

Secretary of Rajya Sabha :

- (i) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 111 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill, 1969, which has been passed by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 3rd December, 1969."
- (ii) 'In accordance with the provisions of rule 115 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 8th December, 1969, agreed to the following amendments made by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 1st December, 1969, in the Indian Registration (Amendment) Bill, 1968 :

Enacting Formula

1. That at page 1, line 1,—
for "Nineteenth" substitute "Twentieth".
Clause 1
2. That at page 1, line 4,—
for "1968" substitute "1969".

MERCHANT SHIPPING (AMENDMENT) BILL

As Passed by Rajya Sabha

SECRETARY : Sir, I also lay on the Table of the House the Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill, 1969, as passed by Rajya Sabha.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Fifty-Sixth Report

SHRI M. G. UIKEY (Mandia) : I beg to present the Fifty-sixth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

12.14 hrs.

MONOPOLIES AND RESTRICTIVE TRADE PRACTICES BILL

MR. SPEAKER : Now we come to Item 8.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : The Ministers concerned are not here.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara) : The House may be adjourned as the Minister is not here. (*Interruptions*).

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। यह बिल बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है। सिलेक्ट कमेटी की रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने है। राज्य सभा से यह पास हो कर आया है। दो साल से हम देखते आ रहे हैं कि जिस मन्त्री का विषय होता है वह हाज़िर नहीं होता है। यह बड़े ताज्जुब की बात है। उनको मौजूद होना चाहिये या। लेकिन वह हैं नहीं। श्री फखरुद्दीन प्रली ग्रहमद को आप डांटिये। उनको कुछ दण्ड दिया जाना चाहिये। हाउस को आप एडजर्न कर दें।

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : The House may be adjourned. There is no business now. (*Interruptions*)

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : *rose*—

SHRI RABI RAY : Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed is disregarding the House. वह सदन का सम्मान नहीं कर रहे हैं।

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH (Buxar) : I beg to move that the House do now adjourn because the Ministers concerned are not here.

श्री रवि राय : मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूँ। हाउस को इन्होंने तमाशा समझ रखा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : दोनों हाउस चलते हैं। कई बार लेट हो भी जाते हैं। क्यों इतने इम्पैशेंट हो गए हैं अब बात खरम हुई।

श्री रवि राय : उनको माफी मांगनी चाहिए। आपको उनकी भर्त्सना करनी चाहिए।

SHRI ASHOKA MEHTA (Bhandara) : The Minister was not here and the Motion was moved. The Motion cannot be dismissed like this. The Motion is before you.

MR. SPEAKER : Minister has already come.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : It will be a very bad precedent, Sir. It will be a very bad precedent for the House if the Chair (*Interruptions*).

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : They do not have any responsibility.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : Sir, the Chair should not take this affront to the House so lightly. The Motion was moved by Dr. Ram Subhag Singh that the House may be adjourned. There was no Minister before the House when the item was taken up and even when he comes, he does not apologise, he does not express regret for his absence, and you, in the Chair also do not rebuke him. Really this is very surprising. You must uphold the dignity of the House. If the Minister starts behaving like this, I do not know where we will be.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : Sir, such lapses should not be treated lightly.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : मैं केवल एक ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। किसी एक विभाग से सम्बन्धित क मन्त्री ही नहीं है बल्कि उनके साथ एक राज्य मन्त्री भी है और एक उपमन्त्री भी है। अगर मान लीजिये सदन में कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर नहीं है तो राज्य मन्त्री को या उप-मन्त्री को यहाँ रहना चाहिये। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आज आप इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ निश्चित परम्परा का प्रारम्भ करें और देखें कि लोक सभा को इस प्रकार से हलके रूप में ये मन्त्री लोग न ले सकें। इस तरह का कोई

निर्देश आप अवश्य दें जिससे भविष्य के लिए परम्परा बने।

MR. SPEAKER : Thank you for giving me time to speak also...बनर्जी साहब, आपकी क्या सिफारिश है।

श्री संमो० बनर्जी (कानपुर) : आप हमें रोज डांटते हैं, आज आप इनको डांटिये।

MR. SPEAKER : I am very sorry I was kept like this for a few minutes. There was no Minister, nor could anybody tell me where you were. If you are to come any time late, please do inform the Chair so that I may be in a position to take up the next item. This is not a question which needs my interference; it is the general business of the House and the business of the House should not be ignored like this.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, INTERNAL TRADE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI F. A. AHMED) : Sir, I am very sorry for the inconvenience caused to the House, and, to a certain extent, I am myself responsible, because I was going through the various amendments which the Hon. Members have tabled. I had left instruction that as soon as the Calling Attention is over I may be informed so that I may come here. Well the information was given to me, but as the hon. Member knows, I do not walk very fast and so it took me a little time.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Minister has expressed his regret.

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर आप एक मिनट के लिए हम को सून लें, तो आप हम से एग्जी करोगे।

MR. SPEAKER : I still hope that the business of the House would not be taken so lightly. Of course, it is not a question of fast walking. That may be so in the hon. Minister's case; we can accept it. But there are younger people in the Ministry; there is the Deputy Minister and there is also the Minister of State; at least they should have been present here in the House.

The hon. Minister must know that the times are different now. They cannot behave in the same old manner. All the times the Opposition Members are up and so vigilant and they are looking after any type of anything that is wrong in the hon. Minister. The hon. Minister should be very much aware of that.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi) : You have uttered immortal words. You have made history, today, Sir.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : After I had expressed my regret at the inconvenience caused to the Members of the House, I thought that the matter was over. I am really very very sorry for this inconvenience.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai) : The hon. Minister does not walk fast. But what about the Minister of State and the Deputy Minister ? Do they not also walk fast ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I beg to move :

"That the Bill to provide that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of economic power to the common detriment, for the control of monopolies, for the prohibition of monopolistic and restrictive trade practices and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

As early as on the 6th April, 1948, Government had adopted a resolution emphasising the importance to the economy of securing a continuous increase in production and its equitable distribution. Subsequently, the Constitution of India had been enacted through which our people promised to themselves that the system of economy would be so directed that the ownership and control of material resources of the community would be so distributed as to subserve the common good and that the operation of the system would not result in concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment. These basic and general principles were given a more precise direction when Parliament accepted in December, 1954 the socialist pattern of society as the objective of social and economic policy of the country.

SHRI M. R. MASANI (Rajkot) : We are not able to hear the hon. Minister. If he wants us to understand him, he must speak louder and not mumble something.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member can use his ear-phones.

SHRI N. K. SOMANI (Nagaur) : I am using it, but still it does not help very much.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I am speaking as loudly as possible.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : I sympathise with the hon. minister. Either he should retire or he should pull up himself.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I am not to accept that suggestion.

In more recent years, we have had a close look at the developing economic pattern, and what we have found is that though the industrial production has increased and it has brought about economic development also, as a result of the various activities undertaken in the private sector, there is no doubt that there is a tendency of concentration of wealth in the hands of a few...

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Those sitting on the Treasury Benches.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : ...to the detriment of the public at large.

On the other hand, while we have given various incentives for the development of the economy and for industrial production, we have found that the incentives have actually benefited a few hands, with the result that there was a demand for appointing a commission to find out whether this had resulted in the concentration of economic wealth in the hands of a few, and as a result of that demand, two bodies made inquiries into this question. One was the Mahalanobis Commission and the other was the Monopolies Inquiry Commission which was set up on the 16th April, 1964, and they submitted their report to Government on the 31st October, 1965. The recommendations of this commission were

contained in their report and were considered by Government and their decision was embodied in a resolution dated the 5th September, 1966. Subsequently, the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Prices Bill was introduced in the Rajya Sabha on the 18th August, 1967. The motion for referring the Bill to a Joint Committee of the Houses was adopted by the Rajya Sabha on the 21st November, 1967. This House discussed and concurred in the motion on the 23rd December, 1967. The Joint Committee submitted its report on the 19th February, 1969. The Bill as passed by the Rajya Sabha on the 24th July, 1969 is now before this House.

While the structure of the Bill as introduced in the Rajya Sabha was basically the same as that recommended by the Monopolies Inquiry Commission,

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Question. It is entirely untrue. It is not so. It is a different Bill altogether.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : some important modifications were introduced by Government. I am just pointing out the modifications which were introduced by us.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Let him not make a misstatement. It is a different Bill altogether.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : Hon. Members must have noted that the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission has been given mandatory powers in respect of restrictive trade practices. In other matters, relating particularly to concentration of economic power and monopolistic practices, the commission has been entrusted with powers of an advisory nature ..

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Shame !

SHRI F. A. AHMED : in as much as those powers will enable the commission to make inquiry and to report on certain types of cases which Government may from time to time refer to them.

The suggestion in regard to the proposed commission with such advisory powers has been mooted, having regard to the vital necessity for considering and deciding upon such matters at the level of the Central Government, which, *ipso facto* have to take

into consideration several factors having a direct bearing on economic planning in the country as a whole ..

SHRI M. R. MASANI : And corruption.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : The other important modification introduced in the Bill includes provisions for exercising control over undertakings belonging to a group having total assets of the value of not less than Rs. 20 crores.

This group concept has to find expression through the agency of interconnection.

SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL (Dabhoi) : Why should the hon. Minister have to read it? Let him speak extempore, if he has studied the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER : Since he is piloting a Bill, he can read out from the written text also.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : There can be more than one opinion on the provisions of the Bill. This is evidenced by the fact that as many as 12 Members of the Joint Committee submitted their minutes of dissent. The Joint Committee, therefore, had the difficult and challenging task of reconciling these opinions, while keeping in view the directives enshrined in the Constitution, enjoining on the State to direct its policy towards securing an order under which ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good and the operation of the economy does not result in the concentration of wealth.

May I say that the Joint Committee has done a commendable job? Apart from filling in certain gaps and streamlining the procedure prescribed, the Joint Committee has tightened some of the important provisions of the Bill with a view to make them more effective. The Bill also prescribes a time-limit within which the commission has to complete its inquiries, if any, and the Government have to dispose of the cases. This time-limit has been inserted with a view to obviating any adverse effect that might stem from administrative delays in dealing with the application of this legislation.

[Shri F. A. Ahmed]

It will also be seen that clause 38 of the Bill provides that a restrictive trade practice shall be deemed to be prejudicial to public interest, unless the commission is satisfied that the prevalent practice is justifiable on one of the eight grounds specified therein. Thus, the onus of proving that a prevalent practice is not prejudicial to public interest has been cast on the undertaking. Part A of Chapter III of the Bill deals with concentration of economic power. It will be seen from clause 20 that the undertakings to which this part shall apply have been defined from the standpoint of both countrywise and productwise concentration. *Apropos* the countrywise concentration, which is based on the concept of business group as such, the definition of the term 'interconnected undertaking' has been enlarged to cover cases of simultaneous interconnection.

Clauses, 21, 22 and 23 of the Bill empower the Central Government to regulate the scheme of substantial expansion, establishment of new undertakings and schemes of marginal amalgamation and take-over which may be resorted to by an undertaking to which Part A of Chapter III applies.

The definition of the term 'monopolistic undertaking' has been amplified to bring within its purview any undertaking which together with not more than two other independent undertakings produces, supplies and distributes one half of the total goods or produces or controls not less than one half of the services also.

Clause 10 of the Bill has also been amplified so as to empower the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission to inquire *suo motu* into cases of monopolistic and restrictive trade practices.

Hon. members are aware that the development of industrially backward countries such as ours is an infinitely difficult task. Together with this task we have also to take into consideration the various directive principles enshrined in our Constitution. While we are anxious to bring about a speedy development in our country, we have at the same time to implement the provisions contained in the directive principles contained in the Constitution. Between the two, we have to decide and take action which, while on the one hand helps in implementing these

directive principles, on the other does not retard industrial production in the country.

It is with this end in view that this Bill has been brought before this House, I have no doubt that it will receive the support of the hon. members to check the unfortunate tendencies which have been noticed during the past few years that while incentives and other help have been given by Government for the purpose of economic and industrial development, the resulting wealth from this development has in some cases gone into a few hands which is detrimental to the public interest. As I said, the object of the Bill is to check this tendency; it is not to retard economic or industrial development.

So I hope that the Bill which has been examined very minutely by the Joint Committee and has also been discussed in the Rajya Sabha will receive the support of hon. members of this House.

I know that there may be a difference of opinion with regard to this matter. But what I would ask, members to remember and consider is that on the one hand, we must keep in view the consideration that we should not take any action likely to impede industrial production; on the other, we should also see that on such tendencies as I have alluded to are allowed to develop which while increasing expansion will result only in the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few to the detriment of the public at large.

It is with this object that this Bill will be taken into consideration. If any amendments are moved at the appropriate stage, they will be considered in the light and I will reply at the appropriate time. I move.

MR. SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That the Bill to provide that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of economic power to the common detriment, for the control of monopolies, for the prohibition of monopolistic and restrictive trade practices and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration".

SHRI ASOKA METHA (Bhandara) : Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to discuss a matter of vital importance to the country. It is regrettable that as far as monopolistic and restrictive practices are concerned, the Government and Parliament have taken such a long time in taking action. These are matter on which legislations have been enacted in other countries of the worlds, even by conservative Governments. I think the lead was taken in this matter in the U.K. by tea Conservative Government. As far as monopoiistic practices are concerned, in the U. S. A., anti-trust legislation has existed from the days of Sherman and Clayton.

So, no one I believe would favour any kind of restrictive practice or any kind of monopolistic practice and on this I am sure irrespective of one's philosophies, no one can ever agree that restrictive practices or monopolistic practices can be condoned. The core of the problem, therefore, is where provisions have been made for deconcentration of economic power; here again, I believe that there is a great deal of agreement against the concentration of economic power. The question arises, how do you do it. What are the ways of doing it, and what is the context in which you are seeking to achieve your objectives? I would, therefore, like to make it very clear at the very beginning that as far as the broad objectives of this Bill are concerned, I am in complete agreement with those objectives. The question is, what are the approaches, and it is on those approaches that a great deal of thought and attention has to be given.

But before I turn to my comments on the approaches adopted in this Bill, I would like to point out that a great deal of prevailing restrictionism and a great deal of mischief that monopolistic practices flow directly from the policies of the Government. With all seriousness and with a full sense of responsibility, I want to charge Mr. Fakhruddin with being responsible—presiding as he does over the Ministry of Industrial Development for pursuing an economic policy which leads to shortage, to restrictions of all kinds, to sheltered markets and to easy profits. These are the inevitable consequences of the policies that he has pursued. Under him we are witnessing and will continue to witness increasing shortages of fertilisers, of steel and of

aluminium, paper and of all kinds of other commodities, because his policy is to seek what I call industrial development through a hurdles race which he puts up. If you go and ask any entrepreneur in the country whether public or private or co-operative, the general view is that Mr. Fakhruddin has converted the Ministry of Industrial Development into a Ministry of Industrial dithering, and this dithering has converted this country into a sheltered market, a paradise of profiteering.

We are anxious, and I am sure every section of the House, and I believe even Mr. Masani, is anxious to see that interlocking of ownership and directorships are straightened out, but that cannot be done when you are imposing upon the country an interlocking crisis, political crisis, economic crisis, social crisis imposed upon this country by Shri Fakhruddin and his distinguished Leader. Therefore, this cannot be isolated; these good ambitions, good aims and good objectives cannot be isolated from the general context in which this country is being pushed.

Leaving this aside, let us take up the Bill and its provisions. I am sorry to say that many parts of them are vague, confusing and many clauses have been loosely drafted. Please go through the definitions. I have had no time to go through every definition. Various amendments will come up. But there are any number of definitions. At one place, for instance, there is the definition of "trade practices." Trade practices are supposed to include "a single or isolated action of any person in relation to any trade." It is an amazing trade practice: it is an amazing definition of trade practice. In the same manner, take even the selection of the Chairman of the Commission. It is a very important Commission. Who will be its Chairman? Any one who is qualified to be a judge of a high court. Sir, you are a distinguished lawyer, and you know. All that Mr. Fakhruddin has to do is to pick up a lawyer with 10 years' standing, because he is qualified to be a high court judge. Are we taking up this matter in a serious way, or, is this the manner in which we are approaching this subject? But I do not want to take time on these definitions. At the appropriate time, various amendments will come up, and I would like to concentrate upon the main thing, and I would like to

[Shri Ashok Mehta]

devote my attention to the main problem of how to bring in deconcentration of economic power. But before I turn to that, I have one more thing to say. While the public sector is free to establish a monopoly, whether it is the Life Insurance Corporation, or any other Corporation, of, even if there are more than one public corporation, it will still be ultimately a monopoly, because it is owned by a single party. I have no quarrel with it. Some people may have quarrel with it, but I have no quarrel with it. But my point is, any public corporation or any public authority, because we are here also dealing with the services, may be a transport service, may be a bus service is quite capable of indulging in monopolistic or restrictive practice. Monopoly is something different from monopolistic practice. I hope the Minister has cared to go through the distinction between these two. Surely, I or any man who uses the transport services in the city might come to the conclusion that the transport services are being run in a manner which is restrictive. Have I not the right to bring this matter up somewhere? Can I not agitate about it? It is not as if it is a sacred cow that you cannot touch. And everywhere, the Minister's argument is that the Government will decide as to what is to be done. I will come to that now, as to what kind of powers are given to the Government without any kind of charter, without any kind of framework, without any kind of policy perspective.

I hope the Minister is aware that concentration of economic power can be attacked only if there is a policy framework. Secondly, one has also to see to the responsibility. You do not put responsibilities upon enterprises that they cannot fulfil. I can understand, you ask any entrepreneur who comes to you to tell you, what he is going to produce, what his processing is, what his cost will be, what will be the import content and how much he will export, what is his financing scheme. You can ask him all that. But how do you expect the poor fellow to convince the Government? According to clause 23, if you want to set up some enterprises, you have to convince the Government that it will not lead to concentration or that it will not harm the public interests. The Government should be able to find it out by itself. You should be

called upon to say what you are trying to do, in what manner you are trying to do. The Government has to judge it in the light of its framework and policy known to us and in the light of its own judgement. Instead of that, you are saddling the enterprises with this kind of responsibility.

Again, I want to say that no expansion of any significance takes place, and no new undertaking is set up in this country unless everything is cleared with Mr. Fakhruddin. I know the amount of scrutiny that Mr. Fakhruddin wants: manysided, dilatory, tortuous scrutiny that Mr. Fakhruddin is anxious to have. I am aware of it as his colleague in the Government once. Therefore, with all the scrutiny at his command, does he want to have second scrutiny? Let us be clear about it. Are you going to do this in one scrutiny or is there going to be another, second scrutiny? Is one more hurdle to be placed in the famous hurdles race in which Mr. Fakhruddin is a pastmaster?

What are our objectives? Mr. Fakhruddin directed our attention to objectives of industrial growth and the Directive Principles enshrined in the Constitution. In this Bill, the objectives have been squarely laid down in clause 28. If you read clause 28 carefully, you will find that these objectives are not like the horses hitched to the chariot of the sun. There are seven horses to the chariot of the sun and they move in one direction. But these objectives are like Plato's team of horses. You remember, Sir, that Plato's team of horses ran in different directions. Where you have the objectives which run counter to one another, how do you reconcile this? This is where a policy framework is necessary. This is where the real understanding of the country and the technological problem of industry is necessary, and I am afraid the Bill shows no reflection of that.

