this agreement is broken or any violation of the agreement takes place our security forces do take appropriate measures. They have full powers to curb any unlawful activities.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now the question is :

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

15.50 hrs.

INDIAN TARIFF (AMENDMENT) BILL

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI MOHD. SHAFFI QURESHI) :

Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, be taken into consideration".

Sir, This Bill seeks to amend the first Schedule to the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, in order to give effect to Government's decisions on certain recommendations of the Tariff Commission relating to the Dyestuffs, Aluminium and Automobile Industries. Hon. Members would be aware that the protection to the Dyestuffs and Automobile Industries was originally due to expire on the 31st December, 1967. Owing to the Tariff Commission's preoccupation with certain more urgent inquiries, it was not able to submit its regular reports in respect of these industries during 1957, and the protection on them was therefore extended as interim measure upto the 31st December, 1968, throught the Indian Tariff (Amendment) Act, 1957. The Commission has since submitted its regular reports on these two industries, as well as on the Aluminium Industry which also the protection is due to expire on the 31st December, 1968.

Copies of the Tariff Commission's Reports on the three industries and of Government's resolution and notifications issued thereonhave already been laid on the Table of the House. Notes on these industries, containing the gist of the Tariff Commission's reports and recommendations, have also been circulated to Members. Hon. Members will no doubt have gone through the documents and the details given therein regarding the development of the respective industries under protection.

At this point, I would like to make a brief reference to the functions of the Tariff Commission. Members would have seen the "Review of Work of the Tariff Commission for the period October, 1957 to September, 1968" which has also been circulated for their information. Under the provisions of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, a permanent Tariff Commission was constituted in January, 1952. The main functions of the Tariff Commission are to make protection and price inquiries and reviews. In this connection, I would like to mention that Section 11 (a) of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, contemplates "the grant of protection (whether by the grant of subsidy or the levy of protective duties or in any other suitable form) for the encouragement of any industry in India . . ."

I would also like to mention that a protection industry has obligations as well as facilities and that it is one of the function of the Tariff Commission to keep a watch on protected industries to see that they fulfil their obligations. Section 11 (d) of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, provides for inquiry and report regarding action to be taken where an industry in taking undue advantage of the tariff protection granted to it, as for example by charging unnecessarily high prices for its goods or acting in a manner which results in deterioration in quality etc. The continuance of protection to an industry would therefore enable periodic reviews to be made by the Tariff Commission, not only to guide the progress of the industry but also to see that it does not act to the detriment of the national interest.

I shall now briefly refer to the industries in question. *Dyestuffs* : Protection was first granted in 1955 for the period of ten years ending the 31st December 1964, to a certain group of days. At the time of the 1954 inquiry, the scope was widened to include all coal tar dyes and a few intermediates, and protection to the industry was continued for a further period of three years, *i. e.* till the 31st December, 1967,

[Mohd. Shaffi Qureshi]

which as I mentioned earlier, was extended to the 31st December, 1968.

The industry covers finished dyestuffs as well as intermediates for the manufacture of such dyestuffs. Most of the consumers seemed to be satisfied with the quality of indigenous dyestuffs. The Commission is of the view that industry has diversified the range of its products and is now in a position to meet about 90 percent of the domestic requirements of dyestuffs, and by and large is in a position to withstand competition from abroad. The devaluation of the rupee in 1966 has also provided some built in protection. The Commission has, therefore, recommended that tariff protection to dyestuffs need not be continued beyond the 31st December, 1968. However the industry should continue to be deemed to be protected and should be subject to periodical reviews in order to ensure that it does not take undue advantage of the protection afforded by quantitative control over imports.

As regards dye-intermediates, the position is different. The need for protection not only remains, but has increased. In respect of a number of intermediates, where there is a possibility of manufacturing them in reasonably adequate quantity, and quality, the Commission has recommended that it is necessary to give tariff protection. Thus, it has recommended that the protection on three intermediates namely (1) 2-amino-anthraquinone, (2) Benzanthrone, and (3) Beta Oxy Naphthoice Acid, should be continued. In respect of 50 specified intermediates, the Tariff Commission has recommended that protection should be newly granted. In making its recommendations, the Commission has also taken into account the need to avoid an increase in the prices of intermediates whose importation cannot be avoided. In their case the Commission has either not recommended a protective duty or has recommended the levy of concessional rates of duty.

Government have accepted the scheme of protection recommended by the Commission. Details of the intermediates to be subjected to protective duty, and the rates of duty proposed, will be found in the Bill. The scheme of protection is proposed to be made applicable till the 31st December, 1971.

Aluminium : Protection to this industry was first granted in 1949. Periodical reviews were made and the protection was extended from time to time, the last inquiry being in 1964.

The Tariff Commission has stated that general satisfaction has been expressed with the quality of the primary metal, whereas with regard to sheets and circles a certain amount of dissatisfaction still prevails. According to the Commission, although the production of this industry has increased considerably since the last inquiry, a price disadvantage still exists. The Commission has, therefore, recommended the continuance of protection for a further period of three years at the existing rates of duty. Government have accepted this recommendation. The present effective rates of duty namely, 20 percent on ingots etc. and 27½ percent on sheets circles, etc. have been in force from the date of devaluation of the rupee, by virtue of a Notification u/s 4(1) of the Indian Tariff Act, 1934. These effective rates are now proposed to be incorporated in the first schedule to the Act.

Automobiles : The first report of the Tariff Commission on this industry was made in 1953. Since then this has been deemed to be a protected industry, with the scheme of the protection being modified from time to time in the light of further inquiries and reviews. The tariff protection on the components and ancillaries subject to protective duties was due to expire on the 31st December, 1967. Protection was continued for one more year upto the 31st December, 1968, on an *Ad hoc* basis as mentioned earlier and is now due to expire on the 31st December, 1968.

Due to the highly restrictive import policy, imports of automobiles have been significantly less during the last few years. The export Performance on the other hand has considerably improved. As against Rs. 3 lakh's worth of exports during 1960-61 the exports of automobiles increased to Rs. 22 lakhs in 1963 64 Rs. 71 lakhs in 1964-65 and Rs. 106 lakhs in 1966-67.

In its present report, the Tariff Commission has observed that it is anomalus that while the main automobile industry does not enjoy protective rates of duty and complete automobiles are liable to revenue rates of duty, ancillaries and parts should be liable to protective rates of duty. It has therefore recommended that the protective rates of duty on ancillaries and parts may be withdrawn and revenue rates of duty imposed instead. Both the automobile industry and the automobile ancillary industry should however continue to be regarded as protected. To remove the surveillance over the functioning of the industry merely because of the formal substitution of revenue duties for protective duties would be unrealistic and also unfair to the consumer and to the economic growth of the country. It is for these reasons that the Tariff Commission considers that this industry should continue to be protected industry and as such liable to periodic reviews by the Commission. Government have accepted the above recommendations. The revenue rates of duty will be fixed at the same levels as the existing protective rates.

In its three reports the Tariff Commission has made a number of other recommendations relating to the three industries in question. The decisions taken on these recommendations have been announced in the resolutions which have been placed on the Table of the House, and necessary action is being taken by the Ministries concerned with those industries. The Present Bill seeks to give effect to those decisions of the Government which involve the continuance or discontinuance of tariff protection or the extension of protection to new items.

