

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : That is what is being done.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : But my point of order is something else. My point of order is regarding the procedure and conduct of business in this House. No doubt a Member is allowed by the Chair to raise a point but it is never discussed in the House. That is the position under our present procedure. But is the discussion going to be allowed now and if you have allowed..,

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : It is not a discussion.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Then why the other Members are being allowed ? This is not the procedure in the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : There are several procedures in the House; I know and hon. Members also know. Yes, Mr. Misra.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I am thankful to you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I was submitting that if the Prime Minister earnestly wanted to have a discussion with the leaders of the Opposition, she should have called all the leaders of the Opposition and discussed the matter a little seriously with them and tried to evolve a consensus among the Members in the House. The Vice-President who is going to be the presiding officer of the House at least should be generally acceptable to the House. If that is not so there would be disorder in the House in the functioning of the House. What harm would have been caused if the Prime Minister had tried to evolve a consensus regarding the candidate for the office of Vice-President and Chairman ? That is what I wanted to submit. I would submit again through you to the Prime Minister that if it is possible she should evolve such a consensus among the Members of the House.

**I. RESOLUTION SEEKING DIS-
APPROVAL OF THE BANKING
COMPANIES (ACQUISITION AND
TRANSFER OF UNDERTAKINGS)
ORDINANCE, 1969 (NO. 8 OF 1969)**

**II THE BANKING COMPANIES
(ACQUISITION AND TRANSFER OF
UNDERTAKINGS) BILL, 1969**

SHRI PITAMBER DAS (Uttar Pradesh) :
Mr. Vice-Chairman, I beg to move :

"That this House disapproves the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Ordinance, 1969 (No. 8 of 1969) promulgated by the Vice-President acting as President on the 19th July, 1969."

Sir, the question of nationalisation...

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) :
Mr. Vice-Chairman, copies of the Bill as passed by the Lok Sabha and the motion were circulated to us yesterday after 7 o'clock. Do you think this is enough notice for the Members to deal with such a heavy legislation and how much time has been allowed ? Even the Business Advisory Committee I understand was not unanimous about it. It has been the tradition to do things unanimously in the Business Advisory Committee as far as possible. I want to remind you that the Bengal debate we had yesterday and the Bill for the abolition of the Upper House in Bengal was not passed in this House only because Mr. Bhupesh Gupta did not want it. One person did not want it; otherwise the House was willing to do it. In this case are the heavens going to fall if a little more time was given to this House ? This is a very wrong way of doing things. You can do something which is right or wrong but it seems the Congress Party has got into the habit of doing things the wrong way and the Law Minister was moving amendments in the other House even in the third reading stage. It is very rarely such things have happened. I would like to know if there are precedents where in the matter of legislation of such a serious nature, a matter concerning the banking industry in the country, even during the third reading stage amendments are sought to be brought in and the whole measure hustled through. Why should we be hustled in this manner ? The manner in which this is being done is very wrong. Sufficient time should be given to this House. It is very unfair that things are being hustled in this manner.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) :
I think normally we can raise such points but in this present case there is some national urgency and if you acknowledge the national urgency you must also think of emergency measures. In the House the rules of procedure can always be altered at the will of the House; it is for the House to decide. As far as the time factor is concerned, I think this measure has got too much support in the country and so little controversial that.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

we can dispose of all the amendments in no time. Really there is very little to be debated. Now, I am warning you—warning you in a good sense, no* in a bad sense—that there must not be any obstructive tactics, any deadlock. . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : As is happening in Bengal. What is happening in Bengal ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : He is asking, what is happening in Bengal.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Let us get on with the debate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I would appeal to you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that you apply your authority against all obstructive and frivolous tactics.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : As they do in Bengal.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi) : I mentioned in the Business Advisory Committee yesterday that when this particular question is raised I should be given permission to say a few words about it. My submission is ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : It was mentioned in the House after the Business Advisory Committee. If the hon. Member was not present what can be done ? Mr. Loka-nath Misra did mention about your objection and the House is in the know of it.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : My submission is that yesterday in the meeting it was decided that it should be mentioned at the time when the Resolution or the Bill was taken up. Now, Bhupesh Gupta has come up with a very novel idea that in the case of a certain issue for which there is so much support—I do not know how he has gauged this support; if he has gauged it from the type of demonstrations ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is written in the skies.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : ... that we see then does he mean to say that where *etc* such demonstrations can be stage-managed the lights and privileges of the House should be taken away and we should not take up a measure or a Bill, for which the country has to ponder deeply, with some peace, with some calmness and

give it a dispassionate consideration ? My submission is there is no such urgency that we should hustle the whole thing through. After all there is political background to it; the way the Ordinance was promulgated, the time when t* w's promulgated, the manner in which the Bill is being pushed through even when the matter is before the Supreme Court, these are all bad portents and I submit that these things should not be allowed. We should be permitted to have our full say and to give full consideration to this matter. The Rajya Sabha should not be taken for granted. It should not be said that the Lok Sabha has taken seven days and we should finish it in three days, we should go on discussing it till it is finished, and the non-official day should be devoted to it. After all heavens are not going to fall if two more days are taken; the Rajya Sabha has the right to say what it feels about it.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमान्, मैं एक निवेदन आपके द्वारा ड. ह्याभाई से और भाई महावीर से करूंगा कि असल में हम भी जो एक संसदीय तरीका है उसके विरुद्ध इसको जरूर मानते हैं, कम से कम 48 घंटे का समय तो होना ही चाहिये, मगर एक राइडर 11 तारीख का लग चुका है, चूंकि सुप्रीम कोर्ट में 11 तारीख पड़ी हुई है इसलिये अगर 11 तारीख के पहले हम इसको पास नहीं करेंगे तो जो संसद् का एक प्रधान कर्त्तव्य है किसी विधेयक को पास करना उससे थोड़ा सा हम च्युत हो जायेंगे, इसलिये हम इन लोगों से निवेदन करेंगे कि हां उचित समय नहीं मिला है, जो हमारा रूल है वह भी थोड़ा बायलेट हो रहा है, लेकिन सब की कमेंट से हो रहा है, कभी भी फ्यूचर में, भविष्य में, हमको यह अनुमति सरकार को नहीं देनी चाहिये कि इस ढंग से वह विधेयक लाये और इस ढंग से वह आर्डिनेंस लाये, मगर जो स्थिति आज बन गई है उस स्थिति को देखते हुये और चूंकि 11 अगस्त की तारीख पड़ी हुई है, उसके पहले हमारा लेजिस्लेशन होना चाहिये, इसलिये हम भी यह चाहेंगे कि अब इस पर एंतराज न उठे और इस पर हम सामान्य रीति से अपना सामान्य विवाद जारी रखें।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार) : भविष्य में भी ऐसा ही होगा। ऐसा नहीं करना चाहिये।

श्री राजनारायण : यह चेतावनी हमने दे दी है। आपका ठीक कहना है, यह ठीक है, हम चाहते हैं और श्री भूपेश गुप्त भी इसमें हमारा साथ दें कि भविष्य में इस ढंग से कमी नहीं होना चाहिये, यह एक स्पेशल, विशेष स्थिति है। यों तो हमें इस गवर्नमेंट को नीयत पर विश्वास नहीं है और न इसको हम वैलिड गवर्नमेंट मानते हैं, यह तो एक खानदानी मसला चल रहा है, वह सब बात तो अलहदा है, लेकिन आज जो स्थिति है उसमें आप लोग क्षमा करें, इसका सामान्य विवाद चलना चाहिये। अगर 11 तारीख की जगह 15 तारीख, 16 तारीख, हुई होती तो हम जरूर निवेदन करते कि उचित समय मिले और चार नहीं सत्त दिन मिलें। वैसे तो यह सब फेमिलो अफेयर है, अगर फेमिलो अफेयर नहीं होता तो श्री गोपाल स्वरूप पाटक का नामि-नेशन करते वाइस-प्रेसिडेंट के लिये ?

SHRI BANKA BEHARI DAS (Orissa) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, one thing everybody and all of us agree and that is this House is the master of its own procedure. You will remember that when the news came of the Supreme Court's partial stay order, the entire House, barring a few, urged upon the Government at that time to bring forward immediately a Bill, so that this difficulty will not arise and, in deference to the wish of the House, I would say—whatever might be in their mind—they brought forward this Bill expeditiously. So, if we do not pass it early, particularly before the Supreme Court is seized of the matter, the entire effort will be nullified. So, I want to request all my friends here. It is not a question of circumventing it, but are we not masters of the procedure of this House? Whether the ruling Party is going to...

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Most of it is here.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: Where the majority of the House, an overwhelming majority—it is not a question of 51

and 49—wants to pass this measure before the Supreme Court is seized of the matter, I think we are the masters of the House and it is being done with the consent of the House. It should be passed before the . . .

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Tamil Nadu) : Abolish the Supreme Court.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: We are not going to abrogate the powers of the Supreme Court. We are going to regularise it on our own accord, without any disrespect to the Supreme Court. If anybody is opposed to it, surely he is free to go to the Supreme Court even after this law is passed. I do not understand why anybody should be so touchy with this law. If they are so much concerned with this law and feel that it is unconstitutional, they can go to the Supreme Court and see that this law becomes illegal. That is why I request all my friends to see that we are the masters of our procedure and we should try and pass this Bill. This Bill can be discussed by the Supreme Court after it has been passed.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: Sir, the question of nationalisation .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Let it be clear that I protest. Let me make it very clear that I protested yesterday in the Business Advisory Committee meeting and I have with me the support of Dr. Bhai Mahavir and one or two others whom I do not want to mention, but all the same they did not even count whether the majority was on my side or on the other side. Somehow they wanted to hustle through. I said the Rajya Sabha appeared in the eyes of the people as if it is a satellite of the Lok Sabha.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It is. You have made it. Do not say 'No'. The Rajya Sabha should not appear as a satellite of the Lok Sabha. I wanted to . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are not satellites.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I am on my feet. Will you kindly sit down?

SHRI RAJNARAIN: It should not be.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : It should not be. Let it not appear as a satellite of the Lok Sabha. Let it not appear that the Lok Sabha can take its own time at its sweet will and it is only the Rajya Sabha which can be hustled through by the Treasury Benches. Therefore, I want to uphold the dignity of the Rajya Sabha. Therefore, I protested and with a clear conscience I protested that forty-eight hours' notice should be given after the circulation of the Bill and nothing short of it is going to satisfy me as a democrat. I believe in democracy. I believe in the rule of law. I believe in principles. I cannot ignore principles for convenience. Therefore, I protested and I still protest even now, that the Bill should not be taken up.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: Sir, the question of nationalisation and more so the nationalisation of banks has been a very controversial issue, a highly controversial one. There are elements in this country who madly favour nationalisation and there are others who badly oppose it. The way they advocate their case, it appears that their approach to the problem of nationalisation is dogmatic. The approach of Jan Sangh to nationalisation is pragmatic and not dogmatic. The elements who favour nationalisation think that it is an end in itself. My party thinks that it can only be a means to an end and it can never be an end in itself. We honestly feel and we frankly say it that the time chosen for the bank nationalisation is not appropriate and the way in which it has been done is not only unpleasant, but it is also highly disgraceful for those who are responsible for bringing out the Ordinance. I do not want to enter into the question of the constitutionality of the Ordinance or the legality of it, because this point has already been raised in the House once. It is commonly said and believed that this Ordinance was signed by the Vice-President acting as President much after his own resignation had been signed by him.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, you will recall that the Imperial Bank of India which was established under the 1921 Act was nationalised in 1955. The name of State Bank of India was then given to it. Before the nationalisation of the Bank we had only one day's strike in 1954. That strike did not last longer than a day because it was before the nationalisation of that Bank. But after nationalisation we had two strikes, one in March 1960,

which lasted as many as 21 days and about 22,000 persons of the lower staff were involved in it. Another strike we had in June 1969, only two months ago, and it lasted for seventeen long days. About 7,000 officers were involved in the strike. You will see, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that throughout the world history of banks—I am not talking only of India but of the world—you will not come across a single strike of the type that we had witnessed in the State Bank of India only two months ago. The losses on account of this strike of June 1969 ran into several crores of rupees. The loss of revenue was, there, and since it was the sowing season) for the farmers many transactions which pertain to agriculture could not materialise and we had to suffer losses even in the agricultural sphere. Mr. Vice-Chairman, what would happen if such a strike were to take place in as many as 14 major banks of India and to how many crores would the losses run? The reason for the strike to continue for that long period was that the Chairman of the Board of Directors being a bureaucrat and being incapable of tolerating organised behaviour or rational changes stood on false sense of prestige. He had an attitude of cutting the workers to size obviously because he had no stake and the losses did not affect him. This generally we find is the Big Bosses' attitude with regard to all the public undertakings. Nationalisation of different industries can never be successful unless we have nationalised the nation itself. So long as the people are not nationalised, nationalisation of this industry or that is not likely to lead us anywhere. Mr. Vice-Chairman, in that strike of June 1969, the officers who were on strike made an offer to the bosses sitting in the Secretariat that they would abide even by any verdict that those bosses were to give after giving a patient hearing to the officers on strike. The bureaucracy did not pay any heed. The 14 major banks that have been nationalised are not going to have a management which is in any likely to be different from what we have in the State Bank of India today and, therefore, we have grave doubts that howsoever laudable the objectives may be, howsoever high-sounding phrases our hon. Prime Minister may use, really speaking the nationalisation of these banks is not going to cut much ice so far as the progress of the nation is concerned. Therefore, this Ordinance, ill-timed as it is, I feel should be disapproved and therefore I strongly appeal to the House to disapprove this Ordinance. Thank you -

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRI P. GOVINDA MENON) :
Mi. Vice-Chairman, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the acquisition and transfer of the undertakings of certain banking companies in order to serve better the needs of development of the economy in conformity with national policy and objectives and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, in moving this motion I do not want to address the House at length. On an earlier occasion as soon as the Ordinance was issued the Prime Minister made a statement in this House in which he clearly explained the reasons why it was thought that these major Indian banks should be nationalised, and I was glad to hear Mr. Pitamber Das, while opposing the Ordinance, say that the objectives may be laudable but he has his own doubts whether the management would be proper. Now at this stage when we are considering the Bill it is enough if we get a concession that the objectives of the Bill are laudable because the implementation of the objectives comes later. Therefore, I do not want to say further about the matter except to protest against the statement of Mr. Pitamber Das that the signature of the Vice-President acting as President to this Ordinance was given after his resignation. That is not correct. That is not true. He also referred to the strikes in the State Bank of India. In the Imperial Bank before it was nationalised and converted into State Bank he concedes that there was one strike. In the State Bank of India there were two strikes and therefore it would appear to him that there should be no nationalisation. Does he mean to say that undertakings in the private sector will not be faced with strikes?

Sir, earlier today in this House we heard the Minister of International Trade referring to the strike in the jute mills in West Bengal and several Members, particularly those who come from West Bengal, referred to the immensity of the problem created by the strike in the jute mills in Bengal. Now I am surprised that Mr. Pitamber Das should have put forward these one or two strikes in the State Bank of India after it was constituted in 1955 as an argument against the Ordinance which was issued whose objectives, he concedes,

are laudable. Sir, I do not want to say anything further about the Ordinance.

Regarding the Bill I must say that it is a very important Bill, probably one of the most important that this Parliament would have enacted during its existence.

Although it is a very important Bill, it is also a very simple Bill. That would be the characteristic of most important Bills. It is conceived in a simple manner. The object, Sir, is to nationalise or to take over the banking activities or the banking undertakings of these 14 major banks referred to in this Bill, and these are taken over by 14 corresponding banks which are referred to in the Bill as the corresponding new banks. The names are given there. These banks, it is intended, should continue as separate entities. That was also referred to by the Prime Minister. They will continue as 14 separate banks.

Regarding the management of these banks, it is intended that a scheme should be framed in consultation with the Reserve Bank and it is also our intention to place the scheme before Parliament so that Members will get an opportunity to discuss the provisions of the scheme, to amend it, to alter it, etc. That is so far as the new banks are concerned. It is proposed that the acquisition should be effected by paying compensation. Now we have decided to pay compensation not only because the Constitution demands that when undertakings are taken over by the State there should be payment of compensation but also because it is right that where the ownership of these undertakings vested in thousands and tens of thousands of shareholders spread throughout the country we should pay them for what we take over from them.

The principles regarding the compensation to be paid can be discussed later when we come to the Second Schedule in the Bill. We also want to see that if the shareholders would immediately like to get some money, it should be open to these existing banks to demand from the Government interim payment of a certain amount which will be equal to half the paid-up value of the shares and this will be paid partly in cash, partly in 4 per cent securities with a term of ten years and partly in 5 per cent securities with a term of thirty years. It is open to the banks to say and the shareholders to say whether they would have the one security or the other. Where the amount of paid-up share of a certain shareholder is a small amount

[Shri P. Govinda Menon]

and half of it exceeds Rs. 5,000, then there is provision to pay Rs. 5,000 in cash. If it is less than Rs. 5,000 such half will be paid in cash. These interim payments will be undertaken by the existing banks, on an undertaking that they will be distributed to the shareholders; interim payments will be made to them.

Sir, we have also provided that till the scheme is finalised, there should be Custodians for these new banks. As the House is well aware, the Chairmen of the existing banks have been made Custodians of the new banks, *i.e.* of the public sector banks. This is on the model of what we did when the Life Insurance Corporation was constituted a few years back. The general managers or chairmen of the life insurance bodies which were taken over were asked to continue as the custodians. It is a matter of convenience. But that is a transitory arrangement. These Custodians will be advised by an Advisory Committee and we have provided that in the Advisory Committee, the employees of the banks also should be given representation, not to speak of representatives of artisans, small farmers, etc. Now, when the scheme comes and the Board of Management is constituted under the scheme, we intend to continue the same arrangement. Sir, this is a progressive step which we are taking up in connection, and in conjunction, with the nationalisation of these fourteen banks.

Now, there is absolutely no reason to think that in taking this measure the Government did anything other than a pragmatic step, it is not a dogmatic step.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Political step.

SHRI P. GOVINDA MENON: In 1955, the State Bank was constituted. In 1959, State Banks in the Princely States were taken over and made subsidiaries of the State Bank of India. Those who would care to study the record of the State Bank and the subsidiaries of the State Bank in the matter of promoting agriculture, small-scale industry, cooperatives, etc., etc., will see that we are moving in the right direction. And in the case of these new 14 banks, the Prime Minister has stated that the objective will be to see that while banking considerations are not forgotten and commercial considerations will prevail, simultaneously an attempt will be made to see that a new concept of credit-worthi-

ness is adopted and that the smaller people are benefited by this procedure. There is absolutely no dogma associated with this, and if Mr. Pitamber Das and his party would adopt a pragmatic approach and reject the dogmatic approach, I am sure, after the discussions have gone on in this House today and tomorrow, they would support this measure.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: After that, it would be an enigmatic approach.

SHRI P. GOVINDA MENON: After all, what is it that we are taking over? I hope that the House will consider the nature of banking business. It is a business in which a few handle the money of the many. After all, what are the assets of a bank? They are the deposits made in the bank by the public, the shareholders' money also is there and there are a few directors who handle this amount and make profits. Now, the idea is that where public money is involved, the management should be in public hands, and it is up to the House to suggest, when the scheme comes up for consideration, the measures which would enable the Government to carry on the administration of these banks successfully and to the benefit of the public.

Sir, I move that this may be taken into consideration.

The question was proposed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): There are three notices of amendments, by Shri Muniswamy, by Shri Man Singh Varma and by Shri Jagdambi Prasad Yadav for reference of the Bill to a select Committee. Shri Muniswamy has not sent the names. So, I shall not permit him to move the amendment. Shri Man Singh Varma is not here. So, the question of his amendment does not arise. Mr. Yadav, you may move your amendment at this stage without speech.

SHRI J. P. YADAV (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I move:

"That the Bill to provide for the acquisition and transfer of the undertakings of certain banking companies in order to serve better the needs of development of the economy in conformity with national policy and objectives and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be referred to a Select Committee of the

Rajya Sabha consisting of 15 Members namely—

1. Shri Pitamber Das
2. Shri Sundar Singh Bhandari
3. Dr. Bhai Mahavir
4. Shri D. Thengari
5. Shri Nirajan Varma
6. Shri Rattan Lai Jain
7. Shri N. K. Shejwalkar
8. Shri Man Singh Varma
9. Shri Prem Manohar
10. Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel
11. Shri Lokanath Misra
12. Shri M. K. Mohta
13. Shri Sitaram Jaipuria
14. Shri Devi Singh and
15. Shri J. P. Yadav, the Mover,

with instructions to report by the 31st day of August, 1969."

The question was proposed.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have heard the speech of the hon. Law Minister. I have also tried to follow the proceedings in the other House in this connection. The itep, whatever the Law Minister may try to call it—pragmatic or whatever word he has used—is clearly political. It is a political itep taken by the Prime Minister because of certain developments in her own party. There was no question of the merits or otherwise of the nationalisation of banking when this announcement was made.

I would refer the House to the Prime Minister's own statement not long ago. The 'Times of India' on the 2nd August reports the round of talks of the Prime Minister in referring to the banks' takeover. In referring to the banks' take-over the Prime Minister says :—

"Now there has been much enthusiasm for this measure. I must say I have had no conception that it will have this reception and would be so popular among the people. Many of these people even do not know what it involves ..."

