

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The others who have tabled amendments are not present now. So, I put clauses 4 to 33 to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That clauses 4 to 33 stand part of the Bill.

*The motion was adopted.*

Clauses 4 to 33 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1—(Short title, extent and commencement).

*Amendment made:*

Page 1, line 5,—

for "1974" substitute "1975" (7)

(Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

**Enacting Formula**

*Amendment made:*

Page 1, line 1,—

for "Twenty-fifth Year" substitute—"Twenty-sixth Year" (6).

(Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Enacting Formula, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

The Enacting Formula, as amended, was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the title stand part of the Bill".

*The motion was adopted.*

The title was added to the Bill.

SHRI VISWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

15.45 hrs.

**COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILL AND RESOLUTIONS**

SHRI S. P. BHATTARCHARYYA: (Uluberia). Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the Fifty-first Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 26th February, 1975."

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is.

"That this House do agree with the Fifty-first Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 26th February 1975."

*The motion was adopted.*

15.46 hrs.

**RESOLUTION RE. GROWTH OF FASCISM IN THE COUNTRY**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We now resume discussion on the resolution moved by Shri Shyamnandan Mishra on the 30th August 1974. He had just started.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this motion of mine has had a very chequered career and it has been almost in a state of abeyance for the last two or three sessions.

15.47 hrs.

[SHRI ISHAQUE SAMBHALI in the Chair]

But right in the beginning, Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the House that I have not brought up this subject in any lighthearted spirit or, if you so like even in a spirit of political malice or campaign against the ruling party I would also like to emphasize that I am not using this term 'fascism' or for that matter 'fascistic' at any stage as a term of abuse against my political opponents. It is obvious that it is the monopoly or privilege of the ruling party to use these terms of abuse against their political opponents. In fact, their whole progressivism seems to consist in the use of such words against their opponents. Otherwise, there has been absolutely no manifestation of their progressivism in any field, economic or social so far. So, I do not want to cut into their monopoly or high privilege of using these terms of abuse against others. It is they who have been saying that their political opponents are reactionaries, CIA agents and what not. We have never used these terms against them.

May be all of us on both sides of the House are responsible to a certain extent in contributing to conditions for the growth of fascism in this country. I am prepared to accept responsibility to the extent it belongs to me or to the opposition. May be both the cabal in Delhi and the rabble of the opposition are responsible for the fascistic conditions growing in the country. But it cannot be gainsaid if they are fair, objective and impartial, that the main responsibility for creating these conditions have to be accepted by the ruling party. In fact, they can be created only by an elephantine, gigantic party like theirs or by a mighty government like theirs. It is not given to any political party to create such

conditions in this country. So, to that extent where the responsibility lies is clear.

I am bringing up this motion in order to make the House weigh the situation carefully, sit up and think before it is too late and before the trend towards the precipice becomes somewhat irreversible. But it does appear to me that the way in which we are going towards the precipice, there may not be any turning back from it after a particular point of time, and it is in that spirit of seriousness and gravity that I have brought up this motion before the House.

It is not necessary, so far as I see it, to enter into any kind of formalistic argument about the definition of this term, so long as we understand the basic features of this system. The previous historical experiences are indeed important to an extent. But, let me make it absolutely clear that, so far as I am concerned, I do not think there can be any uniform model for fascism in all countries. The experiences in the year of grace 1975 are bound to vary from the conditions which prevailed in Italy, Germany, or Japan, or in any other country for that matter. But the behaviour patterns, of course, are very clear and the basic features of those patterns are also very clear, so far as we can see.

It is on this basis that, I want to warn this House, and through this House the country, that our system now seems to be hurtling towards a fascist stage. I am not suggesting at the moment that the conditions for fascism have already been created. I am only saying through my motion that the Government is creating conditions in which the growth of fascism may be possible in this country. To repeat I am not saying that at this point of time the system has already matured into what you can call a fascist system. But what I am apprehensive of is the fact that very soon we might be approximating these conditions.

What do we find today? We had a kind of disequilibrium in our society which is similar to the one in which the political conditions for the growth of fascism are created. This disequilibrium is typified by a ruling party unable to solve the crisis by ordinary means, by ordinary laws and so on, and the poor people unable to bring about through any organised effort a social transformation. This is the peculiar situation in which we find ourselves. The ruling party is now completely like a squirrel charmed by a snake. It is not able to tackle the crisis that is developing in this country and which very soon might overwhelm it. That is the state of the ruling party. On the other hand, the poor people of this country, of which the working class is also one of the important elements, are not in a position to bring about a situation in which the social transformation can take place. This was precisely the condition in Italy or Germany when fascist take-over took place.