The government's sole response is: "leave everything to us" because the Mughal-like authority of the government is there to decide everything. This Parliament does not recognise any Mughal. Tell us on what lines you are going to do it. In Shri Fakhruddin's speech he referred to economic planning in passing. If you have plans, surely this policy has to be part and parcel of the Plan. What are your policies and plans, let us know.

There are three types of concentration. There is concentration of ownership, which is objectionable and obnoxious. There is concentration of production. I do not want concentration of production. There is concentration of management. In some cases, in specific cases, concentration of management will be very necessary. Shri Fakhruddin has not even bothered to differentiate the different types of concentration and the different measures to be taken against them. If we are to compete in the world market—my friend Shri Bhagat is not here, but I presume that India is a part of the world market and we want to be a part of the world economy—if we are to compete in the world market, there will be certain areas of production, there will be certain types of production in which production will have to be carried out on a very large scale and in very large-size plants. Not only that, I go farther and say that any government which has any understanding of the needs of exports and the needs of economic development will have consciously to pursue a policy of merger of some plants.

Do you know what the British Labour Government under Mr. Wilson did, unlike Shri Fakhruddin, because he knows and understands world economic development, has set up under Government auspices the British Industrial Reconstruction Corporation with £150 million as its capital. This Corporation has brought about 36 mergers including a merger between Leyland and BMC, the two big automobile concerns, between G. E. C., English Electric and A. E. I. Why are they doing it? Is the British Labour Government interested in creating monopolies? No. It is to compete in the world market today.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA (Begsati) : They are interested in creating monopolies.

SHRI ASOKA MEHTA : In certain selected areas I want the government to take up an instrument of that kind. What are the areas where it is necessary to do it? Take the automobile industry in India. These three footling little plants will never achieve anything. They have to be merged today under one single management... (*interruptions*) You can bring it about either by nationalisation or some other method. But if you allow them to continue

as small plants the cost becomes too heavy, the scale of production does not go up, ancillaries cannot develop and exports cannot be brought about. These are economic and technological problems and they can not be decided on ideological grounds alone.

DR. MAITREYEE BASU (Darjeeling) : This is an apology for keeping managing agencies.

SHRI ASOKA MEHTA : Managing agency has been abolished. The hon. Member is living in the Rip Van Winkle age.

DR. MAITREYEE BASU : He is trying to create managing agency system again.

SHRI ASOKA MEHTA : Shri Fakhruddin referred to a plan. I have before me the latest issue of the Reserve Bank of India bulletin. I am sure you have seen it. It speaks about the matrix of savings and financial flow. What does it show? In the Fourth Plan Rs. 2,800 crores will be invested in the corporations in the private sector. Out of that savings of the corporations will be only 25 per cent. Here I am talking of the corporations in the private sector and not of the corporations in the public sector. 13 per cent of the resources will be raised from the general public. 7 per cent will be foreign private investment. The other 55 per cent will flow under the direction of the government. It is not government's money; nationalised banks' money is not government money, but the direction is with the government and the government financing institutions. Cannot Shri Fakhruddin and his planners sit down and say these are the areas which will be developed? What is the meaning of this... (*interruptions*) If Shri Fakhruddin and his colleagues are not capable of doing that, let them ask us. We will produce a plan to show the areas, the strategic and non-strategic areas, what is the kind of flow and what is the credit plan. I hope when the budget is presented, it will be accompanied by a credit plan because a budget has no meaning in planning unless it has a credit plan side by side.

We come next to what can be done even with the limited resources that the government may have. What is it that Italy has done? Italy has IRI, which is a governmental institution, which controls 130 firms

[Shri Ashok Mehta]

in different areas. Five per cent of the gross national product of Italy is today controlled by the IRI. The Ministry of Public Participation, controls the IRI that is something like the Ministry of Shri Fakhruddin here, but it believes in development. So, five per cent of the gross national production Italy is produced by 130 firms under the IRI. For every lira of fund the government invests, 20 liras are contributed by the public. So, under the Ministry of Public Participation and the IRI there is a tremendous transformation in the Italian economy.

But here we see all negative things. Shri Fakhruddin says : "give me more power, I will decide ; let the files pile up on my table ; I will dispose of them whenever I like". He says he is too weak to walk. I sympathise with him. But I hope he is not too weak to dispose of files also. The files keep on piling on his table and he wants the pile to become bigger so that he will become the biggest Minister in the Cabinet.

Let us realise that in our production there is such a thing as upstream production and down-stream production. The upstream production consist of production of basic and primary material and the down-stream of processing and fabrication. In some areas in metallurgical and chemical industry the upstream production, that is, the production of the basic material, has to be on a very large scale. Take steel, for instance. There are 19 firms in the world that produce more than 7 million tonnes, and they are scattered everywhere—USA 6, Japan 5, USSR 2, Poland and Czechoslovakia 1. Poland and Czechoslovakia are small countries but they want production of steel in a competitive way. Here in India steel is nationalised. I understand it. But it applies to many metallurgical industries and chemical industries where we have to compete with the rest of the world. There are giant corporations in the chemical industry. In Germany three chemical industrial corporations have invested in 1969 alone nearly one billion dollars. It is with these concerns that we have to compete. Therefore, in the case of these industries it has to be produced on a massive scale somewhere. As far as the production of synthetic yarn is concerned, it can be done a medium

scale. As far as the weaving of yarn into cloth is concerned, it can be done on a decentralised scale but caproectum has to be produced on a massive scale.

There are economies of scale related to export needs. Time and again the Minister has been using the term "modern technology". You can produce, phospheric fertilizer on a small way. Can you produce nitrogenous fertilizer in the backyard ? Therefore, this has nothing to do with capitalism and communism, irrespective of what their theoreticians may say. Anyone who has understood the modern technological problems and practices knows that both upstream and down-stream have got to be controlled and regulated in different manners. What is this programme ?

The argument will be like this. If we permit large units like Mafatlal to grow up, what is the result. Questions will come up here in the House and Shri Fakhruddin will be in jitters what all these howling members would say. If he does not allow that, what will happen ? He will make some wishy washy statement and somebody will pounce upon him. The result is that poor Mafatlal will suffer and the country will suffer.

AN HON. MEMBER : Not poor.

SHRI ASOKA MEHTA : I am not referring to any particular person. I am referring to the system.

Here is a petro-chemical industry. Will you not permit it to grow ? You have also public sector production programme. But if expansion is permitted will that lead to concentration of economic power ? Even a country like West Germany has gone into it very carefully. In the chemical industry no individual is permitted to own more than three per cent of the shares. You limit the share-holding, you insist that no person will have anything more than three per cent of the shares, or as you have done in the case of Banking Companies Act, nobody can have more than one per cent of the vote. There are various ways of doing it. I would be willing to go with you—I do not know whether every section of the House will go but my colleagues and I will be willing to go with you—in taking those steps to deal with the concentration of economic power, but do not impede the growth of large-scale

enterprises where it is necessary. Processing and fabrication industries can be scattered all over the country but there are industries like aluminium and steel, basic drugs and pharmaceuticals and some other basic chemical materials which have to be produced on a mass scale in order that you have the maximum advantage inside the country on cost and development of ancillary industries on the hand and their export on the other.

There is no such conception here. All that you want is that Moghul like you sit in your throne and everybody comes to you and says, "This is what I want to do," and you decide whether you will permit him or not. On what grounds or criteria will you decide? You have kept to yourself unquestioned power.

Shri Masani was telling me that this is a Bill purely for concentraing economic and political powers in the hands of Shri Fakhruddin and his colleagues. This is highly objectionable. Let us have a clear picture. If the Commission is to do it, by what will the Commission be guided and if the Government wants to do it, by what will the Government be guided? If it is that every entrepreneur has to come to you and satisfy you, how does the entrepreneur know how to satisfy you? You should have a clearcut yardstick, standard and policy framework in which people come and either satisfy you or not. If they fail to satisfy, we will also know that they have failed to satisfy. This kind of a blanket power in your hands will only lead to dilatoriness which is so characteristic of your ministry. It will only lead to widespread frustration which is so obvious in our country. It will pull the country in the cesspool of corruption, whether you like it or not.

Therefore, while the objectives are desirable and laudable, the approaches have not been properly worked out. It is not merely a question of going into the clauses of the Bill. The Bill needs a proper framework. You talk of economic planning. This Bill is completely divorced from your Plan; it has not been integrated with your five-year plan. Do not come with a shoddy thing and tell us that this is the way to control monopolistic and restrictive practices. You are yourself selling shoddy goods to the country. Please take back these shoddy goods and come back with something decent and worth while.

SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA : What about Tatas and Birlas? Are they not monopolists?

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : आपका यह सब ज्ञान कहां गया था जब आप मन्त्रिमण्डल में थे? इधर आने से शायद ज्ञान बढ़ जाता है।

श्री अशोक मेहता : मन्त्रिमण्डल में भी ये सभी बातें कही लेकिन इनकी समझ में नहीं आ पाया। *Interruptions*

SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA : What about Tatas and Birlas? Are they not monopolists?

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. I think, in future I shall pass on to the leaders of parties the time allocated to them so that they may adjust their speakers accordingly. to the number of parties : Congress (O)... *(Interruption)*

AN HON. MEMBER : What does Congress (O) mean?

MR. SPEAKER : Congress (O) means... *(Interruption)*

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Chittoor) : Congress (Organisation).

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : कांग्रेस को का कितना समय है?

MR. SPEAKER : I enquired from Dr. Ram Subhag Singh and he says that Congress (O) is full of many meanings. He mentioned five Os. I think, he remembers that.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : They are : Congress (Old), Congress (Original), Congress (Organisation), Congress (Opposition) and Congress (Ordinary) :

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur) : Congress (Zero).

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : You may add, Congress (Ousteers).

MR. SPEAKER : These are the Treasury Benches... *(Interruption)*. Anyway, Congress (O) has 31 minutes; Swatantra—20; Janasangh—16; DMK—13; CPI—12; CPI

[Mr. Speaker]

(M)—10; SSP—10; PSP—10; UIPG—11; BKD—6; Unattached—15 and Congress (Government)—1 hour and 56 minutes.

13.00 hrs.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Congress (Opposition) have got the maximum time.

MR. SPEAKER : It includes everything. The Minister is also included. In future you will receive the slip for allocation of time.

श्री रवि राय : मेरा निवेदन है कि पहले जब कांग्रेस एक युनाइटेड पार्टी थी तो एक उधर से और एक हमारे इधर अपोजीशन साइड वालों की तरफ से बुलाया जाया करता था। लेकिन आज जबकि कांग्रेस पार्टी बंट गयी है तो वह पुरानी प्रक्रिया जोकि अभी भी चल रही है उस में परिवर्तन होना चाहिए। चूकि उन की तादाद कम हो गयी है इसलिए एक उधर से और एक हम अपोजीशन वालों की तरफ से बुलाने वाली प्रक्रिया समाप्त होनी चाहिए।

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai) : What is the total time ?

MR. SPEAKER : Total time is 4½ hours.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : That is too little.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Panigrahi.

श्री रवि राय : लन्च का समय हो गया है।

MR. SPEAKER : Yes, we may now adjourn for lunch.

13.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Seven Minutes Past Fourteen of the Clock.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair]

MONOPOLIES AND RESTRICTIVE TRADE PRACTICES BILL—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, Shri Chintamani Panigrahi. The hon. Member may make his speech as brief as possible, so that it may be possible to accommodate a few more Members from his party.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Bhubaneswar) : I shall try to be brief. Though late, this Bill is a most welcome measure. According to the Directive Principles of the Constitution, we have given pledges to this country and to the society and to the people that we shall secure an order in which the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good and the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and the means of production to the common detriment.

For many years, the people of this country and many Members of this House had been trying their best to impress upon Government to come forward with a measure of this nature, and, therefore, I am glad and I am sure the whole House will also appreciate that at last this Bill has come before us today.

I am very happy that Shri Asoka Mehta had raised the tone of this debate to an intellectual level. Now, let us see what points were made out. The three important points which he made out were concentration of management, concentration of production and concentration of ownership. In a highly industrialised society, we can try to find subtle ways of differences between these three aspects. But after taking into consideration the background of India and its economic development and the class structure that we have in this country and that has developed during the last 20 years in this country and also the progress of industrial growth, I think the difference between these three aspects is largely marginal. I could give some instances to illustrate my point.

The monopoly houses appear on the scene of economic growth in many avatars; like the manyheaded Ravana, they come in different shapes. Thus, certain groups of monopoly houses exercise control over management as a group so that they get control over production and distribution as

well. This is their economic power; by exercising their economic power of control over management, they control production and distribution and they get control over ownership also.

So, the difference here is marginal between these three sectors of concentration, and sometimes they overlap as well. We have seen that in the case of the banking institutions, the number of shareholders is high, but it so happened that there were just a few who exercised control because all the shareholders are not able to go to the general body meeting of the banks; naturally those few people get control over the institutions.

I would like to submit that monopoly itself is an antithesis of higher production in society at any stage of development. You will find that in many cases, when the rate of profit goes down, the production also goes down. What this Bill is trying to do is this. It tries to control concentration, but not by retarding production; it seeks to control that power which retards production, because monopoly itself is an antithesis of higher production, because it is by less production that they are able to get more profit, and when the profit falls, they also restrict producing more.

Shri Asoka Mehta was saying one thing which surprised me a little. I do not know what he meant by that. He suggested, I think, that if we had failed to have any plan or had failed to have any thinking, then he could give us the thinking or we could take his thinking or something like that. I did not quite follow what he meant by that. But as far as my knowledge goes, Shri Asoka Mehta was concerned with the Planning Commission for almost four years and was also in the Government till the other day. I do not know what kind of suggestions he had made, because he knows so much about planning and other things, and he was connected with the Planning Commission also and in fact virtually presiding over it. I can only say that after whatever the Planning Commission had done, after all the wise-council that the Planning Commission and the Government got from Shri Asoka Mehta, we find the emergence of monopolies. So today we have had to come forward with this Bill seeking to remove the distortions that the economy is suffering from as a result of the growth of monopolies.

The question now is how we shall control these monopolies. In regard to control of management, it was made out that if there was no unified management, production may not be rationalised. It is possible in those bigger countries where they combine things so that the cost of production may be less, and they could innovate newer and more scientific methods of production so that they could sell the goods more and more at a cheaper rate. But here in India, I am afraid that, that situation does not prevail.

I feel that without Birlas and Tatas we can produce something in our country, but without the technocrats who are involved in the very method of production, we cannot increase the production of this country. I hope the Bill has made a difference between management and technocracy which helps in the method and growth of production. We shall have to see that the technocrats who are involved in the process of production must be protected from the grip of the monopoly houses so that they can apply their intelligence and they can apply their skill and develop newer and better methods of production and increase production which is the crying need of the hour and the crying demand of all sections of the House and the country.

The instances of Italy and Britain were cited. But I would submit that they have reached their present stage of economic growth after so many hundreds of years. I think it will take some time to discuss the economic growth, the pattern of growth etc. in Italy and Britain and those in India before we could make such a comparison and say that the monopolies here should not be controlled.

After Shri Asoka Mehta's speech, I do not know what Shri M. R. Masani is going to speak. I do not know how he can improve on the speech of Shri Asoka Mehta.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : I shall try.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : Shri M. R. Masani always makes a studied speech, but on this occasion, I do not know how he is going to improve on the speech of Shri Asoka Mehta.

I shall cite now some more instances. Take, for instance, the case of lireolcum. There is control of management, and control

[Shri Chintamani Panigrahi]

of ownership in one unit. But the margin of profit in the case of the linoleum industry is 250 per cent. Take the case of nylon and other industries which we have built up with the collaboration of foreign partners. Take the case of Unilevers ; the rate of net profit is 75.6 per cent ; no home-industry is making that much of profit today. In the case of the ICI, it is 19 per cent. In the case of Union Carbide, it is 26.4 per cent, and in the case of Indian Aluminiums, it is 23.3 per cent, and in the case of Dunlop Rubbers, it is 19 per cent and so on and so forth. Therefore, there is nothing to warrant the criticism that this Bill will retard the economic growth of this country.

In fact, I would go a step further and say that after having gone through the provisions of the Bill, I feel that it is inadequate to control the growth of monopolies in this country. It should have been more restrictive and more stringent. Therefore, I would urge Government to study and examine the recommendations of the Dutt Committee in this respect. In the light of those recommendations I feel that if necessary Government may even have to nationalise all the 75 monopoly houses which have been enumerated by the Monopolies Commission. They may not be nationalised today or tomorrow, but perhaps the logic of developments would lead to such a step.

I have been keenly watching the progress of things ever since the committee was set up, how it was working, how many people came forward to give evidence, and how many months it took to prepare the report. I do not know how far he meant it, but probably out of a sense of disgust he had said that 'If you go on talking so much time, then why don't you nationalise such things?'

SHRI M. R. MASANI : I have said that.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : Probably out of disgust or some such thing he had said that, and I feel that Government should accept what he had said.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : I never said that.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : He did not commit that crime.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : Now, I come to the case of the automobile industry. I feel that the time has come when the three leading automobile firms should be nationalised so that we can have control over the transport system and afford more facilities to the travelling public so far as the road sector is concerned.

The only way to increase production of wealth in all sectors without monopoly growth is to nationalise as many industries as possible which have a higher rate of profit and which have concentration of ownership and control over distribution which is not in the interest of the common people. I feel that that should be the broader policy which Government should pursue.

I also feel that the time has been come in this country when we should take steps, within a period of one or two years, to see that the great disparity between incomes is removed or narrowed down. I feel that this Bill is a first step in that direction. I think it is clause 3 which provides that where certain business houses or a group of houses want expansion of their units they should come and satisfy Government whether further expansion is needed or not. I do not know what Shri Mehta was trying to suggest. If he reads that provision, he will find that there an opportunity has been given to the group of houses so that they can approach Government and convince them that a further expansion to assist increased production is necessary. If that provision is deleted, Government will have more power which Shri Mehta does not want to vest Government with. Therefore, whatever little provision is there is good so that such groups of houses as want to expand could come and explain to Government and make out a convincing case for further expansion for further growth of production in that particular sector.

Lastly, I would refer to another thing. We have to look into the role of the financial institutions.

The Dutt Committee has said that in spite of provisions of law like the Banking Companies Act, the Companies Act, the Essential Commodities Act and so on in our armoury, the growth of monopoly houses continued unchecked. Therefore, the last thing which remains by which something can be done is in regard to the functioning

of the bureaucracy. Here comes the question of the administration of the provisions of the Bill. I think this aspect should be taken note of and taken care of. Even in regard to the heavy industries we have developed in the public sector, you will be surprised to know that their products are mainly consumed by the monopoly houses. Take the Bhilai steel plant. All its products go to the monopoly houses. Therefore, unless along with these heavy industries we also develop ancillary industries to utilise the products of the heavy industries, we will find the same monopoly houses benefitting and growing by feeding on our heavy industries in the public sector. There are so many factors which help the growth of monopoly houses in this country.

As you know, there are people who earn Rs. 100 and Rs. 90 per month in this country; there are others who earn Rs. 1 lakh and Rs. 10 lakhs per month. The time has come to remove this disparity. This is a little measure we have which will check the growth of monopoly and help in releasing the forces of production for the common good. It will help all those who are engaged in production activities in this country so that we can get rid of the clutches of the monopoly houses and utilise our energies for further growth, for increasing production, for augmenting the national wealth which can go towards satisfying the needs of the people by proper distribution. If this is done, I am sure we can achieve further success.

