

Speech delivered by Shri Minoo Masani, M. P. General Secretary of the Swatantra Party of India, on the 21st August, 1966, at the Auditorium of ATTRA at Ahmedabad.

541

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am very happy to respond to the invitation of the Junior Chamber to participate in this excellent programme that they have conceived and which they are carrying out with much eclat and success. Already, in the last few weeks, I have been reading in the press.

The reports of what has been going on here and I think that the Junior Chamber deserves to be congratulated on a magnificent job of public education and, if I may say so of efficient public relations.

I was favoured with the text of the speeches made by those who preceded me on this platform. They have made a very estimable contribution, but Mr. President, I hope, you will forgive me if I do not follow them in two respects. One is that I do not share with them the feeling that the more time you take, the more conviction you carry! Therefore, I propose, as the spokesman of a Party which is trying to introduce some discipline in the life of our country, to confine myself to the 45 minutes which you have been kind enough to allocate to me. That will also, Ladies and Gentlemen, put you at ease for it is an assurance that I shall not bore you for more than three-fourths of an hour!

The other respect in which I would like to depart from the previous speakers is that I do not propose to sell the Swatantra Party to you this morning. I do not propose to

make a single statement which I know to be inaccurate and if, in the course of questioning, there is criticism about my Party which I consider legitimate, you will find that I will join in it along with you. This, I believe, is not only sound morality but sound politics, especially when you are talking to intelligent people. I do not think there is very much need for me to try to sell the Swatantra Party's policies here. When you read, Mr. President, the Creed of the Junior Chamber, I was very much glad that you had copied it out from the programme of the Swatantra Party! Every single statement and sentiment there is one to which we passionately adhere. That is why, in trying to answer two questions this morning, I shall allocate the time somewhat differently from what my predecessors have done.

The two questions to which I want to address myself are these! One, has the Swatantra Party got the right ideas? Secondly, can it make the grade? Can it get anywhere? Now, I do not propose to take too much time on the first for the reasons I have already explained, but I would like to take more time on the second because, there, I think, there is need for greater conviction.

Now, what is it that the Swatantra Party stands for? You have been given copies of our Statement of Policy among other papers distributed and I do not propose to go through the Manifesto of the party clause by clause or aspect by aspect. I shall try to give you what I consider the essence of it, and leave it to you to question me, because I have agreed to stay here till 1.00 O'clock for questions so that we can have more than 1½ hours for having that kind of informal discussion in

which you can draw me out on any aspect which you think I should deal with and which you think I have not.

The Swatantra Party believes in limited Government. It believes that while Government has a role in society, there is a limit beyond which Government may not function. This is an eternal truth. We are not inventing anything new. The Bible put it by saying:

"Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's
and unto God what is God's."

God, in our context, is the conscience of the individual citizen. It is as sacred as the word of God and no Government can invade the domain of the private conscience. That great man, Abraham Lincoln, said again: "Do not try to do for the people what they can do better for themselves." This is the Creed of the Swatantra Party. Finally, Mahatma Gandhi, our own great man, at whose feet some of learnt, used to repeat over and over again the message of the Swatantra Party as it has now been developed that "that Government is best which governs the least." This is the basic philosophy of the Swatantra Party. It involves a stress on the freedom of choice of the individual; the right to reside where you like; the right to move about freely in the country and outside; the right to carry on the vocation or profession that you choose or that you may like to change from time to time; the right to have your own job or employment; the freedom of choice of the consumer to buy what he likes or to refuse to buy what he dislikes; the freedom of choice of the producer to work where he likes, invest his money where he wants, to take the risk that he wants to take; the right of the Labour to deny its labour individually and collectively by the right to strike.

These are the Fundamental Rights in which we believe, and finally, of course, the right to express oneself and to associate as one likes. I am very glad that since last few years even the Trade Unions are coming to appreciate the fact that, if there is one political party in this country that stands for the right to collective bargaining and the right to strike, that is the Swatantra Party and it is the best friend that Labour has in this country.

We do not turn our back on the State. We accept the fact that, in the twentieth century, the State has a role to play. We believe that State enterprise is a contradiction in terms. The human body is a good analogy. The different organs of the body are meant for different purposes. You cannot eat with your lungs, chew with your ears, hear with your nose, or smell with your eyes. Each organ has its own role to play. Similarly, in a society, different functions are left to different mechanisms or organisms. A farmer can produce more food, a joint stock corporation or a limited company can produce goods, a Government has to rule, to dispense justice, protect the country, give security to its people and maintain the rule of law. The Government is an umpire, it is a referee, it is a judge. It is not meant to produce either food or cosmetics or steel. It would be as absurd as asking the wrong organs of the body to do the right things. Therefore, we think that the proper business of the Government is to govern, not business. However, we are prepared to depart from that. If a Government has decided on industry, trade or commerce, let it do so. That is the mixed economy. We have no objection to the Government entering any field of enterprise as part of the mixed economy.

On one condition, and that is that it must be prepared to complete on free and equal terms with others who are in the field. It must neither have a monopoly like the Life Insurance Corporation of India or the Indian Airlines Corporation nor should it have preferential treatment like the State Trading Corporation. That we are resolutely opposed to. We do not believe that the Government has any right to dominate, control or load the dice against those citizens who may want to enter a field of enterprise. That is why, if we come to power, we will not abolish the Life Insurance Corporation or the Indian Airlines Corporation but we would certainly throw the field of air transportation and life insurance open to free competition by any citizen or citizens who want to enter those fields.

We are no more opposed to planning than we are opposed to State enterprise. We are advocates of planning. Every business is planned. Every housewife plans her home. There is nothing new about planning, but planning has become an umbrella to cover a multitude of sins. There are two kinds of planning in the world today, viz. Soviet planning which is dictatorial, and democratic planning which is called indicative planning, which has many examples like Monrt planning in France, the National Economic Development Council, called Neddy, in England. In Holland and in Belgium and other countries like Sweden, they have their own kinds of planning. The difference between Soviet planning and democratic indicative planning is that, behind one is the police power; behind the other are the suggestions which free citizens may accept or reject. There is no mechanism in France or England by which

...6...

people can be forced to conform to plan. The plan is a suggestion for those who want to follow it. If a businessman says: 'I do not believe in this plan. I think it is all wrong. You estimates are all out. You forecasts are crazy, "then he has a right to risk his capital in the way he thinks right, and there is no mechanism in France or England by which he can be bullied or forced to conform to the plan. Now, you see from what I have said that our pattern of planning is the Soviet pattern because our Planning Commission, which started as an advisory body, has now become a super-Government. Cabinet Ministers have to cringe before the Planning Commission and for that we have evidence of those who retire from the Cabinet from time to time. If suggestions become law, because of the Industries Control and Regulations Act and the various police powers of Government which are then harnessed to stop anyone from doing anything which the planners do not want. This is nothing but a command economy of the Soviet dictatorship and it has been bodily lifted from Moscow. The National Planning Commission is a translation of the Soviet word "Gostplan", which means exactly that in the Russian language. Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru got it from there. Now we have stood, from the beginning, for the dissolution of the present National Planning Commission. We think it is a disaster for this country and must be wiped out as soon as possible. It may be replaced later by purely advisory bodies of experts, such as Prof. Shenoy, who is sitting here. But they cannot have the power of making policy. The job of making policy must be with the Parliamentary executive responsible to Parliament and the people of this country.

I am very glad that certain other parties like the Jan Sangh which voted for the Five Year Plan only a few years ago, have now gradually learnt the lesson and only last month they came out for the dissolution of the Planning Commission, thus bringing their Party gradually in line with ours.

There are many things wrong with this kind of planning. Among them is the wrong order of priorities. Just as the kind of planning was taken from Moscow, so were the priorities adopted from Stalin. The priorities of the Second, Third and now the Fourth Plans are Stalinist priorities. By that I mean that they are obsessed with heavy industry at the cost of agriculture and consumer goods. There is no change in the Fourth Plan as it was laid before the Parliament a few months ago. We shall now wait to see what new outline is placed before us in the next few days.

The whole philosophy of planning, as at present followed was laid down by none other than the Planning Minister, Mr. Asoka Mehta, when he spoke to the West Bengal Business Convention on 21st March, 1964. His latest statements show no change. He, then, spoke clearly and I am grateful to him for his frankness. Mr. Mehta warned the people that there was no escape from an annual increase of a hundred crores of rupees in taxation. The severest curbs on consumption would be necessary to ensure surpluses. The present generation, (that is, all of us) which was a bridge between the stagnant present and a bright future would be trampled upon in the process. But that could not be helped". There are the words of Stalin applied to our Indian environment. This exactly was the Stalinist practice, with the result that this is one of the most execrated

memories in recent human history.

We take an entirely a different view. We see no reason for austerity. We want our people to go places and have a good life, Nothing is too good for the Indian people. The sky should be the limit. Let people be happy and enjoy themselves. We share the view of the Irish M.P. who once said in the British House of Commons before Ireland became independent: "What has posterity done for me that I should do anything for posterity?" In other words, let the future look after itself. Enough for us that the men, women and children of today have a rich and satisfying human life.

We reacted against this Stalinist order of priorities, when, Rajaji at the foundation of our Party gave us the slogan of "Farm, family and freedom". This is the reaction of those who want to help the rural masses against the ruling classes of the cities. One of the basic facts about India today is and has been now for a century that the people of cities have exploited the people of the villages. Gandhiji, who understood this and who was the greatest of our democrats, never stopped anything that the people of the villages must be given justice. He said with his dry humour that we of the cities will do everything for the people of the villages except one thing, namely "get off their backs!" Our charge is that the Nehru Government, the Shastri Government and the Gandhi Government will not get off the backs of the peasant. The new class that has come up in Delhi, following the language of Mr. Djila's book, the new class is out to squeeze the peasants dry. We want to reverse these priorities. We want to do justice to the rural people. In that sense, we are, a peasants' party.