Only when such a conflict situation is created, or a situation of stalemate is created the conditions for the growth of fascism are brought about. In this conflict situation, as I have portrayed before you, I am quite sure that the ruling party would now be taking recourse to methods to resolve it by greater political concentration in their hands, as it happened in Germany or in Italy earlier. That is exactly what we find now.

As this resolution, it does appear to me, is going to be carried over to the next day also, may I, at this stage first describe—when such situations were prevailing in other countries—how they tried to solve their problems by various devices? One of such devices was of national socialism in Germany; pseudo corporativism in Italy; in Japan, there was aggressive nationalism; in France, there was the device of popular front; in America, you might say, there was the device of New Deal. When such situations

arise, you have to take recourse to some of these methods. It is quite clear that you are going in the direction in which Italy and Germany went earlier.

As I have submitted earlier, there could be no uniform model for fascism. That is precisely because of the fact that there can be no uniform model for any system—even for capitalism, socialism or communism. There is no such uniform pattern for any system today. Similarly, in this country also, it may not be exactly the replica of what prevailed in some other countries.

What are some of the traits of fascism which seem to be emerging in this country?

The first is the identification between the State and the party. That is really what seems to be worrying us a great deal. Do you find the party and the State to be distinguishable entities here? What you have brought about is: the State and the party seem to have merged in one kind of entity. That is precisely what happened when you held your session at Calcutta in 1972. Even the Defence Department was mobilised to build bridges for your Congress session. Recently, what happened at Narora? Many people who visited Narora during those days would bear witness to the fact that there were hundreds of tents put up by the State on that occasion and at every step, there was police to guard the delegates who had assembled there. It is, therefore, very clear that you do not see any distinction at all between the State and the party.

Another important feature of the situation is the process of de-stabilisation of the situation. This is being fostered at the moment. Everything seems to be brought into a state of instability. The only stable element that is sought to be projected is the Supreme Leader. And this is one of the basic features of fascism that everything must be made un-stable and the only stable factor must be the supreme leader.

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

We never had this concept of supreme leadership even during the days of Nehru. We never called him as the supreme leader of the nation or even for that matter, the supreme leader of our party. Can any person, any hon'ble Member on the other side, cite a single instance when Nehru was called the supreme leader? But, now, hardly there is any occasion when the Prime Minister is not designated as the supreme leader of the party. This is Fuehrer principle that prevailed in Germany. There was the glorification of an individual representing the general will of the people...

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Where did you hear anyone of our partymen calling the Prime Minister as the supreme leader? Can you quote even a single instance?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I can show it you. (Interruptions).

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): The Hindi translation is, Durga Devi.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: What is emerging now is the cult of personality in this country and the apotheosis of an individual. If you elevate a person to the position of Goddess or God, as my hon. friend said, you can imagine the fate of democracy in this country.

16.00 hrs.

Can democracy flourish under the shadow of a personality who is supposed to be beyond laws? It is to that position that you have elevated the present Prime Minister. Now you may say that the cult of personality also requires a personality. But even for running a different system, you require a personality. Hitler also had a personality. My humble submission is that the kind of personality that you are trying to project is a personality which cannot run democracy but a system quite different from democracy.

This is the cult of the supreme leader. What did we find the other day? Right in the heart of the city of Delhi, an important businessman called Mr. Narang set up a pillar, in Connaught Circus....

AN HON. MEMBER: A hoarding.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: It was on a pillar which proclaimed, "The Leader is Right, our Future is Bright" So, the leader must be proclaimed to be right in all possible circumstances: And here is a clear collusion between the big business and the Government. What business has Mr. Narang to set up a pillar of that kind proclaiming to the entire wide world that we have got a leader who must be considered to be right in all conceivable circumstances and that our future must be considered to be bright under her leadership? This is precisely what happened in fascist Italy where it was said that Mussolini was always right. This is what happened in Nazi Germany where also it was said that Hitler was always right. Therefore, we found the amusing spectacle yesterday that the Prime Minister was applauded by your Party at every stage, even though she was saying the most fantastic things which cannot be absorbed by any party. And if we interrupt the Prime Minister, you say that we are interrupting your leader. I ask you do you ever subject, what the Prime Minister says, to any kind of careful scrutiny in your Party? Did it appeal to you at all that what the Prime Minister was doing yesterday was making another kind of Address, another kind of speech? We are now being treated to two Addresses, one Address from the President of India and another from the Prime Minister. Otherwise, that was not a reply at all to the criticisms that had been made in this House. (Interruptions). That means, the Prime Minister is completely impervious to the criticisms that are being made in this House. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, my submission is that though the

infallibility of Pope has been debunked, you are now raising another infallibility (*Interruptions*). The personal rule is absolute and, correspondingly, the institutional decline is total.