SHRI M. R. MASANI (Rajkot): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I speak for a Party which believes in competition. That is the classical Liberal school of economics. We believe that any restriction on competition is *prima facie* undesirable, though in rare cases it can be connived at by the State for social purposes. We believe that competition is a therapeutic element which cures a lot of things including exploitation of the consumer and many other mal-practices. Therefore, we are vigorously opposed to all restrictive trade practices and to monopolies of any kind.

We are also opposed to concentration of power in the same hands, whether it is concentration of economic power or a combination of economic and political power. We agree with Mahatma Gandhi when he used to say :

"I look upon an increase of the power of the State with the greatest fear because, though apparently doing good by minimising exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality which lies at the root of all progress".

Therefore, in our Election Manifesto—I quote from our Manifesto of 1967—we said :

"The Swatantra Party is opposed to all monopoly whether in the State or free sector and will seek to re-establish competition wherever possible for the benefit of the consumer. Monopolies, where tolerated, will be subject to essential control. Where owing to temporary scarcity of certain vital resources regulation becomes inevitable, there should be a quasi-judicial authority to indicate the necessary priorities and allocations".

This Liberal point of view is not really different from an intelligent Democratic Socialist point of view. I will quote from the manifesto of the German Socialist Party of which Herr Willy Brandt, the present Chancellor, is the leader. They said exactly the same thing. The German Socialist programme is nothing but a paraphrase of the Swatantra Party's programme in regard to monopolies.

It says :

"Totalitarian control of the economy destroys freedom. The Social Democratic Party, therefore, favours a free market wherever free competition really exists. Where a market is dominated by individuals or groups, however, all manner of steps must be taken to protect freedom in the economic sphere. As much competition as possible, as little planning as necessary..."

Therefore, I am not surprised that the speaker from the Opposition Congress Party made a speech with a great deal of which I find it easy to agree.

We believe in the ballot of the market place, where the consumer decides the pattern of production. We are prepared to support any anti-monopoly legislation which is honest and genuine. It is against this very friendly background that we judge the Bill.

We find the Bill terribly disappointing because it is not an anti-monopolies Bill at all. It was bad enough when it was intro-

[Shri M. R. Masani]

duced in Parliament. Even then it was not on the lines of the draft Bill attached to the Das Gupta Commission's Report, as the hon. Minister wrongly claimed this morning. It was a Bill entirely different from what the earlier Monopolies Commission had recommended. After coming back from the Joint Committee I regret to say that the Bill has got much worse, and it is a great pity that it should be so. When you read the evidence before the Joint Committee, it was in an entirely different direction. The changes made in the Bill by Joint Committee, I regret to say, are entirely in the opposite direction from what the weight of the evidence would have dictated.

Let me turn to some features of the Bill and show why I say it is a bad Bill, not an anti-monopolies Bill at all. I will list certain aspects which are objectionable.

The first is that the Bill does nothing to stop monopoly. Let me start with the definition of "monopoly", because, listening to my hon. friend opposite, I realise that at least certain hon. Members of this House do not know the meaning of the word "monopoly." I shall read from Chambers's Twentieth Century Dictionary, but you can take up any dictionary, you will find they are all agreed on the meaning of the word "monopoly." Chambers Dictionary defines monopoly as follows :

"Sole power, or privilege, of dealing in anything, exclusive command or possession ; that of which one has such a sole power, privilege, command or possession."

So the meaning is absolutely clear. Whatever you have monopoly of, you have to yourself, there can be no sharing of monopoly. There cannot be three monopolists sharing a thing, only one can be a monopolist. So monopoly is a hundred per cent domination or control or possession of production of particular article or commodity. Judged by that test, there is not a single monopoly outside Government enterprises in this country today. I have asked in the Joint Committee and elsewhere for a single monopoly to be produced which is not a Government monopoly, and it is obvious that there is not a single one where it can be alleged that a private enterprise is indul-

ging in monopolistic practice which would bring it within the purview of this Bill.

Then are there any Government monopolies ? There are Government monopolies. All of them are Government monopolies, those that exist in India. I will mention three. The Life Insurance Corporation is a hundred per cent Chambers Dictionary kind of monopoly because when anyone tries to compete with LIC he can be punished and sent to jail. The Indian Airlines Corporation is another monopoly, and Air India International is a third one. Then, the Indian Railways are a monopoly.

AN HON. MEMBER : Also roads.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : No, because hundreds of operators compete on the roads.

Telegraphs are a hundred per cent monopoly, telephones are a hundred per cent monopoly, All India Radio is a hundred per cent monopoly.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA : You want to abolish these monopolies ?

SHRI M. R. MASANI : I would gladly deal with these interruptions, but you, Sir, are a very good Deputy Speaker, as I have noticed during these two days, and you try to keep us to time. So I will not be able to deal with these rather futile interruptions.

I was saying that the only monopolies in India, and the only monopolistic practices are those of the Government of India enterprises like those I mentioned.

There are partial monopolies also. There is the STC, MMTC, FCI, and so on.

The Das Gupta Commission on monopolies when it reported took note of this fact and it advised that, when a Bill was introduced, Government monopolies should not be excluded from the purview of the Bill. It said :

"It was rightly pointed out that all such public enterprises are no less capable of indulging in restrictive practices that may be harmful to the general public than their private sector competitors. And if the latter require

in the public interest the controlling supervision of the Commission, such controlling supervision is equally needed for the public sector enterprises."

The Commission went on to say :

"We are bound to say that there is considerable force in these contentions that the Government and Parliament should consider seriously whether these public sector enterprises should be allowed to enjoy special immunity or whether they should be made subject to the Commission's jurisdiction in the same manner as the private sector concerns in respect of any restrictive practice."

And yet the hon. Minister had the effrontery to try to mislead the House this morning by pretending that this wretched Bill that he has introduced has any family resemblance to the draft Bill that the Das Gupta Commission had recommended.

Now, the sad thing is that all these State monopolies, which are the only monopolies in India, are specifically excluded from the purview of the Bill. My two colleagues, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel and Mr. C. C. Desai, in their excellent Minutes of Dissent, have stated our objection to this very well. Therefore, the first aspect of the Bill is that it does not deal with the only monopolies that exist ; it pretends to deal with non-existent monopolies that do not exist. It has been argued that democratic control exists over the nationalised industries and therefore no anti-monopoly legislation need be applied to them. I want to ask the hon. Members to be honest with themselves : to consider how little democratic control is exercised over this Government, leave aside over the enterprises of the Government. I have been Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee for two years. I think my Committee did a good job, but let me admit that the influence we had on Government policies and administration was marginal ; it was peripheral. I think the same applies to the Estimates Committee and the Public Undertakings Committee. What they can do is very limited, because when the large industries are conducted by the Government, a body like Parliament is not capable, is not made to exercise effective control. Therefore, this idea that democratic control is there

and therefore an anti-monopoly Bill should not apply to them is a wrong idea.

Prof. Galbraith, the great American socialist, who was an Ambassador in our country, was a strong supporter of the Government of the day and the planning of the day. In his latest book, *The new Industrial State*, he has given his judgement on our public enterprises. He said he had studied them at close quarters and has described them as "remote, irresponsible bodies, immune from public scrutiny or democratic control."

So the Government monopolies are the worst monopolies because they are irresponsible. Private monopolies have the police power of the Government to check them. There is the doctrine of countervailing power between the corporation and the Government. But where the Government becomes a factory-owner or the factory-owner is the same as the policeman, there is no appeal. So the poor consumer who has to buy from the Government enterprises is completely at the mercy of the Government monopolies. The worker in the establishment also has no right of appeal to any third party. That is why I would call the doctrine embodied in this Bill industrial feudalism of the most reactionary kind. The Bill is a fraud on the people of India because it pretends to fight monopoly while it does nothing of the kind.

A second aspect of the Bill is the one which has been referred to by Shri Asoka Mehta : the way in which the Commission that is sought to be appointed is downgraded into a mere advisory body while all real power is to be exercised by my hon. friend the Minister as he likes. That is the second aspect of the Bill which we cannot accept as being honestly anti-monopoly.

A third aspect of the Bill which does not commend itself to us is that it tries to restrict competition. It does not foster competition as an anti-monopoly Bill should. It restricts competition in two ways. First of all, it restricts competition between private enterprises and State enterprises by giving the latter a complete monopoly. Secondly as between private enterprises, it gives the Government power to stop free competition by inhibiting real competition between the rival private enterprises by using their permit-licence powers and their anti-monopoly powers.

[Shri M. R. Masani]

This is sought to be done by a whole battery of clauses, with which I have no time to deal, which subjects any organised enterprise in industry to the arbitrary whims and fancies of the Government of the day.

Take the definition given in clause 2 of what is a dominant company, what are inter-connected companies and what are monopolistic companies. According to clause 2(j), a company is a monopolistic company if, along with two other independent unconnected companies with which it is competing, it shares 50 per cent of the market. It is astounding that the Minister was not ashamed to read out this definition. Imagine the absurdity of this clause. Let us imagine that there are three companies which together share 50 per cent of the market in competition. One of them may have 25 per cent, one 15 per cent and the third 10 per cent share of the market. The companies which have 10 per cent or 15 per cent share in the market competing with two others are monopolistic concerns! It is an outrage on the English language. I am sorry the Minister was not here when I read the definition of monopoly. Otherwise, he would not have introduced this clause.

The whole of the third Chapter has no place in this Bill. It deals with so called concentration of economic power, but gives concentration of power to the men sitting opposite. It is an impertinence to tell us that this whole chapter by which he seeks to put his hands on power is designed to decentralise economic power. Therefore, for this reason that it inhibits competition and really concentrates power in the hands of those in office for the time being, we are opposed to this Bill.

The entire Bill is based on a confusion between size and monopoly. Size and monopoly have nothing to do with each other. You can have a small concern completely dominating the market in a particular product and it would be monopolistic, even if it is small. You can have giant companies like the American automobile companies fighting a struggle to the death in competition; yet, none of them would be a monopoly. The trouble is, that many hon. members do not wish quietly to think about it and they seek to make out anything

big as a monopoly. If they start with a wrong definition, they cannot come to a wise conclusion. This elementary distinction between size and monopoly has been completely ignored by this Bill. I am quite sure the Minister and his advisers in the official gallery are not so perverse as not to know this distinction. Therefore, I can only conclude that they are deliberately trying to rouse a hysteria against organised industries and big business of a competitive nature by trying to put the communist label of "monopolist" on them and to pass this Bill.

Let me say this that in this country there are no big companies. I repeat: in this country there are no big companies.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Tatas?

SHRI M. R. MASANI: I am coming to them. There are no big companies in this country by international standards. There is a list of 200 big companies in the world which is authoritatively published. It may interest hon. members to know that the only Indian company that figures in the list is a Government of India enterprise, Hindustan Steel Limited. There is not a second Indian company worthy to enter the list of the giants. Of the ten biggest Indian companies, there are nine that are Government of India enterprises only one that is a private enterprise. These are pygmies; only they are slightly bigger ones than the average pygmies. Of the ten, there are nine Government of India companies and the only exception is the Tata Iron and Steel Company. It is interesting to note the nature of Hindustan Steel, which is one of the ten biggest Indian companies. Hindustan Steel ranks tenth in the whole world in terms of size of capital, but it ranks 120th in terms of production and sale. Look at the lousy nature of this big enterprise of ours. Whereas it ranks tenth among the capital structures of the world, it stands 120th out of the 200 big companies of the world in terms of production and sale. This is the second reason why I say this Bill is a fraud on the Indian people.

The third reason why we are against this Bill is that it will retard India's economic development; it will retard our

exports and it will retard employment in our country. Mr. Asoka Mehta has given a very intelligent analysis of world trends. He has pointed out how the British Labour Government and the German Socialist Government are going in for mergers, because otherwise they cannot maintain their place in the world market. I will only add to the countries he gave, another.

The Japanese Government is going out of its way to allow Mitsubishi and the old Zaibatsu, which were broken up by General MacArthur and the Americans after the war, to be put together again in order to compete in the world market and promote exports. The two biggest Japanese steel works, Yawata and Fuji, bigger than ours, are being merged today with Government's approval.

France, Germany, Britain, America all are following the same pattern because they want to protect their economy and fight in the world market. So this Bill goes completely against the world trend.

India has no big companies; Britain has very much bigger companies but let me read out a sentence from the Monopolies Commission of the British Labour Government to show that they consider their companies also to be small, though they are bigger than ours. This is what the British Monopolies Commission says:—

"The absolute size of British companies does not, for the present at least, seem to raise any important issues for the public interest. 'Large' is a relative term, and large British companies, though big in relation to the British economy, are not for the most part big in relation to the international companies with which many of them compete."

What they have said about Britain applies a hundred times more to this country.

I would go further and state the fifth reason why this Bill is pointless. All these powers which they are trying to take are not necessary. Even today, with the kind of restrictions that exist which, as Shri Asoka Mehta pointed out are responsible for limited monopolies and concentration of wealth, this "permit-licence raj" and regime of corruption based on sale of quotas, permits and licences by which the honourable gentleman opposite and the Government thrive, these powers are already there.

Managing agencies have been abolished and there is a whole battery of legislation that gives the Government power of life and death over industrial enterprises. Let me name some of them: The Industrial Development and Regulation Act, 1951; The Capital Issues Control Act, 1947; the Companies Act, 1956; the Essential Commodities Act, 1955; the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, 1947; and the Imports and Exports Control Act, 1947. All these give the Government enough power to decide the location of an undertaking, how much they should produce, at what price they should sell, and whether they can expand or not. What more power do they want?

That brings me to ask the question: Why did they introduce this Bill? I can only say that, as in Russia and Yugoslavia about which Mr. Milovan Djilas, the well-known Yugoslav Communist, has written in his book, *The New Class* there is a New Class in India also. The physiognomy of that new class is embodied by an hon. friend sitting opposite, the Minister, or if you like both the Ministers. It is this class which exploits its political power to get its hands on the economy and to extort what Karl Marx would have called "surplus value" out of the peasants and workers and the middle class of this country.

Ours is a mixed economy. So it is a mixed class. This class has three heads—the political head, the official head and the business head outside—who conspire to loot this country and squeeze out the hard-earned earnings of the common people. If there is one vested interest in India today, it is the one symbolised by this Government, corrupt officials—such of them as are corrupt—and the corrupt businessmen outside who join hands with them to loot the people.

This Bill is an instrument that is being forged by this new class of monopolists here and outside who want to create a State capitalist monopoly system to exploit the common people for the benefit of this new class. Mr. Nirad Chaudhuri, one of our courageous and good writers, in an article that he wrote on 1st December, 1969 in the *Hindusthan Standard* of Calcutta made the remark that today in our country—

"Socialism has supplanted patriotism as the last refuge of a scoundrel."

This Bill is the handiwork of the

[Shri M. R. Masani]

kind of people about whom Nirad Chaudhuri has written. They are like a dog in the manger; they cannot produce anything. My English friend, Graham Hutton, has described such as a dog in the barnyard, the dog that barks, disturbs the hens from laying eggs but cannot lay an egg itself. This Bill is of that nature. It is a Dog-in-the-Barnyard Bill which would do harm to our enterprises, and to our economic development but will be no good to anyone else.

Therefore, we are opposed to this Bill precisely because it does not fight monopoly and concentration of economic power; in fact, in an amendment that I have tabled, which I shall move at the appropriate time. I have described the Bill as a Bill for increasing concentration of economic power in this country, as a Bill for destroying all monopolies excepting those enjoyed by the Government. That is an accurate description of this Bill. And precisely because we want competition and we stand for the consumer, we oppose this Bill.

Now, the consumer is completely forgotten in this Bill. The Bill does not even provide that at least one representative of the consumer should be there on the Commission. I am glad that Mr. Somani has tabled an amendment to that effect. We stand for the consumer, we stand for the market economy which gives the consumer a fair deal, because in our philosophy "the consumer is king." In this Bill, the consumer is the forgotten factor.

Therefore, we shall try to improve the Bill, when it comes up for clause by clause consideration, and try to make it a genuine anti-monopoly Bill. If we fail -- and I can judge from the attitude of the Government we may fail -- we shall oppose the Bill and we shall vote against the Bill. If the Bill is still carried, we shall pledge to the people of India to remove this Bill from the statute book and promise to replace it by a genuine anti-monopoly law which will fight monopoly in this country.

श्री कवरसाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) :
उपाध्यक्ष जी, जिन भावनाओं के साथ यह बिल सदन के सामने आया है, मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ हमारे विधान में जो डायरेक्टिव

प्रिंसिपल 38 है वह मैं आपकी आज्ञा से पढ़ना चाहता हूँ :

"The State shall strive to promote the welfare of the people by securing and protecting as effectively as it may a social order in which justice, social, economic and political, shall inform all the institutions of the national life."

