

B7
C/038

58

S. A. DANGE
ON
MUNDHRA AFFAIR

83



*Speech in Parliament
on Chagla Report*

February 19, 1958



AITUC PUBLICATION

Price: 12 Naye Paise

४८

RESOLUTIONS ON CHAGLA REPORT

Life Insurance was nationalised in January 1956 by an Ordinance and the Life Insurance Corporation (LIC) was established in September 1956.

The LIC has about 40 crores of rupees per year to invest. The LIC officials have about 10 lakhs per day of public money in their hands to buy and sell on the stock exchange.

The millionaire Mundhra and his associates influenced the Finance Ministry and the LIC to buy his shares for Rs. 1,26,85,750, at prices which were fraudulent and in which public funds to the extent of 80 lakhs were lost.

The scandal came before the Parliament on 16th December 1957. The Government appointed Chief Justice Chagla as a Commission to enquire into the matter on 7th January 1958.

The Commission found that the "object of the purchase was to finance Mundhra to the extent of a crore and a quarter by the purchase of his shares"—to help him out of his difficulties.

The Report of the Commission came before Parliament on 13th February 1958.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister, moved the following resolution:

This House, having considered the Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the affairs of the Life Insurance Corporation of India approves of the statement made on behalf of Government that:

(1) Government accept the Commission's findings to the effect that the transaction resulting in the purchase of shares of the six companies was not entered into in accordance with business principles and was also opposed to propriety on several grounds;

(2) Government propose to initiate appropriate proceedings, on the basis of the findings of the Commission, in respect of the Officers responsible for putting through the transaction; and

(3) Government propose to examine carefully the principles recommended by the Commission for adoption by Government and the Corporation.

To this Shri S. A. Dange, Shri Surendranath Dwivedy, Shri R. K. Khadilkar and Shri N. Sivaraj moved an amendment seeking to add the following to the Government resolution:

(a) that Government should institute a further inquiry into all investments made by the Life Insurance Corporation since its inception; and

(b) that a Standing Parliamentary Committee should be set up to supervise the workings of autonomous Corporations and State Undertakings.

SPEECH ON MUNDHRA AFFAIR

The Prime Minister, when he opened the discussion, made certain observations which illustrate to us what has been the net result of this enquiry. The observations made, the original motion put forward which is absolutely vague, and the amendment that comes forward immediately after the original motion—all this shows what a terrific confusion and contradiction exists in the ranks of the Government. They did not know whether to go before the public accepting the findings; then they see that it will not do good to themselves and their health, and they change their minds; and all that is reflected in the last half hour's discussion about substitute motions and amendments and so on.

And it is quite natural that there should be confusion, that there should be, in fact, panic, and that there should be sadness accompanied by a self-congratulatory speech that we are a great democracy and that we are certainly far better than other sinners—we sin less than other countries. That is the conclusion. One can congratulate oneself, if one likes, on being a small sinner while others are big sinners. But that does not lead us to the right conclusion.

Therefore, I would like to help the House in looking at the matter in a more realistic manner. It is not a question of bringing in false accusations or generalisations, or damning the Government, or in general damning the ruling party. That is not the point. The point is that, from the things which have happened, correct conclusions are not yet being drawn.

See the way in which things are being discussed. There was a debate in December on this question. The Government took one month to appoint an Enquiry Commission. The Prime Minister says, perhaps, the Parliament hustled the Government. Is that correct? There was one month to consider the whole problem, and to appoint a commission. The terms of reference were discussed by the Finance Minister in consultation with the Attorney-General, and perhaps in consultation with other Ministers. Maybe, according to the rate and speed of governmental functioning, one month was not enough, and, maybe, it was hustling.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Not one month. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Member. The hon. Member's timing is not correct.

Some Hon. Members: Twenty days.

Shri Nath Pai: The debate was over by the 17th December, 1957, and you appointed the commission on the 7th January, 1958.

Shri S. A. Dange: All right. Twenty days. You can reduce it to ten days. I have no objection. I am coming to the real question later on.

COMMISSION DEMANDED BY ALL

It is not such a hustling as it seems. Now, here, the commission was appointed. But on the day when this question was brought up in this House, what was the attitude of the Government? It was to deny everything and to say that, maybe, something has happened, we will look into it and so on. And a tremendous pressure, including the pressure from the Congressmen themselves, was needed in order to make the Government accept the demand for the appointment of a commission.

