

DROP THE SEVENTEENTH AMENDMENT BILL

In the course of an article on the 17th Amendment, Mr. M. R. Masani General Secretary of the Party wrote that "it was the Nagpur Resolution of the Congress Party of January 1959 threatening, on the one hand, a State monopoly of foodgrains trade, on the other, a ceiling on land holdings and, lastly, the expropriation of the land of the peasants of India and the establishment of collective farming under the slogan of 'Joint Cooperative Farming' that was the primary reason for the birth of the Swatantra Party." And Rajaji gave the Party the slogan 'Farm, Family and Freedom'. Once again, a threat has been posed to the peasant's farm, family and freedom by the introduction of the vicious, anti-people and obnoxious Constitution (17th Amendment) Bill. It is hardly a matter for surprise, therefore, that the Swatantra Party has again swung its machinery into gear to oppose the measure.

The Congress Government has amended the Constitution sixteen times in thirteen years. Every amendment has resulted in lessening some part of the citizen's fundamental rights. The Seventeenth Amendment cuts deeper into an already badly mauled Constitution.

The Seventeenth Amendment in substance says "that it does not matter which kind of land it is—all land can be acquired without fair compensation whether it is farm land, whether it is waste land, whether it is forest land, whether it is building sites or even the small ryotwari farms in Maharashtra, Gujarat and in the South—no court may question the quantum of compensation offered."

The last issue of the *Newsletter* reproduced a strongly worded resolution of the Central Organising Committee which, while denouncing the Bill in no uncertain terms, called on "units of the Party in the States, districts, talukas and villages to launch an intensive campaign to educate the rural people about this matter and to give expression at public meetings and otherwise to their protest."

And the response to this call, as the ensuing report will indicate, has been very encouraging.

The first major protest against this obnoxious measure was made by a Conference of Southern States in Bangalore on August 6. The Conference was jointly convened by the All India Agriculturists' Federation and the Mysore unit of the Party. It was inaugurated by an eminent barrister, Mr. M. K. Nambyar, and presided over by Mr. K. R. Karanth, a former Congress Minister of Madras and a Supreme Court advocate. Rajaji, Prof. Ranga, Mr. V. P. Menon and Mr. Jinaraja Hegde, among others, participated in the deliberations.

A report of speeches delivered at the Conference and the full text of the resolution adopted are reported separately (Annexure A).

Earlier on July 31, the Swatantra Legislature Group in Andhra waited in deputation on President Radhakrishnan in Hyderabad. Led by the President of our State Unit, G. Latchanna, M.L.A., the 20-man deputation presented to the President a memorandum which denounced the proposed amendment and called for its withdrawal. The deputationists appealed to the President to secure withdrawal of the Bill and thus protect democracy. When the President pointed out that the opposition should avoid controversies during the period of the emergency, Mr. Latchanna drew the attention of the President to the fact that it was actually the Congress Party which was provoking controversies by introducing legislation aimed at cutting down citizens' fundamental rights. The memorandum, among other things, states: "The amendment is nothing short of a communistic approach to the property rights of people, particularly the toiling masses and classes, and is a near step to expropriation without justiciable intervention of even courts."

In the Punjab agitation against the 17th Amendment occupied a considerable part of the Party's activities in August. On the 5th of that month, a mass rally of Kisans was held in the historic town of Baba Bakala in Amritsar District. Presided over by Swatantra member of the Legislature, Sardar Gurmej Singh, the meeting was addressed by State President Jathedar Udham Singh Nagoke, Sardar Basant Singh, Sardar Darshan Singh Pheruman M.P., Sardar Uttam Singh, Sardar Gurdip Singh and Dr. Mehar Singh. A resolution unanimously adopted at the meeting described the Bill as an act of "naked dacoity on the age-old hereditary rights of the peasant proprietor" and called for its immediate withdrawal.

The State Unit has made elaborate arrangements for a post-card campaign by which peasants will send postcards by the thousands to the Lok Sabha demanding the Bill's withdrawal.

On August 8 and 12, in the talukas of Saklaspur and Holenarsipur in Mysore State, meetings of agriculturists were held where the speakers explained in detail the implications of the draft Bill. Agriculturists present unanimously resolved to oppose the Bill and to send their individual protests to the Lok Sabha.

At Junagadh, in Gujarat, Mr. M. R. Masani presiding over the Saurashtra Kutch Peasants' Conference on August 24, charged the Congress Party with having gone back on the promises given by the former Law Minister, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, that no enactment would be made to turn the peasant into a mere land labourer.

Mr. Masani observed that Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru was semi-communist and some of his colleagues

wanted to bring Communism and deprive people of their independence gradually.

The Conference attended by over 10,000 peasants unanimously adopted a resolution opposing the 17th Amendment.

At Varanasi, in U.P., party workers from the Ghazipur, Mirzapur, Gorakhpur and Varanasi districts gathered for a three-day training camp to organise protest meetings against the Amendment.

Addressing the Camp on its concluding day, the President of the Maharashtra Unit of the Party, Mr. N. Dandekar, said that the 17th Amendment sought to widen the definition of the word 'estate' to cover all kinds of landholdings.

This, he said, meant the acquisition by Government of authority to acquire any land without paying adequate compensation and the owners could not seek redress from Courts. Mr. Dandekar described the measure as the first step towards collectivisation.

In Bombay, the city unit has launched a campaign to educate people on the implications of the Amendment.

Addressing a party workers' meeting on August 30, Dr. R. C. Cooper the Unit's Treasurer, warned that the Amendment would cut at the very root of 'our meagre property rights'. He added that previous amendments had systematically curbed the fundamental rights enshrined in the Constitution "under one pretext or the other."

The Coimbatore District Unit, in Madras State, meeting on August 25, appointed a five-member committee to organise public meetings to protest against the Amendment.

The State General Secretary, Mr. S. S. Mariswamy, in a statement from Coimbatore, said that a post-card campaign launched by the State unit describing the Bill as totalitarian in nature was rapidly gaining momentum.

On September 14 the Madras State Unit will hold a conference at Palani to oppose the Amendment. Mr. Jinaraja Hegde will preside, while Rajaji, Prof. Ranga and others are expected to speak.

A press note issued by the General Secretary of the Delhi unit announced the launching of a campaign against the 17th Amendment. A team of the Party's officials in Delhi visited villages in Shahdara area explaining to the villagers the sinister implications of the proposed Bill. Posters and handbills were distributed and farmers were asked to send individual protests to Parliament seeking the Bill's withdrawal.

Meanwhile, over 50,000 petitions have already been sent to the Lok Sabha Secretariat by farmers from all over the country protesting against the Bill. More petitions are pouring in, according to our spokesman in New Delhi.

Our Party's campaign is in full gear. At the time of writing, newspapers report that a motion for referring the Bill to a joint select committee of Parliament would come up for discussion shortly.

Prof. Ranga has, in a statement, in the Lok Sabha, regretted that Government were going ahead with the Bill at the fag-end of the session ignoring his plea to the Prime Minister that a controversial measure of this kind should not be taken up during the emergency. He described Government's decision

as a "slap on our face" and a "favour done to the Communists."