जिन्होंने हमारे देश का विधान बनाया था उन्होंने एक ही आशा व्यक्त की थी कि सरकार को ऐसी नीतियां होंगी जिनसे जो भी हमारे देश के रिसोर्सेज है उनका वितरण इस प्रकार से होना चाहिए कि छोटी से छोटी जगह भी वह चीजें पहुंच सकें। उसका लाभ सर्व-साधारण को पहुंचेगा और देश में घन कुछ हाथों में नहीं जायेगा - यही विधान की एक स्पिरिट थी और इसी दृष्टि से यह विधान बनाया गया था। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि विधान में हमने जो चीज रखी थी, क्या पिछले 22 सालों में सरकार ने उसको पूरा किया है ? मैं चाहूँगा कि मन्त्री महोदय जरा अपनी आत्मा को टटोलें जैसे कि पहले भी टटोलते रहे हैं कि क्या उन्होंने 22 सालों में देश में मानोपली कायम नहीं की ? पहले देश के अन्दर जो स्थिति थी आज उसमें ज्यादा मानोपली, कंसेन्ट्रेशन आफ वेल्थ हुआ है या नहीं हुआ है ? मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि 22 साल समाजवाद का नारा लगाने के बाद भी सन् 50 में जो मानोपली थी जो कंसेन्ट्रेशन आफ वेल्थ था उससे कई गुना ज्यादा आज है उसके लिए चाहे आप बिड़ला पर इन्क्वायरी कमीशन बिठाये टाटा पर बिठाये या किसी और पर बिठाये लेकिन मैं तो यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप ईमानदार हैं क्या बिड़ला ने अपने हस्ताक्षर करके पमित ले लिए थे या टाटा ने अपने हस्ताक्षर से स्वीकृति ले ली थी ? यह सब आपकी मंजूरी से हुआ है, मन्त्री महोदय के हस्ताक्षर से हुआ है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप जो कमीशन बिठाने जा रहे हैं, बिड़ला का या किसी और का, आप उससे एक ब

कमीशन बिठायेँ जिसके टर्म्स आफ रेफ्रिन्सेज में यह भी हो कि उसके लिए सरकार कहां तक दोषी है, समयिदार कहां तक दोषी हैं और जो बड़े-बड़े अधिकाारी हैं वे कहां तक दोषी हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन तीनों की साजिश है और उसी के कारण आपने कंसंट्रेशन आफ वेल्थ ज्यादा की है।

मैं आपकी सेवा में यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि आजादी आने के बाद टाटा की असेट्स 30 करोड़ रुपए थी जोकि आज 559 करोड़ हैं, बिड़ला की 20 करोड़ थी जोकि आज 510 करोड़ है। जो रेट आफ प्रोथ है वह बिड़ला का सन् 63 से लेकर 66-67 तक तीन साल का 74 परसेंट है और टाटा का 32 परसेंट है। यह जो रेट आफ प्रोथ हुई है उसके लिए कौन जिम्मेदार है ? 22 साल के बाद यह जो विल आया है इसका मतलब यह है कि सरकार 22 सालों में बुरी तरह से फेन हुई है। विधान में जो बात कही गई थी, उसकी जो आशा थी वह आपने पूरी नहीं की। ...*(स्ववधान)*...टाटा बिड़ला की बात पूरी की होगी, और दूसरे बड़े-बड़े आदमियों की बात पूरी की होगी लेकिन इन्होंने सर्वसाधारण की बात पूरी नहीं की। उनको इन्होंने केवल समाजवाद का नारा लगाकर, समाजवाद की लोरियाँ देकर सुलाया है और जेबें किसी और की भरी हैं।

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप नेशनलाइजेशन की बात करते हैं। हमारी पार्टी के लिये राष्ट्रीयकरण कोई टैबू नहीं है, और यह भी नहीं है कि हम प्राइवेट सेक्टर के खिलाफ हैं, और जैसा प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कल कहा कि हमारे देश में एक ही सेक्टर है, कोई प्राइवेट सेक्टर और पब्लिक सेक्टर भ्रम-भ्रम नहीं है। मैं मानता हूँ कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर ने हमारे देश की बढ़ोत्तरी में काम किया है, पब्लिक सेक्टर ने भी किया है। दोनों की सेवार्थें हैं।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : प्रधान मन्त्री ने कहा कि यह लोग गलत कहते हैं कि हमारे यहां दो सेक्टर हैं। न प्राइवेट सेक्टर है, न पब्लिक सेक्टर है, तो कौन सा सेक्टर है, यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ।

श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त : स्टेट बैंक, एल०आई० सी० और जो सरकार के इरादे हैं उन्होंने इतने सालों में क्या किया। आप ने बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया लेकिन हम समझते हैं कि देश के लिये हित नहीं हुआ। लेकिन स्टेट बैंक का क्या परफार्मेंस है ? जितनी भी अग्रेसिबल ट्री है उसका 23.9 परसेंट बिल बिजनेस हाउसेज को गया है। और यही परफार्मेंस एल०आई०सी० का है। लेकिन यह जो दांत हैं माननीय फलरूटीन साहब के यह दिखाने के और हैं और खाने के और हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप के एक ही तरह के दांत हों, एक ही तरह की शकल हो। यह जो दो मुंह हैं, यह अच्छा नहीं है।

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : टाटा, बिड़ला के दांत तोड़ दीजिये।

श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त : मोनोपली को हम नहीं चाहते, उस को रेगुलेट करने के लिये कोई भी कदम सरकार उठायेगी हम उस का स्वागत करेंगे। मोनोपली को खत्म करने के लिये, कंसंट्रेशन आफ वेल्थ को खत्म करने के लिये, उस को रेगुलेट करने के लिये सरकार जो भी कदम उठायेगी मेरी पार्टी उस का स्वागत करेगी।

जहाँ मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर भी बड़े वहां यह भी चाहता हूँ कि पब्लिक सेक्टर भी बड़े और दोनों का कम्पटीशन होना चाहिये। मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि आप प्राइवेट सेक्टर की मोनोपली खत्म करें और पब्लिक सेक्टर की मोनोपली पैदा करें यह भी अच्छा नहीं है। इस बिल के अन्दर आपने जो बातें रखी हैं उस में सरकारी सेक्टर में यह चीज लागू नहीं होगी। मैं पूछता हूँ कि ऐसा क्यों ?

[श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त]

अगर आप के सरकारी इदारे इतने इनऐफीशियेंट है, वहाँ पर करप्शन है तो उन को ठीक कीजिये और मुकाबला कीजिये प्राइवेट सैक्टर के साथ। तभी देश की इकोनामी ठीक हो सकती है। आप की इनऐफीशियेंसी की वजह से, फेवरेटिज्म और करप्शन की वजह से जो कन्ज्यूमर है उस को क्यों नुकसान उठाना पड़े ? इसलिये मैं चाहूँगा कि जहाँ प्राइवेट सैक्टर के अन्दर मोनोपली नहीं होनी चाहिये, वहाँ पब्लिक सैक्टर में भी मोनोपली नहीं होनी चाहिये। दोनों सैक्टरों में फेयर कम्पटीशन हो ताकि लोगों को, तबसाधारण व्यक्ति को उस का पूरी तरह से लाभ हो सके। लेकिन अगर सरकार मोनोपली के नाम से प्राइवेट सैक्टर को तो खत्म करती है और खत्म भी कुछ लोगों को करती है और पब्लिक सैक्टर में जो इनऐफीशियेंसी है उस को आज तक 22 साल में दूर नहीं किया और आज जो यह बिल रखा मैं उस में जो ऐग्जम्शन क्लज है उस में उस को ऐग्जम्बट कर दिया गया, मैं इस के खिलाफ हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि फ्री कम्पटीशन हर एक सैक्टर में होना चाहिये ताकि लोगों को सस्ती से सस्ती चीज मिल सके।

आप राष्ट्रीयकरण कर रहे हैं कुछ चीजों का, लेकिन हमें डर है कि इस के अन्दर पोलिटिकल कन्सेन्ट्रेशन आप पावर होगा। हमें डर है कि जो राष्ट्रीयकरण करते समय आप ने बड़े-बड़े नारे लगाये वे ठीक तरह से इम्प्लीमेंट नहीं होंगे। और मैं चाहूँगा जैसे आप ने बैंको का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया है, अब, 5, 6 महीने बीत गये लेकिन आप ने कौन से कदम उठाये जिस से मालूम पड़े कि आप उन नारों को वाकई पूरा करना चाहते हैं ? केवल दस, पाँच लाख रुपया दे कर एक वातावरण बनाया जा रहा है कि बहुत बड़ा कदम उठा दिया। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि कौन सी बड़ी स्कीम आप ने बनायी ? राष्ट्रीयकरण का फैसला तीन दिन में लिया और पाँच

महीने बीतने के बाद आप कोई इम्प्लीमेंटेशन की स्कीम नहीं बना सके। आप कहते हैं कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट रोक रहा है। लेकिन क्या रिजर्व बैंक ऐक्ट के अन्दर अधिकार नहीं है कि आज उन को आज्ञा दे सकें ? आज जो सोशल कंट्रोल है उस के तरह क्या आप बैंकों को यह आज्ञा नहीं दे सकते कि इतने परसेंट जो आप का कर्जा होगा यह स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज को जायगा, इतना बड़ी इंडस्ट्रीज को जायगा, इतना फार्मर्स को जायगा ? लेकिन पाँच महीने बीतने के बाद भी आप कुछ नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। मैं अपने बहस से कहूँगा कि यह उनकी गलती है, इस सरकार को ठीक करें, नारे के जरिये आप एक, दो महीने खड़े रह सकते हैं, लेकिन जब लोगों को मालूम होगा...

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीकाम्तम्मा (लक्ष्मण) : मुझे मालूम है कि आज कल छोटे लोगों को कर्जा अधिक मिल रहा है नेशनलाइजेशन के बाद।

श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त : पाँच महीने में आप ने कोई स्कीम नहीं बनायी। आप के नारे थोड़े रहे। मैं चाँज करना चाहूँता हूँ कि यह सरकार का पोलिटिकल स्टैट है और लोगों को कोई इस में फायदा नहीं होने वाला है। आप ने बैंकों के रिसोर्स अपने हाथ में ले लिये, पोलिटिकल कन्सेन्ट्रेशन अपने हाथ में ले लिया और इस के बाद आप ऐक्सप्लायट करना चाहते हैं एक पार्टी के एक हिस्से के लिये। यह चीज गलत है।

मेरा कहना है कि जो भी आप ने राष्ट्रीयकरण किया, या जो भी स्कीम है उस का एक फेज्ड प्रोग्राम बनाइये, हर साल उस की रिपोर्ट आये ताकि लोगों को मालूम हो कि कितनी प्रोग्रेस हुई है। और जो नहीं हुई, तो क्यों नहीं हुई, आया इम्प्लीमेंटेशन ठीक होता है कि नहीं, आया पोलिटिकल पावर का मिस्यूज तो नहीं होता, इन सब का पत

जनता को लगे। मैं माँग करूँगा कि एक इंडिपेंडेंट हाई पावरड कमीशन बैठाना चाहिये इस चीज के लिये जो बाच करे कि आया ठीक तरह से इम्प्लीमेंटेशन हो रहा है कि नहीं और पोलिटिकल एक्सप्लायटेशन तो नहीं हो रहा है। जो आप के हाथ में अधिकार आया है उस का दुरुपयोग किसी एक पार्टी के लिये तो नहीं हो रहा है? इस लिये एक इन्डिपेंडेंट कमीशन होना चाहिये तब तो लोगों को विश्वास होगा, अन्यथा नहीं। आप अक्सर अपने कब्जे में कर रहे हैं, अल इण्डिया रेडियो आप के कब्जे में है, एजेन्सीज आप ले रहे हैं, बैंक आप ले रहे हैं, बायों तरफ से पकड़ कर के देना को फासिज्म डिक्टेटरशिप की तरफ ले जाना चाहते हैं। हो सकता है कि कुछ देर के लिये आप जनता को बेवकूफ बना लें लेकिन भारत के लोग जागरूक हैं और ज्यादा दिन आप इस तरह लोगों को धोके में नहीं रख सकते, कोई न कोई कार्यवाही आप को अवश्य ही करनी पड़ेगी।

15.00 hrs.

मन्त्री महोदय कहते हैं कि अर्बन प्रोपर्टी पर सीलिंग होगी, वह कहते हैं कि यह इंडस्ट्री ली जायगी, वह इंडस्ट्री ली जायगी। मैं कहता हूँ आप सारी इंडस्ट्रीज ले लीजिये लेकिन लेने के बाद क्या आप नेशनल मिनिमम की गारन्टी करेंगे कि एक स्पेसीफाइड पीरियड के अन्दर आप लोगों के लिये यह यह चीज कर देंगे? अगर आप 1971 तक यह गारन्टी देते हैं कि नेशनल मिनिमम हर एक देश के आदमी को मिलेगी तब तो ठीक है, वरना काम चलने वाला नहीं है। लेकिन जब यह बात आती है तो प्रधान मन्त्री कहती हैं कि यह चीज नहीं की जा सकती, समय नहीं दिया जा सकता, कोई गारन्टी सरकार नहीं दे सकती। तो इस में क्या अक्ल की जरूरत पड़ती है। पहले नेशनेलाइज कर दो, फिर दूसरी चीज नेशनेलाइज कर लो, फिर तीसरी चीज नेशनेलाइज कर लो, और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी आप के साथ है। हो गया काम। तो इस तरह से

देश में डिक्टेटरशिप पैदा करेंगे लेकिन लोगों को फायदा नहीं करेंगे, यह चीज मैं समझता हूँ कि गलत है।

आप गारन्टी कीजिए लोगों से। आपको तीन हजार करोड़ रुपया बैंकों से मिला। उसका कैसे इस्तेमाल होगा, उनका हमारे देश की इकानामी पर क्या प्रभाव पड़ेगा, एक सर्व-साधारण आदमी को क्या लाभ होगा? मैं चाहूँगा कि आप यह याद रखें कि अगर इस पीरियड तक हर एक को नेशनल मिनिमम की गारन्टी अगर सरकार नहीं कर सकती तो आपका यह जो समाजवाद है, यह बिल्कुल धोखा है। क्या राष्ट्रीयकरण करने के लिए कोई अक्ल की जरूरत नहीं पड़ती? उसके बाद चाहे वह घाटे में जाय या नफे में जाय। मैं चाहूँगा कि आप बहुत सोच-विचार कर कदम उठायें, यह नहीं कि हवा में बातें करें।

यह बिल आप 22 साल बाद लाये हैं।

22 साल तक आप क्या सोये हुए थे? क्या आपको माझूम नहीं था कि मोनोपली हो रही है, कंसन्ट्रेशन आफ वेल्थ हो रहा है? आपको माझूम था और कभी यह रुकने वाला नहीं है इस बिल में गवर्नमेंट को पूरी पावर दी गई है अगर उसको शुबहा हो तो वह कमीशन को रिफर करके कमीशन की रिपोर्ट ले। रिपोर्ट आने के बाद गवर्नमेंट को पूरा अधिकार है कि वह दे या न दे। क्या गवर्नमेंट को अधिकार होना चाहिए कि वह कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को स्वीकार करे या नहीं करे? कमीशन की जो रिपोर्ट हो वह वह वाइडिंग होनी चाहिए। वह एक इंडिपेंडेंट कमीशन है, जुडिशल कमीशन है उसकी रिपोर्टे को गवर्नमेंट वाइडिंग क्यों नहीं करती? गवर्नमेंट क्यों फंसला लेती है? लेकिन आपने अपने हाथ में इसलिए रखा है कि वह आपको चन्दा दें, आपको हवाई जहाज दें आपका फोटो अक्सर में छापें, इन सब कामों के लिए आपको सरमायेदार चाहिए। वह जो बीकनेस है, समाजवाद कहने से वह नहीं दूर हो सकती। यहाँ पर हमारे साम्यवादी

their business with the connivance and with the help of this Government which has been on the saddle for the past 22 years and it is thus that these big business-houses have grown.

We have been talking about concentration of economic power and wealth, and this Government has dedicated itself at least by paying a lip-service to socialism. But in spite of the Industrial Policy Resolution, the Directive Principles of the Constitution and the expert committees that have been set up by the Planning Commission and various other committees, and in spite of the fact that they had ample powers of regulation in their hands to curb the growth of big business, they have miserably failed to curb it. I would say that they have succeeded in making the big business grow in stature and acquire concentration of wealth.

I would now give a few instances to show how the assets of the big business groups have given up during the last few years. In the case of the Mafatlal group, the total value of assets which stood at about Rs. 45.9 crores at the end of March, 1964 grew up to Rs. 106 crores in 1966-67; in the case of Tatas, it went up from Rs. 417 to Rs. 547 crores, and in the case of Birlas, it went up from Rs. 292 crores in 1964 to Rs. 450 crores in 1965-67; this means that the assets have gone up by 131 per cent in the case of Mafatlal, by 31 per cent in the case of Tatas and 64 per cent in the case of Birlas. These groups have grown with the connivance and with the blessings and with the full support of those who are there in power.

Therefore, it is the Planning Commission, it is the planning pattern and it is the financial programmes of this Government that have helped in the concentration of wealth and in the growth of these big business-houses.

I would agree with Shri M. R. Masani on one point, namely that compared to the international combines, our companies are only pygmies. He also said that there were the big pygmies and the small pygmies in the country.

SHRI RABI RAY : But in the Indian context they are big.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : Concentration and monopoly are only relative terms. We do not want the big pygmy to swallow the

small pygmy here. We do not want the big fish in the small pond of India to swallow the small fishes. That is why this Bill is there. So, we need not compare the pygmies here with those in other countries.

As I have pointed out already, the concentration of wealth is the creation of the plan. I would quote in this connection no less an authority than Dr. D. R. Gadgil himself. This was what he had said :

"It is clear that currently in India it is implementation of plans of development, particularly in the modern business sector, that is creating on a very large scale situations described as monopolistic position created by private action, appearing few as compared with those created as a result of official and planned policy, for the larger part of monopoly gains with national research accruing in Indian economy are the result not of collusion and other practices indulged in by businessmen but of the licensing and other allocative decisions taken by the administration in their favour."

Dr. Gadgil said this in 1966. Since then he has become Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission. I do not know how much he has reoriented planning, how much he has been able to correct this policy of helping the business houses is yet to be seen.

I will give some statistics concerning how much help has been given to the big business houses by the financial institutions set up with public money, like LIC, ICICI, SBI and UTI. As per the report of the Industrial Licensing Policy Inquiry Committee, all these institutions have contributed to the growth of big business. The total financial assistance sanctioned by these public institutions between 1956 and 1966 was Rs. 808 crores, out of which the large industrial sector, 73 big business houses, have monopolised as much as Rs. 456 crores, that is 56 per cent. If we take the individual institutions, the picture is horrible. ICICI has given 67 per cent of its total financial assistance to the large industrial sector. SBI term loans alone to this sector are of the order of 81 per cent. LIC has given 80 per cent and UTI as much as 93 per cent. As regards the last, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari had said that it is the small man's money which will go to the small man

[Shri Sezhiyan]

the small sector, but now it has gone into the bigger houses. This is the state of affairs.

I can say that just by nationalising banks we are not going to have panacea to the country's economic ills. It is not going to help the people of this country, unless the funds placed in your hands are directed and given to the small entrepreneurs, the farmers and workers. Without this, any amount of nationalisation alone will not cure the disease Indian economy suffers from.

The State Bank of India is very much a nationalised institution, in the hands of Government. But in 1968 according to the report, 23.9 per cent of its total assistance has been given to gentlemen directors belonging to big business groups. One-fourth of it has gone that way. Therefore, just nationalisation of this bank or that sector is not going to helping the economy, unless other measures are also taken.

I can quote another gentleman, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, who was called from his retirement from Madras to assist this Government in its economic planning and policy formulation. Speaking in Delhi at the requisitioned AICC, he said—I am quoting from the press report :

“Speaking on controls, Mr. Krishnamachari said, ‘You cannot have socialism and say ‘we want decontrol’. He criticised the Government for lack of a clear policy after the introduction of cement control. Cement control was introduced to protect the consumer, not to protect the mills.”

On the one hand, they talk of socialism on the one hand, they say we are going to curb monopoly ; on the other, decontrol of cement is being contemplated. I do not know what final conclusion they will come to. I hope they will have second thoughts.

After decontrol of cement, big business will have its way reestablished. For example, ACC, one of the biggest concerns in cement will after decontrol earn additional profit of Rs. 160 lakhs ; Dalmias will earn Rs. 40 lakhs additional profit ; Sahu-Jains will earn Rs. 83 lakhs.

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM
(Visakhapatnam) : They are pleading for controls.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : No, it is the other way.

My Party stands for genuine control of cement, because that is in the interest of the consumer at the present juncture ; there must be a uniform rate applicable throughout India. Once control is lifted, prices will be distorted and freight charges will be added and the consumers will be fleeced to benefit the big business.

Therefore, while I support the general objective of this Bill, I am very much afraid that this Bill in isolation, without any other scheme to help it, will not achieve much. Till now they could say that they did not have the co-operation from all and had certain opposition from some Congressmen. Now that they have got a clear field, I want to know whether they will enunciate any clear economic programme. Talking in the air will not help. Saying so many things about socialism is not going to help the Indian masses. There should be clear programmes, they should be very clear in their objectives, very sincere in their approach and very firm in implementation. Though there are so many statutes giving ample opportunities to curb monopolistic growth, they have not been used. All the powers given to them by Parliament were misused, abused, with the result that big business has grown as I pointed out. Therefore, putting one more law on the statute-book is not enough, is not going to help the country, unless it is followed by a clear programme, firm action and sincere approach. Without that the objective will not be achieved.