This is what she herself says, "Many of these people even do not know what it involves."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : One of them is the hon'ble Member.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Mr. Vice-Chairman, may I speak without being interrupted at every sentence by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta unnecessarily? I am always prepared to meet his interruptions and answer questions even from Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. But will he kindly allow me to proceed? Mr. Bhupesh Gupta reads newspapers and he has got a bunch of secretaries.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I have no secretaries.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Your whole party is working for you. The Prime Minister says :—

"The nationalisation of banks is not a magic wand. It is not going to remove poverty from the country. It is not going to remove the difficulties but it is one small step which, if implemented properly..."

It is a very big "if", Madam, Prime Minister and the House must remember.

And what is the record of this Government? Do not the figures of the working of public undertaking in this country indicate what is going to happen to these banks? Therefore, Sir, it is a difficult dose to swallow.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : That we can understand.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : The Prime Minister herself not very long ago in 1966 ...

श्री राजनारायण : प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने एक ही सही बात कही है कि यह कोई जादू की छड़ी नहीं है और उस पर भी आपको आपत्ति है ।

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL
मैं उनकी और भी सही बातें बताऊंगा, आप सुनिये तो । In 1966, the Prime Minister herself said, speaking of the public :—

"faulty planning with regard to concept, size, location, raw materials, design, choice of site and equipment".

What is left? This has been the general pattern of public sector projects. The Prime Minister added :—

"faulty equipment, personnel, contractual arrangements, supervision, coordination, time-schedule etc."

{Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel]

All these have been faulty in the matter of public sector projects. What is the guarantee that these mistakes will not be repeated in the case of nationalisation of banks ?

The Prime Minister should not be guided by brought out demonstrations that are staged in front of her house every day. I do not know how many of them have bank accounts and whether they understand banking. She herself says that they do not understand banking. But she is being carried away by these people and she is driven into this step which is a political step, which has not much to do with the country or its future. It is because of the party politics of the Congress that politics is being injected into the economic stability of this country which is very wrong.

The Prime Minister has further stated :—

"Faulty systems of financial control and audit, lack of a well-thought-out personnel policy constitute another set of problems."

If you have got so many problems with regard to the public sector projects that you cannot manage, I want to know how you will manage these 15 banks. At one time the Prime Minister talked of taking over four or five banks....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Which one have you added ? There are only 14.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Thank you for the correction, Mr. Vice-Chairman. If it could be 14 from 5, from 14 to 5 is not much of a difference and the way in which friends on the other side want to proceed, I do not know whether they will stop at 14. They may be wanting to go even up to 50. I do not know whether they could do it.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh) : That is exactly what should be done.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : You can if you want to because there are people who are interested in creating chaos in this country. This is the real road to financial chaos.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You think the Prime Minister is a Naxalite.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : That the Prime Minister would know better whether she is a Naxalite or not. The Prime Minister is tolerating Naxalites much more than many of us would like to tolerate. That is very clear.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, this measure, to my mind, takes away the fundamental rights of every citizen to choose where he can keep his money. I propose to keep my money in a bank, not managed by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta & Co. but somebody who, I think, knows what banking is, and who manages it well.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : With S. K. Patil & Co.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : It may be S. K. Patil & Co., if they know how to manage it. It can be Mr. Chinai sitting there. I do not know whether he heads a bank or not because I have not gone into that aspect of it. But I do say that banks managed and run by people who know how to manage banks generally inspire confidence and people deposit their money with those banks.

Now, Sir, by this measure the Government has taken away the fundamental right of the people to choose where they would put their money. A system of regimentation is being introduced. The people are forced to put their money where the Government has decided for them to put.

SHRI P. GOVINDA MENON: I am, not interrupting; because I have to reply. I would like to know which that fundamental right is codified in the Constitution, viz., to put your money wherever you like. Which is that fundamental right?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : So far we have been exercising it. I know under the present Law Minister who has a flexible method of interpreting law, many things can happen. Even to the guarantees given in this House the Law Minister attaches no value. Take for instance, the privy purse. So under the flexible legal acumen of the Law Minister many things can be taken away. But I do maintain it may not be completely legal in that sense—I am not speaking as a lawyer. I am speaking as an average citizen of this country—but as a citizen of this country I must have the right to put my money wherever I think it is safe and not where the Law Minister wants me

to put it. Why do I do it? Because I want to be assured that I will get my money back with the due return whenever I want it. Are we going to get it under this method of running the banks?

The other objection to this take-over which is yet uncertain, is the method of paying compensation. If I deposit in a bank today, or if I hold shares of a bank today, I continue to hold them and get interest. As soon as this measure comes into force, perhaps the deposit will remain there, but the possibility of getting some interest will remain there or not I do not know.

The share money is going to be refunded to me. I do not know in what manner they will do it. The first thing will be I will be subjected to a tax due to appreciation of price. If the shares have appreciated I will be subjected to a tax on appreciation. And where do I put the money? When everything is at this high rate, I suffer another loss. Therefore, at a time when we want to promote capital formation, when we want people to put their money into industry—to put it at the disposal of the Government, if you want, for financing the industries—what we are doing is to shake the confidence of the people on the one hand, and on the other to put them to losses which will result in diminution of capital, making capital shy. Therefore, this measure is objectionable. Among the provisions of the Bill, I notice that the Central Government wants to take too much power for itself, even ignoring the Reserve Bank. I would suggest that the Law Minister should recognise that the Reserve Bank is a competent body, it has expertise and knowledge on banking....

SHRI P. GOVINDA MENON : Although nationalised.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : It is yet safe and it has not become a hot-bed of politics. But if you are going to make it a public sector project of the type you have and put it in charge of Malaviyas, then you know what will happen.

SHRI P. GOVINDA MENON : It has been a public sector project.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : It has not been a public sector project of the type that you have. It is a separate, safe and independent banking institution, and I hope it will remain so.

I was saying that I hope the Government will continue to take the advice of the Reserve Bank on most of these matters. I find that in some of the provisions, the advice of the Reserve Bank is mentioned and in some others it has been deleted.

SHRI HAYATULLAH ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh) : At least you have one bank where you can deposit your money.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I do not know what that gentleman is trying to say. But I would suggest to the Law Minister to agree to the Reserve Bank's advice being taken at every stage as long as the Reserve Bank is preserved as it is to-day. If it becomes later one of your public sector projects, it is all the same whether you take its advice or not.

SHRI P. GOVINDA MENON : The Ordinance was on their advice.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : As regards the compensation that is going to be paid to the shareholders, I hope that a just and fair compensation will be paid. I am not yet clear—I have been trying to study the Bill—as to what compensation they are going to be paid, when they are going to be paid, whether it is now, whether it is tomorrow; some are going to be paid now, some after 20 years and some after 40 years; I do not know what sort of compensation it is. But by this method of dealing with the shareholders—some of them are small shareholders, holding 5 or 10 shares, who have put their hard-earned money into the banks which have their confidence—their faith is going to be shaken. The habit of thrift will perhaps decrease. Is that what the Law Minister or this Government wants people to do? If people are going to be treated like this when they save money, why should people save money? People will say : All right, we have got money; let us use it to-day. What is the use? If we save money, tomorrow the Government is going to take it away willy-nilly, this way or that way. You may sugar-coat it; you may put a soft glove over it or call it by any name. If this is how the Government is going to play ducks and drakes with our money, why not use it today?

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : And that is what socialistic pattern actually means.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Yes, that is their socialist pattern. But is that in the interest of the country? This

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel]

measure is neither in the interest of the country, nor is it going to help the economy of the country. It is a politically inspired measure. It is a political step, connected with the internal politics of the Congress Party and, therefore, it is bad. Such bad measures should not go on the statute book. I strongly oppose this measure.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, to-day is one of the glorious days of our parliamentary history and a humble but courageous attempt is being made to break through the stagnation of our economic life. I want to remind my friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, that it is not shaking the confidence, but sharing in the confidence of common man of the country, it is for the economic development of this poor country where millions are starving even to-day after 22 years of freedom.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I was surprised to hear Mr. Pitamber Das saying that this is a dogmatic approach and there is some dogma behind the nationalisation of banking institutions. Some people try to make out that this step has been taken because of certain considerations which are not purely economic. I do not say that these steps are not political because after all, we are here in this House because we are political beings and economics is also determined very much upon political factors. It is not true to say that economics is wholly devoid of all political considerations. The speeches of Mr. Pitamber Das and Mr. Dahyabhai Patel are also inspired by political considerations. And let us agree that our political considerations and our approaches are quite different. We are poles apart. There should be no hesitation on our part or on their part to say that we are poles apart in our political thinking and consequently, in our economic approaches.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, if I emphasise this point, I emphasise it with one consideration that it is not in 1969, that the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, has come out with this proposal. In 1931 at the Karachi Congress Session, a resolution was moved and indications were given. In 1937-38, under the Chairmanship of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, a committee of all the Industries Ministers at that time was appointed. A conference was held and it passed a certain resolution. Under that resolution an economic

I programme committee was appointed under I the chairmanship of Pandit Jawaharlal. Nehru, and in that report it has been specifically mentioned that for the economic regeneration of this country, these banking institutions should be taken under State control. And for the information of the Swatantra Party Members, I may add that Mr. N. G. Ranga was one of the members of that economic programme committee. Not only this, in 1948, in Parliament, the then Industries Minister Shri Shyama Prasad Mukherjee, for whom Mr. Pitamber Das has great regard, said that fiscal and financial measures will have to be taken in order to curb concentration of economic power. It has been our attempt from the very beginning, and it has been our endeavour, to curb the concentration of economic power. This nationalisation of banking institutions is nothing but an initial step to move in that direction. Not only has the Congress Party adopted this resolution for curbing concentration of economic power, but in the Directive Principles of the Constitution we have enshrined that this concentration of economic power should not be allowed. Every Member sitting in this House takes the oath of allegiance to the Constitution. After taking the oath, in the name of morality, in the name of higher principles of politics, how are these friends opposing any attempt to curb concentration of economic power? This may be their Political morality; this may be their ethics..

But I think if any ethics can be there in this Parliament and in this country, it will be that everybody should attempt to curb the concentration of economic power. Not only this. In the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1948 we again emphasized this thing. This has been mentioned in the Monopolies Inquiry Commission's Report also. I shall not go into all those details. But the consequences of the concentration of economic power were given in the chapter on the social, political and economic consequences.

Some of my friends on the other side feel that there will be chaos, that there will be anarchy because certain people are upset in this country by the nationalisation of the banking institutions. But have they ever cared to see whether social tensions are not being created, whether strains are not there in the working of our parliamentary democracy? Millions in this country have remained still without any amenities of life. It is true the Prime

Minister says that mere nationalisation will not bring the removal of poverty, but at least it will remove the stranglehold of certain monopolists, of certain exploiters of the resources of our country. How these resources have been utilized, I shall not go into those details. But the recent report that has been laid on the Table of the House—the Dutt Committee Report—has made it quite clear as to how a few monopolists and business houses are indulging in all sorts of malpractices; not only in malpractices, they have been able to so manipulate and inspire such trends in our society and in our planning that wealth is being concentrated in a few hands and poor people are becoming poorer every day. When all these factors are there, whether we should have taken any steps or not, that was the political consideration for the Congress Party and Prime Minister.

And I agree with my friends who say that there were some political considerations, not today but for the last two years. Soon after the AICC Resolution of 1967 which is known as the ten-point economic programme, some of our friends were impressing upon the Prime Minister and the Government of India that certain measures should be taken in order to avoid chaos and anarchy and a total disintegration of our social fabric. I am glad and I congratulate the Prime Minister, though late, today even after two years, she has taken the most courageous, bold and right step. In all my speeches, both outside and inside Parliament, not once or twice, but many a time, I have repeated that social transformation is not an easy thing. It is quite easy, it is quite graceful to claim ourselves to be socialists and raise high slogans of socialism from housetops, but no sooner it affects our economic life, no sooner it affects our social status and money status, than there will be stiff resistance. And that stiff resistance will be there from all quarters, whatever quarters they may be, from political quarters, from business houses and from vested interests. Why should you worry about it?

Mr. Dahyabhai Patel was saying that a few thousand people are marching towards the gate of the Prime Minister's residence and it is taken as mass support. What is the meaning of democracy? The meaning of democracy is not that only a few elite, a few intellectuals—perhaps Mr. Dahyabhai Patel may claim himself to be an intellectual—with their opinions should guide the Government.

6—23 R.S./69

In our parliamentary democracy there are five hundred million people of this country who are going to determine the course of history, who are going to move the destinies of this nation, and not the few business houses. These few business houses will not be allowed to change the destinies of this country. Mr. Vice-Chairman, when I emphasise this point I am really surprised that my friends there who claim themselves to be opposed to monopoly, say that nationalisation cannot succeed. Mr. Pitamber Das says that this measure cannot succeed unless the people are nationalised. I do not understand the meaning of his English. What does he mean by nationalising the people? Does he want some sort of a concentration regimentation? Does he plead in a roundabout way the theory which once Hitler pleaded in Germany? I think our people are patriotic enough if he thinks that by nationalisation he means patriotism. The Indian people have stood the test of patriotism. He says that because in the State Bank there were some strikes, the public sector failed. The strike is a fundamental right which we have given to the people of this country, to the workers of this country. They resort to strike at times not because of a sense of indiscipline, but because of a sense of realisation of their rights and their privileges. What does he mean? I am really surprised that when there is a strike by workers in some factory or even in a Government undertaking, Shri Pitamber Das and his colleagues come and say that fundamental rights should be guaranteed. But when the nationalisation of banks is being discussed, he brings in the strike of the State Bank employees and says that the number of strikes in the State Bank of India is more than what it was in the days of the Imperial Bank, and so the public sector has failed. There were less number of strikes in the British days than today, but does it mean that every thing has failed? Does it mean that the Constitution which we have given to the people of this country, to the down-trodden mass of this country, has failed and so we should scrap the whole Constitution? The people who are sitting on the other side accused the Prime Minister of violating the Constitution. In fact, by their own words, it is they who are violating the Constitution. Not only are they violating the Constitution but they are instigating the people in the streets, in the farms and factories, to violate the Constitution because they say that they want to give the impression that nothing is possible within a parliamentary democracy. A few monopolist house⁸

[Shri Chandra Shekhar]

can do whatever they like and when we have got control over these banking institutions, then they say their fundamental rights have been usurped. I do not know what fundamental rights have been usurped. If you see these 13 or 14 banks which have been nationalised, you will be surprised to find that the biggest shareholder today is the Government of India. More than 60 per cent shares of these 14 banks are held by the LIC. Some of the shares are held by the UTI and other financial institutions. The Government of India has also some shares in these 13 or 14 institutions. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have got a study of the Reserve Bank though I am told it is a confidential study. Here is a report of about thirteen banking institutions. And these thirteen banking institutions are almost the same which have been nationalised. If you take the Central Bank of India, its total paid-up capital is Rs. 473.91 lakhs and their LIC's investment is Rs. 89.70 lakhs, that is, 18.9 per cent. If you take the Bank of Baroda, the LIC's share is 25 per cent, the UTI's share is 5 per cent, and the Government's share is 7.2 per cent and the share of other financial institutions is 10 per cent. The total comes to 47 per cent in the Bank of Baroda. If you take the United Commercial Bank, the LIC's share is 16 per cent and the UTI's share is 5 per cent, but the share of the joint stock companies is 21 per cent. In the Bank of Baroda or in the Central Bank and in other Banks also, the joint stock companies have got larger shares and in these joint stock companies the financial institutions have again their own shares. So, if a study is made about the shareholding of these banking institutions, we will find that one of the major shareholders is the Government of India and other financial institutions which are controlled by the Government of India. So, if these shares were held by the Government of India, it was proper for the Government of India to take interest in the management of these banking institutions. It is unfortunate that we do not take any interest in the management of these banking institutions. Of course, we try to regulate the functioning of these banking institutions through the Reserve Bank. But you know that this banking industry is a very sensitive industry and in such a sensitive industry it is not possible for the Government to take very stringent measures because if the Government comes out with a certain statement or if any action of the Government is exposed, it will be a run on these banking insti-

tutions and the whole economy can be put to a great difficulty.

If you see the number of shareholders the small shareholders are very small in number. There are about 313 shareholders which will account for 3 per cent of the remaining shares of these banking institutions. So when it is said that the shareholders will be in great difficulty, who are these shareholders who are dominating there after the Government institutions? They are the few big monopoly houses.

Then what has been the pattern of deposits? If you see the deposits in these banking institutions, more than 90 per cent of the deposits have been that of the small depositors. It has not been that of the big corporate sector and out of these deposits, the advance or loan that they have taken has been utilised by the big monopolists. If you see the figures of deposits showing ownership pattern of demand, savings and fixed deposits under three categories, the demand deposit was 1529 and it came to Rs. 408.9 crores. The government account was 41 and the cooperative credit amounted to Rs. 185.7 crores. Then savings deposits were 6728 which comes to Rs. 581 crores. Fixed deposits were 1855 which comes to Rs. 929 crores. In this way we see the small depositors have deposited their money in these banking institutions and what is happening in these banking institutions from the other point of view?

From the under-developed regions of this country every year Rs. 350 crores are pumped out and they are given as loans and advances to the 4 big cities of the country, namely, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and Delhi. In these cities the advances and loans given by the banking institutions are Rs. 350 crores annually more than to the others. Who are the sufferers? The sufferers are Rajasthan, Orissa, Telangana, Madhya Pradesh, Eastern UP, all such backward areas. So these banking institutions instead of creating a psychology for developing the backward regions of the country are taking away the money from the backward areas and they are pumping it into the more sophisticated regions or more developed areas. In this way these banking institutions have been responsible for creating regional imbalances. I say this regional imbalance has not been set right even by the State Bank but as the economic structure stands today the State Bank is also getting domina-

ted b/w'im? M/ friends in the opposite say that the State Bank has not been able to achieve the objective but who are the Directors and Chairmen of the State Bank." Almost all the people of the big houses were made directors of the State Bank and the old IGS officers. Mr. Patel has a knack to have a dig at politicians and says that if they nationalise the banking institutions, it will be handed over to certain discredited politicians. An interesting study has been recently made by the Indian Institute of Public Administration about public undertakings which are under the direct control of the Government of India. Out of 52 public undertakings, 45 are manned by the old IGS/IAS officers. Only 7 or 3 politicians are there, and 3 or 4 are from the big business houses. There is no politician who is controlling the big public undertakings. This has been the unfortunate trend in our management policy. The Government should take a lesson from this that the old retired ICS officers, who have no commitment to the policies that our Indian Constitution or the party in power pursue are given the charge to man these institutions and this is the result. Mr. Patel might be feeling very happy when the control is that of the monopolists and the ICS officers but he is very averse to the politicians but may I ask him why these public sector undertakings have failed." There was no political interference. Out of 400 directors, nearly 60 per cent, were civil servants and hardly 3 or 4 were directors from politicians. It is not a question of policy. Who are destroying the public sector? It is the old ICS officers of the thinking of Mr. Patel who live in the outmoded . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I¹ is your Government that appointed them. Your Government has proved incompetent to do anything.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : I do not want to annoy Mr. Patel.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I am not annoyed, I can take it.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : He advanced a very peculiar logic. He said : 'My fundamental right is that I should have the right to deposit in the bank of my choice. The bank of my choice should be manned by the man I like'. This is a very primitive instinct.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I did not say so. I select the bank by knowing the

person who manages it. You are twisting the words. Give your own arguments.

I SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : I say that it is a very laudable primitive instinct but man has advanced especially in the civilised society. Suppose a man today from the South says that it is his privilege or right to be safeguarded by the police or military of his liking or suppose a man says that it is his right to commit suicide, in a civilised society it cannot be allowed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : In some cases I will allow it.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : The State is a concentration of power but the man is wedded to this institution of his free will because in a civilised society we surrender certain of our rights to the State for the civilised society to the institution, so that the good of the society as a whole can be taken into consideration. It is not the good of one individual or of a privileged few but it is the good of the common man, of the overwhelming majority that is to be looked to by the Government, by the parliamentary institution and the civilised institutions. Mr. Patel said that he does not understand what is the intention of the Government. There I have my own grievance against the Government. The Government should have published some White Paper in order to educate persons like Mr. Patel because a politician of his stature thinks that by nationalising the banks all the depositors' money will be taken away by the Government and squandered somewhere. I do not understand this logic. If this is the understanding of an experienced politician like Mr. Patel I am surprised what will be the understanding of the common man in the country. If the Prime Minister says that the common man does not understand, at least he understands that he has no deposits in any bank and so he has no fear. Perhaps Mr. Patel has deposited much in the banks and he is naturally afraid. I would request the Prime Minister to publish a White Paper giving all the facts and information about the nationalisation of the banking institutions because it is not only necessary for educating men like Mr. Patel but also to educate the people whose cooperation and goodwill are required for implementing this programme.

Mr. Patel and others raised and I also raised this question. If these ICS officers are not going to man these banking institutions, who is going to man them?

[Shri Chandra Shekhar]

I think there is no dearth of intellectuals or proper persons in the country. The Government should make a survey, go round the country and contact economists, small industrialists and people who are working in the cooperative field to take their cooperation and help to run these banking institutions. Thousands of young professors and economists in the country are there who are willing to cooperate with the Government in this move.

