

services of the financial year 1963-64."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri Morarji Desai:** I introduce† the Bill.

12.27 hrs.

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

**Mr. Speaker:** The matter is serious and the occasion is solemn. Let us enter into it with all serenity and the seriousness that it requires. Shri J. B. Kripalani.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, with your permission, I move:

"That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers."

Sir, it is a matter of deep regret for me to move this motion against a Government which is being conducted with many of my old friends, almost of 30 years' standing, but the call of duty and the call of conscience are paramount and there can be no question of any sentiment here. I hope I will keep before the House what is felt largely by our people.

It is very strange that so far as the progress of the country is concerned, the views of the Government are diametrically opposite to the views of the people. The Government think that the country is rapidly progressing. The people feel depressed. They feel we are going down. The Government say that we are progressing from the fact that our neighbouring countries' condition is not so good as ours. Maybe, but at least there is one point in which the neighbouring countries are better than ourselves, and it is this: in the neighbouring countries there is no deficiency of food. Apart from this, we must know the difference between our neighbours and ourselves. We were all commonly under the colonial rule but we have got our independence largely by our own efforts,

suffering and sacrifice. More than that, Sir, we had a unique leadership both intellectually and morally. Such leadership can rarely be found in the annals of the world. The second rank of our leaders were superior to the first rank leaders in other colonial countries. And, if we have to make comparisons, Sir, we may make as well comparisons between those countries like Japan and Germany and other countries in Europe whose lands were devastated. We got a running Government. We had only to make it efficient and reform it. And, yet we have not been able to do so and our people are in the slough of discontent.

Now, let us look at our home policy and our foreign policy. Our home policy is woven round the Five Year Plans. They are not only designed to take us forward economically but also socially. What could be the objects of these Plans. The primary object of these Plans is to see that our people get at least the minimum requirements of physical life. Speaking at the Second Round Table Conference Gandhiji said that the Congress stands for the poor, the weak and the down-trodden. He also said that their interests are paramount and any other interest whether it is foreign or native must subside before their interests. And, Gandhiji was not a socialist. Our Government has posited socialism as its creed. I suppose it is a genuine kind of socialism. Then it must also look primarily to the condition of the poor.

What is the condition of the poor today. The Draft Report of the Third Five Year Plan says that the lowest strata of our society, the landless labourers—and their number is ever increasing—get less real wages and less work. If this is not a sufficient evidence that we have not progressed in terms of the masses of our country, the evidence comes from Congressmen themselves. A former President of the Congress, Shri Dhebar, in one of its meetings said: "The poor are getting poorer, and the rich are get-

†Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

ting richer". A more sophisticated account of it was given by the Prime Minister himself. He said that the Plans have made the rich richer and have not to any extent improved the condition of the poor. He also said that in these few years the rich people have made money which they had not made for the last hundred years.

Therefore, I say, there must be something radically wrong with our Plans. I submit, Sir, that the Plans are defectively drawn and more defectively executed. When we draw the plans, we do not take into consideration what we will be able to do or what we will not be able to do. Our administrative capacity, our technical know-how, the money that we will be able to raise at home through taxation and borrowings and the money that we will be able to raise from foreign sources and also from foreign charity are not taken into consideration when we make our plans.

Recently, there was a mention of this in one of the local papers, I think the *Times of India*. It appears that three public sector projects of the Third Plan are being dropped because they were initially drawn up on questionable assumptions and wrong information. Rs. 11.25 crores phyto-chemical project to be located in Kerala with Soviet collaboration has now been given up, after processing for five years, because it transpires that basic raw materials will not be available at reasonable prices there. There is yet another case. The Rs. 12 crores project for manufacturing dye-stuffs with German collaboration in Maharashtra was processed since 1955 and it is now being given up because it has been discovered that the cost of raw material will be too high, but Rs. 1 crore has already been spent on construction work. Similar is the fate of the Mangalore port project. This port was relevant against the programme of exporting iron ore. It was expected that two hundred million tons of high

grade ore would be available for export from the hinterland. Now the Bureau of Mines has given its opinion—perhaps, it was not consulted before—that only 13 million tons of ore, and that too of a doubtful quality, would be available. Examples of defective planning can be multiplied. If the plans are not properly conceived, they are most defectively executed.

In a proper and scientific plan there should be only marginal differences, say, 10 to 15 per cent, between the expenditure on a project and the produce from that project. I gave examples as to how our plans were not properly executed when the Third Plan was being considered. I can show that while the money allotted for the plans has almost been exhausted, the production had not been more than half or one-third. The Third Five Year Plan itself complains that in those sectors of our economy which were to be cushion for further movement we have failed. We have failed in coal, electricity, iron and fertilizers, and these were the things on which was to be based our future progress. So, neither were the plans properly conceived, nor were they properly executed. This is the picture of the industrial sector.

As for the agricultural sector there have been controversies among the Ministers themselves. There has been no progress in this sector. It seems that our agriculture has become stagnant in spite of the costly dams that we have built with a great deal of money.

It must also be remembered that this is also due to the rapid changes that we make about the size of the holdings and about the conditions on which the land is to be given to the peasants. They have been constantly and continually changing; therefore also this deficiency. We must remember that all our progress depends primarily on our agricultural produce.

This is, in short, the condition of our economy today, namely, that we spend

any amount of money but the result is negligible.

Coming to the second item in the home affairs is the administration of the country. It was admitted that there was corruption at the lower levels of the administration, but today he will be a bold man who would say that there is no corruption in the higher ranks. But corruption in the higher ranks is nothing; there is corruption in the political field. We have seen ministers and ex-ministers accusing each other and getting money from doubtful quarters and for doubtful purposes. The President of the Congress recently said that in his Party paupers had become millionaires.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain):** He has contradicted it. It has appeared in the papers.

**Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur):** Has he contradicted it under pressure?

**Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur):** That you know.

**Acharya Kripalani:** He also said that they possessed fleets of cars, cinema houses and cold storages.

**Shri Ansar Harvani (Bisauli):** What is wrong about it?

**Acharya Kripalani:** Evidently, this was meant for our frontier province which was notorious in these things.

It is not denied that ministers and ex-ministers accuse each other. There is yet another thing which was said in the last meeting of the AICC when a senior member of the Congress said that he has heard that a Chief Minister had boasted that he got his ministership by spending a few lakhs of rupees and that he could get the Prime Ministership of India by spending a couple of crores of rupees.

**Shri Ansar Harvani:** Why do you not try it?

**श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) :** पटनायक था, पटनायक ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** जो माननीय सदस्य अपने आप को गुप्त के मेम्बरस क्लेम करते हैं. . . . .

**श्री बागड़ी :** वह पृच्छ रहे थे ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप से तो नहीं पूछ रहे थे ।

**श्री बागड़ी :** किसी ने नहीं बताया, इसलिये मैं ने बता दिया ।

**Acharya Kripalani:** A Persian proverb says that when a ruler of a country takes a pinch of salt without payment, his officers would loot the whole country. If any minister thinks that what he does in secret is not known to his staff, he is living in a fool's paradise. The administration have means of knowing what a minister does and therefore also our administration, even in the highest ranks, has greatly suffered.

This is about the plans and about our administration. Now I come to our foreign policy. Our foreign policy is wound round something that we choose to call non-alignment and we consider that this non-alignment means non-violence. Further, we consider this non-alliance as if it were a moral imperative, that circumstances may change and our interests may require something else yet we must go on mouthing the same word again and again that we are non-aligned.

But we have to change. Circumstances oblige us to change. For instance, we are at war with China today. Are we non-aligned? Are we a neutral nation so far as China is concerned? We are not neutral at all; we are a belligerent nation. If the dictionary meaning of political words is not twisted in order to serve our purpose, we would know that there is no such thing today as non-alignment so far as China is concerned and that we are a belligerent nation. Maybe, all that we can say is that we have no military alliance with any country.

I am also afraid that in our greatest requirement that is, in the protection of our country, in keeping its inde-

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

pendence and in seeing that foreigners do not occupy our land, we have drifted into ideological considerations. I submit that ideological considerations should not come when the defence of the country is in question. There was Russia. It had to defend itself against Hitler. It threw to the winds all ideas of international communism and allied itself with imperialist and capitalist countries. The capitalist and the democratic countries, though they hated totalitarian regimes and were absolutely against communism, had no hesitation to ally themselves with a totalitarian regime like Russia and help it. So, I think, it is very wrong to suppose that non-alignment is such a moral principle that to deviate from it would be a sin. It is permitted to us to be non-aligned. For a century or so America was non-aligned; it did not interfere in the quarrels of Europe or of any other country, but whenever America's interests were involved, that non-alignment did not exist. They enunciated the Monroe Doctrine because they knew that if people came forward and had bases in their continent, their country would be in danger.

What did we do? The small kingdom of Tibet was attacked. We allowed it to be swallowed by China without protest. On what ground? We thought that the Chinese Government was a progressive government, was even a democratic government and the regime in Tibet was medieval and also theocratic. Therefore, we did not mind what happened to our neighbours forgetting that they acted as a buffer state.