श्री डा० ना० तिवारी (गोपालगंज) : इस बिल र जो क्रिटिसिज्म अब तक हुआ है उस को सुन कर मुझे कुछ आश्चर्य हुआ है। अभी तक चार दलों के स्टालवाट्स बोले हैं। डी० एम०के०के० के रिप्रिजेंटेटिव को छोड़ कर बाकी तीन दक्षिण पन्थी पार्टियों के जो रिप्रिजेंटेटिव बोले हैं उन में एक समानता थी और वह यह कि गवर्गमेंट अपने हाथ में बहुत पावर ले रही है।

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : एक ही वाली के बट्टे बट्टे हैं तीनों।

श्री हा० ना० तिवारी : मेरी गाली देने की श्रादन नहीं है । मुझे आप बोलने दें । उन्होंने कहा है कि गवर्नमेंट के हाथ में बहुत पावर आ रही है । अशोक मेहता साहब ने कहा कि गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी से इंडस्ट्री में हिड्रॉस हो रहा है । तीसरी बात उन्होंने यह कही कि गवर्नमेंट ने आज तक जो किया है, सब गोलमल किया । कोई अच्छा काम किया ही नहीं है । जब तक अशोक मेहता साहब गवर्नमेंट में थे तब तक तो ऐसी कोई बात नहीं हुई लेकिन जैसे ही वह गवर्नमेंट से हट गए वैसे ही उनको शासन में बग़ाबर दोष ही दोष नज़र आ रहे हैं । शायद अधिकार की यह महिमा है कि जब कोई अधिकार में होता है तब उसको कोई दोष नज़र नहीं आता लेकिन जब वह अधिकार से हट जाता है तो सको मालूम पड़ता है कि दोष ही दोष हैं । पता नहीं यह उनका दोष है या सभी में यह दोष होता है । खास कर जो बड़े सोशलिस्ट बनते हैं या सीडो सोशलिस्ट हैं, उनको इस प्रकार की विचारधारा का होना एक आश्चर्य की बात है ।

मैं जानना चाहता है कि एकट में जो प्राविज्ज हैं उनको एनफोर्स करने के लिए पावर किस को दी जायें ? क्या अशोक मेहता साहब को दी जाये, मसानी साहब को दी जायें या कंबर लाल गुप्त जी को दी जायें ? गवर्नमेंट ही उनको एनफोर्स कर सकती है । हमारी समझ में नहीं आता कि इस क्रिटिसिज्म का क्या मतलब है । अगर किसी को पावर लेना है तो वह गवर्नमेंट ही हो सकती है ताकि काम ठीक तरह रेग्युलेट हो । अगर काम ठीक तरह रेग्युलेट नहीं होता है तो देश में बद-अमली फैल जायेगी । यह बिल क्यों आया है ? इसलिए आया है कि रात दिन इस पार्लियामेंट में और बाहर भी कहा जाता था कि रिच आर प्रोइंग रिचर एंड पूअर आर प्रोइंग पूअरर । कंसिट्रेशन आफ बॅल्थ बढ़ता जा रहा है । इस क्रिटिसिज्म को देखते हुए एक कमीशन बहाल हुआ । उसकी रिपोर्ट आई और उसके फलस्वरूप यह बिल

आया है । इस बिल की किसी प्राविज्ज को वह क्रिटिसाइज् करते, उसको सुधारने की कोशिश करते तो समझ सकता था । लेकिन एक जनरल तौर से यह कह देना कि गवर्नमेंट बहुत पावर ले रही है, कोई माने नहीं रखता है । यह कहा गया है कि हिड्रॉस इससे हो जायेगा । अब बतायें कि कैसे हिड्रॉस हो जाएगा ? यह बात हमारी समझ में तो आई नहीं है । यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आई है ।

हम लोगों ने हिन्दू फ़िलासफ़ी में पढ़ा है : "संसर्गया दोष-गुणाः भवन्ति" मनुष्य की जैसी संगति होती है, वैसे ही दोष या गुण उसमें आ जाते हैं । श्री अशोक मेहता सोशलिज्म में विश्वास करने वाले लोगों से दूर चले गये हैं । अब वह श्री मसानी, श्री वाजपेयी और श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त के पास बैठते हैं । इसी लिए उनके ख्यानात बदल गये हैं, उन के सोचने और बोलने का ढंग बदल गया है । (व्यवधान)

श्री मसानी ने कहा कि ससार में जितनी मानोपली कम्पनीज हैं, हिन्दुस्तान की कोई कम्पनी उनके समान नहीं है । मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जिस देश में जितना धन या सम्पत्ति है, जितना उसका विकास या उन्नति हुई है, उसके मुताबिक ही कोई कम्पनी या कोई व्यक्ति, छोटे या बड़े समझे जाते हैं । गांव में जिस आदमी के पास दस हजार रुपया है, वह धनी समझा जाता है, जब कि शहर में दस हजार रुपये वाला गरीब समझा जाता है । अगर यहाँ कोई 150 या 200 करोड़ रुपये की कम्पनी है, तो वह यहाँ की स्थिति को देखते हुए बड़ी भारी मानोपली ही समझी जायेगी, इंग्लैंड, अमरीका या जर्मनी में वह भले ही न समझी जाये । हमें तो अपने देश के जीवन-स्तर के मुताबिक देखना होगा कि कानसेन्ट्रेशन हो रहा है या नहीं ।

अमरीका में तो कोई ऐसा फार्म नहीं होगा, जो तीन चार सौ एकड़ से कम हो । लेकिन इस देश में जब साधारण आदमी के पास पाँच

[श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी]

कट्टा ज़मीन भी नहीं है, तो जिस आदमी के पास सौ कट्टा ज़मीन है, वह बड़ा आदमी ही समझा जायेगा। इस लिए अमरीका के मापदंड को यहां लागू करना या यहाँ की कम्पनियों का कम्पैरिजन अमरीका की कम्पनियों के साथ करना उचित नहीं होगा। यह कहना तथ्य से परे है कि हिन्दुस्तान की कम्पनियाँ छोटी छोटी हैं और यहां कोई कानसेन्ट्रेशन नहीं है।

श्री मसानी को कनज्यूमर्ज़ के लिए बड़ा दर्द है। उन्होंने कहा कि कनज्यूमर्ज़ को चीजें सस्ते दामों पर मिलनी चाहिए। जब बड़े बड़े इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट या बिजिनेसमैन अभाव में चीजों के दाम बढ़ाते हैं और प्राइसेज आसमान को छूने लगती हैं, उस वक़्त उन को दर्द नहीं होता है। (व्यवधान) ये बड़े बड़े इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट और बिजिनेसमैन अभाव में ही फायदा उठाते हैं और अगर किसी वक़्त अभाव न हो और चीजें इतनी अधिक हों कि कनज्यूमर्ज़ को आसानी से मिल सकें, तो वे घबराते हैं, उनको वह अच्छा नहीं लगता है। हम चाहते हैं कि हमारे देश में काफी प्राइवशन बढ़े, ताकि किसी चीज़ का अभाव न रहे और कनज्यूमर्ज़ को अधिक दाम न देने पड़ें। लेकिन माननीय सदस्य तो कनज्यूमर्ज़ के नाम पर क्राफोडाइस टियज़ बहाते हुए गवर्नमेंट को दोष देना चाहते हैं। गवर्नमेंट मानोपलीज़ पर इस लिए रोक लगाना चाहती है कि कनज्यूमर्ज़ को सस्ते दामों पर चीजें मिल सकें, और उस स्थिति का अन्त हो, जिस में कुछ ही हाथों में अधिक से अधिक कनसेन्ट्रेशन होता है और वे लोग जैसे चाहे, बाज़ार में चीज़ें बेचें।

माननीय सदस्य श्री मसानी ने पब्लिक सेक्टर और प्राइवेट सेक्टर की तुलना भी की। उन का ग्राउण्ड यह है कि पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग भी मानोपलीज़ है और उन के साथ भी प्राइवेट सेक्टर के समान ही व्यवहार करना चाहिए। मुझे इस बात पर आश्चर्य होता है। पब्लिक

सेक्टर की कम्पनियाँ नेशन की सम्पत्ति हैं, जिन पर नेशन का, टैक्सपेयर का, पैसा लगा हुआ है और उन से जो आमदनी होती है, वह भी टैक्सपेयर के पास ही जाती है, किसी एक आदमी, या कुछ आदमियों के घुप, के पास नहीं। इस लिए उन का कम्पैरिजन प्राइवेट कम्पनीज़ के साथ करना कहां तक उचित है, यह बात समझ में नहीं आती है।

15.25 hrs.

[Shri M. B. Rana in the Chair]

माननीय सदस्य ने जो आर्गुमेंट्स दी हैं या जो विचार प्रकट किये हैं, वे इस लिए नहीं कि इस बिल की व्यवस्थाओं में कुछ सुधार किया जाये, बल्कि इस लिए कि उन्हें गवर्नमेंट को गाली देनी है, उसको क्रिटिसाइज़ करना है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बिल को लेकर गवर्नमेंट पर गुस्सा उतारने की जरूरत नहीं है। गवर्नमेंट से गलतियाँ भी होती हैं और खराब काम भी होते हैं। माननीय सदस्य उन के बारे में कहें और उसके लिए उनके पास अनेक अवसर हैं। लेकिन यह तो नहीं होना चाहिए कि कोई अच्छा बिल इस सदन में लाया जाये, तो उस अवसर का उपयोग गवर्नमेंट की टीका और आलोचना करने के लिए किया जाये। (व्यवधान)

आज व्यापार या उद्योग में हिन्दुस्तान की क्या स्थिति है? अब भी हम को बहुत सी चीजें बाहर से मंगानी पड़ती हैं। यहाँ के उद्योगपतियों में इतनी शक्ति नहीं है—और कई मामलों में इच्छा भी नहीं है—कि वे इस देश में व्यवसाय या उद्योग कायम करके उन चीजों का उत्पादन करें। इसी लिए गवर्नमेंट को स्टेप इन करना पड़ता है, उन चीजों के उत्पादन के लिए कोई कम्पनी या कार्पोरेशन बना कर रुपया इनवेस्ट करना पड़ता है। यहाँ के बिजिनेसमैन और इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स तो उन्हीं

चीजों को बनायेंगे, उन्हीं व्यवसायों या उद्योगों को शुरू करेंगे, जिन से उन को अधिक से अधिक मुनाफा मिल सके। वे ऐसी चीजों में हाथ नहीं डालेंगे, जिन से देश को फायदा हो, भले ही उनको प्राफ़िट न हो या कम हो। आखिर वे सदाब्रत खोलने के लिए तो उद्योग या व्यवसाय शुरू नहीं करते हैं; वे तो प्राफ़िट मोटिव से गाइडिड होते हैं। उन को जिस चीज से फायदा नहीं होगा, वे उस को हाथ में नहीं लेंगे। लेकिन गवर्नमेंट को तो नेशन की जरूरियात को देखना है। यहां पर जिन चीजों की जरूरत है, गवर्नमेंट को प्रयत्न करना है कि वे देश में ही बनाई जा सकें। अगर प्राइवेट लोग इस के लिए आगे नहीं आते हैं, तो गवर्नमेंट अपनी इनवेस्टमेंट से वह उद्योग शुरू करती है।

यह टिप्पणी की जाती है कि गवर्नमेंट की कम्पनीज को घाटा होता है। लेकिन ये लोग भूल जाते हैं कि गवर्नमेंट की कम्पनीज और उद्योगों आदि में कोई दोहरे स्काउंट्स नहीं रखे जाते हैं, उन में एक ही एकाउंट रखा जाता है; उन में इनकम टैक्स से बचने की कोशिश नहीं की जाती है। अगर रेलवेज के बैगन नहीं मिल रहे हैं, तो प्राइवेट उद्योग पति या बिजिनेसमैन सब मारल नाइसटीज को ताक पर रखकर रेलवे एगारिटीज को घूस दे कर बैगन ले लेते हैं। लेकिन गवर्नमेंट की कम्पनियां तो ऐसा नहीं कर सकती हैं। उनका यह ड्राबैक है। अगर उस स्टैंडर्ड से प्राइवेट कम्पनियों को नापा जाये, तो मालूम होगा कि उन में कितनी गड़बड़ी है।

हिन्दुस्तान में एन्ट्रप्रेनर इतने अधिक नहीं हैं कि वे सब उद्योगों का इन्तज़ाम और व्यवस्था कर सकें। प्राइवेट कम्पनियों को जो नफा हो रहा है, वह गोलमाल और एकाउंट्स मैनिपुलेशन से हो रहा है। देहात के जिन गरीब लोगों ने इन कम्पनियों में पांच दस रुपये के शेयर ले रखे हैं, एकाउंट्स में मैनिपुलेशन कर के उनको कुछ नहीं दिया जाता है और इसी

कारण इन कम्पनियों को नफा होता है। अगर गवर्नमेंट की कम्पनियों की तरह प्राइवेट कम्पनियों में ठीक ठीक हिसाब रखा जाये, एकाउंट्स में गड़बड़ी न की जाये, तो मालूम होगा कि वे शायद पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग की तुलना में ज्यादा मिसमैनेज्ड हैं।

मैं मानता हूँ कि पब्लिक सेक्टर की कम्पनियों में भी गड़बड़ी है। उसका कारण यह है कि उन का मैनेजरियल स्टाफ सैक्रेटेरियट से लिया जाता होता है और उन का कंट्रोल सैक्रेटेरियट में रहता है। कमेटी ग्रान पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग, एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी और पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी इन तीनों ने यह राय दी है कि ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए और इन कम्पनियों के मैनेजरियल स्टाफ का कैंडिड, अलग होना चाहिए, तभी वे ठीक ढंग से चल सकती हैं। अगर ऐसा न किया जायेगा, तो सरकारी कम्पनीज ठीक ढंग से नहीं चल सकेंगी। गवर्नमेंट को इस तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिए।

SHRI BEDABRATA BARUA (Kaliabor): Sir, the whole debate today started with an attack on State monopoly, which is the favourite whipping boy of my hon. friends opposite, who sought to discredit the public sector. Naturally, the whole content of the Bill has been forgotten in the general desire to justify the type of concentration that goes on in the economy now.

The concentration of economic and political power, as they say, has been rather distorted to mean the concentration of political power which is a sort of political monopoly according to them. But they have rather benevolently mentioned the anti-trust laws which have been in operation even in the United States. They concluded by saying that this government is not competent to implement anti-trust laws and so we should go back to *status quo ante*, we should have no control over the monopolists or the malpractices which have been attempted to be perpetrated by them.

The tragedy of the Indian situation has been a sheltered market which gives exorbitant profits and scope for corruption. Here we have to remember that corruption is prevalent in the private sector and not in

[Shri Bedabrata Barua]

the public sector. When the public sector makes purchases from undertakings in the public sector, there could be no scope for corruption. It is only when the public sector comes into contact with the private sector that there is corruption because the private sector is interested in getting more profits by getting more business and so it offers bribe.

There will be no efficiency in an industry if it has a sheltered market. Shri Masani contradicted himself by referring to the motorcar industry which is selling its products at two or three times the international price. So, the solution lies in economy of scale. I would be one with them if the big business agree to merger for economy of scale. But they are opposed to economy of scale. Take the automobile industry. When I asked the Minister a few months ago why Hindustan Motors could not have collaboration for expansion, the answer was that even if they are allowed to expand they would not be willing to bring down the cost by more than Rs. 1,000. So, given concentration of wealth and monopoly, economy of scale cannot be achieved merely by helping an industry in the private sector to grow. Even if we allow it to grow in a monopolistic way we will not be able to make it efficient, because it is not concerned with efficiency, it is concerned only with a sheltered market.

Therefore, what is necessary today is to find out how exactly we control the private sector from exploiting the protected market in its desire to make huge profits by restricting production and raising the price. The object of this Bill is to see that there is no restriction on production. That is one of the strong points of this Bill. Therefore, this Bill deserves the support of all elements in the country who want the development of the economy.

Now most of the things are done at the bureaucratic level. I would admit that some of the plan objectives of the government have been frustrated because they were implemented by people who were not informed of the major policies of the government or because the guidelines were not properly observed. This Bill, for the first time, lays down that there will be an Independent Commission and the guidelines are also laid down in the Bill itself as to how

the Commission should function, what are its objectives and what are the tests on which monopoly or otherwise would be decided. There can be room for discussing whether these areas can be widened, whether the guidelines can be improved or broadened to serve the purpose of greater production and stricter control over monopoly.

I am surprised that Shri Masani of all persons sought to refer to the Concise Oxford Dictionary to explain "monopoly". It is an economic concept and it should be understood in that context. Shri Masani is a well-known economist of reputation and he knows that the perfect competition where the prices come down to the lowest died, died as a concept in the beginning of this century. Mrs. John Robinson had written a book about the theory of imperfect competition where she said that even under conditions of competition the economy can be operated in a monopolistic manner and monopolies could exist at all levels. Even when there are a hundred producers, there can be a monopoly. Monopolistic competition is the norm throughout the economy. I am surprised that a man of Shri Masani's stature seeks to ignore that aspect and tries even to distort it.

It is said that the public sector is also a monopoly. This is also a distortion of facts. What we mean by monopoly is an industrial system of production in which profit is sought to be created by restricting production or by other means. The essence of monopoly is the restriction of production and the raising of prices. Even if a public sector enterprise seeks to restrict production, it would be very unnatural to imagine that it was doing so only to derive profit. In fact, from the very beginning the very basic postulate of the public sector was that it would go into lines where the private sector is unwilling to go, that it would try to help the industry and lay down the infra-structure or build steel etc. How can there be raising of prices and restricting of production then?

So, the whole idea that the public sector is monopolistic is bypassing the needs of the nation to lay down the basic economic foundations. It also shows that we want the public sector to be cowed down and brought to an equal level of the private

sector which will mean that we are trying to do a great disservice to the nation's economic development.

I would say that free competition between the public sector and the private sector is a misnomer because there cannot be free competition. Will they agree, for example, to competition in the textile industry or artificial silk; or will they agree to competition in the same industry, say, the production of nylon and others? Would they agree to the nationalisation of those industries? I think, there is certain democratic control in the public sector.

The charge that we have no big industry in the country is also not true. It is not necessary that the industry should be big; it is necessary that they should be restrictive. That is the only criterion on which to test how we are to control their using whatever bigness they have, in the interest of their own profit and against the national interest.

We have to fight the corrupt businessmen, the corrupt politicians or for that matter the corrupt bureaucrats. We have to fight all these evils. We have to find ways, also legislative ways so long as we are in this Parliament. The legislative way is to find out if we can take these issues outside the jurisdiction or realm of control of politicians and put them under the control of some commission as is being instituted now.

So, I think, from all points of view it is necessary that we support this Bill. There is no doubt that there needs to be free competition but competition should be at a level at which we can really get more production so as to bring down prices and increase efficiency, quality and all that.

