

would require on the part of the Government a somewhat more deep and more specific dealing, especially with those particular industries where this matter has come up—that is, in the coal mines, in the textile industry and in the jute industry. Jute industry has been, to a certain extent, discussed, and I am surprised to learn from the hon. Minister that there is a small tendency even in the plantations. In such industries these matters must be taken up, so that at least this matter, which has been discussed and decided at the Jute Conference, that there should be no further retrenchment of women workers, is decided upon and the entire question gone into.

Since we have already had some sort of an enquiry into the situation of women labour undertaken by the Labour Ministry, and in view of what has been actually done in the Jute Tripartite Conference, and also in view of the suggestions made by the hon. Minister that the question may be taken up at the next Labour Conference, I would withdraw this resolution and wait and see how matters develop in the course of the next few months.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: Sir, I want to have one clarification from the hon. Minister. Apart from the larger question, wherever middle-class women are employed, especially in commercial concerns, there is a clause in their service conditions to the effect that the moment they get married they will lose their jobs. I would like to know whether something could be done by the Government, whether some statutory protection could be given in regard to this.

Shri Nanda: We shall bear it in mind in the course of our discussions.

The resolution was, by leave, withdrawn

15.50 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE WORKING OF MONOPOLISTIC CONCERNS

Shri Kunhan (Palghat—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

“This House is of opinion that a Committee consisting of Members of Parliament be appointed with a view to examine the operations of the monopolistic concerns in the country and to suggest suitable measures to curb their powers and activities which are detrimental to the national economy.”

Sir, in moving this resolution, my intention is to give effect to one of the fundamental functions of the State as defined in the directive principles of State policy embodied in our Constitution. According to these principles, we are supposed to conduct the affairs of State. In article 39 of the Constitution, it is said:

“The State shall, in particular, direct its policy towards securing:

(b) That the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good;

(c) That the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment;” etc.

This Parliament is the guardian angel of the people's rights, the upholder of the Constitution. It devolves on us to point out and bring pressure upon the executive to give effect to the wholesome provisions of the Constitution. It is, therefore, in the fitness of things that we today discuss in this forum one of the crucial economic functions envisaged to be carried out by the State.

[Sri Kunhan]

Again, the second Five Year Plan, a document which this House has accepted in its wisdom, and enjoined on the Government to implement, states as one of its cardinal objectives:

“(d) the reduction of inequalities in income and wealth and a more even distribution of economic power”.

Discussing the objectives of the second Five Year Plan, the report states:

“The benefits of economic development must accrue more and more to the relatively less privileged classes of society, and there should be a progressive reduction of the concentration of incomes, wealth and economic power”.

Further, on the problem of development of under-developed economies, the plan points out that:

“the problem before under-developed countries embarking upon development at this late stage is so to plan the alignment of productive resources and of class relationships as to combine development with reduction in economic and social inequalities; . . . There are existing inequalities of income and wealth which need to be corrected and care has to be taken to secure that development does not create further inequalities and widen the existing disparities”.

Therefore, the problem is not merely one of correcting the admittedly existing wide disparities of income and wealth, but also to prevent the problem from becoming acuter due to economic development. Where does concentration of wealth arise from? Primarily, concentration of wealth and disparity in incomes arise from the ownership of property, ownership of

the means of production, land factories, mines, banks, etc. Therefore, in tackling this problem of concentration of wealth and income, our attention has to be directed towards the location of ownership of factories, mines, banks and land. And in a developing economy, with orientation towards industrialisation, attention has first to be focused on factories, mines and banks, because in spite of the present primacy of landed property, the future will be decided by the ownership of the former, being the growing factor.

The first question which we have to answer is: do conditions of monopoly exist in our economy and, if so, in what sectors and lines of production? Dr. M. M. Mehta, in his study of the structure of Indian industries, points out:

“the most striking feature of India's industrial development has been the concentration of ownership and control in fewer hands and in fewer establishments”.

He says further that:

“for all practical purposes a few leading families in India control and guide the industrial destinies of the country. Fresh and young blood seldom find an opportunity to enter the closely-preserved and well-organised industrial oligarchy”.

Another feature of our industrial organisation to which Dr. Mehta draws attention is the close link that has developed between industrial power and financial power, either through managerial integration or the system of interlocking directorships. Thus, all the six leading Indian managing agency houses maintain close connection with banks, insurance companies and investment trusts through the system of interlocking directorships.

The penetrating study conducted by Dr. Mehta reveals that a few managing agency houses exercise overwhelming control over a major portion of Indian industry. More than 250 industrial establishments are controlled and managed by nine leading British managing houses, while 11 Indian houses control and manage 220 industrial establishments. Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao, now the Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How many pages does the hon. Member desire to read?

Shri Kunhan: I will finish within one minute.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It was brought to my notice that he had some difficulty in speech and so I allowed him to read. But the speech must be short. It cannot go on like that. Reading of speeches is prohibited otherwise.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: He is the mover of the resolution and he has the right.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has no right to read as such.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It is his maiden speech.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is not the question. The House should not become dull both to the ear and to the eye. He may try to finish his speech.

Shri Kunhan: Yes, Sir. I was mentioning Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao. He is a leading economist in the country, whom the Government invites to every conference of economic importance. He remarks, in his foreword to the book, as follows:

"The domain of managerial activity is not confined to one or two specific types of industries but ranges, in many cases, over a wide

variety of industrial undertakings. Thus, one managing agency house controls 50 companies of which 10 deal with jute, 17 with tea, 10 with coal, one with sugar, two with transport, two with electricity, and seven with miscellaneous industries. The extent of managerial integration that exists is revealed even more when one looks at individual industries. Thus, in the cotton mill industry, out of 408 mills, 81 are controlled and managed by a group of 15 managing agents and accounted for more than one-third of the productive capacity of the industry. The concentration is greater in the jute industry, where, of the 85 companies, 33 were in the hands of four managing agents, two of whom controlled and managed 21 jute mill companies. Of the 166 sugar mills in the country, 51 were in the hands of 16 managing agents of which five controlled and managed about 32 sugar mills. Similarly, in the coal industry, about 60 companies were managed by 14 managing agents, four of them controlling 30 companies. In the tea industry, 128 companies were managed and controlled by 11 managing agents, six of them controlling 96 companies."

In the case of the cement, iron and steel, and match industries, managerial integration has gone further and taken the form of formation of giant units enjoying a semi-monopolist position.