I shall request the Prime Minister that immediately she should address Heads of all Departments, all Economic Departments, all the research institutions and the universities and ask the professors there that they should select two, three, four persons. And they should be taken into confidence while pursuing this policy further.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the other point, which I shall like to emphasise on this occasion is this. I am happy that this Banking Companies Bill has provided for the representation of bank employees in the management. But it is not enough. Immediately we should call a conference of bank employees and their representatives and we have to impress upon them that it is not the Government alone, that it is not Parliament or the Congress Party or other parties alone, and that the success of this measure will depend upon the willing co-operation of the bank employees also.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, a hue and cry is being raised in my own party, and also outside, that Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India, is seeking the co-operation of the people who are undesirable. Sir, I do not know who are those undesirable people. But on economic issues, where the people agree, whether they are politicians or they are economists or they are labourers or they are workers, their co-operation should be sought. It may not be their right, but it is the duty of the Prime Minister and the Government of India that they should seek the co-operation of the Members of Parliament and also the people in the country outside, ask them to co-operate in this measure.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Chandra Shekhar, I will have to ask for your co-operation also.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : How many minutes more I can speak, Sir?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : It is time 10 wind up now.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : All right, Sir ; I shall wind up; I shall cooperate with you.

Sir, I shall like to emphasise here only one aspect of the point I was making and it is that any attempt to seek the co-operation of other political parties seems to produce something like a hysteria in the Congress Party. This hysteria should be removed, and I shall respectfully tell Mr. Dahyabhai Patel that chaos will not be created by seeking the co-operation of the Communist Parties or the SSP or the DMK or the Praja Socialist Party on any economic issue. But chaos will be created in the country if you want to maintain the *status quo* in the name of stability. There cannot be any stability in the country if you want to maintain the *status quo*. This stagnation has got to be broken, and in order to break this stagnation there is no other way for Government but to mobilise the resources and to control them.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the State Bank might have failed in other respects but the State Bank has done one good service; they have their net work of branches also in the rural areas. They have mobilised resources from those rural areas which had been neglected in the past, whereas these private banking institutions. Mr. Vice-Chairman,—I am not able to give all the figures—they have invested more money than their paid-up capital in other corporate sectors. How did they do it?

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI (Maharashtra) : By obtaining licences from the Government.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : That is another point, Mr. Vice-Chairman. It is where their own vested interests lie. That also should be taken into consideration. You know it, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I shall give some examples. The Bank of Baroda has its paid-up capital and reserve amounting to Rs. two crores. But it has invested Rs. two crores in other corporate sector companies, in private companies, of course, not in the public sector companies. The Bank of India has a total of Rs. four crores made up of paid-up capital and reserve, and they

have invested Rs. 3.91 crores in other I companies. Same is the case about the Central Bank of India. Their paid-up capital with the reserve is Rs. 4.7 crores and they have invested in other companies Rs. 5.4 crores. These are the firms and these banking institutions are indulged in all these luxuries.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, in the end I shall refer to one thing which is agitating the minds of many people in the country. They say, "why can't you experiment with the social control Act for some more time?" This question is being raised here in the House and outside the House, what is the purpose of this nationalisation of banking institutions? I have quoted the figures from 1937 to 1967. Every time we have said that these financial institutions should be taken under the control of the Government in order to curb the concentration of economic power. I shall request all Members present here to see this. Let me make the point. In the whole Bill which was enacted for social control of banking institutions, where has it been mentioned that the objective of the social control of banking institutions is to remove or curb the concentration of economic power? When that Bill was being moved and passed in this House, again, at that time also I took objection and said that the Bill would not serve the purpose, whereas the whole purpose of this nationalisation of banking institutions is to make an attempt for curbing the concentration of economic power.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the other hoax that is being created is that depositors will lose faith in it, and some friends on the other side are going on crying this at the top of their voice. But only last week a weekly survey based on a report of the Reserve Bank has given this information that after the nationalisation the deposits have shown an upward trend in the coming two weeks.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. GHINAI : Always it happens.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Well, if it has always happened, it shows that their faith is not shaken. So the hoax has been completely exposed. People's faith is not shaken. The faith of those people is shaken who want to maintain the *status quo*, who think that this country can be built with the willing co-operation of Birlas, Shanti Prasad Jain and Dalmia. But, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I say that

this country can be built only with the willing co-operation of the people at large the teeming millions of this country. In the end, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel will get jittery, but I shall like.

SHRI DAHVABHAI V. PATEL : I do not get jittery over whatever you say. Nobody will lie as you say. Why do you worry about me?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is true that fourteen banks have been taken over by the Government. But there are such small banks whose deposits are less than Rs. 50 crores. But then these banks are not controlled by smaller people. These banks are controlled by the big monopoly business houses. For that the Government of India and the Reserve Bank will have to pay special attention. I shall like to mention a few of these which have come to my notice.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Chandra Shekhar, I will have to pay special attention to you.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Now I will have to request you to wind up.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : It is particularly so in the case of Sahu Jains who control two (Universal Bank and National Bank of Lahore), Bangui- (New Bank of India), Thapars (Oriental Bank of Commerce), Soorajmall Nagarmalls (Hindustan Mercantile Bank), and J-K's (Hindustan Commercial Bank). In addition to this, Parsads of South India control the largest private sector bank (Andhra Bank) and Thiagarajas have two banks (Bank of Karaikudi and Bank of Madura). These banks are small banks. Their deposits are less than Rs. 50 crores. But as these banks are being controlled by the big business houses, special provision will have to be made, or some special attention will have to be paid.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, in the end I congratulate the Government for bringing forward this Bill, and I request Mr. Pitamber Das, who is a very wise person, who speaks with some feelings, to concede that the time has come when our attention should be diverted to the teeming

[Shri Chandra Shekhar]

millions of people. We should not be worried about the sentiments and emotions of those tycoons who had been thwarting the economic development of this country for centuries and those who are still there to thwart all attempts at economic development of this country.

The recent committees have made it clear in their reports that it is through these banking institutions that the monopolists have been exploiting the country, not only exploiting the country, they have also been vitiating the whole planning process with its result in the starvation, degradation and degeneration of our people. I hope this step will prove to be only an initial step and the Government of India will be courageous enough and with clarity of vision, with courage and also cohesion they will move further in the direction for which they have initiated this step, and I hope we will be able to establish a new social order where every man will enjoy a fuller life with equality, compassion and friendship.

Thank you. Sir.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : On one point I want to be informed if you allow me. Mr. Chandra Shekhar was talking about 'curb on concentration of economic power'. I would like to know where those words occur here. I do not find them in the preamble of the Bill. These words 'curb on concentration of economic power' is not here anywhere.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : When the whole banking institution has been taken over, it is curb in itself.

श्री राजनारायण : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सर्वप्रथम यह बतला दूँ कि संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी प्रमुख उद्योगों के समाजीकरण की मांग करती है। लोग इधर उधर बहकें नहीं, इसलिये जो उद्योगों के बारे में हमारी नोति है, उसको मैं चाहूँगा कि पहले ही बतला दूँ। मैं चाहूँगा कि श्री चन्द्र शेखर जरा इस बात को ध्यान से सुनें क्योंकि उन्होंने 45 मिनट तक भाषण किया और अब बगैर हमें सुने चले जायेंगे तो उनका भाषण बेमतलब हो जायेगा। संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी इस प्रकार के उत्पादन

के साधनों और व्यापार के समाजीकरण के पक्ष में है जिसने पगारी और मजदूर काम करते हों, लेकिन ऐसा समाजीकरण श्रमिक होगा और जीवन में जो खास महत्व की चीज है, जैसे लोहा, इस्पात, रसायन, बिजली, खनिज इंजीनियरी, चीनी, कपड़ा, सीमेंट, बीमा, बैंक और आयात-निर्यात जैसे उद्योगों का समाजीकरण किया जायेगा। मैं श्री डा. ह्याभाई पटेल और श्री पीताम्बर दास जी को बतला देना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हमारे हाथ में ताकत आयेगी तो इन कामों को करने में तनिक भी विलम्ब नहीं किया जायेगा। (Interruptions.) जिस समय सदन में भाषण होने लगे तो सदन में डिस्टर्बेंस नहीं होना चाहिये।

हम श्री चन्द्र शेखर से कहना चाहते हैं कि वे जनसंघ से परेशान नहीं क्योंकि जनसंघ का जो 1967 का घोषणापत्र है वह स्पष्ट बतलाता है कि वह मिश्रित अर्थ-व्यवस्था में विश्वास करता है। भारतीय जनसंघ निजी क्षेत्र में उद्योगों के राष्ट्रीयकरण के पक्ष में नहीं है। यदि कोई ऐसी स्थिति उत्पन्न हो जाये जिसमें उद्योगों के राष्ट्रीयकरण की आवश्यकता प्रतीत हो तो उसका निर्णय राजनीतिक आधार पर न करके न्यायिक जांच के आधार पर किया जाना चाहिये। यह भारतीय जनसंघ कहता है। वह कहता है कि जो वर्तमान उद्योग है उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण न हो। श्री पीताम्बर दास जितनी भी बाधाएं उत्पन्न करें, वे अपने घोषणापत्र के प्रति ईमानदार हैं क्योंकि उन्होंने अपने 1967 के घोषणापत्र में स्पष्ट कह दिया है कि वे राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं चाहते हैं और जो वर्तमान उद्योग है, किसी का भी राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं चाहते हैं। इसमें आगे उन्होंने बहुत कुछ कहा है क्योंकि हमारे पास इस समय, समय नहीं है, इसलिये हम उन बातों की ओर जाना नहीं चाहेंगे और न सदन का समय लेना चाहेंगे।

स्वतंत्र पार्टी के बारे में भी मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि उनकी ओर से भी कितनी ही

बाधाएं क्यों न खड़ों की जायें, श्री चन्द्र शेखर और श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी को परेशान नहीं होना चाहिये। अगर ये इस तरह की बाधाएं खड़ी न करें तो जिस तथ्य को लेकर ये खड़े हैं, उस तथ्य की ईमानदारी में कमी होगी। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि श्री पीताम्बर दास अपने घोषणापत्र के मुताबिक और श्री डा. ह्याभाई पटेल अपने घोषणापत्र के मुताबिक रहें और इस प्रकार यह उनका पुनोत्तक कर्तव्य होगा कि इस विधेयक को पास करने में बाधा उत्पन्न करें।

अब मैं श्री चन्द्र शेखर से कहना चाहूंगा कि उनके भाषण को सुनकर मुझे बहुत चिन्ता हुई कि काफी दिनों तक समाजवादी आन्दोलन में अपना जीवन व्यतीत करने के बाद उसका असर शेष नहीं रह गया है और थोड़े दिनों तक श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी के सम्पर्क में रहने से उनमें बुद्धि भ्रम पैदा हुआ और उनकी बुद्धि कहा से कहाँ चली गई। इसलिये मैं आपके द्वारा श्री चन्द्र शेखर और ऐसे लोगों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि नेशन और सरकार, ये दोनों एक चीज हैं या फिर दो अलग अलग चीज हैं। अगर ये दोनों एक ही चीज हैं तो नेशन-लाइजेन और सरकारीकरण में क्या फर्क है? इसलिये मैं श्री चन्द्र शेखर सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों तथा ट्रेजरी बेंच के लोगों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इसीलिए हम "समाजीकरण" शब्द का प्रयोग करते हैं क्योंकि जिस तरह से श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी ने रुपये का अवमूल्यन किया था उसी तरह से आज वे भारतीय शब्द का अवमूल्यन कर रही हैं।

राष्ट्रीकरण यह क्या है? क्या यह जो विधेयक है, वह राष्ट्रीयकरण है? श्री चन्द्र शेखर इसका जवाब दें और वे इस बात को नोट कर लें कि आज सरकार के पास पोस्टल सेविंग्स डिपोजिट्स जो है वह 330 करोड़ रुपये के बराबर है। इसी तरह से एल० आइ० सी० का 1200 करोड़ रुपया, इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट बैंक का 200 करोड़ रुपया, इंड-

स्ट्रियल फाइनेंस कारपोरेशन का 208 करोड़ रुपया और यूनिट ट्रस्ट का 50 करोड़ रुपया है। अग्रोकल्चर फाइनेंस कारपोरेशन के आंकड़े अभी तक हमको नहीं मिल पाये हैं। स्टेट फाइनेंस कारपोरेशन का 125 करोड़ रुपया और फिल्म फाइनेंस कारपोरेशन के आंकड़े भी अभी तक हमें नहीं मिल पाये हैं। इसी तरह से स्टेट बैंक आफ इंडिया का 1200 करोड़ रुपया, स्टेट कोऑपरेटिव बैंक आफ इंडिया का 500 करोड़ रुपया और इम्प्लाई-प्राविडेंट फंड के आंकड़े हमारे पास नहीं आये हैं। इन्डस्ट्रियल क्रेडिट इन्वेस्टमेंट कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया का 200 करोड़ रुपया और स्माल सेविंग्स थ्रू नेशनल सेविंग्स सर्टिफिकेट्स एण्ड डिफेंस सेविंग्स सर्टिफिकेट आदि का 1070 करोड़ रुपया सरकार के पास है ये सारे आंकड़े हैं और इनमें से तीन आंकड़े हमें नहीं मिले हैं जिसको श्री चन्द्र शेखर कहते हैं कि यह पब्लिक सेक्टर है। इसमें से फिल्म फाइनेंस कारपोरेशन, अग्रोकल्चर फाइनेंस कारपोरेशन और इम्प्ला-इज प्राविडेंट फंड के आंकड़े हमें नहीं मिले हैं। इस तरह से जिन पब्लिक सेक्टरों के हमें आंकड़े मिले हैं उनमें 5327 करोड़ की पूंजी लगी हुई है और यह सब सरकार के हाथ में है और आज जिन 14 बैंकों को लिया गया है उनकी पूंजी कुल 2700 करोड़ रुपया है। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि पब्लिक सेक्टर में जो धन लगा हुआ है वह पहले से ही दुगुना लगा हुआ है और जो आज धन हमारे पास आ रहा है वह भी सरकार के पास जायेगा। अब पहले से आज का दुगुना सरकार के पास धन हाथ में था तो क्या उस समय किसी किसान को खेती में उन्नति करने के लिए कर्जा मिला? किसी निम्न मध्यम श्रेणी के लोगों को उन्नति करने के लिए कर्जा मिला? वह सवाल मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ।

आज कहा जाता है कि देश हरा भरा हो गया है और समाजीकरण हो गया है तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अनावश्यक ढंग पर तिल का पहाड़ न बनाया जाये और स

[श्री राजनारायण]

की बात करना शोभा नहीं देता है। मुझे इस का अफसोस है कि इस समय न श्री भूपेश गुप्त मौजूद हैं और न श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी मौजूद हैं। जगत् इस मौके पर मैं थोड़ी सी उनकी तरफ ध्यान देना चाहता हूँ। कम से कम बेचारी ने इमानदारी से यह तो कह दिया कि यह एक सिम्पल मेजर है, यह कोई जादू की छड़ी नहीं है। इस चीज से गरीबी दूर नहीं हो सकेगी और न इससे कोई नया जमाना आ जायेगा। यह बात वे कह रही हैं। जब मैं श्री भूपेश गुप्त और श्री चन्द्र शेखर को सुनता हूँ तो ऐसा लगता है कि मानो कोई ऐसी चीज हो गई है, कोई ऐसी अनहोनी चीज हो गई है जो कि नहीं हो सकती थी। मैं हैरत में पड़ गया हूँ कि क्या हो गया और श्री पीताम्बर दास जो परेशान क्यों हो गये, श्री डाह्याभाई पटेल परेशान क्यों हो गये। तो मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि इसमें धराने की क्या बात है। कम से कम कुछ हिला तो है, कुछ हलचल तो हुई और एक जम्बिघाता हुई। इसलिये इसमें परेशान होने की कोई बात नहीं है। इस विधेयक से तो केवल 2700 करोड़ रुपया ही जा रहा है और इसमें परेशानी किस बात की है।

श्रीमन्, चन्द्र शेखर जी चले गये। प्रधान मंत्री साहिब चलो गई। अब कानून मंत्री जी हैं और मुझे मालूम नहीं है कि यह गांधीजी को समझेंगे या नहीं। मगर गांधीजी का एक वाक्य मैं पढ़ना चाहूँगा। उन्होंने यह कहा है :

"What I personally would prefer would be not centralisation of power in the hands of the State."

गांधीजी ने वहाँ सफाई से कहा है और उन्होंने यह कहा है आगे चल कर कि स्टेट के हाथ में केंद्रितता आफ पावर बहुत खतरनाक है बनिस्बत कुछ व्यक्तियों के हाथ में। इसका जवाब क्या है? मैं चाहूँगा कि इसका जवाब प्रधान मंत्री साहिब दें क्योंकि कभी कभी वे कहते हैं कि मैं तो कांग्रेस में पैदा हुई हूँ,

कांग्रेस में आई नहीं हूँ। यद्यपि मैं जानता हूँ कि वे गलत बोल रही हैं, अतर्कित बोल रही हैं, लेकिन अगर भावविशेष में आ कर वे यह कहें जायें कि मैं कांग्रेस में पैदा हुई हूँ, तो मैं इसको बुरा नहीं मानता हूँ। तुम कांग्रेस में पैदा हुई हो, तो ठीक है, लेकिन तुम फिर वैसा ही विधेयक लाती। इस विधेयक का फाड़ कर के राष्ट्रीयकरण शब्द के साथ जो आज यह सरकार बलात्कार कर रही है उसका मैं धूँधट खोलना चाहूँगा। इस राष्ट्रीयकरण दुल्हन के चेहरे पर धूँधट है उसको मैं खोलना चाहता हूँ। मैं सच्चा राष्ट्रीयकरण वाला और मैं चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्रीयकरण हो। मगर राष्ट्रीयकरण शब्द के साथ जो बलात्कार श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी कर रही हैं, मैं चाहूँगा कि आज उसका धूँधट खोला जाये।

यह रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया आपके पास श्रीमन्, होगा। जरा देखियेगा। डाइरेक्टर्स नामिनेटेड अंडर 8(I) (बी) आफ आर० बी० आई० ऐक्ट :

श्री आर० जी० सरैया। यह किसान हैं? यह मजदूर हैं...

एक माननीय सदस्य : कोअपरेटर हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : ... यह मध्यम वर्ग के हैं? यह बहुत बड़े व्यवसायी हैं बम्बई के। श्री बीरेन मुकर्जी, यह क्या हैं? यह कलकत्ता के बहुत बड़े उद्योगपति हैं। हमारे बालकृष्ण जी कह रहे हैं कि ये उनको जानते हैं। राजा बजरंग बहादुर सिंह, यह बजरंग बहादुर कौन हैं? यह वही भदरी वाले हैं न, श्री दिनेश सिंह के रिश्तेदार। और श्री बी० एस० त्याग-राजा मुदालियर मद्रास के बहुत बड़े उद्योगपति हैं। यह रिजर्व बैंक भी एक तरह का पब्लिक है, यह प्राइवेट नहीं है और यह सरकार उनको नामिनेट करती है। उसमें सरकार ने किस को नामिनेट किया, किस किसान को नामिनेट किया, किस मजदूर को नामिनेट किया और कहाँ डाउन-ट्राडेन म.सैज आफ

दि सोसाइटी ऊपर चले गये ? जो शोषित, पीड़ित जनता है, जो मजदूर और महकम जनता है उसकी जिन्दगी सुधारने के लिये क्या इलाज किया गया है ?

अब जरा स्टेट बैंक को भी देख लिया जाये कि इसमें जिन जिन के नाम हैं उनमें कौन किसान हैं और कौन मजदूर हैं। श्री वो० टी० दहेजिया चेयरमैन हैं। श्री कान्तिनाथ टी० देसाई चाइस-चेयरमैन हैं। श्री रामानन्द राव और श्री आर० के० तलवार डाइरेक्टर हैं। ये सभी तो उद्योगपति हैं और पुराने सरकारी कर्मचारी आई० सी० एस० हैं। जरा इसको देख लिया जाये कि जो पुराने आई० सी० एस० और उद्योगपति हैं उनको ही यह सरकार नामिलेट करेगी। (Interruptions.)

हमको इस तरह से श्री डाह्याभाई मत बनाओ। हम डाह्याभाई जो को जानते हैं और उनको कृपा पर रहने वालों को जानते हैं। बेमतलब की बात करने से कोई फायदा नहीं है। हम ऐसे लोगों को जानते हैं जिन्होंने अंग्रेजों या साम्राज्यवादी हुकूमत में अंग्रेजों के तलवे चटे थे और आज वे कांग्रेस मंत्रिमंडल में हैं और कांग्रेस मंत्रिमंडल में बड़ा बड़ा जगहों पर हैं। तो अनवश्यक शेर मत बनो। हमने बहुत से तोसमार खा लोगों को देखा है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह 29 मार खा है।

श्री राजनारायण : हल्ला करने से कोई लाभ नहीं है। हमारा यह कहना है कि आज जो राष्ट्रीयकरण राष्ट्रीयकरण का बड़ा हल्ला मचा हुआ है, इसको सच्चे रूप में इन्दिरा-करण कहना चाहिये। यह इन्दिराकरण है, यह सरकाराकरण है, यह मंत्रोकरण है, यह राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं है। राष्ट्रीयकरण कैसे होगा, इसके बारे में हमने पहले बताया। इन्दिराकरण और राष्ट्रीयकरण में बड़ा फर्क है। राष्ट्रीयकरण अगर हो तो सारे उद्योग-वन्धों पर गरीबों का स्वामित्व हो, समाज का स्वामित्व हो।

The State must necessarily belong to the producing masses and workers in the field, and factories.

