

[श्री राजनारायण]

(*Interruption*) देखिए नियमावलि के मुताबिक बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी का जो प्रपोजल है वह सदन में आएगा। हर मेम्बर को हक है कि उस प्रपोजल के लिए वह कह सकता है संशोधन के जरिए कि इसको बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी में दुबारा विचारार्थ भेजा जाय। मैं यह संशोधन रख रहा हूँ। क्यों रख रहा हूँ? इसलिए रख रहा हूँ क्योंकि यह जो मोनोपोलीज बिल है, यह बहुत बड़ा विधेयक है और इस विधेयक पर सारे देश का भविष्य निर्भर करता है। इसमें सारी सरकार की बंगलिंग, कम्पनी अफेयर्स के मिनिस्टर की बंगलिंग सामने आ जायेगी और उसमें समय लग जायगा और तब चेयर की ओर से कहा जायेगा कि समय नहीं है। इसलिए 16 घंटे से कम समय नहीं रहना चाहिए। यह मेरा बिनम्र निवेदन है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have expressed your opinion. Mr. Biren Roy.

A POINT OF PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY SHRI BIREN ROY

SHRI BIREN ROY (West Bengal) : Madam, with your permission, I rise on a point of privilege and personal explanation. I was fortunate that I came back . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Only explanation.

SHRI BIREN ROY: Personal explanation.

SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh) : No privilege.

SHRI BIREN ROY : It comes. I will explain how it comes.

It was fortunate that I arrived here a little bit earlier on the 23rd April to attend Parliament Session, and on that day in the Lobby of the Lok Sabha I heard that some remarks had been made the previous day, on the 22nd April, during the Defence Budget—I think on the Grants—by a particular Member about me. Here I do not want to mention his name. I had a chance to meet that Member the same afternoon. I did not know him personally before; he also did not know me. I told him, "I hear of such things" and asked him, "Have you made such remarks?" He said, "Yes. I am very sorry. I did not know you before. Otherwise, I would have asked you." I said, "This should have been done." When you say something about a Member of another House in one House and that Member has not got the opportunity to appear there and say something, then it becomes a question of privilege. Before making any remark about any Member's utterances wherever it may be or on the floor of the House, he should have ascertained from that Member whether what he was stating was a fact or not. Madam, about five years ago—it was not a similar statement—but some statement about me was made and I protested also at that time, but I had no opportunity to say anything. This time I did not lose any opportunity. I have got a copy of the actual statement which was made in that House. Therefore, immediately I wrote a letter to the Hon'ble Speaker. It was alleged that just over two years ago, when I was abroad I mentioned about two gentlemen, to a member of the Australian Labour Party supposed to be a Shadow Minister. He says, that during a discussion, very private—I do not know how he got it—he asked me—it is his version—that the Congress is now defeated and therefore what are you going to do? Why don't you call the military?; that I said, yes, yes, we could call the military. But I do not trust—I or we of the Congress Party—present C-in-C General Kumaramangalam. In those words he said, "General Kumaramangalam". Therefore, we are waiting till General Manekshaw comes and

takes over. Now, General Manekshaw comes two years later and this has been referred to me as stating in 1967—this is 1969—in 1967 General Manekshaw was not even in the picture of taking over from General Kumaramangalam.

The absurdity of the position should have been apparent to the gentleman who is supposed to be a very prominent Member. So, I have to deny this categorically, and say that such talks never took place and are distorted. Not only this, after all, I am a democrat. I told him that I have been in political life since 1925, even before he was born. And this is 1969. And I never entertain such views that a country should be governed militarily. And another fact also should have been apparent to him besides, that General Kumaramangalam's family also is intimately known to me. I was with Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan a Member of the Second Lok Sabha—who is his sister. And I knew also his father Dr. P. Subbaroyan, former Aviation Minister, very intimately. The question that I or even the Congress do not trust General Kumaramangalam as the Commander-in-Chief could not even arise. Madam, that much I want to say.

I think in future a convention should be created that if a Member of this House speaks about a Member of the other House, he should at least consult him before such a statement is put in his mouth, or in the reverse way.

**THE MONOPOLIES AND RESTRICTIVE
TRADE PRACTICES BILL, 1967—
contd.**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We go to the legislative business. The Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Bill, 1967. Mr. B. K. P. Sinha.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar) : I rise with mixed feelings to make my observations on this measure. I welcome it in a formal sense, for this Bill

seeks to implement one of the Directive Principles of the Constitution, that is, to prevent the concentration of wealth and means of production to common detriment. Now, in pursuance of that Directive, the Monopolies Inquiry Commission as set up and it reported some years ago and suggested a measure of this type. And thereafter, demands have been persistent from many quarters in this country for a legislation of this nature. Therefore in a formal sense, when Government have acceded to that demand, when Government seek to implement the Constitutional Directive, I welcome it. But in a substantial and real sense, I have great doubts if this Bill will achieve its professed aims.

Madam, this Bill reminds me of the title of a famous play of Shakespeare, "The Comedy of Errors". This Bill is, of course, not a comedy of errors, but ten years after or 20 years after, people may think that this Bill had better be described as a tragic comedy of misconceptions. What are the misconceptions that are at the root of this measure, that provide the ground for this measure ?

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

The first great misconception is that it is a socialist measure that brings us nearer the socialistic pattern of economy and society. This measure, Sir, is in no way a socialist measure. This is a measure to restore capitalism or system of private property to its pristine purity. It is a measure really aiming at buttressing what they call the system of capitalism. What is the nature of capitalism? Capitalism started with mercantilism-capitalism in the sphere of trade. Then it developed into an industrial capitalism. So many enterprises—not one, but hundreds and thousands—came into existence owned by individuals, particular persons, who on the basis of their savings or on the basis of their earnings, established industries. Now, these industries, these firms, were fiercely competitive, and the apologists of that system