Then, in 1954 we entered into a treaty with China. In that treaty were enunciated the five nonsenses of Panchsheel. It is really preposterous for politicians to use terms that were used by a prophet in quite a different context. And we stuck to these five principles. But the elementary thing which we ought to have done, when we entered into the treaty of alliance with China was to see that the new

borders—we never had borders with China, we had borders only with Tibet and Tibet was practically an independent country because in the Simla Conference it participated and in the White Papers also we see that it was almost independent—were demarcated. And when did we recognise the idea of suzerainty? It is another form of imperialism. We did not demarcate the line; we did not insist upon our new borders to be demarcated, at least on the maps. We had the treaty with China. The Prime Minister afterwards said that he had mentioned the matter of borders. He may have mentioned it. But even when there is a written document, there are any number of interpretations. We do not do these things by word of mouth. We did not demarcate the line; we did not ask for demarcation though we knew that there were maps in circulation which claimed a great deal of our Himalayan kingdom.

Having done this, then after three months of the signing of the treaty, there was aggression—three months after the treaty. In 1954, there was aggression but the country never knew it, the Parliament never knew it. In 1959, we knew that a military road had been constructed in our territory and then we raised questions here and the Prime Minister said that that was an old caravan route, only a stone had been kept here and kept there in order to make it serviceable. Well, now we know that this road that was constructed was a great feat of engineering. The Chinese have claimed it so and it has been made into a military road. You will be surprised to know that our External Affairs Department, while protesting against this road building, all that it said was that the Chinese had entered into the Indian territory without proper visas.

Now, today also in this deal that we have with America, the Voice of America Deal, we do things in a state of somnambulism. For four months and a half, or for five months this deal has been debated between at least

three Departments of the Government of India, the Foreign Department, the Broadcasting Department and the Finance Department. The deal is signed at a ceremony, but the next day the Government say, "We were sleeping. We did not know the implications". This is a very strange way of conducting the Government of a big country.

Then, whenever I raised my voice and said that we must be careful about the Chinese, often times the Prime Minister and his friends, the communists, have accused this speaker of being a war-monger. Afterwards, when they, at one stroke wanted to raise the budget by a hundred thousand, I asked them, "Why are you raising this defence expenditure by so much when Hindi-Chini are Bhai Bhai and so far as Pakistan is concerned, at least in those days, it appeared that it would not attack us unless it got a green flag from America, because all its strength came from America. Chinese aggression was minimised and when we persisted in saying that we should be careful, we were given assurances that our army was competent enough to see to the defence of our borders. In 1959 in this House I said:

"the Prime Minister has asserted today our army is competent for this (the clearing of the border from the Chinese). But it is quite possible that any effective action against the Chinese may increase the area of conflict. In that case it is a fact that India with her present industrial and military resources and lack of certain types of modern weapons, may not be able to meet the danger. Therefore, a declaration of readiness to accept military aid in an emergency will be very helpful. It only provides for an emergency which I hope will never arise. It will, however, convince China that we have no intention to stand alone. No nation can afford to wait to resist foreign aggression until its industrial potential is

increased through the Five Year Plans."

In those days it was considered that if we take military aid—it was said both by the Prime Minister and the then Defence Minister—we would be entering into the cold war. Again, in 1959 November session I said:

"Chinese have dug themselves in positions. They have centrally heated jeeps and are otherwise well equipped. We may expect further advance. We must be vigilant.....".

But unfortunately, we were not vigilant. In 1960 and onwards, we were assured that though we were a little weak in the Ladakh area we were very strong in the NEFA area and we would see that there is no attack in the NEFA area. But the greatest shock that we received in modern times was in October last when our force cracked before the first onslaught of the Chinese army. We ought to have known that Chinese were mobilised and poised for action. They had logistic advantage. They were on higher heights. They established securely their line of communications. If the Government did not know this, then the Government was certainly negligent. The Chinese may or may not have attacked. We do not know. But we took a decision to dislodge them from their advantageous position. The Prime Minister was for a day in India coming from Africa and going to Ceylon. It was at that time that the decision was taken to drive away the Chinese army. The decision, I submit, was taken in Delhi. It is believed that there was no consultation whatsoever with the officers in charge of the army in NEFA. It was said that it was a political decision arrived at in Delhi. It is astounding that military decisions on the battlefield are taken without consulting the army headquarters on the spot by civilians sitting in Delhi or flying from place to place. We were attacked and the result was disastrous. If there is anything wrong in what I have said, let the Government publish the report

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

of the committee that was appointed to investigate into the causes of our reverses in NEFA. In any case, the report of that inquiry must be placed before the House. People have reason to believe that there has been treachery. Suppressing the report would be like this that there has been a suspected case of homicide and because of that suspicion a post-mortem has been ordered and the results of that post-mortem are there; and yet those who ought to know what happened are kept in darkness. It is believed that the Prime Minister and a few of his companions are the only patriots in this land, that we all are deficient in patriotism, that we should not know what happened and who was responsible for it.

13 hrs.

It is not that our soldiers were weak. It is not that our soldiers were cowardly. Everybody knows that we have a first-class army. This army opposed the German General Romel in Africa. Everywhere they had gone they had won laurels. It was a formidable army. The soldiers were not weak. They were not cowardly. The Government communiques themselves say that they fought to the last bullet, and when their bullets were exhausted they fought with their knives.

So what was this due to? It may be treachery, it may not be. But there are certain things which are plain because the Government itself demanded those things from the people: our soldiers had no warm clothes, they had no shoes for those altitudes. (*An Hon. Member: Question*). What is the good of questioning me when the Government communique wanted these things, wanted blankets, wanted pull-overs and warm clothes for these people? It is no use denying these facts.

And another thing which was much worse was this. The guns they were fighting with were those of 1902. And

they were used in 1962 as if two wars had not taken place at all since then. They were guns that were used in the Boer War.

And when our army was defeated, the Government immediately declared an emergency. It is astounding. The Government did not declare war with China. We were at peace with China; we were yet "bhai, bhai". The emergency was declared. We had not even broken off diplomatic relations with them. I wonder how a people can be at war without breaking off diplomatic relations. But we said it was a practical war and therefore there is an emergency. And in that emergency were passed laws which never have been passed in any democracy in the world even in war-time.

And what happened? Even the opposition parties were so frightened that they consented to everything that was being done. The leaders of opposition parties consented to the postponement of by-elections, as if the parties alone were fighting them and there was not a candidate like me who was independent!

Also, before this onslaught took place the Government had been trying to minimise the gravity of the situation. And that has given an advantage to the neutrals who see it from outside and an advantage also to our enemies. We said that this land is barren, not a blade of grass grows there, not a human being lives there. And when we asked what is the meaning of it we were told this is the truth. There are grades of truth. It is true that not a blade of grass grows there; it is true that not a human being lives there. But this land is ours. That is the first and foremost thing. The bigger truth is forgotten in order to throw dust into the eyes of people, and a smaller truth is thrown in their face. This is how things happen in this unfortunate land of ours.

When the people heard that we had suffered such a crushing defeat they

were roused. There was a spontaneous anxiety among the people. They forgot their differences. Men, women and children were willing to contribute everything that they could in order to help the Government. Women gave their ornaments, their heirlooms, they gave also their marriage-signs—*mangal sutra*. There was not enough machinery to collect what was being given. But our Government was not satisfied with the spontaneous response that our people gave. I think they were sorry that there was such a response. What they did was, to oblige people to pay, they sent round their ministers, their district magistrates, their tahsildars. Every officer was out to take money from the poor. They did not feel that the goodwill of the people counted much more than the money. They valued money more than the goodwill of the people. On every occasion, when there was a licence to be taken or a permit to be taken, when these were to be renewed, some money was to be paid for the Defence Fund. I have heard in the villages that villagers were asked to pay two rupees poll tax for every member even the new-born baby. And the cultivators were asked to give so much per acre. And we see no accounts of this Defence Fund at all. And one State Ministry view with another. There is a state that gave very large amounts of money and got the Prime Minister's weight twice over in gold which was donated to the Defence Fund. Whether it was pure gold or adulterated gold, I do not know. But I know that the funds collected were Government funds, Funds were given from local board accounts, funds were given from the panchayat accounts. And all this is said to be public contribution. This is how our country is demoralised, definitely, and with a set purpose. Otherwise, these things are such that any man with a commonsense can see that if a country is to fight, the morale of the people should be kept up, it should not be defeated, repressed and depressed.

Then the Chinese withdrew, what

they call, unilaterally. It is no use calling it unilateral; it is bilateral because we have accepted it. There the Prime Minister said in all seriousness that there has been no disgrace or humiliation. Evidently he was replying to the Rashtrapati who said we had been shamed and humiliated by the defeat. The Prime Minister said there was no humiliation. I can understand people being defeated in a battle and there is no humiliation. But they must be fighting. We are humiliated and we are not fighting, and even then there is no humiliation! I do not see how this can be the way of keeping the morale of the country intact.

And when we had this emergency there was an outcry that foreign military aid should be taken. I dare to say that up to the day of the emergency no order for arms had been given to America. It was after that. And you will be surprised to know that the first order was so dis-coordinated..... (An Hon. Members: Haphazard) haphazard that it had to be re-made by American experts to make it of any use to the fighting forces. This is how we have been acting in our foreign policy which we consider was the best in the world, which had brought us encomiums from all the countries.