यह सन् 42 के 8 अगस्त का प्रस्ताव है जब कि गांधीजी के हाथ में ए० आई० सी० सी० ने बम्बई में सारे आन्दोलन को बागडोर गपुर्द की थी। यह समाजवादी दल की विजय थी जिसको सरदार पटेल नहीं चाहते थे और दूसरे लोग नहीं चाहते थे। उस प्रस्ताव में कहा गया था कि जब अंग्रेज जायेगा तो राजसत्ता पर खेतों में काम करने वाले किसानों का और कल-कारखानों में काम करने वाले मजदूरों का आधिपत्य होगा। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वह आज कहाँ है लोगों का आधिपत्य निरर्थक शब्दों के साथ बलात्कार करना, शब्दों के साथ घोखा करना, यह किसी के लिये उचित नहीं है।

अब जरा देखिये कि इस विधेयक का क्या उद्देश्य है :

“राष्ट्रीय नीति और उद्देश्यों के अनुरूप अर्थ-व्यवस्था के विकास की आवश्यकताओं की पूर्ति अधिक अच्छी तरह करने की दृष्टि से कतिपय बैंकारी कम्पनियों के उपक्रमों के अर्जन और अन्तरण का तथा उससे सम्बद्ध या उसके आनुषंगिक विषयों का उपबन्ध करने के लिए विधेयक।”

यह उद्देश्य तो ठीक है, मगर हमारी राष्ट्रीय नीति क्या है, राष्ट्रीय नीति का संचालन अब तक क्या हुआ है। इसका एक ही उदाहरण मैं देना चाहता हूँ। आज जब बिड़ला से संबंधित रपट निकली है उसी को मैं पढ़ देता हूँ :

"The Committee also dealt with the allegation that the house of Birlas had secured a loan of more than Rs. 200 crores from Government financial institutions, from foreign countries, from the Gooley Fund and from Indian banks during the years 1965-66 and 1966-67. It estimated that the Birlas had secured a credit of over Rs. 80 crores. This amount did not include credit facilities made available by private commercial banks".

[श्री राजनारायण]

यानी सोशली ओण्ड जिसको यह सरकार मानती है उसने 80 करोड़ का कर्जा श्री बिड़ला को दिया। श्री घनश्याम दास बिड़ला जिन के बारे में यहाँ बड़ा चर्चा चली, इस विधेयक के सम्बन्ध में आप कुछ कहिये, लेकिन मैं कहूँगा कि यह उन्हीं बिड़ला का विधेयक है क्योंकि वे इस विधेयक का स्वागत करते हैं, वे इस विधेयक को बेलकम करते हैं। काहे घबड़ाते हो डाह्याभाई जी, छोटे छोटे उद्योगपतियों, बिड़ला जो ने डंके की चोट पर कहा है कि जिस तरह से अब तक लिया है, उसी तरह से इन्दिरा रानी के हाथ में आने दो, वे जायेंगी कहा, वे हमको पहले से ज्यादा देंगी। अब 27 सौ करोड़ अपने से दूनी रकम 54 सौ करोड़ में मिल जायेगी जिसको आप पब्लिक सेक्टर कहते हैं। इसलिये इन तथ्यों को पकड़ो, इन तथ्यों को देखो। अगर श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी या प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा हमारा ऐप्रिसिएशन चाहती हैं, तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उनका दिल बैठ क्यों गया विदेशी बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने में, उनका चित्त दुर्बल क्यों हो गया सभी बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने में? मैं यह भी पूछना चाहता हूँ कि बैंक कर्मचारियों की तनखाह के बारे में, उनकी छुट्टी के बारे में, तरक्की के बारे में, राजनैतिक अधिकार के बारे में इस विधेयक में कुछ है? यह बेचारा चन्द्र शेखर असल में पार्लियामेंटरी सिस्टम में नया-नया आया है।

श्री ब्रजकिशोर प्रसाद सिंह (बिहार) : काफ़ी पुराने हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : प्रधान मंत्री क्या पब्लिक लेक्चर देती हैं भूपेश गुप्त के जनों को उससे हमको कोई मतलब नहीं। इस विधेयक में क्या है? क्या परसेंटेज बोर्ड आफ डाइरेक्टर्स में किसानों का होगा, क्या परसेंटेज बोर्ड आफ डाइरेक्टर्स में मजदूरों का होगा, क्या परसेंटेज सरकारी कर्मचारियों का होगा? कहीं इसकी व्यवस्था है?

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : है, है।

श्री राजनारायण : झूठ बोलते हो, कहीं नहीं है। बिन पढ़े टे-टे करते हो। मैं पढ़ रहा हूँ एक-एक करके, जब क्लाज़ बाई क्लाज़ आया तब पढ़ना ही पड़ेगा, मैं अभी यह पढ़ रहा हूँ :

"The Advisory Board shall consist of representatives of the following, namely, the depositors of the corresponding new bank, employees of such bank, farmers, workers and artisans, to be elected in such manner and by such authority as may be prescribed, and shall also consist of such other persons as the Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, appoint."

इनके प्रतिनिधि लिए जाएंगे। तो दस प्रतिनिधि इन्दिरा जी के आ जाएंगे तो एक इनका भी ले लिया जायेगा नाम के लिए। राष्ट्रीयकरण का मतलब क्या है? Nationalistic plus people nation, नेशन और सरकार में फर्क है। "नेशन" में राष्ट्र की जनता आएगी। राष्ट्र की जनता का मैनेजमेंट में प्राफिट में, डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन में, सभी में प्रमुख हाथ होगा तब उसको राष्ट्रीयकरण कहा जायेगा। केवल सरकार का बड़े बड़े ओहदेदारों को बैठा कर बिल्कुल व्यूरोक्रेसी के हाथ में सारे उद्योग-धन्धों को कह देना कि राष्ट्रीयकरण है तो राष्ट्रीयकरण शब्द के साथ वह कानून मंत्री का बलात्कार होगा। मैं चाहूँगा कि जो जितना है उतना कहो। यह ठीक है कि प्राइवेट हाथों से आपने छीन —माफ कीजिए "आप" नहीं, आप शब्द तो चेयर के लिए है—सरकार ने छीना, मगर सरकार सभी उत्पादन के साधनों, सभी विनिमय के साधनों, सभी वितरण के साधनों पर अपना स्वामित्व बना कर तानाशाही व्यवस्था परिचालित कर दे तो उसको रोकेगा कौन? फिर डिक्टेटरशिप और समाजवादी जनतंत्र में फर्क है। मैं अपने मित्र भूपेश जी को कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरह डाह्याभाई पटेल के लिए विरोध करना धर्म था, हमारे मित्र पीताम्बर दास के लिए विरोध करना

धर्म था, उसी तरह भूपेश गुप्त को जितना यह विधेयक है नहीं उससे ज्यादा हल्ला मचाना था। ये भी अपनी जगह पर है, ऐसा मत समझना कि भूपेश गुप्त भावुकता में बात कह रहे थे, ये विकुल्ल ठीक ढंग से चल रहे थे, इनकी व्यवस्था है, इनका प्लान है।

तो मैं श्री चन्द्र शेखर को इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक विधेयक डा० लोहिया ने पेश किया था लोक सभा में, यह रखा था मार्च 25, 1967 को। डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया का जो विधेयक है उसमें से थोड़ा मैं पढ़ना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने यह व्यवस्था दी थी कि जो इस तरह से बोर्ड बने उसमें 5 तो नामांकित हों सरकार की ओर से, जो इन डिपार्टमेंट्स से आए—

Planning Commission;

Ministry of Commerce and Industry;

Department of Company Law Administration;

Department of Labour of the State Government concerned;

and a nominee of the Municipal Committee or Corporation of the locality in which the head office of the company is situated.

अगर प्रधान मंत्री जी इसको राष्ट्रीयकरण कहें तो मैं उसको राष्ट्रीयकरण मानने के लिए तैयार हूँ लेकिन इस व्यवस्था को शिरो-धार्य करें कि सरकार जो बोर्ड आफ डाइरेक्टर्स बनाए उसमें 5 ही सरकारी प्रतिनिधि रहे जिनमें एक प्लानिंग कमिशन का हो, एक मिनिस्ट्री आफ कामर्स और इंडस्ट्री का हो, एक डिपार्टमेंट आफ कम्पनी ला एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का हो, एक डिपार्टमेंट आफ लेबर अंडर स्टेट गवर्नमेंट कंसर्गड का हो जिस स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के अंतर्गत वह आफिस हो और एक म्युनिसिपैलिटी या कारपोरेशन का हो जिसमें कि हेड आफिस हो, इसी तरह से जो वर्कर्स हैं 5 उनके डायरेक्टर्स चुने जायें और उसी तरह से 5 जो किसान हैं, मजदूर हैं, दूसरे लोग हैं जो उससे लेनदेन करते हैं उनके

द्वारा चुने जायें। तभी इसमें पोपुल्स पार्टिसिपेशन कहलाएगा, पोपुल्स पार्टिसिपेशन एट एवरी स्टेज कहलाएगा, तब यह राष्ट्रीयकरण के स्वरूप जैसा होगा, राष्ट्रीयकरण लाइक होगा, मगर आप तमाम ब्यूरोक्रेटिक इम्पैरियलिज्म को स्थापित करके कहें कि यह राष्ट्रीयकरण है तो मैं कहूंगा कि उस व्यवस्था को इस ढंग से नहीं होना चाहिए, उस व्यवस्था को ठीक ढंग से होना चाहिए। इसलिए मैं सुझाव दूंगा कि इसको ठीक ढंग से आना चाहिए, जनता का पार्टिसिपेशन होना चाहिए। कांस्टीट्यूशन आफ बोर्ड आफ डाइरेक्टर्स के बारे में हमने कह दिया। अब जरा 15 क्लॉज भी देख लीजिए—

"Every person holding office as Chairman, managing or whole-time director of an existing bank shall, on the commencement of this Act, be deemed to have vacated office and every other director of such bank (hereinafter referred to as the 'continuing directors') shall, until directors are duly elected by the existing bank, be deemed to continue to hold such office."

जब तक ड्यूली इलेक्टेड नहीं आ जाएंगे तब तक जो बैंक डाइरेक्टर अभी हैं वह अपनी जगह पर विद्यमान रहेंगे। कोई टाइम लिमिट है? अगर श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी के दिमाग से उनकी राष्ट्रीयकरण की दुल्हिन का चेहरा साफ था तो राष्ट्रीयकरण दुल्हिन ने यहाँ पर टाइम क्यों नहीं निश्चित किया, क्यों नहीं टाइम बांध दिया कि कानून बनने के 15 दिन के अन्दर, कानून बनने के एक महाने के अन्दर-अन्दर उनके चुनाव की व्यवस्था हो जायेगी, मगर इसमें पूरा का पूरा अधिकार प्रधान मंत्री साहिब के हाथ में है। यह विधेयक पास करने के बाद भी श्री भिन्न भूपेश जो पुराने डाइरेक्टर अपनी जगह पर विद्यमान रह सकते हैं।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : नहीं, नहीं।

श्री राजनारायण : नहीं, नहीं मत कहो।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : हम नहीं समझते।

श्री राजनारायण : नहीं समझते तो हमसे समझ लो। इस विवेक में कहीं समय की पचन्दी नहीं है, यह सरकार जितने समय तक चाहे उन्हें वहाँ रहने दे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : राजनारायण जी, यहाँ भी समय की पचन्दी है।

श्री राजनारायण : समय की पचन्दी चन्द्र शेखर पर नहीं रहेगी, जो 45 मिनट बोले ?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : चन्द्र शेखर 35 मिनट बोले।

श्री राजनारायण : आप ठीक से देख लीजिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : 3-05 से 3-40 तक।

श्री राजनारायण : प्रधान मंत्री साहिब चली गई। मुझे यहाँ कोई पुराना कांग्रेसी नहीं दिखाई पड़ता है, मैं कोई कान्ट्रोवर्सी यहाँ खड़ी नहीं करना चाहता लेकिन मैं याद दिलाऊँगा कि पुराने राजाओं के प्रिवी पर्स को रकम कितनी हो, उस प्रिवी पर्स की रकम को तय करने में सरकारी मंत्रियों ने कितना-कितना रुपया लिया। हमारे पास जानकारी है, इस समय हम कहेंगे नहीं, यह अपने तरकश का तौर किसी और दूसरे समय के लिए रख रहे हैं जब इन्दिरा गांधी रहेंगी। आगे इसमें कहा गया है :

"registration of the transfer or transmission of shares;

arriving at an agreement about the amount of compensation payable under this Act or appearing before the Tribunal for obtaining a determination as to the amount of compensation."

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस एग्रीमेंट में बड़े लूप-होल है। यह एग्रीमेंट का अधिकार प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिब अपने हाथ में रखना चाहती है। बड़े बड़े बैंक के मालिकों से बड़े बड़े शेयर-होल्डर्स से हम उनको कितना मुआवजा दे इसका हम एग्रीमेंट करेंगे। जानते हैं आमतौर पर अच्छी तरह से कि ट्रिब्यूनल के पास जायेगा ही नहीं। इसलिए मैं चाहूँगा कि अगर का मंत्री ईमानदार है अपने प्रति तो यह कहें कि एग्रीमेंट जो होगा, वह भी ट्रिब्यूनल के पास जायेगा। अगर ट्रिब्यूनल का फैसला एग्रीमेंट से ज्यादा हुआ तो समझौताशुदा रकम देना होगा और अगर कम होता है तो ट्रिब्यूनल का फैसला मान्य होगा। अगर यह जनता के हित की बात है तो इस संशोधन को आप स्वीकार कीजिए कि एग्रीमेंट का पूरा अधिकार सरकार के हाथ में हरगिज हरगिज नहीं छोड़ना चाहिए। इस परिधि में हम इस बात को मानने के लिए तैयार हैं कि सरकारी मंत्री लोग एग्रीमेंट करें, एग्रीमेंट की एक रकम बंध जाये और फिर उसे ट्रिब्यूनल के पास भेजा जाये। अगर ट्रिब्यूनल उस एग्रीड, समझौताशुदा रकम से कम माने तो ट्रिब्यूनल का फैसला मान्य होगा, अगर ट्रिब्यूनल समझौताशुदा रकम से ज्यादा फैसला करे तो जो समझौता हुआ है वही वाईडिंग होगा। वह दिया जाये। इस तरह की कोई बात होनी चाहिए। अगर मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि बेमतलब 1931, 1948, नेता सुभाषचन्द्र बोस, जवाहरलाल नेहरू, यह सब नाम लेने से क्या फायदा। कांग्रेस की हिस्ट्री हम उनसे ज्यादा जानते हैं। क्लास में पढ़ाते हैं। बाहर नहीं तो जेल में दो बार पढ़ाते ही हैं। तो हमारा कहना है कि बेमतलब शब्दों का प्रयोग करने से कोई फायदा नहीं। इस बात को सीधे सीधे पकड़ो कि कंपेंसेशन क्यों ? मैं सफाई के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का सवाल है हम कंपेंसेशन के घोर विरोधी हैं। हम कंपेंसेशन सिद्धान्त का मूलतः विरोध करते हैं और कंपेंसेशन—मुआवजा देने के पक्ष में हरगिज

हरगिज नहीं है। काहे मूआवजा दें? किसी का जन्मसिद्ध अधिकार है? मैं प्रोधन के उस वाक्य को आज भी सही मानता हूँ कि 'प्रापटी इज राबरी' जिसके पास धन है वह डकैती का है। बिना डकैती डाले हुए, चाहे वह कानून की हो या पोलिटिकल, धन किसी के पास एकत्रित हो नहीं सकता। तो मैं आज भी मानता हूँ कि "प्रापटी इज राबरी" किसी के पेट से पैसा निकला है क्या? राजनारायण को माँ ने राजनारायण को पैदा किया और श्री बाबुभाई चिनाई को माँ ने बाबुभाई के साथ खजाना भर कर भेज दिया?

एक माननीय सदस्य : गंगापुर का धन कहां से आया?

श्री राजनारायण : गंगापुर का धन तो वाजिद अली को मार कर आया। पहला किला हमने गंगापुर में बनाया। वाजिद अली का जो गढ़ था उसको तोड़ा और 96 परगाना दखल किया। अपने बाहुबल से एक डाकू से छीन लिया। एक मानवीय डाकू था और एक अमानवीय डाकू था। मानवीय डाकू ने अमानवीय डाकू से छीना। मगर वहां हमारा सिद्धान्त अपनी जगह पर है और मैं उसको बिल्कुल सफाई से कहना चाहता हूँ कि कंपेंसेशन के बारे में हमारा सिद्धान्त यह है। आप कहेंगे कि संविधान में कंपेंसेशन की बात है यदि संविधान बाध्य करे तो नममात्र दो हम रिट्रैबिलिटेसन ग्राण्ट के पक्षपाती हैं। रिट्रैबिलिटेसन ग्राण्ट दो, पुनः वास अनुदान को सिद्धान्ततः मानो। जिनकी संपत्ति का अपहरण हो, यदि उनके पास जीवन निर्वाह के दूसरे साधन नहीं तो उनको जीवन निर्वाह के साधन देना मानवीय दृष्टि से उचित है, मगर यह बात हम भूपेश जी से क्यों कहें क्योंकि उन्होंने तो अपने घोषणा-पत्र में ही मूआवजे के सिद्धान्त को मान रखा है। इस

लिए मैं उनसे उस संबंध में नहीं उलझूंगा क्योंकि वे अपने घोषणा-पत्र के अनुसार ही चलते हैं। मैं तो सफाई से यह कहना चाहूंगा कि पूंजीपति, पूंजीपति, पूंजीपति की बहुत चर्चा होती है तो पूंजीपति का जब चर्चा हो तो पूंजीपतियों के बारे में मैं . . .

(Hon. Shri Rajnarain sat down while searching for some papers.)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : राजनारायण जी, आप बैठ गये तो मैं दूसरे को बुलाता हूँ।

श्री राजनारायण : यह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के घोषणा-पत्र का एक वाक्य है, उसे देखें :

"The Communist Party recognises that in the present stage of our development, patriotic minded Indian capitalists can make an important contribution towards the economic development of our country. The Party desires that Indian industries should be protected against foreign competition, that all legitimate rights of the capitalists should be ensured and that their active cooperation should be secured for implementation of the plan of national reconstruction".

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Active co-operation should be "given to the Chair, Mr. Rajnarain.

आप तो संसदीय प्रथा के बड़े मानने वाले हैं। आठ घंटे का समय है . . .