It is in this situation that fascist conditions are bound to grow. Even a totalitarian regime, for that matter, I would like to submit to you, has got a larger hierarchy around it. A totalitarian regime in any country, you would find, is sustained by a larger hierarchy. But is there any hierarchy with the Prime Minister at the moment? Indeed, you have got the most friendless Prime Minister in the world. The Prime Minister is running the show not with the aid of my hon. friend, Mr. Sathe, or even for that matter with the aid of my hon. friend, Shri Dwarak Nath Tiwary, who has spent 55 years of his life in public cause. Is she running the country with the help of any one of you? Do you think that any one of you matters in the deliberations of the Prime Minister? Whether it is the hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture, Mr. Jagjivan Ram or the hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Chavan—does anybody matter in the deliberations?

I am only trying to show you true face in the mirror. This is what happens to be the position. We have to think of a larger circle running the country, not one individual running the country. We can not think in terms of an edifice which rests on one pillar; such an edifice is the precursor of a fascist regime in a country.

Then, you find that a fascist leadership asks for more and more powers and goes on grabbing more and more powers, but those powers are not used for any social change or transformation. Now, what did the hon. Prime Minister do right from the beginning? I would like to refresh your memory.

In 1969 when we parted company, the hon. Prime Minister said, 'The bosses in the Party do not allow me to have my way.' Was it not precisely the formulation of the hon. Prime

Minister at that stage which was put across to the country? And the result was in a sense the surrender of the party, a large section of the party to the Prime Minister. But what did it bring about? After that surrender to the Prime Minister and after the bosses were eliminated, there was only more and more drift towards chaos.

Then in 1970 the Prime Minister said 'the Parliament was not giving me enough powers'. That is the difficulty which the Prime Minister said that she experienced at that stage. So, she dissolved the Parliament. The Congress, as we have always considered it is not only a seat of power or a sort of a sign-board which you can fix anywhere. The Congress is not the Government. Any usurper can usurp the seat of power. But Congress means a set of values. However, you liquidated that Congress in 1969 with your declaration that the bosses came in your way. And, later on, in 1970 the Prime Minister said that the Parliament was coming in her way, the Parliament constituted as it was. So, she dissolved the Parliament. Now, she got another parliament..

SHRI PILOO MODY: Now, the opposition is coming in the way. So, she tries to dissolve the opposition.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I am coming to that.

Now, in 1971 she got a new Parliament and what was flaunted in the face of all of us also was a massive majority. We knew how hollow this claim was. Now you say that with all this massive majority you are not able to have your way. So, I ask, Madam Prime Minister, how solid is your massive majority? Is this massive majority viable? If this Opposition, a very minuscule opposition, could come in the way of this massive majority then it is clear that your massive majority is not viable at all. You are not able to put it to any use. You are not able to utilise this massive majority for any social change or transformation.

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

Then, in 1972, after having got this massive majority, the Prime Minister said to the country, 'The fundamental rights come in my way.' So, the demand was that the fundamental rights must be liable to be abridged. That also was done by this Parliament which impliedly agreed even to the abridgement of the fundamental rights including the rights of the minorities.

That did not satisfy the Prime Minister and this wonderful party. She then said, the judiciary came in the way, the judiciary was obstructing the necessary social reform. What has been the result? We have witnessed how was it cut down to size and asked to behave. I don't know whether the judiciary is even then going to be subservient or obsequious, in its behaviour to the ruling party because I have still my faith in the judiciary

Later the Prime Minister said this in 1973 and other spokesmen have also endorsed her that bureaucracy came in her way and it must be committed. Committed to what? To any social change? To any progress? In effect, what it means was that it should be committed to the leadership of the Prime Minister. So what you find is this: not commitment to the honourable gentlemen sitting on those benches on the other side not committed to the Cabinet but commitment to a single individual. That as what this commitment means.

Now, what has this commitment brought about? Has this commitment brought about any progress in the country? Has this commitment brought about any change in our society? Has the commitment brought about any prosperity in the country? No, not at all. The country is stagnating at the same level as it was in the year of grace 1965-66. Nay, there has been steady decay due to this regime. In 1973 you blamed the bureaucracy for all your omissions and commissions,

You wanted the bureaucracy to be committed. The result is this that we have got this completely demoralised administration.