16 hrs.

Thus, in the cement industry the ACC controls and manages 15 and Dalmia group 5 of the 25 cement companies in India and Pakistan. More than 90 per cent. of the productive capacity is under the managerial control of two big firms—Tata and Martin and Burn and Company. WIMCO controls more than 75 per

[Shri Kunhan]

cent of the output in the match industry. We have already concentration of wealth and industrial and financial control in a few hands in the country.

Now let us see how this concentration of production has affected the national industries. The tyre industry is a typical example of such a situation. This industry is completely owned by four foreign subsidiaries.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member gave the impression that he was finishing soon.

Shri Kunhan: I will finish in two minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I understood him to say that he will take only one minute.

Shri Kunhan: The Tariff Commission in its Report on Fair Prices of Rubber Tyres and Tubes, 1955 points out:

"The tyre industry provides a typical instance of oligopoly which so far as prices are concerned, functions virtually like a monopoly."

We have already seen the concentration of ownership. What does it mean in terms of democracy and the peoples' welfare. We cannot allow this state of affairs to continue and grow. It is, therefore, the bounden duty of the Members of this House and the executive to take such measures as will curb the activities of this monopolistic group. They will have to take measures to break them up to sizable proportions. The Constitution enjoins on us to prevent the growth of this concentration. In spite of all the protestations of socialistic pattern, it is an established fact that Government has been going against the letter and spirit of the Constitution. It is, therefore, necessary that the House

should appoint a Committee to go into the whole matter and suggest such measures to realise one of the injunctions of the Constitution.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that a Committee consisting of Members of Parliament be appointed with a view to examine the operations of the monopolistic concerns in the country and to suggest suitable measures to curb their powers and activities which are detrimental to the national economy."

Shri Bimal Ghose (Barrackpore): On the face of it, the Resolution appears to be innocuous and unexceptionable. But I am not quite sure if the mover has made out a case in favour of the Resolution. Because, the Resolution refers to monopolistic concerns, not to concentration of economic power and wealth. There appears to be some kind of confusion between the two. The two are not the same thing. It is true that in India we have a very large measure of concentration of economic power and wealth, particularly through the managing agents. But we cannot say that we have very many monopolists in this country. It was for the mover to point out as to whether the monopolies do occur so that a case could be made out for the Government to intervene.

Now, what is a monopoly? When would you say that a state of monopoly exists in industry? It has been said that a state of monopoly would exist when a particular concern is able to dictate the market, dictate the prices. Now, which are the industries in India where we have a state of monopoly? I am not saying that there is no concentration of economic power, to which I shall come presently. I do not know whether there are

many industries in India where a state of monopoly exists, and where it does exist whether nothing has been done. For example, take the steel industry. We might have said that the Tatas, before the present expansion, was in a monopolistic position. But then the prices were used to be fixed by the Tariff Board or Commission. So, it could not be said that Tata was acting to the detriment of the social interests, because there was an expert committee. Take the ACC in cement, which may be considered also to be more or less in a monopolistic position. There also the price is dictated by the Government, so that we cannot say that the monopoly has been acting to the detriment of the social interest.

This question has arisen in all countries and all countries have also taken action and enacted legislative measures against monopolists. It was in America first that we had the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890. We also have had legislation in France, Belgium, South Africa and other countries. Even Great Britain, in 1950 or 1951, passed the Monopolies and Restrictive Practices Act. But the question is why this legislation was sponsored. The legislation was sponsored because it was felt that certain industries were functioning in a way which was detrimental to the public interest of the country, that they were charging high prices to the consumers or that they were not supplying the quality to the purchasers that they should have for the prices they were charging. That is the main basis for legislation against monopolistic activities.

Now we have to make out a case in our country as to whether a condition like that obtains. In our country, as far as I see, even if a monopolistic condition exists in an industry or a unit of an industry charges higher prices or offers a quality which is inferior relative to the price that it is charging, then the Government has ample power under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act to

take action. The Government may not have taken action. Then it would be for us to point out to the Government that here is a case where you have not taken action. So, it is not as if there are not sufficient powers with the Government to take action in a case where a monopoly exists.

Now, if it is not a question of monopoly but concentration of economic power and wealth, I would agree with my hon. friend, that there is a case for something to be done. A beginning in that direction was made when we amended the Indian Companies Act, wherein much of the powers of the managing agents were curbed. But, even so, it remains that a few houses today control the industry and trade of this country, so far as the big units are concerned. As a matter of fact, it has become impossible for a small man to start an industry or trade. Now, that is a situation which requires Government's attention as to whether anything can be done in that matter. The costs have become so high, the economies of large-scale production have become so large that for a small unit to survive has become extremely difficult.

16-09 hrs.

[SHRI MOHAMMED IMAM in the Chair]

In this context, it will be seen that a monopoly by itself is not bad. We have to realise that we have moved away from the 19th century ideas of monopoly when it was felt that *laissez-faire* was the natural state of things, that competition was the natural course of things and anything which came in the way of competition was unnatural. In course of time we found that in certain industries or trade when a unit became larger certain economies became available and it was of advantage to have larger units of a monopolistic character, as, for example, the public utilities where we do not allow competition. Why don't we allow competition in industries like gas, electricity, tramways:

[Shri Bimal Ghose]

and so forth? Because, if you allow-
ed competition then the disadvantage
to the society would be greater than
having a sort of monopolistic concern

Then, therefore, as I was saying
monopoly by itself is not bad, but
monopoly has a tendency to charge
higher prices. It has a tendency to
make higher profits by charging
higher prices. Then a case arises for
its control. Now, in this country,
firstly we do not have so many cases
of monopolies and secondly if there
are monopolies there is ample power
with the Government to take action
and if the Government has not taken
action, of course we can point out to
the Government that here is a case
where action was deserved but
nothing has been done and we might
move the Government to take action.
Therefore I feel that the Resolution
as it has been framed really is not
one which can be supported. But if
it were a Resolution which wanted
something to be done about the con-
centration of economic power and
wealth certainly I would have sup-
ported it because that is the bane of
our present economy.

However much the Government
may say and try to do good to the
small man, the small man really to-
day has no place in the Indian eco-
nomy. Anybody who is in business
or industry as a small man knows
that he has no chance. He is wiped
out by the big man and therefore if
something could be done that way—I
wish the Government would give
their attention to that problem—and
if a Resolution of that kind were
brought forward, certainly I would
have given it my fullest support.