I will not deal with devaluation here because I am speaking on this subject this evening at another place, but I shall be very glad to answer questions on this subject. I will only say that, unlike other opposition parties, the Swatantra Party is not either for or against devaluation. We think that talk about being for or against devaluation is like being for or against an operation. Nobody is for a surgical operation and nobody is against it. These are necessities that have to be faced. The question is, "why did that operation become necessary? What are the things that led to the situation where the doctor has to use the knife?" That is much more relevant. There we indict the present Government for having deliberately and perversely followed policies which could not but result in devaluation, as Prof. Shenoy to his credit had warned for many years. When a doctor warns against cancer, when a weather expert warns about the coming storm, he does not welcome it, as our opponents in the ranks of the opposition try to make out. A warning means you dislike a thing, but you point out that it will become necessary if you do not put certain things right. Well, I think, it is wellknown that some of us in Parliament and outside - nearly two years before this happened had warned that unless the policies of Government were changed, devaluation would become inevitable. We were told that we were talking nonsense, but we have been vindicated by what has happened. Here, may I say without claiming anything that is unfair, that our analysis and diagnosis of the economic situation in India since our Party came in birth in 1959 have proved correct? On every issue, where we have given warnings, where we have made pleas, what we have said has come true. This is, in our view, something that may

be remembered.

In regard to the international relations, we suffer from no sense of inferiority as most other political parties in India do. We are quite sure in our Independence. We are not frightened that the Indian people can be deprived of the Independence that we have recently gained. We are prepared to face the world on a basis of mutuality and trust. We are prepared to take foreign capital without being frightened. We are prepared to enter into foreign alliances without being frightened. We think that non-alignment was a "Himalayan blunder" in every sense of the word. This has resulted in the combination of Communist China and Pakistan against us. We believe that we should enter into healthy regional security alliances with our neighbours in South East Asia. We believe that in that regional security, India, Japan and Australia have a leading role to play. These three countries which are powerful, India, Japan, and Australia, can guarantee collective security of the whole region that lies between them. This will not only make possible the containment of Chinese Communist expansionism, but also make it possible to do so without ruinous economic burdens of taxation on our people. We see nothing wrong with such an alliance being underwritten by the Democracies of the West.

We support the war in Viet Nam. We give a hundred per cent support to President Lyndon Johnson in the bombing of Hanoi and Hyphong and we hope that the war in Viet Nam will be fought and won. We say this because we believe that the victory of freedom in Viet Nam is essential to the security of our own country. We believe that Viet Nam is defeated and occupied by the Chinese satellites from North Vietnam, soon the other countries of the region will fall. Laos, Cambodia, Thailand,

Burma, Malasia, will be wiped out and we shall be faced by a hostile combination of Communist China and its allies all the way from Karachi down to Singapore. The frontiers of India are not on the Himalayas alone but also along Mekong river, and we want that the frontiers of India wherever they are being attacked by the enemies of the country today. We, therefore, condemn unequivocally the stand of our present Prime Minister and Government, which gives nothing but aid and comfort to the enemies of our country.

We stand for the liberation of Tibet, we stand for the recognition of the Dalai Lama as the Head of a free Government of Tibet. We are humiliated at the mean and scurvy way in which he is being treated today, when his movements are being hampered, when his freedom of speech and expression is being restricted by our Government.

We believe in accepting realities. We see nothing from a realistic point of view that prevents our country recognising the existence of a friendly State in Israel. We see nothing from the view point of reality, that prevents us from recognising the existence of the Republic of China based today on the Island of Tsiwan. These are friendly countries whom we insult and repulse out of a misguided idea about what our interests demand. These are some of the things that we stand for in regard to international relations.

Now, we are sometimes called "reactionaries" for the kind of policies we are following. In that context, I am reminded of what Mr. Winston Churchill once said: "If they indulge in stupidities and crimes and if we react, they call us reactionaries!" In that sense, we are reactionaries. We react to the stupidities and crimes committed by the Government.

You have, among the papers circulated to you, our brochure "Who Is Outdated?". You will find there, in parallel columns, the programme which the Swatantra Party of India follows and the programme of the German Social Democratic Party, one of the leading Socialist parties of the world. You will be amazed to see in it the fact that the German Socialist Party's programme is nothing but a paraphrase of the programme of the Swatantra Party. Now, I am not for the moment suggesting that the German Socialists, who brought out their programme a few months after ours, copied our programme. They came to the same intelligent conclusions as ourselves because sensible people everywhere think in the same direction. We therefore, claim that we are a modern, twentieth century party of Liberation which deserves the support of young, dynamic and progressive people.

Now, I come to the second question. Some people say: "All that you say is true. We are with you; you are nice people; you have good principles; but you have not got a chance. This is a phenomenon I come across throughout India that otherwise intelligent people are completely defeatist, that they have lost hope in the common people of their country. They claim intelligence for themselves, but they deny it to the masses, our peasants and the common man. They will say: "we are with you, but the poor Indian masses are so illiterate and ignorant that they do not understand you when compared with the Communists. Therefore, you have no chance of displacing the Congress. We must be prepared to live under the Congress Government for the rest of our life and, if that is so, why should we put our hands into our pockets? Let us stay out of all that and save our necks." This, I may say, Mr. President, is the point of view of large number of otherwise intelligent and patriotic people. I would deal with

Now, let us consider the situation today, the political condition of India. I think that all of you will agree that a functioning Opposition is the need of the day. Today there is no functioning Opposition in the country. A functioning Opposition has two roles to play. One is to be vigilant critic of the government of the day. That role we are performing. The other function is to provide an alternative Government as and when the country goes to the polls. That function we are not performing, because no one political party is today in a position to say that it is in a position to get a majority in Delhi and displace the Congress Government. I am talking at the national level. Now, this failure of any political party in India to be able to provide a national alternative Government, is one of the biggest weaknesses of our Democracy today, I think, you will all agree that the prime need of the Indian political situation is the emergence of a Second Party, a second party to the Congress party, which can hope to defeat the Congress Party in the near future.

The second thing, I think you will agree with me, is that the country is sick and tired of the Congress Government. By and large, I think, it is correct to say that most people in India would like to see a change, but they don't see how to make it. In other words, it is time for a change.

Now, a very interesting letter appeared in the press recently with reference to the white cap. During my bye-election in Rajkot, the popular slogan used to be :

I find that Chamber's Twentieth Century Dictionary has a definition of white cap, whether it has gone from India or not, I do not

know. But it also fits with what the white cap stands for in India. With no disrespect to Shri Vadibhai and others who are our own friends, Chamber's Twentieth Century Dictionary says this:

"White cap is a member of a self-constituted vigilance Committee who, under the guide of purifying the morals of the community, deals violently with persons of whom they disapprove". I think the country has had enough of the white caps, in that sense of the term. If this change cannot be brought about democratically next year, then I fear we are headed for very unpleasant and ugly times. The symptoms are very clear. What happens on the floor of Parliament is one thing. What happens on the floor of Parliament is one thing. What happens in the streets of our country in the form of 'bandhs' and demonstrations is another thing.

Mr. Bhupesh Gupta made an excellent speech to you. That is his job. The Communist Party claims that lying, deceit and even murder are all legitimate in the service of the cause. The reality is the violence that the Communist Party practises, not Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's pious platitude. The Communist Party believes in violence. The Communist Party believes that violence is hundred per cent ethical and justified along with lying if it serves the cause of what they call the proletarian revolution. Their method of democracy, their method of tolerating differences of opinion which he claims exists is to show black-flags when anyone says something which is not to their taste! I can understand the anxiety of the Communist Party of India and why they are keen that I should be stopped from talking over South Viet-Nam. Otherwise, how can the poor Communists hope to take

over India? The occupation of Viet-Nam is nothing but a threat towards the Communist domination of our own country. Therefore, when some of us say we are behind the American defence of South Viet-Nam, naturally they get angry. That is understandable. But when they come to demonstrate in unconstitutional and objectionable ways, then I think we must realise the character of the enemy. The Communist Party believes that, on the day they get physical police power, they have a moral right to liquidate all opposition parties and all opposition points of view. This is something that must be remembered and that is the thing that will face this country if we do not manage democratically to change our Government.

Now, there is no reason whatsoever why this cannot be done. Our neighbours in Ceylon did exactly that in March, 1965. In March, 1965, the people of Ceylon threw out a Congress-type Government led by another lady, Mrs. Srimao Bandarnaike, and replaced it by a Swatantra-type Government led by my good friend *Mr* Sir Dudley Senanaike. It is a Liberal Democratic Government like the one we would provide. Now, if the people of Ceylon could democratically displace a Marxist Government by a Liberal Government in March, 1965, I would like to know why the people of India cannot repeat this change in February 1967, unless it is contended that we are stupid people, that the Sinhalese are a very much more intelligent or patriotic people than we are I, for one, I know the Sinhalese and I have nothing against them, but I would be inclined to discount or question the idea that we are lacking in intelligence compared to the Ceylonese.

We have the intelligence and the capacity to do it. The question is one of will.

Now, here I come to the Swatantra Party's role in helping in this historical change. Our Party's objectives for the February, 1967, elections are twofold. One is to end the Congress monopoly of power in New Delhi which has gone on for the last twenty years. I choose my words carefully. We want to end the monopoly of power enjoyed by the Congress Party for the last nineteen or twenty years. That can only be done if the strength of the Congress Party in the Lok Sabha can be reduced below two hundred fifty seats which is half the strength of the House.

