

Shri K. K. Basu: The character of Parliament has changed.

Mr. Speaker: The character has not changed. It has changed in this sense only that it is now more representative of the Indian people. So far as the principles are concerned, I do not think there is any change at all.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): I have made a very cursory search of the rules and I find that rule 192 says that the procedure in regard to an Appropriation Bill shall be the same as for Bills generally with such modifications as the Speaker may consider necessary. I would submit, Sir, that the principle is that the same procedure should apply in the case of Appropriation Bills unless, of course, the Speaker, for some extremely important considerations, thinks it necessary to stop the debate.

Mr. Speaker: I quite agree with that position, and I think that any discussion on the Appropriation Bill, unless points are fresh, will be useless waste of time. It is a very important consideration, and the Chair has its own right of discretion vested in it under the rules, to make such modifications as it thinks fit. The procedure in the case of a Bill will be that first there will be the consideration motion; then there is the second or clause-by-clause reading, and then there is the final or third reading. There the procedural part, so far as that rule goes, ends. The other part is the part of allowing discussion. Now, there too, even in ordinary legislation the Speaker has got the power to stop the discussion in case he finds that there has been sufficient discussion. Then there is the closure move and hon. Members know that. Though there is usually no time-limit so far as legislation is concerned, it is not absent. The Chair has got the discretion of accepting the closure and, of course, the House may vote upon it. So I need not dilate on that. I am going to follow this procedure, that I shall put the motion before the House and I shall immediately proceed to take votes on this without any discussion on any of the motions. That is the precedent, as I said, even in Western Parliaments and we have been following it here for the last three years.

So far as the other Bill is concerned, the Appropriation Bill in respect of the other Demands for Grants, I have received the points which the hon. Members have given to me and when that Bill comes, I will state to the House what my views on those are and then I shall hear again if they want to say anything—not on the

procedural part of it. Now, without disclosing, of course, all the details I may only state that there are some points that are raised therein which are really important, and I do feel that they were not discussed in the 18 days' discussion; and therefore, some time has to be allowed. But what that time exactly will be and what those points exactly will be, I will say when I come to the second Bill. I am clear about the first Bill which I will put to the House now.

The question is:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1952-53 for the purposes of Railways, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 1 to 3 were added to the Bill.
The Schedule was added to the Bill.
The Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Shri L. B. Shastri: I beg to move:
"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:
"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

APPROPRIATION (NO. 2) BILL

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): I beg to move*:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1952-53, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Speaker: I will first place the motion before the House and then I will state whatever I have to state about the scope of discussion.

Motion moved:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1952-53, be taken into consideration."

In respect of this, I have received intimation of the points proposed to be raised. There are in all seven points mentioned. I shall read them, so that the House may know what they are:

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Mr. Speaker]

(1) Grants allocated last year for specific purposes (e.g. Malamphuza Project) which were unutilised, suspended and abandoned.

(2) The appropriation of Rs. 30 lakhs for the National Income Committee, which has so far not reported, leading to serious interference with announced plans for reconstruction and development.

(3) The reported failure of our foreign loans programme, and the consequent effect on the economy of the country, in regard to the ways and means and the planning budgets.

(4) The recent steps taken to identify the Administration with the Congress Party, e.g. the Planning Commission being present at Congress Party meetings and Working Committee meetings, and the constitution of special group committees of the Congress Parliamentary Party, at which officials are present to take advice.

(5) Proposed abolition of Standing Committees of the House.

(6) The Bharat Sevak Sangh, with possible expenditure of public money, as an adjunct of the Party in power.

(7) The appointment of afforestation officers by the Government, in the light of the progressive denudation of forests, with its effects on crop acreage and soil erosion.

These are the seven points. There is another intimation by Shri Gurupadaswamy. I shall refer to that later.

Now, as regards these seven points, points Nos. (4) and (6) seem to be allied and I have treated them for all practical purposes as one point. And there is a further point—No. 5—proposed abolition of Standing Committees of the House. These points were not touched, so far as I remember, in the discussion during the last 18 days, and I believe they are very important points on which Parties should have their say and the Government also should have an opportunity of explaining their position. Therefore, I would allow discussion on these, shall I say, two—they are in fact three, not two; but I will take them as two—points. As regards the other points, I can say in detail as to why I reject them, but I need not take the time of the House in doing that.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): Are we to understand that we cannot discuss the subject of foreign loans?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think it can be touched now. It is not a point which was not touched at all during the course of discussions. I know that hon. Members may like to put their views pointedly again—as some hon. Members put it yesterday, “emphasise a point”—but we are not here now to “emphasise” any point. This is the ruling of the Chair. It may be arbitrary, but it is a ruling.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The hon. Finance Minister has made certain observations in regard to the kind of foreign assistance we are getting, which, we feel, ought to be countered, if it is possible for us to counter it from the point of view of the Opposition; and that is an opportunity of which we can avail ourselves in the course of the discussion on the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will see that this is not to be taken as an opportunity to meet every argument of every other person or Member in the House. That way again the discussion will be repeated. But whatever that may be, I am not going to occupy long by giving reasons. In short, that is my conclusion, unfortunately for the hon. Member.

Now, there is the other intimation. Shri Gurupadaswamy raises three points: (1) Capital punishment; (2) Prison reforms; and (3) Delegated legislation. I am not quite sure—I did not make any inquiry—but capital punishment and prison reforms, are more or less questions for the States. In any case, I am very clear that Prisons is not a responsibility of the Centre. If I am wrong, the hon. Law Minister will correct me.

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): You are referring to capital punishment. Capital punishment anyway is the responsibility of the courts. The law prescribes capital punishment. It is for the Judges to say whether in a particular case they will award it or not. The question of policy for Parliament is whether they should retain capital punishment as part of the statute. Neither the State Governments nor the Central Government award capital punishment to anybody.

Mr. Speaker: My point was whether it is competent for the State Governments to legislate on the subject of capital punishment.

Dr. Katju: I imagine it is in the Concurrent List.

Mr. Speaker: I believe there is some Bill also which has been brought in. I do not know whether it is a private Member's Bill.

An Hon. Member: Private Member's Bill.

Mr. Speaker: In any case, Members will have an opportunity of discussing the question of capital punishment if and when that Bill comes up. We need not take any time now. *(Interruption)*. Let the hon. Member not interrupt. Hon. Members should first hear completely what I am going to say. I am not going to decide finally. Before I say that I rule, I always give an opportunity to hon. Members to have their say.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: May I make one last submission, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: In respect of these points?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The previous points.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid that is closed.

Prison reforms is decidedly a matter for the States. So far as delegated legislation is concerned, hon. Members will see that the Rules of Procedure provide for a Committee for examination of delegated legislation. Of course, this committee is not yet constituted, but in course of time that Committee will be constituted. So, far as these three points are concerned, either the points are not important, or we shall be anticipating some further discussion or some further action. In that light, I have not thought it fit to put any of these three points for inclusion in the discussion on this Bill.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): My first point 'Capital Punishment', Sir, is a Central subject...

Shri S. C. Deb (Cachar-Lushai Hills): On a point of order, Sir. What are the three points?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The expression 'Point of Order' is used, it appears, by some hon. Members in two senses—'Point of Information' is included in the 'Point of Order'. There are three points which he wants to discuss. They are:

- (1) Capital Punishment.
- (2) Prison reforms.
- (3) Delegated legislation.

These are the three points which the Chair is not prepared to accept as points properly to be discussed on an Appropriation Bill. Members will remember the occasion in respect of which these points are pressed. The points are very important in themselves. There is no doubt about it. But whether they are important points so far as the discussion on an Appropriation Bill is concerned, that is the question to which our mind is to be applied. I should like to hear Shri Gurupadaswamy.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Sir, so far as capital punishment is concerned, I feel that it refers to the fundamental law of the land and it is a Central subject.

Mr. Speaker: He need not argue that point.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Yes, Sir. You were kind enough to inform the House that there will be a Private Member's Bill on this matter. But I do not know whether that Bill will come up for discussion and how far the discussion on this point can be anticipated, I do not understand.

And further, Sir, so far as the point of delegated legislation is concerned, you were good enough to say that there will be a Committee appointed in course of time but the appointment of that Committee I feel does not in any way prevent us from discussing the points coming under 'delegated legislation'. After all the Committee may be there or may not be there. But we must agree that it is the sovereign right of Parliament to go into this question of delegated legislation because it is very important in view of the fact that recently there is progressive decline of parliamentary control over the executive. And I also feel, Sir, it is the fundamental right of the hon. Members present here to go into this question as it pertains to the liberties of the people. That is all my submission, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Even after having heard Mr. Gurupadaswamy, I say that I cannot concur with him. So far as the present discussion is concerned—I do not want to rule generally as to whether the points are important or unimportant or what their nature is—the result is this that we shall have discussion on these three or two points as I said—if you combine Nos. (4) and (6)—which means "Identification of the administration with the Congress Party" in the two ways that are stated there and "abolition of Standing Committees". Now let us start.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): In order to facilitate discussion, so far agreed lists of names from the Opposition have been submitted. But from today such a practice may not be possible and I hope the Speaker's eye will be there to adjust the debate.

Mr. Speaker: Speaker's eye has always been there. It may not be so watchful in respect of certain Members as they may desire. That is a different thing. Although it is the usual practice to give the lists, the Speaker is never bound to go by those lists. They are just for his guidance and for his information. But I think that hon. Members who wish to speak may attempt just to rise but not stand all at once and unless called upon by the Speaker may not begin to deliver their speeches.

I think a period of two hours, inclusive of the reply from the Government side to the debate, should be sufficient for these two points.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: How much for the Government side?

Mr. Speaker: It is rather difficult to define but we could possibly be fairly short and the Government must have at least, I think, one hour to explain the position.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Any time limit?

Mr. Speaker: The time-limit is 12 o'clock and at the end all the motions will be put to the vote of the House. Let the hon. Members choose between themselves. Let them have one or two of them to have their fullest say or let them have half a dozen to have their say in brief.

10 A.M.

That is an arrangement between themselves. But so far as the end is concerned, we shall take the motions for voting at 12 o'clock and thus finish the things.