With these words, Sir, I beg to move that the Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, be taken into consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, be taken into consideration".

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

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 15th March, 1969". (1)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey is absent.

श्री पन्नालाल बारपाल (गंगानगर) : सभापति महोदय, मैं एक कठिनाई की ओर आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करने के लिए एक मिनट चाहता हूं । हमारे जो दर्शक बाहर से आते हैं, उनके लिए जो एमरजेन्सी पास बनवाये जाते हैं, उसके लिए पहले नोटिस आफिस में जाना पड़ता है, जहां वह टाइम देते हैं, उसके बाद रजिस्टर में दस्तखत करने के लिए जाना पड़ता है, उसके बाद दर्शकों को छोड़ने के लिये जाना पड़ता है । इसमें हमें बहुत कठिनाई होती है । यह बात मैं अपनी ओर से नहीं, सारे सदस्यों की ओर से कह रहा हूं ....

सभापति महोदय : मैं इसके लिए स्पीकर साहब से कहूंगा ।

16.00 hrs.

SHRI LOBO PRABHA (Udipi) : Sir, I would base my remarks on what the Minister himself stated in respect of this Bill. He began by stating the functions of the Tariff Commission and I think he very rightly did so, because the Tariff Commission has now become, like the vermiform appendix, a useless body. On its own admission the effective control of our industries, is exercised not by the Tariff Commission but by the Finance Ministry which restricts the imports of many of their competitive items.

Secondly, in that connection, I would also refer to the very proposals made by the Tariff Commission, which the Minister mentioned. Almost all of them are asking the Government to convert the protective duty to a revenue duty. Just for two or three recommendations-in the case of Benzanthrone and Beta Oxy Naphthoic Acid that the duty be reduced from 100 to 50% and also in the inclusion of some intermediates, some new recommendations have been made-I don't think there is any justification for these vast labours on the part of Tariff

[Shri Lobo Prabhu]

Commission as also for these vast volumes, which the Tariff Commission has produced.

The Minister added that the function of the Tariff Commission is to see that the protection given is properly used to produce articles of good quality at a reasonable price. You would see from the reports of the Tariff Commission, in respect of dye-stuff, the price rose upto 170% above the world price. Is this a proper use of the protection given by the Government ? The Minister has not referred to what the Tariff Commission has done to see that the prices are kept within reasonable bounds. In respect of motor components and spare parts, probably the increase in price is even higher sometimes four times more than the landing cost. Here again the Tariff Commission has failed in its duty.

What I am suggesting is not the abolition of Tariff Commission here and now, but that better use should be made of this very large, important and expensive body. No doubt, the Minister referred to many proposals of the Government, but none of them includes the very vital proposal that the Tariff Commission should keep a watch on prices and quality in the interest of consumers. My party stands for consumers and would like the Tariff Commission to be on their side, not on the side of Government or producers.

One other observation I would like to make at this stage, which also arises from my Amendment, is this. A period of three years. which has given for this protection, does not seem to have much meaning. Within a period of three years no industry can plan with the confidence that it will be able to break even or to have economic production. In the beginning, many of these industries used to get ten years. Now it seems to me that only three years are given to provide recurring work to the Tariff Commission which is otherwise idle. It will now be enabled to resume work every second year on its own proposals to repeat the same result. I would, therefore, press that the protection instead of being only up to 1972, should be up to year 1975. This would be in accord with the request of the industries themselves, which want protection for a period of ten years.

Now there are three major items involved in the proposals. The first is in respect of dye-stuffs. In the case of dye stuffs, a distinction has to be made between the finished product and the intermediates. Any protection to the intermediates raises the prices and, therefore, to that extent makes import substitution much more difficult. In those circumstances, there is a case for revising the existing rates of duties Of course, the argument will be that there is an in-built protection,as the Minister hemself suggested, from devaluation He may also have suggested that when it is all added up, the tariff duty forms a very small part of the duties imposed by the government. The excise duty and other uties total up to much more. Even so, the duty on intermediates, not on finished products, deserves to be less than what is proposed.

I am now coming to the sbject of aluminium which has bee having rather a bad time of late. Because the electrical installation indust has suffered a set back. aluminium is not wanted as much as in the past when the electrical programme of the government was more. In the circumstances, it is almost agnating and instead of growing as one expects this industry to do. today many of the poroducers are not able to make both ends meet or are not able to find finances to carry on production. Of course, it is not correct to say that this is affected by import duties. It is affected by excise duties. But as the Commerce Minister is concerned with both import duties and excise duies, in the sense that he is concerned with industries, on this occasion I would priess the Minister to ensure that the Finance Ministry notes the parlous condition of the aluminium industry and reduce the excise duties, which are more relevant than import duties, on this industry.

Last and most important of all I come to hie automobile industry. The Tariff Commssion has admitted that the existing duty is not required for protection and, therefore,it will continue only because of revenue purposes. I would like the Industries Minister to consider carefully why he should provide revenue to the Finance Ministry by making the prouction of automobiles more expensive than what it is. It must be within his knowledge that the production of jeeps has

fallen down by 50 percent, from 10,869 last year to 5,700 this year. There was a fall in the production of commercial vehicles also last year, which is not so pronounced this year. Still, it exists and production is very much below capacity and to that extent, there is an increas in overheads.

It has been calculated that the duties on commercial vehicles vary between 43 to 49 percent of the cost of the vehicle. I am not referring to the duties on diesel and petrol, because I shall refer to them later on. In respect of jeeps the duty is from 42 to 47 percent of the cost of the vehicle. On a commercial vehicle as much as Rs. 15,000 is paid as duty. Whatever the pretentions of government in respect of socialism may be, they do not seem to apply it in respect of commercial vehicles.

Commercial vehicles serve the people as buses or as lorries to bring themselves or their products to the market. If the interest of the industry is any business of the Ministry, it has to see that these duties are reduced.

Along with these duties, we are now concerned with the import duty. If it is only a revenue duty, there is no reason why it should be 50 percent *ad valorem* and why it should not be about 25 percent. You have to realise that if it is 50 percent. *ad-valorem*, it is already increased by 57 percent devaluation. You are getting the benefit of the increase in *ad valorem* and when I suggest 25 percent, practically it will be 50 percent that is of what it was before, if the calculation is followed. But whatever it is, when the price of our vehicles is so high-the price of an ordinary vehicle in this country is higher than that of a luxury vehicle in other countries-there is a case for reducing this duty to 25 percent.

Then, these spare parts are imported into this country for older vehicles, for vehicles of long ago for which people cannot find the replacements in this country. Is it fair to these old vehicles, rather to their old and dilapidated owners, that you make them pay 50 percent revenue, to the Finance Ministry ?

I would press finally that the Commerce Ministry may not act as the tax-gatherer of the Finance Ministry. The Finance Ministry must find its own resources and not use other ministries and production, the users of vehicles, dyes and aluminium, to reimburse its depleted coffers, depleted because the Finance Minister does not know what is waste and what is good for the country.