Our second objective is to carry a couple of the States including - if you will co-operative with us - our own State of Gujerat. These are our two objectives. Some people tell me that they are very ambitious. But I believe that "It is not failure, but lower aim, that is a crime". I do not think that these are over ambitious targets. They are certainly not as ambitious as the targets of the Third and the Fourth Plan which are incapable of achievement!

Now, what are the qualifications of the Swatantra Party to be able to destroy the Congress majority in the Lok Sabha and to carry a couple of States including Gujarat? I would say that our qualifications, as compared with those of other Opposition parties, are three fold.

The first is that we are the only party that can provide a clear cut alternative to the philosophy and principles of the Congress Party in office, both in the domestic and international fields. We are not like the Socialist satellites. The Communist and the Socialist parties are nothing but satellites of the Congress regime. They want to push the Congress Government down into the gutter a little faster! We, on the other hand, want

to reverse the engines and take the country in a diametrically opposite direction. In that sense, we are the only Opposition party in this country and ours is the most revolutionary opposition. We want to scrap the entire domestic and international policy of the Congress Government.

Our second qualification is our National Democratic character. "National" in the sense that our roots are in this country. We have emerged from the struggle for independence. Everyone of our senior leaders had been to jail, I think, at least two or three times. We have emerged from the struggle for freedom of this country. Our roots are in the nationalism that brought this country freedom. Many of those who now talk in terms of "nationalism" were satellites or stooges of the then British Government in India, like the Communist Party. Our national democratic character is also non-denominational. There are other nationalist parties. I do not deny that. But then they are not non-denominational. We are a Party to whom religion, community, location in India are absolutely irrelevant. In our Party members of different religions, members of different communities and faiths, people from one extreme of India to the other, can feel equally at home. Generally in India the wrong word "secular" is used for this. I object to my Party being called "secular". We are not secular. We believe in religion and tradition. But we are non-denominational. That is what people mean when they talk about secularism in this country. That is our second qualification.

The third qualification is our capabilities. If there is any one Party in India which can hope to defeat the Congress Party and replace it democratically, I think, you will agree that it is the Swatantra Party. I make that claim on the basis of the quality of our leadership and the strength that we have, the self-

confidence that we have to replace the Congress Party.

But then the defeatism of the elite, of the intelligentsia, comes in our way, as I said earlier, they say: "Hopeless, the Congress Party can never be defeated. It is the Karma of this country. We must suffer till we go to doom. You people do not go to the masses. The masses are illiterate. Universal franchise will never allow a Liberal party to come to power."

Now, ladies and gentlemen, forgive me if I say that people who talk like that suffer from tremendous ignorance of the facts. Let me give you the facts because I think the intelligentsia of the country needs to be told the facts.

The facts are that the Swatantra Party is an agrarian, peasants' party. It is not the party of the businessman. If any businessman thinks that we are here to log roll for the business community, I would respectfully say "Please don't back us for that reason because we are not here to back your business interest. We are here to back the interests of the peasantry and lower middle-classes of the towns and cities."

Most people of India do not know that we do not have any urban support. It is a pity and I deplore it. Ahmedabad is an example; Bombay is another; Calcutta is the third, Delhi is the fourth. We simply do not exist as a powerful force in any of the leading cities of India where the highest intellectuals congregate. Our only strength is in the villages. Every single Member of Parliament and Assembly whom we have succeeded in electing has been elected by the votes of the farmers --- every single one of them. There is not a single urban constituency we have carried in this whole sub-continent. This is a basic fact which you must face. The peasantry of India have shown the

intelligence to vote for the Swantra Party. The city intelligentsia has not yet shown that enterprise. So, please do not pass the luck to the poor peasants. Please do not go on telling us that we are with you and the poor peasants won't understand. The peasants do understand.

The tragedy is this thanks to your passivity, the passivity of our class, the class of all of us sitting in this platform, we do not have enough educated people to go to the villages and take our message to the peasants. Our crying need today is active workers and money. The resources of the cities are not available to us to go to the villages. As I put it some times, we need a conveyor-belt. This is a Junior Chamber. You will understand this industrial metaphor. We do not have this conveyor-belt to take the raw material - our message - to the electorate and to bring back the finished goods, the votes. This is what we need. We need men and money and jeeps to take our raw material to the machinery and to bring back the votes. Wherever we go, wherever we reach, the peasants go with us. But we simply do not reach more than a small percentage of Indian peasantry today. There are whole States where we are unable to function for lack of the intelligentsia to back us. I hope I have said enough to show that the peasantry, wherever it is approached, is behind us.

Now, the business class is not with us. We have very little business support. Examine the ranks of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce & Industry, and you will find that a large majority of them are on the Congress band-wagon. Here I would like to say a word of commendation for the improvement that has been brought about in those circles in the last two years. I would like to pay my tribute to two

very fine business leaders who have been thrown up as Presidents of the Federation in the last two years, viz. Mr. S.L. Kirloskar and now Mr. Ramanbhai Amin. For the first time, the leaders of the Indian business have begun to talk in what we may call a self-respecting way. I take my hat off to them for having tried to lead the business community away from its unfortunate past.

I will give you my own concrete experience. When I stood in Rajkot in 1963, every single class in my constituency backed me except one. The Khedut Samaj was working for me and I owe my election targets to them. Every single Trade Union in Rajkot was working for me. The Railwaymen, Postmen, Government servants, Rekdiwalas all stood on my side. The shop-keepers were a hundred per cent with me. The goldsmiths were with me. But there was one class that was against me and that was the Rajkot Chamber of Commerce and its leaders. They gave their cars to the Congress Party. They gave money to the Congress Party. They signed an appeal against me. I am quite prepared to believe that, in the secrecy of the ballot box, their conscience might have made them to vote for me! But even after the election was over and the people of Rajkot accepted me and I announced that I was the servant of all the people of Rajkot, Congressmen included, and when I tried to meet the leading businessmen of Rajkot to ask them in whay way I could be help to them, I am sorry to tell you, Mr. President, that they ran away from me, they would not accept even my invitation to tea, except for one or two honourable exceptions! They were too frightened to sit and talk with their duly elected M.P.

This is the attitude of a large section of businessmen to their obligation as citizens. The usual alibi given by business people for not helping us is the alibi of fear. They say: "We

✓ shall be hurt by Government. This is a vindictive Government." I wish I could accept the sincerity of this fear, not that there is anything very creditable about it. I have an unpleasant suspicion that this is not the genuine reason. This is an alibi to cover other motives. I can tell you that I have tested this and found out that it is not true.

Rajaji had once given a public assurance in Jawaharlal Nehru's time that if any businessman was ever penalised for joining the Swatantra Party or for standing for Parliament or for giving his contribution to the Swatantra Party, he (Rajaji) would go to Jawaharlal Nehru and get justice for that man. That challenge was never accepted. Not a single businessman has come to us saying: "Mr. Masani, for joining your Party, look what has happened to me!" No businessman has come to us with the specific complaint that for his political activity he was made to suffer. Many people come with complaints of victimisation, but they are people -- far away from the Swatantra Party. In other words, this is not true. I am a critic of the Government. They must have been vindictive here and there, I don't deny. But let us say in fairness to them that they are not Fascists. I have asked many businessmen "Have you suffered?" They say "no, no". In fact, Mr. President, I have a feeling that, if anyone joins the Swatantra Party as a business man, he will probably do better for himself. Because this is a government of weak characters that favours men with courage and if a businessman throws off fear and comes out, they will probably like to accommodate him more than their own Party people!

^ Now, is the Congress so strong that it cannot be displaced? I would claim that the Congress is a "paper tiger". It looks very much more impressive than what it is. Let us see the facts.

What is the percentage of the Indian people's support for the Congress Party? Is it a majority of 70% or 80%? No. Congress Party has never received support from the majority of the Indian people ever since Independence. The highest parliamentary poll for the Congress was 48% under Nehru. In 1962, Nehru's last election, it dropped to 44.72%, or let us say 45%. In other words, the Congress is a minority party. It is the biggest of the minority parties of India. The second party was the Communist Party with 10% and then the Swatantra Party with 9%. So, 45%, 10% and 9% and then others with 5% or 4%. In other words, the disparity is not as wide as it looks. True, they have 365 seats in Parliament. We have got 23. But this, as I will explain to you later, has nothing to do with the facts. The facts are that they have got only 4% times or 5 times as many votes as we got in 1962, and that gap has narrowed to a great extent. I do not think that the Congress Party will get more than 40% of the popular vote in next year's parliamentary elections. I will be surprised if they get even that. Let us say they will get 40% or 39%. Now, is there any reason why such a party cannot be defeated?

The Indian Institute of Public Opinion is having periodic polls of public opinion. They had one in May this year of cities like Bombay, Ahmedabad, Lucknow, Hyderabad, metropolitan cities, the capitals of all the various States and here are the results. The Congress Party had 60% support of the urban class in January-February, 1966. In May, 1966, it had dropped to 41%. This is the steepest drop ever noticed in the history of independent India - from 60% to 41%. According to the same report, the potential support of the non-leftist parties, which includes the Swatantra Party, Jan Sangh and maybe, some other

groups, went up from 20% to 42%. In other words, today the non-leftist parties have as much urban support as the Congress Party. Now, if the Swatantra Party doubles its poll from 9% to 18% or 20%, the Congress Party would not have a majority in Parliament.

On the other hand, if because of the electoral system which exists at present, the Congress Party gets another bogus majority in 1967, then you will have to think what will happen to parliamentary democracy in this country. Are the Indian people, with rising prices, food shortages and hardships of every kind, going to endure for five more years a Government which 60% of the electorate has rejected? If they get 40%, the oppositions combined will get 60%. Will the Indian people tolerate a 40% Government ruling them for the next five years?