An Hon. Member: Only from Congress Benches. (*Interruptions*)

Shri S. A. Dange: Are you ashamed of this pressure? No, I do not think so. You did good; it is good that the Congress Benches also joined in the demand.

Some Hon. Members: No, no. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Tyagi: They initiated the debate.

Shri S. A. Dange: I thought Shri Feroze Gandhi was a Member from the Congress Benches.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Shri Tyagi: And he had initiated the debate.

Shri S. A. Dange: That can be excused.

You can deny, because many things are being denied now, because the skeletons in the cupboards are getting out one by one. So, naturally, there is confusion and denials are there. However, at that very point, there was resistance to the appointment of a commission. But the Government knew that the matter was serious, and they agreed to a commission. In fact, I would have been prepared to congratulate the Government on agreeing to appoint a commission with a judge like Chief Justice Chagla. Certainly, the Government should have deserved congratulations, but should they get them? The way they started looking at the conclusions shows that after appointing the commission, when they saw how things were moving, they repented about the appointment. . . .

Some Hon. Members: No.

... and started detracting from the conclusions. And it was an astounding thing to hear, before the matter came up before the House, the Prime Minister passing judgments, giving certificates to officials and to people saying that there was no corruption involved. Certainly, handing over Rs. 80 lakhs of public funds to a well-known fraudulent speculator was the highest kind of morality that was shown in the ranks of the officers who dealt with it; it was not a case of corruption at all! And I am quite sure, we should not be surprised later on, if Shri H. M. Patel and the other officials were to get titles next year of *Padma Vibhushana* or *Bharat Ratna*. It has become a habit. I am sorry, either in his magnanimity or in his blindness to reality, the Prime Minister develops a habit of sheltering people whom he should not and hitting at people whom he should not. The result is the confusion that is being seen in the debate and even in the remarks which he was making. He accepts the findings that the transaction was wrong, and yet, he says that the officers were good, they were honest, they were not corrupt, and they have to be congratulated.

NOBODY IS RESPONSIBLE!

And he singled out one, the Governor of the Reserve Bank, for a special certificate that he is not at all concerned. So far as the Finance Minister was concerned, he was the least concerned. Then, we should like to know who was concerned; not the Finance Minister, not the Principal Secretary, not the Governor of the Reserve Bank, not the Chairman of the State Bank, not the president of the stock exchange, and not the Cabinet; then, who was concerned? Only one person, Mr Mundhra. He was the man who somehow or other inveigled people and ran away with Rs. 80 lakhs. And, of course, he was a great man. In fact, he himself claims that he was just following in the foot-steps of the Prime Minister (*Interruptions*). He was trying to build an empire. And building an empire is not a special virtue of Mr Mundhra; building such empires is the virtue of all the big monopolists that are still rampant. One Mundhra has been found. But others also exist in the world of monopoly capital. Let us remember that.

The matter does not end there. You may detract from the conclusions; you may run down the method. In fact, there was frowning at the installation of loudspeakers, and it was said: "Why were people allowed to hear the whole thing? It was going to be a public enquiry, but a public enquiry where no one

should hear anything. That should have been the method. That should have been the approach." We fail to understand that sort of criticism. The enquiry is there. Let the people hear. We must congratulate Mr Chagla for making it so public. We should congratulate the public of Bombay on their political consciousness, when in thousands they went to the court and they wanted to hear what was being done. Instead of congratulating the people, congratulating the Chief Justice, and congratulating the way in which things were done, there comes the statement, "No, the approach was wrong, the method was wrong"; and later on, you deny and say, "No, no, it is not a reflection on Mr Chagla." What a confusion, one statement being contradicted by another. However, let us not deal with the confusion part any more.

NOT THE FIRST SCANDAL

The question is this. Why was this done? To my mind it seems that in this House there have been references to many scandals before. The House knows it. There were references, I do not know, to how many scandals. In fact, it is rather difficult to make a list. It is presented as if this is the only scandal which has suddenly come upon the people, come upon Parliament and come upon the Government, and they are surprised that such a thing did take place. No, that is not so. There was reference to many scandals in this House. There was the jeep scandal. It was suppressed. There was the fertiliser scandal. One or two officers were just prosecuted or something was done, and Shri T. T. Krishnamachari gave his parting kick with particular reference to this scandal. He said that the Minister at that time did not find it convenient to resign. Of course, he complimented himself—that like an honourable man he accepts and walks out; while the other gentleman, who once becomes a Governor and at another time a Cabinet Minister and a third time a petty lawyer who goes hawking about for defence cases against working classes, did not have the courage to resign when he was a Minister. The hit was right, and I congratulate Shri T. T. Krishnamachari for having given that hit, though both of them belong to the same Congress Party.