SHRIMATI TARA SAPRE (Bombay-North-East) : Mr. Chairman, I am going to deal only with the automobile industry, particularly passenger cars. The automobile industry in India is a fairly old industry. It has got protection for the last ten years. This industry is a protected industry since 1957. In 1960 the *ad hoc* committee, which studied the working of the industry, observed that sufficient care was not being taken to avoid minor but irritating defects creeping in at the assembly stage which could easily have been avoided. There is no adequate system of inspection and check before the vehicle left the factory.

Then again, the Motor Car Quality Enquiry Committee was set up by Government to make a full and complete investigation and a questionnaire was circulated. A number of car-owners categorically stated in reply to the questionnaire that the quality of the three models of cars had deteriorated during the last ten years.

The complaints about the cars are numerous and they start almost from the moment of purchase. They go on mounting with every month that passes. There are complaints about every part practically-the short life of light, inefficient radiators, poor quality of electrical wiring, the poor quality of steel used for making chassis and the bodies of the vehicles. That is another sad story of our public sector undertakings.

16.14 hrs.

[SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR *in the Chair*]

The car industry is shifting the blame of poor-quality product on the manufacturers of ancillaries. At present all the components are indigenous; so, in view of the many complaints about components, it

[Shri Vasudevan Nair]

is desirable for the industry to set up testing facility in co-operation with the ancillary industries.

Another disquieting aspect of the development of this industry is the steady increase in car prices. For this the manufacturers' explanation is that 80 percent of the increase in cost during the last few years is due to Government levy, 42 percent on passenger cars and 45 to 49 percent on transport vehicles. Even accepting this, is there no scope for reducing cost in other directions ?

All these years the industry has been enjoying sellers market. It was able to sell whatever was produced irrespective of the price in view of the large pent up demand.

It is true that there is certain amout of stagnation in the industry or its capacity is not fully utilised. There is little reason for satisfaction over the development of industry because for the country of India's size, an annual off-take of 40,000 cars is pitifully small.

The industry is, at present, in such a position that if protection is taken out the whole industry will dwindle down because it has reached to the stage where it cannot stand competition from foreign imports. The best solution under present circumstances is to put up a machinery to have a quality control or at the same time Government must come forward with small-car project in the public sector which will put some control on the rising prices.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : (Kanpur) Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have heard with rapt attention the speech of the hon. Deputy Minister. I cannot understand how the automobile industry could be given further protection. It is always said that this industry needs protection without telling us the ground on which this industry deserves further protection.

You are aware that the prices of motor-cars, whether it is Ambassador or Fiat or even Standard, are going up. Today, the cost of an Ambassador car is about Rs. 21,000. Three years back, its price was Rs. 19,000. I do not know how much it is going to be increased. We have been assured in this House that efforts are being made to bring down the prices. I do not agree with Shri Lobo Probhu when he said that it is because of the excise duty that the prices are going up. That is exactly the view-point of the capitalists and industrialists who want further reduction of excise duty. But nobody talks of the fabulous profits which they earn. After paying Rs. 21,000 for an Ambassador car, what do we get ? One foreign expert, when he came to India, was asked to give his comment or his opinion on the Ambassador car. He said, "This is a wonderful car where every part makes noise with the exception of the horn." The horn does not make noise but every part of the car makes noise. If that is the standard of an Ambassador car, I do not know how it is going to cater to the needs of the people.

I would request the hon. Minister to appoint a high-power Commission to go into the entire price structure of the automobile industry, whether it is Fiat or it is Ambassador or even Standard, whether it is a four-doors or two-doors car. There should be a Commission appointed for it so that the high profits earned at the cost of denial of bonus to the workers, at the cost of all benefits to the workers, are properly checked.

I am against giving further protection to the automobile industry. There must be a Commission appointed and, I am sure that will definitely come to the conclusion that a car can be purchased at a much, lower price than what it is today. Moreover I know that some people wanted some more, things to be added in the car, specially, in an Ambassador car, and they were told that that will mean additional expenses of Rs. 20 lakhs to Rs. 30 lakhs, increasing the price of the car by Rs. 1000 or Rs 1,500, that is, about Rs. 22,000 or so. What is the cost of a car in foreign countries ? I do not know whether it is a fact that many parts of the car are still being imported.

What has happened to our public sector car project. It can never come. As long as Birlas or Walchands are alive in this

country, whether it is taking over of the Birla House or taking over of the car industry, nothing will come.

The competition is going on. Whether Birla will take over the Government or the Government will take over the Birla House is a matter to be decided. Therefore, I oppose this Bill which seeks to give further protection to industry. I want a Commission to inquire into all the malpractices, mismanagement and everything that is happening in the automobile industry.

SHRI NARENDRA SINGH MAHIDA (Anand) : The Indian Tariff Commission has been doing a laudable work. Mr. Lobo Prabhu criticised it, but this Commission gives protection to our industries. This Bill seeks to amend the First Schedule to the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, in order to continue or discontinue tariff protection to certain industries and to bring certain new items under the scheme of protection on the advice of the Tariff Commission. The scope is very limited. It gives protection to para-aminosanthra-quinone and certain other acids and discontinues giving protection to Naphthols and other dyes. It also seeks to continue protection to aluminium industry because, on account of the recession, the aluminium industry is suffering.

About automobiles there is a difference of opinion whether protection should be given or not. But I would say that the quality control should be there. Whether it is acids or dyes or aluminium or car, protection has to be given or discontinued according to the position of the local market as well as the international market. About motor cars we have to see that cars are made in this country; we cannot afford to import cars even if they are cheap. Opinions may differ on this. Whether the automobile industry is run by Birla or by others, we definitely expect that there should be quality. Cars should be manufactured as cheap as possible. Japanese cars are very cheap and are available all over the world; they have entered into the world market. If India enters into the world market, I do not think that it will find any buyer outside our country. If we participate in the race from London to Sydney, I do not think that our car will go more than a couple of hundred miles. Therefore, we must improve our quality and also see that car is available at a cheap rate.

The Indian Tariff Commission is necessary as it has to guide the Government in various aspects. But the quality control should be insisted, and I believe that the Government is quite aware of this problem. We insist on quality control, more particularly of the goods which are exported. We are now paying attention to our tea industry because there is competition from other countries, specially from Ceylon. Many complaints have been received from foreign countries that without proper control, our traders are apt to cheat, more particularly the foreign countries. It is, therefore, very necessary, that the Tariff Commission should exercise its rights and advise the Government in a proper way. Unless our quality is improved, whatever talks we may have in our country will not raise the status or name of the country. That is why I would request the Tariff Commission, and more particularly the Government, to see that tighter controls are exercised over quality, particularly in the case of the goods that are exported from this country.

With these remarks, I support this Bill.