श्री स० न० बमर्जी (कानपुर)

सभापति महोदय, श्री कुन्हन ने सदन के
सामने जो अपना प्रस्ताव रखा है, मे उसका
समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं
समझता हूँ कि आज यह प्रस्ताव जिस जरूरी-
साइज्ड बे में रक्खा गया है शायद आज

देश की उस हद तक परिस्थिति न हो कि
जिसमें हम यह साबित कर सकें कि देश में
मोनोपोलिस्टिक कंसर्न्स का बोलबाला है
लेकिन अगर इस प्रस्ताव के एगेंस को देखें
और उसके सक्स्टेंस को हम देखें तो इसमें
कोशिश यह की गई है कि आज जो इस देश
में मोनोपोलिस्टिक टेन्डेन्सी बढ़ रही है और
इस देश में जो धन का समुचित रूप से बट-
वारा नहीं हो रहा है और धन कुछ खास
लोगों के हाथों में ही पकूच रहा है तो इस
बुराई को किस तरीके से खत्म किया
जाय या उसकी जाच की जाय और इस चीज
का उपाय किया जाय कि आज जो धन
का बटवारा और सर्कुलेशन ठीक तरह से
नहीं हो रहा है और वह कुछ लोगों के हाथ
में कंसंट्रेट हो रहा है वह न हो कर धन का
समुचित रीति से बटवारा और सर्कुलेशन
हो।

मेरे मित्र श्री कुन्हन ने अपने भाषण में
यह समझाने की कोशिश की कि आज जिस
तरीके से कंसंट्रेशन आफ वेल्थ हो रहा है
और मैनेजिंग एजेंसिज की बात भी उन्होने
रक्खी।

सभापति महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान
दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना की तरफ दिलाना
चाहता हूँ जिसका कि समर्थन हमारे देश के
लगभग सभी राजनैतिक दलों ने किया था
और केवल राजनैतिक दलों ने ही नहीं बल्कि
ग्राम जनता ने भी उसका समर्थन किया था
और उसका एक ही कारण था कि उसका
मकसद यह था कि हमारे राष्ट्रीय उद्योगों
का विकास हो। लोग यह समझते हैं कि
राष्ट्रीय उद्योगों का विकास होने से देश की
सम्पत्ति बढ़ेगी और सम्पत्ति का समुचित
रूप से बटवारा होगा और देश का कल्याण
होगा। यही वजह थी कि देश भर द्वारा
इस दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना का समर्थन
और स्वागत किया गया और आज भी हो
रहा है।

इसके विपरीत प्राज अगर हम उन पूंजीपतियों की ओर देखते हैं तो हम क्या पाते हैं ? उनका ध्येय क्या है ?

प्राप सारे देश के इतिहास को देखें । केवल यही नहीं है कि वे लोग केवल इंडस्ट्रियल कनसर्न्स को अपने हाथ में लेते हैं, बल्कि उनके अपने बैंक हैं, अपना इन्फोरेस है, अपने प्रेस हैं । और इसी तरीके से वे कोशिश करते हैं कि देश की प्रथम व्यवस्था के ऊपर इनका काफी जोर हो, इतना जबरदस्त ग्रिप हो कि वह अपने टर्म्स को डिक्टेट कर सकें । अभी मेरे मुम्बजिजब बोस्त विमल घोष साहब ने कहा कि शायद अभी हमारे देश में वह कडीशन नहीं है । हमारे देश में वह कडीशन नहीं है बल्कि बहुत से दूसरे देगो में नहीं है । उन्होंने प्रायरन और स्टील की बात भी की कि उनके प्राइसेज फिज होते हैं । लेकिन एक मिसाल में प्रापक नामने देना चाहता हू यह दिखलाने के लिये कि प्राज इनका कितना जबरदस्त ग्रिप है हमारे देश की मत्ता के ऊपर । मुम्किन है कि एक ट्रेड यूनियनिस्ट की हैसियत में अगर मैं यह मिसाल देता शायद लोग यह समझेंगे कि वही चीज में लाना चाहता हू जा मैं दूसरे तरीके से लाना चाहता था । लेकिन प्राज उनका जा मोनोपोलिस्टिक स्वरूप है उनका कितना ज्यादा असर प्राज की सरकार के ऊपर है । प्राप एक मामूली मिसाल लीजिये कि अभी कुछ दिन पहले वहा सिर्फ एक दिन की हड़ताल हुई और यह एक दिन की हड़ताल हुई क्यों ? वह इस वजह से हुई कि यूनियन ने कोशिश की कि एक रिप्रेजेंटेटिव कॅरेक्टर की जाय होगी चाहिये । यूनियन ने सिर्फ यह काशिश की कि जो मुनाफा टाटा प्रायरन एंड स्टील कम्पनी दिन ब दिन करती जा रही है उसका कुछ हिस्सा महगाई की शबल में हमका मिलना चाहिये ।

श्री ए० कु० घोष (जमशेदपुर)

जो स्ट्राइक हुआ वह इकानमिक डिमांड की वजह से हुआ या किमी और वजह से हुआ ?

श्री ए० कु० बनर्जी प्राप श्रीरज रखिये । मैं हिन्दी में बोल रहा हू । सबकी समझ में आयेगा ।

तो मैं कह रहा था कि उसमें डिमांड क्या थी । यूनियन के वजूद का मवाल था और दूसरा महगाई का मवाल था और महगाई की माग इसलिये की गई थी कि चाहे किसी और इंडस्ट्री में क्राइसिस हो, टेक्सटाइल में क्राइसिस है या नहीं इसको जाच रहा है, हा सकता है कि उसमें कुछ न कुछ क्राइसिस हो, लेकिन स्टील इंडस्ट्री एक्सपेंडिंग इंडस्ट्री है जिसमें क्राइसिस की बात नहीं है इसलिये वहा के मजदूरों ने माग की उनको महगाई ज्यादा मिलनी चाहिये । उस डिमांड को मनवाने के लिये वह एक दिन की हड़ताल की गई । प्राप देखें कि इस तरह की हड़ताल का सप्रेस करने के लिये एक मानोपनिस्ट एक कॅपीटनिस्ट जिसका सत्ता के ऊपर हाथ हो वह धार्मी तक बुलवा सकता है । प्राप प्राज भी टाटानगर की हालत देखें । टाटा प्रायरन एंड स्टील के मालिकों को यह अच्छी तरह से मालूम है कि चाहे वह प्रान्तीय सरकार हो या चाहे वह मेट्रल गवर्नमेंट हो, किमी की इतनी जुरंत नहीं है कि वह वर्कर्स के सप्रेसन में देखल दे सकें क्योंकि प्राज उनके पास वह बैलैसपीटी मौजूद है जिसमें दस लाख रुपया चुनाव फंड में दिया गया है ।