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : सभा-पति जी, यह जो मौजूदा एकाधिकार तथा निबंधनकारी व्यापार प्रथा विधेयक पर बहस चल रही है, समर्थन तो मुझे भी करना ही होगा, क्योंकि अगर समर्थन नहीं करूंगा तो चट-से प्रतिक्रियावादियों की लिस्ट में शामिल हो जाऊंगा। इसलिये इस का समर्थन तो करना ही होगा। लेकिन मैं पूरे सदन से कहूंगा कि आखिर कब तक हम अपने आपको, सारे समाज को, जनता को धोखा देते रहेंगे, क्योंकि मैंने इस

में जो कुछ पढ़ा है और जो कुछ समझ पाया है, इसमें हमको कहीं भी एकाधिकार समाप्त होने की रोशनी नहीं मिलती, कहीं मामूली भ्रमक भी नहीं मिलती है। लेकिन हमारे दाहनी तरफ कुछ ऐसे लोग बैठे हुए हैं, मसानी की तरह के लोग, कंवर लाल गुप्ता की तरह के लोग - ये इस बात का विरोध कर देते हैं तो लगता है कि बहुत क्रान्तिकारी विधेयक आ गया है और श्रीमती इन्दिरा-नेहरू-गांधी बहुत शाबासी और वाह-वाह लेने लग जाती हैं—एक सर्टिफिकेट तो ये लोग उनको दे देते हैं। कुछ हमारे दोस्त ऐसे हैं, जो इधर और उधर दोनों तरफ बैठे हुए हैं, जो इसको क्रान्तिकारी कह कर उम और हमला बोलने लगते हैं—यह दूसरा सर्टिफिकेट श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी को मिल जाता है कि सचमुच यह बहुत क्रान्तिकारी विधेयक है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कितने दिनों तक हम इस तरह से इस देश की जनता और इग पूरे सदन को भ्रमित करते रहेंगे, इस तरह कानून को ला कर, नकली वामपंथ और नकली समाजवाद की बात को ला कर? मैं तो कहूंगा कि नकली संघर्ष क्यों न हो जब तक विरोध नहीं होता उसमें मजा नहीं आता और इस नकली संघर्ष में हमारे मसानी बर्गरह बैठ कर कुछ कदम दे दिया करते हैं, इसी से आपको समाजवाद की याद आ जाती है, समाजवाद का मजा ले सकते हो, लेकिन इस धोखे में अपने को और देश को मत रखो।

मुझे दुख है—आज एक फैशन हो गया है किसी भी चीज को क्रान्तिकारी बनाने का, समाजवादी बनाने का और जो करोड़पति लोग हैं, बड़े व्यापारी लोग हैं, बड़े अफसर लोग हैं, जिनका साधारण जनता से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है, वे भी आज सब क्रान्तिकारी, समाजवादी, साम्यवादी हो गये हैं। यह चीज इतनी खतरनाक है कि जब चोर साधु बन जाया करता है तो ज्यादा धोखा देता है, चोर से तो फिर भी लोग सजग रहते हैं। मैं कहूंगा कि जरा इस पर ध्यान देना।

[श्री राम सेवक यादव]

सभापति महोदय आजकल हमारी प्रधान मन्त्री सधुआ गई है, वैध्याव हो गई हैं और उनको याद आ गई है, किसकी ? गरीब रिक्शा-वालों की, गरीब टांगे वालों की, गरीब किसान मजदूर की, लेकिन अगर वे खुद अपने रहन-सहन को देखें, अब का नहीं, शुरू से रहन-सहन देखें। स्वर्गीय श्री नेहरू से लेकर अब तक का खर्चा देखें तो क्या हिन्दुस्तान की गरीबी से, हिन्दुस्तान के सर्वसाधारण की मामूली आमदनी से और बड़े लोगों की शान-शौकत से, उनके खर्च के साथ कोई सम्बन्ध है ? समाजवाद का मतलब समता, बढ़ती हुई विषमता घटे, न कि बढ़ती हुई विषमता और बढ़ती जाय और समाजवाद का नारा भी चलता जाय। पूरे 18 वर्ष बाप और बेटे का हिस्सा हुकूमत में रहा है, लेकिन बिरला बड़े हैं, टाटा बड़े हैं, सिंघानियाँ बड़े हैं, इन लोगों की हैसियतें बढ़ी हैं, लेकिन समाजवाद का नारा भी चला है—यह कौसी विडम्बना है।

सभापति महोदय, मैंने इस एकाधिकार कानून को पढ़ा। इस में हम को एक चीज दिखाई दी कि इस विधेयक से अगर कुछ हासिल होगा तो पूंजीपतियों के बीच में बराबरी हासिल होगी, जो आज एकाधिकार कर रहे हैं, सेठ लोगों के बीच में बराबरी करने का कानून में इसको समझ सकता हूँ। लेकिन, सभापति महोदय, उस एकाधिकार को खत्म करने या साधारण जनता को इससे कोई लाभ मिलेगा, ऐसी कोई दिशा नहीं मिलती है।

लेकिन एक मसानी साहब हैं, इनको बुरा लगता है, समाजवाद के नाम से इनको चिढ़ है, सेठों में भी बराबरी कायम की जाय, उसको भी वे बरदाश्त करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं, जनता की बात तो बहुत दूर की है।

सभापति महोदय, मैंने आज ही अखबारों में पढ़ा है, अगर मैं किसी का नाम खूँ तो बहुत चिढ़ जाते हैं। सचमुच हिन्दुस्तान की आर्थिक

नीतियों को चलाने की जिम्मेदारी उनकी न हो, तो मुझे क्या मतलब है कि उनका नाम खूँ, लेकिन चूँकि वह हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को चलाने के लिये जिम्मेदार हैं, इसलिए नाम लेना पड़ता है और जब नाम लिया जाता है तो कहा जाता है कि व्यक्तिगत बातें बोली जाती हैं, बहुत अन्याय कर देते हैं बहस के साथ और मुझ जैसे लोगों के साथ, लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैंने आज ही अखबार में पढ़ा है एक बार हमारे स्वर्गीय डा० साहब ने कहा था कि इस देश में जोड़ियाँ चलती हैं, कौन जोड़ी ? एक जोड़ी पंजाब में थी, किसकी ? एक सरकार चलाये और एक व्यापार चलाये—वाप-बेटे की जोड़ी। गुजरात में भी जोड़ी है, हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश में भी एक जोड़ी है—कमलापति त्रिपाठी और उनके बेटे की—करोड़ों रुपये का नहर विभाग का गबन हो गया। सी० बी० गुप्ता की जोड़ी, इस तरह से खूब जोड़ियाँ चली हैं...

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : आपकी और मधु लिमये की जोड़ी।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : हमारी और मधु लिमये की जोड़ी हो सकती है, शायद चौधरी साहब की भी जोड़ी हो सकती है। मैं कहूँगा—माँ और बेटे की भी जोड़ी...

एक माननीय सदस्य : साहू-जैन की जोड़ी।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : वह भी बड़ी जोड़ी है, शायद आपकी उनसे कोई रिश्तेदारी होगी। मैं कह रहा था—माँ और बेटे की जोड़ी, जिसके साथ साहू-जैन की जोड़ी है, इसको नोट कर लें।...

श्री रणधीर सिंह : यह क्या बात है, ऊट-पटांग बात नहीं करनी चाहिये। We take strong exception to what he says. It must be expunged. क्या यहाँ पर प्राइवेट मामले डिस्कस किये जा सकते हैं ?

श्री तुलसीदास जाधव (बारामती) : सभापति महोदय, मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है । मैं यादव जी से बिनती करूंगा कि जब हम यहां पर बोलते हैं, तो आपको बीच में ला कर बोलते हैं, सरकार को जो कुछ भी कहना होता है, वह आपके द्वारा कहा जाता है, उसमें बाप-बेटे, माँ-बेटे का लाना पालियामेंट की दृष्टि से और मेरी दृष्टि से ठीक नहीं है, यह अच्छी परम्परा नहीं है ।...

श्री रणधीर सिंह : यह बहुत गिरावट की बात है, पालियामेंट के स्टेण्डर्ड से गिरी हुई बात है ।

श्री तुलसी दास जाधव : सभापति जी, मेरा अपसे इतना ही कहना है कि जब ऐसी बात आती है तो आप कृपा करके कन्ट्रोल रखिये, चाहे प्रेम से कहिये, लेकिन हाउस में ऐसी चीज नहीं होने चाहिये ।

श्री रणधीर सिंह : इसको एक्मर्पज करना चाहिये । इण्डाविजुअल बात यहां पर नहीं आनी चाहिये ।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : मैं बहुत बिनस्रता के साथ बिनती करूंगा कि अगर मेरी बात से उनको ठेम लगी है तो मुझे धमा करेंगे । लेकिन मैंने कोई ऐसी खराब बात नहीं कही है । तथ्यों से परे बात नहीं कही है । मैं पुनः अपनी बात को साफ करना चाहता हूँ । आज हमारी प्रधान मन्त्री हिन्दुस्तान में अखबारों और रेडियों के हिसाब से समाजवाद की प्रतीक बन गई हैं । मैंने आज ही अखबारों में उनको समाजवाद के प्रतीक के रूप में पढ़ा है । लेकिन दूसरी तरफ प्रधान मन्त्री के सुपुत्र—संजय—साल की पचास हजार मोटर कार बनाने जा रहे हैं, उसके लाइसेंस के लिये उन्होंने प्रार्थना-पत्र दया हुआ है ।...

श्री रणधीर सिंह : यह बेहूदा बात है । इसमें क्या हो गया है—अगर एक लड़का

हो शियारहू तो इसमें क्या बात है । अगर आपका ही लड़का हो तो क्या हर्ज है...(व्यवधान)...

श्री राम सेवक यादव : इस निगुण समाजवाद से काम चलने वाला नहीं है, सगुण समाजवाद बनाओ प्रीर मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि यदि सचमुच समाजवाद लाना चाहते हो तो खुल कर कहना चाहता हूँ—चाहे सत्ता का एकाधिकार हो, चाहे नौकरशाही का एकाधिकार हो, चाहे सरकारी लोगों का एकाधिकार हो, सब खराब है । अगर बिरला के कारखाने में या मोदी के कारखाने में बना हुआ कपड़ा, चार आने मोटर वाला कपड़ा बीस आने या डेढ़ रुपये मोटर बिकता है और गरीब जनता लुटती है तो वह भी बुरा है और सरकार के कारखाने में बनी हुई दो आने की स्ट्रेप्टोमाइसीन दो रुपये में बिकती है तो वह भी बुरी है । यह शोषण है, दोनों पर प्रतिबन्ध लगे । जनतन्त्र में एकाधिकार उसका दुश्मन होता है और समाजवाद में तो और ज्यादा उसका दुश्मन हो जाता है । इसलिये अगर सचमुच चाहते हो कि एकाधिकार खत्म हो तो सब निजी धन्धे बंद करो, मिश्रित अर्थ व्यवस्था चलने वाली नहीं है । मिश्रित अर्थ-व्यवस्था से समाजवाद नहीं आयेगा । इसलिए एकाधिकार खोवा है । यह कानून संतोष के लिए है । जैसे कि राष्ट्रियकरण संतोष के लिए हो सकता है उसी तरह से एकाधिकार विधेयक भी संतोष के लिए हो सकता है । जब तक दाम निश्चित नहीं करोगे दाम नीति नहीं बांधोगे, खर्च पर रोक नहीं लगाओगे और यह मिश्रित अर्थ-व्यवस्था का नारा बन्द नहीं होगा तब तक कुछ होने वाला नहीं है । इन शर्तों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक को समर्थन इसलिए करता हूँ क्योंकि ये साम्यवादी भाई कहेंगे कि यह कौन हो गया, क्या सिंडीकेट और इन्डोकेट की बीमारी यहां भी चल गई ।

श्री तुलसीदास जाधव (बारामती) : सभापति महोदय, यह जो एकाधिकार तथा निर्बन्धनकारी व्यापार प्रथा विधेयक हाउस के

[श्री तुलसीदास जाखन]

सामने है उसको मपोट करके हुए मैं कहना चाहता है कि एक बात तो साबित हो गई इस देश में और मारी दुनिया में कि इंडिविजुअल प्रापर्टी ओनशिप और प्राफिटियिंग की मनोवृत्ति से किसी भी जगह विषमता दूर होकर समानता नहीं आ सकती है। और यह बात केवल आज़कल की ही नहीं है बल्कि जबसे दुनिया बनी है तभी से यह चीज मौजूद है। तो इससे समाज की जो गरीबी है, जो समाज में विषमता है वह जाती नहीं है। यह बात दुनिया में सिद्ध हो चुकी है। जिनको हम साधु सन्त कहते हैं उन्होंने भी कहा है, कुरान शरीफ, वाइबिल और दूसरी सभी धार्मिक पुस्तकों में समानता की बात कही गई है लेकिन भ्रमल में कहीं भी वह चीज नहीं आती बल्कि उससे उलटा ही आचरण होता है। हमारे माननीय कंबरलाल गुप्त, मसानी साहब और दूसरे सदस्यों को हम यहां पर सुनते हैं, वह इसके ऊपर यहां टीका टिप्पणी करते हैं, उनको इस का हक है लेकिन वे कोई दूसरा रास्ता भी नहीं बताते जिसमें कि यह बीमारी दूर हो जाये। जब एक बीमारी समाज में मौजूद है वह बीमारी कैसे चली जाये उसका कोई तरीका पालूम नहीं है। और कोई दूसरा रास्ता इस देश में और दुनिया में है भी नहीं। एक और रास्ता हो सकता है लेकिन हम सब हिन्दुस्तान के लोग उसको चाहते नहीं हैं। जो स्वतन्त्र पार्टी, जनसंघ या और पार्टी के कुछ लोग हैं वे हम से भी ज्यादा उस चीज का विरोध करते हैं जिसको कि रेवोल्यूशन कहा जाता है। जो चीज कहने से नहीं होती है, कानून से नहीं होती तभी गरीब लोग उन चीज को करते हैं जैसे कि नक्सलबाड़ी में हुआ। तो जैसे वे विरोध करते हैं वैसे ही हम विरोध करते हैं और देश ने उस रास्ते को अस्वीकार नहीं किया। तब फिर दूसरा रास्ता कौन सा है जिससे कि एकोनामिक इनस्टैबिलिटी को दूर किया जा सके और कोई भी चीज हो वह सभी को ठीक तरह से मिल

सके। अब उमका तरीका कानून ही हो सकता है। उसी रीति पर चलते हुए यहां पर कानून लाया जाता है इसमें हो सकता है कि इधर उधर कहीं कुछ गस्तियां हों जिनको दुरुस्त करना आवश्यक हो तो जब हम क्लोज़ वाई क्लोज़ पर आयेंगे उस वक्त उसकी दुरुस्ती की जा सकती है। लेकिन मेरी दृष्टि में इसके अलावा और कोई रास्ता नहीं है।

अभी यहां पर कुछ भाइयों ने कहा कि स्टेट मानोपली नहीं होनी चाहिए क्योंकि हो सकता है स्टेट मानोपली में भी डिक्टेटरशिप आ जाये। उस स्थिति में कुछ तकलीफ हो सकती है लेकिन यहां की स्टेट तो उस रीति की नहीं है जिसको कि डिक्टेटर कहा जा सके। बचपन में हम देखते थे कि पुलिस को देखकर बड़े बड़े आदमी भाग जाते थे लेकिन अब तो बिल्कुल उसका उलटा जमाना आ गया है। चाहे प्राइम मिनिस्टर हों, मिनिस्टर्स हों या पुलिस के आफिसर हों या कोई दूसरे बड़े अधिकारी हों, अब डरने की कोई बात नहीं रह गई है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर इस प्रकार से निर्भयता आ जाये तो उसमें भी हर्ज नहीं है। लेकिन इसके साथ साथ यह बात भी आती है कि समाज के कानूनों को ठीक तरह से भ्रमल में लाया जाये। समाज के जो नियम और कानून हैं उन पर ठीक तरह से भ्रमल करते हुए अगर हम चलेंगे तो समाज को आसानी से बदला जा सकता है। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि उसके उलटा ही हो रहा है। ऐसी अबस्था में मेरी दृष्टि में एक ही रास्ता रह जाता है कि कानून के द्वारा आहिस्ता आहिस्ता समाज को बदला जाये। जिस प्रकार की देश में एकोनामिक कन्डीशनस हैं, कुछ लोगों के पास धन का कन्सेन्ट्रेशन हो जाता है उससे तो दोष पैदा ही होंगे। जब किसी भी आदमी के पास इस प्रकार की चीज हो जाती है तो वह बिगड़ता ही है। इसी प्रकार से यह भी कहा गया है कि जब गवर्नमेंट में पावर कन्सेन्ट्रेट हो जाती है

तो वह भी करप्ट हो जाती है। इसी प्रकार से समाज में भी होना है। यहां पर विरोधी पार्टियों की तरफ से रोज शिकायत की जाती है कि काला बाजार हो रहा है। तो जब कहने से वह बात नहीं रुकती है तब कानून से रोकने के लिए ही यह बिल लाया गया है और मैं समझता हूँ इसको सपोर्ट किया जाना चाहिए।

एक बात यहाँ पर कई लोगों ने कही, यादव जी ने कही कि जो बड़े बड़े धनवान लोग हैं वह भी समाजवाद कहते हैं। मैं उनसे ज्यादा तो पढ़ा लिखा नहीं हूँ और शायद मेरा अनुभव भी उनसे ज्यादा न हो परन्तु समाज सत्ता बाद या कम्युनिज्म जो आता है, उसके लिए कोई इंडिविजुअल कितना ही सीफाइस करे उससे वह नहीं आता है बल्कि वह स्टेट की तरफ से आता है। कम्युनिस्ट भाई, ऐसा तो नहीं है कि वे फकीर हों या सन्यासी बने हुए हों। कांग्रेस पार्टी या दूसरी पार्टियों में जो लोग हैं उनमें भी ज्यादा धनवान लोग उसमें पड़ हुए हैं। इसलिए किसी इंडिविजुअल में जाने की जरूरत नहीं है कानून से जब बदलने की बात हो उस समय उसका विरोध करते हैं या नहीं, इस चीज को देखना होता है। ... (व्यवधान) ... हाँ एक बात जो उन्होंने कही वह मुझे भी पसन्द है और वह यह कि इस देश में मिक्स्ड कोनोमी मत रखो चाहे सब स्टेट की मालिकी रखो...

श्री राम सेवक यादव : मैं ने स्टेट की मालिकी की बात नहीं कही है मेरे अर्थ का अर्थ न लगाया जाये। मैं सार्वजनिक चीज का हिमायती है और व्यक्तिगत चीज का विरोधी है। मैं सामाजीकरण चाहता हूँ, समाज का नियंत्रण चाहता हूँ, सरकारी और मशीनरी अफसर शाही नहीं।

श्री तुलशीदास यादव : समाजीकरण करना हो तो उसके तीन तरीके हैं। एक तो यह कि स्टेट की मालिकी हो, चाहे कोई फॅक्टरी हो या कोई और मीन्स आफ प्रोडक्शन

हो, दूसरा तरीका यह हो सकता है कि कोऑपरेटिव सेक्टर बन जाये। इसके अलावा एक इंडिविजुअल प्रापर्टी ओनरशिप होती है परन्तु उसका तो हम विरोध करते हैं। जहाँ तक कोऑपरेटिव सेक्टर का सवाल है, आपने भी सुना होगा कि कोऑपरेटिव सेक्टर बहुत बढ़ रहा है, महाराष्ट्र में बहुत बढ़ रहा है। लेकिन उसकी भी टीका की जाती है। तो इस तरह से ये दो तरीके ही रह जाते हैं क्योंकि इंडिविजुअल प्रापर्टी ओनरशिप को हम चाहते नहीं हैं। लेकिन दूसरा हिन्दुस्तान में कोई तरीका नहीं है। 14 वर्ष असेम्बली में और 10 वर्ष से यहां देव रहा है कि कोई और तरीका नहीं है। तीन तरीके होते हैं, कोऑपरेटिव सेक्टर बढ़ते बढ़ते बढ़ जाएगा क्योंकि वहां प्रेम से काम होता है। उसमें गड़बड़ होती है तो दिक्कत पैदा होती है। एक ही तरीका है इकानामिक कन्सेन्ट्रेशन न हो, और देश में सब को समानता मिले और जहाँ गलती हो वहाँ बोलने के लिये फ्रीडम हो। यही एक तरीका है कि स्टेट का अधिकार मीन्स आफ प्रोडक्शन पर हो और वहाँ से जो सम्पत्ति आती है वह देश के लिये, गरीबों के लिये ज्यादा से ज्यादा काम में आये। यही मेरा कहना है।

16.00 hrs.