Sir, Government has failed in its foreign policy; it has failed in its home policy. The country is in depression. And do not suppose that I stand here to represent only 73 Members of this House. The voting strength with me is greater than the voting strength with the Congress. The Congress had only 45.27 per cent votes polled in the last election, and the Opposition had 54.76 per cent. You must remember that the Communists are also at least in one thing with us and that is that they also have no faith in this Government and they want it to quit.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta** (Calcutta South West): We have no faith in you either.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** That may be so, but that is not the question here. Of

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

course, you have no faith in me. I can understand that. But I am not the ruler of this country. So, what is the good of having faith in me or not? The point is that you have no faith in the rulers of this country. That is very clear from the motion that you moved or tabled. But even if you take away the 10 per cent of votes polled by the Communists, still we have a substantial strength with us, but you cannot take it away because they have given a no-confidence-motion themselves and they cannot get out of it. Our motion is only more general. That is all. You may have your own reason not to want this Government. That does not make any difference because you are at one with us in this that you do not want this Government. So, it is not a minority of the votes. That is not the question. The percentage is really more than what the Congress commanded. I can say that if there had been a system of voting by single transferable vote, the Opposition would have been in greater numbers than the congress. The voting system today is such that it gives people with 45 per cent of the votes 75 per cent of the seats.

Living in the comforts of our homes, we have shown a callous disregard for the sufferings of the poor, and in the name of the emergency we have imposed taxes which are preposterous. Now, there is this Gold Control Order. It has deprived lakhs of goldsmiths of their livelihood. Even when people are killed on the battle-field, the Government provide for their families. It would have been more better for the goldsmiths to die in the battlefield, then, at least something would have been granted by Government for their families. Here by a stroke of the pen the authorities have deprived people of their livelihood. It is said that more than one hundred of them have committed suicide. And they were not given even six months time to rehabilitate themselves, and to learn a trade or a profession. They are out of work altogether. This order was pro-

mulgated because it was said that there was smuggling. If there was smuggling, I say that it is the duty of the police, and it is the duty of the administration to check it.

On a former occasion, when there were many thefts in the trains, it was not the thieves that were put behind the bars; it was we the public or the travellers who were put behind the bars of the windows, from which in an accident there could be no escape, because they were barred up. Instead of putting the evil-doers behind the bar, they put their customers behind the bar. This is a very strange arrangement.

Now, the emergency exists.....

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member has taken forty-five minutes already.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** I shall take a few minutes more. Today the emergency exists not for the Government but for the Opposition, so that if they raise the voice of the people they are considered as traitors. So far as senior members of the ruling party are concerned, they do not know that there is an emergency, and we saw it yesterday in this House. The emergency is merely to frighten us, to tell the people that we are against the war effort. Those who have been urging stringent measures against the Chinese have repeatedly been accused of hampering war effort, because they have spotlighted the grievances of the people. This is how things go on here.

It is said that the Opposition parties make only destructive criticism, and that they have no constructive proposals. But the constructive part of it, to a wise man, arises from the criticism that I have offered here. What you have done, you have to undo and take a defferent way. But then, who am I to give any constructive.....

**Mr. Speaker:** That would be misunderstood if instead of addressing me,



the hon. Member addresses the Government direct.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** I thought that I was addressing the Government. I am sorry, Sir. 'You' comes in, but it is not actually meant for you.

Even if I were to give some constructive proposals, is this Government going to listen to me? No. They are all-wise; they are all-seeing; they have all the wisdom in the world. Nobody's words can affect them. So, I am not giving it for their benefit, but I give it for the benefit of the public.

The first thing that I want is that the people be provided with good government. To that end, I want that the services, both political and administrative, be honest, upright, efficient, hard-working and intelligent. Those in power, whether in the administration or in the political field must consider themselves as servants of the people—Congressmen get annoyed when the word 'servant' is used—Every case of corruption and negligence in high places must be investigated by some competent judicial authority, and immediate action taken. If immediate action is not taken, the investigation has no value. The findings of such an authority must be kept before the Parliament. Otherwise, I think that it is injustice to people who are accused of having done something or the other. For instance, we saw yesterday that it was very unjust to my hon. friend Shri K. D. Malaviya, that there should be no investigation, when he says that he is innocent, when he says that neither witnesses were called nor lawyers were allowed; I do not know how you can hang a man on a *prima facie* case. Sir, you have been a High Court judge. Would you condemn anybody on a *prima facie* case?

In foreign affairs, what I want is that we wait no more on the Chinese for negotiations. We have waited long enough. Let us do what we want to do without reference to them. The first thing in this connection is that we

reoccupy our lands vacated by the Chinese. Let us also stop sending ever-increasing protest notes which are thrown in the waste-paper basket. Let us take note of further aggression from China and inform our people of it and also inform the world at large. The constant and unending protest notes only humiliate us. I would also want the end of our diplomatic relations with China. On all evidence, our representatives there are constantly and deliberately insulted and humiliated. Any insult or humiliation offered to our representatives by a foreign country is a humiliation for this country, and an insult to this country.

I remember how our representative in China was obliged to be present at the banquet which was given to celebrate the signing of the treaty between China and Pakistan, by which Pakistan gave away big chunks of our territory to china.

**Some Hon. Members:** Shame!

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** We are considered to be very self-respecting people, and yet we do things that no self-respecting nation in the world would do.

Let us then prepare ourselves psychologically and physically for the task of defending our country and driving our enemies from our soil. To this end we must take all military and financial aid that we can from any country on reasonable terms. I believe that if these things are done something yet can be achieved.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are these suggestions for the present Government or the one that will follow?

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** For the people. I have no hope from this Government. It has failed in everything. I have hope in my people. If these things are not done...

**Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh** (Parbhani): You have hope in yourself.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** Then many Congressmen have asked me: if this

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

Government leaves, who comes in? If this Government leaves, there will be a general election. Whoever has the majority in the general election shall form the Government, and if no party is in a majority, there can be a coalition Government.

**An Hon. Member:** Chaos.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** It is only in England and in America that there are two big parties, but in all other democratic countries, it is customary to have coalition governments and those governments are going on. So it is not necessary that one party should have a preponderating strength in this House. Even if there are a few parties, they can unite, as we have united this time (*Interruptions*). Remember, so far as the government of the country is concerned, there can be no vacuum. 'The King is dead. Long live the King'.

And if you want to know my credentials, I have got so many telegrams from all over India. I have not been able to read them. Here they are. They say that this Government is tyrannical, it must go. If you like, I may lay them on the Table of the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion moved.....

**Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh:** What to do with the telegrams?

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion moved.

"That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers".

The House has 15 hours for its discussion. The time is to be divided between the ruling party and the Opposition. The Opposition gets 6 hours and the ruling Party 9.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy** (Kendrapara): It should be equally divided.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** It should be equally divided.

**Shri Priya Gupta** (Katihar): The ruling party should be given only half an hour.

**Shri Raghunath Singh** (Varanasi): It should be 60 : 40.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** What will they talk about? The ruling party may be given only half the time. They are ruling over here.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** Shall I lay these telegrams on the Table of the House?

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not asking him. He may do whatever he likes.

So far as this Motion is concerned, I cannot deny the ruling Party its legitimate share because it is in the dock. It has to answer charges. Therefore, that proportion would continue, that is, 40 and 60. The Communists have not joined in this common motion that is there. Therefore, they will have a separate share.

So far as other parties are concerned Acharya Kripalani just said 'We have all joined together'. So, they can divide it among themselves and decide which speakers they want (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Priya Gupta:** The Congress Members are very jubilant.

**Mr. Speaker:** Now, I will have to place a time-limit on speeches.

**Dr. M. S. Aney** (Nagpur): This division of time is among the parties which are regularly formed. Those who are not in any parties are entirely ignored. We seek your protection. You fix some time for them also.

**Mr. Speaker:** For their rights, they unite; for their obligations, they pull apart. That should not be the case.

**Shri H. P. Chatterjee** (Nabadwip): Why do you say that we unite only for rights? I do not agree. I have supported both the communist motion and the other motion. I am an Independent.

**Mr. Speaker:** If he is, the exception proves the rule.

**Shri Ranga** (Chittoor): Without consulting any of us, you have been good enough to make some statement now that all the others who have united in giving notice of this no-confidence motion should settle it between themselves.

**Mr. Speaker:** It was only a suggestion of mine. I am not imposing anything.

**Shri Ranga:** I do not know at what stage your suggestion becomes a direction.

**Mr. Speaker:** No. It would be better if he hears me. Then probably it will be clear.

If they cannot decide among themselves, the time taken by Acharya Kripalani would be deducted from the allotment for the Opposition and the rest would be divided according to the numbers that each party has. That is the only reasonable course that I can adopt.

Now probably Shri Ranga has no objection at all.

Now, unless there are special reasons, I cannot put up the time-limit. So far as the communists are concerned, because they have their own time, they can decide whether to put up one, two or three speakers. I am not concerned with it. So far as others are concerned, normally it would be 20—30 minutes. I suppose that would be enough.

**Shri Ranga:** You give us the privilege to make our own allotment so far as our respective times are concerned.

**डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद):** अध्यक्ष महोदय, जो बिल्कुल नया सदस्य है और जिस ने पिछले १५ वर्षों से . . .