श्री श्रीचन्द गोयल (चण्डीगढ़) : सभापति महोदय, इस विधेयक के द्वारा कुछ उद्योगों को संरक्षण दिया गया है और कुछ उद्योगों से संरक्षण छीना जा रहा है। जिन उद्योगों को संरक्षण दिया जा रहा है मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूं लेकिन इसके साथ साथ मैं निश्चित रूप से आप के द्वारा मांग करना चाहता हूं कि यह संरक्षण केवल कुछ उद्योगपतियों के ही लिए ही न हो बल्कि यह संरक्षण या इसका उपयोग उपभोक्ताओं और कंज्यूमर्स के हित के लिए भी होना चाहिए।

यह सचमुच बड़े दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि पिछले 10-12 साल से मैं इस स्थिति को देख रहा हूं कि सन् 1956-57 में जिस ऐम्बेसेडर गाड़ी का मूल्य 10,000 रुपये होता था आज वही ऐम्बेसेडर गाड़ी 22,000 रुपये की हो

[श्री श्रीचन्द गोयल]

गयी है। कीमतों के अन्दर कुछ तो बढ़ना मेरी समझ में आ सकता था लेकिन 10 साल के अन्दर दस हजार की गाड़ी की कीमत बढ़ कर 22 हजार रुपये हो जाय यह वास्तव में एक बड़े आश्चर्य की बात है। कीमत इतनी बढ़ने के साथ ही उसकी क्वालिटी भी इस कदर गिर जाय कि आज कई लोग वह जो ऐम्बैसेडर का 1956-57 का माडल खरीदते हैं तो वह तो पांच, सात साल चल जाता है लेकिन नया माडल जो इतना महंगा है उसकी 2 साल की भी गारन्टी नहीं है। इतनी अधिक कार की कीमत बढ़ने के बाद उसकी क्वालिटी का गिरना मैं समझता हूँ कि यह इस बात की दलील है कि जितना भी संरक्षण यह सरकार की तरफ से इन उद्योगों को मिलता है उसका उपयोग उपभोक्ताओं के लिए करने के बजाय वह उद्योगपति अपनी जेबें व तिजोरियां भरते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार को सचमुच इस बारे में जांच पड़ताल करानी चाहिए। मैं श्री बनर्जी के इस सुझाव से सहमत हूँ कि इस के बारे में कोई आयोग अथवा समिति स्थापित करके जांच पड़ताल कराई जाय कि दरअसल क्या मामला है? क्या सचमुच सारे वर्ल्ड मार्केट के अन्दर 10 साल के अन्दर 10,000 रुपये वाली चीज की कीमत बढ़ कर 22,000 रुपये हो गयी है और साथ ही उसकी क्वालिटी भी गिर गयी है? हम पाते हैं कि दूसरे देशों ने अपने वाहनों की क्वालिटी उसी तरह से कायम रक्खी है। हम देश भक्त होने के नाते यह उचित समझते हैं कि हम अपने देश के अन्दर बनी हुई चीजों का इस्तेमाल करें। हमारे द्वारा स्वदेशी माल का ही प्रयोग होना चाहिए। लेकिन जब हम यह देखते हैं कि आज सरकार का उचित नियंत्रण इन उद्योगों के ऊपर नहीं है और आज कुछ उद्योगपति मनमाने तरीके से कीमतें बढ़ाते हैं और मनमाने तरीके से उसकी क्वालिटी गिराते हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सचमुच में एक जांच का विषय है।

दूसरा मेरा निवेदन है कि जिन उद्योगों पर से यह संरक्षण हटाया जा रहा है मैं समझता हूँ कि आज हमारे उन उद्योगों को उसकी आवश्यकता थी कि ऐसे संरक्षणों को जारी रक्खा जाता। आज इस बात का कोई कारण नहीं बतलाया गया, इसकी कोई वजह नहीं बतलाई गयी कि क्या वह उद्योग धंधे जो कि प्रगति की स्थिति को प्राप्त हो गये हैं, उन को संरक्षण की आज आवश्यकता नहीं रही है, उन्हें क्यों संरक्षण प्रदान किया जा रहा है? मैं यह भी समझता हूँ कि जैसे ही उन उद्योगों से आप अपना यह संरक्षण वापिस ले लेंगे तो उस का परिणाम स्वाभाविक रूप से यह निकलेगा कि वह उद्योगपति उन चीजों के मूल्य और अधिक बढ़ा कर उसका सारा बोझ उपभोक्ताओं के ऊपर डाल देंगे। क्या मंत्री महोदय सदन को इस बात का आश्वासन दे सकते हैं कि जिन उद्योगों से वह संरक्षण हटा रहे हैं उन वस्तुओं के मूल्यों को वह बढ़ने नहीं देंगे? इस प्रकार का ऐश्योरेंस या आश्वासन वह सदन को दें।

मैं इतना कह कर इस विधेयक के उन प्राविधानों के द्वारा जो संरक्षण दिया गया है उसका स्वागत करता हूँ लेकिन साथ ही साथ मैं मंत्री महोदय से इस बात का भी आग्रह करता हूँ कि वह इस बात को देखें कि इस संरक्षण का उपयोग केवल कुछ उद्योगपतियों के लिए न हो बल्कि उपभोक्ताओं के लिए हो। माल की क्वालिटी की गारन्टी हो और चीजों के जो बढ़ते हुए दाम हैं उनको निश्चित रूप से काबू किया जाय।

सस्ते दामों पर छोटी कार मार्केट में लाने की मांग काफी अर्से से चल रही है। उसके मार्केट में लाने की बात पिछले दस साल से सुन रहे हैं लेकिन अभी तक तो वह आयी नहीं है। लेकिन उस छोटी गाड़ी का भी मूल्य जहां कि यह समझा जा रहा था कि 4-5 हजार रुपये में वह मिल जायगी आज उस छोटी कार के बारे में 10-12 और 15 हजार की बातें होने लगी हैं जबकि उस के मुकाबले दूसरे देशों ने कम

कीमत में अच्छी क्वालिटी वाली चीज तैयार की है । इसलिए आज उन सभी साधनों के बारे में खोज करने की आवश्यकता है जिससे कि हम भी मुनासिब मूल्य पर सही माल तैयार कर सकें ।

SHRI RAJARAM (Salem) : The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill No. 120 of 1968 is before us. We are at the fag end of this session. Every time this Ministry is bringing forward a Bill like this and getting it passed in a few minutes. No member is given full time to think over these Bills and their implications, what for they are given continued protection and so on.

This Ministry is giving protection to all kinds of cars manufactured in the country. As other members have said, the quality of the wonderful Ambassador or Fiat car is that if you close one door, the other will open. This is the condition of a Fiat car manufactured here.

SHRI SWELL (Autonomous Districts) : That is the genius of the car.

SHRI RAJARAM : Of course, this kind of automatic system prevails in the kind of cars made here, and nowhere else will one find it. I would ask whether it is possible for our Government to sell any car manufactured by any of these three concerns abroad, either Fiat or Ambassador or Standard. All the cars are rotten ones. Instead of giving protection to them, we should get cars from abroad which are available at a cheap rate and have them repaired, if necessary. I have seen hundreds cars of standing on the roads in foreign countries. One can buy those cars at Rs. 500, Rs. 600, Rs. 1000 like that. These could be brought here and repaired; it will incidentally give work to our labour. Even after giving a bonus, one could sell these cars at a lower rate than one has to pay for the cars made here. By protecting this industry, we are only protecting the rich people who are the manufacturers.

We have been protecting these three companies for so many years. An Ambassador which was costing Rs. 8,000 now costs Rs. 21,000. Who is enjoying all this profit ?

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : Government most of it is tax.