Shri Syamandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): Sir, will the discussion be confined to the Members of one Party only or.....

Mr. Speaker: That is not the idea. It is not the case that one Party can make all sorts of allegations and state facts and the other Party has no right to reply. Certainly, they will have a right. [The discussion on a motion when started becomes the property of the whole House. But the point is that it is not fair to the whole House that only certain Members should hold the field all the time and thereby take an advantage of the time-limit to deprive other people from participation in the discussion. That is the point.]

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): With your permission, Sir, may I submit that in regard to Demands we had cut motions and in regard to specific clauses of the Bills we have got the procedure of amendments. What will happen here in this case?

Mr. Speaker: As I said, there is going to be a discussion on the consideration stage of the motion and in that consideration stage these are the two points. Identification of the administration with the Congress Party is one. And the second is the abolition of Standing Committees. I think these points are clear enough and we need not take any more time of the House on them.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): May I understand, Sir, if the only points to be discussed are these Nos. (4), (5) and (6)? You were good enough to indicate that Government may have one hour. So far as I am concerned, I hope not to take more than ten minutes or possibly 15.

Mr. Speaker: When I said one hour, it meant the Government side should have one hour.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh (Amravati East): I say that 45 minutes should be utilised by us.

Mr. Speaker: That also is to be adjusted between the hon. Members and the Leader of the Party.

The points for discussion in respect of this consideration are: "Identification of the administration with the Congress Party with special reference also to Bharat Sevak Sangh" and "the proposed abolition of Standing Committees". These are the two points.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): Is it the procedure that amendments are to be moved?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members will see that just as in the case of Finance Bill anything would be said by way of a grievance, in this case also anything can be said but the hon. Members should see that they say only with reference to certain specific points and not generally. Yes, now let us proceed.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): It is our bitter experience to see that in this country Government is thoroughly and fully identified with the Congress Party and to facilitate matters it is fresh within the memory of many how the Prime Minister of the Government unceremoniously ousted the revered President of the Congress from

officer. (An Hon. Member: Who was ousted?) I feel sorry to say that my friend Mr. Tandon was ousted last year. I feel sorry that because they govern the country, the Congressmen, whether of importance or no importance, by the help of their officials and by bringing pressure upon them, get things done according to their ideas. And I believe, Sir.....

Hon. Members: We cannot hear. Louder please.

Dr. N. B. Khare: I believe, Sir, that to my mind there is strong comparison between important Congressmen at this time in our history with the nabobs or officials of the British East India Company.....

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. Member kindly resume his seat? I do not think it is a matter on which we really want to have a correct decision or to raise any heat or controversy. I am just watching to see as to how the Congress comes in here or how the internal administration of the Congress is concerned here. I wanted to see as to what his argument is. I would request hon. Members not to refer to something which is not quite relevant to the points that are being discussed. I do not know on what he is trying to base his argument. Therefore, I am allowing just a few seconds or a few more sentences. But that apart, I will also remind the hon. Member that the point at issue is not the Congress organisation or the Congress participation in the country outside with this or that. The principal point is, so far as parliamentary government is concerned, whether it is proper for the Party in power, whether it is the Congress or the Party which the hon. Member himself represents or any other Party for the matter of that, to associate the administration with its own machinery in a manner so as to influence the whole thing, according to him, in an adverse manner. That is the only point to be discussed and discussed, first, academically and then in the practical application of the facts. Therefore, let us ascertain the facts. That is the real scope. Let us not raise heat unnecessarily by going into the Congress administration.

Dr. N. B. Khare: That is exactly what I have been pointing out when I compared the present Congressmen to the nabobs of the East India Company. That is all. It is patent to anybody, it is complained of everywhere, including the Press, that Congressmen interfere too much with administration to the detriment of justice and fair-play.

The second point is that a new organisation has been formed under the name and style of the Bharat Sevak Samaj. It is supposed to be a non-political organisation although the Communists and the so-called communalists like me are banned from it, and it is only meant to carry on constructive work and to help in bringing to a successful end the Five Year Plan. In the first place, I should point out that to say that it is a non-political organisation is itself politics of a high order. It is founded, sponsored, managed, ruled and bossed over by Congressmen—it can never be a non-political organisation. I have a shrewd suspicion that this organisation is brought into being simply because the Government or the Congress High Command realises that the old Congress organisations are now getting out of gear and are getting rotten from internal dissensions. They will not be useful for future elections, therefore, this Bharat Sevak Samaj is established simply because it should help in the next elections to restore the Congress to power. That is my shrewd suspicion—I may be wrong, I hope I will be wrong, and I shall then stand corrected—but that is my shrewd suspicion. Therefore, it is very wrong to finance it out of State funds which are paid by all and everybody.

[SHRI PATASKAR *in the Chair.*]

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I find myself in a very difficult situation because even though we have got rather used to the lash we receive occasionally from the Speaker's rhetorical whip, I was not quite prepared to be so tied hand and foot as it were when we were discussing the Appropriation Bill. Anyhow, since we have to speak under certain limitations I will try to do what I can and I shall have to forego the temptation of referring to the speech, the rather delicious speech but somewhat reminiscent of the curate's egg, which was good in parts, which was delivered by the hon. Finance Minister yesterday. I shall have to forego the temptation of referring to certain points which he had made and which I had hoped I would get an opportunity to attempt to counter. I shall therefore confine myself to the points which the Speaker has reserved for our consideration.

I would say first of all, that we on this side of the House take a very serious view of the reported decision of Government to abolish the Standing Committees which have been associated with the different Departments. We take a very serious view of it because we do not think it is a purely routine matter of no particular

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

significance. We are afraid it is connected with certain fundamental policies which this Government is going to pursue and those policies we fear are not to the benefit of this country. Now, the idea of the association of Members on these Standing Committees certainly is that Members of Parliament of different persuasions have an opportunity of getting to know how the administration is run and to offer their suggestions if they have any in regard to the improvement of the administration. But the position as now adumbrated is this that except in so far as the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee give us some little chance, the Opposition will have no other opportunity of getting to know those elements about the administration which it is important that we should know if we are going to make any constructive contribution to the discussion in this House.

As far as I am concerned, I have certain rather serious apprehensions because I feel that this exclusion of the Members of the Opposition from some knowledge of the inner working of the administration is linked up with certain policies which the Government is pursuing, policies which were previously characterised as indicative of our Government's unfortunate subservience to certain interests abroad. I wish in this connection to draw the attention of this House to certain provisions of the Mutual Security Act which was passed in the United States of America which is extremely relevant for our purposes because the Indo-American Technical Assistance Agreement is conditioned by the provisions of the Mutual Security Act. As I had said before, it is openly stated in that Mutual Security Act that the object of American assistance to different countries is to promote the foreign Policy of the United States and there are provisions to which I shall draw your attention, Sir, in the Mutual Security Act which say very openly that assistance is not going to be offered to countries which behave in a particular manner. I fear that the Government of our country has got an idea that the Opposition, in spite of Mr. Chester Bowles, includes unfortunately a certain number of undesirable people and there is a fear in the minds of Government that if these undesirable people have an access to the inside functioning of the administration then that would be a matter of which serious notice would be taken by the Government of the United States and the assistance to

which we look forward, on which we have pitched our hopes in such pathetic fashion, as the hon. Finance Minister did in his Budget speech, would no longer be forthcoming. I would like to refer to section 511, sub-section (b) of the Mutual Security Act which reads thus:

"No economic or technical assistance shall be supplied to any other nation unless the President finds that the supplying of such assistance will strengthen the Security of the United States and promote world peace, and unless the recipient country has agreed to join in promoting international understanding and goodwill and in maintaining world peace and to take such action as may be mutually agreed upon....."

Please note the word "mutually"—
".....to eliminate causes of international tension."

This is a provision in that Act which is the sheet-anchor of the entire assistance programme of the United States of which we have rushed to take advantage in this country. And this provision proves beyond the slightest possibility of equivocation that the assistance we are getting is an assistance with very definite political strings. We have to mutually discuss things with the United States, otherwise assistance will not be forthcoming. There is also another paragraph to which I should like to draw the attention of the House.

Mr. Chairman: May I draw the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that the discussion is confined only to two points. Of course, he has made an attempt indirectly to say why Standing Committees are abolished, but I think he should not go too far into the details of the agreement and all those matters.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: My point is very clear and that is this. It is only on account of certain commitments which unfortunately our Government has made with the United States that I fear, I apprehend—if my apprehensions are wrong, I would like to be corrected—that we are excluded from the opportunity of work on the Standing Committees which are going to be abolished.

Mr. Chairman: That point has already been made by the hon. Member. But to go into details of that agreement, I think would not be warranted when our discussion is confined to these two points.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: If it is your ruling, I shall not go into details of it. But I would like to pass on—if the hon. Prime Minister or the hon. Finance Minister wishes—the information which I have in my possession which is absolutely authoritative, in regard to the provisions of the Mutual Security Act and I hope that the House will take note of the Mutual Security Act.

We take, therefore, a very serious view of the abolition of the Standing Committees because it denies the Opposition an opportunity of getting to know how the administration functions.

I shall refer next to the other point which has been permitted for discussion, namely the Bharat Sevak Samaj business. It is a very good idea to associate our people with planning. Actually every time we have spoken on planning we have said that the most important problem which this country's Government has to face is the problem of convincing the country that the planning is conducted in their own interests and therefore they should not hesitate to stint themselves, if necessary, in the execution of these plans. Therefore, the idea of a Bharat Sevak Samaj is a very good thing. But what we fear is that the Bharat Sevak Samaj is going to be another auxiliary of the Congress Party. We have found that in the group discussions that the Congress Party holds and which are fairly publicised, members of the Government and members of the Planning Commission take part. As members of the Congress Party I think they are entitled to go. But we have found indications of a close association of the members of the Government with the functionaries of the Congress Party in a fashion which we apprehend is going to lead to results which we do not like, as far as the country's interests are concerned. In regard to Bharat Sevak Samaj also, our apprehension is that this is going to be another Congress-sponsored body whose object would be to carry on Congress propaganda with the support of the State's resources.