Then, there was the debate about the affairs of the Industrial Finance Corporation. There was resistance to giving names of those who took loans. It was found that the amiable gentlemen of the Industrial Finance Corporation were appropriating loans for their own concerns or for the concerns run by their brothers-in-law or sons-in-law. When the scandal came out, somebody resigned, and the whole thing was hushed up.

There was the Stores Purchase scandal also. There was somewhere, I think, a reference to the supply of defective vehicles to the Defence Department running into a bill of crores. The man who exposed it, a simple worker, was victimised and dismissed. And I do not know what has happened to these defective vehicles. I am told they are being returned.

Things are going on; people do talk. People are asking questions. But what is the result? Questions are asked but Ministers evade replies. They evade telling the truth. And when the whole thing accumulated like a dead weight of heavy sins, the Government thought, "Let us face it out." They thought nothing much would come out of it. They said: "You have mentioned so many scandals. Here we are appointing an Enquiry Commission for one." And, they were horrified to find that things came out which they did not expect to come out. Therefore, there was confusion; there was panic.

AN ATTEMPT TO HUSH UP

However, I want to say this that the concession to appoint a commission was not so much due to a high sense of democracy. Things had accumulated too much and they wanted to let out a little steam and see if the whole thing could be covered up somehow. But the commission did reveal things they did not expect.

What did the commission reveal? There was practically no reference here to the simple thing, the simple truth that is revealed in the enquiry—and all parts of the truth are not yet known—yet the truth that is revealed is so stinking that the whole world is talking about it. And, what is the truth? We should pay some attention to that.

I do not want to go into the details of the case, but I want friends and hon. Members to see the essence of that. What is the essence of that? It is that fraud was discovered in insurance funds when it was in the private sector. I am told that some Dalmia was hauled up for that and something. Then, they nationalised it and they handed over the administration, the investing power, to those very people who opposed nationalisation. Mr Vaidyanathan, the Chairman (*Several Hon. Members*: The Managing Director) of the LIC had campaigned against nationalisation. It was handed over to them and with what policy? That the funds shall be put at the disposal of the private sector as they were done before.

So, what was the net result? The net result was funds were taken over from the Dalmias and handed over to the Mundbras,

once from the private sector, and now from the public sector. This is the net result of the transfer from the private to the public sector. And it illustrates the truth of the statement by the Prime Minister that there is no difference really in our economy between the public sector and the private sector. That is the truth. But the traffic is only one-way traffic; funds go out from the public sector to the private but they never come from the private to the public sector. This is the way in which nationalisation is handled.

Was this policy correct? It was not correct. What was the importance of nationalisation? That small savings of poor people should be gathered together and put at the disposal of the Plan. When we ask bonus payments, we are told by the Ministry and the Government to buy savings certificates, and not take cash. When people ask for higher wages, even in this Insurance Corporation, they are told: "Do not ask for higher wages; save and lend to the Government." Yes; save and lend to the Government so that the Government can lend to Mundhras. That is the slogan. So, that is the policy! It was not the adopted policy of the Plan; and yet who changes the policy? It looks as if any Minister, any Finance Secretary, any Reserve Bank Governor can change the policy of the Government and change the policy of the Plan. Is that the way the Government should function? That is the question we should all ask the Government: Why such functioning takes place?

What was revealed is now made out as if it is a bolt from the blue. No, Sir. This thing happened because there is a certain method of functioning of the State machine; there is a certain method of Cabinet functioning; a certain method of functioning of the permanent bureaucracy—and that method is the cause of this.

MUNDHRA AFFAIRS KNOWN SINCE 1954

For example, it is said that the thing has come upon us suddenly. Is that so? It is on record from the Secretary of Company Law Administration that the history of Mundhras was known to the Government since the year 1954. It is not merely in June or December 1957. This is not a thing in which hustling has taken place in 20 days' time. The Government of India knew Mundhra since 1954. What were they doing; what were all the Ministries doing about this affair?

The Reserve Bank made a report against the Mundhras. What was the Government doing? There is a letter in July about these transactions. What did the Government do till

December until the House brought it out in the debate? Not only that. Who does not know that the omnipotent and omniscient Home Ministry, which can chase communist workers from railway departments and can find out who is talking with whom and with what politics, could not find time to chase the Mundhras and find out what they were.