केवल यही नहीं है कि वे प्रथम व्यवस्था में अपना हाथ रखते हैं बल्कि वे यह कोशिश भी करते हैं कि जो यह सरकार वा शूकाव सोशलिज्म की तरफ है या जो सरकार का शूकाव समाजवाद और इस्तराफीयत की तरफ है, वह शूकाव वापस आये और फिर कॅपीटलिज्म की तरफ हो जाये । वह इस कोशिश में है सिर्फ इतना ही नहीं । जो फिर्स अभी मेरे भाई ने दिये हैं उनको अगर

[श्री म० म० बनर्जी]

आप अच्छी तरह से देखें तो आपको मालूम होगा कि ये मानपली की तरफ जा रही है। आप जूट इंडस्ट्री का लीजिये, रबर इंडस्ट्री का लीजिये, मंच इंडस्ट्री का लीजिये अगर इनको इसी तरीके से पनपने दिया गया, तो मैं आपका विश्वास दिलाता हूँ कि आज भले हा एपैरेंटली वह मोनोपॉलिस्टिक न मालूम हो या मोनोपली रिग की हालत में न हो, लेकिन आखिर में वह नतीजा जरूर आयेगा कि वे एक मानोपली रिग की हैसियत से देश की सत्ता के ऊपर जोर डालने की कोशिश करेगी या हमारी नेशनल इकॉनमी पर हमला करने की कोशिश करेगी और उसके ऊपर अपना पूरा ग्रिप हो यह कोशिश करेगी।

सदन में जा यह प्रस्ताव पेश किया गया है ऐसा नहीं है कि उगमें कुछ महत्व न हो। माननीय मंत्री इस पर विचार करेंगे और यह समझाने की कोशिश करेंगे हम लोगों का कि ऐसी देश की अवस्था नहीं है देश में मानोपली नहीं है। अगर आप उर्वरक की मानी के मर्ताबक इमका देखें तो यह हो सकता है कि अभी मोनोपली न हो लेकिन क्या यह सच नहीं है कि हिन्दुस्तान की अर्थ-व्यवस्था के ऊपर आज तो या दस आदिमिया का एक जबरदस्त हाथ है। क्या यह सच नहीं है कि ये लागू अक्सर हमारी राजनीति पर कुठाराघात किया करते हैं? क्या यह सच नहीं है कि आज कुछ लोगो ने मिल कर देश के हितों और देश की नीति के खिलाफ ऐसी चीजें की हैं कि इनमें देश का नुकसान हो रहा है। टैक्सटिल इंडस्ट्री आपके सामने है। आप कहेंगे कि यह मोनोपली कहा है। आप कहेंगे कि कुछ मिलें किमी मरमायेदार की हैं, कुछ दूसरे मरमायेदार की हैं। इसलिये यह मोनोपली कहा है? तो यह तो सही है कि एक ही फैमिली सारे हिन्दुस्तान की अर्थ-व्यवस्था को कंट्रोल नहीं करती। ऐसा तो अमेरिका में भी नहीं है। वहां भी

गठ तो फैमिलीज है जो कि वहां की अर्थ-व्यवस्था को कंट्रोल करती है। और साथ ही हिन्दुस्तान में इन लोगों के बैक है, इयोरेश है। अभी हाल में इयोरेश का नेशनलाइजेशन हुआ है। आप देखें कि जब से नेशनलाइजेशन हुआ है ये मानोपलिस्ट लोग कहते हैं कि नेशनलाइजेशन गलत है और जो यह नेशनलाइजेशन की भावना है उनके खिलाफ काफी प्रचार करने की कोशिश करते हैं। आप देखें कि ईस्टन इकॉनामिस्ट में आर्टिकल के बाद आर्टिकल इसी विषय पर निकल रहे हैं। आप पढ़ें तो आपको मालूम होगा कि ईस्टन इकॉनामिस्ट ने नेहरू जी के बारे में कहा है मिरु में भी लोगो ने बहुत बड़ा पब्लिक सेक्टर खड़ा किया था और उन्होंने पिरामिड बनाये थे। लेकिन पिरामिड बनने के बाद जब काम खत्म हो गया तो फिर बेकारी फैल गई। आप देखें कि हम और आप तो बराबर दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना की कामयाबी का नारा लगाते हैं और कुछ लोग यह कहते हैं कि ये पिरामिड बनाने जा रहे हैं और इस तरह में कम्पैरिजन करत है और कहत है कि अभी तो मिलियन्स को काम मिल जायेगा लेकिन फिर बेकारी हो जायेगा। इस तरह के आर्टिकल्स स्टन इकॉनामिस्ट के हैं। इमानिये में ममझना है कि यह अच्छा होगा अगर इस सदन की तरफ में एक कमेटी बनाई जाये जो हम जान की जाच करे कि वाकई हम देश में इंडस्ट्री कितना रुपया मुनाफे के तौर पर कमा रही है। आज देश को पैसे की जरूरत है। आज हम देश में विदेशों में रुपया लाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। लेकिन मुझे खतरा हाता है कि यह जो विदेशी पूंजी देश में आ रही है यह कहीं एक नई ईस्ट इंडिया कम्पनी की शकल में न आ जाये। एक ईस्ट इंडिया कम्पनी की करत तो हम देखें चुके हैं। यह जो बाहर से रुपये की शकल में या सामान की शकल में भरद आ रही है यह देश की आजादी को फिर गुलामी की जंजीरों में जकड़ने की कोशिश कर सकती है। तो