SHRI RAJARAM : Then we are giving protection to dyestuffs. I come from a handloom area. A number of people use handloom dyes for the handloom. But the pity is that everything has disappeared into the black market. I would ask what is the meaning of this protection. We are not able to maintain a certain price level. The manufacturers are creating an artificial scarcity and selling it at abnormal rates. On top of it, no dye-stuff is available in the open market. So many handloom workers have been suffering because of this state of affairs even in my own place, Salem. It is to protect such people that a Bill is brought here and got passed because the ruling party has its majority here.

This is an unwanted Bill, unnecessary Bill and this protection will destroy our country and our people.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA (Cuttack) : This Bill seeks to continue protection to certain industries. It says in statement of objects and reasons that protection is being discontinued in the case of the automobile industry. In the case of the aluminium industry, protection is sought to be continued at the existing effective rates of duty. Under items 30(15), 30 (1) (b) (i) and 30 (16) protection is being discontinued.

But after protection is taken away, they are maintaining the same rate as revenue. Will it not get into the price? Simply changing the name from 'tariff' to 'revenue' will not help the consumer. He has all the same to bear the burden.

To come to the dye-stuffs industry, what is being protected ? We know who are the producers of these items being protected ? 90 per cent of the organised sector is in the hands of big industrialists with foreign collaboration with which they are manufacturing all these big items, specially wet dyes. They are being protected on the wrong assumption that the intermediates are being taxed at a higher rate, and the finished products are being taxed at a lower rate. The Tariff Commission has time and again pointed out that this is an anomalous position which should be discon-

[Shri Srinibas Misra]

tinued. If the intermediates are taxed at a higher rate, the production in this country will be more costly. If you are taxing the actual article at a lower rate, are you giving any protection ? So, the underlying policy of all this is that the big manufacturers with foreign collaborators are importing dye intermediates and they are in a position to under cut the small scale producers here. The Tariff Commission in its report has quoted many figures, but at the outset they have said that they have not been able to collect the figures for the small-scale industry. So they have depended upon an approximate figure given by some commission. This will show that the proper figure of production was not before the Tariff Commission when they recommended these things. There should have been an attempt to find out the real figure. If the figure of production of the small-scale industry is really much more, there is no need to give protection to fatten these already fat people.

There should be a policy of co-ordination in the licensing department, after the small-scale units get licences for producing a certain type of dye. At present, without taking into consideration whether they have actually commenced production, what is their capacity etc., you are protecting the existing manufacturers only without protecting the small manufacturers.

Regarding aluminium, some items are still protected, and duty is being levied at the same rate. Have you estimated the actual production in those items in this country, have you ascertained whether the actual capacity of the organised sector has been utilised ? Without an attempt to utilise the real licensed capacity, protection is being granted. That should not be done.

To come to automobiles, the same question arises of protection and revenue. I need not dilate upon the points which most of the hon. members from this side have made, but it has to be seen that the big companies which own these automobile manufacturing concerns are seeking more and more protection, and our Tariff Commission is not loath to recommend and our Government also is not unwilling to extend protection to them.

Shri Goyal was trying to argue that tariff should be to benefit the consumers. Actually it is the reverse, the tariff is being imposed to benefit the industry. Our policy has been to encourage the industry by imposing tariff so that there will be no undercutting and we are also imposing countervailing duty to counteract dumping into our country. But if we look to the consumers, in any given item if the price increase as a result of tariff compares unfavourably with the international market, then the tariff should be discontinued. I am not opposed to imposing tariffs, but it should not be done recklessly and without proper examination.

16.39 hrs.

[SHRI R. D. BHANDARE *in the Chair*]

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Chittoor): I have to mention about the manufacture of cars and the quality they are maintaining. In India there are some lucky people who manufacture cars, and the Government is only allowing them to mint money by this Tariff Bill.

We have got three types of cars manufacured in our country. One is the Hindutan Ambassador. Second is the Fiat and the third is the Standard. Out of these three cars they have made the die long ago. The same die is used for five years. There is no change in the machinery. What about the type of metal they use ? The metal will be worn out after running a few hundreds of miles. The tyres will be worn out. No quality control is there. When there is competition in the country about the same type of cars and there are 2 or 3 cars, each man will try to manufacture a good car, changing the models every year and giving a cheaper car. Now due to the Government's policy of encouraging only the three people and not allowing anybody to manufacture car nor the Government coming forward to manufacture any car in the public sector, the car manufacturers are minting money and the poor people are being robbed. Not the poor people, but those who purchase cars are being robbed. For a car worth Rs. 10,000 they are paying Rs. 20,000. For Rs. 5000 worth car they have to pay Rs. 10,000 and another Rs. 10,000 as taxes to the Government. If this is continued, the Government is not suffering; it is the car users who are suffering and the factory owners are

minting money. So I want the Government to start at least one small car factory in the public sector and allow one or two private manufacturers to manufacture car in the country and there should be competition.

The other thing is that there must be a strict control over these manufacturers. Every year they should change the model. They use the same die and they do not change the car. This is the position of the car. Coming to tyre manufacture, there are so many factories in our country. They manufacture tyres. You give them protection. You do not allow anybody to import tyres. It is very good that we have to encourage our people. What about the distribution ? The Commerce Ministry should look into the distribution system. They are not looking into the distribution system. There is no price control. To-day what the big tyre companies are doing is that they have got so many dealers in every district and they sell the tyres to some selected dealers and they openly sell them in black-market. That is not black market, that is open market. They give a Bill. A tyre costing Rs. 200 is sold for Rs. 300. They give a bill. Another type of tyre costing Rs. 290 is sold at Rs. 450 . This is the position in the country. The Minister who uses Government cars does not know the cost of the tyre. For a tyre which costs Rs. 290 I paid Rs .450 due to the negligence of these Ministers. Otherwise I would not have spent so much.

Another thing is the tractor tyre. The manufacturers sell them in black market by giving these tyres to a selected few and they take money in underhand dealings. I want the Government to see that there is control over these tyre companies, especially over the distribution system so that the tyres may not go into the black market.

Coming to agriculture, we have tractors. To purchase a tractor is very easy. For that too we have to wait for 3 or 4 years.

But it seems to be very easy now, and getting tyres is very difficult. For a tractor tyre costing Rs. 400 to Rs. 450, we have to pay Rs. 1,000 or Rs. 1,200 and the Government comes forward to put all sorts of control on the agriculturists saying that they are making more money. How ? You say that you want the country to be self-sufficient. But are you taking any interest to supply at least tyres to the agriculturists to grow more food ? You are not taking interest at all.

I want the Government to think of all these things and not simply encourage the tyre companies alone. If you want to put down the tyre companies, allow import. Import some tyres and see that the prices are cut down and that they do not indulge in black-marketing, and also see that the tyres distributed to all the dealers equally. That is my request.

