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This chapter explains the salient features and traces the gradual development of industrial sector in India. It presents a detailed picture on the pattern of industrial development in the country particularly, after Independence under the impact of the policies and strategies initiated by the Government of India during different periods. Finally, it analyses the impact of the New Economic Reforms of 1990s on the industrial development in the Country.

The evolution of industrial sector in India can be traced to the beginning of Country's history. In course of its evolution the Indian Industry passed through numerous phases marked by severe up and downs. In ancient India sole trader system was the main type of organization. There were sole traders in every village, town and city in this traditional period. The main characteristics of this form of organization are: (i) the sole trader himself contributes the capital either from this own property or by borrowing and takes the risks himself inherent the business; and (ii) he himself or with the help of his family members or some servants manages the business or industry. But with the introduction of machinery, industry perpetually started increasing its scale of operation which required huge capital.\(^1\) The individual trader was unable to contribute such huge sum of capital. Hence, he was
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compelled to associate with others for capital which led to the emergence of a type of organization, namely, partnership. As the partners in this type of organization were few, there was the limitation of capital. As such efforts were made to evolve a suitable system which provides huge capital for the needs of the modern industry. The outcome was the emergence of joint stock company type of organization. The system of Joint Stock Companies became popular in course of time and was able to shape the contours of Indian Industry in the years to come.²

It was widely held by the historians that before the advent of British Rule, India was industrially more advanced as compared to the European Countries. The Britishers systematically destroyed the industrial base of India. As a result, India inherited a weak industrial base, underdeveloped infrastructure facilities and a stagnant economy at the time of Independence. The Government immediately after Independence organized an Industrial Conference at New Delhi in December 1947 to consider ways and means to utilize the existing capacity more fully and to develop industry to meet the growing requirements of the free nation.³ After this Conference to promote better relations between management and employees, a Tripartite Agreement was entered into which provided for three year industrial truce between the management and labourers.⁴ The Government granted several tax concessions to the industry in 1948-49 and passed the Bill to establish the Industrial Finance Corporation of India. The Industrial Policy Resolution was
also passed in 1948. These factors had created a favourable climate for the growth of industrial sector in the years to came.\textsuperscript{5}

In addition to the above mentioned measures the Government of India took further steps to speed up the process of industrialization. One of the important steps taken was the appointment of an Interim Tariff Board in November 1945 to examine the cases of wartime industries for protection and assistance.\textsuperscript{6} The other measure was the declaration of a well-defined Industrial Policy in April 1948 followed by the passing of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951. The third step was the appointment of the Fiscal Commission in April 1949, to decide about the long-term tariff Policy. The Report of the Fiscal Commission submitted in July 1950 was followed by the enactment of Tariff Commission of 1950 and the constitution of the Tariff Commission in January 1952.\textsuperscript{7}

In the opinion of a scholar the process of industrialization was launched, as a conscious and deliberate policy immediately after the country became a free nation. In pursuance of this policy, large investments have been made in building up capacity over a wide spectrum of industries. Industrial production has gone up by about five times during the early period. Apart from this the industrial base was widely diversified covering broadly the entire range of consumer, intermediate and capital goods. In course of time the Country achieved a large-measure of self-sufficiency, providing the capability to sustain the future growth of vital sectors of the economy
primarily through domestic effort. The rapid strides in the industrialization was accompanied by a corresponding growth in technological and managerial skills, for the efficient management of highly complex and sophisticated industrial enterprises. Considerable advance was also made in the area of industrial research and in absorbing, adapting and developing latest industrial technology.

THE PATTERN OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

The Industrial Resolution of 1956 which proposed the adoption of a socialist pattern of society as the national objective argued that all the industries of basic and strategic importance should be placed in the public sector. Other industries, which were essential and required investment on a massive scale also had to be in the public sector. On the whole, the 1956 Industrial Policy Resolution classified industries into three different categories: (i) Industries whose future development should be the exclusive responsibility of the state; (ii) industries which should be owned by the state but where private sectors is also necessary for the development of which would generally be left to the initiative of private enterprise; and (iii) the new types of industries which should be placed in the public sector.