Is it a fact that they were not known? The Commerce Ministry has been concerned with the foreign exchange of the Mundhras and their concerns. What were they doing? What were all these Ministries doing? It is on record—in the Chagla Commission Report—that the Prime Minister himself knew it. It is no use simply hanging T.T.K. for a sin for which he should suffer and did suffer. It is no use doing that.

Acharya Kripalani: Don't bother; he will come back.

Shri S. A. Dange: No. No; he will not come back.

GOVERNMENT HYPNOTISED BY MUNDHRA

It is on record that the Finance Ministry knew about the Mundhras in 1954. Mr T.T.K. knew it in August 1955 when he was the Commerce Minister. Mr Rama Rau, Governor of the Reserve Bank, knew in February 1956 and reported to the Government. One Justice Tendulkar, when he was confronted with a petition from the Mundhras, put it on record that he was a dishonest man; and the Prime Minister himself wrote to the Ministry saying that there is a new star appearing, please watch it. And, the Ministry started watching it. And, they were so dazzled by the star that they became its statellites and started moving round the star, and the star has landed them ultimately in a mess. When they became satellites, the result is bound to be a crash that we saw in December in the debate. Why were not steps taken? The Prime Minister also knew that the star required to be watched. Why was not that done?

After the June transactions, in September 1957, for a time when T.T.K. was out and the Prime Minister was acting as the Finance Minister, at that time, he got a file from the Finance Ministry on certain affairs—we do not know what those affairs were—and he writes on that: "I have no good opinion of this man; he has a bad reputation." He had no good opinion about the reputation of the man. He should have asked the other Ministers. We are yet to know what was the file on which this remark was made. Why did not the Prime Minister make a statement before the Chagla Commission on this? It was after the June transaction. There must be some explanation about it. It is recorded in the evidence before the commission.

What I am going to say is this. There was a sort of hypnotism cast almost over every Ministry by this gentleman. Every-

body knew about it and nobody would move about it. And they started running criss-cross with this man and that brought a crash. This is the picture that comes out. From 1954 till 1957, the whole picture is that every Ministry knows about it and yet nobody moves about it. And, when the thing did crash, even the June transactions did not come before the people, even when the Governor of the Reserve Bank and others reported in their July letter to the Finance Ministry, even when the Prime Minister knows from the files that were before him. This is the sort of paralysis that has crept over the governmental system for 4 years, when this man, a known fraudulent man, a gambler, a flamboyant personality, a man who wants to build an empire of industry, with no money in his pocket, by speculating on the stock exchange goes on adventuring. For 4 years it goes on and yet no Ministry can do anything. What is the secret of this? What is the use of blaming the ICS or giving good certificates? The permanent bureaucracy was involved in it. Shri H. M. Patel is a brilliant man of this bureaucracy, but his brilliance went to the service of the Mundhras.

THE POWER BEHIND THE THRONE

Who are the officers involved? The list is very interesting. There is Mr Bhattacharya, there is Mr Iyengar, there is of course T.T.K., then there is Mr Kamat and then there is Mr Chaturvedi. In this you will find that there is no difference of language, community or linguistic provinces. No difference of south or north, or east or west. Every direction is equally represented—Bengal, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Tamil Nad and U.P. Everybody is represented. They have acquired one very good understandable common language—the quotations of the stock exchange. It could be understood without any differences of language or philosophy.

What are these men? They are the men who are the power behind the throne. Who rules us? Sometimes the Ministers, sometimes these gentlemen. Many of them are honest. I do not want to cast a reflection on the whole service as such. What is the system? T.T.K. is asked a question. From behind comes a pad and he says: "I do not know what was written there." Who is running the Government? Who is running the democracy? There is a wonderful and funny division of labour, between the Ministers and the ICS.

Even today you can illustrate it. T.T.K. went out. What about the Budget? Just as easily or with greater ease, the Prime Minister will get up and read the Budget. Who makes the Budget? We should like to know. What is the relation between

the ICS service, the steel frame which we have inherited from the British and the democratic functioning of the Cabinet and the Parliament. Why has this happened?

Why could these ICS people be bamboozled? I do not want to say just now about their particular careers. But why are they taken in by the Mundhras? Because the State machine has tremendous faith in private capital. They are dazzled by the power of the monopolists. It is not unnatural. If Mr J. R. D. Tata or Mr G. D. Birla or for that matter Mr H. D. Mundhra walks into the office of an ICS Secretary, he is overwhelmed by the power of the millions, by this ownership of the sugar mills, textile mills, iron mills, railways and so on. There are ten directors controlling hundreds of crores of rupees of capital, 20 or 30 companies despite the new Companies Act. When these capitalists, mighty owners of finance capital, walk into the office, what can the poor Secretary do? Even the Ministers collapse. What to talk of the ICS.