In illustration of my thesis, I would refer to a camp which was recently held in Khadralla, in Himachal Pradesh, for which the Education Ministry—I challenge them to correct me if I am wrong—made a grant of Rs. 4,000 to the sponsors of the Khadralla Youth Camp, which was sponsored openly, unequivocally by the All-India Congress Committee's Youth Department. I would refer hon. Members to the Library of this House where there are

copies of the *Congress Sandesh* where there are copies of the *Hindustan Times*, a Birla paper, where open statements are made and articles written by spokesmen of the Congress Party that the Khadralla Youth Camp was sponsored by the All-India Congress Committee's Youth Department. Moneys belonging to the Government of this country, that is moneys paid by the people of this country, have been spent for the running of this Khadralla Youth Camp. The camp as such has possibly done good work. I am not concerned with that, but here is an indication of the way the wind is blowing. If the Khadralla Youth Camp which is a Congress-sponsored organisation can get assistance from the Government in this fashion, in a rather surreptitious fashion, we do not know how the Bharat Sevak Samaj is going to function later.

I do not wish to say hard words, because the hon. Prime Minister has been a fighter in the cause of anti-fascism. But the formation of this Bharat Sevak Samaj reminds us of the formation of bodies like Storm Troopers and similar organisations and we do fear that this kind of thing is going to lead to results which are extremely detrimental to the interests of the country. I am sorry, Sir, I cannot go into details, because you will pull me up, but I would like to say with all the emphasis that I can command that these straws in the mind are extremely dangerous and the abolition of the Standing Committees, the exclusion of the Opposition from any participation and opportunity of getting acquainted with the working of the Government and the proposed formation of the Bharat Sevak Samaj in the face of what has been done in the case of the Khadralla Camp are extremely dangerous symptoms of which the country should be aware in time.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I should like briefly to address myself to the question of the Bharat Sevak Samaj and the Standing Committees. On the 12th of June the hon. the Leader of the House while replying to the debate on Demands of the External Affairs Ministry made a statement that it is eventually for this House to decide the question whether or not the Standing Committees of the various Ministries should be continued. Speaking from my place in the Opposition, it occurs to me that every procedural and constitutional assistance should be made available to Members of the Opposition to come to grips with the activities, the day-to-day working, of the various Ministries of the Government of India. There are no ideological or other considerations for me to say

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

this. But it occurs to me that without some sort of continuous contact with the working of the machinery of Government, it will not be possible for most of us on this side of the House to be able to make any useful contribution.

After all parliamentary government is government by discussion—I am not going into the larger issues—based on competent knowledge of details, we want that access, and I dare say there would not be any suggestion on the part of my hon. friends opposite that most of us on this side would not behave responsibly, or would not keep the secrets. In fact, Sir, I was heartened from the little experience we had only a couple of days ago when the Prime Minister called a few of us for an informal discussion, and I am very happy to say this now on the floor of the House that no information—there was quite a bit of it confidential and secret—has leaked out to the press. I would like these questions to be judged from this little experience which has heartened me as a Member in the Opposition.

I feel, without the continuance of the Standing Committees, at any rate as far as the major Ministries are concerned, it will be extremely difficult, and it would constitute a handicap to most of us here on this side of the House to intelligently and effectively participate in the discussions leading to the improvement of the administration of this country. As one who raised this question on the 11th of last month as regards the Standing Committee for External Affairs, I feel I should make these few observations purely from the procedural point of view, in order to assist Members of the Opposition to discharge their duties not only to this House, but also to their constituencies, and also to assist, wherever possible, the Government, for the time being, in the administration of the country.

As regards the Bharat Sevak Samaj, I should like with your indulgence, to make a few observations. It was fourteen months ago that the Planning Commission was good enough to write to me a letter asking me to submit a note on the manner in which Sarvodaya work was being done in my part of the country. I am glad my hon. friend Mr. Nanda is here this morning. Such a note was written by me because myself and a number of my colleagues have been doing this work for a number of years. My hon.

friend Dr. Jaisoorya has come all the way to participate in the Sarvodaya, without subscription, without membership, thousands and thousands of people working together towards the building of roads, repairing of tanks, digging of canals, and so on and so forth, as a symbolical gesture, that the villagers are not left to themselves, and that town-people, educated people, people in high social position are willing to co-operate.

As a result of that memorandum, my hon. friend Mr. Nanda was good enough to have a discussion with me last year. I am referring to this, only to show that there is no disposition on the part of any one of us here on this side of the House to withhold co-operation to the Government, provided Government comes forward. I went to the electorate as a *swachchanda Congress vadi*. Not one single Congressman as such accepted the invitation to come forward and work. I am making the statement with some sense of responsibility, because I believe in Sarvodaya. Why I make this point will be plain when I say this. I do not find any disposition on the part of the Congress Party, and certainly of the Government as such, to invite all sections of the people, whatever their political persuasions, to join them so as to serve the people as servants and not as rulers. I have compared very carefully the original draft constitution of the Bharat Sevak Samaj given by the Planning Commission last year and the little printed booklet issued a few days ago and made available to hon. Members of this House. So far as the rules and regulations of this particular organisation are concerned, I do not see any State aid given to it. But I have a suspicion that eventually the State Governments, at the provincial as well as district and local levels will come into the picture, and finance will be found in order to enable this organisation to carry on. I would only make an appeal to my hon. friend Shri Nanda and also the Leader of the House that every attempt should be made by the Government in order to make it possible for every individual in this country, whatever his political persuasion, to become a member of this organisation. I have been very carefully watching the early membership of the Delhi branch of the Bharat Sevak Samaj, and I have not come across many people of parties other than the Congress becoming members. Of course, I am not passing my verdict on the formative stages of the local organisation in Delhi. But a right approach must be made by Govern-

ment because this Bharat Sevak Samaj has the *imprimatur* of the Planning Commission, so that every one, whatever his political persuasion, may come forward to co-operate. For that an attempt must be made in all sincerity, and I am sure the hon. the Leader of the House and my hon. friend Shri Nanda would not forget this point when they eventually decide upon the details for the launching of this really wonderful organisation, without which, to my mind, there will not be any possibility for this country to be re-vivified.

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta North-West): I support the views of my colleagues on this side of the House that the abolition of the Standing Committees to the Ministries is a very retrograde step, and I oppose this measure from this side. The hon. Members on the Treasury Benches have often appealed to us that there are many matters which have to be treated above party basis. The hon. Minister of Planning has particularly mentioned Planning in that connection. But what do we find? To this Planning Commission the Congress Party Members are invited, but I do not know of any occasion where any Opposition Member has been invited. It is very well known to the House that a large number of Members in the Opposition have taken a very prominent part in planning in the past. I might go further and say that the whole idea of planning in this country was initiated by one of them. But the present action proves that the Party in power is proceeding towards fascism, because they are trying to exclude the Opposition Members from getting an intimate knowledge of the mechanism of administration. It should not be forgotten that though four-fifths of the Members of the House belong to the Congress, they represent only 45 per cent. of the population and the majority of the people of this country do not think in the same way as the Congress does. Therefore, to try to exclude the persons who represent the majority of the people of this country from getting a knowledge of the mechanism of administration appears to me to be a very retrograde step.

I might refer in this connection to the working of the Legislatures in the United States of America. There you have got Congressional Committees and Senatorial Committees for many of the important items. Even an item like atomic energy development which is considered—for reasons not very clear to me—to be a very closely preserved secret is not kept away from the Members of the Legislature. I know something about atomic energy

development and I have never been able to understand why atomic energy development and everything connected with it has been kept a close preserve and the Members of this House are not allowed to know anything about it. As I was saying, in the United States of America there is a Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy and the whole matter of policy, the whole matter of administration with respect to atomic energy is freely discussed there. Of course, when those reports come before the public, certain matters are excluded from them.

In the matter of Planning I think the Opposition has got a good deal to contribute and therefore if the Standing Committees are allowed to function they will be able to obtain knowledge as to how planning is being done. I may refer in this connection to the fact that with regard to this Planning we have not been able to represent our points of view to the Government. There are many things in Planning where we can make a very good contribution. I think that all this Planning as visualized by the Government of India is going to be an idle day-dream unless you can formulate measures for the raising of finance. And, as far as I have seen, the measures which we have taken for the raising of finance are absolutely futile.

I do not wish to take more of the time of the House. I would only like to say that any attempt made by the Party in power to proceed towards fascism would be resisted by people on this side with all the strength which we have.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indian): I wish to say a few words about the proposed abolition of the Standing Committees. As one of the oldest Members of this House—oldest not from the point of view of age but from the point of view of membership—I feel very strongly that this proposal is, as Dr. Saha has just pointed out, not only a retrograde but even an undemocratic measure. I have always felt that the work and the proper functioning of these Standing Committees have represented a vital and even an integral part of the whole machinery of Parliament, and [I should have thought that those of us who were interested in promoting healthy parliamentary conventions would have been interested to encourage, to nurture and to foster these Standing Committees. None of us who have been members of these Standing Committees and have participated in their work and discussion in the past ten or even fifteen years can

[Shri Frank Anthony]

for one moment say that Government has not been strengthened, that Government has not drawn from the experience of the members of these Committees. And I do feel that Government is gratuitously dashing away one of the sources of its strength in abolishing these Committees, from all sections of the House. As I see it, this proposed step is a step by which Government is knocking away one of the pillars of our parliamentary structure.] I should have thought that the leaders of the Congress Party would have endeavoured to secure the maximum of co-operation from all sections of the House. And in the past it has been the experience that these Committees have functioned as a source of strength to the Government. What has been the actual experience of those of us who are not members of the Congress Party, in the functioning of these Committees? More often than not, non-Congressmen have agreed with Government policies after they had been placed for consideration and analysis before the members of these Standing Committees. With the result, that those policies after they have emerged from these Standing Committees have had the support of non-Congressmen, and Congressmen who are members of the Standing Committees, if they had accepted, as they have often done, the policies evolved by the Government in the Standing Committees, and they have been bound, if not to support those policies, at least not to speak against them and not vote against them, in this House. What will happen now? Gratuitously, Government will compel not only those who may be here to oppose for the sake of opposition, but even those who wish to support the Government, or to judge governmental policy objectively, to speak against and vote against governmental policies. [I may respectfully submit this: that it will not be good enough to have informal discussions, haphazardly to invite one or two people from certain groups, in order to superficially discuss some particular aspect of governmental policy. This kind of superficial *ad hoc* discussion can never take the place of the work of the Standing Committees.]