The basic principles of the 1956 Policy Resolution continued to guide the Government Industrial policy till the 1980s although several amendments were made to it during the period. It is noted that the importance given to development of the public industrial sector changed from time to time. The
Second Five Year Plan (1956-61), in particular, assigned highest priority to the public sector and the objective was the ensuring of 'commanding heights' of the economy. The Third Five-Year Plan (1961-66) laid less emphasis on the state sector but after 1973 the development of public sector again received high priority to achieve the object of economic growth with social justice and also as a means to further self-reliance.¹¹

Over the period from 1950 to 1990 the Indian economy underwent several significant structural changes. The contribution of industry to the GDP went up from around 15 per cent in 1950 to almost 30 per cent in 1990. This relative increase was due to the significant growth of industrial sector. In terms of employment, however, the share of industry did not grow much over this period. It even fell during the 1970s and remained below 14 per cent of the total workforce.¹²

India’s industrial development during the period 1950 – 1990 may be divided into three distinct phases. The first phase from 1951 to 1966 was characterized by high rates of growth of industrial output, with concentration on capital goods and metal-based industries in the public sector. The second phase from 1966 to 1980 was marked by very slow growth, because of the slowdown in public investment and low productivity in the public industrial sector. During this period, there was a much higher share of gross domestic capital formation as well as GDP in this sector.¹³ The slow down of Industrial growth was particularly marked in the capital goods industries. The third phase during 1980-1990 witnessed a gradual recovery of industrial growth,
with the production of consumer durables achieving fastest growth followed by the capital goods. The high annual Industrial growth rates achieved during the latter half of the 1980s probably to some extent is on account of the relaxation of investment regulations in 1985.\textsuperscript{14}

In 1980s, the industrial productivity improved more than before, but the total productivity continued to rise slowly. This has resulted in lower growth rates. Moreover, there was little spurt in the overall growth apart from investment in physical capital and employment. Productivity increases have accounted for only a small per cent of India's industrial growth over the period from 1951 to 1990.\textsuperscript{15}

If is often remarked that the significant development that has taken place in the public industrial sector after 1956 influenced strongly the pattern of development of Indian economy as a whole. On the positive side, the public sector contributed markedly to the diversification, import substitution and development of basic and capital goods industries. However, the costs involved in running more and more loss-making public sector enterprises became a burden on the country.\textsuperscript{16} The taking over of a large number of sick units, mainly the textile and engineering industries, to promote employment increased the burden further of the State. The Reports of various Official Committees appointed during the 1980s highlighted on the comparatively poor returns on the investments in the public sector. They also argued that the poor performance of public sector enterprises could be mainly attributed to lack of managerial autonomy and the several policy induced constraints.\textsuperscript{17}
These Official Reports have also emphasized that irrespective of the modest growth rates the industrial development in India, and particularly the growth of manufacturing industries has contributed significantly to the overall economic development of the country. One important fact is that the organized manufacturing sector increased its contribution of the GDP from 5.4 per cent in 1950-51 to 11.5 per cent in 1990-91. The unorganized sector during the same period increased its contribution from 6.1 per cent to 7.1 per cent. However, the employment grew only at a rate of around 3 per cent until 1980 i.e., about half a percentage above the rate of growth of the population. This slow growth of industrial employment reflected the capital-intensive nature of India's indutrialization process. The employment growth rate slowed markedly during the 1980s which is a period of recovery of industrial growth. This could be partly explained by increasing capital intensity, but it added to the slowing down of (registered) employment growth which was due to the reason that many firms increasingly used contract labour rather than payroll labour so as to bypass the rigid Labour Laws with respect to the hiring and firing of labour.18

Analysing India's industrial performance from 1951 to 1990, Dilip Mookherjee observed that the performance of Indian Industries has been encouraging in terms of overall growth and diversification relative to the objectives of the industrial policies. At the same time, as he noted, the authorities are not paying sufficient attention to factors such as efficient organizational structures within the public sector, maintenance of competitive...
pressure on the private sector, Inadequate investment in human capital and technological upgrading absence of flexibility in the labour market and lastly the adverse effects of the regulatory regime on productivity. He adds that the implementation of the industrial policies provoked reactions that tended to stall the achievement of the original intentions. He went on to argue that the over-bureaucratic controls adversely affected the investments by accentuating delays, increasing uncertainty, and preserving the monopoly power of large business houses. Similar results could be expected from the strategy of indefinite protection from foreign competition, originally in the spirit of infant industry development. The system was geared neither to exploit the existing patterns of comparative advantage nor to utilise the strategic development of such advantage in the long run.19