MOTIONS OF NO-CONFIDENCE

Last month, in the Lok Sabha, as our readers are no doubt aware, our Party's Parliamentary Group took a leading part in supporting Acharya Kripalani's motion of no-confidence. Similarly the Swatantra Party Legislature Groups in the Rajasthan and Gujarat Assemblies moved motions of no-confidence in the Council of Ministers in their respective States.

In Rajasthan, the motion was moved by the President of the Rajasthan Unit and Leader of our Legislature Group, Mr. Laxman Singh of Dungarpur.

Opening a 3-day debate in the Rajasthan Assembly on August 27, Mr. Laxman Singh said that the third five-year plan had imposed so much burden on the people that it had become intolerable. He said inflation had become an inalienable part of the plans which were over-ambitious. Planning in Rajasthan, he said, had led to more excessive borrowing, floating of public loans and heavy taxation than in any other State. Repeated appeals had failed to induce the Government to reduce the size of the Ministry. He charged that 80% of the expenditure incurred on the Bharat Sevak Samaj and the Social Welfare Department was a waste and was being incurred in the interests of Congressmen. The motion was defeated by 61 votes to 93.

More recently, in Gujarat, the Leader of the Swatantra Legislature Party, Mr. Bhailalbhai Patel, with the support of other democratic groups in the State Assembly, moved a motion of no-confidence in the Council of Ministers of that State. Moving the motion on September 10, Mr. Bhailalbhai Patel, in a reference to the bitter wrangles within the Congress ministry and the likelihood of a change in the Chief Ministership, said that the motion would have been tabled by the opposition against the Congress Party irrespective of who their leader was. He clarified that the motion was against the Congress government and not against any individual.

Replying to the debate, Mr. Bhailalbhai Patel bitterly criticised the land Policy and the Police Department of the State Government. He demanded a judicial inquiry into the allegations against the Deputy Home Minister. Before concluding his speech, the opposition leader quoted the results of the recent Parliamentary by-elections in the State and demanded that the Congress Government should resign and that fresh General Elections should be held.

At the time of writing, it has been reported that the motion has been defeated.

THE KAMARAJ PLAN

Leaders of our Party had some interesting comments to make on the "theatrical performance" of the Congress Party under the commonly known title "Kamaraj Plan".

In a statement to the Press on August 24, Mr. K. M.

Munshi said: "the process of eliminating Ministers who are responsible to the legislatures by party mandate is unconstitutional. Competent people going out of the Government is not likely to make the administration efficient or incorruptible. The whole plan is going to fail and this, at a time when the country is passing through an emergency, is all the more reprehensible."

Addressing newsmen in Rajkot on August 26, Mr. M. R. Masani said that he had not expected major changes in government policy as a result of the Kamaraj Plan, though, he added, "the possibility could not be ruled out of changes in the Gold Control Order and the Compulsory Deposit Scheme, which had proved very unpopular."

Reverting to the subject at a meeting in New Delhi on August 29, Mr. Masani doubted if the resignations by leaders of the Congress Party from the Central and State Cabinets would do any good to the nation. He affirmed that this would not necessarily end the squabbles and power struggles within the ruling party.

In Coimbatore, the General Secretary of the Tamil Nad Unit, Mr. S. S. Mariswamy, said that Mr. Nehru had carried out the wishes of the Communists in sending out Mr. Morarji Desai and Mr. S. K. Patil from the Central Cabinet. Another example indicating Mr. Nehru's anxiety to please the Communists was the removal of Mr. B. Gopala Reddi from the Cabinet. On the whole, he said, it appeared that the Kamaraj Plan was a deep-seated conspiracy to oust inconvenient people from government.

So far as Tamilnad was concerned, Mr. Mariswamy pointed out, Mr. Kamaraj has now emerged as the *de facto* leader of government, whoever might succeed him as Chief Minister.

Writing in *Swarajya* under the interesting title "The Renunciation Sleight of Hand", Rajaji said that the plan to get Ministers in the Union and States to relinquish office and go out to do organisational work had been, generally speaking, found to be no more feasible than to induce the toothpaste that had been squeezed out to get back into the container. No one, who has tasted power will descend to function in the Congress organisation, specially when it has lost the respect and confidence of the people, said Rajaji. He added that the Congress Party now consisted only of those who had seized or hoped to seize some slice of power at some level or other, or who were in the enjoyment of concrete benefits resulting from Congress rule. There was really no intellectually free political group believing in Congress rule and Congress politics. "No wonder, therefore, there are rifts, rivalries and quarrels at high level. Defeats in by-elections have underlined the weaknesses." According to Rajaji "Reshuffling is not renunciation, whether it be inside the Union or State Ministry. It is a mere adventure for recapturing lost influence by creating mass illusion. Let no one mistake it for any kind of sacrifice. The essence of legerdemain is swift movement. When it is clumsily done and the trick is exposed, the performer stands disconcerted. This is the present plight of the Kamaraj Plan."

"The stunt," he said, "had proved a farce. Nothing else could be expected when Sri Nehru was un-animously asked to remain as P.M. and given power

and discretion to order people to the funeral pyre. Dismissal has taken the place of resignation. Murder, so to say, has taken the place of proposed *sati*."

"Where acceptable substitutes could be got, some Chief Ministers are ready to go out and enjoy power from outside. The people, and I fear officials too, will have, in those instances, two commands over them—the new officially recognised CM and the old CM who is pretending to be a mere worker. Party committees will begin to look upon themselves as official Government machinery and try to function as such."

In a post-script, Rajaji expressed the hope that the ultimate issue of all this shake-up would be "something good, that the clever, diligent intriguers will go out of office to look after the party and its interests, and just and honest men, though dull, will be left behind to look after the administration with the help of permanent officials trained for their tasks. This indeed would be an unintended but good result."

SWATANTRA IN PARLIAMENT

The Swatantra group in Parliament was in no small measure responsible for enabling Acharya Kripalani to table the motion of no-confidence in the Council of Ministers. It was at a meeting of all non-communist opposition groups convened by Prof. N. G. Ranga that a decision was taken to table this motion. *The Hindustan Times* of August 13 reports: "This is the first time in Parliamentary history that all the non-communist opposition groups have combined to censure the government. No-confidence motions have been brought against the Government on two previous occasions also, but they collapsed for want of requisite support."

Mr. M. R. Masani and Mr. P. K. Deo spoke on behalf of the Swatantra Party in the debate. Mr. Masani's speech on the opening day of the debate was received with plaudits both within the House and outside. Leading national dailies variously described his performance as "outstanding", "excellent" and so on.

One of Europe's leading papers the *Neue Zurcher Zeitung* front paged its report on the No-Confidence debate in its issue of August 27.

