

promised this country, not today but in 1931 in the Karachi Congress, when we took the pledge for independence, and with total independence we declared before this country in 1931 that we would like it to go on record that we favoured a fixed ceiling on individual income to be lowered by stages to twenty times the nation's minimum. We also declared that the State should control key industries and services. We reiterated those desires again in 1948 and 1956. I would certainly say and admit that the dichotomy of pretensions and accomplishments has been our greatest weakness. I do not deny it. I accept as a member of the party that we have promised the people, people took us by faith, people have given us immense love and affection, but the dichotomy, that we created has been to a certain extent our undoing. Therefore, with the policy that we ordained, that we decided upon to act, we did not act. Certainly, therefore a name was given to us—not a very palatable name—and we were described as a Janus-like character who really says much but does nothing. That is why I say if this kind of awareness has been indicated in the Prime Minister's note and in this resolution why should I be ashamed about it. The realisation comes to human beings (*Interruption*). Sir, they might be super human beings, I do not claim parity with them, or they may be devils and I do not claim parity with them. This institution being an institution of human beings I would certainly say that we have realised that despite our resolutions we have the inspiration to live and contribute for the fight for a life worth living for and to fight against the enemies of human happiness. We have not united ourselves and our goals are still distant.

That is why I have come back with this resolution to bring all of us nearer to the goal. I think this is the time because for the first time—it might be an accident, deliberate or otherwise—it cannot be denied that today we are standing on the crossroads and from there we have to create a new image shaping the destiny of this country. That is why we are standing today. If we succeed, and I am sure we will succeed, we can take ourselves away from the personality. They have really bedevilled the political life of this country.

सभापति महोदय : क्या सदस्या महोदय दो तीन मिनट में समाप्त कर सकेंगी ?

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : मैं अगली बार बोलूंगी। दो तीन मिनट में समाप्त नहीं कर सकूंगी।

सभापति महोदय : तब आप अगली बार बोलें। अब हम आधे घंटे की चर्चा लेते हैं। एक बात का ध्यान रखा जाए। यहां सदन में शान्ति बनाये रखने के लिए मैं आर्डर के स्थान पर आदर शब्द का प्रयोग करता हूँ तो केवल इसलिए कि आदर करें आप संविधान का, आदर करें अपना, आदर करें इस सदन का और आदर करें उन लोगों का जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व आप यहां पर करते हैं। इससे सदन की शान्ति बनी रहेगी।

17-30 hrs.

HALF AN HOUR DISCUSSION INDUSTRIAL LICENSING POLICY ENQUIRY COMMITTEE

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this half an hour discussion arises out of the answer given by the Minister of Industrial Development, Internal Trade and Company Affairs to a certain question raised by Shri Ram Avtar Sharma and others regarding the reports of the Enquiry Committee appointed to go into the industrial licensing policy. They have made a very voluminous document, after going extensively into the entire problem in its various facets connected with industrial licensing. I have tried to go through the pages of this voluminous book and the impression that I gather is that this apparatus which we have set up, the apparatus of industrial licensing, seems to have achieved nothing except all that it was supposed to avoid. One wonders whether our objectives could have been well-achieved, objectives which the industrial licensing was supposed to achieve could have been better achieved by our non-operating the industrial licensing machinery.

The main drawbacks in the industrial development of our country, if one was to make an objective assessment, can be broadly be found to be four. These four maladies

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

have plagued our industrial development. The first and foremost one, to which Shri-mati Tarkeshwari Sinha has also made a reference, is our failure to eradicate the huge disparity in wealth between the rich and the poor. The first severe drawback and malady is the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few or the absence of wide diffusion of industrial enterprises. The second serious drawback is inadequate industrial activities in certain essential areas on one side and, on the other, idle capacities of industrial units which have been licensed unpragmatically. Thirdly, there is an imbalance in the industrial growth, first vis-a-vis industries and also vis-a-vis region. Fourthly, there is the extremely unsatisfactory industrial growth production-wise, employment-wise and export-wise.

The irony of fate is that the report in terms categorically and unequivocally says that the way the entire industrial licensing has been worked it was never the purpose, it was never the objective of industrial licensing to overcome any of the four maladies or drawbacks which have plagued the industrial progress of our country.

