant merits the highest. The committee set up by the Government of India in 1964 for selection of a site for a steel plant in South India has recommended the setting up of a steel plant with a capacity of 3 million tonne ingots at Torangal in Hospet. I may briefly mention that the reports of Messrs. Dastur and Company and of the British American Steel Works for India Consortium disclose the definite advantages that the Hospet site possesses over the other two. Moreover, the site near Torangal in Hospet is well-situated near good iron deposits with reserves estimated to be available for 90 years hence. Hospet is comparatively closer than other areas to southern Indian market by rail and road and has good access to the eastern and western steel consuming sectors. An increasing proportion of output of Hospet would cater to the requirements of Mysore, Tamilnadu, Kerala interior, central and south Andhra and south Maharashtra.

Sir, it is the considered opinion of the Committee set up by M/s. Hindustan Steel Ltd. that the size of Hospet area steel plant should be of the order of 3 million ingot tonnes of steel as against the suggestion of M/s. Dastur & Co. to have a plant to produce 1.5 million tonnes of ingot steel and 1 million tonnes of foundry

iron. This would avoid larger movement of coal or consumption of coal. The cost of raw-material at Hospet is cheaper when compared with that of Goa. Moreover, the iron ore in Hospet area being richer in content the consumption of material for a ton of hot metal would also be lower. It is estimated that the Hospet plant will have an advantage over Goa of Rs. 32 to Rs. 40 per ton of finished product. In the case of Goa it is estimated that at least 50% of the coal will have to be imported which involves a foreign exchange expenditure of Rs. 16 crores which the country can ill-afford in the present circumstances. Such a situation would not arise in the case of Hospet. This point alone would be enough for location of the plant at Hospet.

The location of the plant at Hospet has other advantages viz., very little additional investment on overheads will be involved. There is a developed source of water supply for steel plant in the Tungabhadra reservoir. Power requirements would be met from the Sharavathy power station. No new railway line need be constructed to serve the site. The complete doubling of the East Coast line presently in progress will secure the required capacity for the movement of coal. It has the additional advantage of being both on the metre gauge and the broad gauge.

The cost of land would be much lower at Hospet. The population that would need to be displaced and rehabilitated will also be much less.

Scope for development of ancillary industries is also very much greater at Hospet than at Goa.

If at any stage, it is considered necessary to switch over the plant at Hospet, to the use of partly imported coal, it would be done without any significant effect on the cost. The mechanised mining of iron ores in Donimalai in Hospet area by the NMDC will be able to provide ready supplies of ore to the plant.

Sir, the Committee set up by the Government of India in 1964 has already recommended the case of Hospet. Under these circumstances I would only earnestly appeal to the Government of India that without being guided by any consideration and being guided by the technical opinion not only of these respective committees which I have quoted but also the present HSL high level Committee you should forthright take a decision to go ahead with the Steel Plant.

[SHRI M. N. NAGHNOOR]

Sir, I was mentioning that we have invested about Rs. 1100 crores on these three steel plants. Let us go into the question of this investment and the production and the losses in this behalf. As a modest return on this investment we should expect a return of 5 per cent. This should give us at least Rs. 55 crores *per annum* on our investment. On the other hand, our performance during the last three or four years has been very unsatisfactory. The loss during the year 1969-70 was of the order of Rs. 40 crores. So, instead of earning Rs. 55 crores on our investment, we are losing Rs. 40 crores and so far we have incurred a loss of Rs. 200 crores.

People are being taxed year after year for the luxury of these three uneconomic units. It is high time that we seriously studied the problems and found solutions to them.

This is one part of our investment on steel projects. Now we are going to invest another Rs. 1,100 crores on the Bokaro steel plant. In the very first stage we are going to invest Rs. 700 crores and will be able to produce, after three years, 1.7 million tonnes. I think, the steel that is produced in this plant during this period would be costlier than the price at which we can buy silver in the market. Later on we are going to spend another Rs. 400 crores and after another five years we will be able to produce 2.3 million tonnes; that is, after investing Rs. 1,100 crores we will ultimately be able to produce 4 million tonnes. In the light of these experience, I think there is no justification for a big steel plant as Bokaro.

Let us make sure that such uneconomic units do not become permanent millstones around the neck of our nation. We must carefully and at an early stage go into the causes of such high cost of production. The HSL had obtained a detailed project report which mentioned that on an average each unit should be able to produce 100 tonnes per man-year whereas Bhilai is able to produce only 76 tonnes per man-year, Rourkela 68 tonnes per man-year, Durgapur only 47 tonnes per man-year while the world average production is 125 tonnes per man-year. At the same time I may mention that Japan has produced 400 tonnes per man-year. From this we see that all the three units have not given a good account of production and of these three Durgapur is working in the most unsatisfactory way.

The main causes for losses and low productivity are: labour production is very low, management is weak, general purpose man is neces-

sary instead of ICS officers looking into these technical units, no technical guidance and scientific direction, we have also not yet built our own technical cadre of steel officers for top level management and over and above all these things and the most unfortunate, there have been frequent changes of ministers resulting in lack of continuity of policy and direction.

Lastly, we have a weakness for giant plants. The result is that we have not produced like giants but we have produced successfully giant problems. We have no control whatsoever over the Durgapur steel project.