The following is a translated extract from that report:

"The best opposition contribution came from Minoo Masani, the secretary general of the liberal-conservative Swatantra Party. He attacked, in particular, Nehru's economic policy in an exceedingly violent but solidly grounded speech. He said that the government was throttling the economy by its system of licences and controls. He quoted a remark of the Minister of Heavy Industry, Subramaniam, who recently admitted in a public speech that in India to-day an industrialist is obliged to waste the greater part of his working time in fighting against red tape or to discover subterfuges with a view to circumvent it. Masani pointed out that corruption will persist in the country as long as the executive power tried to control and direct all of economic life. Masani stated, furthermore, that Nehru's socialism had so far not helped the hungry masses at all and that it can only

lead to the gradual establishment of state capitalism in the country. There was, however, one point in which Masani departed from his former attitude, a fact that everybody noticed: so far he had always condemned any kind of planning; this time he said that he had nothing against planning as long as it kept within reasonable bounds. These bounds, however, had long been overstepped.

The communists voted against the motion of no-confidence but, with an eye to their constituents, they did not want to abstain completely from joining the critics, so they concentrated their attacks on the Minister of Agriculture, S. K. Patil, and the Minister of Finance, Morarji Desai. They called these two ministers reactionaries and asked for their exclusion from the government. Patil who, economically speaking, is nearer to Masani than to Nehru, reacted in the most violent speech that has ever been made in Parliament by any of Nehru's ministers."

While the full text of his speech has been printed as a booklet entitled "Time for a Change" a few extracts have been included in this issue. Similarly, extracts from Mr. P. K. Deo's address have been included.

We have also reproduced extracts from speeches by our MPs during discussions on other matters, received by this office. (All extracts in Annexure B)

PARLIAMENTARY GROUP OFFICE-BEARERS

The Swatantra Party's Parliamentary Group, which met in New Delhi on August 13 under the presidency of its Leader Prof. N. G. Ranga, elected Mr. M. R. Masani Deputy Leader of the Group in the Lok Sabha.

Mr. P. K. Deo and Sardar Kapur Singh were elected Secretaries.

In the Rajya Sabha, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel continues as Leader with Prof. Ruthnaswamy as Deputy Leader. Mr. Loknath Misra is the Secretary of the Group in the Upper House.

GENERAL SECRETARY ABROAD

Mr. M. R. Masani, General Secretary of the Party, left for Switzerland on September 2 to attend the Annual Conference of the Liberal International of which he is an Honorary Patron. After participating in this Conference, Mr. Masani will proceed to New York to attend the International Management Conference on September 16 as one of the delegates representing the All India Management Association. Mr. Masani will present to the Conference a paper on "The Evolving Pattern of Relations between Government and Free Enterprise".

"USURPATION"

Writing in *Swarajya* of August 17, Rajaji, drawing attention to the unfortunate practice of the Prime Minister, and not the President, unfurling the National Flag states: "Once again, I declare, on Independence Day, it is the President who should, on behalf of the State, unfurl the flag and receive the salute from the armed forces at Red Fort—not the

Prime Minister who holds his office by being the leader of the majority party. It is an usurpation however often it may be repeated. It is a dangerous ambiguity leading to one party statism."

To reinforce Rajaji's protest, Prof. N. G. Ranga stayed away from the flag-hoisting ceremony at Red Fort performed by the Prime Minister on Independence Day.

AGAIN MR. KAIRON

Five Opposition members of Parliament, including Mr. Dahyabhai Patel of our Party, waited in deputation on President Radhakrishnan and demanded that a judicial inquiry be ordered into the allegations of corruption and misrule against the Punjab Chief Minister, Mr. Pratap Singh Kairon.

Later, in a talk to pressmen, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel said that they had requested the President to order an inquiry under the Commission of Inquiry Act, but, as a first step, they demanded that the Chief Minister resign so that the atmosphere in the State might improve. Actually the deputation was sparked off by the Supreme Court's ruling in the case of a civil servant of Punjab in which the Chief Minister had come under severe strictures. In a majority judgement, the Supreme Court stated, inter alia, that the civil servant's dismissal was vitiated by *mala fide* motives; that the dominant motive appeared to be the fact that the civil servant had incurred the Chief Minister's wrath and that the Chief Minister and Mrs. Kairon had not chosen to state on oath the true facts according to them.

The matter was also the subject of an adjournment motion on the state of administration in the Punjab in the Lok Sabha. Prof. Ranga, supporting the motion, said that the Chief Minister had obviously violated his oath of loyalty to the Constitution and that, therefore, the Centre had a special responsibility to discharge.

He sought the Speaker's permission to table before the House a copy of the Supreme Court's judgement. He said the country should not get an impression that, like the Prime Minister, the Parliament was also trying to shield the Chief Minister. The motion was, however, rejected by the Speaker.

THE HIGH COST OF A MINISTERSHIP

The *Hindustan Times* of August 10 quotes an interesting PTI Report on a clash that took place between Mr. K. Hanumanthaiya, a former Chief Minister of Mysore, and the West Bengal Congress leader, Mr. Atulya Ghosh over the means adopted by Congressmen to acquire position. The incident occurred at a meeting of the AICC on August 10. The report states:

"Mr. Hanumanthaiya said that he had heard that a Chief Minister had attained his position by 'spending a few lakhs.' He had also heard that, if one could spend a few crores, one could even become Prime Minister.

"Mr. Ghosh, interrupting Mr. Hanumanthaiya, asked: 'Who told you?'

"Mr. Hanumanthaiya: 'I will tell you privately. You know it already.'

"Mr. Ghosh insisted on the disclosure of the identity of the person. Several members also demanded that either Mr. Hanumanthaiya withdraw his allegation or disclose his informant.

"Later, Mr. Ghosh walked up to the dais. He was seen animatedly discussing his point of order with the Congress President, Mr. Sanjivayya.

"A few minutes later, Mr. Sanjivayya told Mr. Hanumanthaiya that Mr. Ghosh would like him either to disclose the name or withdraw his charge.

"Mr. Hanumanthaiya replied that he had said what he had heard. "I would rather go out of the Congress than withdraw," he said.

Mr. Sanjivayya then intervened to say that Mr. Hanumanthaiya could not make statements from hearsay. As the member was not withdrawing his statement, he directed its expunction from the AICC records."

THE PRESIDENT ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

In the context of the constant ideological experiments indulged in by the ruling party, the latest example being the proposed 17th Amendment Bill, the following remarks by the President, during his address to the Nation on the eve of Independence Day this year, makes interesting reading:

"But agriculture does not expand rapidly. We have tried by different means to increase our agricultural output and, in the third five-year Plan, we aim at attaining self-sufficiency in foodgrains. This self-sufficiency can be achieved not by shouting slogans, but by a very determined effort on the part of our people. Fertilizers, better seeds and adoption of modern implements are the *only* ways by which the output can be raised. *This depends on wise leadership and administrative efficiency.* (Italics our's).

NEWS FROM THE STATES

BOMBAY

The Bombay Executive Committee has been re-constituted. The following are its Office-Bearers:

President: Mr. N. Dandekar, *Vice Presidents:* Mr. Piloo Mody and Dr. (Mrs.) Shantabai Gulabchand, *General-Secretary:* Mr. Madhu N. Mehta, *Joint-Secretary:* Mr. B. K. Mistry, *Treasurer:* Dr. R. C. Cooper.