श्री राजनारायण : आप खड़े हैं, तो मैं बैठ जाता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : आठ घंटे का समय है जिसमें 4 घंटे अपोजीशन पार्टीज के हैं और 4 घंटे कांग्रेस के। कांग्रेस के कितने मेम्बर बोलेंगे यह कांग्रेस पार्टी के डिस्टाइड करने की बात है। आपकी पार्टी का समय 25 मिनट है और आप 30 मिनट ले चुके हैं। अब आप खत्म कीजिए।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं अद्वय के साथ आपके प्रति श्रद्धा और आदर रखते हुए यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस विधेयक को समय की टेक्नोकलिटोज में मत ले जाइये।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : आप खुद चाहते हैं कि यह विधेयक जल्द से जल्द पास हो, इस लिए जब तक आप प्रयत्न नहीं करेंगे यह नहीं होगा।

श्री राजनारायण : आपको मालूम होगा कि उत्तर प्रदेश में जब जमींदारी एबालिशन का नियम लाया गया तो 12 बजे रात को हमने घड़ी बंद करा दी और हमने कहा कि घड़ी की सुई 12 बजे के बाद नहीं चलेगी क्योंकि प्रस्ताव हो चुका था कि 12 बजे तक यह पास हो जायेगा। तो अब तक 12 बजे . . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : हम किसी के 12 नहीं बजाना चाहते।

श्री राजनारायण : खैर, मैं इतना कह दूँ कि 1967 में भी हमारे मित्र भूपेश गुप्त ने सफाई के साथ यह लिखा है कि सभी उद्योगों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करना न तो जरूरी है और न वे चाहते हैं। देशभक्त उद्योगपतियों का सहयोग लेना उन्होंने अपने घोषणा-पत्र में माना है। अब यह कौन डिस्टाइड करेगा कि कौन देशभक्त है। हम उनको सरकार के ऊपर नहीं छोड़ना चाहते। इसलिए हमारा कहना है कि सभी उद्योगों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करो। इसलिए हमारा कहना है कि विदेशी बैंकों को भी लिया जाये, छोटे छोटे बैंकों को

श्री लिया जाये, मजदूरों को पूरा अधिकार दिया जाये और उसी के साथ साथ राष्ट्रीय आय, हर आदमी की, इनकम, हर आदमी का खर्च, इसको भी अच्छी तरह से बाँधा जाये। अगर आप चाहते हो कि समाज का उत्थान हो तो आज मैं प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जितने जन समूह के समर्थन की उनको जरूरत पड़ेगी वह उनको हासिल रहेगा। 1500 रुपये महीने से ज्यादा आमदनी चाहे तनख्वाह के रूप में हो या किसी भी रूप में हो, किसी की नहीं होनी चाहिये और 1500 रुपये महीने से ज्यादा कोई खर्च नहीं करेगा। इस चीज को प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा लायें, उनको पूरी ताकत मिलेगी। मगर मैं प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे स्पष्ट क्रान्तिकारिता के मार्ग का अवलंबन न करें। यह उचित नहीं है। मैं इसीलिए आपके द्वारा यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार ने जो यह विधेयक प्रस्तुत किया है हम इसके समर्थक हैं, किन्तु हम कहते हैं कि यह सही माने में राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं है। यह कुछ सरकारी कर्मचारियों और कुछ राजनीति से निकले हुए लोगों को खपायेगा। इससे मेहनतकश और जान लगाने वाली जनता का उत्थान नहीं होगा। कानून मंत्री अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि फ्रान्स और इटली में बैंकों का सरकारीकरण हुआ, लेकिन सरकारीकरण होने के बाद क्या वहाँ पूंजीवादी धारा रुकी? कहीं से रकम निकल कर किसान के पास चली गई, कहीं से रकम निकल कर मजदूर के पास चली गई, कहीं से रकम निकल कर भूमिहीन के पास चली गई। आज अगर सरकार चाहती है कि कुछ हो तो जब तक छोटी और बड़ी आमदनी का रिश्ता एक और दस का नहीं हो जाता जब तक भूमिहीनों के लिए खर्च नहीं होता, जब तक जो जमीन फालतू पड़ी है उसके लिए अन्न सेना नहीं बनाई जाती, उस जमीन को तोड़ने पर खर्च नहीं किया जाता, जो हरिजन हैं, दबे हुए मजदूर हैं, जो आदिवासी हैं, जो औरतें हैं उनकी तरक्की में यह रकम

खर्च नहीं होती जो कि कुछ व्यक्तियों के हाथ में जाती थी तब तक मैं समझता हूँ कि यह राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं हुआ। आज इसमें कहीं भी गुंजाइश नहीं है कि जो सरकार अपने हाथ में स्वामित्व लेगी उसका किस प्रकार से उपयोग किया जायेगा। केवल कह देना काफी नहीं है आपके बैंकिंग का जो कानून है उसमें जाइये। कर्जा नहीं मिलेगा, पूछा जायेगा कि हैसियत क्या है, सर्टिफिकेट लाओ और सर्टिफिकेट नहीं रहेंगे तो नहीं मिलेगा।

तो इसी रूप में इस विधेयक का राष्ट्रीयकरण नाम देना राष्ट्रीयकरण शब्द के साथ बलात्कार है, राष्ट्रीयकरण शब्द के साथ धोखा है। राष्ट्रीयकरण तब होगा जब कि राष्ट्र की जनता इसमें पूरी पूरी भागीदार होगी प्रबन्ध में होगी, मुनाफे में होगी, संचालन में होगी, लेनदेन में होगी। तब राष्ट्रीयकरण होगा।

श्रीमन्, अगर देखा जाये तो यह सही है कि अमी जो बैंकों की व्यवस्था थी उसमें स्पेकुलेशन में बड़ी रकम खर्च होती थी और सही तरीके से अगर हम कहते हैं कि उसको चलायेंगे तो यह रोका जा सकता है, अगर सही तरीके से हमारी यह सरकार हमारे सुझावों के अनुसार चलेगी तो दाम-रेखा बांधी जा सकती है और उसी के साथसाथ बैंकिंग सिद्धांत के विरुद्ध जो डायरेक्टरों के हाथ में धन एकत्र होता है उसको भी रोका जा सकता है और ठीक तरह से उसको अन्न सेना में, शिक्षा प्रसार की सेना में, जमीन के बंटवारे में और खेतों की सिंचाई व्यवस्था में लगाया जा सकता है। मगर यह सरकार उधर जा नहीं रही है। मैं एक वाक्य कहना चाहता हूँ कि वर्तमान सरकारी व्यवस्था में और वर्तमान व्यूरोक्रेटिक ढांचे में आज जितना भी कायदा कानून बनेगा उसका फायदा वही उच्च मध्यम वर्ग और बड़े बड़े उद्योगपति और बड़े बड़े धनपशु लेंगे और उन्हीं धनपशुओं के हाथ में सारी पूंजी जायेगी। श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी इस समय यहां नहीं हैं, हमारी आवाज में वह ताकत हो कि उनके कानों तक पहुंचे

कि इस विधेयक में कहीं इस बात की गुंजाइश हो कि पहले जो समाज का नीचे का तल्ला है, जो समाज का शोषित-पीड़ित वर्ग है, जो हैब-नाट्स हैं उनके उत्थान पर सारी पूंजी लगाई जाये और अगर केवल जो उच्चतम तत्का है उसी के लिये हम बैंकों को सरकारी हाथ में ले कर उसे राष्ट्रीयकरण की संज्ञा दें और केवल खपत का अमानकीकरण करें तो यह बड़ा भारी देश का दुर्भाग्य होगा। चन्द्र शेखर जी चले गये, मैं चन्द्र शेखर सरीखे दिमाग के लोगों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज उनमें और भूपेश गुप्ता में कोई फर्क है या नहीं कोई फर्क हो तो बताइये। जिस प्रकार की आर्थिक व्यवस्था भूपेश जी चाहते हैं उसी प्रकार की आर्थिक व्यवस्था चन्द्र शेखर जी चाहते हैं, इन्दिरा जी चाहती हैं या उसमें फर्क है? इसको बराबर मद्देनजर रखना है। क्योंकि भूपेश जी जिस सिद्धांत को मान कर चलते हैं उसको सफाई के साथ कहेंगे। वह, अपनी जगह पर दृढ़ हैं, यह किसी से डरते नहीं क्योंकि इनका एक मन्दिर है, उस मन्दिर की पूजा है, उस मन्दिर का प्रसाद है, वह मंदिर उनको मंत्रणा देगा कि राज्य के हाथ में सारी आर्थिक ताकत, सारी राजनैतिक सत्ता आ जाये तो उसको जिस ढंग से चाहेगा उस ढंग से चलायेगा। हम वह नहीं मानते, हम तो तृतीय धारा चलाते हैं, न अमेरिकी धारा और न रूसी धारा, हमारी तो एक तृतीय धारा है जो सच्चा जनतंत्र है। हमारे जनतंत्र में समता है, स्वतंत्रता है, सत्ता का विकेन्द्रीकरण है, समाजवाद है और शान्तिमय जनतांत्रिक मार्ग है, पांचों को एक में पिरोया हुआ है, अगर इसमें एक भी दूषित हो गया तो दूसरा भी दूषित हो जायेगा।

मैं, श्रीमन्, आपका आभारी हूँ। आपने चन्द्र शेखर जी से थोड़ा कम ही समय हमको दिया . . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव):
नहीं, आपको ज्यादा समय दिया है।

श्री राजनारायण : ... फिर भी मैं आपके प्रति आभार व्यक्त करूंगा और मैं कहूंगा कि राष्ट्रीयकरण को राष्ट्रीयकरण के रूप में चलाया जायें। मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि राष्ट्रीयकरण के काम को सच्चाई से यदि प्रधान मंत्री साहिव करेगी तो हमारी तरफ से उनको पूरी पूरी सहायता मिल सकती है, मिलेगी। फिर भी एक जगह से उठ कर दूसरी जगह गये तो आने जाने के मार्ग में कुछ तूफान होगा, कुछ बवंडर होगा, कुछ झंझावाज होगा और उससे एक नई चीज पैदा होगी। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह विधेयक जल्दी से जल्दी पास हो और यह चाहता हूँ कि जो कुछ भी हमने संशोधन किये हैं, जो कुछ भी सुझाव दिये हैं, उन सुझावों को कानून मंत्री महोदय अच्छे प्रकार से अपने दिमाग में रखें और समय के अन्दर ही वह संशोधन कर लें। तब इसका राष्ट्रीयकरण का स्वरूप होगा। वर्तमान स्वरूप में इस विधेयक को राष्ट्रीयकरण का कहने में हमको कुछ हिचक होती है। हम चाहते हैं कि यह शुद्ध राष्ट्रीयकरण बने। मगर शुद्ध राष्ट्रीयकरण बनने में बाधा है। और जैसा कि हमारे कुछ मित्रों ने लोक सभा में इसको बताया, श्री मधु लिमये ने बताया है, हम भी कहते हैं, कि युनाइटेड कमिशिल बैंक ने कांग्रेस पार्टी को चुनाव में 10 लाख रुपया, पंजाब नेशनल बैंक ने 15 लाख रुपया कर्जा दिया। अब सभी बैंक इन्दिरा जी के हाथ में आ जायेंगे तो कांग्रेस पार्टी को कितना कर्जा देंगे? इसका भी प्राविजन होता चाहिये। किसी भी राजनैतिक दल को सरकार के हाथ में बैंकों के आने के बाद से एक पैसा कर्जा नहीं दिया जा सकता। ये सब बातें सफाई के साथ इसमें आये यह मैं चाहता हूँ बरना जिस उद्देश्य के लिये यह विधेयक है वह उद्देश्य धूमिल होगा, गन्दा हो जायेगा और सिद्धांत और व्यवहार का फर्क हो जायेगा। इसलिये आखीर में यही कहूंगा . . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भागवत):
समता की बात मान कर अब आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री राजनारायण : ... हमारे मित्र श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने एक आदमी को सलाह दी है कि वह हमारा जवाब दें, तो मैं उनको पहले ही से बता देना चाहता हूँ कि वह जवाब क्या देंगे, उस जवाब को पहले से दिये देता हूँ। छिद्रेषु अनर्था बहुली भवन्ति। छोटा सा छिद्र भयंकर उत्पात कर देता है इसलिये उस छोटे से छिद्र में मत पड़ो भूपेश जी। (Time bell rings.)

यह बिड़ला का एग्जीमेंट है। उनके सारे प्रमुख दृष्टमन, एनिमी नम्बर वन तयाकथित श्री चन्द्र शेखर जी और भूपेश जी सुन लें। बिड़ला से यह किया तब कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी एक थी और तब उनके साथ जो इनका एग्जी-मेंट है उसी के टर्मस को मैं पढ़ रहा :

"That it is the right and responsibility of the Company to maintain discipline and efficiency in the plant, and to hire labourers and to discharge them for any cause which to the company appears just, and to relieve labourers from duty on account of inefficiency, of lack of work or other reasons subject only to the provisions contained either in the Statutes in force or in the Standing Orders of the company."

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भागवत) :
यह कहाँ का पढ़ रहे हैं !

श्री राजनारायण : यह केरल गवर्नमेंट का है, 1957 का है, जब कि भूपेश जी और गोपालन साहब एक थे तब 1957 का है, क्योंकि 1957 के घोषणा-पत्र में यह दे चुके थे कि ऐसा करेंगे—1967 के घोषणा-पत्र में थोड़ा सा चेंज है—कि राष्ट्रीय प्रगतिशील, पूंजीपतियों का सहयोग हो।

"It is the right of the company to make such rules and regulations, from time to time, for the purpose of maintaining discipline, order, safety for effective operation of the company's work and to require obedience thereof by labourers."

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भागवत):
अब आप खत्म कीजिये। हो गया।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं हर्गिज नहीं चाहूंगा कि आपको इसके लिये कहना पड़े। पांच मिनट दे दें तो खत्म कर दूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :
अब पांच मिनट कैसा ?

श्री राजनारायण : मैं पढ़े देता हूँ :

"That the bonus will not be related to the company's profits or earning but where found necessary by the company will only be related to and paid on efficiency and productivity, according to scheme which may be formulated by the company from time to time."

अब, बोनस का सिद्धांत बराबर हमारे मित्र चिल्लाते हैं कि मुनाफे से रिलेटेड है लेकिन वहाँ उसके लिये कह दिया कि नहीं, समय समय पर जब चाहेंगे तब देंगे, जैसा चाहेंगे उसके मुताबिक बोनस देंगे। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि कोई भी अपने को प्रगतिशीलता का दम भरने वाला कहने वाला दल इस तरह का समझौता किसी पूँजीरति से कर सकता है। यह स्पर्श-प्रगतिवादिता है, इसको हम कहते हैं सूडो-लेफ्टिज्म, स्पर्श क्रान्तिकारिता से काम नहीं चलेगा, अगर मूल रूप से आप परिवर्तन करना चाहते हैं तो सिर्फ व्यापक शब्दों के प्रयोग से काम नहीं चलेगा जैसा कि हमारे मित्र लोग करते हैं, मार्क्सवाद, जन-वाद, जन-मोर्चा, क्रान्ति, प्रगति। यह कोई शब्द है ? What do you mean by this? What do you mean by removing inequality?

आप असमानता और विषमता को दूर करने का अर्थ क्या करते हो, आपका क्रान्ति का माने क्या है ? जिनके चेहरे आज मुरझाये हुये हैं, जिनके चेहरे आज मटमैले हैं जब उनके चेहरे रोशन हों तब समझा जाना चाहिये कि क्रान्ति हुई। इस प्रकार का बैक आप हाथ में ले लो अच्छा है, ठीक है, दरबसल हम उसकी तार्ईद कर रहे हैं, समर्थन कर रहे हैं, खूब खले हाथ से समर्थन कर रहे हैं मगर मैं साफ बताता हूँ कि व्यूरोक्रेटाइजेशन नहीं होना चाहिये। इसको होशियारी के साथ

देखा जाये। मगर हमारे लिये थोड़ा सा रास्ता आसान हो जायेगा अगर मैं वहाँ एक वाक्य पढ़ दूँ . . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :
राजनारायण जी, देखिये आपके 50 मिनट हो गये।

श्री राजनारायण : नहीं तो। हमने आपसे 5 मिनट के लिये कहा था।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :
देखिये, यह बात सही नहीं है। आप तो संसदीय प्रथा को जानने वाले हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, साढ़े 3 मिनट हुआ है, डेढ़ मिनट और आपसे चाहता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :
देखिये, यह आप गलत बात कर रहे हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : बैठ जाऊँ ?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :
बिल्कुल बैठ जाइये।

श्री राजनारायण : खैर, मैं यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि सिद्धांत का जेनरलाइजेशन नहीं होना चाहिये, सिद्धांतों का टोस और कान्क्रीट रूप होना चाहिये। जेनरलाइजेशन जो होता है कार्यक्रम का उसी को हम प्रिन्सिपल कहते हैं और कान्क्रीटाइजेशन जो होता है प्रिन्सिपल का उसी को हम कार्यक्रम कहते हैं। तो कार्यक्रम और सिद्धांत एक में लेकर चलना चाहिये। दूर लक्ष और नजदीक लक्ष्य में तारतम्य होना चाहिये, नहीं तो समाजवाद एक घोखे की टट्टी रह जायेगा और समाजवाद के नाम पर, वर्क्स डिक्टेटरशिप और प्रोलिटेरियेट के नाम पर सारे भारतवर्ष में डिक्टेटरशिप हो जायेगी। इसलिये मैं खास तौर पर आगाह करना चाहता हूँ कि सही रूप में आज बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हो, उद्योगपतियों से समाज के हाथ में स्वामित्व जाये, समाज के हाथ में प्रबन्ध जाये, समाज के हाथ में

[श्री राजनारायण]

उसका लेनदेन लेखा-जोखा सब रहे और समाज के हाथ में समाज के प्रतिनिधि जो कि जनता के हों, मजदूरों के हों, वे रहें। सरकारी प्रतिनिधित्व चाहे कोई भी बोर्ड हो, कोई भी एडवाइजरी कमेटी हो, उसके हाथ में बहुत नहीं होना चाहिये तब तो हम समझेंगे यह राष्ट्रीयकरण है, वरना यह राष्ट्रीयकरण का दुरुपयोग है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Before I call the next speaker, I want to appeal to the House that there is a very longlist of hon. Members who want to take part in this debate. Barring the party leaders, I shall request all hon. Members from now on to limit their remarks to 15 minutes. Otherwise many of the Members who want to express their opinion will not be able to do so. Mr. Changalavaroayan.

SHRI T. CHANGALAVAROYAN (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, never in the recent history of the debates of this House have we considered a Bill of such momentous importance and far-reaching consequences as this Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Bill. With reference to this Bill, it is my respectful submission that it will be rather irrelevant, if not irrelevant, to refer to the ante-natal accident in the birth of this Bill. This historic measure is the result and outcome of the decision of the Congress Party in its evangelical endeavour to implement the 10-point programme for the economic development and progress of this country.

In its long historic role, the Congress has always endeavoured to be the emphatic emblem of the upheavals and the urges of the people, and this Bill comes in that historic sequence. Mr. Vice-Chairman, our illustrious Prime Minister, characteristic of the great inheritance which she has got and much more so of her legacy, has given a gallant lead in regard to the implementation of the economic programme. We have been noticing for some time past, particularly with a certain amount of anxiety, the growing disappointment, discontent, despair, dissatisfaction and disgust among the vast sections of our people on a wide area of our nation. We have long and loyally laboured to elevate the

country and the people to the full stature of political and economic manhood. Particularly in the field of development, we have built one storey upon another, and each storey has a story to tell of the stupendous effort and the immeasurable task and of the extreme suffering that we have put in in order to speed up economic progress. We have also combated problems of development and growth. We tried to catch up with the economic momentum. We initiated a certain system of social control of selective choice subjects like agriculture and small-scale industries. We initiated a process of adjustment between the demand and the availability of the resources. We also tried to reconcile and in that process embarked upon a monetary and price policy, reinforced by fiscal measures which can only attain reconciliation between demand and supply, so that certain vulnerable groups were protected and certain growths were sustained. In spite of all these regulatory endeavours, in spite of all these restrictive controls, our economy showed and suffered alternately a recession, a depression and a crisis. It becomes, therefore, increasingly clear that it is no longer useful, and it has become rather absurd, to rely upon Adam Smith's doctrine of *deus ex machina*, which means that the hidden hand somehow harmonises the economy. We have now come to realise that normally when there is growth in output and transactions in economy, in diverse sectors, a higher and vast volume of money supply becomes necessary. And it has always been the practice that the banking system, through its lending operations either to the private sector or to the Government, will always give such an amount or volume of supply. We wanted, Mr. Vice-Chairman, to initiate a policy of restraint on credit and at the same time we were trying to see that the flow of credit is canalised in proper, regular and purposive channels like agricultural production and industrial expansion.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair]

We were faced with a situation where functional finance was not available to all sectors at the required moment or for the required amount. We also tried very honestly, in the same spirit of dedication, the principle of social control of these banking institutions. We wanted to restrain credit and regulate its flow into certain selective social objectives like agriculture and small-scale industries. In this connec-

tion, I may be permitted to pay my tribute of respect and admiration for the leaders of the banking companies who have risen spontaneously and willingly to the great heights of responsiveness and co-operation in trying to make social control a very satisfactory and a very significant success. But when we take a kaleidoscopic view of the growth of the economy, we find that it was not able to stir that much momentum in order to achieve the social objectives which we have set before us. Therefore, we have to consider other useful and more dynamic directions by which we can certainly have the realisation of the objective of national priorities. We also considered the other question, particularly what has been facing the economies all over the world. The dilemma of the economists throughout the world has been whether to have economic freedom with crisis or abolition of economic freedom with stability. The latter choice has been made by countries like Germany, Italy and Belgium and lately by France and Sweden. And nationalisation of banking institutions is no longer the Utopian view of society. It has become the current phenomenon of contemporary economic development. Therefore, if we realise the twin functions of a bank, we will equally be convinced as to what is meant by the theory of nationalisation. The banking system has got two functions, one is to create institutionalised finance and the other is to retail credit. It is not disputed by any quarters, particularly in the economic circles, that the first function of creating credit and institutionalising it is largely a social undertaking, taken by the State. And it is the latter function of the retailing credit that has been entrusted to the banking institutions. The nationalisation of banks is, therefore, an integration of this dual function of creating credit and of retailing credit under one agency, under one authority. Nationalisation is not an abolition of functions. It is an integration of functions under one unified control and coordination. Mr. Vice-Chairman, if we just examine as to why we have come with this momentous measure of nationalisation, we will know that it is because we want to serve faster and better the growing needs of the economy. It is to implement the needs of priority of our national objectives and social purposes, it is also to inspire the large spectrum of the people who are affected by the ramifications of the banking system throughout our country with a larger and a deeper and a higher social and pub-

lic purpose, it is also to subserve the high priority in social objectives of agricultural expansion, of small-scale industries, of technological entrepreneurs, of development of backward areas, and to subserve the employment potential, that this Bill is now thought of. It may be asked that the banking system could have very well implemented this proposal. But I must submit with very great respect and absolutely without any reflection whatsoever that in this matter a more vigorous and vibrant velocity is required to be given in order to achieve this purpose. We believe, therefore, that this Bill will give sufficient steam, sufficient strength and sufficient speed, for the realisation of the great social objective.