We have also the Central Engineering and Designs Bureau. We have 600 to 1,000 engineers who are supposed to be technically qualified and who are really experts in their own subjects. But there had been a tendency in the past that we were depending too much on foreign help. As such it has become a damper on our own engineers and has killed their initiative so long.

As regards the Bokaro project, during the 1960s and 1970 there has been a great revolution in the technical aspect of production. Even the smaller countries, like, Iran, Iraq, Yugoslavia and UAR have been given by the Russian collaborators the latest know-how and the latest methods of LD convertors whereas this Bokaro plant has been depending on the same old pattern which would, definitely, make a difference of 20 per cent less in production as compared to the latest plants that have been given to smaller countries that I mentioned just now.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF STEEL AND HEAVY ENGINEERING (SHRI K. C. PANT): This has LD convertors also.

SHRI M. N. NAGHNOOR: I would appeal to the Government, since we are going to invest another Rs. 1100 crores, to be equipped with the latest modern machinery because the steel units which the Government of India are having are the second biggest public undertaking in our country next only to Railways. We will have almost invested another Rs. 2500 crores on the public sector units. Let us take all the care to see that these steel units which we are having are run with the latest modern technical skill.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA (Bangalore): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. [Member from the Opposition, I must admit, has made a very constructive speech. In fact, the speech he

has made contains nothing with which I could disagree. The point that he has made, the arguments that he has advanced, are, I must admit, acceptable to all sections of the House. He has approached the problem from the point of view of the national interest and the prosperity of the industry.

I would only deal with the demand that he made for Mysore for the location of a plant in Hospet. I very much wish he had adopted an equally liberal attitude towards the distribution of steel plants. So far as we are concerned, there is a demand from each southern State, Madras, Vizag and Mysore. There is an idea in the technical realm also that it is not necessary to have giant steel plants, taking risk of that proportion. If the units are smaller, there is an advantage of better management, better supervision, and, if something goes wrong, that can be rectified in time. If instead of a big, giant, steel plant, three plants are located in three different places, it is advantageous for the prosperity of the nation as well as from the point of view of doing justice to various localities.

So far as Salem is concerned, I understand that the ore in Salem is not of a much high-grade as that of Hospet. But I am not a technical person. I would make a suggestion to the Government of India that the demand made by each State must be weight with certain financial responsibilities. In Mysore State, when we started our iron and steel plant, we were not helped by the Central Government at that time but we did it on our own initiative. Even today, Bhadravati iron and steel plant is only being assisted by the Central Government. It is not being run by the Central Government nor its capital is being fully subscribed by the Central Government. Some such pattern may also be attached to steel plants. The steel plant demanded by the Government of Tamil Nadu for Salem may be granted with certain financial responsibility attached so that the State Government may feel committed to the project not merely because of its locality but also because the plant is financed. Likewise Visakhapatnam, I suppose, is better situated so far as granting of a steel plant is concerned. There is an industrial area and I am sure, my hon. friend, Shri Viswanatham, will make a better case for Visakhapatnam than I can possibly do.

19 hrs.

So far as losses are concerned, I happened to go into this problem of steel plants in our

report on public undertakings. One of the first mistakes committed was to invest enormous amount on buildings and facilities to officers and labour even before there was any profit or even before production; so much was invested that it became a liability. The investment on buildings and other facilities alone is of the order of Rs. 80 crores in these steel plants. I would like to point out to the hon. Minister that we, in the Commission, have made a recommendation that hereafter expenditure on swimming pools, playgrounds and princely palaces and airconditioned accommodation should be controlled. Under the principle of autonomy given to these undertakings full control on expenditure was invested with the Board of Directors. Therefore, they went on merrily spending on these buildings and other facilities for officers and labour. We have made a suggestion that hereafter you may give full autonomy in the matter of management of the plant, but, in the matter of facilities and expenditure thereon, you should be controlled by the Bureau of Public Undertakings which is permanently in existence in the Finance Ministry. I hope that recommendation has been accepted and if that recommendation has not been accepted, it should be accepted. Then the men who wanted to spend on themselves were so interested in overspending that it has resulted in this Rs. 80 crores expenditure which has become a liability.

All that time this House was interested in blaming only the management. The real loss has been incurred because of inter-union rivalries which have gone to the extent of breaking the plant in Durgapur. The responsibility in the matter of loss in these steel plants, as my hon. friend said, is not merely that of the management but it is that of the labour unions also. We, in order to make this country prosperous, have to draw the attention of the labour unions, however unpopular it may be, to their sense of patriotism and responsibility to see that production is not interrupted. We have made a suggestion in the Administrative Reforms Commission that the pattern of labour policy be quite different in public undertakings from that of private undertakings. Uptill now we have followed the same labour policy both in the private and public sectors. I am happy to say that some of the labour unions, especially the All India Federation of Bank Employees, have expressed the view that public undertaking unions should behave in a more responsible manner. In Socialist countries they do not

[SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA]

allow strikes and all kinds of demonstrations and agitations to press their demands. It logically follows that public undertakings in this country are in the same category and labour laws should be changed and there is no question of labour bargaining in the sense in which the labour unions are bargaining in the private sector.

Unless this fundamental change in labour policy takes place, we will not be able to make much headway in the matter of making these Public Undertakings prosperous. Thank you.

19-06 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, April 17, 1970/Chaitra 27, 1892 (Saka).*

---