Then a different chapter appeared. That is what I am going to narrate to you. Do you, hon. gentlemen, sitting on the other side, think that the licence scandal is going to be left at the stage it was in the last session? No. This licence scandal is going to blow up in a big way in this House. Let there be absolutely no doubt about it in your mind. It is not in any spirit of sensationalism that we want to take it up but we are going to take it up in a big way during this session with further facts and material. After all the administration of the country is a responsibility of everybody and how the country has been run; you get a slice of this in the mirror of the licence scandal.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** When is it going to blow up? On the 6th?

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** You better get a seat on the roof of this House. Otherwise my hon friend will not have the good fortune of having a look at the vast millions who would be surging towards this House. Some 20 lakhs of people who would be moving towards the Parliament House with the national charter. That should send thrill down your spine on that day.

The entire administration is demoralised, this is what is happening now.

Now, may I remind you what the Prime Minister said after the Samastipur blast which took the life of Shri L. N. Mishra? Can anybody have any shred of faith in this investigation that is to be conducted under your auspices? The Prime Minister is the head of this investigating agency and she has already pronounced her verdict. Is that the way any democratic leader would function? Has not the Prime Minister placed the investigating

agency in a difficult predicament in which they have either to confirm her or contradict her? But the Prime Minister thought it fit to give expression to her views.

All these things did not help the Prime Minister and the blessed ruling party. Then they thought that they must have the abnormal laws, extraordinary laws. Ordinary laws of the land cannot help them. And therefore they had been continuing the state of emergency and the rule of MISA and the DIR in this country. You are having this regime to your heart's content. But, the country asks you: where are we heading to? Are we going to have more of bread, more of employment, more of cloth and more of houses in spite of all these things? You have been granted by the country all these powers in a pusillanimous manner. You have got what you have demanded. The House had also conceded in a generous way all these powers. And yet what exactly has been achieved for this country? You see now that our democracy is ruled by ordinances. We have the rule of money power and bayonet power. That is what the country has witnessed. You have already proclaimed to the entire wide-world that you cannot run this country in a normal way. Democracy is run by means of ordinary laws of the land. You require extraordinary laws like the DIR and the MISA.

Yesterday the hon. Prime Minister was shedding crocodile tears over the arrest of a student under MISA. If the Prime Minister is so solicitous as far as the student is concerned, I ask her to make a firm and clear declaration that MISA would not be used against the political workers or the political movements. And that was also the assurance given to the House by the Minister who had piloted the Bill on MISA.

But, now MISA is being used against the political workers largely. But, I would like to remind my hon. friends on that side that like the Roman

Senate, they are now passing laws of which they are going to be the first victims. This was what happened in Rome. You are sheepishly supporting a rule of that kind.

This is the way Fascism works. Hitler asked for more and more powers. But ultimately he used those powers. But ultimately he used those to destroy the soul of the nation. And that is what might be done by the ruling party here also.

Mr Chairman, now I come to another trait of Fascism. Fascism wears the mask of socialism and it speaks the language of socialism. And that was what Nazism did. It donned the mantle of national socialism. Benito Mussolini was at one time a Socialist. If it was true of Fascism more than three decades ago, it would be much truer of it in the year of grace, 1975, to have a facade of socialism, progressivism and what not. Now, the urge is for greater equality and for social justice. The tide cannot be turned back that easily; they cannot put the clock back so easily. In India, Fascism is indeed going to have pseudo-radicalism of a greater magnitude. Here it may be more radical seemingly than it had been in Germany and in Italy earlier.

श्री राम सहाय दांडे (राजनंद गांव) :  
आप जल्द से ज्यादा डर गये हैं।

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : डरे हुए रहते तो  
6 मार्च को यहां पर महला बोलते क्या ?  
मगर हमारा हमला तो शांति के साथ होगा।  
हमारा हमला वैसा नहीं होता जैसा इंदिरा  
ब्रिगेड वाले करते हैं।

Then, Mr. Chairman, there are certain checks and balances which work in a Parliamentary system. Have my hon. friends ever taken stock of the checks and balances working in the system? For a check on the arbitrariness of the executive the ruling party in the first instance,



[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

must provide a check on the Government. But I ask you to tell the House honestly and candidly whether you are able to have a check on your Government. The reason why I say that this party is not able to exercise any check on the Government is that it does not seem to be functioning at all.