**अध्यक्ष महोदय:** जो पहले से खड़े हुए हैं उन की बात को अगर माननीय सदस्य

सुन लेने देते तो उस के बाद मैं उन की भी सुन लेता ।

**डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :** ठीक है, मैं बैठ जाता हूँ ।

**Shri Ranga:** Kindly give us the privilege of arranging it between our own speakers, to make our own allotment.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have no objection.

**डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :** सरकार [अपने कामों से १५ वर्ष से बोल रही है । इस समय उसे ६ घंटे देना अनुचित होगा । मेरे जैसा आदमी जो पिछले १५ वर्ष से इस घड़ी के लिए आशा लगाए हुए था, पहली दफा बोलना है तो उन को आप क्या करेंगे ? इसलिये मैं आप से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि हम जैसे लोगों को कुछ ज्यादा मौका मिले । चाहे हमारी ताकत यहां कुछ हो या न हो लेकिन देश में तो है ना ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अब मुझे ताकत यहां की देखनी है । बाहर की ताकत से मुझे सरोकार इतना नहीं होगा क्योंकि ज्यादा तो मुझे जो अन्दर ताकत है उसे देखना है । अगर माननीय सदस्य बहुत अर्से से आशा लगाए हुए थे और उन की आज आशा पूरी हुई है तो उन को जो वक्त मुनासिब है वह जरूर मिलेगा । मगर जितना वक्त इस हाउस ने मुकर्रर किया है कि कुल इतने समय में सारी बहस खत्म हो वह मेरा और जो दूसरे चेअर पर होंगे उन का फर्ज होगा कि उस के अन्दर यह सारी बहस खत्म कर दी जाय ।

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** May I submit that you should not consider the motion as you normally consider other discussions. I think you should use your discretion. Although three days have been fixed, you should not limit speeches, as you have suggested, to only 20—30 minutes. We have to project our own point of view. This is a serious matter. It is the only

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedi]

occasion when this House has this opportunity to discuss this matter. Therefore, I beg of you to extend the time at least by a day so that we can get more time for the discussion. Otherwise, we shall have to rush in and the discussion will not be worthwhile.

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द** (करनाल) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक मिनट . . . .

**अध्यक्ष महोदय** : आप बैठ जायें ।

**Shri Frank Anthony** (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): I would like to add to what Shri Dwivedy has said. You know it better than I do, but may I very respectfully submit that you do not adopt any rigid division between the ruling Party and the Opposition? May I also respectfully request that you consider extending the debate within your discretion by one hour each day? You will remember that in the Business Advisory Committee we said 3 days, not less than 15 hours. We did not say you would not have your normal discretion.

**Mr. Speaker**: I remember very well what I said, and I will keep to that.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath**: May I remind you and the House that last November the resolution moved by the Prime Minister was discussed for full seven days. This motion is of equal importance at least, and the time should be extended. You have discretion, you are master of the House, and if the debate is proceeding at a good pace, you will kindly extend the time.

**Mr. Speaker**: This much must be appreciated that the House has taken a decision. Only one speech has taken place. There is no occasion yet at this moment to consider that an extension is necessary.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy**: Because you have limited the time.

**श्री बागड़ी** : समय बढ़ा दिया जाये ।

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द** : मैं आप से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार सोलह बरसों से बहुत बोलती रहती है। उस की सारी करतूत जनता के सामने है। इसलिये उस को ज्यादा समय नहीं मिलना चाहिये। अगर उस को समय मिलना ही है, तो बहुत थोड़ा मिलना चाहिये।

आप ने कहा है कि आप ने हाउस को देखना है। मेरी प्रार्थना है कि पिछले चुनाव हो चुके हैं। उस में कांग्रेस को कितनी सीटें मिली हैं, या तो आप उन से अन्दाजा लगाइये, अथवा मिनिस्ट्री से सब त्यागपत्र दे कर मैदान में आ जायें और फिर आप हाउस को देखें। (Interruptions.)

**अध्यक्ष महोदय** : मैं तो अन्दर ही स्वामी जी से डरता रहता हूँ। वह बाहर के लिए मुझे क्यों चेलेंज करते हैं।

**डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया** : तर्क को देख लीजिए ।

**श्री बागड़ी** : समय बढ़ा दिया जाये । (Interruptions.)

**अध्यक्ष महोदय** : जो माननीय सदस्य इस तरह बोलते रहेंगे, यह वक्त मैं उन के वक्त से काट लूंगा ।

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta Central): It is nearly tragic that so soon after the crisis of November, 1962, when our people with heart-warming unanimity had entrusted this Government with the twin tasks of maintaining the country's integrity and dignity and of accelerating its social and economic development at the same time, a situation has been created when, in sheer desperation at the Government's ineptitude, so many of our people have come to feel that this Government should quit the job which it appears unable to perform.

13.33 hrs.

[M8. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

If Government, secure in the thought that it has a massive majority in this House, ignores the grave significance of this reversal of public feeling, so much the worse for this Government. For all the pride that power and pomp may have lent them, the people have put the Council of Ministers in the pillory, and irrespective of the fate of this motion they will remain in the pillory, morally till they justify themselves.

I have not hesitated to say this though my party and I do not by any means fully subscribe to the motion made by Shri Kripalani. In the motion for which we had vainly sought the permission of this House, we had tried to make our position clear. Unlike Shri Kripalani and most of his allies, what we want is that the Council of Ministers as constituted at present should go, and that the Prime Minister should reorganise it, keeping out reactionary Ministers, among whom, of course, the Finance and Food and Agriculture Ministers take the cake,.....

**Shri Ranga:** And also the Prime Minister.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:**... assuring the country that the basic national policies would be genuinely implemented. Non-alignment in foreign policy, which Shri Kripalani chose to ridicule by referring even to Panch-sheel terms which go against the very grain of Indian culture and Indian history, non-alignment in foreign policy and the quickest possible advance to a socialist society are pre-eminently matters which most of those who have massed behind Shri Kripalani resist. That is why we disassociate ourselves emphatically from their stand. The camp of which Shri Kripalani is the principal spokesman is aimed against the Prime Minister, against non-alignment, against planned development, against the public sector, against friendly relations with the USSR and

other socialist countries, against building up of our own independent defence potential. We have no truck with all that, and we seek to halt the shift to the right which has taken place very seriously inside the Government. We want to help our people to secure relief by strengthening our economy, by building up our defences without surrendering to Anglo-American blackmail and the anti-national pressures of our own profit-mongers.

Shri Kripalani has naturally made much of the Government's faults of omission and commission in the sphere of defence. I shall leave it to the Government mainly to defend its own position, because that is the proper way of proceeding in this kind of matter. But I feel that it is fair to remember that raking up the past might not always be a good thing, and if we remember the past when we all wanted to move together in the tasks of maintaining the country's dignity and securing the country's development, then we should not be unconscionable of the obligations which continue even today. It may be devil the present and the future if we rake up too much of the past. It is right and proper also that we all stand together on this issue, for today on account of the Government's determined pursuit of peace with honour, our acceptance of the Colombo proposals which China still rejects, and our determination that our frontiers must remain inviolate, on account of these China finds itself increasingly isolated.

But I see also that there are perhaps too many trappings of unnecessary secretiveness in our defence policy which Parliament has a right to resist. Parliament might very well be taken a great deal more into confidence by a serious discussion of our military situation.

We live in a world in which, situated as it is, with the blocs balanced as they are, perhaps even with our limited resources we can make sure that aggression against us would not pay. In regard to that, Parliament

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

rightfully has a legitimate justification for asking that the cards be placed on the table, in conformity, of course, with the interests of the country's security.

Shri Kripalani and his friends, however, are carried away by certain fixations about which we have warned the country repeatedly, and I wish to repeat that warning. Unless we are careful, we may find ourselves committed to a military machine which will eat into our economy and make us even more vulnerable to the pressures of an ideologically divided world.

Only recently the Prime Minister wrote an article in the American journal *Foreign Affairs* of April, 1963, where he made a statement which I am quoting:

"India is such an outstanding member of the non-aligned community that her defection, whether voluntary or enforced, cannot fail to bring grave and far-reaching consequences in its train".

And then the Prime Minister went forward to say that we shall not be panicked into abandoning either the goal or the methods of our foreign policy. This is a very heartening statement. But in the Voice of America agreement episode, by no means over yet, we find a hideous reminder of the dangers that lurk in so many places. The Prime Minister has said since that the agreement has to be changed since it involves an infringement of our non-alignment policy. He has said also that it had not been processed through the Cabinet properly. The matter was briefly mentioned to him, a very perfunctory proceeding.

Shri Ranga: Three times.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: As Prime Minister, naturally he has taken the responsibility for it. He would. It is his job to do so, and he has done so. But the entire business is unsavoury

and steps must be taken in regard to it.

Have things come to this pass that the rightist elements in the Government and a circle of highly placed officials, in league with the Americans, make an agreement and impose it on the country as an accomplished fact, without the sanction of the Cabinet and in flagrant violation of the basic policies of the country?