There is another matter which I would ask the Leader of the House to consider seriously, before this decision is finally taken. If the Government does decide—I believe it will be an unwise decision—to abolish these Standing Committees, then, one of two interpretations will be placed

on this step and any amount of explanation from the Treasury Benches will not prevent the people from making one of two interpretations. My hon. friends who have spoken so far have made one interpretation more or less and that interpretation is that this proposal has been inspired by a sense of dictatorship. That has been the main theme and main complaint. If we look at international history and experience, we find that where a majority party seeks more and more to confine to itself the administration of the Government, where a majority party seeks more and more to disregard the other groups and parties, where the majority party seeks more and more to identify itself with the Government or Government seeks to identify itself with the majority party, then parliamentary conventions and democratic conventions become a casualty. I would particularly appeal to the Leader of the House to look at both these interpretations. One interpretation is that this is inspired by a dictator-complex.

What is the other interpretation? It is an interpretation which has not been made so far. Let us face it without our tongues in our cheeks. People will say either that the Congress Party has made this decision because they identify that Party with the Government or the Government with that Party or, the other interpretation which may well be made is that this has been inspired by a sense of fear. Fear of whom? Fear of the Communists. As I said, let us face this problem without our tongues in our cheeks. [It is quite conceivable that the Government has in its possession information which justifies that fear that the Members of a certain Party, either because of their avowed or implied policy, cannot be trusted with the secrets which will be made available to them as members of certain vital Standing Committees like Defence. That is an interpretation which many of us in this House are prone to make: that because the Government feel that they cannot, in the interests of the country, in the interests of the conservation of national secrets, safely associate Members of a certain Party, this decision has been taken.]

I say, if this decision has been inspired by that fear, then the decision should have been of a more radical nature. If Government is afraid that certain Members of this House cannot be trusted with the secrets which are made available to these Members because they are members of the Standing Committees, which secrets

may be purveyed to foreign powers, Government should have adopted a radical policy. There is no point in indirectly proscribing people in this House. The proscription should have come before. If Members cannot be trusted with secrets, or to look after the national interests or with the secrets which are made available to them, they have no right to be in this House. I do not want to draw comparisons; comparisons are always odious. Even during the last war, secrets were made available to members of Standing Committees—even to those parties which were not prepared to support the war effort; the Muslim League and the Congress. Members from those parties were associated with the Standing Committees. That is why I feel very strongly that this is an unfortunate, and even an unhealthy departure.

That there is need for these Standing Committees is shown by the fact that the Congress Party has set up Standing Committees *vis-a-vis* most of the Ministries. Here again, as some speakers have emphasised, it is going to underline an unhealthy feature. It is going to accentuate this idea of identifying a particular Party with the Government and to lead to the impression in the minds of certain people that one Party and the Government are synonymous. By identifying committees drawn from one Party with the Ministries, by associating these Ministers with the Members from that particular Party, what is going to happen? I referred to it the other day, and I pleaded that Ministers should not regard themselves as creatures of a particular Party. This deliberate dissociation of other elements in this House will accentuate that feeling. Ministers will more and more feel that they are not the servants of the public, that they are not the servants of the nation, but that they are the servants or minions of a particular Party. This is the tendency which we have to guard against. I would ask the Leader of the House to consider what I have said. I am not, I have made it clear, opposed to dictatorship. I have never had any doubt about that; I have said it over and over again. I feel that dictatorship is the best form of Government for India. That is the only form of Government which will make our people active. It is the only form of Government which will make our nation strong.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): I agree.

Shri Frank Anthony: If we are working towards dictatorship, do not

let us pay lip service to the principles of parliamentary democracy on the one side while pursuing insidiously dictatorship on the other. Let the Leader of the House tell us that in the interests of a firm unitary dictatorial policy we have decided to do away with the Standing Committees. If he says so, I shall categorically withdraw all I have said. If we are working towards dictatorship, which is benevolent in certain respects, ruthless in others, I am quite prepared to say to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, 'Abolish all these trappings of democracy'. I would be the first to support him. But, if the Government still wishes to subscribe to parliamentary democracy, and to the trappings of parliamentary democracy, then, I would ask the Government to consider that this is one of the main, and as I said, one of the most integral features of parliamentary democracy.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In what country, may I ask, is this the main feature of parliamentary democracy?

Shri Frank Anthony: In India, for the last several years. We are always told that we should set up our own precedents. This is one of the main healthy precedents which we have set up. I would earnestly appeal to the Leader of the House, if, as I have said, either of these two interpretations is not correct, that this policy is not inspired either by a dictatorship-complex or fear of the communists, that this very healthy precedent which we have set up should be continued.

श्री बी० डी० शास्त्री: माननीय सभा-पति जी, मैं आपका कृतज्ञ हूँ कि आप ने मुझे यहाँ पर बोलने का अवसर दिया। मुझे अपने उत्तरदायित्व को निभाने का ऐसा मौका संसद् में मिल सका है। हमारा देश आज़ाद हुआ और आज़ादी हासिल करने के लिये देश में सैकड़ों लोगों ने क़ुरबानियाँ कीं। देश ने जिस महामानव के नेतृत्व में आज़ादी हासिल की थी उस महामानव को आज न केवल देश बल्कि सारे विश्व से श्रद्धांजलि मिल रही है। शासन आने से पहिले कांग्रेस कहा करती थी कि हम महात्मा गांधी जी—पूज्य बापू जी—के चरण चिन्हों में चलने की शपथ लेते हैं, प्रतिज्ञा करते हैं कि हम उनके आदर्शों के मुताबिक़ हुकमत

[श्री बी० डी० शास्त्री]

का काम चलायेंगे। इस तरह से उन लोगों ने बापू के आदर्शों के अनुसार शासन की बागडोर चलाने की प्रतिज्ञा की थी। मगर मुझे बड़ा अफसोस है कि शासन की बागडोर हाथ में आते ही सरकार का नक्शा बदल गया, सिद्धान्त सब उलट गये, जितनी प्रतिज्ञायें थीं वह सब भुला दी गईं और जाने क्या का क्या हो गया।

इस देश के लोग आशा करते थे कि हमारा देश आजाद होगा तो हमारे देश के शासन की बागडोर हमारे लोगों के हाथों में आयेगी जिस से हम लोगों को हर प्रकार के समान अधिकार मिलेंगे, प्रत्येक व्यक्ति शासन की दृष्टि से बराबर देखा जायगा। चाहे किसी श्रेणी का आदमी हो, चाहे किसी जाति का हो और चाहे किसी धर्म का हो या भारत के किसी छोर का हो, उसे बराबर के हक प्राप्त होंगे। किन्तु आज इस सरकार ने सारी ही आशाओं पर पानी फेर दिया है। आज उसने सारा नक्शा ही बदल दिया है। कांग्रेस वालों ने जिस नक्शे की उम्मीद दिलाई थी वह नक्शा बिल्कुल ही गायब हो गया है। देश में ए, बी, सी, राज्यों का जो निर्माण किया गया है वह केवल कांग्रेस ने अपना स्वार्थ सिद्ध करने के लिये किया है। एक बड़े आश्चर्य की बात है कि जिस विश्व रंगमंच

Mr. Chairman: Order, order, we are only concerned with two points, and if the hon. Member goes on speaking generally, he would be unnecessarily taking time.

श्री बी० डी० शास्त्री: तो मैं कह रहा था कि कांग्रेस ने ए, बी, सी राज्यों का जो निर्माण किया है वह अपने स्वार्थों का पूरा पूरा उपयोग करने के लिये इन राज्यों का निर्माण किया है। जिस तरह से विश्व रंगमंच में अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्प्रदायवाद है, ठीक

उसी ढंग से—उसी तरह से, इस देश में वैधानिक सम्प्रदायवाद है। इसी सम्प्रदाय के आधार पर ए, बी, और सी राज्यों का निर्माण किया गया है जो एक आश्चर्य की बात है। होता यह है कि ए प्रान्त का हारा हुआ व्यक्ति जिस को वहां की जनता अपने यहां के शासन के योग्य नहीं समझती है, जिसे वहां की जनता का जनमत न मिला हो, जिसे शासन में या पार्लियामेंट में या लेजिस्लेचर में कोई स्थान प्राप्त न हो सका हो वह इन राज्यों में ऊंचा स्थान प्राप्त कर सकता है, बशर्ते वह कांग्रेस का व्यक्ति है, कांग्रेस से सहानुभूति रखता है और अपने स्वार्थों को उससे सम्बद्ध रखना चाहता है। यहां तक कि ऐसे व्यक्ति को सी श्रेणी के राज्य का प्रधान तक बनाया गया है। जिस व्यक्ति को कहीं जगह नहीं मिलती है उस व्यक्ति को सी श्रेणी के राज्यों में जगह दी जाती है।

Mr. Chairman: मैं हिन्दी में जितना भी जानता हूं उसके मुताबिक आप जो कुछ कह रहे हैं उसका इस समय कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। यहां पर कांग्रेसवालों का सवाल नहीं है। यहां पर तो चार पांच बातें हैं वही यहां पर कहा जानी चाहिये।

may I bring.

to the notice of the hon. Member that he is speaking on matters which have absolutely no connection with the points under discussion.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma: It is his maiden speech. He must be excused.

श्री बी० डी० शास्त्री: माननीय सभापति जी, भारत सेवक समाज द्वारा कांग्रेस अपने स्वार्थों को सिद्ध करने के लिये उसको बना रही है। इसलिये यह संस्था बनाई जा रही है कि कांग्रेस में जो लोग हैं उनके स्वार्थों की सिद्धि होती रहे।

दूसरी चीज मुझे जो कहनी है वह विन्ध्य प्रदेश के बारे में है और उस को दृष्टिकोण में रखते हुए

Mr. Chairman: That is out of order. The hon. Member should not refer to any such things.