Six Sub-Committees have been formed. Mr. N. Dandekar, is Convenor of the Advisory Sub-Committee, Mr. Shantilal Thar, Convenor Finance Sub-Committee, Mrs. Sosan Panday, Convenor Public Relations Sub-Committee, Mr. P. S. Koppikar, Convenor Programmes Sub-Committee, Mr. K. B. Mohite, Convenor Constituency Sub-Committee, and Mr. Girish Munshi, Convenor Civic Grievances Sub-Committee.

Professor P. J. Shroff, Mr. Piloo Mody, Mr. K. B. Mohite, and Mr. Fred Fernandes continue as convenors for the Colaba, Walkeshwar, Mazagoan and Bandra Units.

The Party Office held various functions. A symposium on the Continuation of the Emergency was held, presided over by Mr. Madhu N. Mehta.

Amongst the various speakers, Mr. Mahinder Lall in a brilliant speech explained the causes of Chinese aggression and said they would only quit if force were applied. Unless rigorous military preparations were made and an Alliance with the Western Powers formed, as to-day no country can fight a war alone, the Emergency in the context of War had no meaning. Mrs. S. Athaide, said that in practice it seemed as if the Government had accepted the conquest of parts of Indian territory as a 'fait accompli'. The Emergency it seemed was used more as a lever to give vent to their pet dogmas. Mr. Girish Munshi averred that the Emergency must remain, as China sitting on the borders and faced with her population and food problem would be tempted to strike again. Mr. S. V. Raju stressed that to-day the conditions of the Sino-Indian conflict were the same as they were in 1954, when the Chinese had first made

inroads into Indian territories and hence there was no justification for the Emergency to continue.

Mr. Narayan Rao Jagtap, an old veteran of the freedom movement and now an active Swatantra Party worker unfurled the Party flag on Independence Day. Later Dr. Mrs. Shantabai Gulabchand addressed the gathering.

Mr. R. C. Khanna and Mr. R. V. Murthy addressed a public meeting on 'Politics and Propaganda'. Mr. Murarji Vaidya presided.

Mr. R. C. Khanna addressing the gathering said: Most humans are irrational, guided and motivated by their impulses. The Communists have understood this thoroughly and within each country they have a superb organisation, which studies the various problems and then exploit them by appealing to peoples' emotions to propagate their own dogmas. Marxism has always been interpreted in the day to day conditions. Mr. R. C. Khanna stressed that the Western Democratic countries had not been as forceful as the Communists in their propaganda.

Mr. R. V. Murthy said, the Swatantra Party was the first in this country to advertise and explain the Party Manifesto through paid advertisements in the Press. The Congress followed suit, but by merely publishing a portrait of Nehru, with an exhortation to 'follow the leader'.

Mr. Murarji Vaidya said propaganda cannot be divorced from truth and reality if it has to build a lasting effect.

Professor P. J. Shroff, addressed a meeting on 'The impact of Government's economic policies on labour.' He said deficit financing, heavy taxes and the Compulsory Deposit Scheme had adversely affected the economic development of the country. Industrial unrest and strikes had resulted in increased loss of man-days. From an average of 30,000 man-hours per month it had now shot up to 1,21,000.

Mrs. Shantabai Gulabchand, presiding over the meeting said that trade unions today were controlled by political parties. Conciliation, mediation and arbitration should be the means to settle labour-management differences.

The Bandra Unit Cultural League has opened various Fair Price Stalls. Mr. Fred Fernandes, Mrs. Arthus Santos, and Mr. Fian Hodges have been actively connected with the venture.

DELHI

Sapru House was the venue of a packed public meeting on August 14 addressed by Rajaji, Acharya Kripalani, Prof. N. G. Ranga, Mr. M. R. Masani and Col. H. R. Pasricha. Rajaji in his speech described the Kamaraj Plan as a "theatrical performance." He compared the proposition of Ministers being drafted to work for the Party like a government servant getting a job with a commercial firm.

Prof. Ranga said that Congress defeats in the recent by-elections were the beginning of the end of Congress rule in this country. Mr. Masani, who also referred to the recent by-elections, opined that the defeat of the Congress was an indication of the craving of the people for a good and clean administration.

Acharya Kripalani made a strong plea for an united front against the Congress. He said that it was the fault of the opposition parties to have allowed the Congress to govern the country on a minority vote.

Presiding over the meeting, Col. Pasricha blamed the Government for the rising prices and high cost of living on the heavy taxation imposed both by the Centre and by the States.

The Swatantra Club gave a reception to Mr. Masani on his Rajkot victory. Prof. Ranga, Thakur Yashpal Singh, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, Sardar Kapur Singh and other members of Parliament were present on the occasion.

Meanwhile, an earlier report from the Delhi Unit has referred to the good progress being made by the Party's Hindi weekly, *Lok Bharati*.

A workers meeting of Karolbagh Zone was held on July 21 at the residence of Mr. A. C. Bisaria, the State General Secretary. Col. Pasricha exhorted the workers to create a sense of dedication for the cause of the Party. A similar meeting was held on July 31.

MYSORE

The Malleswaram Constituency Unit of the Party in Mysore is doing good work. The Unit reports brisk enrolment of members, including Life Members. The validity of Swatantra criticism of various policies of the Government is now realised by the people who are being ground by high taxation and rising prices, on the one hand, and the CDS, on the other, states a report received by the Central office.

Mr. G. K. Sundaram and Mr. S. S. Mariswamy, Vice-President and General Secretary respectively, of the Tamilnad Unit of the Party were invited to address four public meetings in different areas of Bangalore City. The meetings were well attended and the Party's point of view ably put forward by the visiting speakers.

ORISSA

Five satyagrahis of the Swatantra Party arrested for defying Sec. 144 on July 14 started a hunger strike on July 24 protesting against the maltreatment and inadequate diet in Bolangir Central Jail. A

sympathetic hunger strike was staged on the morning of July 25 by Krishna Chandra Panda, Chairman, Bolangir Municipality, and 14 other Swatantra Party workers in various parts of the town to protest against inadequate supply of meals to satyagrahis by the Central Jail authorities. The sympathetic strike was called off after official assurance had been given of proper treatment to satyagrahis. Meanwhile, the satyagrahis in jail were being fed by raising subscription in public quarters.

PUNJAB

Representatives of democratic opposition parties in the State have agreed to the formation of a united front to agitate against growing corruption and crippling taxation and the curtailment of the Fundamental Rights of the people.

An all-party meeting held for the purpose laid down the scope of the united front leaving participants free to propagate and carry on their respective programmes and policies.

On August 23, a meeting of the United Front of Opposition was held in Chandigarh under the presidency of Ch. Devi Lal. Sardar Basant Singh of our Party was chosen as one of the two General Secretaries. The United Front organised a huge procession in New Delhi on August 14.

RAJASTHAN

Over 24 public meetings in the various towns and villages of Tonk District were addressed by the President of the State Unit, Mr. Laxman Singh, Mr. Jai Singh, Mr. Ayuwan Singh Joint Secretary of the Party, Mr. Jai Narain, MLA, Mr. Radha Krishna Goyal, MLA, Mr. Digvijay Singh, MLA, and Mr. Devraj, Pradhan of Niwai Panchayat Samiti who had accompanied the State President during the tour.