THE INDUSTRIAL POLICIES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

The Industrial Policy Resolution (I.P.R) 1948 contemplated the establishment of mixed economy where a sphere was reserved for the private sector and another was left for public sector to be owned and controlled by the government. The industries were divided into four categories where in the cottage and small scale industries were assigned a significant role to play in the national economy. The Industrial Policy Resolution also favoured the need for securing the participation of foreign capital to speed up the pace of industrialization. This Resolution evolved a scheme of maintaining healthy industrial relations. It also required the evolution of a tax system for encouraging more savings and investments.20
The national Government announced its first Industrial Policy on 6th April 1948. The main objectives of this Policy were: (i) establishment of a social order wherein justice and equality of opportunity shall be secured to all the people; (ii) provision of educational facilities and health services on a much wider scale and the promotion of a rapid rise in the standard of living of people by exploiting the latent resources of the country; (iii) increase in production, both agricultural and industrial; (iv) offering of opportunities to all for employment in the service of the community; (v) need for careful planning and integration of effort and necessity for the establishment of a National Planning Commission; (vi) determination of the extent of the state responsibility and the limits of private enterprise; and (vii) regulation of the private enterprise.

CLASSIFICATION OF INDUSTRIES

(I.) The industrial Policy Resolution (I.P.R) divided industries into four groups:21

(a) The Central Government will have exclusive monopoly in the industries manufacturing arms and ammunition, Production of atomic energy and the railway transport.

(b) The State will undertake the industries relating to coal, Iron and steel, aircraft, shipbuilding etc.
(c) The Central Government would plan and regulate industries of basic importance. It comprised industries of automobiles, heavy machine tools, heavy chemicals and fertilizers etc.

(d) The remainder of the industrial field left open for private enterprise.

(II) These industries were assigned an important role in the national economy because they provide good scope for employment in rural and urban areas. They help in decentralization and equal distribution of income and wealth.

(III) It was felt that healthy industrial relations between the employers and employees is necessary to maintain industrial peace and help the growth of industries. Tripartite mechanism was evolved to solve industrial disputes. The Indian Labour Organisation was created. The Industrial Policy Resolution also emphasized the need for fair wages, housing, bonus, etc.

(IV) The Industrial Policy Resolution recognized the need of foreign capital for speeding up the pace of industrialization. However, it was laid down that the major share in ownership and effective control should always be in the hands of the Indians.
(V) A tax system encouraging savings for investment should be evolved.

The Industrial Policy of 1948 lasted till 1956. Between 1948 and 1956 three major developments of far-reaching consequences took place. Firstly, there was the enactment of Indian Constitution, which guaranteed certain Fundamental Rights and also laid down certain Directive Principles for the state to follow. Secondly, the Country was committed to the establishment of a democratic and socialistic pattern of society in the country. Thirdly, the Government adopted the method of planning for the rapid achievement of economic development of the country. The First Five Year Plan was successfully completed in 1956. All these circumstances necessitated a revision of the then existing industrial policy.

Accordingly, the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956 was passed which laid down the following objectives for the industrial policy:

(I) to accelerate the rate of growth and to speed up industrialization;

(II) to develop heavy industries and machine making industries;

(III) to expand public sector;

(IV) to reduce disparities in income and wealth;

(V) to build up a large and growing co-operative sector; and
(VI) to prevent private monopolies and the concentration of wealth and income in the hands of a small number of individuals.

Although the 1956 Industrial Policy Resolution was more explicit and clear and carried a greater amount of flexibility as compared with the 1948 policy, it was not welcome by all and sundry. Despite its emphasis on the creation of infrastructure for development, increased financial and other assistance, etc., it did not evoke a favourable response from the private sector.²³ The private industrialists accepted the importance of public sector and the logic of the mixed economy, but were apprehensive about the relatively greater role of the public sector. They wanted the state to limit its role to the extent where it could help the private sector and not beyond.