I may have to refer very briefly and rapidly to some of the more salient features of this Bill and it is rather difficult within the course and compass of the time which your grace has allotted to me to refer in detail to any exposition of some of the fundamental features of the Bill. I may content myself with saying that this Bill contains the usual pattern of legislative drafting whenever any undertaking is acquired or transferred. I may particularly refer to the provision of retrospective operation of this Bill and it is very cardinal indeed in such far-reaching measures that we have to provide a retrospective action for the provisions of the Bill. Let there be no criticism against that in that matter.

Again I draw very respectfully the attention of this House to the constitution of the tribunal for the adjudication of the rights and interests and claims with regard to the working of this nationalisation. I am particularly pleased with the composition of this tribunal and the powers that are given to it so that it will be able to expeditiously dispose of the claims of rights and all disputes that may arise from out of the transfer of these undertakings. I am particularly satisfied with the provision for compensation which is perhaps the most sensitive part of the entire Bill. And I think that the provision that is now contained is only a replica, if I may say so with great respect, of those criteria of awarding compensation which have been recognised by the courts of law in respect of all such legislations of acquisition and transfer of undertakings.

[Shri T. Chandalavarayan]

I, therefore, commend very respectfully the salient features of this Bill, and as our learned Law Minister stated, when the scheme is placed before the House, we shall have a greater and fuller opportunity to examine the scope, nature and extent of that scheme and try to see how far and to what extent we can settle and improve the objectives of this Bill.

I have to answer one or two points, if I may, with your permission—some of the very out-standing criticism against this nationalisation. We are told that we should not precipitate this Bill, particularly in view of the pendency of the proceedings before the Supreme Court. Due to my tradition at the Bar and the training in politics, I regard our judiciary not only as the guide of our democracy, but as the guardian of our democracy. But this Bill is not *sub judice*. What is *sub judice* is the Ordinance and not the Bill. Moreover, though we recognise the parliamentary prohibition of considering certain matters which are *sub judice*, Sir Erskine May in his monumental treatise said that this parliamentary prohibition based upon the doctrine of *sub judice* does not apply to the initiation of Bills in Parliament.

There is the second criticism that our Prime Minister has assumed to be a dictator. If there is anything that she abhors, if there is anything that we on this side of the House detest, it is the dictatorship either of this variety or of that variety. What is it that we have done? We have merely implemented a long-standing programme of economic development and we have done it with the parliamentary sanction and with the popular support. If there is anything, it is the dictation of the wishes and the needs of the people and the growing requirements of our economy.

We are told further that by this nationalisation there will be bureaucratic inefficiency, there will be political influence, there will be other kinds of low profitability. May I most respectfully submit that these banking institutions have attained organisational perfection and operational efficiency of such a high standard that it will take a very very long time for any inefficiency to creep in? But I am sure when this nationalisation has taken effect, we shall see with everything in our nerve

that we will not allow the bloody bugs of bureaucracy to bite this system of nationalisation. I can assure you, if an assurance is necessary, that under nationalisation of these banks, we shall be much more vigorous and much more vibrant and much more efficient than what any private sector could ever hope to be.

Then there is the criticism that this Bill does not include in its fold the foreign banks. May I most respectfully answer those critics that this criticism is more out of anger than out of argument? Why have we not included the foreign banks? It is because of this very great principle of reciprocity in international relationship and unless we are able to find out the reciprocal reaction of the other countries, those are not necessary and not desirable and indeed not wise to include the foreign banks inside the scope of this Bill.

There has been another criticism with reference to the international impression of this nationalisation of banks. I may at once answer those critics that we are not going to behave in order to get prizes from some country or the other. We are going to behave according to the needs of our country and the requirements of the people.

One word more and I have done. We see today that we have accepted planning as our path, as our programme, as our article of improvement. In any planning it is the economic management of the State regulated by certain well-known laws of development and growth that has to be assured. And in the case of planning, particularly planned and balanced development emerges and begins to operate only when public ownership of the fountains of finances is established and public ownership of these fountains is necessary in order to ensure a very conscious proportionality in regard to the growing needs of the different sections of our economy and the needs of the rapid progress and of technological advance. This banking system, by its very nature and by its very constitution, by its very fabric, could not lend itself to such an elastic function, to such a concentrated endeavour and, therefore, this nationalisation has become not only a historical necessity, but it becomes an absolute economic culmination of the great endeavour that we have put in.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are embarking upon a venture may I say, an adventure. What is it that gives us the courage? What is it that inspires us with faith? What is it that gives us the assurance? I say it is the dedication of the officers, it is the devotion of the staff, it is the determination of the people, that gives us that courage, that faith and that assurance. May I appeal to my friends here to applaud us when we start—we start under good auspices—to console us when we falter we will not falter—to cheer us when we succeed and we will succeed sooner than our friends hope and critics doubt. For the sake of the people of our great country who have been waiting on the barren banks of time for a very very long time in their struggle for a fuller and happier life, may this Bill that we pass give them that sense of direction and that sense of destiny?

SHRIKALYN ROY (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, on behalf of the Co-munist Party we support the Bill. After many years the people of India will say: 'Here came a Prime Minister to bury the Caesars, not to praise them—the Indian Caesars, Do not they see what is happening outside.' Do they not have eyes? AH the central trade union organisations have come out solidly in support of this Bill. All the kisan organisations have come out solidly in support of this Bill. The miners down from the black pits to the white collar workers have come out in support of the Bill. Even those Central Government employees, some of whom were butchered by Morarji and Ghavan gangs, have come out to-day in support of our Prime Minister. Support for what? It is for a very modest step in the eyes of the Communist Party.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): For the information of my friend, it was under the leadership of Mr. Chavan that in 1963 the Maharashtra Congress Committee passed a Resolution for the nationalisation of the banking industry. It is not to day.

SHRI KALYN ROY : It only supports what Mr. Gupta said yesterday that the Young Turks have unfortunately become Young Chavans. Anyway the nationalisation by itself is not a very great step to us. We call it insufficient, we call it inadequate, we call it incomplete. Unfortunately not a single foreign bank has been nationalised.

There lies the big Grindlays Bank, there lies the American banks through which the CIA funds spread all over the country. They have not even been touched. The oil cartels are there where the Minister said they are trying even to prevent other fellows who are prepared to sell crude oil at cheaper rates. You have not yet touched the import and export trade, not even the coking coal mines where slaughter mining is going on every day and the Chairman of the HSL is crying today : "We will not get the coking coal and the steel mill will have to be closed down". You have taken none of the steps which even a tiny American country, Peru, ruled by military junta, took. It took over all the foreign banks, petrol pumps and the big plantations but even this good step you have taken for which we are happy, what mad fury it has created? What a howling we are hearing all over the country and particularly from two parties. What an agonised cry comes from the Malabar Hills and the GIVE Street. Look at the pale faces in the Rotary Club where Mr. S. K. Patil spoke of murder of democracy. The spectre is haunting both Mr. Patil and his gang, the spectre of Communism. Unfortunately today Mr. Kamaraj Nadar says that the Communist Party is trying to split up the Congress. Not at all. We support where you take the progressive, courageous step and we would continue to support, it does not matter whether we are criticised or abused. We are proud that we gave the slogan of bank nationalisation long back. We wanted that these worms who were getting fatter and fatter should be exposed. So long these worms were ruling the mighty financial empire from the darkness. Now our Prime Minister focussed the light on them and that is why they are crying and raving like madmen in mad-houses. We support the Prime Minister when she is fighting the challenge of the mighty establishment of the Syndicate like Vir Abhimanyu of Mahabharata. She has said before the people of this country that it is not an ordinary fight. She said yesterday : "I have taken my stand by the people and I will not come back even if it comes to a fight to finish against a few individuals". Do we not know who are these few individuals? They are those who are responsible for the devaluation of our currency, those who conspired and imposed Dharm Vira to topple the U. F. Government of West Bengal those who wanted the banning of the Communist Party and all the democratic movements in this country and

[Shri Kalyn Roy]

those who wanted to turn India into a semi-colonial country like South Korea or South Vietnam. Why are they frightened to day because of this little step which the Congress Party has taken after 20 years? The Congressmen themselves admit in their speeches that it should have been taken long back, as Mr. Chandra Shekhar said. It is late but better late than never. Why are they frightened? It is because by one decisive step the fundamental power, the monetary power has been transferred from a few individuals to the society at large. They are not able to speculate with Rs. 3000 crores which they were doing for the last several years. This nationalisation has also unfortunately frightened those who wanted to sabotage the coming Fourth Plan because the outlay proposed for the Plan by the Government is approximately Rs. 2700 crores of which the Centre is supposed to provide Rs. 1600 crores. 'In comparison the total deposit of the 14 banks that have been nationalised add up to Rs. 2700 crores. If we leave about 65 per cent, which is already committed, even then the Government, for the success of the Five Year Plan which is very vital and for running the factories requires at least Rs. 500 to Rs. 600 crores per annum and that is why they are fighting because they, the champions of the private sector, do not want the Fourth Plan to succeed. This time about six hundred crores will come from nationalised banks.

I am not going into the deposits or assets but I only want to say this. Do we not know who are the people who owned these 14 Banks? The Tatas controlled the Central Bank. The Birlas controlled the United Commercial Bank, the Dalmias controlled the Punjab National Bank and some of the big business controlled the Dena Bank. These big business houses were utilising the resources of the banks so long according to their wishes. They did not care for the needs of the economy. For economy the rural sector needs funds for development. This Mr. Patel also admits but what happened to that? The National Credit Council suggested that the extension of the bank credit to the agricultural and small industries should be made by private scheduled banks out of the additional resources. The allocation to agriculture and small industries were to be 15 per cent, and 31 per cent, respectively but the private commercial banks ignored it,

sabotaged it. They did not open their offices in the rural areas. According to a study made in October 1967 only 3.8 per cent, of the offices of the private scheduled banks were located in places having a population of less than 5000 and 13.2 per cent, were in places having less than 10,000. The State Bank has done much better. Sir, it is known to everybody that these monopolists have been sucking the blood of the teeming millions. We must fight them to the finish, and as the Prime Minister had said, further flow of credit to the big business should be stopped.

According to a study, two-thirds of the bank branches have been concentrated in urban centres with a population of one lakh and above; in 1966, of the total bank credit of Rs. 2432 crores, Rs. 1800 crores went to only 4000 accounts and only Rs. 600 crores were shared by nearly nine lakh accounts. A huge chunk of the bank credit extended to borrowers favoured only a few hundred, and they were found to be only four or five business houses, which also controlled the largest banks in the country. Further, according to a survey of directorships of 20 leading banking companies, 188 persons who served as directors of these banks were also director of 1100 companies. The debt due to bank directors or their companies was Rs. 55.8 crores in 1954 and had gone up to Rs. 100 crores by 1965. The bank loans given to the directors and their companies in the same year stood at Rs. 317.4 crores. This shows, Sir, how the big business is becoming big and big and big. Don't we know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, how recently the shares of the Iron and Steel Company at Asansol were cornered by the banks? That is why, Sir, we are supporting this timely step of the Congress Party. They have admitted openly today what the Communist Party has all along been shouting— why Communist Party? In fact, the employees, the workers, the peasants and, even the INTUC have been saying so long—they have been shouting that your social control has completely failed, finish it and have nationalisation. But Mr. Patel and Shri Patil were saying that the Reserve Bank has control over other banks. But don't we know that the Reserve Bank has told them, "Please do not make advances in agricultural commodities in this season. Please do not give advances on securities. They are going in for

speculation, and by speculation hoarding is taking place. Prices are rising"? How many times the Reserve Bank has reported, "Orders are violated"? Why? Because the Board of the Reserve Bank also consists of speculators. Because the Boards of the other banks consist of speculators. That is why even the Congress Party, in spite of the crisis it faces within its own ranks, has to bring out this Bill, and we are glad that our Finance Minister, the Prime Minister, refused to pay in sterling the compensation demanded by the Allahabad Bank. We are glad about it. But we are afraid of the compensation because, in the Bombay weekly "Commerce", they say that the compensation will go up to Rs. 150 crores. Would you pay the pirates for the piracy they have done? Would you pay the thieves for the good job of theft they have done in the last fifteen years and more? Would you pay the dacoits for the good job of dacoity they have committed? Now, Sir, we are against any compensation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AK-BAR ALI KHAN) : Your time is up.

SHRI KALYAN ROY : I am finishing, Sir. But if you at all want to pay them any compensation, the suggestion is that not a single Paisa should be paid in cash and the compensation decided on should not in any case exceed, at best it may be equal to, the value of the net assets, and the shareholders, except the small ones, should only be paid in 50-year Bonds.

Lastly I have one more suggestion to make. Unfortunately because of certain political trends in West Bengal, our State of West Bengal has been completely neglected. Everybody knows that last year there was complete devastation of North Bengal. There are the irrigation projects which the Irrigation Minister says cannot be done. Because we do not have money. The whole Calcutta Master Plan is collapsing. The Durgapur-Asansol area is collapsing. There is no money. So we want an assurance that for the development of the North Bengal region, which even according to the Swatantra Party and the Jan Sangh is a very strategic area and should be developed, we would be given loans.

Again we say that we are with you because you have taken this step. But please do not ignore the raving of mad

men. Remember what happened to Kennedy when he started the fight with the steel bosses and with the white bosses. As Shakespeare said, "Madness in great ones must not unwatched go." Once again we want to say that we are with you in this step. The question before the country today, as the Prime Minister said yesterday, is this : "Are we to make India a really democratic country, or are we to continue to make a farce of democracy and deny the people the fruits of democratic precepts?" So it is a right step and I conclude by only quoting four lines by a famous poet Dryden who wrote towards the end of the eighteenth century in England.

Thy chase had a beast in view

Thy lovers were all untrue

It is well an old age is out

It is time to begin anew.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as a decision has been taken by the Congress Party, to which I have the honour and the privilege to belong, to support the nationalisation of 14 banks, I cannot but vote with my party. My approach would seem to be conditional, but I would like to categorically state that I am not a believer in the policy of *laissez faire* in the banking system, or in the economic system as a whole. It is axiomatic that the operations of the banking system should be informed by a larger social purpose and should be subject to close public regulation. At the same time I do not exclude nationalisation under certain conditions. Do these conditions obtain to necessitate the present nationalisation move ?

The promulgation of the Banking Ordinance on the 19th July, about a week after the AICC meeting in Bangalore, and on the last day in office of the then Acting President, raised, as may be expected, widespread reactions. There was jubilation in some quarters, indignation in some, and surprise not unmixed with grief in others.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Will you name those quarters ?

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI : Today, for my part, I would like to take the view that what has happened has happened and should like to urge upon all to get to a mental state of

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai]

increasing calm and decreasing neurosis. Let us resist the easy temptations of target-manship. Only then, I believe, this important piece of legislation can be considered in the right perspective.

A minute ago I referred to the promulgation of the Banking ordinance by the then Acting President, and this comes under the category of what has happened has happened. A more sensitive and ticklish problem is afoot. The present President in office must give his assent to the bills so that it can become effective. He too will be laying down his office in a few day's time, and presumably will go back to adorn the high office of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. What will happen, I wonder, if some aspect of this legislation were to go to the Supreme Court either for clarification or for decision? I do not claim to be well versed in the constitutional and judicial proprieties and therefore I do not know the answer to it. Nevertheless, I submit it is a point to be considered by the legal pundits of which the present Acting President is a distinguished one.

Within the short time available to me, I propose to deal with three questions. Has bank nationalisation become so imperative here and now; more exactly on the 19th July? What part can it play to secure those objective which really make a difference in the quality of living of the common man? Lastly, what are the changes necessary to ensure that the efficient working of the nationalised banks is promoted?

The policy of social control of banking was formally adopted at the AICC Session in Jubbulpore in 1967. Since then, the banking law was amended last year to spell out social control in precise terms. Even before the amendments were passed, the main provisions were being implemented. Industrialists who were the Chairmen of the Banks retired and their places were taken over by professional general managers. The Boards of directors were reconstituted to give greater representation to small scale industries, agriculture and professional men like economists, lawyers, chartered accountants etc. The banks took greater interest in the activities of the agricultural, export and small scale industry sectors. A national Credit Council was set-up by a Resolution as the supreme policy-making body in regard to distri-

bution of bank credit among various sectors of the economy. From all accounts, the banks were trying their honest best to train personnel and gear their institution facilities and functioning to large-scale lending to agriculture and small scale industries and exports.

It is not generally known that in the past one year banks have made a sustained effort to help agriculture and small industry. Let me illustrate by quoting a few figures. Credit limits to agriculture by 90 major banks rose from Rs. 67 crores in June 1968 to Rs. 244 crores in March 1969. Credit outstanding in the same period rose from Rs. 30 crores to Rs. 97 crores *i.e.*, more than threefold. Credit limit to small industries rose from Rs. 320 crores to Rs. 430 crores while outstanding credit increased from Rs. 167 crores to Rs. 222 crores. These figures, I believe, speak for themselves.

It would be mere expression of prejudice if any one says that banks have failed to help agriculture and small scale sector. If they have failed—a proposition which I discard—then it must be the failure of the authorities as not to give targets for expansion of credit to the 14 banks which have now been nationalised; in the event that such targets were given how is it that no action was taken against the recalcitrant banks.

It has also been stated that foreign banks have been excluded from nationalisation because they provide by and large business of a specialised nature such as facilitating foreign trade and tourism. I believe "facilitating foreign trade" means financing of imports, exports, giving of guarantees, etc. Is it seriously contended that the Indian banks, including the nationalised State Bank of India, after 22 years of our independence, have not still acquired the necessary expertise in handling financing of foreign trade? I should think not, for, some of the 14 major nationalised banks have not only specialised departments of international trade, but also have transacted a much larger turnover of foreign exchange business than the three or four major foreign banks.

Then there is the extraordinary statement made by the Law Minister in the Lok Sabha the other day that "Ever since Imperial Bank was nationalised, people at large in India had been preferring to put their funds in the State Bank if possible and in other banks if necessary."

I do not know from where the hon. Law Minister gets his facts. But I know for certain that the total deposits of the State Bank of India registered a rise of only 84 per cent during 1960-68, while the total deposits of other Indian scheduled banks in the private sector went up by 164 per cent during the same period.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That is not a fair comparison. You compare the whole number of banks with one bank.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI : But this was what the hon. Minister said.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Take any one of the big commercial banks and compare it with the State Bank of India.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, the field of the State Bank is much wider. It covers 33 per cent of the total banking. You must not forget that and therefore to compare the State Bank with any one of the other banks is not correct.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But that is one bank and you compare it with other banks. How can you do that?

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI : I should like the hon. the Law Minister to find out as to whether or not the 14 nationalised banks now have recorded a higher rate of growth in deposits during 1960-68 as compared to the State Bank of India.

If it has been decided to nationalise banks, let it be done gracefully. Do not give the dog a bad name and hang it.

In a modern civilised community, whatever its political system, the lot of the common man must receive the highest priority. Towards this end, what is required more than anything else, is to follow programmes which will increase employment opportunities, augment public facilities and improve the quality of education all round, so that the potential of the young is garnered to the full and the talent requirements are always higher and also fully met. My plea is this : let us concentrate on first things first.

Now I come to my last point as to how best the 14 nationalised banks can be run. I would appeal to Government not to be

in haste in regard to amalgamation of these banks, nor in respect of effecting changes in top management personnel. I am glad that the Prime Minister has assured that these 14 nationalised banks will be run separately and they will be allowed to compete with each other. I have no doubt in my mind that the present heads of these organisations will supply the competitive element so necessary for efficiency as well as service to the depositors and creditors.

The credit policy to be pursued should soon be declared with clarity and precision. It is not enough to say that no sector will suffer or will be made to suffer or even to say that special attention should be given to some sectors. Such statements are good in so far as they go but the details must be soon announced if only to assure the management as well as the clientele of the banks that the rights of each and obligations of both are not a plaything of politics.

In my view, the running of these 14 banks also should be the direct concern of the Reserve Bank of India. It will be dangerous if the powers and duties of the central monetary authority are superseded by edicts of Government Departments.

The shareholders of former banking companies must be enabled to be represented by a Committee of Shareholders for representing their case before the proposed Tribunal. And the Custodians must be directed to take immediate action in this behalf.

It will enhance the confidence of the public if compensation to shareholders is paid in cash. And it should not be difficult to do this because the amount is not large and there are sufficient funds in the banks that have been taken over. In any case, there will be only book adjustments to be made as between the banks and Government even if such cash payment is made.

Inasmuch as the shareholders are deprived of their right to investment because of nationalisation, the compensation received should not attract any tax. Indeed, whenever any property is taken over by Government, this policy must be pursued instead of falling back on the legal stand that compensation cannot escape capital gains tax because such a tax is on the Statute book. What is required is an amendment of the Income-tax Act.

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai]

Having said this, let me conclude by hoping that the nationalised banks will not be yet another losing venture of Government, that this measure will not erode the confidence of international financial institutions and foreign Governments and foreign business in our Government's policies, and that the clients of the nationalised banks will be served well by the rank and file of bank employees. Is this too much to expect? I should think not. With supporting measures of the right kind, I believe it is possible.

I will end with just one quotation :

"Don't act in haste and repent at leisure
Don't gamble with the country's economic future.

A rash step taken now—under political pressure?—Will do permanent harm.

It will be suicidal and destroy the very basis of confidence which is so indispensable."