श्री शिवचन्द्र झा (मधुबनी) : सभापति महोदय, मैं इस इण्डियन टेरिफ (एमेंडमेंट) बिल का विरोध करता हूँ, क्योंकि यह इस नीति और सिद्धान्त को आघात पहुँचाता हैकि अन्दरूनी ताकत और साधनों की बदौलत देश का औद्योगीकरण हो और यह बाहर के उद्योगपतियों को हिन्दुस्तान में मुनाफाखोरी करने का मौका देता है ।

टेरिफ कमीशन की सिफारशों के नाम पर कुछ उद्योगों की टेरिफ प्रोटेक्शन ड्यूटी में परिवर्तन लाये जा रहे हैं और मन्त्री महोदय ने अपनी रपट में कहा है कि इससे इकानोमिक ग्रोथ होगी और वे उद्योग विकसित होंगे । लेकिन यदि आप इस विधेयक की तफसील में जायेंगे, तो साफ जाहिर होगा कि हकीकत में वे उद्योग विकसित नहीं होंगे, बल्कि उनके नाम पर कुछ बाहर के लोग विकसित होंगे ।

इस विधेयक में खासकर तीन उद्योगों, डाईस्टफ, एलुमिनियम और आटोमोबाइल तथा आटोमोबाइल एन्सिलरी इण्डस्ट्री के बारे में प्रावधान किया जा रहा है । एलुमिनियम उद्योग को तो पहले की स्थिति में रहने दिया जा रहा है । डाईस्टफ इण्डस्ट्री की प्रोटेक्शन ड्यूटी में कुछ परिवर्तन किये जा रहे हैं । उसके बारे में मुझे कुछ विशेष नहीं कहना है ।

[श्री शिवचन्द्र झा]

मुझे खास तौर पर कार उद्योग के मुताल्लिक कहना है।

हम चाहें या न चाहें, हिन्दुस्तान में कार उद्योग का होना बहुत जरूरी है। सुरक्षा, यातायात और परिवहन आदि कई दृष्टियों से देश में मोटरकारों और लारियों वगैरह की बहुत जरूरत है। इस समय कार उद्योग सात आठ प्राईवेट कम्पनियों की मार्फत चलाया जा रहा है। हकीकत में इस उद्योग के विकास का बुनियादी और लाजिमी रास्ता यह है कि सरकार इन सात आठ प्राईवेट कम्पनियों पर कब्जा कर ले और या इस उद्योग को प्राईवेट सेक्टर से हटा कर पब्लिक सेक्टर, सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र, में ले जाये। एक कांग्रेसी सदस्य ने कहा कि इस उद्योग का कुछ भाग पब्लिक सेक्टर में ले जाया जाये। लेकिन ये लोग तो डर कर बोलते हैं; जो मन में है, उसको बोल नहीं सकते हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर कार उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण हो, तभी उसका विकास होगा। लेकिन सरकार ऐसा नहीं कर रही है। वह इस ढांचे में कुछ परिवर्तन लाने जा रही है। यह विधेयक आटोमोबाइल इण्डस्ट्री और आटोमोबाइल एन्सिलरी इण्डस्ट्री के सम्बन्ध में टैरिफ कमीशन की सिफारिशों के खिलाफ है। इस उद्योग के बारे में टेरिफ कमीशन का कानक्लूजन यह है :

> "For these reasons, the Commission has concluded that there is no practical alternative but to let the industry continue under the present scheme of protection."

अर्थात टैरिफ कमीशन की सिफारिश है कि कार उद्योग में प्रोटेक्शन का सिलसिला अभी उसी रूप में रहे। लेकिन इस विधेयक में कहा जा रहा है :

> "In respect of automobile and automobile ancillary industry .... the Bill seeks to discontinue the tariff portection ...."

टैरिफ कमीशन की सिफारिश कुछ है और किया कुछ जा रहा है। आटोमोबाइल एन्सिलरी उद्योग के बारे में टेरिफ कमीशन की रिपोर्ट कहती है :

> "The ancillary industry is an important adjunct of the main automobile industry and its development needs to be carefully watched."

अर्थात टैरिफ कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है कि इस उद्योग के डेवेलपमेंट को वाच किया जायेगा, बाहर से जो पार्ट आते हैं, उनकी निगरानी की जायेगी और कुछ समय बाद ड्यूटी में परिवर्तन किया जायेगा। लेकिन इस विधेयक में टेरिफ प्रोटेक्शन को डिसकान्टीन्यू किया जा रहा है और टैरिफ कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के खिलाफ काम किया जा रहा है। तो साफ हो जाता है कि टेरिफ कमीशन की जो सिफारिशें हैं उसके खिलाफ यह विधेयक काम करता है और टेरिफ कमीशन ने कहा है, कार उद्योग और ऐंसिलरी उद्योग में जो सब से बड़ी कमी है और जो कमियां हैं, उनके बारे में उसने कहा है :

> "Its main handicaps are fragmentation, low volume of production, constant high prices, non-availability of raw materials, even where indigenous sources are capable of supplying them and extensive tie-up through collaboration agreements."

कार उद्योग में एक्सटेंसिव कोलेबोरेशन है, फारेन कोलेबोरेशन है और यह बहुत बड़ी कमी है। तो इस विधेयक के जरिए हकीकत में भारत के अन्दर अन्दरूनी उद्योग बढ़े यह चीज नहीं है बल्कि इस में छूट देकर बाहर के जो कोलेबोरेटर्स हैं उनको बढ़ावा दिया जा रहा है ताकि वह हिन्दुस्तान के बाजार में अच्छी तरह से मुनाफाखोरी कर सकें और अपना फैलाव कर सकें। इससे साफ हो जाता है कि यह विधेयक बाहरी पूंजी देश में विकसित करने के लिए है। यह सरकार अपनी ताकत के बल

पर नहीं बाहर की मदद से यह काम करना चाहती है जिससे भारत का और शोषण हो। हकीकत में जो हिन्दुस्तान के औद्योगीकरण का रूप है, जिस रूप में होना चाहिए, उस रूप में नहीं है, लेकिन जो भी छोटा मोटा रूप है, जिस लिमिटेड रूप में यहां का औद्योगिकरण है उस पर भी यह आघात पहुँचाने वाला है। देश का औद्योगिकरण होना बहुत जरूरी है। अपनी ताकत पर देश की अर्थ व्यवस्था को मुनहस्सर रहना चाहिए, यह जरूरी है। लेकिन यह सरकार, टाटा और बिरला की जो सरकार है वह अपनी ताकत के बदोलत देश का औद्योगीकरण नहीं करना चाहती बल्कि ऐसा रास्ता अख्तियार करना चाहती है जिससे बाहर के पूंजीपतियों को मदद मिले और वह हिंदुस्तान में मुनाफाखोरी कर सकें। बिलकुल इससे साफ हो जाता है कि भारतीय पूंजीवाद दुनियाई पूंजीवाद और अमेरिकी पूंजीवाद का एक अंग है और यह सरकार जो भी कदम उठाती है एक के बाद दूसरा, राउंड एबाउट वे में, घूम फिर करके बाहरी पूंजीवाद की मदद करती है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं कहता हूं कि यह विधेयक सर्कुलेट कर दिया जाय सारे देश में और जनता के विचार ले लिए जायें, तब टैरिफ कमीशन की जो सिफारिशें हैं उन पर ठीक तरह से गौर किया जाय और तब इस को सदन के सामने लाया जाय। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं इसका विरोध करता हूं और मैं चाहूँगा कि सरकार इसको वापस कर ले।

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI : Sir, I am very grateful to the hon. members who have taken part in the discussion. Most of the speeches related to the automobile industry, which is under the Ministry of Industrial Development and not under Commerce Ministry. Some hon. members have referred to food prdouction and rubber tyres, which relate not to the Commerce Ministry but some other ministry. But the main point is this, Mr. Lobo Prabhu and some other hon. members raised certain doubts about the functioning of the Tariff Commission. As could be seen, the Tariff Commission has been rendering very important service to industries. They not only discharge their statutory obligation of looking into the progress of the protected industries, but also perform other functions. In fulfilment of its obligation, the Commission sends quarterly reviews to the Central Government reviewing the position of the protective sector, based on information relating to production. sales, stocks and other things.