A serious analysis of the criticism of 1956 Industrial Policy as put forward by the private capitalists exposes the weakness of this criticism. It is clear that this criticism was based on the individual selfish interests of the capitalists and did not take into account the needs of the time. It is impossible to think of industrial development in under-developed countries without a strong and vibrant public sector.²⁴ In pre-independent India, the participation of the state in industrial development was minimal. However, it is only natural that such development in the post-independence period should have seen the progress of both the sectors public as well as private-together. In fact, the expansion of the public sector created an environment for the private sector to expand the area of its activities.
However, the implementation part of the Industrial Policy Resolution, 1956 was wrought with several defects. Because of its loopholes the underlying goals of this Policy were glossed over. Licences were issued to private sector units in areas exclusively reserved to be in the public sector. These include coal, oil, fertilizers, chemicals, engineering etc. As noted by Rangnekar, "proposal for setting up state owned steel mills were held back for years (in the earlier phase) in preference to the expansion of the private units. Schemes for setting up public sector units in new fields were watered down under the pressure for private sector participation, association or continuance. For several years after its adoption, the Resolution was not even fully implemented. In the 1960s as it was pointed out by experts industrial development was slowed down reflecting the reluctance of the implementing authorities to implement the Resolution in true spirit and ideals."

It was contended that the results of the different Policies pursued in the industrial field till end of 1960's decade had not come up to the expectation of declared objectives. The per capita national income during 1970s had been about 1.5% per annum and was clearly inadequate to meet the needs of Country's developing economy. Unemployment had increased; rural urban disparities had widened and the rate of real investment had stagnated. The growth of industrial output in the 1980s decade had been less than 3 to 4% per annum on an average and the incidence of industrial sickness had become widespread; further, the pattern of industrial costs and
prices was distorted and dispersal of industrial activity had become very slow. The new Industrial Policy must therefore, be directed towards removal of these distortions of the past so that the genuine aspirations of the people can be met within a time bound programme of economic development.\(^{26}\)

Although the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956 has shown conclusively the merit of constructive flexibility and served the country well during these years; fresh interpretation with fresh emphasis has been given to it from time to time. The Janata Government announced its policy approach towards Industrial Development in November 1977. The Congress Government also spelt out its approach on 23\(^{rd}\) July 1980. The 1956 Resolution formed the basis of these two Policy statements.

The main components of these Industrial Policy statements included: optimum utilization of the installed capacity; maximizing production and achieving higher productivity; higher employment generation, correction of regional imbalances through a preferential development of industrially backward areas; strengthening of the agricultural base by according a preferential treatment to agro-based industries; faster promotion of export oriented and import substitution industries; promoting economic federalism with an equitable spread of investment; and consumer protection against high prices and bad quality.
The Government of India adopted a liberalized economic policy approach in 1991 to remove the existing economic crisis. The objectives of this liberalization policy were to increase Industrial production, to remove the disequilibrium in balance of payments, to get rid of the sick units of public or private sectors and to control inflation by increasing production and regulating money supply. To enforce the devices of liberalization the Government of India announced the new Industrial Policy in 1991.

The aims of new Industrial Policy of 1991 included:

1. To maintain the gains from industries already made.
2. To improve deficiencies or imbalances which emerged in the economy from previous policies.
3. To maintain international competitiveness, that is the formation of internal competitive market.
4. Continuity in the increase in production.
5. Provision of more opportunities of employment.
7. More freedom to the private sector.

The above objectives are similar to those specified in the earlier Industrial Policy Resolutions, of course; the difference lies in the strategy to
achieve these objectives. The strategy now shifted from controls to liberalization and from nationalization to privatization.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT DURING THE DECADE OF 1990's

With the new era of liberalization beginning in 1991, there was a hope of high industrial growth in the country. The initial years justified the hope with Industrial growth peaking at 9.1 per cent in 1994-95 and 13 per cent in 1995-96. Since then the overall growth rates stabilized somewhat at 6.1 per cent in 1996-97 and 6.6 per cent in 1997-98, before declining to 4.9 per cent in 1998-99. This makes it clear that the Industrial development—even after the introduction of economic liberalization process—is fluctuating in the post-reform phase. The Economic Survey (1998-89) identified several factors responsible for the slowdown of industrial progress.28

As this Economy Survey explicitly stated the decline in the agricultural production in 1997-98 affected the rural incomes which directly resulted in lower demand for certain industrial goods particularly, the consumption goods like food products, textiles etc. Both the primary and secondary capital markets were depressed due to scarcity of investments for industry. Apart from subdued capital markets, the small and medium corporate institutions could not get institutional funds. The Banks reduced their lending due to high incidence of overdues. Relatively higher costs of borrowing affected several
industries. The deficiencies existing in the infrastructure services adversely affected the industrial growth.