A report received from the State Unit estimates that over 60,000 people must have heard the speeches ranging from an enunciation of the Party's philosophy and programme to a criticism of the Government's policies.

Organisationally, the tour resulted in the formation of an *ad hoc* District Committee for Tonk with Mr. Jai Singh as President.

The Jaipur District *ad hoc* Committee met on July 7 when the progress of the Party's work in the district was reviewed. The meeting decided to establish offices in all Legislative Assembly Constituencies of the district and the Party's MLAs were asked to tour their constituencies and send monthly reports to the State Office.

The Party's workers in Alwar District met at a meeting under the Presidency of Mr. Ayuwan Singh. An *ad hoc* Committee for the District was formed with Mr. B. L. Mahawal as Convenor. Mr. Ayuwan Singh subsequently toured numerous villages in the districts of Alwar and Jaipur.

Mr. Udai Lal Bardia, the Party's MLA from Salumbar, Mr. Balchand Daga from Kishangarh and Mr. Chothmal from Bhinai toured their respective constituencies helping villagers with their problems.

The workers of Banera Tehsil Bassi met on July 28 with Mr. Devi Singh presiding to discuss organisational matters.

ANNEXURE A

A report of speeches delivered on the occasion of the Southern States' Convention

MR. M. K. NAMBYAR

Inaugurating the Southern States' Conference, Mr. Nambyar said with the passing of the Bill into law, legislatures would have uncontrolled power over all landed property in the country.

Mr. Nambyar, whose advocacy before the Supreme Court against the Kerala Agrarian Relations Act resulted in its being struck down, said a legislature could pass any Act taking away the property of a political rival and hand it over to anyone of its choice.

Mr. Nambyar said Article 31-A, which was sought to be amended, did not exclude even urban properties from its tentacles. If any land or building came within the definition of "Estate", Article 31-A would operate and deny the citizens the Fundamental Rights. Lands even in large towns are held under ryotwari pattas, and any urban property would not then be saved from arbitrary legislation, he cautioned.

Acts of expropriation and confiscation, acts directly transferring one man's estate to another and other similar partial, arbitrary and discriminatory exertions of legislative power would be absolutely immune from challenge in the courts of law. The Bill would then transform a government of laws into a government of men, uncontrolled and absolute, he declared.

Mr. Nambyar said under the new Article, no law providing for the acquisition by the State of any estate or the taking over the management of any property by the State for a limited period either in public interest or in order to secure the proper management or the amalgamation of two or more corporations or the extinguishment or modification of any rights of managing agents, secretaries or treasurers, etc. of corporations or the extinguishment or modification of mineral rights shall be deemed to be void on the ground that it abrogated or abridged Articles 14, 19 or 31.

After the Fourth Amendment came into operation, Mr. Nambyar said, any person could be deprived of his property, if a law was enacted for the purpose. If, on the other hand, it was to be acquired, the Government was under no obligation to pay its market value. In a Welfare State, the welfare of the citizen was the welfare of the State; and the border line between private benefit and public purpose was becoming thinner every day, Mr. Nambyar said and added, whatever results in benefit or advantage to the public had been said to be a public purpose. Even acquisition of lands for a company manufacturing refrigerators had been held to be a public purpose! "Public Purpose" had ceased to be an effective safeguard against arbitrary acquisition, he said.

Drawing the attention of the people to the iniquities of the Fourth Amendment, Mr. Nambyar said the definition "Estate" applied to every species of landed property that could be called so by law. In Bombay, every yard of land was an Estate! In the name of agrarian reform, he said, the lands of a citizen in excess of an arbitrary ceiling were wrested and given

away, sometimes to the landless and sometimes to others, paying little or no compensation.

Mr. Nambyar said that none of the ceiling Acts which had come to the Supreme Court, could be effectively scrutinised because of the bar of Article 31-A. It was at that stage the Kerala Agrarian Relations Act came up before the Supreme Court. One of the two petitions related to ryotwari land; and ryotwari land in the erstwhile Madras State, now forming part of Kerala, could not come under the definition of "estate" in Article 31-A. For the first time, the veil covered by Article 31-A was pierced. The Kerala Act had also received Presidential assent. But when the Supreme Court examined its provisions, it felt that the Act must be struck down.

Mr. Nambyar said the proposed 17th Amendment was the Government's answer to the Supreme Court decision. What the Bill purported to do, Mr. Nambyar pointed out, was to bring the Ryotwari Lands (transferred from the State of Madras to Kerala) within the fold of an estate, and thus within the bar of Article 31-A. To call the ryotwari lands an estate was a contradiction in terms. "The Bill seeks to secure immunity to legislative measures relating to land situated anywhere in India from any challenge under the Fundamental Rights," he added.

Mr. Nambyar said that the party in power wanted to have its stranglehold over all the lands in India, for absolute and unquestioned disposition, undeterred by Fundamental Rights and unhampered by judicial review.

Mr. Nambyar concluded with the warning: "No Land Act made by any Legislature after the Bill becomes part of the fundamental law, however harsh, oppressive or unjust, however arbitrary in application, discriminatory in operation or confiscatory in effect, could ever be touched by a Court of Law, nor injury caused thereby, however grave, ever be redressed."

MR. V. P. MENON

Earlier, welcoming the delegates, Mr. V. P. Menon, Chairman of the Reception Committee, said if the people did not fight against the proposed Amendment, the alternative left to them was serfdom under the Government.

If the amendment became law the peasant's farm or the urban land owners site can be taken away similarly, on payment of nominal compensation. The affected would be mostly people of the middle class, and they and their dependants numbered half the population. In Kerala alone, three million families would be deprived of "the last vestige of their rights" and turned into 'serfs', Mr. Menon added.

Mr. Menon warned that if the villagers were going to be enslaved the townsmen could not expect to escape serfdom.

He pointed out that Ministers, when criticised often said that people must keep quiet because of the danger from China. That was a misuse of the emergency. "If we keep quiet in the face of injustice, what

happens to democracy?" If our liberty and democracy were lost in the process, there was no point in our fighting the Chinese, he added.

MR. K. R. KARANTH

Mr. K. R. Karanth, in his presidential address said nobody need have any objection to socialism if it were to be conditioned to the character of the people. But in the present brand of Congress socialism, there was more of politicking and party aggrandisement than social welfare of the masses.

What is the use of socialism when people are prepared to defy the moral law, he asked.

Mr. Karanth, quoting from the speech of the Congress President, Mr. Sanjivayya, said 90 per cent of Congressmen lacked integrity, and were roaming about like a giant exploiting the people.

Mr. Karanth said there was greater corruption in the Mysore Ministry than anywhere else.

Describing the 17th Amendment of the Constitution as a controversial measure of doubtful intentions, Mr. Karanth said this measure would neither ensure the security of tenure nor would it make the ryot the freeholder of the land.

True, the people must respect the Constitution. But when the ruling party treated it as a scrap of paper, for its own purposes, how can there be any respect, he asked. He also attacked the Gold Control Order and said if the Government were to sincerely feel that there was emergency in the country, it should not have brought such contentious measures during the period of emergency.