It is my respectful submission that one is pained to read through the pages of this report, when the authors of this report point out that the government persistently failed to give any guidelines, they have failed to give any indications, they failed to give any directions; in fact, it goes to the extent of saying that no social or economic objective as such was laid down while laying down the policy or while working upon the industrial licensing. In fact if one were to read through the report carefully and try to analyse it, one would find that there is an extremely scathing indictment of the entire Government working and the severe lapses of Government so far as licensing is concerned.

I will briefly refer to a few lines in this report. One would be startled to find these observations, these findings of facts by the Committee. On page 384 in paragraph 8.02 they observe :—

“We have already pointed out that while the general objective of preventing concentration of economic power and mono-

polistic tendencies was emphasised on a number of occasions from 1948 onwards, no specific instruction was given that the licensing authorities should keep this purpose in view. Our studies show that licensing in the earlier years was guided far more by technological than by economic, leave alone social, considerations. It may, therefore, not be considered surprising that during a large part of the period of our inquiry, not only was no attempt made to use licensing to prevent the further growth of the Larger Industrial Houses, but the process actually worked in their favour.”

Further they observe :—

“However, for reasons that we have already discussed in the previous Chapters, the licensing system as it actually worked could not ensure the development of industries mainly according to Plan priorities. The lack of clarity about plan targets and their implications in terms of creation of capacity.”

The last observation of this paragraph is :—

“Licensing failed to prevent the growth of capacity in less essential industries; and it could not be expected directly to ensure the creation of capacity in the more essential ones.”

I beg to draw your kind attention to the very salient fact that while we have been working for the last one and a half decade to implement the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956, this Committee finds that while implementing industrial licensing we never laid down any social or economic objectives before us. This Committee strangely finds fault with the system of licensing, the inherent drawback and defects in the system of licensing as well as in the actual implementation and working of licensing. Still, it is strange that it takes an extremely doctrinaire approach of the matter and says that with certain modifications nonetheless we must again vigorously reimpose licensing even in some of the industries which have been delicensed as though, they seem to consider, with these modifications a miracle would be achieved and the entire licensing system which has brought so much havoc to the country, which has created, according to

them, such monopoly and such deep concentration of power, would nonetheless stand remedied merely if we were to accept their modifications.

I accept the very grave concern which the Committee has shown in this report about the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few companies. They have viewed with the utmost concern this tendency on the part of some large companies to acquire more and more licences. They acquired 66.03 per cent licences. But whose fault is it? They have not tried to analyse as to where exactly the fault lay. They have given in details cases out of number as to how one business house manipulated to see that the other man was stifled in getting licences and they were given licences and how the cream was taken by manoeuvring and manipulation in the licensing system by this big business house. Strangely they still want to persist in licensing.

I know that in the reply which the Minister gave on 22nd July, 1969, he stated that Government had not yet studied this report. It is a very voluminous document and it will take quite some time for the Government to go through this. Still I should like to know a few matters from Government so far as they relate to findings of facts because the Minister has to make his position clear in respect of facts, not with respect to anything in the future but something which has already happened. Therefore the first question which I should like to know is whether the Government's industrial licensing was a device to implement the industrial Policy Resolution of 1956 or not. They have stated that if at all we have observed that resolution it is in its breach and not in its compliance or observance.

My second question is may I know whether the Government accepts the findings of facts in the report that Government has totally failed to give proper guide-lines and instructions and has failed to exercise proper supervision over appropriate authorities to achieve Government's avowed economic and social objectives through industrial licensing. They seem to point out that there was persistent failure of the Government to lay down any guidelines or to give any instructions to the authorities concerned which

could achieve the economic and social objectives of Government.

My third question is, when faulty licensing is responsible for concentration of economic power and for creating large industrial capacities and great potential in the hands of what is described in the report as large industrial sector or large business houses alone and has stifled the diffusion of industrial enterprise, as a fact found by the Committee, will not the Government again be taking risks of creating fresh monopolies if the present de-licensed industries were brought back in the industrial licensing sector?

As reported in the *Times of India* dated 27th July, 1969, is it correct that after de-licensing of certain industries, there has been a marked increase in the industrial production and productivity of such de-licensed industries?

Lastly, may I know whether Government is thinking in terms of establishing a new managerial cadre in the all-India services who could be trained to act as Government directors in a joint sector as recommended by the Committee?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, INTERNAL TRADE & COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI F. A. AHMED): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Member for the anxiety he has given expression to after he has gone through the report of the Committee. But, as he has pointed out himself, it is very difficult for one to go through the voluminous report and come to a decision straightway. I shall have no hesitation in confessing that it has not been possible for me to complete the reading of the entire report. I have been doing my best and, on the basis of what has been done by us, we are also sending notes to various other Ministries which are concerned with these matters.