श्री बी० डी० शास्त्री: मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि कम से कम प्रत्येक देश में प्रत्येक समाज के लिये कुछ न कुछ सहानुभूति की नीति होती है। मुझे इस सम्बन्ध में सीधी ज़िले के बारे में कहना है। वहाँ पर सोशलिस्ट पार्टी . . .

(English translation of the above speech)

Shri B. D. Shastri (Shahdol-Sidhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to you for having given me an opportunity to speak here and an opportunity also to discharge my responsibility as a Member of this House. Sir, freedom came to our country and for the sake of the achievement of this freedom, hundreds of our countrymen made enormous sacrifices. Today, not only this country but the whole world is paying warm tributes to that great personality under whose leadership we could achieve independence. The Congress, before it was entrusted with the administration of the country, used to make high promises that it would strictly follow the principles of the revered Bapuji. The Congressmen pledged that they would run the Government on the ideals preached and practised by the Mahatma. Such were their words, but I regret to observe that with the taking over of the administration by the new Government things have changed for the worse, the principles have melted in thin air, the promises have been thrown to dogs and everything has gone topsy-turvy.

The people of the country hoped that with the advent of freedom, the reins of administration would be taken up by our own men, so that every citizen of the country would have equal rights and that there would be no discrimination between one person and the other. They thought that all persons, whatever their status, community and religion may be and to whatever part of India they may belong, would have equal rights and privileges. But our hopes have been

belied by the Government of the day. The beautiful pattern of the country, for which the Congressmen had given us high hopes, has disappeared. The distribution of the States into Parts A, B and C has been done by the Congress to serve its own selfish purpose. One thing which surprises us is that the international stage

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. We are only concerned with two points, and if the hon. Member goes on speaking generally, he would be unnecessarily taking time.

Shri B. D. Shastri: I was pointing out that Part A, B and C States have been created by the Congress for its own selfish ends. Just as there is international sectionalism on the world stage similarly there is constitutional sectarianism in this country. It is on the basis of this narrow-minded sectarianism that Part A, B and C States have been formed, which is a matter of great surprise. What happens is that a person defeated in a certain 'A' State—a person who has not been able to secure confidence of the people, whom the people of the State think unfit for the purpose of administration and who has not succeeded in getting a place in the Government or the Parliament or the Legislature, is given a very high post in these States provided, of course, he is a Congressman, or a Congress sympathiser or one who wants his personal interests to be closely tied with the Congress, so much so that such a person has been appointed the head of a Part C State. Persons who do not find a place for themselves anywhere in the country are provided with good posts in Part C States.

Mr. Chairman: From my knowledge of Hindi, howsoever small it may be, I can understand that the hon. Member is not relevant in his observations. There is no question of Congressmen. There are only four or five points which should be referred to. May I bring to the notice of the hon. Member that he is speaking on matters which have absolutely no connection with the points under discussion.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): It is his maiden speech. He must be excused.

Shri B. D. Shastri: Sir, the Bharat Sevak Samaj is being organised so that the Congress may serve its own purposes. It is for the personal interests of the Congressmen that the said body is being set up.

Another thing which I would like to say is about Vindhya Pradesh and taking that into consideration

Mr. Chairman: This is out of order. The hon. Member should not refer to any such things.

Shri B. D. Shastri: What I mean to suggest is that in every country, there is a policy of at least some sympathy towards all sections of society. I would like to make a reference to Sidhi district in this connection. The Socialist Party there.....

Mr. Chairman: I can understand his referring to the Bharat Sevak Samaj, but I am not able to understand his referring to Vindhya Pradesh. I think the hon. Member has not been able to grasp the limits within which these points are to be considered. It is better he speaks on another occasion.

Shri Raghavaiah (Ongole): On a point of information, Sir, I would like to know whether the Chairman is limiting himself to the number of speakers that have been given from the Opposition side or whether he is going to allow a chance for a speaker who is going to put forth a new point that has not been covered by any of the speakers from the other side or from this side.

Mr. Chairman: So far as I see, up till now only the Members from the Opposition groups have spoken. It is not a question as to how the speakers must be chosen and from what side, and it is impossible for me to pre-judge who is going to raise which point. For instance, the gentleman who spoke just now pressed upon me that he would like to speak on some of these points but we found probably he was not prepared to speak on these issues. So, it is not possible to judge previously whether a Member is going to talk on a new point. However, I shall continue the discussion till 12 o'clock.

Shri Raghavaiah: He will give the point on which he wishes to speak.

Mr. Chairman: That cannot be done.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): I have been trying to catch your eye.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Mr. Deshpande.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I rise to voice the just and well-founded apprehension of the Opposition side regarding the misuse of the proposed organisation of the Bharat Sevak Samaj that is contemplated by the Ministry of Planning. I was agitated on this point since I read it in the newspapers and after I received the pamphlet giving details of the Bharat Sevak Samaj.

Let us not be misunderstood. We are not here deliberately to misrepresent the Party in power. In fact, I read the pamphlet of the Bharat Sevak Samaj with a sincere desire to make my humble contribution to that organisation and co-operate with the Government in its effort to bring economic prosperity to this country. But, when I was reading the clauses very carefully, I came across one clause and I found that even in the constitution of this Samaj, the same perversity of approach, the same intolerance about the other men's point of view, was apparent. I found that under the heading of disqualifications, there was one clause, that those persons who are involved in activities or those persons who believe in violence or believe in communal hatred or are connected with organisations which believe in violence or believe in communal hatred, cannot be its members. I do not know what they mean, nor am I speaking with a guilty conscience that the Hindu Maha Sabha or the Communists are Parties which believe in violence and communal hatred. I know that the Hindu Maha Sabha is the most national organisation that was ever established in this country. Yet, I am speaking because the Congress Party and their leader, responsibly, and irresponsibly sometimes, have been accusing us of communal hatred, and I do not know which is the agency which will be called upon to decide which person believes in communal hatred, which person or which party or organisation believes in violence.

Dr. N. B. Khare: The Jamiat-ul-Ulema will decide it.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: That has nowhere been made clear in the constitution of the Bharat Sevak Samaj.

Yesterday, with all humbleness, I wrote a letter to the Minister of Planning, Mr. Nanda that "I am not likely to get an opportunity to speak in the debate on Planning. Will you kindly explain in your speech whether under this clause, persons belonging to the following organisations will be excluded from working in this Bharat Sevak Samaj?" I had given the names of the Hindu Mahasabha, the R.S.S., the Ram Rajya Parishad, the Communist Party of India, the Scheduled Castes Federation, and many other organisations. I wanted a categorical declaration from the Party in power. My hon. friend asks here whether we had mentioned the name of the Muslim League. I do not know, because the Party in power does not regard anything Muslim as communal. Muslims are the most national people and

everything Muslim is national according to secular definition of nationalism. Therefore, I had not included Muslim League in that list because I knew that according to the Congress, the Muslim League, the Jamait-ul-Ulaima-i-Hind and all those organisations are the most nationalistic organisations. I am rising here to get an explanation from the Party in power, because it has been made very clear in the rules of the Bharat Sevak Samaj that the State Government will be called upon to give financial aid to this Samaj. It has been further made clear that whole-time paid workers will be appointed and a colossal gigantic machinery will be created throughout India. Protesting too much naturally leads to suspicion. Many times it has been mentioned that it will be absolutely above party politics, and that it would be a non-political organisation. This too much of protestation has led me to share the view that most probably this organisation will be misused for popularising their views.

It seems to be now impossible to popularise the Congress and this is a method of forcing and thrusting the Congress Party on the electorate in India. I want an explanation from the Party in power. In fact, as my leader Dr. Khare has stated, if our apprehensions come out to be false or are not true, none would be gladder than myself. In fact, I would have wished that all these organisations ought to get popular support. I do not know how under the aegis of the Congress Government, foundation members are being enrolled. We never knew where to go, or how to become a foundation member, whether the Minister invites only certain people to become foundation members. Everything is kept in the dark. I propose to come to the hon. Minister, if he allows us or gives us an opportunity to speak. He does not answer our letters, he does not make any announcements in answer to any requests that we make in writing. Perhaps we may get a better experience hereafter and then as I have said, these efforts of popularising these schemes ought to be made. But I would certainly have wished—I do not mind if the Congress happens to be a majority party, the members of that party have a right to do social service—that they had followed in the footsteps—even as they have taken the name Bharat Sevak Samaj, which is literally a translation of "The Servants of India Society"—of the late Mr. G. K. Gokhale and had formed non-official public social organisations for popularising various schemes. I would have wished for that. But now the Government machinery is there. But they say "the Government is ours, no

one should criticise us; now there could not be any Standing Committee, and people ought not to be associated with the administration". I say it is not only a question of Standing Committees. Questions are asked whether in the other Parliaments of the world, such Standing Committees are appointed. I had tried to read very carefully *May's Parliamentary Practice*. The words 'Standing Committee' do occur there. There are many committees, and many times, the Parliament itself goes into a Committee and those Houses are taken into greater confidence than this House. My complaint is that gradually the Party in power is also being thrown into background. When the Standing Committee goes away, it is not only the Opposition that will not get the chance, but even the Party in power will not get a chance to associate and mix with the administration of the Government. I feel that it is an encroachment and a trespass on the rights, privileges and prerogatives of the Members of Parliament. We find that the majority party has elected a Prime Minister, and a leader. The Ministries are there. We do not know what they are doing. If the Standing Committees were there, we would have some control and some chance of association with the administration. I am voicing therefore the feeling of the Opposition particularly and the House generally when I say that the Standing Committees have to be restored.