With these words I support the Bill.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Mr-Vice-Chairman, it is my pleasant job to speak just after Mr. Babubhai Chinai has spoken, because it was very difficult for me to understand, with all the common-sense that God has given me, whether he was supporting this measure as a disciplined soldier of the Congress Party or opposing it.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI : I started with it and I ended with it. I also showed some of the salient features of the Bill and put them in my own way.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : You started with support and ended with support and in between throughout you opposed it. I agree entirely with you. After hearing him I am reminded and I am again reminding him also that in May 1967, just after two months of my coming here as a Member of the Rajya Sabha, I moved a non-official Resolution in which I stated that all the credit institutions in this country, including banking and insurance companies, should be nationalised, so that the stranglehold of the monopolists on the Indian economy could be broken and Mr. Babubhai Chinai was a speaker. If you go through the records today you will find that he gave a very fine speech, and I complimented him also, . . .

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI :
Today I complimented you.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : ... in which he opposed it. So, it is another pleasant occasion for me to speak just after Mr. Babubhai Chinai, in support of the Bill, which his party has sponsored. Of course, I will not go into the political aspect of the affair, which I usually do not do, but I will have to refer to it because of certain political matters having been brought to bear in this debate. I am not at one with some of my leftist friends here who went to praise Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of this country, as if by her action, a new era has dawned in the economy of this country. I know she herself has admitted that it is not going to usher in a new era in the country. Had she the social perspective which is a long-range one and which is, to a certain extent, in conformity with the professions of the Congress Party, I would have praised her. Whatever it may be, I am supporting her measure because of the fact that it is a very important step in regard to the economic policy of this country.

Here I want to deal with a few facts. In 1967 when I brought forward my non-official Resolution and got some support from certain sections of the Congress Party, including Mr. Dharia and Mr. Chandra Shekhar, the Congress Party brought forward an amendment to indirectly oppose my motion. Because some of the Congress friends on that Bench opposed that amendment, the amendment was not put to vote. It was talked out. I was again happy that in December 1967 Mr. Morarji Desai had to come to this House and make a statement that social control of banks was absolutely necessary and gave some of the arguments which the Congress Party and Mr. K. C. Pant, as the spokesman of the Congress Party, opposed at the time of my resolution. Then also we opposed it and said that social control would never serve the purpose, but they did not hear. They thought that social control would bring in the millennium that they desired, but what happened within these two years ? Has it brought that new era which the social control measure contemplated? They themselves have admitted that it is not going to solve the problem. Then, they thought that the nationalisation of the fourteen banks was absolutely desirable. I want to plead here that this measure, again, is inadequate, because the taking-over of these fourteen banks is not going to solve the problem. It is going to divert the attention of the whole country in a different direction. I am going to quote here all the statistical

data from the report of the Reserve Bank of India. You will see from this report that we have just now in India, after these measures, 71 scheduled banks, out of which 13 are foreign banks. We have twenty non-scheduled banks. Out of the scheduled banks we have eight in the State sector up till now. One is the State Bank and seven are its subsidiaries. You will find that a large chunk, even after this measure, will be in the private sector. What will be their tendency? The depositors who want to break up the whole measures, who want to see that nationalisation does not succeed will gradually shift their money and control to all these banks which have a deposit of less than Rs. 50 crores. The Bill does not contemplate that banks with a deposit of more than Rs. 50 crores will automatically come under the State sector. Your measure is only confined to fourteen banks. So, the natural tendency of some of the people who want to see that the whole measure is nullified, will be to shift their money from these banks and to control some other banks. That is why from the outset I want to plead with you that nationalisation of banking institutions as a whole can solve the problem. Not only banking institutions, but I would give you some facts about general insurance also. If it had been done at one stroke, then I would say that you would have at least commanded a huge amount of money to be diverted in the direction in which you wanted the whole economy to progress. That is why from the outset I want to say that this is an inadequate measure and you will not be astonished if some of the aspirations are nullified because of this inadequacy.

Secondly, I do not understand why the foreign banks have been excluded. Some of the international understandings and agreements—though I do not know whether the Minister will say it here—have been talked about outside. I was going through the Reserve Bank of India Report. Can the Government tell us how many banks of our country have their branches in other countries, particularly developed countries? I was going through this report and find that only in two developed countries outside India we have the branches of Indian banks. One is in the UK and the other is in Japan. Some of these countries like Malaysia, Ceylon and Pakistan have our branches, but only in two developed countries we have branches. One is Japan in Asia and the other is the UK in Europe. We have no other

branches either of the Government of India banks or of the private sector banks in other countries. On the other hand, you will find many branches of the banking institutions of other countries in our country. You will find how much money is being diverted through these banks, through deposits, through credit, to foreign countries and we have to suffer for want of foreign exchange. One thing is being said just to dupe the public and that is these banking institutions of foreign countries are operating near the ports, that they are dealing with the import-export trade and they have a specialised mechanism, and so you do not want to touch them. I have figures here to show that one important bank, the National and Grindlay Bank, has 53 offices in India. Have you got 53 ports in India? Is it not a fact that all the important cities in India have been covered by the National and Grindlay Bank. If Mr. A. D. Mani gives any argument, I am prepared to reply. The sponsored argument that has been given by the Government of India is that most of these banks are operating near the ports. I am going to show that in India there are at least two banks—all the statistics I can produce here—which have not only spread to the ports but to almost all the important cities of the country. The National and Grindlay Bank has 53 offices and the Chartered Bank has 16 offices. This argument against nationalisation of foreign banks is also fantastic. So, I want to plead here with the Government of India that they should not only nationalise all the banking institutions in the country, but also all these foreign banks, whatever may be the consequences. If others do not allow our banks to operate in their countries, we may also not allow their banks to operate here. Moreover, our banking institutions have not spread to so many countries, as I find from the Reserve Bank Report. It is not on a reciprocal basis. It is not a fact that only those banks have branches here where we have our branches in those countries. Mr. Mani tries to argue things about which he does not know. That is why I have given my amendments. My amendments will show that not only all these banking institutions in the private sector, besides the fourteen, should be brought under the State sector, but also the foreign banks should be nationalised.

Secondly, about the policy of the banks. I was again astonished to hear Mr. Chinai say that agriculture has been given enough of importance by the banking institutions. I do not know from where he got these

[Shri Banka Behary Das]

statistics. But here again I have the statistics of the Reserve Bank India in which they say that in the year ending March 1951 agricultural credit given by all the banking institutions of the country was Rs. 12 crores and it was 2.1 per cent of the total bank credit given in that year.

SHRI A. D.MANI (Madhya Pradesh):
You must have security.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : I am going to refer to that. I am first replying to Mr. Ghinai, not to you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Your time is limited.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : What shall I do ? Because he wants to say something which he does not know. That is my difficulty. In the year ending March 1967 the agricultural credit was Rs. 5b crores which is again 2.1 per cent of the total credit given to Indian agricultures. I do not know how Mr. Chinai is fabricating all those figures, from which source, to show that agriculture has been given importance by banks. Is it his argument that the State Bank has not given as much attention to agriculture as it should have given ? That is so in case of all Banks. That is how you are adding another ammunition to the attacks of all those friends who are against the notionalisation of Banking institutions. These are the statistics of the Government. Let us see what industry has got. In the lame year 1951 industry has got Rs. 198 crores which is 34 per cent of the total bank credit in that year. In the year 1967 industry got Rs. 174a crores which is 64.3 per cent of the total bank credit. That was given to industry. I do not know how the figures have been cooked by Mr. Chinai. Whereas the bank credit to industry has gone up not only in terms of figures which is natural, but as regards percentage....

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) :
It is a Chamber of Commerce fabrication.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : That is the whole difficulty. He wanted to support his argument by giving all such manufactured figures against nationalisation. Agriculture got the same percentage in 1967 as it got in 1951.

I am not going into details because some of the facts have been mentioned by Mr. Chinai. I wanted to show that these are absolutely manufactured, cooked-up facts which have no relevance to the present conditions prevailing now.

Now I want to say something about the compensation aspect also. I do not agree at all with all that formula that has been advocated in this banking law. A banking institution is such an institution where there is the minimum necessity for paid-up capital, because the State Bank of India which has such a big business in this country has only Rs. 5 crores and odd as its paid-up capital, and all the subsidiaries of the State Bank of India have Rs. 5 crores as paid-up capital. Regarding all those 14 banks that have been taken over now, none of those banks has Rs. 5 crores as paid-up capital. Most of them range between Rs. 2 crores and a maximum of Rs. 4 crores, and I do not understand how the Government of India is going to give them compensation on the basis of assets. Throughout the world you will see banks are having sky-rocketing houses. Formerly some of the industrialists were having hundred-storeyed buildings. Now-a-days wherever you go, whether it is Europe or America, you find sky-rocketing houses competing with each other, all of them belonging either to banks or to insurance companies, where the paid-up capital is the minimum. Even according to the statistics of the Government of India, the total paid-up capital of all those banks of this country including reserves is Rs. 102,60 lakhs, it includes all banks including the State Bank and its subsidiaries. You deduct Rs. 11 crores out of it which is the paid up capital of public sector banks. Hardly Rs. 90 crores is the paid-up capital of all banking institutions in the private sector of this country, and if you take into account the paid-up capital of the 14 banks which are being taken over, it is hardly Rs. 25 crores to Rs. 30 crores. So, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I want to say here that the Government of India has declared that it is going to give Rs. 75 crores as compensation to those banking institutions. I cannot understand it. Even today the 'Commerce' magazine...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : A pleader or a doctor or a banker does not require a capital. He has to play with other people's money.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : The objects and reasons of this Bill mention that they are going to give Rs. 75 crores as compensation to those bankers who have hardly a paid-up capital of Rs. 25 crores or Rs. 30 crores.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh) : That is not what it says. It says it is estimated that this may be given.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : The Government knows roughly through the Reserve Bank of India the assets of all those banking institutions, and the report also clearly indicates what are the assets. It might be Rs. 1 crore this way or that way. On that basis they are saying that they will give Rs. 75 crores. Today the 'Commerce' mentioned that it is not going to be Rs. 75 crores even according to the formula that has been given in this Bill but it is going to be Rs. 150 crores. Mr. Vice-Chairman, that is why I do not want to go into this very complicated question, whether it is Rs. 75 crores or Rs. 150 crores. I want to ask the Government of India : are you going to pay even Rs. 75 crores for a paid-up capital of Rs. 25 crores to Rs. 30 crores? Are you going to take into account the assets or the share value? I could have understood if you say that you will pay compensation on the basis of the market value of the shares prevailing on the day of taking over the banks. I can understand that formula but I cannot understand the formula of giving them compensation on the basis of assets. We know how the assets of the banking institutions are created because the assets are not those of the shareholders, they are really the assets of the depositors. We know how the banking institutions are behaving throughout the world, and the assets of the banks are always much disproportionately higher than the paid-up capital everywhere in the world. That is why I want to inform the Government of India that not only you are landing yourselves in difficulty by having this formula which you have mentioned, by having this formula on the basis of assets and liabilities not only you are going to pay according to your own version Rs. 75 crores, but as the Tribunal comes into the picture every now and then it will go even beyond Rs. 150 crores. That is why I ask you why are you going to pay for the money of the depositors to the banking institutions who have hardly Rs. 25 crores to Rs. 30 crores. That is why I want to plead with the Government of India that your compensation formula should be completely

changed. It should be on the basis of the share value and not on the basis of the asset.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : Banks should be required to pay to the depositors.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : I do not understand. Banks will not pay to the depositors. Banks will pay to their own shareholders. The shareholders will be paid according to the formula of the paid-up capital. I am a depositor in the State Bank. I am a depositor in a private bank. It has nothing to do with that, in this connection I want to refer to another fact. Nationalisation of banks is not such a very great step as it is being talked about, nor is it such a danger as some of our friends are saying. It has been debated so many times. On January 1st, '956, when four of the biggest banks of France were nationalised which were controlling 55 per cent of the deposits of the country—besides the Bank of France four other deposit banks were nationalised—there was no hue and cry of socialism or Communism in France. But they were nationalised, under what conditions? Under much more stringent conditions than the so-called socialist Government of India is giving. They gave compensation, and they said that the compensation would be paid in fifty years. Who were in power then? No progressives were in power in 1946 in France. All the representatives of capitalists were there in power. That is why I do not know why so much alarm is being created here when even capitalist countries have nationalised their banks. And they have also given terms which are much more stringent than what the Government of India have now given to these shareholders and to all these banking institutions.

In this connection, I want to say that we should beware of one of the dangers which have been talked about outside and also by some of our friends who are opposed to the nationalisation because, I am sure, as I observe the way in which the State Bank is managed, if the same policy is pursued whether it is the credit policy or service to the customers or depositors or service to the backward areas, then the Government of India, again, will face same attack as they are facing from the rightist Benches, because though it is absolutely a public sector undertaking, the State Bank of India has not changed its policy even

[Shri Banka Behary Das]

after 1956. I have statistics with me. Agriculture or the small-scale industries have not been given importance. I want to say here that the credit worthiness formula should be completely changed and unless that is changed, these nationalised banking institutions can never serve the purpose of the economy because only those big people who have assets will get assistance. The Tatas, Birlas and the big monopolists will mortgage their assets and get the money. (*Interruptions*).

THIS VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Mam, you please sit down. His time is up : I have to call another Member.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : If credit-worthiness in terms of assets is the only criterion, then in the agricultural sector only the big landlords will get the credit and the sufferers will be really the poor cultivators who have not got the money and the purpose of nationalisation will be defeated. What will the small-scale industry men and the new entrepreneurs who have got all the skill and all the modern technical know-how but do not have any assets to mortgage get money from the banks, do ? Is it not the job of the Government of India to see that the nationalised banking institutions changed their policy about credit-worthiness so that the assets alone will not be the criterion but the talent, the entrepreneurship, the labour, the sincerity will also be the criteria for credit-worthiness ?

Another warning I want to give to the Government of India that the State Bank of India is doing the same thing as the private banks. I have got statistics here. The per capita credit in this country is Rs. 535. And do you know what is the per capita credit that has been given to the backward areas and what is the per capita deposit that they have taken from the backward areas? Take the case of my State which is one of the backward areas. In Orissa the per capita credit is Rs. 5.9 only, whereas they have got deposits per capita of Rs. 11.3. Leave aside the question of helping the backward areas to progress. They have taken more of deposits from the backward areas and have spent less than half in those areas. I am not only speaking of Orissa. Take the case of Assam. They have got Rs. 27.1 as deposit per capita whereas they have advanced Rs. 6.6 as credit per capita. Take

the case of Bihar. The deposit received per capita is Rs. 35.6 and the credit given to the people of Bihar is Rs. 7.2. It is about one-fourth of the deposit. Take the case of Kerala. They have received deposits per capita of Rs. 59.9 and they have given credit to the extent of Rs. 35.9 per capita. But in Maharashtra they have given credit per capita of Rs. 190.6, in West Bengal Rs. 149.4, in Madras Rs. 74.5, in Gujarat Rs. 665, which is much more than the average of India.

So, the entire policy of these banking institutions whether it is the State Bank of India or the private banks is the same, there is no change, and I am not going to discriminate them as far as the social policies are concerned. They have taken more of deposits from the backward areas and spent them on the developing areas, as a result of which the imbalance between these two areas has grown. Is this new institution going to change the entire credit policy not only as far as the individuals are concerned but also as far as the regions are concerned? That is where I want to give one suggestion to the Government of India.

In a delicate institution like the banking institution, there are two aspects which are to be taken into consideration. One is the technical aspect—how the bank should be run in a very technical manner otherwise the entire economy will be completely devastated. And the second aspect is the credit policy. These are the two governing policies of any banking institution. And I want to plead with the Government of India here that about these two policies, if a new approach is not adopted, these nationalised banking institutions will not subserve the economy of this country in any manner. The credit policy should be guided by a separate institution with experts on economy and with the representatives of the different sections whether they are the agriculturists or industrialists, those who have a social vision as desired by the Nationalisation of Banks Bill. We know that when the Credit Council was constituted, so much was said by the Government of India that the Credit Council will divert credit in the desirable directions so that a socialist economy will be ushered in. What happened to that Council? Who are the members of the Credit Council? Do the members of the Credit Council have that social vision, that new outlook as regards the banking structure and its functions? The same people who were heading the banking institutions in

the country and who were having the same conservative outlook were brought in as members of the Credit Council as a result of which you might have had a little bit of more of credit this side or that side but the basic policy, the credit policy, of the banking institutions did not undergo any change. That is why I want to plead with the Government of India that the Credit Council should not behave in that way and the Credit Council should be reconstituted so that it will subserve the policy that is desired by all of us.

Secondly, about the technical aspect also I want to plead with the Government of India. We know that the Reserve Bank has much work to do. It cannot even properly look after all those private banks as regards the technical aspect. Every now and then their report says that whatever directions they have given every year they have been violated by the banks. In spite of the Reserve Bank's scope and in spite of all other factors about control and other things, they say that many of the banks are violating all those instructions that they give to them. Then what will happen to the 14 banks which will be under their control? Will the Reserve Bank be able to shoulder that responsibility also. That is why I am making this suggestion to you. In France when they took over those biggest four banks according to the law of that country, they created two institutions. One was the Credit Council institution which example we have followed, and Mr. Morarji Desai when he brought forward that Bill admitted that he had borrowed that French formula. We borrowed without taking the soul of it but only taking the form of it. But there in France they have also done another thing. They went in for a Banking Control Commission to look into the technical aspect of the banking institutions of that country and they have the technical surveillance over those banking institutions which are under the public sector there. I want to plead with the Government of India that that scheme should be taken up after this Bill is passed. The provisions of this Bill do not mention that fact. They can either amend it or their scheme should clearly indicate that a separate institution to look after the technical surveillance of these banks would be created in this country so that one body will look after the credit policy of the nationalised banks whether it is the State Bank or any other Bank and the other body will look after the technical aspect. These two aspects are very important for any delicate

financial institution and then only the purpose in view can be served.

पंडित भवानी प्रसाद तिवारी (मध्य प्रदेश) :

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, चौदह बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण के इस विधेयक का मैं समर्थन करने खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मुझे इस समर्थन में विशेष प्रसन्नता इसलिये भी हो रही है कि जिस प्रस्ताव के अनुसार यह विधेयक सदन में आया वह जबलपुर में कांग्रेस कमेटी के इजलास में पास हुआ था जहाँ से मैं आता हूँ। सब पूछिये तो अखिल भारतीय कांग्रेस कमेटी के इजलास में पास हुये इसी प्रस्ताव ने वह भूमिका उपस्थित की कि आज हम इस राष्ट्रीयकरण के विधेयक पर विचार कर रहे हैं।

मुझे यह कहना है कि मैं इस विधेयक को समाजवादी क्रांति का एक महत्वपूर्ण कदम निरूपित करता हूँ। यह कहते हुये मुझे यह भी कहना पड़ता है कि न तो यह पहला कदम है और न यह अंतिम कदम है। कांग्रेस कमेटी ने इसके पहले भी समाजवादी क्रांति के कदम उठाये हैं। हम सब जानते हैं कि जमींदारी की समाप्ति की गई और अन्य कदम इस तरह के उठाये गये। राष्ट्रीयकरण भी कुछ उद्योगों का किया गया। परंतु उस सबके बाद जिस स्थिति पर हम पहुंचे वह स्थिति यह थी कि बार बार हमको इस सदन में कहना पड़ता था कि इस पथ पर चलते हुये भी अमीर अमीर होता जाता है और गरीब की तरक्की नहीं होती है, इसका क्या कारण है। उसकी खोज में लोग डट गये और यह नतीजा सामने आया। जैसा कि इस प्रसंग में अनेक महानुभावों ने कहा, अनेक रिपोर्टें सामने आईं, खोज हुई और यह जाहिर हुआ कि कुछ पूंजीपतियों के एकाधिकार ने तमाम आर्थिक नीति पर कब्जा कर रखा है और वे बैंकों से लेंदेन कर के अपने उद्योगों को पनपाते रहते हैं और जिनके पास बैंकों के जरिये कर्ज पहुंचना चाहिये उनके पास यह कर्ज पहुंच नहीं पाता है। इसीलिये यह आवश्यकता हुई कि चौदह बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाये। इसका परिणाम स्पष्ट है कि जो पूंजी का अड्डा था, जो एकाधिकार करने वाले लोग थे उनका स्वार्थ ढह गया। सरकार के हाथ में था

[पंडित भगानी प्रसाद तिवारी]

जनता के हाथ में यह बैंकों का नियंत्रण आने से यह आगे संभव हो सकेगा कि जिनको कर्ज की आवश्यकता सही मानो में है, जो कि देश की जनता है उसके पास कर्ज पहुंच सकेगा।

हम चलते चलते विज्ञान की सहायता से कृषि क्षेत्र की उन्नति में जब पहुंचें तो उसमें पूँजी की जरूरत हुई। उद्योगों को हम चलाने लगे तो उसमें हमने देखा कि उतनी पूँजी हमारे पास देश में उपलब्ध नहीं होती है जितनी कि आवश्यक है। इसी तरह से विकास के क्षेत्र में इसकी आवश्यकता हुई। जनता के विभिन्न पहलुओं को जानदार बनाने के लिये, उनको पनपाने के लिये यह आवश्यक हुआ कि इन चौदह बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर लिया जाये और तदनुसार इनके कर्ज को जहाँ आवश्यक हो वहाँ दिया जाये। कहा जाता है, शंका प्रगट की जाती है कि यह कर्ज उन लोगों के पास पहुंचेगा कि नहीं जिनको देने के लिये यह कदम उठाया जा रहा है। तो इस विषयक में यह गुंजाइश है कि किसानों के प्रतिनिधि, कारगरों के प्रतिनिधि, मजदूरों के प्रतिनिधि उस व्यवस्था में रह सकेंगे जो इसको संचालित करेंगे। मैं तो यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस दिशा में उठाये हुये कदम अवश्य ही देश के लोगों को एक नई आशा देंगे।

मुझे उन लोगों की आलोचना समझ में नहीं आती जो एक ओर इसका समर्थन तो करते हैं, पर यह पूछते हैं कि छोटे बैंकों का क्यों राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं किया गया या विदेशी बैंकों का क्यों राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं किया गया। उनको मैं केवल यह उत्तर देना चाहता हूँ कि असल में जो विचार-वान् होते हैं वे जैसा कि संस्कृत में एक कहावत है उसके अनुसार कार्य करते हैं :

‘चलति एकेन पादेन, तिष्ठति अन्येन पाण्ता’
एक पैर से जो खड़ा होता है, वह दूसरे से चलता है, दोनों पैर एक साथ नहीं उठा लेता है। उसी

तरह से यह जो कदम आया है उसको ठीक से संचालित कर के किसान, लघु उद्योगों और विकास के कार्यों में कर्ज पहले पहुंचे और फिर जैसा कि मैंने कहा कि यह अंतिम कदम नहीं है और अंतिम कदम न होने से इसमें आगे जब हम बढ़ेंगे तो जो शंका आज उठ रही है वह मिट जायेगी। जो हमने पहले सोचा उसको कार्यान्वित कर के हम आगे बढ़ें जिससे हमको अपना कार्य करने में सुविधा हो।

यह कदम छोटा मोटा इसलिये भी नहीं है कि सामान्य तौर से लोग क्रांति के बारे में सोचते हैं, विदेशों में हुई हिंसात्मक क्रांति की ओर देखते हैं जहाँ परिवर्तन हुये, परन्तु यहाँ जिस क्रांति के स्वरूप से हमने आजादी हासिल की, देश को स्वतंत्र किया और उसी माध्यम से जब हमने प्रजातंत्र यहाँ कायम कर लिया तो प्रजातांत्रिक प्रणाली से इतना बड़ा परिवर्तन हम ला सकते हैं, यह विश्वास आज इस विधेयक के पेश करनेसे पैदा हुआ। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि न केवल इसका महत्व प्रजातांत्रिक प्रणाली को सफलता से है बल्कि एक बात और मुझ को लगती है और वह यह कि जैसा मैं कह रहा था कि अन्य विदेशों में जो क्रांतियाँ हुई हैं और जैसा कि अभी मेरे भाई ने फ्रांस की राज्य क्रांति का उदाहरण दिया, उस वक्त वहाँ की स्थिति वैसी थी जैसा कि कारलाइल ने लिखा है :

"There was a man called Rousseau once. He wrote about Revolution. The Lords laughed at him. But the next edition of the book was bound in their skins."