Shri Ranga: The Prime Minister was an accomplice.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Apart from the Prime Minister who has taken the responsibility, and who would be speaking on this matter no doubt, I have read in the papers a speech made by the Deputy Minister of Information and Broadcasting, defending this agreement. The Minister himself has kept a very discreet silence. As to whether that is a part of valour I do not know. I have seen references in the press to the participation in this matter of the External Affairs Ministry, on whose behalf a very highly placed official had given the clearance, saying the matter could be proceeded with. I have seen today in the Parliamentary Library a copy of the *Organiser* which, I believe, is the organ of the Jan Sangh which is represented here in a fair number, the *Organiser* dated the 19th August, I see there a photograph of the Secretary of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and a caption that he has signed this agreement on the orders of the President. This variation of the theme emendaciously and deliberately peddled by top United States papers that President Radhakrishnan was coming up.....

Shri Ranga: ... on the advice of the Prime Minister.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: All this took place while Governmental celebrities like my friend Shri Krishnamachari and others were having a sort of a relay race to the United States of

America. There must be something very fishy about it; it stinks to high heavens and I wish the matter is examined and Government comes forward with a full statement of explanation of the position. Here on Indian soil the United States Ambassador says in a Press Conference that the agreement is.....

**Shri Ramanathan Chettiar (Karur):** Sir, on a point of order. I think the ruling of the Chair has been that any reference to the President should be avoided. The hon. speaker refers to the President.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He only said that it was the President's order.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** The American ambassador has told us that it is irrevocable, implying thereby that unpleasant things might ensue if we did something about it. Luckily we are not a United States colony and never shall be. Powerful people in Government and in bureaucracy have all but lashed us in a humiliating situation and if we did not rectify the situation soon enough, our name will be mud especially with our Afro-Asian friends and with socialist countries like the Soviet Union. Whatever the consequential loss to us might be, we must not be a megaphone of the Voice of America. Even if for Bokaro, that wonderful example of dilly-dallying over aid, of which we were told by Shri Krishnamachari in a public statement printed in this country's papers that the United States had been completely committed, if even in regard to Bokaro the Americans chose to withdraw their support and did other things to endanger our Plan, we shall never barter away our self-respect. The remissness of the E.A. Ministry is very noticeable and this being the Prime Minister's particular pigeon, he should be extremely careful and tone up his administration.

Incidentally, it was his Minister of State who went recently to West Berlin and made a gratuitous observation about the Berlin wall being a "condemnation" of the German Democratic Republic, a sort of a diplomatic 837 (Ai) LSD—6.

*faux pas* which is most undesirable, particularly in the present context of our country. The Prime Minister should bear in mind that exactly on account of things like this, India's old democratic socialist image has become increasingly difficult to put across; it is exactly because things like this happen from time to time that our stand on non-alignment on which the Prime Minister himself is unequivocal is being suspected in Asia and Africa and our diplomats abroad generally innocent of the foundations of our foreign policy are unable to intervene at any level to help things. Our stock of goodwill perhaps is still sufficient to permit recovery of lost prestige and influence but it will need very serious effort which the Government has got to make.

I turn now to the question of air exercises, virtually a euphemism for the notorious air umbrella about which so much is being heard in recent times. We are still to study in detail the Prime Minister's statement which he placed on the Table of the House, we could not hear it because of its length. But we do fear that this is the first step towards the United States and the United Kingdom getting basis in this country. They are called to familiarise themselves with our terrain. What business have they to familiarise themselves with our terrain, especially the strategic and crucial terrain of the Himalayan region? (*Interruptions.*) *An Hon Member:* The Chinese can familiarise themselves?) They may come and go but later they may come and not go back, I do not know. Things may not remain in the same posture. If my friends like Acharya Kripalani push on with strength sometimes on account of Government's ineptitude, there is additional strength to their elbow—and I do not quite know what may happen. These exercises may very well be something which is very different from what might be envisaged by individuals in the Government like the Prime Minister himself.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee].

Is it only to train our men in radar? If that is so, cannot we buy supersonic planes and train our men? Of cannot we send several hundreds of young Indians who can go abroad for training for this purpose? Why must foreigners "familiarise" themselves with our own Himalayan region by flying over them with full military facilities? I want also to know this. Radar is only a sort of a method of spotting hostile forces across. But how about tackling the hostile forces? Are we getting fast enough planes? Are we getting the other apparatus necessary in order to tackle that sort of thing? Do the United States or the United Kingdom promise us immediate delivery of such planes and other apparatus which would be the necessary follow up? Or do we have to go to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in order to have that sort of help? After all when the Soviet Union helps us, it helps us not only with the offer of machines but with a factory to build those machines. Those other people who are helping us get all the credit in the world. I am sometimes sickened by the exaggerated effusions of expression of gratitude to the United States for aid given from this country? I do not mind our saying: thank you, certainly. They did a job when we were in trouble. But the effusion of thanks which is offered from this country is nothing short of sickening; but that happens. Of course the kind of help they give is always fraught with dangers as far as our future is concerned. Let us know what has happened in other countries where they have crept into the picture, sometimes walked boldly and brazenly into the colonial and ex-colonial territories. They have done such damage that we are even now trying to rectify it from the international point of view and we have not succeeded.

Time being limited, I have to turn to questions relating more closely to our internal policy. There what we find is that disaster is wrought on

millions of our people and vast gains are conferred on the biggest financial sharks but the two Ministers responsible primarily for this, the Ministers of Finance and of Food and Agriculture are going scotfree, going on a pilgrimage when there is an emergency and that sort of thing. They are welcome to do so. I myself very much welcome the opportunity of being taken to places like Amarnath, such wonderful places, if Government gives us facilities which are so badly needed for this kind of journey; but I would like to remind this House of one thing. When a few railway accidents took place, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, several years ago, resigned. Then, later, recently we had some reshuffling of portfolios. When Shri Krishnamachari in his indiscretion assisted one individual called Mundra, something happened to Shri Krishnamachari. The former Defence Minister, Mr. Menon, might conceivably be held responsible for the loss of perhaps a division which was not expected or foreseen by anybody who could properly advise him and he had to pay a price. Shri Malviya took Rs. 10,000 for his party funds, a drop in the crores cornered by the Congress from the profits of companies, but he had to pay a price because against him was the apparatus set up by the oil companies of the world here. Wherever they have gone, they have practised banditry of a description about which no doubt the Prime Minister is a great deal more conversant than I am, and those oil companies have taken recourse to bribery, to murder, to subversion of Government in whichever country they wanted to dominate; here, in this country we have seen the spectacle of those oil companies and their subsidiary interests carrying on a witch-hunt and a smearing campaign in order to single out that particular gentleman. On this very issue, an independent journal like the *Economic Weekly* of Bombay has written a leading article called the "Immorality of Ethics" which shows how terribly the Congress has compromised



itself by taking action against one man for a reason which was technically perhaps feasible but not taking action against others who are wallowing in a kind of corruption which is really eating into the vitals of this country in the wrongest possible manner.

The Finance Minister is there. He issued a Gold Control Order; we welcomed it. We wanted the stoppage of gold smuggling. We wanted the unnatural preoccupation of our people with gold as a very wonderful metal to go. We wanted our foreign exchange position to improve. But what happened? The net result has been that however Shri Morarji Desai might choose to repudiate it by answers which do not conform to facts, the fact remains that several hundred thousand goldsmiths, the poorest sort of people, who work in the jewellery shops—not those who are owners of those shops—are starving and they are thrown out of their jobs. Nothing is done about them. Very paltry things have so far been done about it. Surely, in seven or eight months' time a great deal more would have been done about it. We talk so much about co-operatives. Every month a Co-operative Number of some Government periodical appears. Articles are written by all sorts of people but nothing is being done to bring about co-operative organisations of those goldsmiths who can be given alternate occupation at a very much quicker pace. The Finance Minister himself comes to this House and gives answers which are a study in callousness. He does not even know that suicide cases have taken place. It is his business to know. He has got a lot of people to assist him. He has got five or six personal secretaries and personal assistants and God knows what. He has got the whole apparatus of the administration. I may not be in a position to read all the newspapers in the country. But the Finance Minister cannot say, "I do not know about the suicides of these people." Only the day before yesterday the Finance

Minister chose to say, "I do not know if hundreds or thousands of people are going to jail." Possibly, when a question is formulated in this House there might be some exaggeration in the formulation, but there are people going to jail in large numbers, sometimes women with young children in their arms. They may be misguided; some people might be trying to fish in troubled waters; but there are these people, poor suffering people, starving people, thrown on to the scrap-heap of unemployment, and they are trying to register their grievance with the people's Government as they choose to call this Government. But nothing happens, and the Finance Minister chooses to say, "I know nothing about it. I do not care. I do not care a tinker's curse about it." He would have said perhaps he did not care a tinker's curse about it, but that may not come from a puritanically-minded person! He does not talk the language which I do. But what is he doing, otherwise? Has he done anything to get something out of the privy purses of our princes, some of whom are most estimable people and whom we know personally? Has he done anything substantial? Can he show anything to stop evasion by tax thieves as far as income-tax evasion is concerned? Has he done anything to touch the gold hoards which are there all over the country? Ever since I came to Parliament, probably 11 years ago, I have been asking that there are safety, security vaults in banks and other places, and God knows what is secreted behind those vaults. I was told once by Shri A. C. Guha here who, at that time, was the Minister of State for Revenue and Expenditure, that Government has got the powers to open these security vaults and find out what there is. But up till now not a thing has been done to open these vaults, to find out what there is inside them, to find out if there is gold, to find out if there is black money. I do not say, expropriate them, but I want you to find out what is there. Take charge of it. Even pay

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

interest to your friends who deposit in those security vaults. But do not let that money remain secreted in those vaults. Surely, gold is hidden somewhere, and can you not find them out? Cannot the Home Minister find out who is doing damage to the defence interests of this country? He is scooping down on Communists and other people. Can he not do something to find out something more about those hoards of gold in this country? Nothing of the sort is done because that is not the policy of the Government. It is not a Government which will support, as far as the Finance Ministry particularly is concerned, the interests of the common-man. It is a Government which will stand only by the interests of big money bags. That is why I make this charge, subject to correction; funds out of the LIC money are sent to the stock exchange at particularly critical times so that the big speculators, the monopolists, who are deeply in collusion with Government are not in trouble; so that the stock exchange might come back to something like the normal equilibrium. The monies of the LIC are very often utilised for that purpose.