11 A.M.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, I indicated some time ago that it might not be necessary for me to take more than ten minutes or possibly 15 minutes. If I exceed that time-limit, you will, I hope, show some indulgence because I have been listening to what has appeared to me fantastic stories, imaginings, and distorted perversions of thought on all kinds of things, and I have been wondering what the subject under dispute is. It has seemed to me that some hon. Members—I say so with all respect—suffering from some kind of frustration have brought out all those frustrations and not getting hold of anything logical or reasonable to see, have simply given vent to their anger against the Congress and the Government. The hon. Member who spoke first in his usual way was rather heroic about it, and having performed this act heroically marched out to rest outside. I suppose the House will not expect me to take him seriously on this or any other occasion. Therefore, I shall proceed to deal with some other points. Other hon. Members have waxed eloquent about the fascism of this Government.

बहु रामनारायण सिंह : ठीक तो है ।

[Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-
bagh West): That is correct.]

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: One of the frustrated gentlemen there threw an interjection just now, I am very sorry that I have to deal with these interjections which have no thought or reason or logic or intelligence behind them.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: Every-
thing is there.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The
hon. Member need not interfere like
that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not
mind opposition, but I do expect, if
I may say so, a modicum of intelli-
gence in the Opposition...

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: Which
you lack]

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If the hon.
Member insists on showing his lack
of intelligence, what am I to do?

We started considering two or three
important points. One was about the
recent steps taken to identify the
administration with the Congress
Party, the Members of the Planning
Commission being present at Con-
gress Party meetings, and Working
Committee meetings, and the constitu-
tion of a special committee of the
Congress Parliamentary Party at which
officials are present to take advice.
There are two or three points in that.
I come to the last point. The Congress
Party has constituted group meetings
for study and consultation on various
subjects. I would advise, if I may do
so, the Members of the Opposition to
employ their time equally usefully
instead of concentrating on just slogans
and shouting. A little study does all
of us good, and the Congress Party is
therefore taking its business
earnestly as Members of this legisla-
ture, and are seriously trying to study
these various subjects and confer with
us, and ask us. If any Members of the
Opposition or any group forms such
a study group on any particular sub-
ject, I shall gladly come to it if they
want my advice in the matter. It has
nothing to do with us. It is a private
party functioning. I do not know why
hon. Members on the opposite side dis-
like to see the Congress Party function-
ing actively, effectively and with
intelligence, because they propose to
function in that way. Therefore, to
object to the effective functioning of
the other party is the most extra-

ordinary thing that I can think of.
Apparently hon. Members of the
Opposition think that—if I may quote
a couplet from a famous French
writer, La Fontaine,

Cet animal est très méchant,

Quand on l'attaque, il se défend.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): What is
the meaning?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: "This
animal"—that is the majority party—
"is very wicked; when it is attacked, it
seeks to defend itself".

So it seems to be the privilege of
the Members of the Opposition to say
everything, relevant or irrelevant,
truthful or untruthful, and to attack
in any way, but the majority party
which happens to represent the people
of India more than the minority, which
happens to have come through in
elections recently with great success
and which ultimately has formed the
Government in this country, I say, has
to be treated with respect by every-
body in this country.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Out of
all proportion....

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That hon.
Members of the Opposition do not like
the normal functioning of that Party
is a most extraordinary thing. Are we
to take our orders and directions from
hon. Members opposite? I do not see,
why? On the inner working of the
Party, when it is said that officers go
there for advice, I really do not know
where hon. Members get their facts
from. It is the first time I have heard
it. It has nothing to do with officers;
the Party functioning or a Committee
functioning has nothing to do with
officers.

Now, so far as the Planning Com-
mission is concerned, it is meeting mem-
bers of the Congress Working Com-
mittee. It is true that they have met
the Congress Working Committee as
they met members of the Socialist
Party the other day, as they met
industrialists, trade unionists and
others. Whoever has been interested in
their work, whoever has sought to
find out anything from them or who
has been invited by them to come and
help them, they have met and discus-
sed. If any group of Members or any
one or two or three Members of the
Opposition want to discuss anything
with the Planning Commission, the
Planning Commission will gladly dis-
cuss with them. The only difference
is that members of the Congress Work-
ing Committee are interested in

achieving things, not merely in shouting and doing nothing. Therefore, they wrestle with these problems and in wrestling with these problems they ask the Planning Commission if they would like to discuss this matter with them. The Planning Commission has written to leaders of the Praja Party, leaders of other groups and many others. Many of those leaders are on their Advisory Board with whom they have consultations frequently enough. They are prepared to consult and confer with any group and, subject to time, with any individual, I would say, because they are in search of light. They are not people wedded to any dogma; they are trying to solve these intricate and difficult and complicated problems of India and they seek light wherever they can find it; whether it is America or Russia or China or any other country, their minds are not closed to anything. And certainly they seek light from our own people, apart from outside light. As Chairman of the Planning Commission I invite Members of the Opposition, and not only Members of this House, but others outside this House to come and confer with us in regard to planning in general or in regard to our Five Year Plan. I invite them to come and discuss with the Planning Commission so that we may have the benefit of their advice. They may also realise some of the problems that face us and some of the difficulties that we have to contend against. So that there is no question of the Planning Commission becoming a sort of appendage of the Congress Working Committee or the Congress Working Committee being an appendage of the Planning Commission.

Now to the larger question to which a vague reference was made by some hon. Members—of the Congress Party in a sense of interfering with the administration. If reference is made to something that happens in the districts or locally, all I can say is this, that it has been our endeavour to prevent interference with the administration by any person, whether he is a Congressman or others. But inevitably, we do not want the administration to be isolated from the people. We want to do work with them. We want co-operation. Interference is one thing, co-operation is another. We encourage that co-operation. If hon. Members go to their constituencies, their districts, naturally they are interested in conditions there. Naturally, if they wish to confer with the local authority, they should confer with them; they should hear what they have to say and so on and so forth. They must have a

co-operative spirit. We do not want interference with local authority by members of any party. If reference is made to something that happens in Delhi—I do not know what it might be, I am speaking with all respect—I do not want hon. Members, whether of the Opposition or of the majority party, to interfere with the working of our Ministries. I do not like that at all. If they want any information, we have got methods to supply it as speedily as possible. Through the Ministries, and through the various offices we can undertake to answer questions, apart from formal questions that are put here, we can have inquiries made and do everything. But it is a dangerous thing if hon. Members here belonging to any group or party interfere with the running of the administration, because then those who run it are greatly embarrassed. They cannot, of course, be disrespectful or they may not carry out sometimes the wishes of a Member; at the same time, it may be completely against their own judgment or the manner and method of the working of the Ministries, and all kinds of difficulties arise. Therefore, dealing with a Ministry or Government department should be with the head of the department. Any hon. Member can make a suggestion or make a complaint; it will be inquired into. But one thing I should like this House to remember. It seems to be forgotten what is the nature of our Constitution. Reference was made by—I forget who—one of the hon. Members to the American Constitution, to all kinds of Committees and other developments under that Constitution. Well, the hon. Member should know that our Constitution is not modelled after the American Constitution; it is completely different from it, and, so far as I am concerned, I do not want to follow the American Constitution in these and many other matters. I think, with all respect to that great nation, it is an out-of-date Constitution. It was framed 150 years ago on the basis of something previous to it. The world has changed, but the American Constitution has not changed and while I am not speaking constitutionally, I am not an admirer of the American Constitution from the point of view of a Constitution, apart from everything else. I say deliberately when we made our Constitution, it was not after the American model. It was, rightly or wrongly, largely after the British model, with some variations of course, because the United Kingdom is a small, tight little island with a unitary Government while we are a huge country which necessarily has to be a Federation, and differences creep up. But, generally speaking, this

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Parliament is modelled after the Parliament of the United Kingdom, more or less, and normally we follow its rules and conventions also, unless we want to change them. That has to be kept in mind. Let us not, therefore, get mixed up. We can have the American model if you like, we can have the Soviet model if you like, but let us not mix things up, and criticise the working of this Parliament from the point of the American Congress.

When the hon. Member Mr. Anthony was talking about great parliamentary traditions, about Standing Committees, etc., I asked him where those parliamentary traditions existed about these Standing Committees, he said: "in India". The fact of the matter is that they do not exist anywhere else. However, it would be better if I deal with these Standing Committees later. I was dealing rather with the charge that this administration is a kind of party machine and all that. Again, there seems to be some misconception. This Government is a party Government. It is not a non-party Government. I am the leader of the Party, and I am the leader of this Government.

Dr. N. B. Khare: And the President of the Congress also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Hon. Members opposite want to eat the cake and have it too. They want to characterise this administration as fascist, as everything that can be bad, and all that, and they want to upset it. And yet they want to have a share in the administration. They want to learn the art of administration. I thought that they had come to the conclusion that nothing can be learnt in this way and that all that they had to do was to subvert and to upset it and to start afresh and anew. Now, one cannot have it both ways. This is a party Government, and I say so with no apology, but with pride. I have been a Congressman for close upon 40 years, and it has been my pride and privilege to function through the Congress. It has been the pride and privilege of vast numbers of people in this country to do so. And, if I may say so, some of the Members of the Opposition also gained some stature through this Congress organisation.

There is one point. It is a party Government as Governments are in parliamentary democracies. That does not mean that the Government should function for the benefit of the party through the administration, apart from the Ministers, etc., the permanent

services, etc., should of course be completely apart from any party or any such thing. The Ministers are party men. The Ministers naturally should function for the country and not use their governmental position for their party purposes. That is an individual matter of behaviour. But it would be wrong for the House to consider them as non-party men simply because they have become Ministers.

Again, some instances were brought forward by hon. Members, and the Khadralla Youth Camp was mentioned. I do not know where hon. Members get their facts from. Of course, the Khadralla Youth Camp was a Congress camp. Nobody is ashamed of that. We have plenty of camps. We are workers. We are not talkers like some Members of the Opposition. (Interruption.)

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But the point is whether money was given to it. No money has been given to it by the Education Ministry. Where has the hon. Member got his facts from? Not a rupee has been given by the Education Ministry or any other Ministry here to the Khadralla Youth Camp.