SHRI S. M. BENERJEE (Kanpur): Let himr reply after proper reading of the report.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: It will take sometime before we have completed the reading of the report, before we have had the

[Shri F. A. Ahmed]

comments from the various Ministries and Planning Commission and placed all those matters before the Government for decisions. Therefore, it will not be proper for me to go into detailed discussion of the report itself. I am sure the hon. Member will also agree with me that a Half-an-Hour discussion is not the proper method of discussing such a voluminous report. After the Government have taken decisions in these matters, we shall certainly give sufficient time to the hon. Members to give their observations with regard to what is contained in the report and also with regard to such decisions as Government have taken in these matters. I hope he will agree with me that if this is the purpose of the discussion, this should not be raised in the form of a Half-an-Hour discussion. I think, it will be futile for me to state at this stage, in regard to our Industrial Policy Resolution, to what extent it has been implemented.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: That is not my question. I knew the difficulties involved in going through such a voluminous report. If you consider my questions carefully, they are not on the report as such. They are general questions vis-a-vis our industrial licensing policy.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: If the hon. Member wants replies to the three or four questions which he has raised, I can say that our Industrial Policy Resolution has two objectives in view: one is the satisfactory industrial growth expansion in our country and the second objective, together with that, is that while the industrial production goes on we should see that undue influence and concentration of power and control of the means of production in the hands of a few persons are avoided. It is between these two objectives that we have to see the licensing system and various other policy matters which have to be thought of.....

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: He has not been fair to me. My question was clear, whether industrial licensing was a device to implement the Industrial Policy Resolution. I do not want to know what was the Industrial Policy Resolution and what it sought to achieve. My question was: was this a device to implement the Industrial Policy Resolution or not?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: It was one of the devices—because there are many other devices also—to carry out the Industrial Policy Resolution.

The Second question was whether we were going to accept the findings. I have already said that it will be difficult for me to give any views at this stage when I have myself not completed the study of the report, and that this will be discussed later on.

Then he has asked as to what will be our policy with regard to licensing. There also, we have to take into consideration not only the report submitted by the Industrial Policy Licensing Enquiry Committee but also the views expressed with regard to this matter by the various other bodies—Monopolies Inquiry Commission, Hazare Committee, and even the Planning Commission which has recently dealt with it in their Draft Fourth Five Year Plan. Taking all these things into consideration, Government will have to decide to what extent the Policy will have to be carried out or will have to be modified or will have to be given up.

His fourth question is whether some of the industries which were delicensed have shown increased production. May I submit that it is not so in all the cases? Take, for instance, the paper industry which has been delicensed. I have seen very little attempt on the part of the paper industry to go in for increased production and to go in for production which would meet our requirement in 1972 or 1973 and beyond that. Cement has also been delicensed, but I find very little attempt on the part of the private enterprise to have cement in areas where there is deficiency. But, in some industries, it has helped. Therefore, I cannot say that, because of delicensing, everywhere the result has been good. On the other hand, the other day, the representatives of manufacturers of sewing machines came and told me that I should withdraw the delicensing in regard to the manufacture of sewing machines because they were apprehending that there would be competition from outside companies and they particularly mentioned the name of Singer Company. I told them that even now what was happening was that the machines manufactured by one indigenous company were being handed over

to the Singer people and they put the mark as 'Merritt' and sell them as Singer machines though they were being indigenously manufactured and when I asked them they said that they had to do it because of competition from Usha. There are a large number of complicated questions here and these cannot be answered now.

When this matter is discussed, I shall keep all these facts in view; there will be an opportunity for me and also for the hon. members to give expression to our views when the matter is discussed.