They believe that the words of capital weigh more. Ministers and officials fling abuses at hunger strikers, on students' indiscipline. But what paralysing faith, what imbecile faith they show in these owners of millions of finance capital? What is their power?

I will remind the House of this. My friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, some ten years ago wrote a book *Who owns India?* There you will get a description of this whole power of finance capital. It is this finance capital in the hands of private profiteers, buccaneers of the middle ages, who annex now not pieces of land but huge blocks of capital and factories and mint millions, that owns India. This is the power that controls the Government and takes the policy in the wrong direction.

What is the source of evil? The source of evil is the power of private capital. Therefore, I agree with the Prime Minister that this scandal is not a reflection on the State sector. No. The solution is not to halt the growth of the State sector but to expand it.

MONOPOLISTS QUARREL — TRUTH IS OUT

Nationalise the banks. If you want to find out their frauds, the best key to them is the bank books. Yet the bank books are in their hands. The biggest banks are at their disposal. Nationalise the banks. Take over the Jessops Company. That is where the scandal started. You can read it. Jessops is a gold mine and there are many people who want to grab it. One fellow grabbed it and then others started informing on him. It is the rivalry among the powerful monopoly capitalists that has

brought the truth out. When thieves quarrel, honest men come into their own. This is the example.

There are many hidden scandals and they are not known. Because, there they have a pact among themselves. When they fall out and quarrel, they inform against each other and then a very sorry spectacle starts. One says that he is not responsible. The other says that he was not responsible. Everybody deserted everybody else and we were left with things as they were.

What should be the lesson and what should be the solution? This Government is under the influence of big business—including the Ministers and the ICS officials. They sometimes take their lessons from the Ministers' directions or from the Ministers and sometimes they do it on their own. I had asked the Chagla Commission in my letter to ask one question: "Will you ask how many *benami* transactions were made in the last three years by all those who were connected directly or indirectly with several Ministries in this Government?" Of course, Mr. Chagla said that it was beyond his terms of reference. Now, will the Government do that?

'NOUVEAU RICHE' INFLUENCE GOVERNMENT

The Government passed laws about corrupt officials. Will the Government make enquiries as to how many *nouveau riche* new millionaires had blossomed into power, owning millions of shares in various factories in the names of other people during the last ten years after they came into power. How many Ministries or Ministers and their friends have blossomed into new millionaires and by what methods?

Certainly if their private enterprise were honest, we should have no objection. But it is a matter for enquiry. The whole functioning of the Government is there. The Prime Minister referred to ICS officials being taken over after retirement by businessmen in their service. That is supposed to be a certificate for the way they develop these officers as good businessmen. No, Sir. There are many officials of various Ministries who retire and are taken over by these businessmen so that they can give them expert advice in what way they could get licences and how their bills could be got sanctioned quickly. Bills are hidden in files. They remember their old friendship and their old school ties and these officers come back either on behalf of Tatas or on behalf of Birlas or Mundhras and say: "Let us have the bill quickly." That is why they are taken back by these businessmen into their service, not because they have blossomed into very fine economists, or philosophers or efficient administrators. That is not the only thing. I should like to know why the other

aspect is not mentioned: why the Government takes businessmen or their friends inside the Cabinet.

There is a two-way traffic. Government servants go back to businessmen and businessmen come into the Government. For instance, here is the balance sheet of this very company about which there has been such a lot of discussion—Jessops. The Chagla Commission asked: "What was the driving force, motivating force? What was the haste?" The motivating force was the possession of Jessops. The driving force was the *badla* day that was coming—the crash of Mundhra and others. Anybody who knows the stock exchange could find out what was the haste.

In this Jessops, you have the example of the other way traffic—private businessmen coming into the Cabinet. The Directors' report of Jessops, signed by the managing directors, Mr Satchell and Mr Graham, dated 30-10-1956 says: "Mr A. K. Sen joined the board on 20th August, 1956 and retired on his appointment as Minister in the Central Government." It is a two-way traffic, not one-way traffic.