In the same way, references have been made to the Bharat Sevak Samaj, as if governmental money was going to flow into it. No governmental money is going to flow into it. Undoubtedly, it was my hon. colleague Mr. Gulzari Lal Nanda's idea about a year and a half ago. It is not a recent development. An hon. Member referred to some circular which he had received a year ago. This idea has been considered quite apart from the Congress, and quite apart from politics. It is an idea to get large numbers of voluntary people to work in villages and elsewhere—city people to go to the villages and generally work with the others, etc. There is nothing novel about this idea. But anyhow, we discussed it with members of all kinds of organisations and parties in India. It is rather odd, but probably I think I am right when I say that Mr. Gulzari Lal Nanda has discussed this matter more with non-Congressmen than with Congressmen.

The Minister of Planning and Irrigation and Power (Shri Nanda): That is true.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is only lately that the matter has come up before the Congress. It is true that the idea has appealed to us—the essential idea of allowing opportunities for work, and the other idea that this

should be kept apart from the political level. We do not want to get entangled with the Congress organisation as such. Undoubtedly, we want Congressmen to help it in the sense of work. There are no prizes in it. There are no office-bearers in it. But anybody who wants to work can work. Andbody who wants to take up a spade and dig can take up a spade and dig. That is all. Politics does not come in. In fact, I may tell the House that some political parties wanted to take part in it as political parties. We pointed out to them that that would not be right. They take part as individuals. If I take part in the Bharat Sevak Samaj, I take part as an individual. I do not go there commissioned by the Congress to take part in it. So also others can take part in it too, not to exploit it for political purposes. Whether it is the Congress or whether it is any other party, they can come, but we do want to keep it outside the arena of controversial politics. Whether we succeed or not I do not know. I cannot say. It is true, as I think Mr. Deshpande pointed out, that in some rule or regulation, or whatever it is, it is said that people who believe in violence or who want to function on the violent plane or on the communal plane are not encouraged in it. Well, naturally, as I pointed out, as individuals everybody is welcome. But where an organisation, which is wedded to either violent methods or definitely communal methods, comes into it, difficulties are created all over the place; not only in that work, but in all work, difficulties are created, and the result might be that instead of our carrying on that particular work, we would have controversies and conflicts instead of co-operative endeavour, and may be, exploitation of that work for other purposes. I need not advance any argument before this House in regard to violence, but may I remind this House—many hon. Members may not remember—that this Parliament, or rather, the predecessor of this Parliament, officially by resolution condemned communalism and has directed Government not to have anything to do with communal organisations. Of course, they can have the freedom that the law gives, but the Government is not going to give the slightest encouragement to any communal organisation, whether it is Hindu or Muslim or Sikh or Parsi or any other. That is the official policy of Government which we intend pursuing. But so far as the Bharat Sevak Samaj is concerned, it is not concerned with these policies of Government; it is concerned with carrying on its voluntary work quietly, without argument. It does not want to

introduce the element of argument and conflict into its work. That is the sole purpose behind any rules that have been made. I do not know whether the rules have been finalized or not.

Now the other point is and I must point out—I will not say I protest—but I must express my surprise at the loose way hon. Members who ought to know better use words. Dr. Saha, an eminent scientist, threw about the word 'fascist' in a way which only leads me to think that the hon. Member does not know the meaning of the word 'fascist'. I may call him a 'fascist' too as a term of abuse. But surely these are words of meaning and cannot be used by scientists unless they have forgotten science and lost touch with their science. They cannot use loose words and vague words. It is a degradation of science, if I may say so. He talked about 'fascism' in this House. Why? What is 'fascism' here? Because we have not got Standing Committees of the Legislature? Now is this logic? Is this reasoning? Is this even intelligence? I just do not understand. I do put it to this House with all respect and in all earnestness that the way this House functions, the way this Government functions in this country, the way many of our hon. Members opposite function here and outside is allowed by this Government only. I should like to know in how many countries or in which country in this wide world this freedom is allowed. As a matter of fact our attitude here in regard to the Opposition ought to be appreciated not only with respect to organisations which openly have the policy of conducting activities which can only be called subversive activities but with every kind of opposition. I should like to know in what country in Asia, America or Europe or Africa Opposition of this type has greater freedom? Then I should like to discuss 'fascism' and 'authoritarianism' and the rest of it.

Shri Meghnad Saha: On a point of personal explanation, Sir, I had been in the Fascist regime—Italy—in 1927 and 'fascism' means (*Interruption*)

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member has spoken and taken his time. He should not interrupt now. (*Interruptions*) Order, order Hon. Members should not get excited. What I was saying was that under the garb of explanation, the hon. Member ought not to make a speech or try to give a reply. He has already had his

[Mr. Chairman]

chance to speak. I do not think there is any explanation required now. *(Interruptions)*.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Sir, why should he not be given an opportunity to explain?

[**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: May I suggest to hon. Members to show some restraint if not intelligence?

Shri S. S. More: On a point of information, Sir. Has intelligence become the monopoly of the Party in power? *(Interruptions)*.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Some hon. Members are getting unnecessarily excited. If the hon. Member Dr. Meghnad Saha really wanted to give some explanation, I could have understood. But he wanted, under the garb of explanation, to make a speech. *(Interruptions)*.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not interested in Dr. Meghnad Saha's experiences in Italy 20 years or 30 years ago. We are talking of the present day and I am challenging his statement in the present day.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): Sir, the hon. Members are denied the chance of putting forward explanations, when their statements and *bona fides* are being challenged.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Members in Opposition have been throwing out far greater challenges. *(Interruptions)*.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Raghavaiah: Sir, may I remind the Prime Minister....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. *(Interruptions)* If the hon. Members persist I shall have to be strict. It does not add to the dignity of the House.

Shri Namblar: We are not afraid of the Government, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Dr. Saha rose on a point of personal explanation. He ought to be given an opportunity to explain.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let the Prime Minister go on.

Shri Namblar: Nobody would threaten us like that.

Mr. Speaker: I want to know if the hon. Member wishes to take the functions of the Chair in his own hands? If that is not the intention, then he

must follow the procedure here. Let him not contradict or go on arguing over the whole matter. I am calling upon the Prime Minister to continue his speech.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Sir, some remarks were made by the Prime Minister against Dr. Saha and he wanted to explain the position. He was allowed two minutes to explain facts but he never got the chance. Will you give him that chance, Sir?

Shri Gadgil: That explanation can only be given after the Prime Minister's speech is over.

Mr. Speaker: Let the hon. the ex-Minister leave the matter to the Chair and resume his seat.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): Sir, the hon. Prime Minister in the course of his speech today had made so many allegations against the Opposition—not only he made allegations which have provoked the Opposition in the House but allegations about intelligence and all other things. Not only that but the Prime Minister also has said so many things and has asked whether in any country the Opposition is allowed to function in the way it does here. If the Prime Minister at least will be ready to hear from us the facts and to allow us an opportunity to explain things, that will only be fair. After all serious allegations are made against the Opposition. He said that the Opposition Members have no intelligence and they have no patience and so many other things.....

Mr. Speaker: I understand his point. Now, if more than one persons are going to speak I do not think it is possible to allow that kind of thing. The Leader of the Party, to which those Members who are speaking more than one at a time belong, has already made his submission. I have heard it. His request is that the hon. Prime Minister should give them an opportunity of hearing what they have to say, if not here then somewhere else also. And I am sure the hon. Prime Minister will always be glad to give them that kind of opportunity. I am also sure that if they convince the hon. Prime Minister that any statements of his were wrong, I think he would be first to admit his mistake and he will not stand on any consideration of false prestige. Therefore, it is no use creating here a sort of an atmosphere of tussle and heat. Let us hear whatever he has to say and if any Member has to give any personal explanation, certainly he would be given an opportunity of personal explanation, but not an opportunity of either criticising the Chairman or side-tracking the

discussion. Now we are taking up the time of the House. It is nearing 12 o'clock. That must be remembered also. So I will request the Prime Minister to continue his speech.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I entirely agree, Sir, with what you have been good enough to say. I shall be very happy indeed to have any information, refutation, correction or however else it may be called, for anything that I have said. It is of course a little difficult to measure by a yard or weigh in a balance people's intelligence. But if there is proof of that too, I am prepared to look into that. The discussion on this subject has been going on for some time this morning and thus far, and before I spoke, Sir, no one from our side spoke. I am the first speaker **on this side and we allowed Members** of the Opposition to speak one after the other, and so far as I can remember there was relative peace in this Chamber although all kinds of allegations were made amounting to saying that we were stooges of America, the Mutual Security Act was read out, and it was said that we were subservient to Governments abroad, and all that. I did not say a word. The Opposition was having a field day. And then when I get up and in my very moderate and temperate language point out certain deficiencies in the arguments that had been put across from the other side and also my desire, if I may say so with all respect, to improve the Opposition Members and point out certain proper methods of having this improvement, unfortunately hon. Members on the other side do not approve—I suppose I am right in thinking that they do not approve—of something that I said. It was pointed out that there was a deep intrigue in our not having Standing Committees. One hon. Member thought that it must be connected with the American aid. This remarkable flight of imagination really surprised me because thus far I have not heard this kind of a thing whispered even. These Standing Committees were formed in 1922 or thereabouts I think, under very special circumstances which obviously no longer exist. I am not aware of any country having parliamentary institutions having Standing Committees of that type. That does not mean, of course, that we should not have them or something like them. But if hon. Members think that these Standing Committees took part in the day-to-day administration of the various Ministries as some Members said, they are mistaken—they do nothing of the kind. They met, roughly—except for the Standing Finance Committee which met more

frequently—two or three times a year and they met to consider certain projects which they recommended or passed to the Finance Committee or whatever it was. There was hardly any real insight into the administration, any opportunity for that. It was a formality and a certain check, if you like, on the previous Government that we used to have. Now, as we function today, that particular type of Standing Committee has no meaning; it was an advisory committee, now it has no meaning whatsoever.