जो बीलत देश में आ रही है कहीं ऐसा न हो कि उससे हमारी आजादी को या हमारी आर्थिक स्थिति को खतरा पैदा हो जायें। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि आज इस प्रस्ताव के इससे को हम देखें। यह ठीक है कि अगर आप उसको बिल्कुल टैकनिकल तरीके से देखेंगे तो उसका महत्व जाता रहेगा। मेरी दरखास्त है कि आप इसका मांगना क्या है यह देखें। मैं कहता हूँ कि हमारी एक कमेटी बनने की जरूरत है। आज देश में दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना की कामयाबी के लिये पैसे की जरूरत है। मुझे बताया जाये कि जिन लोगों ने घरों पर प्या मुनाफे में कमाया है उन्होंने पंचवर्षीय योजना के लिये क्या दिया है। उत्तर प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री जी ने एक नारा दिया कि डेवेलपमेंट लोन के लिये प्या दीजिये लेकिन आप देखें कि चेम्बर ऑफ कामर्स के अध्यक्ष ने कहा कि आप डेवेलपमेंट लोन ले लेकिन दूसरी तरफ हमारा भी काम करें हमारी भी टैक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री को चलायें, टैक्सटाइल पर ड्यूटी कम होनी चाहिये, इस इंडस्ट्री में रेशनलाइजेशन होना चाहिये और कह दिया कि आप डेवेलपमेंट करें लेकिन नाट एट अवर वास्ट। मैं कहता हूँ कि इस तरह की डिमांड चीफ, मिनिस्टर या प्राइम मिनिस्टर के सामने करना एक एंटी नेशनल चीज है। आज देश में कपड़े की जरूरत है, आज देश में गल्ले की जरूरत है, लेकिन आप देखें कि आज कौन है होडिंग करने वाले या मिलों को बन्द करने वाले। क्या उन्होंने कभी यह सोचा है कि आज जब कि देश में कपड़े के अधिक उत्पादन की जरूरत है, अट्टाइम कपड़ा मिले बन्द पड़ी हुई है और जूट मिलें बन्द पड़ी हुई है, इसका कारण क्या है? कौन जिम्मेदार है इस का? इस अवस्था में यह कहा तक उचित है कि हम ऐसे लोगों के तरफ की बातें करें और उन्हीं को सपोर्ट करें। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इसके बारे में पूरी जांच होनी चाहिये और वह इसलिये होनी चाहिये, ताकि इसका फरदर योग्य

न हो और इसको बैक किया जा सके। हम लोग तो भिन्न यह चाहते हैं कि जो मुनाफा कमाया जा रहा है, वह देश के कामों में लगे। हम जानते हैं कि नेशनलाइज्ड इंडस्ट्रीज का पैसा देश में ही लगता है। म. नोपलिस्म द्वारा कमाया हुआ पैसा उन्हीं के पास जायेगा और वह कभी भी देश में नहीं जायेगा। निहाजा यह कमेटी बननी चाहिये और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि यह सदन इस प्रस्ताव का पाम करेगा।

श्री० रणवीर सिंह (रोहतक) चेयरमैन महोदय, जहाँ तक इस प्रस्ताव के आशय का ताल्लुक है, कोई इसमें बहुत ज्यादा मतभेद नहीं कर सकता है, लेकिन आया कोई कमेटी एपायंट करने की आवश्यकता है या नहीं, इसमें दो राये हा सकती हैं। अगर हम स्ट्रुक्चरली म. नोपली शब्द को इस्तेमाल न करें और प्राइवेट कॅपिटलिज्म के नुकता-ग-निगाह में देखें, तो हम इस तरीजे पर पहुंचते हैं कि पिछले ग्यारह सालों में हम काफी समाजवाद की तरफ चले हैं। जहाँ तक जमीन के समाजवाद का ताल्लुक है हमने बहुत हद तक उसको पूरा कर लिया है और कई जगह पूरा करने वाले हैं। इसी तरह में जहाँ तक इंडस्ट्री का ताल्लुक है, हमारे देश में सबसे बड़ा बैंक इम्पीरियल बैंक था, वह आज एक सरकारी बैंक है। इसी तरह में जितनी बड़ी बड़ी बीमा कम्पनिया थी, वे सब आज सरकारी लाइफ इन्शोरेंस कॉर्पोरेशन के हिस्से हैं और उनके मालिक भी उन्हीं ही दम खान्दानों में से हैं, जिनका कि अभी आनरेबल मेम्बर ने जिक्र किया है। अगर वे लोग आज तक इस सदन के ऊपर कोई असर न रख सके, तो मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि आगे भी अगर कोई शक, चाहे वह हिन्दुस्तान का कितना ही बड़ा मरमायादार क्यों न हो, अपने दिमाग में यह ख्याल लायेगा कि वह हिन्दुस्तान की राजनीतिक व्यवस्था में कोई असर डाल सकेगा, तो शायद वह गलत-फहमी में रहेगा और इसका सबूत हमने कई

[श्री० रणवीर सिंह]

वफा देना है। पिछले दो इलेक्शन बूये। उनमें कई एक सरमायादारो ने कांग्रेस और दूसरी पोलिटिकल पार्टियो से टेक्निक लेकर, जो कि समाजवाद की तरफ जाना चाहती थी, इस हाउस में और दूसरे सेजिस्लेचर में जाना चाहा लेकिन वे न जा सके।

श्री स० म० बनर्जी : श्री बाबूभाई चिनाय भा गये हैं।

श्री० रणवीर सिंह : मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हू कि अगर पांच सी के हाउस में तीन चार भा भी जाते हैं तो कोई बात असर-प्रदाय नहीं हो सकती है। पर दोस्त ने जितना हौवा दिखाना चाहा है, वह हकीकत नहीं है।

श्री पाणिग्रही (पुरी) वे बाहर में अमर डालते हैं।

श्री० रणवीर सिंह अगर बाहर में उनका असर होता, तो महा पर बीमा कम्पनिया नेशनलाइज न हो सकती।

जहा तक लोहे के बड़े बड़े कारखानो का ताल्लुक है, इस मुल्क के अन्दर सी फी-सदी लोहे का कारोबार कुछ आर्वाभियो के हाथ में था। सैफेड फाइव थीअर प्लान के बाद तकरीबन ७५ फी सदी कारोबार सरकारी हाथो में होगा, चाहे किसी कारखाने को सरकारी कारखाना न बनाया गया हो। इसी तरह से दूसरा बड़ा कारोबार कपडे का है। मैं समझता हू कि अगर अम्बर खर्चा कामयाब हो गया और नये कायम्बटर खर्चो को मोका दिया गया तो जिस तरह से जापान का आदमी यहा के बड़े बड़े कारखानेदारो का मुकाबला कर सकता है उसी तरह से हिन्दुस्तान के देहात में बैठा हुआ कोई आदमी अम्बर खर्चो और कायम्बटर खर्चो से सूत कात कर और जिन देहात में बिजली जाती है, वहा लूम लगा कर यहा के