Apart from several internal factors certain external factors also contributed for the slowdown of the industrial development during this period. The exports growth after 1991 and in 1998-99 was extremely disappointing. Further, the declined demand for exports adversely affected the industrial production. Although the Indian rupee depreciated marginally after August 1997, there was much greater depreciation in the East Asian currencies following the outbreak of the East Asian crisis in mid 1997. The higher depreciation eroded the competitiveness of Indian products by making them more expensive. Several industries like steel, chemicals and electronic components were subject to competitive pressure from imports.

In 1999, however, the recovery for industrial sector became evident. Certain domestic factors resulted in the increasing of rural incomes and consequent greater demand for industrial products. There also happened the revival of capital markets as reflected by the bullish trends in the stock exchanges, higher growth of non-food credit and higher volumes of disbursements in 1992-2000, injecting greater investment in industry besides the decline with inflation and increased demand, resulting in improved capacity utilisation and larger industrial output. The policies incorporated in the Union Budget (1999-2000) promoted demand in key sectors and improving investment in the housing sector, rationalization of excise and
customs duty structures, removal for customs duty anomaly on steel extension of the scope of tax holiday awarded to infrastructure industries and so on. The amendments affected in the Income Tax Act also have their impact on the recovery of industrial sector. 34

During the 1990s, while the relative contribution of basic and capital goods sectors declined, there was a rise in those of intermediate and consumer goods sectors. The relatively low contribution of the basic and capital goods sectors to overall industrial output in the nineties reflect among others, the impact of trade liberalization particularly, imports and of financial liberalization that enabled the corporate sector to make financial gains through other income, as also the lack of competitiveness requiring industrial restructuring and modernization of technologies in a number of industries. 35 It is in respect of the last factor that decisions need to be taken by the industries themselves, given the policy environment that is imbued with the spirit of incentivising foreign trade. 36 The growth rate of industrial production from the First Five Year Plan to the Seventh Plan is presented in the following Table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Plan</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-52 to 1955-56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Plan</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-57 to 1960-61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Plan</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-62 to 1965-66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Plans</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67 to 1968-69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Plan</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70 to 1973-74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Plan</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75 to 1978-79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Plan</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Plan</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81 to 1984-85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Plan</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86 to 1989-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Planning Commission Reports

The annual growth rate of industrial production in certain major Industries over a period is given in the following Table.
TABLE II: 2
ANNUAL GROWTH RATE OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION IN MAJOR SECTORS OF INDUSTRY [1994-95 – 2003-2004]
(Based on the Index of Industrial Production)
(Base: 1993-94=100)

(Per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Mining &amp; Quarrying</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Electricity</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>79.36</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF NEW ECONOMIC REFORMS

There is widespread agreement among both Indian and foreign investors that business opportunities in India improved after 1991. More specifically, the following positive effects on private industrial investment including foreign investment and international trade have often been emphasized as outcomes of the new industrial policies.\(^{37}\)

The following is a general assessment of the impact of liberalization since 1991 on the industrial development.\(^{38}\)

- Costly and time-consuming controls have been abolished. Until 1991, the Industrial approval system implies that private investors and companies had to spend considerable time and resources to obtain the necessary clearances, as described in the previous chapter. Most big companies had to maintain a special lobbying unit in Delhi to deal with the government officials both formally and informally to speed up the approval procedures. After 1991, much fewer approvals are needed from the Central Government. Most clearances which are still required can be obtained at state government level.

- It has been made easier for big companies to expand. Monopolies and restrictive trade practices legislation has been radically changed so that even big companies with market shares above one-third can expand their production and sales without prior approval from the government.
Several sectors, which used to be reserved for the public sector have been opened up for private investment and in some of the sectors special incentives are offered to foreign investors.

Foreign majority ownership is now allowed as the general rule while in the past the rules allowed only 40 per cent of foreign ownership.

Quantitative import restrictions have been abolished and tariffs lowered. On average, weighted tariffs were brought down from 87 per cent in 1991 to less than 30 per cent in 1997.

Convertibility of the Rupee on the current account has been introduced. This is not particularly important for foreign investors. They have for long had the opportunity to repatriate profits without restrictions, and when investments have been financed in foreign exchange there has been no difficulty in obtaining hard currencies for import. But seen from the perspective of Indian promoters, this change of policy has been an improvement.
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