यह फ्रांस की बात है और जैसा कि मैंने कहा कि हमारे देश में क्रांति का और तरीका है। यह गान्धी शताब्दी का वर्ष चल रहा है और इस अहिंसात्मक क्रांति के स्वरूप से यह तारोख या इतिहास अंकित हो जाने वाला है कि इस काल में ऐसा व्यक्ति, ऐसा नेतृत्व और ऐसा दल पैदा हुआ जिन्होंने अहिंसात्मक क्रांति के द्वारा समाज-वादी समाज की रचना की दिशा को उजागर किया और उसे प्रकाशित किया।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं समय की कमी के कारण केवल सैद्धांतिक पक्ष पर बोल कर के अपना मापण समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI A. D. MANI : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this Bill which seeks to nationalise 14 major banks is a historic measure and the country has given its massive support to the Government for this Bill on nationalisation of 14 banks. In regard to this matter, the Prime Minister had stated some time ago at F?ridabad that she had five banks in mind. I would like to mention what those five banks were. They were : the Central Bank of India, the Bank of India, the Punjab National Bank, the Bank of Baroda, and the United Commercial Bank. In terms of the association of these banks, the Central Bank of India and the Bank of India are supposed to be associated with the house of Tatas, though not controlled by them. The Punjab National Bank is supposed to be associated with Sahu-Jains. The Bank of Baroda has been associated with a group of Ahmedabad industrialists. And the United Commercial Bank has been known to be a Birla bank.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : We may continue tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AK-BAR ALI KHAN) : We are sitting upto 6-30 P.M.

SHRI A. D. MANI : As far as the control of the economy by the monopolists is concerned, I am entirely one with my friends on the Opposition side because I am myself a liberal. I do not like concentration of wealth in any form. If nationalisation of banking companies had been confined to those five banks which the Prime Minister had in mind at Fandabad, it would have met the requirements of my thinking because we have to take this country slowly with us. The other banks which have been nationalised are the following : Canara Bank Rs. 146 crores...

SHRI NIRANJAN VARMA (Madhya Pradesh) : What about Syndicate Bank ?

SHRI A. D. MANI : I will come to that. The Canara Bank was started many years ago and has been built by small shareholders, by people who have invested their life's savings in the Canara Bank. The Union Bank of India has Rs. 115 crores and the United Bank, Rs. 143 crores.

The Dena Bank, which was started by Devkarani Nanii—whom I had the pleasure of knowing many years ago—with a modest capital, has Rs. 121 crores. The Allahabad Bank—51 per cent of its shares are held by the Chartered Bank of India—has Rs. 112 crores. The Syndicate Bank, to which my hon. friend referred.

SHRI NIRANJAN VARMA : Syndicate means ?

SHRI A. D. MANI : It is not the Congress "Syndicate". It is a bank started in Mysore.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : In Mysore? The place where the Congress President comes from?

SHRI A. D. MANI : I am sorry, it is Mangalore. Sir, the Syndicate Bank is a bank which has specialised in running its business with women. If you go to Karol Bagh here, you will find a large number of women, trained in banking, highly professional, highly courteous, very smart ladies, running the Syndicate Bank and giving Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000 as overdraft with or without security. For example in regard to doctors who wanted to go and practise in rural areas, the Syndicate Bank always offered Rs. 5,000. They have said "You go and practise in rural areas and return the money within three years." This bank has blazed a new trail in banking business and I was sorry that the Syndicate Bank which has done no harm to big interests or to small interests has been nationalized. The Indian Overseas Bank, which has been serving the interests of the southern half of the country, has got Rs. 93 crores. The Indian Bank has Rs. 84 crores. The Bank of Maharashtra, which has built many industries in Maharashtra, has Rs. 73 crores and it has also been nationalized.

Sir, I would have very much liked nationalisation to have been confined to these five banks that the Prime Minister had in mind. (Interruption) I am not against nationalisation. But these are banks not connected with any big houses at all. There was no question of concentration of capital or misuse of capital by these banks. I am sorry that these banks have also been included. Apart from that, a number of points have been raised in the debate. For example, my hon. friend, Mr. Banka Behary Das, who made a very not-averse speech and which will be recorded

[Shri A. D. Mani]

as a very good speech in both Houses of Parliament, pleaded that different standards of credit-worthiness should be adopted. Sir, I have been to the Soviet Union and I have gone to the East European countries also. My hon. friend, Mr. Raghunath Reddy, who deals with foreign investors knows.

श्री राजनारायण : मणिजी, आप कब गये थे
सोवियत यूनियन ।

SHRI A. D. MANI : In 1962, before you came to Parliament. Even in those socialist countries when you come to the question of finance, they are far more finance-minded than the worst industrialists in our country. They want security, they want interest. Now, in regard to credit-worthiness, we do not want the new banks to advance money regardless of sound banking principles. We want this money to percolate to the countryside. But we have got to follow the traditional norms of banking business. That is essential if nationalisation is to succeed because we do not want these nationalised banks to work in the way in which some of our public sector undertakings are working at the present time. We do not want them to run into loss, because that will shake the confidence of the depositors.

My hon. friend, Mr. Banka Behary Das, and others referred to the question of nationalisation of foreign banks. Sir, I have congratulated the Government on having withstood the pressure and not nationalising the foreign banks, because for a long time to come, whether you develop a dynamic socialistic economy, whether you are going to allow capitalist economy to continue in this country or you are going to have a mixed economy, we require foreign co-operation in respect of trade, in respect of export and import. We would have shaken the confidence of the outside world if we had nationalised foreign banks. Now, I would like these foreign banks to continue. I would like the Indian banks to give the same kind of depositors' service which some of the foreign banks are giving. You find advertisements in newspapers where an American bank says—I do not want to name it . . .

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA : What about the Bank of China?

SHRI A. D. MANI : The Bank of China should not be allowed to function in this country. It is not a *bona fide* banking institution. It is an institution for political subversion. But with regard to some of the American banks, you take only 5 minutes to get a cheque cashed. That happens to Members of Parliament here, but when we go to other banks, we have to stand in the queue for a long time. Sir, in order to promote competition with these nationalised banks, let the foreign banks also continue; and let them also compete with each other. My hon. friend, Mr. Banka Behary Das, referred to the French banking system. These nationalised banks in France are fiercely competing with each other for banking business. There is cutthroat competition, and cut-throat competition is necessary in any nationalised banking system. I am in favour of the Government's attitude not to nationalise the foreign banks, because we should do nothing which will undermine our international credit.

Sir, on the question of compensation I am in favour of the terms of compensation which have been generally offered, though some may urge that the market value of shares should have been taken into consideration. There are families, small families, which have invested their money in these shares, and these shares have been giving a good return. It is no use comparing these shares with *zamindaris*. It is not all people who are holding big blocks of shares. These shares have been sold in the market and they have invested their money in them. If we had gone on the basis of market value, some people would have been hard-hit. Regarding the mode of compensation, payment of half in cash and half in the form of securities, 4 per cent is ridiculous. You get 5 per cent even on fixed deposits. Why not increase the percentage? My hon. friend the Minister of State, should consider, giving the same rates which are given for fixed deposits. After all, these families depend on this return. We should not be unjust to our own shareholders. And if that is done, it will command perhaps a greater measure of public confidence and support for the policy of nationalisation which the Government seeks to enforce in this matter. Sir, regarding the constitution of Advisory Boards, I am glad that the Government has accepted the suggestion in the other

House that representatives of the workers should be taken on the Advisory Boards. We are developing a socialist economy and I would like to see the representatives of workers being taken on the public sector undertakings also. The moment workers' representatives come on the Advisory Boards, the present atmosphere of agitation that goes on in banks will stop. You go to any bank. The Other day I had been to a bank and I do not want to mention the name of the bank—it is in Con-naught Place—and I waited there to take some money. There the Manager said, "Look at the shouting that is going on. We have no control over these people." If the workers are to control banks and take part in the management, there is also a reciprocal obligation on them to maintain certain forms of discipline, and I would like the workers to enter into some kind of an arrangement, a convention, with the banks. In that atmosphere of their taking part in the management, there will be no strikes in the banks and all matters will be settled by negotiation. And this is a fair proposition I am putting forward to my honourable friends of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party who have all along been supporting the strikers. It is most necessary that the workers should make this sacrifice since they are given representation on the Banks. They should give up their right to strike.

I would like to say further regarding the Credit Council that is to be established. Let us not try to approach this matter from a weighted point of view that agriculture should be given preference, that industrialists should be in the background, and so on. If it is a matter of credit policy, as I said, you must run it on sound banking principles.

People who have got experience of banking, people who have worked on the banks, employees who have got the knowledge of banking and who have held important posts, should constitute the Credit Council. We should never depart from sound banking principles. I repeat the point. Security must be given; otherwise, the depositors will lose confidence in the bank.

The final point that I would like to make is regarding bonds which are going to be issued. They should be of such a character as to be encashable within five years because many people have invested their

life's savings. If a man wants to cash those certificates, he will have to cash it at a discount.. . (Interruptions) If it is a five-year certificate, the money that goes towards discount will be less. Since the Prime Minister has come here I would like to repeat the point...

(Interruptions)

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : Repeat your speech.

SHRI A. D. MANI : If a man wants to marry his daughter, he wants to sell his certificates. The marriage of his daughter is equally important as nationalisation. These securities must be saleable in the market. I want to encash them at a low rate of discount. There should be the same rate which is paid on fixed deposits.

With these words I hope that this historic measure of nationalisation will succeed, that all these nationalised banks will restore confidence in the economy and proceed satisfactorily as the nationalised banks of France are doing at present.

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI (Assam) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want to congratulate the Prime Minister for nationalising fourteen major banks—It is a bold and courageous step she has taken for the good of the country. The Prime Minister has rightly said that it is just the beginning; more will have to be followed after the nationalisation of these fourteen banks. This is not an epoch-making, as she has said, but a small measure only. This is just the beginning. She has studied the deteriorating economic situation that prevails in the country in its true perspective and acted at the right moment. But by this courageous act she has initiated a struggle against the vested interests, against the monopolists, against those who are out to hinder all our progress when we are trying to achieve the goal of democratic socialism. The demand for the nationalisation of banks has been there for a long time and we have been consistently demanding for it inside the House, outside the House, and in our party organisations. My friend, Shri Chandra Shekhar, has elaborately explained how it came about in the Congress many years and this is not a hasty step. The nationalisation of fourteen major banks is, no doubt, a radical step. As a matter of fact, we are for nationalisation of all the banks. However, in the circumstances that exist to day this is a very bold step that the Prime

[Shri Sriman Prafulla Goswami]

Minister has taken. She has taken a right step in nationalising these fourteen major banks. Throughout the country today millions of our people, our down-trodden, half-fed people, are jubilant over this action because they see a ray of hope that this would lead towards bringing some good for the weaker sections of our population. Of course, the handful of monopolists who are there, are not happy with this measure and they are coming out with their vociferous protests and they are shouting that something very strange has happened. In fact nothing like that has happened. It is neither communism nor socialism; it is only the nationalisation of fourteen major banks. Many capitalist countries have also nationalised their banks. In India these monopolists have grown after independence at the cost of millions of our starving and poor people. They have exploited the millions of our starving people. It is surprising that they have not taken this measure gracefully. I would say they ought to have taken this measure gracefully since they have been guaranteed adequate compensation. I personally do not feel that such a huge amount of compensation ought to be given to these capitalists. Because we have accepted democracy and mixed economy, because we have accepted democratic socialism, because we have given liberty to everybody to live as a free citizen with his property, we had to provide adequate compensation to them. Instead of feeling jubilant they are angry. As one of my friends on the opposite has put it they have turned mad. And some of them are becoming dangerous like the GIA agents, and they are coming out to frustrate our progressive move. Since independence in India a new class of bourgeois-fund-feudalist class has grown very rapidly and it has taken all the facilities, all the advantages that independence has brought to this country. They have got all kinds of protection from foreign competition and they have grown as monopolists. They are not cooperating with our Government, the Government which has given them so much protection and liberty. If there had been a Marxist revolution in this country, they would have not only been physically wiped out, but their children also would have been deprived of their franchise and their property would have been expropriated from them. The simple affair of nationalisation of the fourteen

major banks is neither socialism nor communism. It is a preliminary step in the direction of building a democratic society. We have been wedded to democratic socialism. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru evolved the pattern of this democratic socialism, the like of it is not found in any other country. This pattern of socialism conforms to our Indian culture and our Indian-tradition. I am very sorry at the behaviour of the monopolists. Many of the big papers, owned by the monopolists are all along creating confusion and propagating against these progressive measures. They have been creating confusion by their propaganda even on the floor of this House—I do not find Mr. Dahyabhai Patel here who wanted to create such a confusion by saying that chaos will come in. What chaos he means, I cannot understand. The monopolist exploitation, the monopolist manoeuvres have created more confusion and chaos. I am not afraid of any chaos of which Mr. Patel has spoken. I remember Mahatma Gandhi saying, during our dependence when he led the struggle for independence, that he was prepared to be in chaos than to remain under British subjugation. Let me repeat that I prefer to have that kind of chaos than to remain under the monopolist manoeuvres and all kinds of corruption and exploitation. It has become intolerable to us. So many motives are attributed to us. They want to divide the Congress by saying that this is a political action. It is not for the division of the Congress. It is a logical conclusion because the Congress is wedded to democratic socialism and the nationalisation of the banks is a must in that process. Even some of those people said that they have no objection to the nationalisation of the banks but it should not have been done now and they want us to wait. How long are we to wait? Twenty two years have passed. All these years they have been doing all kinds of exploitations. I must say that they have not given credit to the agriculturists and they have not removed the regional imbalance and are we still to go on waiting? Then we could have waited for our independence also. The British also said : You are not fit for self-government, 'you better wait'. We did not wait and we got the support from millions of our people who supported us with the expectation that we will build up a social order in which the poor people will be better off but to-day what do we find? The monopolists are controlling

everything. They want to control the politics of our country also. To-day it is a matter of disgrace that these monopolists and the capitalists have not taken it gracefully. They should see the writing on the wall. They should know the dialectics in history, they should understand the social forces that are working. They should know that they will be swept away. It is better that they should accept it gracefully and try to adapt themselves to the changing social order. It is only a reformist move. We have not nationalised the means of production. I agree with Shri Banka Behary Das when he elaborately explained that the compensation is very high in comparison to the paid-up capital of these banks. Anyway, considering the condition of our country and the circumstances and all the political manoeuvres, to-day the Prime Minister has taken such a liberal step. Even then it is a very courageous and bold step. Everyday I am reading her speeches when she is greeted by thousands of people. She said that it is a fight against a few individuals who stand for vested interest, and she would fight to the finish. To-day we are inspired by this act, we, the workers are inspired by her bold stand. We urge on the Prime Minister that she should go ahead with the implementation of the other programmes, mainly the 10 points accepted by the A.I.G.G. and the Resolution on Democratic Socialism adopted at Bhubaneswar. These should be speedily done. If we delay, it will make things worse. We should hasten up the process. If we do not hasten, our country will go the Communist way. I do not want the country to go through bloodshed or chaos. Also I do not want the country to go the fascist way controlled by the capitalists and monopolists. What for we fought for independence? So I am speaking from the political point of view because the other speakers have explained by facts and figures how the monopolists are manoeuvring, how they are investing and taking advantage of the depositor's money and how they are not investing it in the backward areas and how they are investing for their own interests only. They are not giving facilities to the small industries and the agriculturists, So all these are elaborately said. Now, we have to pass this Bill as fast as we can. I understood that some of the Opposition people, the Swatantra Party and Jana Sangh in particular, want to hinder and delay the passing of this Bill. They can delay for one or two days but no reactionary

forces can deter our forward march. I can understand their philosophy for which they are paid but they should understand that the country's trend and Parliament's trend is to pass this Bill. They should say things which they want to say but they should allow us to pass this Bill quickly. Why bring in all the amendments and the Supreme Court here? I wholeheartedly welcome this Bill and I wish the Prime Minister will follow up other revolutionary measures also towards the fulfilment of one declared goal of democratic socialism. We are behind her, the country is behind her and the ideology which is much more important in our fight against the reactionary forces.

SHRI A. P. JAIN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, in the economic development of the nation we have reached a crossroad when the country has to decide what way to take. If we take the courageous path, we will be making India rich and prosperous. If, on the other hand, we continue to follow the present sluggish policy, the lack of investment, lack of resources for our Plans, then India may go down. Therefore, we have to make a big decision. We have had three Five Year Plans and three annual Plans. These plans have no doubt added to the wealth of the nation. Our agricultural production has gone up by 80 per cent, and the industrial production has gone up by more than 100 per cent. So far as that goes, it is good but we have to examine our progress in the background of the ideals which we have placed before ourselves. In the Congress Party we accepted socialism as the pattern of our development and the ideal which "the country placed before herself. Now socialism envisages two fundamentals. The first is that there can be no socialism in a poor society, in a poor country. The country must be opulent, it must create wealth and the second important ingredient is that whatever wealth is created is equitably distributed so that the difference between the rich and the poor is reduced, not enhanced. Now you will remember that yesterday some questions were put to the Prime Minister whether the distance between the rich and the poor has increased or reduced. I agree that the Prime Minister was quite right in saying that it is difficult to answer this question in categorical terms. For, during the very process of development certain tensions and certain inequalities develop and they take time to

[Shri A. P. Jain]

be evened out. I feel that the difference between the rich and the poor has at least not narrowed down. In certain sectors it may have narrowed down, in other sectors it may have even increased. In the countryside there is no doubt that there has been an increase in wages but the income of the bigger farmer has increased far more than the wages of the poor labourer. So it is in that background that we have to view this measure.

Now, the object of this measure is to achieve certain social ends, and these social ends are that our resources must be diverted in a manner so as to achieve the socialist end, that is, firstly, to increase the national income, the Gross National Product, and, secondly, to distribute the Gross

National Product in a manner so that the disparities between the rich and the poor are narrowed down and not widened. It is in that background that I look at this measure.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Mr. Vice-Chairman, there was an understanding that we should adjourn at 6-30. It is 6*30 now and he may continue tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Yes, you may continue tomorrow. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned a¹ thirty minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday the 7th August, 1969.