Now, you may ask why this happens. There are two reasons for this imbalance in our parliamentary democracy. The first is the party structure. We have got half a dozen parties instead of one or two. On the other hand, we have the British electoral system which does not provide for Proportional Representation. In Britain, by and large, it gives fair results, though sometimes even there there are inequities. But here we have a ridiculous situation - that 45% of the electorate get 72% of the seats in Parliament, thereby defeating the very purpose of representative government. To put it in another way, we have accepted an Anglo-Indian electoral system, while we have a Latin temperament!

This explains why we talk about electoral understandings and adjustments with other democratic opposition parties, not because we want to join hands with them, not because our differences with other democratic opposition parties have ended, but because we want to stop this distortion of the popular will which becomes a

✓ real ^htreat to the future of our democracy.

^hThere is one party we will not join hands with or even have adjustment with even to defeat the Congress Party and that is the Communist Party or rather the two Communist parties. As regards reasons for that, I request you to read my 'HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY' published in 1955. There are two things inherent in the Communist Party which make it unfit for association. One is that they are a Fifth Column either of Moscow or Peking, as the case may be. Theirs is not an Indian political party. They are a Trojan Horse of a foreign dictatorship. The second thing is that whenever the Communists come into power, they destroy democracy. We believe that the process of democracy should not be misused for the destruction of freedom. That is why we reject the Communist Parties as we reject the Congress Party.

To those who say: "let us join the Communists to defeat the Congress, which is a menace, I would say: "Beware, you are playing with fire." There is a whole history of people who joined hands with the Communists and who are buried underground, to use Mr. Khrushchev's phrase.

On the other hand, to those who say: let us prefer the Congress Party against the Communist Party, I would say: "Be careful, again." Is there any fundamental difference between the Congress Party and the Communist Party? I would say that in India communism has three faces viz. The Moscow face, the Peking face and the Kamraj face. The policies of the Congress Party prepare the ground for communism as surely as the Communist Party would like to do. They create the objective conditions, to use the Marxist phrase, first chaos and then

dictatorship. They give ground to the theory of increasing misery in which the Communist Party believes. The longer the Congress Party stays in office, the more the miseries of the Indian people and the more likely the conditions in which they would listen to the Communist Party. There are people who believed that the Congress was going to change or improve early this year. You may say I was one of them. I was. I was prepared to give to the new Prime Minister a fair deal, not to join in trying to topple her Government because she started by saying and doing the right things. Unfortunately, the last few weeks have shown that that hope must now be dropped. The Prime Minister has now made it perfectly clear that she is not prepared to deviate. There was an interesting incident on the 8th of August. Look Magazine, which is a reputable one and very friendly to her family, published an exclusive interview with her. In this reputable journal she was quoted as saying that if the interests of India demand it, she would not hesitate to depart from her father's policies. I was very glad to read that. I thought we were doing the right thing in giving her a long rope, in finding out whether she could serve the country. But next day came an amazing denial from her spokesman who said that she denied that she ever said anything of that kind. Now, what does it mean? It means that she is horrified at this very sensible, patriotic statement that she made and she wants to repudiate it. If she repudiates it, then it follows that even if the country's interest demands it, Mrs. Gandhi will not depart from her father's policy. In which case, she is utterly unfit to be the Prime Minister of India for a single day. We have seen the abject surrender to Kosygin when she was in Moscow on Viet Nam, the mouthing of

Communist jargon in the joint communique signed by the Prime Minister of India in Russia. You have seen her advocacy of a "big Plan", when it is big plans that have got this country to bankruptcy and devaluation. All these clearly show that she is a broken reed on whom no democrat or well wisher of India can rely.

The Congress President has, of course, outstripped her in his drift to communism. You remember that he invited the Communists to rejoin the Congress and his lieutenant, Mr. T.S. Krishnamachari, went to far as to say that if the Congress Party is to lose office to any other party, he would much prefer the Communists to the Swatantra Party, thereby proving the devotion to democracy of this gentleman.

Mr. Kamraj Nadar recently visited Moscow and some communist countries and when the communists gave him a send off at the time of his departure, he said, that the Soviet Revolution, undoubtedly, inspired India in her struggle for freedom. This is what we may call a rewriting of the History of India. We know where Mahatma Gandhi picked up his inspiration for freedom, where we all got our love for freedom, India owed nothing to Lenin or Stalin.

Then, Mr. Kamraj was impressed by the housing in Moscow. One aspect of Soviet life that is deplorable, shocking, is its housing. But even that impressed our Congress President! He went on to say: "On seeing your progress, we are enthused that we can make similar progress in the same way as you have done. Your planning can be a guide to our own advancement." A country like Nasser that has to go abroad and sell millions of pounds of gold to buy food for the starving people, a country that does not have consumer goods, people who do not have homes, this is the

path which the Congress President holds out for the Indian people.

When Mr. Kamraj went to Hungary, he was eager to know how the democratic process of electing members of Parliament is managed in a one party State. That, no doubt, is a preparation he is making for himself for the post 1967 period.

Now, is this the party that is going to protect India from communism? I ask my anti-communist friends. Is this the party on which we are going to rely to stop the Communists from taking over India?

^ If So, I come to this conclusion that the Congress Party is disintegrating, is on its way out. It is obvious for anyone to see. The real issue is not between the Congress Party and the Communist Party. The real issue is between the Communist Party and the Swatantra Party. The question is as to who is to inherit the future? The past is on its way out. Who is to inherit the country's future? Is it Communist dictatorship or is it the free way of life which is embodied in the principles and programmes of the Swatantra Party? This, Mr. President, is the choice before our country from next year onward. Now, as I have said earlier our trouble is about the conveyor belt. We have not got enough men. We have not got enough money. That is the responsibility of the elite, of the intelligentsia, of the business class.

✓ Rajaji has made a very touching appeal on Independence Day which you may have seen in the newspapers. He said: "I smell the coming storm and rain. The main difficulty is that Congress had infinite cash as against its Opponents. I appeal, therefore, for offers from good and qualified men, to stand as candidates for Parliament or Assembly on the Swatantra ticket who are able

to meet their own election expenses. We are considering a plan under which we throw all caution to the wind, set up candidates in 300 to 400 Parliamentary Constituencies, and have it out with the Congress."

If I am asked, in the light of this, what is the obligation of a businessman or a patriotic Indian who sees the facts straight, I would say that in the coming months, he should do one of three things or two of thre, or all the three things. He should stand either for Parliament or Assembly and throw himself into the fray. If, for some reason, he cannot do it, let him help others to do it. There are two ways of helping. One is to give one's time, energy and intelligence, and the other is to give money. This, Mr. President, I feel to be the duty of those who believe in the creed of the Junior Chamber.

It is no use criticising before entering a Party. There are many things wrong with my Party. I concede to that. My friends in Ahmedabad know what a severe critic I am - critic of many things that happen in this city and in this State. But you cannot reform a party or a club or institution when you criticise it from outside. You have to go into it and take your proper share of the responsibility and then people will listen to you. Then what you can pull your weight.

^ Ours is not a closed corporation. It is not an exclusive club. Rajaji has already announced that if we come to power, we will not confine membership of the Cabinet to members of our own Party. We shall invite other people. We shall invite leading citizens, businessmen, educationists, Sarvodaya workers. We will say: Come and take your share of responsibility. We

believe in a Cabinet of all talents available in the country. In the same spirit, our ranks are not closed. We shall put up any one who comes and joins us today provided that he accepts our programmes and principles. We are not going to say that we are "Old Bolsheviks", you are a new one, and you must wait.

This is an Open Conspiracy in which we are engaged. We declare that we want to overthrow the Congress Government by the methods and the processes that our Constitution has enshrined. We believe that the removal of the Congress Government is the only hope for this country. I do not mind telling you frankly that, so long as the Congress Party is in office in Delhi, I see nothing but disaster for our country. I tell you this very sincerely. I can see no hopes at all. Every time there is a change of Prime Minister, we allow ourselves to hope. Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri was a very good friend of mine. We refused to support a motion of no-confidence against him. We wished him well. I went and talked to him. I pleaded with him. I gave every suggestion I could give to him. We have done the same to Mrs. Gandhi. Two months back, when she invited the Opposition Leaders, they refused even to see her. Prof. Ranga and I went and sat with her for over an hour. We gave her a written memorandum. We pleaded with her. But all the times our words have fallen on deaf ears. There is a class of people who have got a vested interest in carrying on with the policies of State Capitalism and Controls. They will not give up those controls. They will not give up their Permit-Licence-Raj because they make money out of it. They get power out of it. That class unfortunately dominates the Congress Party today.

Unless and until those people, are thrown out of office,
I see no hope for our country at home or abroad. That is
✓ why there is this Open Conspiracy, and I invite you all,
ladies and gentleman to join it.

Thank you.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Q.1 Prof. Tapasvi Nandi: To do away with the evils of Capitalism, the best way is to make it 'broad-based' i.e. to make it reach the masses, so that the rich may get richer, but the poor also gets richer. Any comments?

Shri M. R. Masani: My only comment is that I agree heartily with the sentiments the Professor has expressed. We believe in what we call "peoples' capitalism" and "economic democracy" which we find developed in countries like the United States of America, where a large part of the working class own a large part of the capital invested in Joint Stock Enterprises, where an average worker is also a shareholder. This is our idea of economic democracy which the Professor has very well summarised in his question.

Q.2. Prof. J. R. Shukla: Is it true that your party is merely a collection of Kings, retired Government servants and frustrated political leaders? I don't think the Swatantra Party gives any new political ideology. Please comment.

Shri M. R. Masani: It is difficult to comment on this kind of categorisation. If it had been made before I spoke before I spoke, I would have merely attributed it to ignorance, but now, I am afraid, I can only credit it to perversity.