I do not at all allege anything. Let me be very clear. I am a frank speaker. I do not allege that Shri A. K. Sen, the Law Minister, was connected with this transaction. I am simply saying that the State machinery is relying on Capital, relying on the private sector, talking theoretically of socialism but really feeding private monopoly. That is how it functions, how Ministries are composed, how ICS servants function. Therefore, you will pardon me, Sir, when I say that once again the old man from the grave has got to be quoted, however much you might dislike him, and that is Karl Marx. One hundred years ago he said: "What is the modern capitalist State? It is an executive committee to manage the affairs of the bourgeoisie." The Mundhra affair shows that the modern State machine, ICS officers, Ministers and others, all were managing the affairs of this Mundhra. He was crashing, wanted two crores. They took public money from the LIC and handed it over to him, and when the thing burst everybody wants to run away from the stink. You cannot run away from the stink like that.

LET H. M. PATEL GO

There was hesitation in accepting the Report; there was hesitation in having a further probe. I am very glad to hear that the Prime Minister at last accepted finally the main recommendations. I am glad that they are going to probe. What I want to ask is this. Will they, for once, use that Presidential power under which they dismiss hundreds of railway workers without assigning any cause, against H. M. Patel? The Railway Ministry knows that the President of the Republic signs warrants: "You

are dismissed; cause will not be assigned in the public interest." Will he dismiss at least one ICS man? A very brilliant man, release him for using his brilliance further in the service, if not of Mundhra who is in jail, of somebody else.

On the previous day Mr Mundhra gave an interview in which he said that he had paid Rs. 1 lakh to the Congress funds; the next day he finds himself in jail.

An Hon. Member: Not more?

Shri S. A. Dange: Maybe, that statement also may be wrong. Who knows whether we could believe Mr Mundhra or not; we do not know. In any case, there it is.

Therefore, Sir, I would say that the State machine is revealed in all its glory of public enterprise in the service of private capital.

At the same time I want to fight the conclusion that nationalisation is bad. I agree with the Prime Minister that if scandals did exist in private concerns, they could not be debated in Parliament. That is the main advantage of the State sector. Whether we agree or disagree with what is being done, we can debate them before the public; we can challenge the *bona fides* of what is being done. Therefore, it is one great advantage in having concerns in the State sector. The State sector does not stand condemned.

An Hon. Member: Advantage of parliamentary democracy also!

Shri S. A. Dange: Yes, advantage of parliamentary democracy also, if its conclusions are not to be denied, if it is consistently followed and its conclusions are not hurriedly denied by high men in power.

SHOOT THE MAN-EATER

In conclusion what I would say is this. Let us study the way our State machine functions; let us study the way things are being influenced by private capital; let us study the power that is still wielded by them; let us find out how that power can be curtailed and finally abolished. Let us think of nationalising the big key concerns; let us think of taking over the Jessops in which we have already invested funds and let us take it over and nationalise it, because it is already running on orders from the Government.

Mr T.T.K. has paid for his sins, whatever they may be, or they may not be. But he did tell the truth before he parted, and the truth was: "Beware, the man-eater is at large." I wish he had told the truth before he resigned. In fact, he accompanied

the man-eater to America and to England, and helped it to secure aid and more blood. And having tasted blood the man-eater turned round and mauled him. In any case he survived and has given the lesson that powerful private vested interests are out to smash the development of the Plan, and especially the State sector. They are out to discredit the State sector; they are out to take possession of the public funds in the Plan, in order to enrich themselves and this man-eater has got to be watched. Well, I hope, Sir, the Government will not watch it as they watched that new star rising and started going round it. I hope they will not have the ambition of thinking they can tame the man-eater and put it in the service of socialism.

No, Sir, the man-eater has got to be shot, and shot in the most non-violent way, if you like, but has got to be shot! The man-eater's claws have to be taken away and its poisonous fangs have got to be knocked out. What are the claws and what are the fangs? The power of capital, the power of banks, the power of ownership of vast textile mills, where they can do and undo things, where they can buy men, morals and everything. This power of the man-eater has got to be curtailed and smashed. And I hope that in faithfulness to the principles which have been laid down by this House towards the development of socialism and democracy, these private vested interests, this power of finance capital will be smashed, and the permanent bureaucracy, not all of them, but those who trip and fall a victim to it, is taught the lessons that arise from this. I also want that the Government does not sleep over scandals for years, passing files from one Minister to another; that it does not disbelieve rumours that go in the newspapers or in the lobbies and scoff at these rumours as being inventions either of this party or that; and that they will take the correct lessons and cure themselves of the sin that they have committed.