Add to that the crushing taxation of the lower income-group the thunderclap of the compulsory deposit scheme which is found perhaps administratively almost impossible. Against that, organised working people are trying to register their protests by refusing to accept their pay-packet, by not accepting their pay, because deductions are being made from the income of people who cannot make both ends meet on any computation whatever. So, all these are taking place, instead of nationalising banks and foreign oil companies and the export and import trade apart from toning up income-tax collections and getting something out of the privy purse and so many other things.

I have not got the time to go into

detail over it. But I may invite the Finance Minister, if at all he has any conscience about this matter, to ask Members of the House and others who are interested, to help them with concrete suggestions in regard to how, without taking recourse to such things as compulsory deposit scheme and surcharge on land revenue, he can get monies which we all wish should be devoted in the interests of development of the country and in the interests of the country's defence. But that has not been so.

I might be saying something rather rhetorical but I do feel that the story of the work of the Ministry of Finance is an epic of infamy. There is no doubt about it. Personally I like Shri Morarji Desai. (*Interruption*). He is a very straight man. I know where I stand in regard to his ideology. In regard to personal matters, he is a very straight man; he gives you a straight answer every time you ask questions. He does not shilly-shally; he does not hedge; he does not beat about the bush. He gives you a straight answer. But he does not belong with the people who are working for the socialist pattern of society. If the Congress has given over that idea, well and good. Let that idea go for all I care, but as long as the Congress wants the socialist pattern of society he is a person who does not belong to it.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** He should join the Communists!

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Then, what shall we say about the Minister of Food and Agriculture? He is a very powerful personality. (*Interruption*). And he is very pleasant and companionable. Indeed, I would like to have a cup of tea or some other beverage with him rather than with most other Ministers. (*Interruption*). But what is happening to his talents? Why is it that he has made a mess much worse even than any former Food Minister who had preceded him had done? He has made a hell of a

lot of speeches. One should not grieve too much in times of stress; but, is it necessary for the defence of India that rice should be selling at Rs. 40 per maund and the profiteers should mint money at the same time? I know the United States lobby in this country is very active, for millions of rupees are available out of the PL 480 fund. The United States lobby tells us that only the present Food and Agriculture Minister can get the food for us from the United States, which implies a threat and blackmail against us. But we cannot accept that proposition. We should rather judge the Food and Agriculture Minister by the results of his work, and the results have been disastrous. With all his flair for optimistic speeches, those speeches have created a smokescreen and the people do not know what is what, after having heard them. Even he has to admit lately that his policies have substantially failed.

A long time ago, the Asoka Mehta Committee, for which I hope some hon friends have a soft corner, had recommended progressive socialisation of wholesale trading in gradual stages no doubt. And, the Government in concurrence with the States had formulated schemes to that end. Our Minister had no heart for such schemes of interference with what he calls the normal channels of the trade. He waxed eloquent once upon a time on the World Food Bank Centre in the United States and the massive P.L. 480 aid which we are going to get, the bounty which has come from America. He has wasted his energy and time because he has not taken steps regarding increase of foodgrains production. Only on the 15th of this month, on the Independence Day, in some of the special supplements I read an article by Dr. K. L. Rao, the latest entrant to the Government, where he has said that in a very quick time merely by improvement in irrigation we can get nearly double the increase in the production of agriculture. We have spent about Rs. 2,000 crores in irrigation and allied things in the last

twelve years or so, and yet the results have not been at all considerable. Why? Why should this happen? This happened because the Government does not know where to start and what to do. In regard to land reforms about which the panel of the Planning Commission has been shouting themselves hoarse, we know what is happening. Even today, I think, in this House there is pending a Constitution (Amendment) Bill which tells us that something is being done in Kerala particularly to make sure that nothing is done in order to bring about at least some tangible improvement in the condition of the poor agriculturists.

14 hrs.

In the meantime, the rise in prices has gone forward so much. During the financial year 1962-63 the wholesale price index of rice went up by about 7.8 per cent, while in the short period of three months, March to June, of 1963 the rise has been of the order of 12.5 per cent. What happens to distribution? What happens to the co-operative method of doing things? Shri Patil has said that he is the businessman's best friend, and that is why the results are as dismal as they have been.

Shri Patil has also complained that the States do not pay much attention to agriculture. The States on their part hold the Centre responsible for the confusion. Up to now his Ministry has not cleared the States' confusion about the Centre's stand on State Trading. The States set up the machinery and spent money on it, but now that Shri Patil has scuttled State Trading they find themselves in a quandary.

Therefore, I am sorry to have to say that in spite of oozing so much of optimism and energy he is a symbol of inaction and ineptitude. Last November, in the height of the crisis a conference was held in Delhi which was addressed by Mr. B. R. Sen, Director-General of the U.N. Agricultural Organisation. I am quoting from States-

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

man dated 7th December 1962. There, in Shri Patil's presence, Mr. Sen who has been talking about the possibility of a four-fold increase in agricultural production in our part of the world, said:

"Even today India was one of the poorest countries in the world and agricultural yield remained very low. The rate of productivity of land even in China was nearly three times more. This was because of the attention given to better techniques."

This is something which speaks for itself. Sir, I do not wonder if men fail in their jobs or even when they act foolishly, but I often wonder to see them unashamed, and wickedly two Ministers, particularly—they have their bed-fellows also in the Cabinet—appear to us always unashamed about themselves. Perhaps they wear a mask of pride, but its real name is fear, fear of the people whom they do not wish to approach. It is not an easy thing to judge our fellowmen. I am reminded of what is said in a Somerset Maugham story. One chap said to another: "Look here, there is one job I do not care for." The other asked: "Which is that?" The reply was: "Gods on judgment day". It is not easy to judge one's fellowmen, to judge even these ministers. But this Parliament must, and if we do, they are bound to be impeached. Instead of that what happens is, there is a pursuit of men like Shri K. D. Malaviya, but these crucial members of the Cabinet who are subverting the entire basis of the country's agreed policy are there flourishing like anything and perhaps going over for a change—a change may be necessary for the sake of one's health,—to the Congress organisation in order to add to the prestige or whatever else they may have got.

Sir, the Congress I feel has got its responsibility, and I myself might be permitted to say very humbly that even one like me who had the privi-

lege of having been a member of the All-India Congress Committee in the Haripura-Tripuri days feels that a great deal of thinking is needed. The Prime Minister does it fitfully and occasionally and amorphously, but can the Congress really continue as a conditioning force in Indian life if it abandons the socialist pattern at home and non-alignment abroad? Is democracy workable in an under-developed country like ours without the vivifying and unifying pursuit of a national minimum programme by the ruling party? Could the established secular, non-communal policies survive without such a programme? Is it not time, and more than time, for Congress to put its own house in order and put a stop to the creeping forces of counter revolution for which reaction has been furnished lately so many godsend and in which powerful Congressmen also seem to be involved.

But the Congress makes an unimaginative approach—the declaration of the emergency, the operation of emergency, the attack on the Communist Party, the misuse of the Defence of India Rules about which the jurists of this country are nearly unanimous that they are *ultra vires* of the Constitution. The bludgeon is no instrument for national progress in a country which is conscious and proud of its historic role, and this is what I am reminded of when, earlier this morning, the Government showed an attitude to the Bombay strike which only reiterated the Government's character, namely, that it is callous, that it does not care to what happens even to a city like Bombay. That is why it adopts that kind of attitude.

I know that quite often we are under attack and all sorts of things are said about us. But, if I may be allowed to say so, I do not mind that attack. Communism is a force which is emerging out of history. The Communist movement is an instrument thrown up by history which with all our frailties, all our weakness and all our

default, we are trying to understand and operate. We may have shed some of our illusions, but we do not shed our hopes. But we say also that Congress will be goaded by social imperatives to see this phenomenon. That is why socialism is today the goal of all worthwhile efforts.