I had the good fortune of belonging to the united party but in those days the general body of the party did function, the executive committee did function. I ask them to tell us candidly whether your general body is functioning now.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Yes. Only today there was a meeting.

**SHRI K RAGHURAMAIAH:** When we were together and worked so much, we got tired and broke down.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** attitude and not because of the democratic attitude of the rank and file in the party.

Now, may I cite one clear instance that in the good old days the Congress Socialist Forum was allowed to function and did function freely. But now you have wound up both the Forum for Socialist Action and the Nehru Forum. This is the state of the Party that all these forums have been wound up. Sir, I happen to be the founder of the Congress Socialist Forum.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** So, you also believe in socialism, Mr. Shyam Babu!

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Now, I would be making myself a ridiculous fool if I declare that I also happen to be socialist because you have made this word a dirty word.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** Are you asking us to change the name of our party?

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**

So, Sir, this is one of the instances. During those days when I undertook the initiative of founding the Congress Socialist Forum it did encounter some difficulties in the beginning but ultimately—I was also asked whether such a body could be brought into being within the framework of the Congress constitution—it did come into being. I said 'Of course there is no bar to this' since it would not have a separate membership and so on. So, it was allowed to function. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru came to the AICC to announce that such forums thinking bodies, were welcome inside the Congress party. He is on record as having said that. But the hon. Prime Minister, the illustrious daughter of the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has thought it fit to wind up these forums. Now, I ask you, had Shyamnandan Mishra been in that party, would any leader of the party have been asked to wind up a body like this? Yet, you say that you happen to be the members of a very progressive party.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Shyam babu wound up the party itself and went away.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**

Now, you are winding up the democracy itself. Your achievement is greater. My achievement pales into insignificance before your achievement, because you are now on the point of succeeding in winding up democracy in this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was saying that in the first instance, this party is not able to exercise any check; neither its general body nor its executive. These are only ornamental bodies now; they are expendable bodies now and the Prime Minister has absolutely no use for them.

What can you expect from this Cabinet also? Does this Cabinet function and who can have his say in it? I am told that nobody has the courage to come out with his views



clearly in the Cabinet because ultimately those views are going to be set at nought. (*Interruptions*).

Of course, this subject is to be carried over to the next day. You have fixed up 5 UM for the presentation of the General Budget and we are bound to adjourn at 4.30 P.M.

So, I am saying that in this democratic system, all the checks and balances are being eroded. The one instance that I have given is of the party itself, which is not acting, which is not exercising its check on the arbitrariness of this Government.

I will come to another check but I must emphasise that the check by the party was particularly necessary because the Opposition in this House happens to be very small in number and therefore, not so effective. In spite of its microscopic minority, it has been able to make an impact on the country, and yet, so far as the measures for the welfare of the people are concerned, it would not be able to do much. It was, therefore, an essential obligation on the ruling party to see to it that it did exercise some check on the executive.

Now, Mr Chairman, the other check was the Press. Where does the Press happen to be at the moment?

MR. CHAIRMAN. You may continue next time.

*The Lok Sabha adjourned till Seventeen of the Clock*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled at Seventeen of the Clock.*

(MR. SPEAKER in the Chair)

# GENERAL BUDGET, 1975-76

MR. SPEAKER: The hon Finance Minister.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM): Mr.

Speaker, Sir, it is my privilege this year to present the budget to this august House.

1.2 Its formulation has been no easy task, but my burden has been lightened to some extent by my distinguished predecessor in office who had applied many correctives earlier in the year, these severe measures had a distinct impact on an admittedly difficult economic situation that our nation has of late been faced with.

1.3 It is unnecessary for me on this occasion to recount in detail the variety of factors, both external and internal, which have interfered with the orderly implementation of our development plans and strategies in recent times. The virulence with which inflation has been spreading and its devastating impact across national boundaries, continue to impose on developing countries such as India burdens and hardships which we have been ill-equipped to withstand. The impact on the living standards of our people and on the pattern of real incomes within the country has been serious enough. What is even worse is the persistent rise in prices which has eroded the capacity to save and thus imposed a painful constraint on the flow of investible resources so urgently needed to sustain our plans for a better future. The 'Economic Survey' sets out in some detail the anatomy of this complex problem and the characteristic features of the current situation.

1.4 It is against this backdrop that I would like the Honourable Members to assess and to judge my budget proposals.

1.5 What, one might ask, has been the underlying approach—the basic philosophy—in framing these proposals? Is it merely an ostrich-like exercise to balance receipts and expenditure for the exchequer? Or does the budget seek more positively and purposively, to subserve larger national objectives?