Voice from the audience: Please answer the question.

Shri M. R. Masani: Do you want my answer? My answer is that it is a cheap type of gibe. I don't agree with it. The facts do not warrant such a categorisation. We have a few retired Government servants, we have a few ex-princes, we have a few retired politicians. All this is true, but the way it is put is not true, because there are more retired politicians in the Congress Party. For every Maharaja that we have the Congress Party has twenty Maharajas. For every Politician that we have, there

are 100 politicians on the other side. So, that I don't think such a question needs any answer. It is a cheap type of gibe.

Q.3. Shri Mayurkant Mehta; If your party comes a ruling Party, how will you solve the food problem? Do you believe in zonal system?

Shri M. R. Masani: It is a very good question. I would like to take a few minutes to answer it.

First, we do not believe in zonal restrictions. Now to solve the food problem, obviously agriculture has to be placed on its feet. Agriculture is India's destitute industry. It is the Cinderella of Governmental policy. It has been starved of capital and it has been grossly neglected. In our Second and Third Five Year Plans, crores of rupees that should have gone to develop irrigation, to build tube wells, to produce fertilizers, to give the peasants modern tools, to encourage methods the Japanese method or whatever you call it - of rice cultivation, have been swallowed by great White Elephants like Durgapur, Rurekela, Bhilai and other big factories. These big projects have done nothing. They have made big losses for the Indian tax-payers and Indian people. This was described by me this morning as Stalinist planning. In Russia it has created a backward agriculture which has not enabled them to meet the food needs of the Russian people. Just as in China, the Communes have resulted in starvation and shortage of food grains, so also in India this kind of Stalinist planning has resulted in food shortage. What we would do is to put agriculture first. That would mean that instead of 21.8 % of the total resources of the Fourth Five Year Plan being devoted to it, we would probably say that about 50% of the entire outlay of Government expenditure should be put in the land. This would mean encouraging the farmer instead of

discourageing him as he is discouraged to day.

Today the farmer is persecuted. He is not allowed to get a fair price for his product, but he is expected to go into market and pay very high prices for kerosene, cloth, corrugated sheets or whatever else he has to buy. If he does not conform to this, if he does not hand over to the Government whatever the compulsory levy requires, then he is treated like a criminal. Only two days ago, they introduced in Parliament the Essential Commodities (Amendment) Bill, which gives the Government more powers that they had taken under the Defence of India Rules which have now lapsed for economic purposes. One of the clauses of the bill says that if the farmer is found to be contravening the compulsory levy or a ban on the movement of foodgrains, then the entire materials which he was transporting would be confiscated, the vehicle in which the foodgrains or edible oil or ground-nuts were being transported would be confiscated, even though no charge was preferred against him. This could be done by the administrative decision of the District Magistrate. In other words, the peasant is reduced to the position of a potential criminal.

We think that the peasant should not be without honour in our country. He should be the foundation of our entire economic structure and any question of industrialising India has no meaning of its main industry, India's basic industry is agriculture, is not put on its feet. So, we would invest money in the land, we would give the farmer cheap credit, we should give him a floor price, and we would allow him to take what he gets in the market so that the production of food can increase.

But here one problem would occur to you. Since you are staying in Ahmedabad, you will say : "What about those consumers in the city

who cannot afford to pay those high prices? We are not oblivious of this angle. Our answer is that the city poor and the village poor must be given food and edible oil at subsidised prices. For the sake of 10% of the people, 90% should not be penalised. Today what is happening is that in the name of the consumers a large majority of the Indian people who are agriculturists are being kept at destitution level.

Similar is the problem of ceilings. Ceilings have been so fixed by the Planning Commission that no peasant's family, no farmers' family, can hope to make more than three hundred rupees a month. That is the official figure that a man should be allowed to keep as much land as will give him and his family of five/ three hundred rupees a month or Rs.3,600/- a year. When the Government of Andhra tried to raise this ceiling to Rs.4,20/- a month or Rs.5,400/- a year, the Planning Commission fought the Government of Andhra for one year saying they would not allow any farmer to retain more than rupees three hundred a month for a family of five. What does it mean? It means creating a new class of Harijans in our country, newers of wood and drawers of water who may never aspire to live, never aspire to sleep on a bed, eat at a table, send their sons to colleges or their girls to schools, have a radio set, have a television set. None of these things must be given to them. They must be kept like coolies for the benefit of the new Ruling Class in Delhi. So, my answer is that all persecution of peasant must stop. He must be given the central place and until he is on his feet, wasteful expenditure in heavy industry must be suspended. If all these things are done, we do not believe that we would require more than two or three years to make India self-sufficient in meeting its food needs.

Shri R. K. Dhariya: Don't you think free enterprise policy propounded by your party will encourage economic exploitation instead of eliminating it?

Shri M. R. Masani: Well, this is a very good question because I think this kind of doubt is entertained by many people. Now, what you call "free enterprise policy", we call competitive free enterprise, with the emphasis on competition. Competition free enterprise means that anyone should be free to produce what he wants to; to sink his capital in it and to take his chance of making a profit or loss. Now, how can he do that? He does it by trying to assess the condition of a particular commodity in the market. We call it "Market Research". There is an institution in Delhi called the Market Research Corporation of India which advises businessmen as to what the market likely in a particular commodity is going to be in the next five, ten or fifteen years. But there is a lot of market research that goes on without going to the Market Research Corporation of India. Every firm has its own cell with staff known as "Marketing Department", which is certainly in touch with the consumers. The work of Marketing Department is to find out what the consumers want, why the stocks are not sold in the market, why this particular thing is more popular than that? What are the remedial measures for it, and so on. All these are the everyday problems of enterprise. Competitive free enterprise does not exploit the people. It gives them the maximum service at the minimum price. Competitive free enterprise is economic democracy. It takes the process of the ballot box for Parliamentary elections, which comes once in five years, to the bazars and the markets of our country. In competitive free enterprise, the consumer goes every day to the market. Sometimes he goes five or six times a day to the

market, sometimes his wife goes to the market for shopping. They exercise a choice every time they buy an article.

Now, how is this choice exercised? When a consumer goes to the market - whether he goes with Rs.10/- or Rs.5/- or 50 paise in his pocket - he goes to vote in the bazar. He casts his vote on a particular commodity and not on another commodity just as he votes for the Swatantra Party or for the Congress Party. When he buys a particular commodity as against another commodity, he casts a vote. He may also cast a negative vote. He may come back without buying anything, like many ladies who go shopping - they just look at things, ask a number of questions to the salesman and come back without spending any money. That is a good thing. We should all encourage it. In that case, the lady casts a negative vote. She is not tempted enough to spend her money on any particular commodity. So, she comes back with her vote in her pocket. That is a negative vote.

Now, it is this consumer's preference exercised by men, women and even children where he has to exercise his choice for a pencil, ball, pen, sweets, cosmetics, etc. it is this consumer's preference exercised in a free society that adds up to the pattern of production in the country. It is just like going to a race where the tickets are bought on various horses. Then, they are totalled up by the Tote. Then, you will see the figures on the board that so many people have backed some favourite, so many people have backed this or that horse. Now the Tote totals up mechanically the preference of the race goers in regard to the horses which are going to run. In the same way, all of us go to the market and put our money on a particular horse or on a particular commodity. This is how economic democracy works and the biggest capitalist has to respond

to the urges of the consumer. Anyone who wants to make a profit has to respond to the wishes of the consumers just as Parliament and Government have to respond to the wishes of the electorate. The difference is this. In an election you have to cast a vote once every five years and in the bazaar your democracy works every day and at every hour. It is for this that the Swatantra Party stands for.

The alternative is the Command Economy exercised through a Planning Commission in Moscow or Delhi, where ten or fifteen people assert to themselves the right to become God, Almighty God, and to decide what is good for us, whether we like it or not, and to say that such and such a thing should be produced, but such and such a thing should not be produced. This is an alternative system of totalitarian dictatorship. That is why the Swatantra Party takes a very clear stand that we believe in competitive free enterprise. We are against monopoly, whether it is private monopoly or State monopoly.

Shri Udayan Chinubhai: Farm, Family and Freedom is a good slogan. How will you implement it?

Shri Minoo Masani : Well this slogan was put forward by Rajaji many years ago. It means that you try to stress your priorities. You try to hold up your objectives.

Now, I think, I have already replied about the farm in my answer to a question only five minutes ago. We believe that the farms of India, which are our basic industries, have been neglected. They must be put absolutely first. Until agriculture is put on its feet, to talk of industrial and economic progress is moonshine.

Family we stress because our Party wishes to modernise India, wishes to transform India into a twentieth century modern society,

but it wants to do so without breaking with the tradition of India. We do believe in the home. We believe that the form of society which has been developed is something on which we should build. We do not believe in Communes. We do not believe in Collective Farming. We do not believe that children should be brought up by the State ^{and} that the parents can escape their responsibilities and wash their hands off them. So, we believe that a family is an institution in society that needs to be preserved and strengthened.

Finally Freedom. Here I can only say that you will kindly read this Statement of Policy, which is in your hands! "To Prosperity through Freedom." This is our basic creed. We believe in freedom. The name of our party itself tries to express this. What does "Swatantra" mean in this context? Swatantra, as I understand it, means self-direction, self-determination, auto-motivation, being motivated from within. It is freedom in a deep sense of the word. When I go to Germany and when they ask me what is the name of your Party, I say Friehat Party. Friehat means freedom. But it is little more than freedom. Freedom means to us not being bullied from outside, not being told what to do, but to tell yourself what to do. "Swatantra" means some power within us which makes us move and which makes us exercise those choices which I referred to this morning. The direction comes from within. Now, we know what is self-determination. We talk of the right of a people to self-determination. The Swatantra Party believes that the right of self-determination belongs not only to a nation, but to every individual. There are limits beyond which this must not be pushed. I actually expressed this in my speech, when I quoted the Bible, Abraham Lincoln and Mahatma Gandhi. Swatantra means that each one has to decide for himself. There are limits beyond which you cannot go.