He asked the Government not to bring such controversial measures during the period of emergency; else, the Government must be prepared to face the electorate on these issues, namely, the 17th Amendment of the Constitution, the Gold Control Order and the capacity to face the enemy.

PROF. N. G. RANGA

The heaviest artillery of the day against the 17th Amendment came from Prof. N. G. Ranga who declared that the Nehru Government was going the Lenin way in dealing with land problems by all kinds of surreptitious measures. Describing the Amendment as "the baby of the Communists fathered by the Congress," he asserted that the Government could never lay its cankerous hands on the ryotwari rights.

Explaining the consequences of the Amendment when passed, Prof. Ranga said once the Government was vested with the power of acquiring property, it would have little or no hurdles to bulldoze the very principle of property ownership (guaranteed by the Constitution) to achieve its objective of collective farming. The ryots, afterwards, would be left with the lone vicious choice either to join the collective farm surrendering their lands or to rest content with the little compensation the Government might dole out by instalments.

Mr. Ranga continued that not only the small peasantry and the agricultural labour but the urban lands as well would come under the mischief of this measure.

Warning the people against this impending danger, Mr. Ranga called upon them to be prepared to resist

this sinister move of the Government either through constitutional methods or through direct action if need be. "We must be ready to launch an agitation on the lines of the Bardoli Satyagraha then led by Sardar Patel," he added.

MR. JINARAJA HEGDE

Mr. K. B. Jinaraja Hegde, Chairman of the Mysore State unit of the Party, moving the resolution, appealed to lawyers to take greater interest in this legislative measure. Explaining the implications of the Bill, he said it was a sweeping one.

MR. RAMACHANDRA REDDI

Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddy, vice-president of the All-India Agriculturists' Federation seconding the resolution, said that while the Bill had no "reasons" at all, its "objective" was to annihilate society. Their's was not a socialistic pattern of society but a Communist one. With every piece of legislation, the Planning Commission did some brain-washing. The country reeked with corruption. They had to fight the Bill and the campaign had already started in the Andhra Pradesh, he added.

MR. RAGHAVA MENON

Mr. R. Raghava Menon, a Congress legislator and president of the Kerala Small Landholders' Association, accused the Government of bringing forward "a highly bureaucratic, undemocratic, antediluvian and inhuman" Bill which, he thought only the Communists wanted. It was an example of the socialistic pattern of society fashioned at Avadi, he remarked. The Kerala people were ready to fight it, he announced.

MR. J. M. IMAM

Mr. J. M. Imam, a former State Minister and M.P., thought the policy of the Prime Minister and the Planning Commission, was to make the ground fertile for Communism and in this direction land legislation was the first step. The curse of the country was poverty aggravated by high taxation and inflation. The external danger could be met by strength and confidence, he said and likened the internal one to the Damocles Sword. Mr. Imam claimed the Swatantra Party was a party of poor people because they did not exploit others. The Congress and the Communist Party had lowered the level of existence of the people and the future was dark, he warned.

MR. G. LATCHANNA

According to Mr. G. Latchanna, socialism was implanted in the country after the death of Mahatma Gandhi and Sardar Patel. He challenged Prime Minister Nehru to declare by Marxism if he is sincere and honest about his professions.

RAJAJI

In a thirty-minute address, Mr. Rajagopalachari attacked socialism and co-operation, as understood

and practised today, as unsuited to our genius. He declared: "I am not for socialism because it is a method which will not produce the objectives which you want. Now it involved the compulsion of all people in the country to work under the orders of the State. The State laid down what one should do. It is more correct to say that socialism was Statism, an ugly word. We do not want Statism."

To him Panchayat Raj and co-operation were goondaraj. They would not work in this country because the moral standards had fallen. If co-operation had succeeded in other countries it was because people there were honest and diligent. "Have co-operative societies if you want deceit and exploitation," he said.

According to Mr. Rajagopalachari his worst fears about the Fundamental Rights had come true. As a member of the Constituent Assembly and outside it he had opposed inscription of these Rights in the Constitution because the Parliament had the right to alter them. But he was told they would not be changed. The example of the American and other Constitutions were cited. But now after this (the Bill before the Parliament), the entire chapter could be scrapped, he said.

He said the Prime Minister might try to convince the people that the Government might not exercise its powers under the legislative measure which only empowered the Government to acquire property.

"Are we to live in a free country in suspense and doubt about our freedom," he asked and added that under the proposed amendment every scrap of land held under any tenure would come under the definition of 'estate', giving power to the Government to acquire at any time and at any compensation to be settled by itself.

Caught in a quandary after the judgment of the Kerala High Court that the land reform law, which did not include ryotwari, the Government was bent on getting it through against the will of the people. The Supreme Court held that the word "estate" did not cover lands under in ryotwari system. The Union Law Department made a "clever and ingenious" discovery by defining "estate" by a new law covering all the 122 pieces of legislation in the country, he said.

Only lawyers could understand all this but the Government knew lawyers would not agitate and the generality of people was ignorant. So the Government could get away with it, he said. He, therefore, endorsed Mr. Ranga's suggestion of overwhelming the Government by "protest post-cards".

Referring to the talk of socialism, Mr. Rajagopalachari said Gandhiji also wanted socialism but by moral pressure only. Socialism by compulsion, as understood today, would not bring about the declared welfare of the people.

Touching on co-operation, he said co-operative farming would lead to exploitation. Unfortunately, the Government borrowed words from the dictionary and from other countries. Co-operation has created avarice. It would be good if it was introduced gradually, he advised.

Mr. Rajagopalachari thought if an individual was given a piece of land with a share in its income he would manage it properly. It would not be so if it

was handled by officers or an organisation. So nobody would be secure if the new Bill were passed, he said.

The Government of a party that outlived its usefulness was the worst form of tyranny. People had turned apathetic. But the new Bill struck at the root of the liberty and security of the people, the Swatantra leader said and called on the people to wage a fight against the Bill.

Resolution

Whereas the 17th Amendment to the Constitution Bill is neither sanctioned by a mandate from the electorate nor circulated for their opinion;

Whereas the Bill is highly controversial and explosive in nature and therefore prejudicial to the defence efforts and declared emergency;

Whereas the Bill seeks with retrospective effect from 26th January 1950, to legalise a fraud on the Constitution;

Whereas the Bill seeks to get over the judgement of the Supreme Court of India, an independent arm of the State, and expose the institution of property to the perils and dangers of absolutism and despotism, thereby undermining the freedom enshrined in our Constitution;

Whereas the Bill seeks to nullify the fundamental rights contained in article 14, 19 and 31 by making justice and compensation discretionary of the Executive and non-justiciable in a manner repugnant to Democracy and long established notions of natural justice;

Whereas the Bill seeks to extend the interpretation of "public purpose" to cover doctrinaire experiments in land reforms establishing Statism and complete annihilation of self-employed peasantry in the country with a view to establish collectivism in agriculture and condemn the owners of land of serfdom on their own land leading to disaster as in China.