बैंक के लिये कहा गया, मेरा अनुभव है कि उन का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने के बाद अभी भी उसके लिये रास्ता खुला नहीं है क्योंकि सुप्रीम कोर्ट में वह केस है। इसलिये और नियम बना कर हम देहात में गरीबों को पैसा नहीं दे सकते, तो भी रिकशा वाले, जैसा माननीय यादव जी ने कहा, हमारे महाराष्ट्र में कार्ट्स-मैन को पैसे मिले हैं। महाराष्ट्र में टैंकी और ट्रक्स वालों के लिये आफिस खोला है और बैंकों से ऐप्रीमेंट कर के उन लोगों को टैंकी और ट्रक देते हैं। कोल्हापुर में रिकशा वाले, कौबलर्स आदि के पैसे दिये। हमारा फर्ज है कि

[श्री तुलसीदास जाधव]

लोगों के पास जायें, उन को ऐप्लीकेशन्स लें, हजारों ऐप्लीकेशन्स बैंकों में पड़ी हुई हैं। और उन को बैंक से उन के काम के लिये पैसा दिलाये। तो बैंक राष्ट्रीयकरण से लोगों को फायदा तो हुआ है। लेकिन हमारा भी फर्ज है कि कायदे कानून ले कर लोगों को बतायें और उन को फायदा कराये। राष्ट्रीयकरण से नुकसान होता है जब तक कि हमारा नैशनल कंरेक्टर नहीं बनता, और इसीलिये उस का दुरुपयोग होता है। लन्दन में देखा कि रेल में टिकट देने के लिए आदमी नहीं होते, चैकिंग के लिये आदमी नहीं है, आदमी उतर कर चला जाता है तो कोई टिकट नहीं पूछता है। लेकिन बगैर टिकट के कोई आदमी अन्दर पांव नहीं रखता। यह वहां का नैशनल कंरेक्टर है।

हमारे लोगों के अन्दर काफी दोष है और उस का चरमा पीला रहने से बाकी चीजें भी बैसी ही दिखाई देती हैं, यह दोष है। राष्ट्रीयकरण का कोई दोष नहीं है। प्लान के बगैर काम नहीं चल सकता, और प्लान के माने ही कंट्रोल है। स्वराज्य मिलने के पहले और उसके बाद हम ही कहते हैं कि यहाँ गरीबी है। तो वह जायेगी कैसे? कहने से नहीं जायेगी। तो कंट्रोल हो और स्टेट ही मालिक हो और ज्यादा से ज्यादा कंट्रोल करके प्लानिंग से इकानामिक कंट्रोल करें और देश का भला करें, यही एक रास्ता इसके लिये है। यही मेरा कहना है।

SHRI R. K. BIRLA (Jhunjhunu) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, before I come to the Bill, I would like to express my happiness over the statement made by our Prime Minister the other day in the Rajya Sabha; according to her, nationalisation is not the end of economic activities and the Government is committed to the mixed economy in which both the private and the public sectors have got an important part to play. Both, according to me, are supplementary and complementary to each other and it is also proof that we are committed to the industrial policy resolution of 1956. The latest statement

of the Prime Minister two days back said that according to her there is neither a public sector nor a private sector; it is a national sector. If that is so, I do not understand why this Bill is applicable only to the private sector, when the Prime Minister says that there is nothing like a private sector and a public sector and there is only one sector. Therefore, if at all, this Bill should be applicable to both sectors.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to what Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, the former Finance Minister and a man of outstanding economic intelligence said, a few days back in Delhi. He said, concentration of wealth in the hands of a few is definitely bad, but no step should be taken which hinders production. It is production which brings socialism. If there is no production, what type of socialism are they going to practise in this country? Firstly, production is to be generated and then it should be distributed equitably in the interest of public good. I would give an example to show how production brings socialism. The utensils and crockery of the French Emperor, Napoleon Bonaparte, were made of gold. At that time, aluminium came into being. It was a sort of invention and the price of aluminium was much more than that of gold. Napoleon was not short of money and he immediately ordered that his utensils and crockery must be made of aluminium. That was done. Today the production of aluminium, not in India but in the world, has increased with the result that aluminium is available to the commonest of the common people in the country. A full set of *thali* with four *katoris* a glass, a spoon and a *pyala* will cost about Rs. 20 only today. But at one time, it was a sort of privilege for Napoleon. That is how increased production brings socialism in the country and in the world.

We know very well that we are spending a lot of valuable foreign exchange on the import of special steel, because the special steel sector of our steel plants is producing only 37 per cent of the installed capacity. Neither we are able to increase our production in the public sector nor we are prepared to give licence to private people who can assure the country that they will meet the entire demand of the country. On

the other hand, we import special steel involving a lot of foreign exchange. The same thing applies to telephone cables. Government appointed a committee a few months back. Their report has been submitted to the concerned ministry. The committee have said that without involving any foreign exchange, the demand of telephone cables can be met if the private sector people are asked to expand their units. I do not know what decision Government has taken, but it has come to my knowledge that the Government is thinking of putting up a factory in the public sector. I am not opposed to the public sector, but what is the use of spending valuable foreign exchange to the extent of crores of rupees in putting up a public sector factory when, without any foreign exchange investment, we can meet the demand? I speak on the Monopolies Bill in the light of these two policy resolutions. The Bill is meant to check monopolies, unfair trade practices leading to concentration of wealth. But here monopoly means the one which Bell Telephone Company of United States had 25 years ago, when they produced everything from A to Z. That type of monopoly should not be allowed. At the same time, I would say that production should be encouraged, not of people but of commodities. That should be uppermost in our mind when we consider any issue. If there are any unfair trade practices, they must be curbed and people indulging in them must be punished without any leniency.

I have some reservation in commending the Bill. Some hon. Members were saying that this Bill is good in parts. According to me, no part of this Bill is good because it hinders production.

According to the Directive Principles of the Constitution government is committed to bring about social change in the economy for the public good. But what is public good? Is not increased production of commodities in which we are short a public good? So, if there is increased production, be it in the private, public or co-operative sector, it should be allowed and encouraged instead of putting impediments in its way.

Government have already got various legislative enactments in the statute book like the Industrial (Development and Regulation) Act, Companies Act, Indian Patents Act, Capital Issue Control Act and so on.

Government can guide and control the industries from cradle to grave with the help of these enactments. So, when everything is done under the supervision of the government, I fail to understand the necessity for this Bill. Further, what will be its impact on production? Some of my hon. friends were saying that industrial growth has been very poor. Some others were saying that it is tolerably good and still some others that it is very good. Whatever it is, in view of the industrial growth which has taken place under the supervision of the government, why bring in such a Bill which hampers production?

The Monopoly Commission which was appointed in 1964 made two recommendations. One of its recommendations was "to secure the highest production possible and ensuring this achievement with the least damage to the people at large". Here I would like to state that Professor Galbraith, former US Ambassador to India, stated in one of his notes to the Government of India that whether in capitalistic countries or socialist countries economic growth comes out of the ploughed back capital of the corporate sector. In other words, it is the savings of the corporate sector which help new industrial undertakings. When this is the law of economic growth government should not put the gear in the reverse direction. Even the Monopoly Commission has stated in its report that we "need not strike at concentration of economic power as such but should do so only when it becomes a menace to best production" in quantity, quality and in prices.

Coming to the Bill under discussion, in view of the enactments which the government have already got in their armoury, I personally feel that the stage has not reached when this Bill should be brought before the House.

Some of my hon. friends have already referred to the definition of "dominant undertaking". I am sure my friends will agree with me when I say that it is going to hamper industrial production, which is badly needed in the country.

What we today need is consumer goods to be made available to the public within their purchasing capacity. This is possible only when there is enough production and there is a glut of articles in the country.

[Shri R. K. Birla]

This control and that control is not going to bring about those results. I would say that what we today need in this country is Cadillac socialism and not bullock-cart socialism. It is only the Cadillac socialism which can improve the condition and standard of our people.

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा (हमीरपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मोनोपलीज एण्ड रिस्ट्रिक्टेड ट्रेड प्रेक्टिसेज बिल, 1969 जो सदन के सामने है, मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूँ मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बिल इससे बहुत पहले आ जाना चाहिए था। लेकिन फिर भी अब यह आ गया है तो इसका स्वागत करता हूँ।

इस बिल को पेश करते हुए माननीय मन्त्री महोदय, श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब ने सारी पृष्ठभूमि पर बड़ी प्रच्छी प्रकार से रोशनी डाली है उससे पता लगता है कि इस बारे में 1948 से यह चर्चा शुरू हुई थी और आज 1969 है, 21 साल हो गये इस मोनोपली बिल के सिलसिले को, और इस पर विचार कई बार होता रहा है। 1954 में पार्लियामेंट ने सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न आफ सोसाइटी को अपना प्रोजेक्ट माना और सोशल इकानामिक पालिसी के बारे में। उसके बाद 1964 में मोनोपली कमीशन मुकर्रर हुआ और 1965 में यह रिपोर्ट दी है इस रिपोर्ट की पढ़ने से साफ-साफ पता चलता है कि पिछले सालों में क्या कुछ हुआ है। अभी मेरे मित्र श्री बिड़ला बोल रहे थे और अब वह शायद बोलकर चले गये होंगे और उनको मेरी बात सुनने का अवसर नहीं मिला।

इस रिपोर्ट में सफा 47 में लेकर 54 तक सात स्कोर्षों में बिड़ला खानदान का चिट्ठा दिया गया है और उसमें बताया गया है कि बिड़ला खानदान ने पिछले दस सालों में क्या कुछ नहीं किया। लेकिन वह सब कुछ होने के बाद भी आज 1964 से 1969 का टाइम आ गया है, पांच साल बीत गये हैं, लेकिन इन पांच साल

बीतने के बाद भी इस मोनोपली कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के ऊपर जो कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए थी वह कार्यवाही नहीं हुई क्योंकि उन 75 खानदानों के लिए जिनके लिये यह रिपोर्ट आई, जिनके बारे में यह रिपोर्ट है, उनके लिए कुछ भी न तो सलाह मिली और न कोई कार्यवाही हुई है। मैं उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपको आकड़े देना चाहता हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बिड़ला, टाटा, मार्टिन, साहूजैन, श्रीराम मुफ्तलाल, दालमिया, सिधानिया, महेन्द्र एण्ड महेन्द्र इत्यादि, इन कंपनियों ने जो दौलत 1951 के बाद 1964 तक पैदा की, उसकी मोनोपली कमीशन में भी रिपोर्ट आयी। जितनी दौलत उन्होंने इन दस-बारह सालों में पैदा की—उपाध्यक्ष महोदय आप हेरान होंगे इन आंकड़ों को देखकर दत्त कमेटी की इस रिपोर्ट से जाहिर है कि सौ फिसदी पांच साल के अन्दर उनकी दौलत में इजाफा हुआ है। जो वह बारह सालों में नहीं कर पाये, वह इस कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के बाद उनकी दौलत में इजाफा हुआ है।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जैसा इस रिपोर्ट का हश्य हुआ है वैसा इस बिल का हश्य नहीं होना चाहिये। इस बिल को यह सदन खुशी से पास करेगा। इसको लाने के लिए हम मन्त्री महोदय को धन्यवाद भी देते हैं। लेकिन जो हश्य मोनोपली कमिशन की रिपोर्ट का हुआ वही हश्य इस बिल का भी नहीं होना चाहिये। वह बिल केवल किताब बन कर न रह जाए बल्कि इस पर पूरा-पूरा एक्शन हो, यह मैं चाहता हूँ। बड़े-बड़े घरानों के मुताहिलक जो पालसी हमने बनाई है। उसका अभी मेरे एक मित्र ने जिक्र किया है। यह सही बात है कि मन्त्रियों ने जो लाइसेंस दिये हैं, उन पर दस्तखत नहीं किये हैं। लेकिन फिर भी सरकार का कसूर इसमें जरूर है लेकिन वह कसूर उतना ही है जितना कि माफ किया जा सकता है। सारे का सारा कसूर

ब्यूरोक्रेसी का है। जितने इंडस्ट्री मिनिस्ट्री के अफसर है वे शुरू से, अंग्रेजों के समय से चले आ रहे हैं और बिड़ला और टाटा ने अपनी मर्जी के मुताबिक उनको वहां हर मुकर्रर किया हुआ था। इसलिये मैं मन्त्री महोदय से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अब बक्त आ गया है कि एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में जो ब्यूरोक्रेसी का सैट-अप है, उसमें तबदीली लाई जाए। जो लोग शोसलिज्म में विश्वास नहीं करते हैं, जो लोग पब्लिक सैक्टर में विश्वास नहीं रखते हैं उन लोगों को इंडस्ट्री मिनिस्ट्री में नहीं रखा जाना चाहिये उनके लिए इसमें कहीं जगह नहीं होनी चाहिये। जब तक ऐसा नहीं होगा तब तक काम आगे नहीं बढ़ेगा, यह मैं विश्वासपूर्वक कह सकता हूँ।

कांग्रेस पार्टी ने पक्का इरादा कर लिया है कि हम पूरे विश्वास के साथ, पूरी शक्ति और ताकत के साथ उन कार्यक्रमों को लागू करेंगे जिन कार्यक्रमों के द्वारा अमीर और गरीब के बीच का अन्तर कम हो, चन्द हाथों में दौलत इकट्ठी न हो, जनता की भावनाओं का आदर किया जाए, शासन जनता की सेवा करे और देश को दौलत का देश की आम जनता के हित में इस्तेमाल किया जाए। साथ ही साथ हमने तय कर लिया है कि नई पीढ़ी को तरबकी और समृद्धि के बेतहर और अच्छे अफसर मिल सकें, इसकी कोशिश की जाए। मैं विश्वास-पूर्वक कह सकता हूँ कि इस सब को अमल में लाने में हम सफल होंगे और इसके बारे में मन्त्री महोदय भी सदन को विश्वास दिलायें।

बिल के चैप्टर दो में खण्ड पांच की तरफ और साथ ही साथ खण्ड 28 की तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। खण्ड 28 में पिछड़े इलाकों का जिक्र किया गया है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप भी और मैं भी पिछड़े हुए इलाकों से आते हैं। हमें खुशी है कि आप उस कुर्सी पर बैठे हुए हैं। इस खण्ड में कहा गया है कि सरकार पिछड़े इलाकों की तरफ पूरा ध्यान देगी और जो डिस्पैरिटीज हैं,

उनको कम करने के लिए कार्यवाई की जायगी। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो यह कहा जाता रहा है कि डिस्पैरिटी कम हुई है वह कम नहीं हुई है, वह बढ़ती ही चली गई है। मेरा जो हिमाचल का इलाका है उसका मुकाबला आप दिल्ली से जो कि भारत की राजधानी है, करें दोनों इलाकों में कितनी डिस्पैरिटी है, इसका आपको पता चल जाएगा। इस शहर में आप कहीं भी चले जायें, एक सैकड़ के लिए भी अग्रर सड़कों पर जो रोशनी होती है वह लाल हो जाती है तो सैकड़ों कारों का जमघट लग जाता है। इसके मुकाबले में हमारे इलाके में आप सारा दिन गुजार दें एक एक बस भी आपको नजर नहीं आएगी। हजारों सैकड़ों मील के इलाके में से आप गुजर जायें, एक बस भी आपको देखने को नहीं मिलेगी। बस की रोशनी देखनी को नहीं मिलेगी। ऐसे हालत में किस मुंह से यह मरकार कहनी है कि डिस्पैरिटी कम हुई है। वह बढ़ी है, कम नहीं हुई है, यह एक सच बात है कि इम वास्ते मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस डिस्पैरिटी को आप जल्द से जल्द कम करने की कोशिश करें और इस रिपोर्ट का जो हश्य हुआ है, वह इस प्राविजन का भी हश्य नहीं होना चाहिये, वह एक व्यवस्था मात्र बनकर न रह जाये, बल्कि इस पर अमल हो।

एक इलजाम अपोजीशन की तरफ से लगाया जात है। कहा जाता है कि सरकार सत्ता का नाजायज इस्तेमाल कर रही है नाजायज फायदा उठा रही है। इस इलजाम का एक ही कारण हो सकता है। घूँकि इलजाम लगाने वा लोग शोशलिज्म की तरफ बढ़ने वाले हमारे कदमों का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकते हैं, सच्ची भावना से जो हम जनता की सेवा करना चाहते हैं, जनता की भलाई के काम करना चाहते हैं, उसका मुकाबला नहीं कर सकते हैं, इस वास्ते वे इस प्रकार के इलजाम लगाते हैं, वे इन चीजों का जवाब नहीं दे सकते हैं। जब जवाब नहीं दे सकते हैं तो उनके पास सिवाय इलजाम लगाने के कुछ इलजाम

[श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा]

लगाने के और गलत तौर पर इलजाम लगाने के और कुछ बाकी नहीं रहता है। हमारे पब्लिक सर्विटर के बारे में मसानी जी और कंवर लाल गुप्त जी ने कुछ बातें कहीं हैं। अगर मोनोपॉली को खत्म करना है, एकाधिकार को खत्म करना है। दोलत को चन्द हाथों में जा कर एकत्रित होने से बचना है तो उसका एक ही तरीका है कि पब्लिक सर्विटर को कामयाब बनाया जाए। तभी ये सरमायेदार जो हमें लूटते रहे हैं, जनता का खून चूसते रहे हैं, ऐसा करने से बाज आ सकेंगे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस बिल के पास हो जाने के बाद बड़े-बड़े सरमायेदारों के साथ सहती से पेश आए, सहती से इस कानून को उन पर लागू करे और साथ ही साथ पब्लिक सर्विटर को कामयाब करने के लिये आवश्यक तबदीलियाँ लाये ताकि जनता का विश्वास पब्लिक सर्विटर पर बढ़ सके।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने मुझे समय दिया और मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि जनता की भावनाओं का आदर करते हुए जो यह बिल लाया गया है, और जो आशाये उसने सरकार पर लगाई हुई है वे पूरी होंगी और इन सरमायेदारों तथा बड़े-बड़े पूंजीपति लुटेरों को आगे बढ़ने से रोका जाएगा।

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, although this Bill does not lead us to the Socialism to which we are pledged, this is welcome measure in the sense that it seeks to curb the concentration of economic power in the country. There is a powerful lobby in this country that is trying to defeat the purpose of this Bill. And, Sir, as I read some of the Minutes of Dissent, I came across a Minute of Dissent where it has been suggested that Chapter III of this Bill should be eliminated. If Chapter III of the Bill is eliminated then the entire purpose of this Bill is defeated.

Sir, to say that this Bill is going to usher in an era of socialism in this country would be an erroneous proposition. It is not going

to do that and this Bill cannot serve the necessary purpose unless we change the socio-economic structure in this country. Now, the socio-economic structure is a very valuable thing which should attract the attention of this Government, which should attract the attention of the people in this country.

Whatever that might be, we do not have socialism in this country. We have only a sort of mixed economy. Whatever lip-service might be paid to socialism, socialism is a pile of gold, but nobody is trying for socialism. If socialism is a mere slogan, then, every intelligent Indian is a socialist. The path of socialism is not paved with disloyalty, indiscipline or manoeuvre. If it means concrete programme of work for socialism, then, nobody in this country is a socialist. That is the question that generally comes to my mind.

Sir, to say that this Bill is going to bring in socialism in this country is erroneous.