8

If I stretch out my arm and it meets my friend's eye or nose, then my freedom to stretch out my arm must be restricted. But if I don't hurt him, then my right to stretch my arm must not be interfered with. The Swatantra Party believes in maximum individual liberty. One of my friends told me the other day: "We are democratic individualists. We are individualists, but we believe in the fullest individual freedom subject to the interest of society." That great man, the present Chancellor of Germany, Dr. Erhard, has written a book called "Social Enterprise," which means free enterprise conditioned by social obligations. My good friend Jayprakash Narayan is going round India holding seminars and discussions on the social obligations of business. I have participated with him in two such seminars, one in Delhi and one in Calcutta. I believe that what he is doing is a wonderful job, trying to make free enterprise aware of its social obligations. But, Jayprakash, like me, also believes that this social motivation must come from within. It must not be imposed by the regimentation of the State of governmental machinery or from outside. This is what, if I may say so, Farm Family and freedom means to us. I hope I have given a satisfactory reply.

Shri Shyam Lasvi : If you come to power, would you ban the Communist Party?

Shri Minoo Masani: This is a very interesting question. I would not like to answer you or no, because it is not a question which should be answered in an abstract way, but only in a concrete situation. Let me explain. I have no doubt at all about the right of the community to ban a Fascist or Communist party any time when the community decides that it is essential for its safety and survival. About the moral rights

I am absolutely clear. The Communist Party has no right to exist. It may be tolerated for the ends of democracy, but not because of its own rights: In other words the banning of the Communist Party or a Fascist Party because they are the same - should be tested not by the rights of the party but by the desirability of taking such a step in a particular context. The American Supreme Court decided the issue by saying "Is the danger clear and present"? If the danger to democracy is clear and present, then the danger must be cut down; But if it is an academic, remote danger, then a strong democracy can take it in its stride and can contemptuously tolerate the existence of a Communist Party and say: "Do your worst, let us see how far you get." This is my approach.

Now, I will exemplify it by what is actually happening. In Brazil and Germany, to take two examples, the Communist Parties are banned by Law. That Law was tested in the supreme court of both the countries and upheld on the ground which I gave this morning that the Communist Parties of Germany and Brazil are the Agents of Moscow, that they do not believe in democracy and they are out to destroy democracy in those countries. They have been legally and judicially banned. I support this. If the German and Brazilian people feel that way, they have a right to do so. The British on the other hand, have not banned the Communist Party. The answer to this is very obvious. The answer is that the Communist Party there is such a ridiculous non-entity that it is not even worth banning. So, the Communist Party carry on its propaganda there and they bang their heads against the stone wall of British Commonsense. Now, in Britain, I would certainly not ban the Communist Party, but I would certainly ban it in Vietnam which is at war. So, I would answer this question

according to a particular situation at a particular time.

The Swatantra Party publicly advocated the banning of the Communist Party in India in 1962. During the Chinese attack, we demanded that the Communist Party of India should be banned as the Fifth Column which sympathies were on the side of those who were attacking our country. Let me explain here that it is a fundamental dogma of the Communist Party that, when a Communist army enters any country, it enters to "liberate" that country and it is the sacred duty of every honest Communist to welcome this liberating army and overthrow their own Government. This is absolutely fundamental. There can be no doubt on that subject. Therefore, it is the duty of every Communist to welcome a liberating army wherever it comes in. If he does not do it, he is not being honest. Now, when your country is attacked by a Communist army, certainly the communist Party should be banned. Also in other conditions, namely when the Communist Party indulges in a civil war or when it creates chaos, certainly it should be banned. It was banned in 1948 during the Telangana . So, I would say that the Communist Party should be banned at such points of time when its existence becomes a clear and present threat to our democracy, and it should be tolerated with contempt when it does not constitute such a clear and present threat.

Kum. Manorama Sarabhai: I have the feeling that the Swatantra Party is repeating the same jargon as the Congress. Agriculture importance has been emphasised by both. What is the specific diversions and specific programmes that you Party advocates? Complete reversal of existing Government programme? Will they not lead to Chaos and confusion?

Shri Minoo Masani: That is also a good question, because during the last twelve months, the Congress Party has started talking about an emphasis on agriculture,. My friend, Shri Lal

Bahadur Shastri, started that talk. I had a debate with him in Parliament. I do not know whether it is there in one of the speeches which have been circulated to you, but this was a debate during his brief tenure of office. After the 4th plan document had been laid on the table of Parliament, I said in my speech that even the 4th Plan showed no shift from heavy industry. This was on my motion of No, Confidence." The Voice of the People" is the title of the booklet. You can read it if it is with you. I made the charge and he said No, in our 4th Plan we have provided more money for agriculture". He then read out the figures which showed that twice the number of rupees had been allocated as in the Third Plan for agriculture. That amount was doubled in the Fourth Plan. Then some Congress members sheered and thought that he had made his point, as obviously you think that the point was made. Well, I followed him immediately because mine was the right of reply on my no confidence motion. As soon as he sat down I said, "Just a moment, Mr. Prime Minister, you have been throwing dust in the eyes of Parliament. This is not true. You have the figure in rupees. There are two things you did not point out. One was that the rupee had depreciated by 35% during the past five years since the Third Plan was made, Therefore, when you say that the amount is doubled you will have more or less to concede that it is only one and half-times. Secondly, you forget to mention that your Fourth Plan is twice the size of the Third Plan and you are going to spend twice the number of rupees. Now, if these facts are brought into play, the result is this that while in your Third Plan 21.2% of the total outlay was devoted to agriculture, in the proposed Fourth Plan only 21.8% was given to agriculture. "Is this what you, the great Prime Minister, have brought forth this little mouse? Even I

could have done more by going and talking to my friend Shri Ashoka Mehta and persuading him to raise to 21.2% from 21.8%". So, my answer to the quest is this. The congress Party talks about putting agriculture first, but it has no intention of doing so. That assurance is given to fool the American Government, the World Bank and the Indian people.

Shri D.V. Shah: Would your party welcome a joint democratic front against the communists? Would you welcome joining hands with Congress for that purpose?

Shri Minoo Masani: I do not know if the questioner was present this morning, because I thought I had answered that question very specifically by saying 'no'. Here again, may I qualify what I said? Certainly, for these coming elections, we would not join hands with the Congress Party against the Communists Party for the reasons which, I thought, I gave in fair detail this morning. I suggested that the Congress Party represented the third face of communism in our country and therefore, could not be supported as an anti-communist force.

But there are situations where my answer would change. If tomorrow one country was attacked by the Chinese and the Congress Government showed sincerity in defending our country by entering into an alliance with America and the Western Democracies to throw the chinese out and to liberate Tibet, I would certainly join hands with the Congress Party in fighting Communists in India. In fact, in 1962, when the Chinese attack came, I do remember that I called on my old friend and political opponent, Jawaharlal Nehru, and told him that we who had been fighting him for the last ten or fifteen years in politics were entirely behind him to the extent that led the Indian people against the Chinese invasion and anything that we can do, we were entirely at his service. It is in that,

spirit that, I think, if such a situation recurs, if Indian democracy were in danger or the Sovereignty of India were in danger from Communist aggression at home or abroad, we would certainly help the Congress Government or the Congress Party to withstand the totalitarian threat. But that is not the situation today. And, therefore, the immediate answer is "no". I hope I have added something which may meet the questioner's needs. My answer 'no' today is in the present situation in which we are placed but certainly, if democracy is in danger in an acute way both from within and from outside, then it would be the duty of all democrats to rally in defence not of the Congress Party but of the Constitution and the sovereignty of our country.

Shri L. N. Mehta: Sir, speaking about defects of your Party, you said it is not proper to criticise a party from outside. The best way is to get in and improve it. Could you please do the same by getting in the Congress?

Shri Minoo Masani: I think this is a very interesting question. As it happens, I followed the questioner's advice many years ago and I failed! I was a Congressman for about 25 years. I tried to do what you are suggesting from inside. Certainly from 1945 upto 1952, when I was a Congress M.P., I tried to do exactly what you are telling to do today. I tried to resist the policy of appeasing Chinese communism. I resisted the betrayal of Tibet when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru put it across. I fought it on the floor of the House, we had a debate on Korea, Tibet, on planning and so on. At the end of those five years I decided that the Congress Party was incapable of improvement or saving. Other people come to their own conclusions in their own time. Rajaji came to the same conclusions a few years later in 1959. So did (Prof. Ranga), who was the Secretary of the Congress Party in 1959, and who gave up

his attempt at that stage. Mr. Munshi did it at the same time. So, one has to go through this experience for oneself. If my questioner would like to join the Congress Party and try to reform the G.P.C.C. I wish him good luck. Well, after a year or two if he comes to me and says that he has failed in his mission, I shall open my arms and welcome him to my Party.

Shri Nagaswami : Does the Swatantra Party believe in having our own Nuclear Bombs or a Nuclear Umbrella?