Whereas the spirit of constitutional liberty enshrined in article 14, 19 and 31 of the Constitution is in peril;

Whereas the land reform Acts which are to be saved by the 17th Amendment to the Constitution are going to result, if brought into force, in (a) the uprooting of tenants, (b) economic ruin of land holders who have leased out lands, (c) splitting up of holdings, (d) wasteful administrative expenditure, (e) increased litigation, (f) curtailment of production, (g) heavy financial burdens on the State, and (h) increased and widespread corruption;

This conference of the representatives of Southern States requests the Parliament of the country to drop the measure and calls upon the people, if the Government persists in it, to oppose this Bill by every constitutional means.

READ

Time for a Change

By

MINOO MASANI

Price 20 nP.

A SWATANTRA PARTY PUBLICATION

Swatantra in Parliament

The No-Confidence Motion in the Lok Sabha

M. R. MASANI

The Government's policy, broadly, is one of socialism at home and non-alignment abroad. Let us examine dispassionately to what extent these objectives have succeeded during the last fifteen years. Socialism, I take it and the House will agree with me, means moving towards a more prosperous, a more free and a more equal society, an objective with which I am hundred per cent in agreement. But to what extent has this objective been furthered during the last fifteen years? Is there more prosperity in this country today?

Are people more free or equal? I would venture to say not. People are tied up in a mass of red-tape. All classes are subject to bureaucratic exploitation. Businessmen have to make trips to Delhi in aeroplanes, while the poor peasant has to walk or go by bus to the taluka headquarters to get some wretched form filled or completed.

And Government employees? Their rights have been truncated. Two attempts have been made in this House to take away their right to strike, which is a fundamental right in a free society. We on this side unitedly opposed those attempts. Today, I venture to say that the misuse of the Defence of India Rules in Bombay in a labour dispute is a shame and a crying shame on this country. Rules which were made to fight the enemy, the Chinese, are being used against patriotic Indian workers who have the right to ask for a higher dearness allowance and to go on strike if no redress or arbitration is offered to them.

Instead of creating employment, this Government has created more unemployment. I refer to the Gold Control Order. It has thrown lakhs of capable, decent people in this country out of a job and on to the streets. Nothing in my month of campaigning in Rajkot was as sad as going into a shop and finding a man looking utterly desolate, with nothing in the shop. I would ask him what was wrong, and he said: *Hu soni chhu. Barbad thai gaya*. He was in utter despair and helpless. This is a new proletariat you have created in this country. Lakhs and lakhs of good people with nowhere to go. You are crucifying them on a cross of gold. And for what purpose? Because Shri Morarji Desai, the Finance Minister, says that hoarding of gold must be stopped, smuggling of gold must be stopped. This is not the way to stop it. It is a meaningless and perverse measure. So long as your rupee is debased, so long as the rupee note in your pocket is worth 20 nP, you cannot stop people hoarding gold, land or anything which has got real and intrinsic value. It is your inflationary policies, your spoiling the money of this country and debasing it into a false coin that makes gold sell at a premium. It has nothing to do with social habits and being reactionary. In any part of the world, destroy the currency and you will get people hoarding gold or land or anything which they think to be a better standard of value. If people in India hoard gold today, they are being good economic animals. They are

patriotic and decent people who know that their money is worthless and that gold has worth today and will have worth in 25 years.

So, one comes to the conclusion that all this talk of socialism, however well-intentioned it may have been, has been a cover for setting up State Capitalism and bureaucracy, benefiting a new class and exploiting the mass of people.

Let us now turn to international relations and defence. Is the record any better? Non-alignment has been our key word.

Panchsheela and co-existence are good. But you cannot co-exist with those who do not believe in co-existence with you. Mao Tse-tung had made his intentions perfectly clear in a hundred quotations that he did not believe in neutrality or in co-existence. We went and signed a panchsheel pact with him. You can sign a panchsheel pact with an honest man but you cannot sign a pact with a bandit regime, which is what you are dealing with.

If I may say so, what has been wrong with the Government's foreign policy, which has invited disaster and defeat on our country, is its failure to recognise the nature of international communism.

... there is the resiling from the Voice of America agreement, the latest example of fear. This war is not a military war; it is a military and psychological war. It is a war of propaganda also; every communist war is a propaganda war. So, propaganda is as important as military force. The people on our tribal borders today are exposed to a flood of anti-Indian and communist propaganda from China. They have transistor sets in large numbers. Our short wave stations in Gauhati and Delhi cannot reach them. A medium-wave station is required. Our Government rightly looked for a medium wave station. They took the only one that they could find available in a reasonably short time. There was nothing unusual about it.

Why have they resiled from an agreement properly entered into? Because of a belated discovery that it violated the concept of non-alignment! All I can say is that, if the architect of non-alignment could not see that there was something wrong with this agreement in terms of non-alignment, then that very word has lost its meaning because, as Shri Kripalani pointed out, we cannot have non-alignment in our own war. We cannot be neutral against ourselves. We are not going to help anyone; we are asking for help. We are not obliging anyone by taking the transmitter.

On the eve of this debate, a red-herring has been trailed across our path. We are told today: "everything will be different because of the Kamaraj Plan." I fail to understand —

Mr. Tyagi: Your party may do the same.

Mr. M. R. Masani: I would like to follow that; yes, for my party but not for the nation. I fail to understand how bad government, delays in government and corruption, can be removed by the Kamaraj plan. As I understand it, it is a plan to salvage the Congress Party from the mess into which it has got. God knows they need it. I wish them well. But how does it strengthen the administration to take away some good and competent senior Congressmen and put them in charge of the party? It is putting the party

before the State which is a wrong thing — putting the party before the country. Certainly, you strengthen the party; there is nothing wrong with it. Every party would like to strengthen itself. But how does it strengthen the Government? How will it create less corruption if four Cabinet ministers resign and four other Congressmen come in their place?

Sir, there are many good people in the Congress Party, many patriots, both in the House and outside. I want to make an appeal to them before I sit down. The Kamaraj plan is not an answer to what the country wants. I appeal to them to assert themselves and save the country. Let me concede, Sir, that for the next three years it is easier for them to save the country than anyone on this side because of the fact that this Parliament is constituted as it is. We have no ambition to form a Government. Let the Congress Party assert itself as others have done, as the Conservative Party did in the time of Chamberlain, and choose a new government from their own ranks. Let them create a government that will make a fresh start — with no pre-conceptions, with a pragmatic approach, without doctrinaire conceptions with all the background that is behind it. Let them provide the country with a clean, decent government, and then I offer from those on this side that we will give them a hundred per cent support for defeating the Chinese and driving them from our soil. The whole country will rally round such a Government if they will set things right. There are many Congressmen who, I think, would respond to my plea. Let them take up courage and say to their leaders who are today in office: "You have done your best. You have had a long innings. You have done the best within your capacity. It is time for a change. The times require new ideas, new leadership, from within the Party. Please step aside, and let a new Congress Government be found."

MR. P. K. DEO

It is a unique occasion to see the Council of Ministers in the dock, replying to the various charges made by the Opposition. We feel that, whatever may be the outcome of the voting, it will have the desired effect of correcting the Government and creating healthy conventions for posterity.

Many speakers have pointed out from this side that the Government has failed in its policies at home and abroad. A persistent pursuit of a policy of platitude and appeasement in foreign relations has brought us to this mess. In spite of our condemnation of colonialism in other parts of the world, we were the first to put our scale of approval on the colonisation of Tibet by China.