बड़े बड़े कारखानो का मुकाबला कर सकेगा और मुझे विश्वास है कि हिन्दुस्तान के बड़े बड़े कारखानो के मालिको के कुछ ही दिन रह गये हैं।

एक और बड़ा सेक्टर शुगर फैक्टरीज का है। उन्होने देश में काफी पैसे कमाया है। जिस तरह से माननीय सदस्य के दिल में जोश है कि उस पैसे को लोगो की भलाई के लिये सरकार को लेना चाहिये, उसी तरह से मुझे भी जोश है। इस बारे में मुझे जरा भी शक नहीं मालूम देता कि आने वाले सालो में हम अपनी पालिसी के जरिये अपने मकसद में कामयाब होंगे। माननीय सदस्य उस सरकार और उस लोक-सभा पर शक करते हैं, जिन्होने यह प्रस्ताव पस किया है कि आने वाले हिन्दुस्तान में समाजवादी ढंग का एक निजाम हम कायम करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन वह निजाम हम अहिंसा के तरीके से कायम करना चाहते हैं किमी का मार कर, लूट कर या बरबाद करके कायम नहीं करना चाहते हैं—देश की तबाही करके नहीं बल्कि शान्ति और अमन से हम अपने मकसद को हासिल करना चाहते हैं। मजदूर भी इस देश का हिस्सा हैं और इस अरसे में उनकी भी तरक्की हुई है। अभी इससे पहले प्रस्ताव पर बोलते हुए माननीय सदस्य के साथी श्री० टी० सी० एन० मेनन ने कहा कि वह मानते हैं कि मजदूरों के लिये अच्छे कानून बनाये गये हैं, लेकिन कुछ वजूहात की बिना पर उनसे पूरा फायदा नहीं उठाया जा सका है। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हू कि डेमाक्रैटिक सिस्टम और हकूमत क डेमोक्रेटिक सिस्टम में एक कमजोरी हाती है कि गरीब के लिये जा कायद-कानून बनाये जाते हैं, उन पर अमल के दौरान में ताकत वाले और आर्थिक शक्ति रखने वाले लोग उनको हुडकवा कर सकते हैं, लेकिन उनकी भी एक हद है और उसमें भी कोई ज्यादा दूर तक नहीं जा सकता है।

जहाँ तक प्राक्कथे इकट्ठे करने का सवाल है, वे तो सरकार के पास होंगे और सरकार को वे रखने चाहियें ताकि हमें मालूम हो कि यह क़ाइद यीधर प्लान को पूरा करने के लिये किससे मे कौन हमारे दोस्त हैं, किन से हमको मदद और शक्ति मिल सकेगी, वगैरह। पिछले ग्यारह साल में सरकारी कैपिटल भी बहुत काफ़ी बढ़ा—सैकिंड फ़ाइव यीधर प्लान में वह तकरीबन ३५०० करोड़ रुपया होगा, जब कि पहली फ़ाइव यीधर प्लान में वह १५०० करोड़ रुपये था। प्राइवेट बैंकटर में भी कैपिटल इन्वेस्टमेंट डबल हुई। यह मैं मानता हूँ। उसकी एक वजह यह भी होगी कि इस हाउस ने कई रियायतें दी हैं। वे रियायतें कम करनी चाहियें, वह मैं मानता हूँ। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की जितनी राजनीतिक पार्टियाँ हैं चाहे कांग्रेस पार्टी हो या कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी हों, या सोशलिस्ट पार्टी हों—हमें इस बात के लिये कोई वजह नहीं मालूम होती कि हम उनकी इन्टेन्सिटी पर शक करें और इस बात से डरें कि कोई सरमायादार उनको देश के हितों के खिलाफ़ असर-अदाज कर सकेगा।

Mr. Chairman: I take it that there are no more speakers.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Chairman: How much time does the hon. Minister propose to take?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): Twenty minutes to half an hour.

Mr. Chairman: I think we have got only half an hour

Some Hon. Members: Two hours are allotted for this

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta—East): **Mr. Chairman,** I was extremely sorry to see that Shri Bimal Ghose could not find his way to give his unqualified support to this Resolution

which our colleague Shri Kunhan has moved before this House. I would not be surprised to find any opposition to this motion from the other side. But, I would be rather concerned to see even some hesitation in supporting the motion from this side of the House at least from representatives of parties who are pledged to socialism like ourselves.

He has raised certain technical objections in this matter as to the existence of monopolies in this country, whether we have or have not a monopoly. The question is not whether there is monopoly in the sense that certain industrial units or certain industrial houses are able to dictate prices. But, we have something which is called monopoly in common parlance, which may not come within the strictest definition of monopoly as we find in the books of Marshal or Pigou or Adam Smith, going back to them. The whole thing is, there are certain families who control large parts of our different economic sectors. My hon. friend Shri Kunhan has given examples from the jute industry, coal industry, tea industry, the textile industry, the rubber tyre industry and so on and the match industry also. All these examples are there. That economy, if it has become more and more concentrated, if it has not yet reached the stage of monopoly, as far as the need to investigate this concentration is concerned, there can be no doubt about it and there can be no doubt that this needs a probe. If they are not in a position to dictate the prices of commodities, they are in a position to do so many things as pointed out by other hon. Members of this House. They are in a position to dictate to the Government in certain respects. They are in a position to buy off the Government simply by contributing large amounts to political funds. It is not as a communist that I express this concern. Whenever this question has come up before the High Court Judges of Bombay or Calcutta, they have expressed the very same concern. The question is whether this

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

kind of economic concentration where they have possession of huge surplus wealth to control the destinies of our country through buying off our rulers or through other means, should be allowed and whether this should not be checked. This is the pure and simple question which arises out of this Resolution. My friend has made it quite clear, definitely clear. Therefore to bring in the question of the definition of monopoly, whether it conforms to the classical definition or not, becomes metaphysical rather than a real question in the context of our politics. I would strongly support the resolution and stress the need for an enquiry

There is no doubt that if we had an enquiry, we can focus much light on the activities of these different family houses.* No doubt, we have passed the Companies Act. No doubt we have imposed certain restrictions on managing agencies and certain restrictions on directorships. But, what is the use of the restrictions when they can easily be circumvented? We have only to split up the Houses notionally. Instead of one Birla, you have to create five Birlas and fortunately, the family does not lack members. Instead of one Tata, you have to create five Tatas and you can circumvent the whole lot of restrictive provisions and precautionary provisions that are enacted in the Companies Act. Therefore, something more serious should be done. Some more attention should be given than simply amending the Companies Act. By amending the Companies Act, we only make it a little more difficult. We only leave it to the ingenuity of the different houses that control our industrial sectors and let it be said to their credit that ingenuity in these matters is not what they lack. Therefore, let us have an enquiry by a body consisting of Members of Parliament representing all the parties, so that we can have a thorough probe into the ways in which they function. And from this probe we shall be able to

arrive at certain economic forms, which we shall enforce in the different States and in the country as a whole. We may be able to arrive at at what kind of laws to enact to protect our economy from getting into the hands of the few.