Shri M. R. Masani: No, Mr. Nagaswami. We do not believe in having our own nuclear bomb. We have debated this in Parliament in the days of Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri and we shall do it again. The basis reasons why we take this line are as follows:

First of all, we do not believe that it is economically feasible for India to make the Bomb without destroying the country. Our leading Atomic Scientist, who is the Head of the apparatus that we have set up in this connection, in a statement some time back has said that, delivery system and the Bomb would cost the Exchequer billions of dollars every year. If we convert it into Rupee currency, it would mean crores and crores of rupees. In that context, please consider to better this country, which is not able to produce or buy foodgrains for its own people, which has gone bankrupt and which had to devalue its Rupee, can produce a Bomb and deliver it. Now let me make this point clear, that the producing of the Bomb is less expensive than delivering it. The production of the Bomb would cost us a lot of money. But the delivery system would cost us much more. In France, they estimated that delivering the Bomb would cost as much as making it. Now, in our case, this delivery of the Bomb is confiscated because of the logistics. Our enemies, the Chinese Communist can drop a bomb, an Atomic Bomb on us from Tibet. They could even do it

in a Dakota. If they could get through and bomb Calcutta or Jamshedpur or Delhi. But our Bomb is not to be dropped on Tibet. We do not want to massacre the few remaining Tibetans who have survived Chinese imperialism. Our bomb is to be delivered on Peking. Now, Peking happens to be, I believe, about 2500 miles away from India. The only kind of plane that could deliver that Bomb on Peking would be a Supersonic Jet, which has to get through to Peking, drop the bomb and come back. Now, supersonic Jet aircraft would cost us many times more than what it would cost us to produce a Hydrogen Bomb or a nuclear weapon. Therefore, we rule it out as an utterly mad thought which simply is not within our means. Supposing, if I ask a person: "would you like to construct a palace when you have not got even a hundred rupees " and the man says: "Yes, I would like to build a palace, but I have not got the money to afford it. " That is the Kind of argument. I would say that it is utterly impossible because of the economic situation. This should be enough because if you have not got anything, naturally, you cannot do it. There is no point of arguing on this any further.

I would go further and say that there are political reasons why it would be better not to make a bomb. What you need today is this that the Bomb is not for dropping purposes. The need for the bomb is to deter an attack on you. In other words, the nuclear system is only useful not for retaliation but to act as a deterrent. We are not interested in bombing Peking. Why should we be interested in that? What are we to gain by dropping a bomb on the poor people of Peking? What we want is to stop Mao Tse Tung and his bandits from entering or bombing India. That is all we want. So, the purpose of making a nuclear weapon would be to stop the bandits of Mao Tse Tung from entering our home. It is not to go and pursue

him in his own territory. Now, how can we best do that? If we make one of these bombs and do not have a supersonic Jet aircraft, Mao Tse Tung will not be deterred.

There is a way of deterring him without spending a single rupee of the Indian Tax payer. That deterrent has been offered to us by those who possess it. President Lyndon Johnson, on the 18th of October, 1964, made a public and categorical offer to us and others menaced by the Chinese threat. He said, 'I am only paraphrasing what he said that if any nation in Asia feels threatened by the Chinese nuclear blackmail, they were prepared to give them a guarantee of protection and defence against that threat. I suggested in Parliament to Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri that that offer should be immediately accepted. I was speaking in November, 1964. Unfortunately, Mr. Shastri did not feel like that. He neither said 'yes' nor 'no' to that proposal, although he supported my argument in regard to the economic argument for rejecting making our own Bomb. He said "I agree hundred per cent with Mr. Masani's argument for not making the Bomb". But, about my suggestion of taking the American deterrent, he was silent. That is the story as it stands today. So, I would say that my Party's policy, as at out in our Resolution, is against making the bomb. We are all for getting free of cost to the Indian people the offer of a fool proof guarantee held out by President Johnson which we have not accepted. If there is no guarantee today, the responsibility for it lies entirely on our own Government.

Shri Behram Kekobad: How do Swatantra Party and Jan Sangh Party differ in policies, etc.? Do you consider the latter as a communal party? If so, why?

Shri M. R. Masani: There are differences in the policies of the Jan Sangh Party and Swatantra Party. Some of these diff-

erences are disappearing because, as I have said, the Jan Sangh which was inclined to be soft on State Planning and soft on controls is now becoming more clear, to the extent that they adopt more and more of our vigorous opposition to State Capitalism and our advocacy of competitive free economy. I think, purely on the economic plan, the policies of the two parties are pretty near, and I would imagine in the coming years, with the lesson of facts, the Jan Sangh will not have specific differences with out economic stand. There are however, differences in regard to what we may call sentimental or emotional issues. That is, differences arising from different background, a different approach, which are natural in a free society.

We are, as I said earlier, entirely a non-denominational party. Being non-demoninational, we are very clear about our attitude to the minorities and their rights. We are recognised throughout the country by the minorities as their friends. We are even recognised as friends by the Nagas and Mizos and Assam Hill People and the perople of Kashmir, because they feel that we have a greater understanding of and sympathy for their problems as against the broad official point of view of Delhi. Now this is something that comes because of the fact that Rajaji and rest of us are broadly Liberal, we have taken from Gandhiji his tolerance for minorities, for the underdog, which is also part of Liberalism. In other words the Swatantra Party's approach to these problems is something of a synthesis of Gandhian thinking and of Western Liberalism. Therefore, we are basically a non-denominational party, sympathetic to minorities, prepared to listen to others points of views. We lack aggressive chauvinism and jingoism of any kind. As Liberals, we can't be jongoists.

Now, there is this difference, Jan Sangh comes from different roots. They feel much more acutely about the problems of

our borders, of our neighbourhood and of our neighbourhood and of our minorities, There is a gulf. But I do not think this is a fundamental gulf which makes us "untouchable" to each other. It should not because we accept their patriotism as they accept ours, as Mr. Balraj Madhok was able to see. He was good enough to say that just as his party is nationalist and democratic, he accepted us the Swatantra Party also as nationalistic and democratic. I say the same thing in return that we accept them as nationalist and democratic. But, that does not mean that we don't disagree with them. There have been differences. There will be differences between us in future. But we agree to co-exist. We accept it as a Party with which we can deal, just as we accept the Socialist/Parties, who have the same national democratic character. We believe that the P.S.P. and the S.S.P. are also basically nationalist and democratic parties. We shall be prepared to deal with them, even if we do not deal with the Communist allies of Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia. He and I do talk; we do try to approximate our understandings. We may even enter into electoral adjustments. That is all. What happens between Dr. Lohia and Mr. Gopalan has nothing to do with me, So far as I am concerned, Mr. Gopalan does not come into my picture. So, what I would say is this. In a democracy, one has to accept the fact that there are differences, but without getting angry about them, without getting bitter, without attributing motives, they should be settled. Sometimes people forget about these things and get annoyed. But we believe that we are mature people and we must take those attacks in our stride and hope that better understanding will come about between all democratic opposition parties.

Shri Kalyan Gandhi: Population control is very important problem of this country. If your party comes into power, how do

you intend to solve it faster?

Shri M. R. Masani: In Calcutta, a year ago, I was asked a very similar question, viz. your party is against all kinds of controls, then why are you for birth control? To that question, my answer was that we are against all controls which are exercised by bureaucrats and politicians, but we are for controls that can be exercised by people in their own homes and of their own free will.

I accept the major proposition that population control is a major necessity in India. I know there are certain eminent members in my Party who do not share that view. But most of us, I think, hold it strongly. I would, once and for all, say that if this population explosion cannot be controlled - I am not saying that it should be destroyed and that there should be no population replacement and if we can't control it within the limits of what our food resources and economic resources can produce, then certainly no system or society can give the Indian People a higher standard of life - neither the Communist nor the Socialist nor the Capitalist. So, I accept your proposition.

Now I will just give you an example. When the third five year plan was formulated, at that time, the Government of India appointed a Population Sub-Committee and they recommended that one per cent of the total outlay of the Plan should be devoted to spreading the knowledge of contraceptives and supplying the people with material which would result in the control of growth of population. I would have thought it a very reasonable proposition that one per cent of the plan allocation was to be spent by Government in the the next five years for this purpose. And yet our late Prime minister, who was a kind of Marxist, and therefor, an anti-neo-Malthusian, he and the Planning Commission rejected this proposal saying that our Socialist country does not need birth control!

forfeited whatever locus standi we had given it. When Pandit Nehru referred to the matter to the U.N. Security Council and made Pakistan a Party to the dispute, Since the Pakistani aggression, our stand is very clear that Pakistan has nothing to do with Kashmir and has no locus standi in so far as the Kashmir problem is concerned.

While the armed aggression by the Government of Pakistan has disqualified it from any locus standi in the Kashmir problem, this cannot reduce the obligations undertaken by India towards the people of Kashmir. Now, let me read, because I would like to be precise on this, What I stand for is not important. The National Executive of the Swatantra Party, which met in Delhi on the 2nd of November, 1965, after the hostilities with Pakistan has come to a stop, passed a long resolution on the international situation in the context of Indo-Pakistani hostilities, of which I shall now read the last paragraph:

"In conditions of infiltration, the goodwill of the people of Kashmir will, in the long run, be decisive and important. While the armed aggression by the Government of Pakistan has disqualified it from any locus standi in the Kashmir problem, it cannot reduce the obligations undertaken by India towards the people of Kashmir. The solution of the problem should, therefore, be worked out in our own initiative and at the proper time such as would be mutually acceptable to India and the people of Kashmir and which should be in the interests of both".

Now, I think the questioner will agree that the whole assumption on which his question was based does not exist. The Swatantra Party does not want to settle the Kashmir problem with our own fellow-citizens in Kashmir in a way that is acceptable to the rest of India and the people of Kashmir. This can be done by free elections next year in which all the leaders of the Kashmir people should be free to participate and show

It seemed that the Socialist country would provide milk and honey so much that every one in the country can go on breeding. It is a fashion that has been shared by other Marxists like Lenin and ^{Map} Tse Tung earlier. But, they have given it up in the face reality in China and Russia. Then, we learnt that Mr. Nehru and the Planning Commission cut it down to half a per cent. So, half a per cent of the resources of the III Plan was allocated to Family Planning. But even that half per cent was not spent. Iforgot the figure, but I think, less than 50% of what was actually allocated was spent during the last five years and the other money lapsed! Now, this shows the utter lack of seriousness on the part of this Government in dealing with this problem. So, my answer would be that the Swatantra Party would certainly, in its administrative policies, give greater weight to the considerations which you have urged and try to make the knowledge and material available to our people much more seriously than the Central Government thinks fit.