Then, Sir, this Bill has not served the purpose of the Directive Principles of the Constitution also. The Directive Principles of the Constitution says specifically that "there should be a curb on the concentration of economic power in a few hands." This Bill has taken this basic fact into consideration to some extent but the purpose of this Bill is not to fulfil fully the Directive Principles of the Constitution. I know, this Bill is only for the future, not for the present. The Monopolies Enquiry Commission has said that the country's economy has been controlled by 75 business houses. Where is the attempt in this Bill to attack these 75 houses? Is there any attempt in this Bill to attack these 75 houses who control the economic power of this country? Therefore, this is a Bill only for the future. You have Bills of this type in countries like the U. S. A., U. K., Japan, etc. I would say, the Anti-monopoly Bill in U. S. A. is more stringent than what obtains in this country. In the Scandinavian countries also, although they do not have the anti-Monopolies laws, they are very emphatic about one particular thing, namely, curbing the concentration of economic power in a few hands. Now, in this country, what has been happening so far? There was the concentration of economic power in a few hands. Those who sing the

song of the private sector think that efficiency is monopolised only by the private sector when they speak of industrial development. Sir, to think that industrial development can take place only if the private sector is allowed to come into operation is an erroneous thing. Do you think that all the efficiency in this country is monopolised only by the private sector and there is nothing left for the public sector? That is why I said that a powerful lobby is allowed to grow in this country.

In spite of the fact that this Government pays lip service to socialism, socialism is an elusive goal. One of the reasons for it is the defective application of the licensing policy. Who gets the licences? It is the big business houses who command the economic power. It is the Birlas, Tatas and Mafatlals who get the licences.

SHRI R. K. BIRLA : Because they can deliver the goods.

SHRI HEM BARUA : That is the mistake he is making. Does he think that all the efficiency in the country is monopolised only by these people, the Tatas, Birlas and Mafatlals? Efficiency is something that is monopolised by other people also. Therefore, Government should come out with a programme for the elimination of this concentration of economic power entirely.

These big business houses who get the licences also get the support of the banks and foreign collaboration. They get foreign collaboration more easily than other small entrepreneurs.

SHRI HIMATSINGKA (Godda) : Why do they get it?

SHRI HEM BARUA : Because they can manipulate, pull strings. Entrepreneurs like Shri Birla and Shri Himatsingka get licences go more easily than the smaller man.

The nationalisation of 14 commercial banks is a welcome move. But every nationalisation scheme must be accompanied by a sort of scheme to implement the objective of nationalisation. Take the nationalisation of the banks. It should have been accompanied by a credit policy scheme. Where is the credit policy? It has been

pledged that since there is a case pending against it in the Supreme Court, credit policy has not been formulated. But credit policy can be formulated according to suggestions given by the RBI.

It is said—and it is a fact—that loans are advanced to poor people also by these banks. But on what terms? May I tell you that India is one of the most corrupt countries in the world? The other day a friend came to me and said that a poor man he knew applied for a loan of Rs. 1,000 from a nationalised bank. He got the loan all right. But for Rs. 1,000 he had to pay Rs. 200 as *gratis*. This is what is happening in the country; this is the corruption prevailing here. If loan-seekers have to pay money like this, for Rs. 1,000 loan Rs. 200 as *gratis*, I would say that corruption of the worst type exists in this country.

SHRI VIKRAM CHAND MAHAJAN : Corruption is 20 per cent.

SHRI HEM BARUA : He is right; it is only 20 per cent. Whatever the percentage might be, there should be no corruption in this country.

There is a lot of controversy about the provision for expansion. This Bill stipulates that if an undertaking wants to expand by 25 per cent its capacity, it has to obtain government permission. But the big business houses know how to circumvent the provisions of the law. They will expand by 20 or 24 per cent which they can do without permission. Thus concentration of economic power in a few hands would grow and go on.

The economy in India is controlled by what? By borrowings only. I have read the book *The Asian Drama*. It has been said that whatever money might be pumped into our economy from external or internal sources, unless there is a basic change in the socio-economic structure, no advance is going to be registered. I am very sorry to say that this Bill does not take us to that goal. In 1955-66, borrowings from external sources in re-arch comparison with the public borrowings of the Government was less than one per cent. By March, 1964 it came to 32 per cent. After the devaluation of the Indian rupee, it has come to 45 per cent. What a stupendous borrowing, what a stupendous dependence on other countries for money. Therefore, I say money can be

[Shri Hem Barua]

found in this country provided we take bold measures towards the socio-economic reconstruction of this country.

There are provisions in this Bill which can be easily circumvented as I have already pointed out. This Bill is not going to serve the main objective to which we are all dedicated. The objective is to establish an egalitarian society in this country. Is it going to usher in that era of socialism? It is not going to.

I am very sorry to tell you that there is no attempt to check the 75 houses in whose hands economic power is concentrated. The Monopolies Commission has made a pointed reference to them. However, I welcome this Bill because this is going to lay the foundation of or give a fillip to the economic egalitarianism in this country and curb concentration of economic power in a few hands which has been detrimental and which has proved hazardous to our economy so long.

SHRI S. R. DAMANI (Sholapur) : At the very outset I would like to say that this Bill which the Government has brought is according to the needs of the country. Such a law is now prevalent in many countries like U.S.A., France and U.K. Concentration of economic power and monopolies have to be controlled and as such I support this Bill.

In the last decade great progress has been made in indigenous production of which we are all proud. In the last 15 years industrial production has increased by 50 times. Today, we are self-sufficient in all consumer goods. The public sector has provided the infrastructure and as such heavy engineering and other industrial could produce all kinds of machinery and consumer goods in the country. Production has increased so much that today we are in a position to export a huge amount. This has been achieved not by only one person, but by the concentrated efforts of the public sector, the private sector and entrepreneurs. With their efforts the country has reached this stage, created employment for hundreds and thousands of people, created wealth in the country and given revenue to the Government for development purposes. The measures that have been taken for the development of industry and the progress made by India as a developing country has gained the praise of many

foreigners and hence the World Bank and many friendly countries have helped us by providing finances for purchase of capital goods and other things. But our population is increasing. The 400 million people who are living in the rural areas are going to require many things and as such we have to establish many more industries for consumer goods, many more engineering factories, many more heavy industries. We are short of steel and we are short of many other items. As such, it is very essential that the production of commodities and the establishment of industries and the growth of industries are not held up. On the contrary, they should increase. There should be encouragement for the entrepreneurs to establish more and more industries so that the country can develop and people can get employment when there is a lot of unemployed in the country; that problem could be solved and we can reach the target of export of Rs. 1,900 crores by the end of 1973-74. Without the establishment of new industries our targets of exports and our internal demands are not going to be met and as such this Bill should not restrict the growth of industries. That is what I want to say and we have, therefore, to examine that these measures do not hold up our industrialisation of the country.

Next, I feel that the figure for dominant undertakings which is fixed at Rs. 1 crore is going to hamper and restrict the growth of industries.

SHRI R. K. BIRLA : To a very great extent.

SHRI S. R. DAMANI : Sir, I was a Member of the Select Committee and at that time I also mentioned it. Today, a small spinning mill with 12,500 spindles costs Rs. 1 crore. It is not economic. Licence for such a small capacity was given only to just allow the small entrepreneurs to go into the industrial field. A small sugar factory of 500 tonnes costs more than Rs. 1 crore. A cement factory of 500 tonnes costs more than Rs. 1 crore. A paper mill of 40 tonnes capacity costs more than Rs. 1 crore. These are the capacities which are the minimum. These are the capacities which are very essential and if, at their very inception, their capacities are to come within this limit of dominant undertakings, what

will happen? How will they expand and how will there be any expansion of these industries and what amount of delay will take place at the very inception? Therefore, I want to submit that this figure of Rs 1 crore should be increased and if it is not increased, then our production and growth of the industries are going to be affected which the country cannot afford. Therefore, I suggest that this figure should be increased from Rs. 1 crore to Rs. 5 crores, so that an economic unit can be put up and the progress is not held up by the need for permission or licence or other factors. Therefore, my first submission is that the definition of dominant undertaking has to be revised and the amount increased to Rs. 5 crores so that economic units can be established and speedily too.

Sir, competition is the essence of any industry, and if there is competition, the management will be more alert. The consumers will be benefited and if, by such restrictions the production is held up, the establishment of new industries is held up, the consumers are going to be put in a disadvantageous position. That is my first submission.

My second submission is this. With that, I shall conclude. The basis for an undertaking is taken on its assets, which I think is not very correct, because there are certain industries which are capital-intensive and there are certain industries which are consumer-intensive like the engineering industry, where for the establishment with Rs. 1 crore, the production will be Rs. 50 lakhs. There are certain industries with an investment of Rs. 1 crore; they can produce goods worth Rs. 3 crores to Rs. 4 crores. Therefore, by taking the assets as the criterion, some industries will be at a disadvantage. Therefore, if the basis is to be changed from the assets to one of production, and if it is defined, say, that an industry producing more than Rs. 4 crores or Rs. 5 crores of goods will come under this category, then, every industry will get justice. I submit that instead of defining it on the basis of assets, it should be on the production basis, so that all industries can get justice.

Mr. Asoka Mehta mentioned that in the last three or four years, the growth of industries is held up because of the Minister and the Government's policies.

It is not correct. He himself has said many times that this was due to the recession, but today he says it is due to the policies of the Government. I think Government is always anxious to ensure growth of industries and as such Government have come forward with this Bill, so that new entrepreneurs may establish new industries and our targets may be fulfilled.

श्री शिव पूजन शास्त्री (बिक्रमगंज) : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष जी, यह विधेयक कुछ बुनियादी आर्थिक सवाल उपस्थित करता है। पहला सवाल यह विचारणीय है कि आर्थिक व्यवस्था कैसे होनी चाहिए। अब तक जो आर्थिक व्यवस्थाएं दुनिया में चल रही हैं एक तरफ पूंजीवादी आर्थिक व्यवस्था है और दूसरी तरफ साम्यवादी आर्थिक व्यवस्था। एक में पूंजी की महानता है और दूसरी में राज्य की। एक तरफ राज्य मजबूत किया जाता है दूसरी तरफ पूंजी बढ़ाने की कोशिश की जाती है। इन दोनों व्यवस्थाओं में इन्तान गायब है। इन दोनों व्यवस्थाओं में यह नहीं देखा जाता कि जो उत्पादक है, जो पैदा करने वाला है उस के हाथ में अधिक से अधिक उसी की पैदा की हुई चीज कैसे जाय। यह विधेयक यह मान कर चलता है या इन निष्कर्ष पर चलता है कि पिछले वर्षों में जो अपने देश में उत्पादन बड़े हैं, जो देश की सम्पत्ति बढ़ी है वह सम्पत्ति उत्पादकों के हाथ में न जा कर केन्द्रित हुई है। बिरला के हाथ में हुई है या किस के हाथ में हुई है, वह तो रिपोर्ट निकल चुकी है। उस पर बहस करने की गुंजाइश नहीं। गुंजाइश तो यह है कि उसे रहने दिया जाय फिर बढ़ने दिया जाय या उसे रोका जाय? अगर बिल कहता है कि रोका जाय तो इस का विरोध कैसे किया जा सकता है और फिर विरोध करने वाले अपनी दलील द्वारा क्या माबित करते हैं? उन के विरोध का अर्थ तो यही लगाया जा सकता है या आप ही आप हो सकता है कि वह खुद घन का केन्द्रीकरण चाहते हैं। व्यवस्था का जिक्र करते समय कहा गया कि

[श्री शिव पूजन शास्त्री]

एक दल है इस मुल्क में जो काम्प्यूटीटिव एकोनामी में विश्वास करता है। काम्प्यूटीटिव एकोनामी की ही वजह से दुनिया के अनेक अर्थशास्त्री मानते हैं कि दो दो विश्व-युद्ध हुए हैं। मस'नी जी यह समझने की अग्रर कोशिश करते कि काम्प्यूटीटिव एकोनामी क्या पहले से नहीं आ रही है, अग्रर आ रही है तो दुनिया में दो दो विश्व-युद्ध जो छिड़े क्या उस के लिए वह कारण नहीं हैं ? इसलिए कोई भी समझदार आदमी, कोई भी अर्थ-शास्त्र की समस्याओं को समझने वाला आदमी काम्प्यूटीटिव एकोनामी को कैसे मान सकता है ? काम्प्यूटीटिव एकोनामी ने ही यह सवाल पेश किया कि किस तरह से जो काम्प्यूटीशन में गला घोटने की प्रवृत्ति है, युद्ध कराने की प्रवृत्ति है, इस से इन्सान को बचाया जाय। हमारे मुल्क में जो नई अर्थ व्यवस्था शुरू हुई है वह न तो 16 आने प्रजावादी है और न 16 आने साम्यवादी है, उस के बीच का रास्ता अख्तियार किया गया है जिसका नाम रखा गया है—मिश्रित इकानमी (मिश्रित अर्थ-व्यवस्था)। जिसमें जो पहले से निजी कारखाने चले हुए हैं उन्हें भी जीने का मौका दिया जाय और साथ ही साथ सार्वजनिक कल-कारखाने भी खोले जाय।

यहां पर चेम्बर डिविजनरी की व्याख्या की गई है परिभाषा निकाली गई है कि उस व्यवस्था को एकाधिकार व्यवस्था कहेंगे जिस पर एकमात्र संस्था का एकाधिकार हो, लेकिन यहां जो सरकारी कल-कारखाने खुल रहे हैं, इन पर किस का एकाधिकार हो रहा है ? इस निये अर्थ का अर्थ करना, बाल की खाल खींचना शायद पाण्डित्य हो सकता है, लेकिन यह सत्य का प्रदर्शन नहीं है, वास्तविकता का इजहार नहीं है। इसलिये मानना पड़ेगा कि कुछ पढ़े लिखे लोग स्वार्थवश अपनी पार्टीबन्दी से अन्वये हो कर वास्तविकता को भी दुनिया से छिपाना चाहते हैं।

हां, यह बात सही है कि जो कल-कारखाने

सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में बने, जनता के बने, वे जनता के हाथ में नहीं रये। कम्प्यूनिस्ट मुल्कों का भी यही कुसूर है। इसीलिये यूगोस्लविया एक नया प्रयोग कर रहा है। सरकार द्वारा कल-कारखाने चला कर वर्कर्स मैनेजमेन्ट के द्वारा, जो कारखाने के मजदूर हैं, एम्पलाइज हैं, उन्हीं के द्वारा कारखाने चलाये जायें। हमारे देश को भी वह प्रयोग करना होगा, तब सही मायनों में हम इन सारे कल-कारखानों पर जनता का अधिकार कह सकते हैं, और किसी का भी अधिकार होने से रोक सकते हैं।

सिर्फ इतनी ही बात कि सरकार इस को महसूस करती है और उस के लिये एक नया विधेयक लाती है—यही सराहनीय है। कोई भी प्रयत्न पूर्ण होगा, किसी की भी तरफ से, यह नहीं कहा जा सकता है, प्रयत्न प्रयत्न है, प्रयत्न में खामियां भी हो सकती हैं, खूबियां भी हो सकती हैं। खामियों के लिये हम को होशियार रहना पड़ेगा, खूबियों के लिये हमें तारीफ करना पड़ेगा। तो जो प्रयत्न हो रहा है, उसका विरोध नहीं किया जा सकता है। हां, उस में जो खामियां हैं—शुरू से ही जो नया प्रयोग किया जा रहा है—एक तरफ मुनाफे पर आधारित निजी कल-कारखाने भी चलाये जायें, दूसरी तरफ मुनाफा-खोरी रोकने के लिये जनता के हाथ में या सरकार के हाथ में कल-कारखाने खोले जायें—ये दोनों प्रयोग एक साथ चल सकते हैं या नहीं, इस पर विचारना जरूरी है।

एक माननीय सवस्य : चल रहे हैं।

श्री शिव पूजन शास्त्री : चल रहे होते तो आज इस बिल की जरूरत न होती। तब आपको नहीं कहना पड़ना कि जो धन देश में पैदा हुआ, वह केन्द्रित हो गया, तब शायद आपको एकाधिकार आयोग की स्थापना नहीं करनी पड़ती और उस पर इतनी माथा-पच्ची करने की जरूरत नहीं पड़ती। इस सत्य को

इन्कार करने से कोई फायदा नहीं है। सरकार को भी इस सत्य को स्वीकार करना चाहिये कि दोनों तरह की अर्थ-व्यवस्था को एक साथ चलाने का प्रयत्न करना खतरे से खाली नहीं है और हम ने पिछले 22 वर्षों में यह प्रयत्न कर के देव लिया। इस लिये हम को जो नया प्रयोग हम करने जा रहे हैं, उस में फिर नयापन लाने की जरूरत होगी और अर्थ व्यवस्था को एक नई अर्थ व्यवस्था बनानी पड़ेगी और वह नई अर्थ व्यवस्था होगी जिस में न तो पूंजी की प्रधानता होगी और न राज की प्रधानता होगी, इन्सान की प्रधानता होगी। इन्सान मिलजुल कर उत्पादन करेंगे और इस लिये उस व्यवस्था को न तो हम मिश्रित अर्थ व्यवस्था कह सकते हैं, न पूंजीवादी अर्थ व्यवस्था कह सकते हैं, न साम्यवादी अर्थ व्यवस्था कह सकते हैं। उस को सहयोगी अर्थ व्यवस्था कह सकते हैं, जो सहयोग के आधार पर चलेगी और जिसका उद्देश्य इन्सान में सहयोग की भावना पैदा करना होगा और सहयोग से उत्पादन कर के हर इन्सान के हाथ में उत्पादन का हिस्सा देना होगा।

मैं इतना ही कह कर अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR CHATTERJI (Howrah) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is indeed a privilege to take part in the discussion of this Bill. So far as the purpose of this Bill is concerned, the hon. Minister has already made it clear that the real purpose is to stop concentration of wealth in a few hands, to stop monopolistic enterprises and to put a curb on restrictive trade practices. I am of the opinion that this Bill will not achieve that end. Even in the UK and USA such enactments have been made to control monopoly and concentration of wealth in a few hands but such advanced countries have also failed to achieve that end. In our present economy position it will not be possible for us by this enactment to contain concentration of wealth even to a limited extent. Even that end cannot be achieved by this Bill.

The Third Chapter has been included in

this Bill to bring about that aim to a purposeful end but I have carefully gone through the clauses of that chapter and I am quite certain that it is not possible to achieve that aim by this chapter alone. The monopoly is so great, as my hon. friend, Professor Hem Barua, has pointed out, that practically the greater part of our wealth is in the hands of 22 families. We have allowed these families to grow in spite of our socialist professions. That has been the real danger that has been created in our economy and our socio-economic structure is distorted to such an extent that we have created extreme poverty on the one hand...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He can continue his speech the next day.

16.58 hrs.

STATEMENT RE : ORDINANCE CLOTHING FACTORIES

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Before I take up the motion of Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta, I would like to dispose of two small items. One is : Shri Mishra to lay a statement on the Table of the House.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Sir, it is a very important matter. Let him read the statement if it is a small statement, because this concerns about 3,500 workers.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He will lay it on the Table of the House. You can read it and after that whatever proper action is needed will be taken.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : We have to seek clarification.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We have to take up Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta's motion and I will request you to agree to his laying it on the Table of House.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI L. N. MISHRA) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement regarding the declaration of more than 3,500 workers as surplus in Ordnance Clothing Factories at Shahjahanpur, Kanpur and Avadi.