श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : सभापति जी, जो इंडस्ट्रियल लाइसेंसिंग इन्वॉयरी कमेटी की रिपोर्ट है, उसमें जो रिक्मेंडेशन्स हैं, मैंने थोड़ी पढ़ी है, मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ और मैं यह समझता हूँ कि उसमें जो रिक्मेंडेशन्स दी गई हैं वह काफी अच्छी रिक्मेंडेशन्स हैं और सरकार को उनका स्वागत करना चाहिए। इससे पहले मानोपली कमीशन की रिपोर्ट भी आई थी। उसने भी कुछ बातें कही थी। मैं सरकार की तरफ से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो बड़े-बड़े बिजनेस हाउसेज हैं वे गलती कर रहे हैं, वे लूट रहे हैं, उन्हीं को दोष दिया जाता है। मेरा कहना यह है कि अगर इन सब चीजों में जो कन्सल्टेशन आफ वेल्थ हुआ है उसको देखा जाये, अभी मंत्री महोदय ने दो आब्जेक्टिव बताये वे बहुत अच्छे हैं, मैं भी उनको स्वीकार करता हूँ लेकिन उन दो आब्जेक्टिव के पूरा न होने के लिए अगर कोई सबसे ज्यादा जिम्मेदार है तो यह सरकार है क्योंकि नीति आपके पास थी। कैसे किसको दें, किसको न दें, उसकी नीति बनाना आपके हाथ में था और आप उसके लिए जिम्मेदार हैं। मेरा तो कहना यह है कि यह एक साजिश थी जिसमें यह सरकार, वह वेस्टेड इन्ट्रेस्ट जो बिग हाउसेज हैं और बड़े-बड़े सीनियर आफिसर्स तीनों ने मिल कर यह कॉन्स्पिरेसी की जिसका परिणाम है कि जो बड़े-बड़े लोग हैं वे बड़े बनते गए और जो छोटे और बड़े के बीच की खाई है वह बढ़ती गई। अभी भी जो बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया तो प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा

कि जो प्रोग्रेसिव इण्डस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स हैं उनको दिया जायेगा। अब प्रोग्रेसिव की परिभाषा क्या है? जो आपके पास आपके दरवाजे पर चला गया वह प्रोग्रेसिव हो गया। उसी तरीके से यह चीज भी है। मेरा यह ख्याल है कि अगर इन्वॉयरी कराई जाये तो यह सरकार उसके लिए जिम्मेदार पाई जायेगी।

इस सिलसिले में मैं तीन सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। एक तो यह कि कन्सल्टेशन आफ वेल्थ को रोकने के लिए, यह कोई पहली रिक्मेंडेशन नहीं है, आपने कहा कि यह आपका पुराना आब्जेक्टिव है तो इसको कम करने के लिए सरकार क्या स्पेसिफिक स्टेप्स उठाने वाली है और क्या सरकार हर 6 महीने में क्या स्टेप्स उठाये उसकी स्टाक-टेकिंग करके सदन के सामने रखेगी कि ये-ये कदम हमने उठाये हैं और यह-यह लाभ हुआ?

दूसरा मेरा सवाल है कि जो कंज्यूमर गुड्स हैं उनको सस्ता करने के लिए जो आपकी लाइसेंसिंग पालिसी है वह उसमें क्या मदद कर सकती है? और इस रिपोर्ट में जो कैटेगरी बनाई गई है इंडस्ट्रीज की तो क्या आप देखेंगे कि एक ही कैटेगरी के जो बड़े बिजनेस हाउसेज हैं उनको उसी कैटेगरी के इंडस्ट्रियल लाइसेंस मिलें, सब कैटेगरीज के न मिलें, इस मिश्रित को आप मानते हैं या नहीं?

तीसरा सवाल यह है कि क्या सरकार स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज को प्रोटेक्ट करने के लिए, उनको फ्रंसिलिटीज देने के लिए, वह चूँकि बड़े बिजनेस हाउसेज के साथ कम्पीट नहीं कर सकते, तो उनको मदद करने के लिए तैयार है? उसके लिए वह क्या करना चाहते हैं?

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : सभापति जी, मंत्री महोदय की जो दिक्कत है वह हम लोगों की भी दिक्कत है क्योंकि अभी तक कमेटी की रिपोर्ट हम लोगों को नहीं मिली है। अभी जो सवाल हम पूछ रहे हैं वह कुछ साधारण सवाल होंगे जैसे कि मंत्री महोदय ने भी साल्वे साहब के

[श्री रवि राय]