If I may be permitted to say so I may add that I disregard as inconsequential the flotsam and jetsam in the tide of our history, whether in radical looking forms or in reactionary characters; they would be swept into the limbo where they belong. That is why I stress what I am convinced is the demand of our people, that the Prime Minister reorganises the Government, removes reactionaries from his Cabinet, tones up the administration and restore in governmental work the values and the objectives which Indian freedom necessarily connotes.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I fully realise the seriousness of the occasion, and when I say that Acharya Kripalani started with a thunder but ended with a whimper, I say it not in a spirit of light-heartedness or levity. Acharya Kripalani started with a full and complete condemnation of the Government. He said that the Plans were defective in their formulation, they were defective in their execution, that the rich has become richer and the poor has become poorer, that agricultural economy is stagnant and, talking of the administration, he said, that the administration was corrupt. He said that politicians were accusing one another and he quoted the Congress President, though I must say with regret that he did not quote him correctly. Talking of the foreign policy, he questioned non-alignment and called the five principles of Panch Sheel as nonsense. That is very unfortunate, coming as those words do, from a senior member like Acharya Kripalani. What are the five principles of Panch Sheel? One is non-aggression. Does Acharya Kripalani think that non-aggression, one

country not attacking another, is nonsense? Does he think that respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of other nations is a nonsensical principle? Does he think that non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries is a nonsensical principle? It is rather disappointing that he should talk in a light-hearted manner.

Then, while ending his speech, the Acharya made certain proposals. And what are those proposals? He said that the people must be provided with good government. Who questions? He said that the administration must be good and honest. Who questions that? He said that the politicians and public workers should consider themselves as the servants of the people. Well, this is a well accepted principle and nobody has questioned it.

**An hon. Member:** You have.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Well, we did not interfere when Acharyaji was speaking. And if it comes to that, you will have it.

He suggested investigation into cases of corruption. Well, important cases of corruption are being investigated and they will be investigated in future. There is no doubt about it.

Coming to China, he said that there should be no negotiations. Why should there be no negotiations? If there are honourable negotiations, we should have them, settle our problem through peaceful negotiations, because war is not the only solution left for mankind. Regarding the re-occupation of the land occupied by the Chinese, we have not given up our claim. But, it will have to be done at the proper time. Before we do it, we must be fully prepared. About severing of diplomatic relations with China, a matter like that has always to be left to the Government. Government knows best how long to maintain diplomatic relations with China and when to break them. Then the Acharya added a rider. He wanted these suggestions to be addressed to the whole nation, the people of India

[Shri A. P. Jain]

but not to this House. Perhaps, he had forgotten that the success of his non-confidence motion depends upon the vote of this House.

Then, some of the charges which Acharya Kripalani levelled against the Government are of a very general nature. Talking of the Plan he said that there are no achievements. Well, the Plan has to be looked at from two points of view—short term and long term. We have been implementing the Plans for the last twelve years, and the results are by no means negligible. Here I may quote some achievements of the Plans. During the last twelve years, from 1951-51 to 1962-63, the real income of India has gone up by 47 per cent; agricultural production has increased by 46 per cent; the production of raw cotton has almost doubled; the output of raw jute and sugarcane has increased by 70 per cent; industrial production has more than doubled; the output of machine tools, known as 'mother machines' has gone up by 3,300 per cent. In regard to other commodities like cement, cloth, sugar, steel and power too, production has gone up considerably.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty** (Barrackpore): What about distribution?

**Shri A. P. Jain:** I am coming to that. Do not be in a hurry, madam. Railways are carrying 90 per cent more of goods and the number of commercial vehicles on the road has almost doubled. Regarding social investment, 70 per cent of the children in the age group 6 to 11 years are now going to school, as against 43 per cent in 1950-51. The expectation of life at birth has increased from 32 to 45 years. These are no mean achievements for any economic planning. But then Acharya Kripalani speaks more on sentiments than on facts, and, his utterances cannot carry weight.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** I quoted your leaders the President of the Congress, Rashtrapathi and the Prime Minister himself.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** He quotes everybody, but he does not quote facts. He hates facts; he hates reality.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** How can you say that.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** As regards distribution, there is a certain amount of doubt in the minds of the people whether the increased income has been equitably distributed. However, I can say that attempts are being made to see that the increased income is more equitably distributed.

The public sector has been growing. In 1951 the total investment in the public sector factories was only Rs. 147 crores. Today, it is Rs. 767 crores. In the Third Plan, out of the total investment allocation of Rs. 2,570 crores in organised industry, Rs. 1,470 crores is assigned to the public sector. There are other measures also to ensure that the increased wealth goes increasingly towards the poorer sections of the society. I do not say that the poverty in India has disappeared. India is one of the poorest countries of the world even today. Particularly, the rural sector has very low income and the landless labour working on the field has so far not received much benefit. But, then, ours is a vast country and you cannot achieve everything in a day. All I can say is that production has gone up and increasingly the distribution is being spread wider and made to percolate to the poorer sections of the society.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Has the disparity increased or not? That is the basic point.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** There is no definite evidence to show that the disparity has increased so far. We are waiting for the report of Professor Mahalanobis. When it comes we shall be in a position to assess correctly.

Acharya Kripalani has arraigned the policy of non-alignment. He has ridiculed the policy of Panch Sheel.

These are rather disheartening things. So far as non-alignment is concerned, it is a creed with us. We accepted that policy after understanding its full implications. It is not a policy that we have accepted today; it is a policy which we had devised or evolved in the pre-independence days. It is a policy which our leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, elaborated when he was the Vice-President of the Interim Government. He then defined the foreign policy of India as being based on three pillars.

One of the pillars was to help countries under colonial domination, countries which were under the governance of the European countries, in achieving their freedom. We have helped all such countries in the world, both Asian countries and African countries, to achieve their freedom. There is not a single case in which we did not do our duty.

The second pillar was assessing the formation of some sort of a world structure. At that time, the United Nations was in the making and since then India had made a very valuable contribution in strengthening the United Nations. It has continuously participated in the annual sessions and played a vitally important role.

The third pillar was the policy of non-alignment. It is not a policy of neutrality or passivity; it is an active policy. The Government of India is interested in the world problems but it does not want to tie itself down with either of the two blocs; it does not want to enter into military pacts with any nation of the world. That is the correct policy and that is the policy by which we stand. If that policy was ever fully vindicated it is today. Those very people, the Americans and the Britishers, who were critical of the policy of non-alignment at one time—in fact, they even suspected that we were playing in the hands of the Communists—they are praising this policy today. It is unfortunate that any of our own people, who are expected to understand and appreciate it better, should not

realise its real efficacy and soundness. What does Averell Harriman say? He said:—

“It was in the interest of the USA that India should maintain the friendliest possible relations with Russia. . . . The USA had no objection whatever to India getting military aid from Russia as well as from the Western countries.”

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** What has non-alignment got to do with that?

**Shri A. P. Jain:** If we were aligned with the Americans, the Russians would not help us. If the Acharya does not understand this much, I am sorry I cannot teach him.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** Who told you to align with anybody? Who told you to align yourself with them?

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur):** That shows his cynicism.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** I will give another quotation from Mr. Galbraith. He said:—

“The military assistance which the United States is giving India is not intended to involve India in a military alliance or otherwise influence her policy of non-alignment. We have often said that we accept India's policy in this regard. . . . Our aid is designed to help defend India's independence and not to compromise it.”

Mr. Khrushchev has uttered equally significant words. He said on the 13th December, 1962.—

Mr. Khrushchev has uttered equally is a refusal to join military alliances and equally a refusal to assume that a conflict between the Communist and non-communist world is inevitable. For the rest it is inconsistent neither with receiving military aid nor with exercising its right of self-defence. . . . India's policy of non-alignment, her neutralist policy, has won great moral and political weight in the world.”

[Shri A. P. Jain]

It is true that the policy of non-alignment has been affected so far as China is concerned. We are no more non-aligned with China; we are a belligerent nation. We are seeking assistance from whatever quarter it is forthcoming, whether it is from the capitalist countries or whether it is from the Communist countries, to fight out China.

Acharya Kripalani has profusely quoted from his own speeches made several years ago. May I make a presentation of what he said in 1958:—

“When I was in Europe recently and when I talked about Gandhiji and his message of non-violence, I was asked, ‘What is your country doing? Why are you increasing your armament?’ I had no reply to give.”

Today the apostle of non-violence is saying that it is only we who are guilty of neglect!

In the same speech he went on to say:—

“Who are our enemies? I do not suppose that many nations on our border have any designs on us. For instance, Ceylon cannot have any designs on us, nor can Burma have, nor can Nepal have. Now there are other big countries that are our neighbours from whom there might be likely danger. But let us see China. China is a big country and it is militarized. But with China we have the relations of *Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai* . . .”

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** I was ridiculing it.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** You are ridiculing yourself today; not then. “. . . and they have accepted the Panchshila.” The Acharya was opposing at that time the increase in the defence allocation and surely he could not have talked in a mood of levity at that time.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** On a point of explanation. I was ridiculing this

Government from time to time when they cried *Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai*. Therefore I said, “Against whom are you increasing the military expenditure?”

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** He is consistent even today in ridiculing us.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** Because they had accepted Panchsheel and our idea of peaceful co-existence.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : सारी दुनिया को पढ़ा दो पंचशील ।

**Shri A. P. Jain:** He went on to say:—

“The same is the case with Russia. *Russi-Hindi Bhai Bhai*. They have also accepted Panchsheel. They have also accepted peaceful co-existence. We have no fear from them.”

The language speaks for itself. It shows whether he was in a light mood and ridiculing us or he was serious. Today he might try to give twist or give a new interpretation, but the whole of his speech is published. It is corrected by him and it is there in the Indian Hansard. One can see whether he was ridiculing or he was serious.