Besides this, the Commission has done some good work. It has examined the cost structure of sugar and is preparing new schedule for determining the fair price payable to sugar industry; It has re-examined the price structure of various categories of catguts. It has reviewd the price structure of alcohol. It has examined the price-structure of man-made fibres and yarns.

So we cannot say that the Tariff Commission is a useless organ of the Government. It is doing very useful work. It is the job of Tariff Commission to review and examine the working of protected industries. It has been stated that, while examining the protected industries, the Tariff Commission does not take into consideration different aspects of a particular industry and it does not make a detailed review. Whatever has been stated by them is not a sort of off-hand review which the Commission makes. The Commission makes a detailed survey of each industry which seeks protection or where the Commission feels that protection should be extended. For instance, it has been stated that the Commission, while granting protection to the dye- stuff industry, did not possibly know the installed capacity, did not know the annual production, did not know the demand for dyes. The Tariff Commission's Report is there before the hon. Members. If they would turn to the first page, on which exact and complete information is given with regard to this industry, it is categorically stated that the total number of existing units is 21 in the organised sector, and 102 in the small scale sector. The estimated annual demand has been shown as 13,000 tonnes in 1968 which would go to 14,2000 tonnes in 1970. The

[Shri Mohd. Shaffi Qureshi]

demand has been put at 13,000 tonnes and the production both of the organised and the smallscale sectors has been given.

16.55 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

It would be of no use to repeat the whole thing again, because whatever I have stated in my earlier speech would, I think, satisfy the hon. Members that the Tariff Commission is not having only a cursory look at the protected industries, but it goes much deeper into the price structure also. It takes into consideration all the details and then comes to certain conclusions, whether a certain industry requires protection for a particular period or not.

Much has been stated about the automobile industry. I quite agree with, some hon. Members here that in a sellers market there is a tendency for deterioration of quality, and automobile is a case in point. This industry is one of the largest industries and the annual sale value of its production constitutes nearly about 7.68% of the total industrial production of the country. The manufacturers have been time and again told that they will have to improve the quality of their automobiles which they are selling to our people. They have been told that they will have to take full responsibility for maintaining quality and standards compatible with those expected by the consumers and those generally available to other people in other countries without giving any opportunity for launching an agitation or without creating a clamour for it. I am sure that the hon. Members know that the Goverment was pleased to appoint a Committee--the Motor Car quality Enquiry Committee--and after this Committee's report was received, the Government has taken certain steps. For instance, one of the grievances about the quality of cars was that the warranty period of cars was only 6 months and it was not a sufficient period to locate the defects. Now, the warranty period has been extended to one year, which will cover all the cars. The Government is keeping a close watch and vigil over the quality of cars.

The manufacturers belonging to protected industries owe an obligation and duty to the nation whenever their industries are protected. They have to see that their manufacture does not fall short of the requisite quality and the requisite standards.

SHRI RAJARAM: This guarantee is for imported cars or for indigenous cars.

SHRI SHAFFI MOHD. QUERESHI : For indigenous cars,

SHRI RAJARAM: The Tariff Commission is capable of reversing it.

SHRI MOHD.SHAFFI QUERESHI: With regard to Mr. Jha's point that we should nationalise the automobile industry, as my hon. friend very well knows, we have got a mixed economy in our country where both the public and private sectors have to exist ; they have to supplement and complement each other. It is not that one should exist at the cost of the other. So the question of taking over the automobile industry or nationalising it does not arise at all. But, we shall see that production in the private-sector industries is improved. It has been stressed on them time and again that they will have to improve the quality and they will have to maintain prices at reasonable levels so that it does not become burdonesome to the consumers.

With regard to the other points raised by my hon. friends--Mr. Naidu stated that we are not able to get good cars, cars go without tyres and therefore food production suffers and so many other things he connected with that--I would like to assure the hon. Members that so far as the automobile industry is concerned, all necessary steps will be taken and I have also stated what steps have been taken by the Government so far. I think now there are no points raised by hon. Members which have not been covered.

With these words I would like the house to approve of the Consideration Motion.

17 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 15th March, 1969."(1)

The motion was negatived

MR. SPEAKER : Now, the question is :

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted

MR. SPEAKER : We will now take up clause-by-clause consideration.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : I will confine my remarks to two points. Firstly, I requested the Minister to consider extending the period of protection to five years. That was a simple request in order to enable the industry to establish itself. He has not said anything on it.

My second request was in respect of the automobile industry that the revenue duty may be reduced from 50 to 25 per cent. There has been some misunderstanding that the reduction of this duty will favour big people, producers and manufacturers. That is a mistake. It will favour the consumers. These articles going into the assembled car are assessed to duty, which the consumer has to pay, a point which the Minister failed to explain. Here I might say that 50 per cent of the cost of the car is paid to the government, not to the manufacturers, not to those who sell the car but as tax to the government. Our claim, therefore, is that to cheaper cars reduce the duty on components. Here in Parliament there is such a process as moving amendments. Since there is so much discussion on this amendment, may I request the hon. Minister to accept the suggestion in my amendment to reduce the duty from 50 to 25 per cent ? It will not reduce the revenue of the government because the Finance Minister will in any case levy a general duty of 50 per cent or even 100 per cent.

SHRI BBDUL GHANI DAR (Gurgaon): Sir, I want to oppose it.

MR. SPEAKER : The Minister will oppose it. Why do you want to oppose it

श्री अब्दुलगनी डार : स्पीकर साहब, दुनियां के इतिहास में बड़े बड़े राजा हुए हैं, जिनको चक्रवर्ती महाराजा कहा जाता था, चन्द्रगुप्त हुए और दूसरे महाराजे हुए हैं, लेकिन भगवान की कसम उनमें इतनी शक्ति नहीं थी, कि जिससे एक फकीर को रात भर में बादशाह बना दें, लेकिन हमारे कामर्स मिनिस्टर साहब अगर चाहें तो एक मिनट में एक फकीर को करोड़पति नहीं तो लखपति जरूर बना सकते हैं। हमारे दिनेश भाई भी नेक आदमी हैं, शफी भाई भी नेक आदमी हैं लेकिन ये इन लोगों के फन्दे में फंस गये हैं। मधुलिमये और हम सब लोग चार साल से लगे हुए हैं कि इनको प्रोटेक्शन मत दो, ये बड़े चालाक लोग हैं, चतुर लोग हैं। मेरे भाई लोबो प्रभु जो आई.सी.एस. हैं, वह भी कहते हैं कि इनको प्रोटेक्शन दो···