Some Hon. Members: Shame.

Shri P. K. Deo: We are the persons who approved of the individuality, the sovereignty, the culture and religion of Tibet being sacrificed at the altar of Hindi Chini Bhai Bhai. Thousands of Tibetans were butchered and thousands were subjected to cruel torture, and I charge the Government of being abettors in the genocide.

... I would like to state here that when El Salvador raised the question of Tibet in the Steering Committee of the General Assembly of the United

Nations, it was the Jam Saheb of Nawanagar, who was the representative of India, who said that the Tibetan question would be solved most peacefully and that India stood guarantee for it.

Some Hon. Members: Shame.

Shri P. K. Deo: Then, the first cartographical aggression started, and it was followed up by naked and unprovoked aggression on this country, and today 20,000 square miles of Indian soil are under the illegal occupation of China. A party and a government which cannot defend the territorial integrity of this country has no business to rule, and I submit that they have forfeited all claims to rule this country.

After Dunkirk, what did Churchill do? He took the entire house into confidence and he placed all the cards before the Parliament. After the discussion, Mr. Churchill emerged from the House of Commons as a taller man with the reassured confidence of the nation. But here the Prime Minister hides things from the House. If the Prime Minister has no confidence in this House what capacity he has got to demand the confidence of this House. If General Henderson Brook's report is published, probably the responsibility of the reverses in Sela and Bomdila would be squarely placed on our former Defence Minister, Mr. Krishna Menon. Probably it is this reason that prompts the Prime Minister to keep the entire report a secret. Similarly Justice Das report has been kept secret and the Prime Minister throws his mantle of protection to protect his favourite Mr. K. D. Malaviya.

Somebody referred to the motley crowd in the opposition. But what is Congress today? It is an assortment of ideologically divergent groups of men in pursuit of self-interest, the common tie being fishes and loaves. The provocative speech of my hon. friend Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad makes it an imperative necessity for me to speak of corruption which has corroded the moral fibre of the nation. Persons in glass houses should not throw stones at others. How businessmen are made to part with money and expect something in return and knowingly corruption is given shelter, is released by the statement of Shri Naba Krishna Chowdhry, the former Chief Minister of Orissa and former President of the Sarva Seva Sangh.

In the Rajya Sabha

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL — August 21 '63

Madam, the House should be grateful to the Ministry of Finance for supplying this Report on the Working of Industrial and Commercial undertakings of the Central Government for the year 1961-62. But my complaint is that this Report is too brief and it lacks essential details which are very necessary. I request that instead of a little booklet like this, something larger should be produced which gave a few more statistics. Apart from the statistics, one would like to understand why it is that the public sector undertakings are failing so badly.

In about seventy-two public sector undertakings, I think the investment is of the order of Rs. 780 crores and the return is only 3 per cent. This, to my mind, is a very very great failing of the public sector undertakings. Now, this upsets our Plans, the Plans by which the Prime Minister, the Planning

Commission and the Congress Party swear so much. It was estimated that Rs. 450 crores of surplus would come for being ploughed back into the Plan from these undertakings. We are nowhere near it and, therefore, the Finance Minister has to come forward with schemes like the Compulsory Deposit scheme.

You may call it an emergency just now but even before that the high level of taxation, the excise duties that have been raised, was done only to finance the Plans, the Plans which they have decided have to be executed and because the planners failed or the management of public sector undertakings, failed, the country has been penalised. The people have been forced to bear heavier excise duties. What would happen to the management of any limited company where the failure was so glaring? But nothing can be done in this case because the people in charge of these companies are people belonging to the guaranteed service. It does not matter to them whether the undertakings are run or not.

We have also projects like the Hindustan Organic Chemicals where we went and purchased a plot of land and built buildings without the necessary know-how and also without knowing whether the project was going through and whether there was any collaboration arrangement and by the time the building was built, I would like to be corrected if I am wrong, the collaboration arrangement which was in the air failed. What would have happened to a private sector undertaking if they had tried to do something of this type? Government would insist on a licence at every stage, "Produce your licence, otherwise you do not get your iron and steel for building. You cannot get cement or bricks without a licence." Why does Government do like this? Why can't Government hold the scales even between two factories? I would like to point out that this is exactly what Mahatma Gandhi was pointing out to us when he said that he had a horror for power. He would shudder to think of giving power for the production of wealth and the power of administration of Government in the same hands because, who was then to decide what was right and what was wrong, who was to hold the scales even in disputes between labour and capital, who was to decide what was in the interests of the country and what was not.

There are many honourable exceptions. One honourable exception was mentioned by our colleague yesterday in the House. There are many others. There are honourable businessmen who would give their times for the love of the work, for the love of a type of work, for the love of a project. Mr. J. R. D. Tata continues to give hours of his time to the Air India International not because he is fond of flying, but because he thinks that the Air India International is a concern that he started and he would like that to prosper. He would like the good name that he established to continue in the world. There are many honest people like that. Why don't the Government make use of them? Especially when so many of your

projects are in the doldrums like this why don't you take their advice?

I hope the Government will listen to reasonable criticism and not, like some of the friends on the Congress benches, say that anything coming from the Swatantra Party is not right. The Swatantra Party is pointing out to you the correct way where you are wrong. Learn to correct your mistakes; or the inevitable will come.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL — August 27 '63

Madam, I feel that the debate on the Appropriation Bill is perhaps not properly timed or, in a sense, is unreal. Whether the matter is formally before the House or not, everybody who reads the newspaper knows that today more than half of the members of the Cabinet that was constituted after the General Election were out by force of public opinion; some more are about to be out for reasons of strengthening the party.

Shri Vijay Singh (Rajasthan): Madam Deputy Chairman, what we are discussing is.....

The Deputy Chairman: I am listening to his speech.

Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel: Already the members of the Congress Party feel irritated. I do not know why they feel irritated when I say this. When they do not feel irritated while reading about this in the newspapers or while hearing the harangues of the Prime Minister for hours together on this very subject, why are they feeling irritated at a little mention of this in this House?

Madam, may I also point out that the Budget was presented to Parliament on the 29th of February and while speaking on it on the 4th of March, in the early stages of my speech I made a comment and I said that the policies of the Government are decided by the Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru who cannot stand a Finance Minister very long like Blue Beard who could not stand his wife very long? I am just quoting what I said on the 4th of March while speaking on the Budget in this House. I am reminding the House how true what I said then has come, rather is about to come.

Madam, I shall be very glad if some of the policies are altered, for instance, the Gold Control Order that has raised such a storm all over the country or the Compulsory Deposit Scheme. So if they go, the Hon. Deputy Minister of Finance, if she is there in the new Cabinet, will have to come to this House again for another Appropriation because the Budget will be out of gear completely if these two points which have irritated and upset the country absolutely unnecessarily, according to me, were not in the Budget. I pointed out even in the Budget speech, and I repeat, that it was not necessary to put in these two irksome taxes. The return that the Government is going to get from them is going to be very much smaller than the expenditure to be incurred on them and the great irritation that they have caused.

(For Private Circulation)