सबाल का साधारण ढंग से उत्तर दिया। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ, असल में पिछले बीस बाइस साल का जो अनुभव रहा है और हमारी आर्थिक नीतियों में जो खामियां रही हैं, बाबजूद इसके कि इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी रेजोल्यूशन 1956 में पास हुआ था, उसके लिए पालियामेंट की अनुमति होते हुए भी और सरकार की जो बुनियादी नीति थी जो नेशनल पालिसी थी कि कुछ कारखानों और उद्योग-धंधों का लाइसेन्स व्यक्तिगत पूंजीपतियों को हम नहीं देंगे, इस सबके होते हुए भी यह जाहिर है कि यह नीति पारित होने के बाद भी सरकार इस तरह के लाइसेन्स जिनको सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में देना चाहिए था वह सरकार ने खुद माना है कि व्यक्तिगत पूंजीपतियों को दिए गए हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह हजारों कमेटी रिपोर्ट है, दत्त कमेटी की रिपोर्ट है, मानोपली इन्क्वायरी कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है, यह हमको आर्थिक जीवन में गैर बराबरी और असमानता की नज़ीर देती है और ये कहती है कि हम गैर बराबरी बढ़ाते जा रहे हैं। तो इन तीन मूल्यवान रिपोर्टों को देखते हुए क्या सरकार आर्थिक नीतियों में कोई बुनियादी परिवर्तन, मुकम्मिल परिवर्तन करना चाहती है जिसके चलते यह असमानता दूर हो सके। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ क्या जैसे इनका मंत्रालय है, इन तीनों रिपोर्टों को देखते हुए शायद फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब इस बात से सहमत होंगे कि इनके मंत्रालय का जो गठन है उसके अन्दर कुछ इस तरह का परिवर्तन करने की आवश्यकता है और क्या वे इस तरह का परिवर्तन करेंगे जिससे मालूम हो कि हमको समाजवादी रास्ते पर चलना है। अगर इस तरह का कोई संशोधन नहीं करेंगे तो यह रपट रपट के रूप में ही रह जायेगी। इस लिए मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ इन तीनों रिपोर्टों को देखते हुए और ये तीनों इनके मंत्रालय के जिम्मे हैं, इसको ध्यान में रखकर ये अपने मंत्रालय में लाइसेन्स की पालिसी में कुछ परिवर्तन करेंगे और पर्सनल कंजम्पशन जो है उसपर कुछ रोक

लगाने के लिए मंत्री जी सोच रहे हैं? और क्या इस सत्र में वे दत्त कमेटी की रिपोर्ट पर बहस करायेंगे।

SHRI BEDABRATA BARUA (Kaliabor): After nationalisation of banks, it is natural that if an industry is licensed according to the recommendations of the Licensing Policy Inquiry Committee, that industry also will have to be financed from the nationalised sector itself. Have Government taken this aspect into account? In the light of this, have Government examined whether the present licensing structure itself is defective or are they considering going into that question?

I say this because so far as the licensing policy is concerned, it was never the intention—, even when there was no policy, that it should be completely subverted as has been happening for quite a long time, as the report has shown. Even the report of the Monopolies Inquiry Commission which was submitted a few years ago has mentioned this. So this matter was before Government for quite a long time. Have Government noticed any change in the policy in regard to this devolution of economic power? Have the declared intentions of Government—Shri Shalve referred to them as the guidelines—which have been made known in the form of nationally accepted norms from the Government side that there should be no regional imbalance, there should be encouragement of small industries and so on, even informed the licensing authorities? If not, if the Committee has not lived upto these nationally accepted guidelines which have been formulated and decided upon by the Planning Commission and Government, what exactly is the way Government are contemplating a change in the entire structure of the licencing authority?

श्री स० मो० बंनजी : सभापति महोदय, पहले तो मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ और आप के माफ़त मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इसकी रिपोर्ट को छपाया नहीं गया है, वह पब्लिश नहीं हुई है। रिपोर्ट शायद हो गई लेकिन अभी छपी नहीं है। उसकी कापियां जो हम को मिलनी चाहिए वह अभी नहीं मिली हैं। तो जब रिपोर्ट अभी तक छप नहीं

सकी है तो इम्प्लीमेंटेशन कब तक होगा यह भगवान जानें। इसलिए हमको दुख इस बात का है कि अभी तक छपी क्यों नहीं। मोनोपली के बारे में फिलहाल सवाल नहीं पूछना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि जितने सवाल हम लोग पालियामेंट में कर रहे हैं उतनी ही मोनोपली बढ़ती जा रही है। इसलिए मैं मोनोपली के बारे में सवाल नहीं करना चाहता हूँ ताकि वह कम हो।