Let us remember that today the extent of monopoly may not be very much, but the tendency is bad and we cannot overlook this tendency. The tendency is not that the economic power is getting more and more diffused. Shri Ghose himself has agreed that the tendency is that it is getting more and more concentrated. He himself concedes that it is impossible for the small man to get into industry today, and my friend Shri Kunhan himself has quoted an eminent authority, Shri Mehta, who says that it is impossible for any one to get into the business controlled by the different industrial houses. Should that tendency be allowed to continue? Should we go on drifting?

It is quite clear, it is mathematically clear that if this tendency continues, then the monopoly in the classical sense, which Shri Ghose has presented to us, will not be far away in our country, and we shall have not only the concentration of wealth which enables the persons concerned to perpetrate all kinds of—I will put it mildly—wrong things in our country, to influence in a devious manner the politics of our country, but in a very short time, if this tendency is allowed to continue, they will be able to have a tighter economic grip on our country, and then they will be able to lead the country by the nose because of their grip on the economy.

Therefore, I would once more urge upon the House to uphold this resolution. It is not a party matter, it is not a matter in which the Communists or the Socialists are interested. It is

a matter in which every man should be interested. The Congress professes to be wedded to the socialist pattern in our country, and if it is so, this tendency cannot be overlooked when it is growing in the country. It has to be checked, and the only way it can be checked is by arriving at the facts through a proper enquiry, and then to take proper measures to remedy the state of affairs.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): While supporting the resolution moved by my friend Shri Kunhan, I would like to confine my observations to the working of the monopolist system going on in my part of the country. While previous speakers have spoken on the monopolist system continuing in the industrial field, I would like to draw your attention to the monopolist system regarding the collection and disposal of the minor forest produce in certain parts of the country, especially in my State.

In this connection, I would like to draw your attention to the Kendu Leaf Control Order of the Orissa Government. Kendu leaf means bidi leaf. As a member of the Forest Enquiry Committee, I had the opportunity to visit the forest districts of that State, and it was brought to our notice that this bidi leaf is mostly grown on tenants' holdings. These are not the leaves which are produced from the tall trees of the reserve forests, but these are mostly collected from the shrubs. These grow on the tenants' holdings. For a better crop of these bidi leaves, pruning is needed, and this part of the operation is mostly conducted by the tenants. But by the promulgation of the Kendu leaf Control Order, the Orissa Government have restricted the fundamental right of the tenant to dispose of the leaves grown from his holdings. This is most unfair. The monopoly right of collection and disposal of these bidi leaves is auctioned every three years and most probably given to the highest bidder. But this relates only to

those produced in Government lands. And yet, by the promulgation of the Kendu Leaf Control Order, the tenant's free right to dispose of the produce to anybody he likes is being restricted, and he is forced to sell these bidi leaves only to the Government monopolists at a great sacrifice.

The Kendu Leaf Control Order further restricts that he cannot possess more than two maunds of kendu leaf. If he is to possess more than two maunds, then he has to take special permission from Government. Moreover, the rate at which the tenant has to dispose of his leaves to the Government monopolist has to be fixed by the district magistrate. All these restrictions are being imposed on the plea that this kendu leaf is an essential article. Under the Essential Commodities Act, Government have brought kendu leaf within the mischief of that Act, and declared kendu leaf as an essential article.

On account of the working of the kendu leaf monopoly system, the labourers are completely at the mercy of the monopolists. There being no other plucker of those leaves, the monopolists being the only person who do this kind of operation in a particular season of the year, the labourers are completely at their mercy and since there has been no organised labour union in that part, these monopolists try to exploit the labourers.

The Forest Enquiry Committee tried to work out how much a labourer would be earning in that area, and they came to the conclusion that a labourer working in the kendu leaf area would be earning only about As. 4 a day, and you can very well understand how this monopoly system is working. Though it is incompatible with the so-called socialist pattern of society and it goes against the Directive Principles of the Constitution, still, we find that these people are being favoured by Government or by the party in power.

[Shri P. K. Deo]

Further, the day these monopoly rights are given is not above board. Sometimes, tenders are called, and sometimes it is done by auction. And it is a sight to see that at the time of these negotiations, all these monopolists run about in the party office and try to give substantial donation to the party in power. As a member of the Forest Inquiry Committee, I had to tour Koraput district, and I noticed that the position in regard to *myrrabolam*, tamarind and *mowha* flowers was also the same. Though in law, the monopoly right is being given only for the collection of the leaves grown on Government lands, yet in practice, the tenants who grow these tamarind or *myrrabolam* or *mowha* flowers on their own holdings are forced to sell their produce to the monopolists. They are mostly given to the favourites, those who could substantially pay to the party funds, and no fixed principle is being followed in this regard. Though this question of discontinuance of this monopoly has been many times thoroughly discussed in the Orissa Assembly, nothing has been done towards it so far. So I earnestly request that the Central Government should as well give a direction to the State Government for discontinuance of this kind of monopoly system.

This Kendu Leaf Control Order has been declared *ultra vires* the Constitution by the Judicial Commissioner in Vindhya Pradesh in 1956, and though this Order goes against the very spirit of our Constitution and against the so-called socialist pattern, it is a pity that only the few blue-eyed boys of the Government are being favoured with this special privilege. I earnestly request that this system should be discontinued.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I thank the hon. speaker who preceded me for extending the meaning of the word 'monopoly'. If his interpretation of the word 'monopoly' is to be taken into account, I think we are living in this

world in the midst of nothing but monopoly. For instance, I go to a city and find that there is only one degree college there. It may be said about that degree college that it has the monopoly of higher education. Now, I do not think the word 'monopoly' is used in that sense in any part of the world. It is a very loose way in which the hon. Member has interpreted this word.