The House will remember that on a previous occasion I said that I would welcome as much co-operation as possible from Members opposite, in fact, from the whole House. It is very difficult to find out a method or to organise a method for that co-operation. There are in the majority party a large number of Members, I think 350 or more. It is difficult for large numbers of Members to be associated with our work. But I should like them to be associated in many ways. As a private matter, party matter, we ask them to form committees to study administration. They had nothing to do with Government, it was a pure party matter. And I mentioned to the Members of the Opposition that I would like to confer with them on any important matter that arises and a few days ago we had such an informal conference about foreign affairs. Now, I suggest that that kind of a thing we are perfectly prepared to have in regard to any subject at any time, and I would go further and say that I should like suggestions from hon. Members opposite or hon. Members on this side of the House as to now we can have more co-operation in the working of Government—I am not talking of co-operation in this House but actual consultations etc. in regard to important matters. I am perfectly prepared to consider any proposal. But I do think that this old system of Standing Committees as they were is completely out of place. It does not give that real co-operation, give those real opportunities, and it was a relic of the old British days which has no place today. Therefore, we decided to do away with it, but not to do away with the possibility of consultation or co-operation. Let us investigate that and I am prepared to go as far as possible. But the House should remember that co-operation is only fruitful when one approaches it in a spirit of co-operation. If on the other hand it is just to oppose and upset then nothing comes out of it. After all, a great part of the business of administration is not what might be called

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

a thing in which there need be opposition. In administration there are many things in common which any political party would have to do anyhow. Well, we do wish to have the views of hon. Members who may be experts or who may know something in regard to those matters and as I had said, I repeat, I shall welcome any suggestions or any ways of meeting them. For my part I have some ideas which I should like to pursue but I would welcome other ways too.

About our subservience to Governments abroad, well, I do submit that in this matter I should have preferred the hon. Member to point out something that we have done which appears to him to have been dictated or governed by some other Government's advice or direction. Surely that is the test. I agree with him that that part of the Mutual Security Act which he read out represents the wishes of the American administration in the matter. I agree. And no doubt they want such help or such support from other Governments. The point is what we do about it, not what the wishes of the American Congress when they passed that Act were. The question is whether we give up our policy in any matter, divert from our policy because either of pressure from a foreign country or, if you like to put it so, of a desire to get money from abroad. At every stage and at every step we have made it clear to every country we have dealt with that we are not going to change our domestic or our foreign policy and this has been accepted. And if at any time it is not accepted, well, there the matter ends; we part company from the aid and from that country if necessary. So that the way to look upon it is this: Have we done anything? If we have done anything, let us examine it, let us get it, and let us withdraw. But merely to say that other countries want us to do something does not carry the argument much further. To take this a few steps further and to say that we have put an end to or intend to put an end to all the Standing Committees because we are afraid that people may have a peep in into the inner workings of the Government is a most extraordinary charge. Hon. Members get somewhat excited and irritated when I in my, as I said, moderate and temperate language point out to them some facts. But do hon. Members realise that they accuse us of secret deals with foreign Powers behind the back not only of the Opposition but behind the back of Parliament, of the Indian public? We

dare not show them these secret deals! That is what is said, not implied almost, said openly. That is a very serious charge. I deny it absolutely. There is nothing secret, nothing underground, nothing hidden from public view, in our relations with any country. We may be right or we may be wrong in any particular action that we may take. But speaking for my Government, speaking for myself, I have never functioned—and I say so with all respect—in politics in an underground way. I am not for a moment accusing people who function in an underground way—not that. But the whole habit of a life-time pursues me. Even if I want to do it, I could not do it. Again, if I may strike a personal note, such influence, or affection that I have received from the Indian people is because I take them into my confidence about my innermost thoughts. [We cannot carry on this Government by way of deals with foreign powers. This Government would deserve to be washed off and smashed up if it did that behind the back of the Indian people or this Parliament.]

Shri Nambiar: That is going to happen.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member opposite displays the attitude which I said previously about some hon. Members opposite. It is rather extraordinary how truth will out in spite of every effort to suppress it.

This has nothing to do with Standing Committees. Let us discuss our foreign policy, or aid programme as you like. Standing Committees even if they exist, it is equally easy for Government to see that nothing secret is sent up to the Committee. In fact the Standing Committees got to know nothing secret. They got to know obvious things which everybody knows.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: May I rise on a point of information? What is the intelligent deduction from a process of acceptance of foreign aid from a particular country which very specifically lays down conditions regarding the acceptance of that aid?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is—if I may say so—a question of your own strength and ultimately it is your own strength that counts.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Vis-a-vis the United States.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In every Parliament.....

Mr. Speaker: Not like this. That is not the way to keep the dignity of the House.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The question is not what the United States may have said we must do, but what we have agreed to. The preamble to this agreement runs as follows:

"Recognising that individual liberty, free institutions, and independence, on the one hand and sound economic conditions and stable international economic relationships on the other hand, are mutually interdependent;

Desiring to co-operate in promoting and accelerating the integrated economic development of India:

Agreeing that increase in the interchange between the two countries of technical knowledge, skills and techniques in the field of economic development is mutually advantageous; and

Considering that the Government of the United States of America and the Government of India agree to join in promoting international understanding and goodwill and in maintaining world peace, and to undertake such action as they may mutually agree upon to eliminate causes for international tension;

Have agreed to carry out the Technical Co-operation programme and its separate projects as follows:"

This is not the occasion for me to discuss foreign policy. I have endeavoured to discuss it previously and I hope to discuss it again in this House and elsewhere, because it is important that hon. Members opposite should understand it. The people of India, even the average villager understands it more or less. But the intelligent person who has allowed his intelligence to be warped and twisted in one direction finds it very difficult to understand simple problems.

In regard to the Planning Commission, nothing has happened which would have really enabled hon. Members opposite to raise this point. The Planning Commission is functioning quite apart from the Congress, though it is true perhaps that prominent Congressmen are connected with it, as they are connected with this Government, as indeed it is a fact that they run the Government. One cannot forget that fact. But they run the Plan-

ning Commission, they deal with the Planning Commission in a completely non-partisan way, not even as Ministers. A Minister has greater latitude in this matter than a member of the Planning Commission. Unless he happens to be a Minister, he is in a sense an official who is not connected with any party. He is functioning as an expert in that particular work.

In regard to the Standing Committees, in my opinion, these Committees were completely out of place. They did no useful work. They might have produced an impression in some Members that they were doing some work. They were too much connected with the old British set-up for us to continue them. If there are other methods of consultation in regard to administration, I am perfectly prepared to consider them.

Shri Raghavaiah: On a point of information. Will the hon. Prime Minister make available to this House the agreements made by the Government of India with other Governments?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They are laid on the Table of the House from time to time; they are not secret.

Shri Raghavaiah: May I remind the hon. Prime Minister of the contradiction in his speech when he characterised.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He must not take advantage under the cover of a point of information to carry on other arguments. It is very wrong. It is not keeping the honour and is a breach of faith.

Mr. Gadgil: he must bear in mind the time limit.

Shri Gadgil: I want to take a dispassionate view of the points raised and the discussion thereon. Undoubtedly, the groups are study groups. Objection was taken on the ground that certain officers were present. What I want to tell the House is that the object of these groups is just to study the problems of the various Ministries with which they are associated and guidance is given in the matter of such studies by the Ministers and the officers are there to supply data and information to the Minister, not necessarily to the Members constituting the group. I think what information is given is available to the Members of this House if they ask questions and that information is bound to be given on the floor of the House. So there has been no breach of the Constitution. As the Prime Minister has rightly pointed

[Shri Gadgil]

out, whatever help is possible in the way of making information and data available would be given to the Members of the other parties also.

Reference was made that this was putting the Government in the hands of one party. I think any commentary on the political institutions and practices in the U.S.S.R. will show that the Government there and the party are indistinguishable. Therefore, in fact the leftists ought to congratulate the Congress party for having emulated the example of U.S.S.R. The real trouble is that they are suffering from a sense of frustration and they do not appreciate the real motive behind the arrangement that has been evolved.

As regards the Standing Committees, as far as I remember, two were constituted under the Government of India Act, 1935 and the others in pursuance of resolutions passed in the Central Assembly. At that time the Government was irresponsible and irremovable. But at the same time the Government felt the necessity of associating the popular element with the formulation of policy and wanted to share some information, though not power, with the representatives of the people. Therefore, we must bear in mind that the constitution of these advisory committees was a feature of a system of Government which is no longer obtaining today. Today our Government is a parliamentary Government. Therefore, all those precedents and provisions which we find in the constitution of the U.S.A. are irrelevant. There the executive is not responsible to the Legislature. Here, under this Constitution of ours you can fix the responsibility squarely on the Government. The constitution of Standing Committees, in my humble opinion, will affect that central theme of responsibility and it will be, I think, against the spirit of the Constitution as well.

What will be the manner of working of the Standing Advisory Committees, if constituted? Suppose the Members of the Opposition come and agree to anything. Knowing as we do the Leftists, they will go out and on the floor of the House they will use that position as a spring-board for something more. In other words, they will not be able to deliver the goods because they would easily say that those were individual commitments not binding on their respective parties. If, on the other hand they oppose it, obviously the Standing Advisory Committees are useless.

In these circumstances I believe that in the interests of parliamentary executive nothing should be done which will take away, even by a grain, the responsibility of the Government, which must be exclusive. They are responsible for the formulation of the policies and their execution, and if they go wrong the Constitution provides the remedy. Moreover, why should we give the Government an opportunity to say "We consulted you, and the policy has been the result of the consultation with you"? Thus there is a moral obligation to support and I think the Prime Minister is perfectly right when he said that the Government cannot share the responsibility with any other party. Therefore, the grievance of my Leftist friends is not valid, unless they have something else up their sleeve which so far they have not disclosed.

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Meghnad Saha is not here. I wanted to give him an opportunity of making a personal explanation, but unfortunately he is not here. I will proceed to put the motion to the House.

The question is:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1952-53, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 1 to 2 were added to the Bill.

The Schedule was added to the Bill.

The Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

12 Noon.

ESSENTIAL GOODS (DECLARATION AND REGULATION OF TAX ON SALE OR PURCHASE) BILL.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the motion moved by Shri C. D. Deshmukh on Wednesday, the 28th May, 1952 in respect of the Essential Goods (Declaration and Regulation of Tax on Sale or Purchase) Bill. The motion is for reference of the Bill to a Select Committee.

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): The motion requires some amendment, Sir, in view of the fact