श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद : जितने सवाल तीन मੈम्बरोँ ने किये हैं वह करीब करीब एक ही मकसद से किये हैं। मैं इसके मुताल्लिक यह कह देना चाहता हूँ—पहले तो बनर्जी साहब का छोटा सा सवाल है उसका जवाब देना चाहता हूँ कि हमने यह रिपोर्ट प्रेस में छपवाने के लिए भेज दी है और हमें उम्मीद है कि चन्द रोज में जब हमें प्रेस इसकी कापी दे देगा तो हर एक मेम्बर को उसकी कापी हम दे देंगे।

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा (हमीरपुर) : 11 दिन निकल गए, 11 दिनों में तो छप जानी चाहिए थी।

श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद : वह इतनी बड़ी है कि इतनी जल्दी नहीं छप सकती है। पर हम कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि जितनी जल्दी आ जाये, हम मेम्बरों को उसकी कापी बटवा दें।

18 hrs.

अब दूसरा सवाल जो कहा गया है—बहुत सारी रिकमेण्डेशन एक कमेटी ने की हैं, उन को मानेंगे या नहीं मानेंगे। मैंने अर्ज किया है कि इस का बहुत सारे डिपार्टमेंट्स और मिनिस्ट्रीयों से ताल्लुक है, प्लानिंग कमीशन से ताल्लुक है। इसलिये इस के बारे में सोच-समझ कर हम अपने विचार आपके सामने रखेंगे और डिस्कशन के बाद जो कुछ भी फैसला होगा, उस पर हम अमल करने की कोशिश करेंगे।

मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि हम कोई पालिसी तय करें और उसके बाद उस पालिसी

को इम्प्लीमेंट करने के लिये हमने क्या क्या कदम उठाये हैं, उनको इस हाउस के सामने जरूर रखना चाहिये। मुझे इसमें कोई हर्ज नजर नहीं आता कि हर 6 महीने के बाद या एक साल के बाद उस पर यहाँ एक-आध दफा बहस हो, और मेम्बरजँ उस पर अपनी आब्जर्वेशन दें कि किस तरह से उन पर अमल हो रहा है, इसमें क्या कमियाँ हैं, किस तरह से उस पर और ज्यादा काम लिया जा सकता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह अच्छा होगा कि आप लोगों की राय उस पर मिलती रहे और जो आपका तजुर्बा है, उस का आप इजहार करते रहें—इस से हमको फायदा पहुँचेगा।

हम चाहते हैं कि स्माल स्केल इण्डस्ट्रीज को जहाँ तक हो सके मदद दी जाय। जैसा कि इस कमेटी ने भी कहा है कि सिर्फ लाइसेंसिंग के जरिये ही नहीं, बल्कि फाइनेन्शल इंस्टीचूशनज, लाइसेंसिंग इंस्टीचूशनज और इस तरह की जो दूसरी इंस्टीचूशनज है, उनमें एक कोआरडिनेटेड पालिसी इस्तिवार करनी चाहिये, जिसकी वजह से मोनोपली को रोका जा सके, छोटी इण्डस्ट्रीज को मदद दी जा सके, छोटे एन्टरप्रेन्योर्स को मदद दी जा सके। उन्होंने यह बहुत अच्छा विचार रखा है, यह गौर करने की चीज है, इस पर हम जरूर गौर करेंगे।

उन्होंने यह भी कहा है कि कुछ हाउसेज में मोनोपली बढ़ती चली गई है और कुछ छोटे लोग नेग्लेक्ट हुए हैं। इस चीज को देखने में लगे हुए हैं, जब हम इस पर विचार रखेंगे और आप डिस्कशन करेंगे तो उस वक्त इन तमाम बातों पर भी विचार रखे जायेंगे।

हमें इस चीज को अच्छी तरह से देखना है कि जो हमारा मकसद है, जो हमारा नस्ट्रुलएन है, जो हमारा औब्जेक्टिव है—किस तरह से लाइसेंसिंग कमेटी के जरिये और उसी तरह की जो दूसरी चीजें हैं उन में कोआर्डिनेशन लाकर पूरा कर सके। मैं समझता हूँ कि जब यह

[श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद]

गौर करेंगे।

मामला यहां पार्लियामेन्ट के सामने आयेगा, उस वक्त हर मेम्बर को डिस्कशन करने का मौका मिलेगा और जो राय होगी, उस पर हम ज़रूर

18.03 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday the August, 4, 1969/Sravana 13, 1891 (Saka).