I also find that other speakers who have preceded me have not tried to get the exact economic connotation of the word 'monopoly'. They have not tried to show in what sense this word 'monopoly' is being used all over the world these days. The word 'monopoly' means that a person or an association has exclusive rights of production and/or distribution of a particular commodity over a vast tract of land or all over a country—that is what you mean by 'monopoly'—and that other competitors in the field are kept out by all kinds of means. They are bought out; they are not allowed to function. Now, I think the word 'monopoly' is used in the economic world in that sense.

I would very respectfully submit that monopoly in that sense does not exist in India. Even if its shadow existed somewhere at some time, I think the ghost of that thing has been laid by the policy which the Congress has been pursuing all these days and years. The Congress started pursuing that policy even before India became free, and it has been pursuing that policy with greater vigour, greater efficiency and greater zeal ever since we attained independence. I think the word 'monopoly' in that sense has not been operative in this country for a long time. To think that some industrial houses are engaged in certain industries does not mean that they have the monopoly of those industries. In the first place, I do not know how many industrial houses are running a

few industries. I look at the industrial map of India and find that so far as that is concerned we are having what I may call limited companies and joint stock companies. These joint stock companies are those companies in which the common man and other people have put their savings. To think that these companies have become the monopoly of certain persons is to beg the question.

I know there was a time when some person used to get hold of companies by the managing agency system. That was a system which did not work always for the good of the common man of the country. It is true that that system had its very grave defects from the point of view of the policy of the Congress. But you know that in the Indian Companies Act we have practically crippled the system and we have almost abolished that. Of course, industrial concerns cannot run without that system; but we have taken the teeth out of that system and made it a system which is not conducive to the furtherance of capitalist interests. We have tried to see that that system does not conserve capitalistic tendencies in society. Therefore, I would say that one could talk about monopolies only in the context of capitalistic countries of old.

Even there the cartels, trusts and monopolies are undergoing some metamorphosis; they are being transformed. Nobody is able to endure that in any part of the country. To talk that these things exist in India, I think, is not always very true.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): How about creating concentration in the hands of a few people?

Shri D. C. Sharma: I do not think there is any concentration in the hands of a few people. I think there is concentration in the hands of people who are able to invest their savings and earnings. I think we are having some

kind of distribution not only of capital all over the country but also of dividends and earnings. It is now being diffused and not being concentrated. If anybody studies the economic trends in this country he will come to the conclusion that there is attendency now towards diffusion and towards checking concentration. I think this concentration is only a bogey in the eyes of certain persons and they are trying to bring it out in the open field. This bogey has only an imaginary existence; it has no real existence.

Look at the history of Congress. The Congress passed a resolution and that resolution said.....

An Hon. Member: A pious resolution.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Let me reply to that question. It is the glory of Congress that what my friends call a pious resolution has been translated into concrete things of glory. Let them call them in any terms they like. So, I was saying that the Congress became aware of this pernicious system of capitalism or monopoly trading or monopoly business as early as 1931. They had voices raised against that even before that (*Interruptions.*) I know you do not like what I say. But you must also know that I am not to be put down like that I listen to you very patiently and one good deed deserves another. You should also listen to me patiently even though my thoughts and ideas are not palatable to you because we live in two different worlds. (*Interruptions.*)

17.00 hrs.

Mr. Chairman: Let him not be interrupted. He is recalling the past glory and one should not have any objection to that. He may please proceed.....

An Hon. Member.... with the past glory.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad):
Let there be some future glory also.

Shri D. C. Sharma: My friend there says that I talk about the past glory of the Congress. I talk about the present, living and continuing glory of the Congress. If you do not understand that, what can I do? I was saying that if there were any monopolistic tendency in our country; the Congress ..

Shri Bimal Ghose (Barrackpore):
The Congress has a monopolistic tendency?

Shri D. C. Sharma:...the Congress set its face against it as early as 1931. You know the measures that we have brought forward in order to put an end to these monopolistic tendencies. I need not give a lecture on the socialist pattern of society. This House has approved of it. It is no mere theory. It has been put into practice in our fiscal, commercial and industrial policies. Take the Industrial Policy Resolution which was reiterated with some modifications recently.

Shri Bimal Ghose: It is now 5 P.M.

Mr. Chairman: We are rising seven minutes past 5 because we commenced non-official business late by seven minutes.

Shri D. C. Sharma: We have given a kind of a big blow to these monopolistic tendencies. This House has passed the Wealth Tax Bill, the Expenditure Tax Bill, the Gift Tax Bill and the Estate Duty Bill, which is coming up before this House again for modification. What is the sum-total of all these measures that have been enacted during these recent years? The sum-total is that all tendencies towards monopolistic trading, monopolistic thinking or monopolistic industrial undertakings should be fully curbed and controlled and they should be gradually liquidated. I think they have been practically liquidated in

this country. There is no monopoly in the economic sense of the word. So, our whole planning, the First and the Second Plans are a kind of a challenge to those persons who think that monopolistic tendencies prevail in this country. We are wedded to the doctrine of equitable distribution of wealth among all sections of society and we do not want concentration of power and wealth in anybody. The Prime Minister has been saying so many times that this kind of concentration is not conducive to the healthy growth of national consciousness. We have always been saying that and I believe there is great truth in it. If anybody comes to us and says: "Oh, you are forced to protect the industrial houses because they give money to you", I think they forget that they also get money from them. Though we are the persons who are sometimes taken to task for that, even then, I tell you, it does not affect our policy, it does not affect our thinking, it does not put any brake on the thoughts and actions of our people.

Therefore, there is no need for an enquiry. I tell you, this House is carrying on enquiry into this kind of work from day to day, from hour to hour. Every day questions are put in this House. There are committees sitting on these points and those committees are formed by this House. There are also other things going on. I feel that our industrial system is always under proper scrutiny, our industrial system is always under the vigilant eye of our Government and our people. And I think that India is now so far advanced in its thinking, so far advanced in the field of a socialistic pattern of society, that even if some of us may not be awake to these things the common man is awake, and I do not think India can tolerate any kind of thing in this field.

Therefore, I should say that though I would be very happy if the Mem-

bers of Parliament are given this kind of work, I think it is unnecessary, because the problem to which this resolution refers is a problem which is already under the constant review of the party and the people of the country

Mr. Chairman: We will resume discussion on this resolution next time

17-08 hrs

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 18th August, 1958