Shri Chinubhai Shah: Your party intends to have a settlement with Pakistan on 'Kashmir Issue'. What shall be the terms of such a settlement? Don't you think that a policy of appeasement towards Pakistan shall be dangerous to India's security?

Shri M. R. Masani: I am afraid the questioner is a little ^{out} of date. It was our policy till the middle of 1965 that India, Pakistan and the people of Kashmir should find a solution to the Kashmir problem which would be acceptable to India and Pakistan and which would ensure the freedom and welfare of the people of Kashmir. That ceased to be our policy when Pakistan aggressed in August 1965. As soon as that happened, we reviewed and changed our policy, because policies are made to suit the facts of the day and are not to be the same even if situations change. We then took the line that Pakistan, by resorting to violence and aggression, had

what support they have.

Shri Ranjit Chauhan: Don't you think the economic policy of Jan Sangh and the economic policy of Swatantra Party run on the same lines?

Shri M. R. Masani: Perhaps, I have answered that already. Probably what you say is true. It is not cent per cent true, because I remember that when we voted against the Third Five Year Plan in Parliament, the Jan Sangh voted with the Government of Mr. Nehru. There have been other occasions when we have found that their understanding of the economic situation is not quite the same as ours. That applies also to the question of devaluation where the stand of the two parties is slightly different in the sense that we do not condemn the policies that led to devaluation. The Jan Sangh says that devaluation was brought about by American declaration and is therefore wrong. So, I would say that the Jan Sangh's economic policy seems to approximate to that of the Swatantra Party, and we hope in the course of time there will be no difference between the economic policies of the two parties.

Shri R. H. Sheikh: We have many inter-State disputes? How does your Party propose to solve them?

Shri M. R. Masani: I have not given thought to this problem. There are certain problems which you do not have to face till you get into the Government. They are of administrative nature. I wish I could answer the question. I am quite frank that I have not thought about it nor has our Party has deliberated on it. When I was in Bangalore, a couple of months ago, attending the State Convention of the Mysore Unit of our Party, this problem came up. I was gratified to see that Mysore Colleagues passed a short resolution saying that this

was not the time to get excited over our border disputes. They depreciated the excitement that had been created between Maharashtra and Mysore over this matter. They were quite prepared to let things lie until the more vital problems facing the country viz., the food problem, bankruptcy and devaluation, were handled, well-being was restored, and they said that after that border problems could be ventilated, so let me put it this way that we are not excited about border problems. In fact, they do not excite us. We feel that they are a bit of a red herring distraction of attention from the real needs of the people which are of a different order.

Shri Davendra Oza: You compared your Party with West German Democratic Socialist Party as it stands at present. But you would agree that perhaps the West German Socialists would not have adopted this present policy and programme if they had to face the same problems, as faced by India? Is not the comparison a little bit irrelevant?

Shri Mr R. Masani: Well, it is a very intelligent question and I have come across it earlier. It is a question of timing. It is true that the Social Democrats in Germany and they are my personal friend, Willy Brandt, the Lord Mayor of Berlin, is a personal friend of mine, Carlo Smith is another friend of mine, it is true that in 1947 or 1948 when Germany became free after the war, they did not take the stand they take today of discarding their Marxist baggage and becoming a Liberal Party. Does it prove that they were right? No. It only proves that they came to their senses a little late. There were other people who had come to that policy even with that stage. When Germany was in ruins after the War, Ludwig Erhard of the Christian Democratic Party and, the great liberal thinker, took our line even when Germany was in ruins and not when it is prosperous. There was a very

dramatic incident. When the new German Government was formed, he was made the Minister of Economic Affairs. At that time, four Allied Generals were still there, watching the new Government and having a veto over its policies. Erhard went to them and said: "I want decontrol, I want to scrap all regulations and controls over the economy overnight". They said: "You are mad. You can't do that. You need socialism. You need regimentation. Gradually you may do it, but we do not let you do it now. When he found he was flouted, he played a trick. He went to the radio one night and announced that all controls had come to an end at midnight. Next day he was called before the four Generals who said: "How dare you do this"? He said that : "this is my country and I am the Minister for Economic Affairs of a free Government. You can dismiss me but I am not going to go back on it. I have taken a stand and I am going to see it through." The Generals were so shaken by the defiance of this man, who had the courage of his convictions, that they backed down, and said: "All right. Now that you have done it, try it out. But we think you will fail". The result was the German Miracle. So, with all respect to my friends Willy Brandt and Sarlo Smith, I would say that they are ten years late. Though the Christian Democrats and Dr. Erhard Stoh the show that has brought Germany to its present prosperity, the poor Socialists, now having nothing to do, are following. So I would say that while today the German Socialists have caught up with the Erhard Swa antra Party Line, we do not have to waste ten years to come to the same conclusion.

Shri M. R. Barot: Please clarify your party's policy on Kashmir.

Shri M. R. Masani: I have answered this! For the satisfaction

of Shri Barot, I will add a few words. I have read already from the resolution we passed. We think that Kashmir is a part of India, but we want it to be a happy and contented part of a family. We do not believe that any part of the nation can be ruled by force, neither the Nagas nor the Kashmiries, nor anyone else. Therefore, we have got to win the hearts of the people, National integration does not merely mean passing laws. It means that the people must feel that they belong to this country. A man must feel that he is a Indian, and it is no good letting him to say he is an Indian. Therefore, our whole approach is one of conciliation. We want to sit with the people of Kashmir, we want to sit with their leaders and make them feel that their interest demands that they be part of India. Smt. Indira Gandhi is doing that with the Nagas and we support her in the repeated negotiations the Government of India is carrying on with the "Naga Federal Republic". We want the same spirit and same approach to be applied to Kashmir so that we have in Kashmir a Government that is a real part of India, which feels part of India, which is loyal to India and which would defend India with its life. We do not believe that a policy of repression or imposition by people from Delhi from time to time is the way to make Kashmir a permanent part of India. On the contrary, we feel that such a policy may easily defeat itself. We may lose Kashmir as a result.

On the other hand, if we have in Kashmir a happy, well contented people, that in our view is the only way in which that part of Kashmir which is today occupied by Pakistan can be got into a free Kashmir that is part of India. There is no other way to get Pakistani occupied Kashmir into Indian Kashmir and into India than that of showing that Indian Kashmir is free, Indian

Kashmir is happy, Indian Kashmir is at peace, while the same cannot be said of the part of Kashmir that lies across the international border. That I believe, Mr. President, is the only Statesmanlike way in which we can attract them to the Indian Union, into the family, the free family to which we belong. We cannot hope to take it by force of arms without a major war. So both for the sake of India Integration and even for the sake of getting back into India that part of Kashmir which is today occupied by Pakistan, I would say that the policies of the Swatantra party of carrying the people of Kashmir, their leaders, their patriots along with us into a feeling that they are part of India, as we are doing with the Nagas, are the Statesmanlike policies from the point of Indian democracy, and Indian nationalism.

Shri I.J.Dhruv: Free Enterprises appears to be very attractive in theory but our experience is that with a very few notable exceptions, our businessmen and capitalists take every opportunity to exploit the consumers. Now will you control their anti-social activities and safeguard the interests of the consumers when you come in power?

Shri M. R. Masani: My answer to Mr. Dhruv is that those who are today exploiting the consumers are doing so as part of the Congress economic policy. They are given a kind of shelter - a private monopoly. So long as they play ball, they are allowed to share the loot. I have said earlier this morning the answer to monopoly is competition, not regulation. The answer to monopoly is anti-trust-laws, dispersal of monopoly conditions, and throwing the field open to competition. Today that class of India business to which you refer is an exploiting class and is thriving on Licence Permit Raj. They are part of "the New Class" of corrupt politicians, corrupt

officials and corrupt businessmen. They are no friends of ours. We would like to put an end to their behaviour.

This matter came up in Parliament when Mr. T.T. Krishnamachari was the Finance Minister. There was a debate in Parliament on the 3rd of March, 1964, and I said: "We are proud of our friends in business. But can the people on the Treasury Benches say they are also proud of their business friends?" I went on to mention Surajuddin as a typical example of the kind of friends they have. I am glad to tell you that neither Mr. Krishnamachari nor any single member of the Congress Party dared to get up and challenge my statement that we were proud of our friends, whereas they had every reason to be ashamed of theirs. Those are our friends: Tatas, Mafatlals, Khataus, Walchands; there are many more. I am sorry I do not want to make invidious distinctions. Once I rattled some eight or ten names in Parliament and I got a letter from the wife of one of our best friends saying that: "You forgot us"!

What I am saying is it is precisely enlightened Free Enterprise which we want to strengthen. It is precisely these black-marketeers, monopolists, licence-wallahs we want to destroy. When I say destroy, I don't mean destroy them in any physical way, but only to take away their monopoly. Let them face competition or get out of the market, but we shall not do it so long as we talk socialism and controls. It can only be done by Competitive Free Enterprise. We shall be happy to join in bringing in an Anti-Monopoly Law applying both to State enterprise and private enterprise in this country by which any attempt to corner a market should be stopped, as they do in Germany and America. So, we are anti-monopolists. We are competition wallahs. I will go on to say that the only way to stop the exploitation of the consumer is by having free enterprise and competition throughout the field of economic production.