श्री लोबो प्रभु : मैंने कम करने के लिये कहा है।

श्री अब्दुलगनी डार : स्पीकर साहब, आप हमारी मदद कीजिये। मधुलिमये का अमीचन्द प्यारेलाल वाला मोशन आनेवाला था, लेकिन अभी तक उसको नहीं लिया गया है। अमीचन्द प्यारेलाल कहता है कि मेरी जेब में 24 मेम्बर हैं.....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उसके बारे में बाद में बोलें। सात बजे जब उसको लिया जायगा, तब उसके बारे में बोलियेगा।

श्री अब्दुलगनी डार : मैं अर्ज कर रहा था कि यह बिल उसी तरह का है जिस तरह से एक फकीर जा रहा था, उसके साथ एक बकरी थी, रास्ते में उसे चार डाकू मिले। उन्होंने कहा— इस कुत्ते को कहां ले जा रहे हो, बारी बारी से चारों ने उसे कुत्ता बतला कर वह बकरी उससे

[श्री अब्दुलगनी दार]

छुडवा दी। उसी तरह से यह कांग्रेस है जो बकरी है और गांधीजी की देन है, उस देन को ये लोग डाकुओं के हवाले करना चाहते हैं।

[شری عبدالغنی ڈار

سپیکر صاحب۔دنیا کے اتھاس میں بڑے بڑے راجا ہوئے ہیں جنکو چکرورتی راجا کہا جاتا تھا۔چند گپت موے اور دوسرے مہا راجے ہوے ہیں لیکن بھگوان کی قسم انہیں اتنی شکتی نہیں تھی کہ جیسے ایک فقیر کو راتب بھر میں بادشاہ بنادے۔ لیکن ہمارے کامرس منسٹر صاحب اگر چاہیں تو ایک منٹ میں ایک فقیر کو کروڑ پتی نہیں تو لکھپتی ضرور بنا سکتے ہیں۔ہمارے دلیش بھائی بھی نیک آدمی ہیں۔ شٹی بھائی بھی نیک آدمی ہیں۔ لیکن اُن لوگوں کے پھندے میں پھنس گئے ہیں۔مدد لیئے اور ہم سب لوگ چار سال سے لگے ہوے ہیں کہ انکو پروٹیکشن مت دو۔یہ بڑے چالاک لوگ ہیں۔چتور لوگ ہیں میرے بھائی لوبو پربھو جو اے۔سی۔ایس۔ ہیں وہ بھی کہتے ہیں کہ انکو پروٹیکشن دو .....

شری لوبو پربھو : میں نے کم کرلے کیلئے کہا ہے—

شری عبدالغنی ڈار۔ سپیکر صاحب۔ آپ ہماری مدد کیجئے۔مدھو لمئے کا آمی چند پیارے لعل والا موشن آیا تھا لیکن ابھی تک اسکو لوھن لیا گیا ہے۔امی چند پیارے لعل کھتاہے میری جیب میں ۲۴ ممبر ہیں—

آدیکش مھو دیے۔اسکی بارے میں بعد میں بولیں۔سامنے بھی جب اسکو لیا جائیگا تب اسکے بارے میں بولیگا—

شری عبدالغنی ڈار۔میں عرض کررہا تھا کہ یہ بل اس طرح ہے جسطرح ایک فقیر جا رہا تھا۔اسکے ساتھ ایک بکری تھی۔راستے میں اسے چار ڈاکو ملے۔اُنھوں نے کہا۔اس کتے کو کہاں لیجا رہے ہو۔باری باری سے چار ون نے اسے کتا بتلا کر وہ بکری اسے چھڑوا دی۔ اس طرح سے یہ کانگریس ہے جو بکری ہے اور گاندھی جی کی دین ہے۔اُس دین کو یہ لوگ ڈاکون کی ہوالے کرنا چاہتے ہیں—

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI : Sir, the amendments of the hon. Member are not acceptable to me. I thought, the hon. Member has some faith and confidence in the private sector that it will be able to increase its efficiency in a period of three years to meet the challenge of foreign competition. We have got full faith in the industry and, I think, within the period of three years the industry will be strong enough not to seek any protection any more.

With regard to the levy of duties, the duties are levied and are fixed by the Ministry of Finance keeping in mind different aspects and the nature of the articles. My hon. friend knows that before devaluation the duty on automobile parts was about 60 per cent and after devaluation it has been reduced to 50 per cent. So there is no question of reducing it further.

Mr. SPEAKER : He has not moved the amendments. So, I shall put the clause to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI : Sir, I move :

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER : The question is.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : Sir, only one question.

Mr. SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That the Bill be passed."

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : The Minister will kindly turn to page 7, Statement of Objects and Reasons, where it says :-

> "In respect of products of the aluminium industry falling within Items Nos. 66 (a) and 66 (1). the Bill seeks to continue the tariff protection, at the existing effective rates of duty."

Now please turn to page 5, where it says :-

> "(f) in Iteme No. 66 (a)-
> in the fourth column headed "Standard rate of duty" for the figures "40" the figures "27½" shall be substituted;".

That means, after devaluation instead of 40, 27½ is the effective rate.

Then, it says :-

> "(g) in Item No. 66 (1),-
>
> in the fourth column headed "Standard rate of duty" for the figures "40", the figures "20" shall be substituted;".

that means, after devaluation instead of 40, 20 is the effective rate. In one case it is 27½ and in another it is 20. What is the reason for this difference ? Are both of them effective rates ? I do not understand this difference. There must be some error somewhere.

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI : They are for two different things, 27½ is for one thing and 20 for another.

Mr. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bil be passed."

The motion was adopted.

17.07 hrs.

RE: BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. SPEAKER : Now before we take up the next item I would like to inform Members that we will dispose of the Bihar Proclamation and then take up the two discussions. The Constitution (Amendment) Bill we will take up tomorrow morning.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA (Cuttack) : What about my motion ?

Mr. SPEAKER : We will take up these things at about 7 o'clock after we have finished the Bihar Proclamation.

SHRI SWELL (Autonomous Districts) : The Constitution (Amendment) Bill will be taken up tomorrow ?

Mr. SPEAKER : Yes. That is the only thing pending.

17.08 Hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: CONTINUANCE IN FORCE OF PROCLAMATION IN RESPECT OF BIHAR.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y.B. CHAVAN): Sir, I beg to move :

> "That this House approves the continuance in force of the Proclamation dated the 29th June, 1968, in respect of Bihar issued under article 356 of the Cotstitution by the President, for a further priod of six months commencing on the 25th January, 1969."

I do not think I need make a very long speech on this motion. As we all know, this Presidential Proclamation was issued on the 29th June, 1968 and was approved by Rajya Sabha on the 22nd July and by Lok Sabha on the 25th July, 1968. The six months' period of the Proclamation will cease to operate on the 24th January, 1969.

As we are aware, we had indicated at the same time that we would like to hold mid-term elections as soon as possible. Indications of this were given to the Chief Election Commissioner who later on went to Bihar and held discussions with all the leaders of the political parties there.

He has recommended and now he has already announced that the elections should be held on the 9th February, 1969. Therefore, it is very essential that this period is extended. Naturally, the period for which we can seek the permission of the House is for six months. But our intention is not to keep the President's rule for another six months. Naturally, immediately after the elections, the Council of Ministers will come