**Shri Tyagi:** In which Party was he then?

**Shri A. P. Jain:** The P.S.P. He has been changing sides.

**Shri Badrudduja (Murshidabad):** He had been in the Congress for a long time.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** He is a migrating bird.

**Shri Badrudduja:** He was the Congress President.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** There was a time when most of India did not think that we shall wage war with any country.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** Is it not what I said?

**Shri A. P. Jain:** That is what he said and that is what we also said.



That was one of the reasons why there was lack of preparation.

Acharya Kripalani sometimes says very wise. In the year 1959, as reported in Volume XXXVII, column 6668 of the Lok Sabha Reports, the Acharya said:—

"In the last two world wars, neither England nor America were prepared. They prepared themselves in the midst of conflicts. It is conflict that brings about the unity of the country and brings about the best that is in people."

It was something very wise. But is he acting upon it? What is the position today? The other day the hon. Prime Minister made a statement in the House in which he said:—

"There has been, during the last few months, considerable activity by way of construction of barracks, gun emplacements, storage dumps and air-fields near the Indian border. There has also been great activity in the construction of roads, laying of underground telephone lines and construction of inter-connecting subterranean trenches along these border areas. Chinese land and air intrusions into Indian areas and Indian air space have also increased considerably."

We do not know what is the objective of Chinese. They might be trying to keep up or sustain the tension or they might be thinking of another attack; but in either case we have to be prepared. Is this the manner in which Acharya Kripalani proposes to prepare the country?

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** Cabinet Ministers fighting with each other is preparing the country.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** I did not interrupt when he was speaking though I was sitting very close to him. Why can he not keep patience?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Nobody disturbed Acharyaji when he spoke.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** I am only correcting him.

**Shri A. P. Jain:** A vote of no-confidence is a very serious matter. It is only on very rare occasions that a vote of non-confidence is given. In fact, the person or the Party which gives a vote of no-confidence must be prepared to assume the responsibility for the government. I was very much heartened to hear Professor Hiren Mukerjee completely dissociating himself from Acharya Kripalani's of no-confidence. He dissociated himself from the Acharya Kripalani's motion of no-confidence. He dissociated himself from the Acharya's views about non-alignment. He dissociated himself from the Acharya's views about planning and public sector.

Acharya Kripalani said that the Congress has secured only 45 or 46 per cent of the votes and that the Opposition had secured more than 54 per cent votes. Hence the vote of non-confidence had the support of the majority of the people of India. It is a gullible way of putting things. The Communists are not with him. There are a large number of independents who do not share his opinion.

What are the people he is representing? He is representing four groups here, namely, the PSP, the SP, the Jan Sangh and the Swatantra Party.

**An Hon. Member:** Republicans. . . (Interruption).

**Shri A. P. Jain:** Major parties, I said. There may be minor parties.

What is common between them on the policy of non-alignment or on planning or on the public sector? They all hold divergent views. They are strange bedfellows. After his success at Amroha Acharya Kripalani made a very bold attempt at what was known, as the Socialist Unity Conference to work out a minimum programme. What was his minimum programme? It was, firstly, that the administration should be made clean and efficient no quarrel with it.

Then, accord with Pakistan. On it there are different views among shri

[Shri A. P. Jain]

Kripalani's supporters. So far as the Government is concerned, we want to have a peaceful settlement with Pakistan. But then he has friends, the Jan Sangh, who recently passed a resolution to the effect that Kashmir must be integrated with India and there should be no further negotiations. He has to take care of his friends.

The Acharya talked of Chinese aggression. So far as the Chinese aggression is concerned, there is no basic difference in the approach of the Congress and others excepting that there might be a shade of difference here or there.

Then the third item of the programme was: expansion of social justice instead of abstract ideas of socialism. It is very difficult to understand what it means. He wants to give up socialism. Why is he so angry against socialism? It is strange a Socialist Unity Conference should end by giving up its basic tenet of socialism. Well, it is for him to do anything.

Another item was the consolidation of nationalised industries. His compatriots of the Swatantra party say, no public sector. On the contrary, the P.S.P. and the S.P. have been accusing the Government for the slow progress of the public sector. His group, an odd combination of odd variety of things, conflicting opinions, contradicting ideologies would find impossible to run the Government of India for a few hours. They cannot manage even a government of a petty State.

Lastly, the Acharya advocated control on anti-social activities of the private sector. What have Swatantrites to say about it? Can such a motley crowd of conflicting interests, conflicting opinions, nothing common between them, carry on the administration of the country? Do they want to throw the country into chaos? The Acharya said that if the Government goes out of power, then there should be general elections. Something very

strange. During the Second World War, the United Kingdom, that mother of democracy, did not have general elections.

**Shri J. B. Kripalani:** There is no war.... (*Interruptions*).

**Shri A. P. Jain:** According to him there is no war. It is a strange way in which he wants to proceed. He claims to be a patriot. Is this patriotism? He claims to love India. Is this his love for India? He wants to secure unity of India. Is this the way to secure unity? If his attempts succeed—I am glad that there is not the least chance of it the result would be absolute chaos throughout the country. It is an attempt not only to wreak vengeance against the Congress and against its leader but it is an attempt to demolish the image of Mother India. Thank God, they will not be able to do it. There is not the least chance of the No-Confidence motion going through which is not, I must submit, based on any valid considerations.

With these words, I oppose the No-Confidence motion.

**डा० गोविन्द दास (जबलपुर) :**  
उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं ने बड़े ध्यान से आचार्य कृपलानी जी का भाषण सुना क्योंकि मेरे मन में उन के लिये सदा से बड़ा सम्मान रहा है, आज भी है। वे अपने को शायद महात्मा गांधी का सब से बड़ा अनुयायी मानते हैं। परन्तु हम लोगों में से भी कुछ ने गांधी जी का अनुसरण करने का प्रयत्न किया है और उन के सिद्धान्तों को समझने की कोशिश की है। इस आधार पर जब हम इस समय आचार्य जी का लोक सभा में भाषण सुनते हैं और अमरोहा के चुनावों के बाद उन्होंने जो भाषण दिए हैं, उन को पढ़ते हैं तब हमें बड़ा खेद होता है। हमें जान पड़ता है कि चाहे किसी समय आचार्य जी गांधी जी के बड़े भारी अनुयायी रहे हों, परन्तु इस समय वे गांधी मार्ग को बिल्कुल भूल गए हैं। गांधी जी अंग्रेजों से

लड़े, लम्बे समय तक लड़े, परन्तु वह लड़े एक सिद्धान्त पर और उन की उस लड़ाई में कटुता का कभी कोई अंश नहीं आया। हम देखते हैं कि आचार्य जी का जो भाषण आज यहां हुआ और उन के जो भाषण सदन के बाहर होते हैं, उन से जान पड़ता है कि कटुता की मूर्तिमान प्रतिमा हो गए हैं।

**श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :** वाइसेट जी, आप ने कटुता की नई परिभाषा की है आज।

**डा० गोविन्द दास :** आज हमें दिखाई पड़ रहा है कि उन का सारा द्वेष पंडित जवाहर लाल जी से और कांग्रेस से है और उन के मन में कोई एक व्यक्तिगत टीस घुस गई है कि जिस के सबब से समय असमय वह द्वेष हमें प्रत्यक्ष दिखाई देने लगता है।

एक छोटा सा साहित्यकार होने के नाते मैं मानव की सब से बड़ी चीज मानता हूं सन्तुलन को। यदि मानव अपना सन्तुलन खो दे तो फिर वह सच्चा मानव नहीं रह जाता। आचार्य जी के प्रति मेरी बड़ी श्रद्धा है : मैं बड़े ही विनम्र शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूं कि इस ७५ वर्ष की अवस्था में वह जो कुछ कर रहे हैं जो कुछ उन्होंने ने इस के पहले कहा है, उस से मिलान कर के देखें और देखें कि अपना सन्तुलन वह कहां तक कायम रखे हुए हैं।

यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव कुछ दलों ने मिल कर यहां रखा है। इन सब दलों के सम्बन्ध में एक हिन्दी की गंवारी कहावत मुझे याद आ जाती है : "कहीं की ईंट कहीं का रोड़ा, भानुमती ने कुनबा जोड़ा"। इन के किसी के सिद्धान्त एक दूसरे से नहीं मिलते। इन का कोई तर्क एक दूसरे से नहीं मिलता और यदि आज पंडित जी की सरकार चली जाए, कांग्रेस की सरकार चली जाए जो असम्भव है, तो मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूं कि ये एक दिन भी इस देश का शासन नहीं चला सकते हैं।

**श्री स० मो० बनर्जी (कानपुर) :** आप की मदद ले लेंगे।

**डा० गोविन्द दास :** आज देश की जैसी परिस्थिति है, उस में हम को, मेरे देश को चलाने के लिए, सरकार को चलाने के लिए नेहरू जी से अच्छा और कोई व्यक्तित्व नजर नहीं आता।

इसी के साथ मुझे कहना पड़ता है कि कांग्रेस के सिवा और दूसरी कोई संस्था इस देश में नहीं है जो शासन चला सके। एक अंकों का जाल बिछा कर कृपलानी जी ने कह दिया कि कांग्रेस को ४५ परसेंट वोट मिले हैं, इस को इतने मिले हैं, उस को उतने मिले हैं। अभी मेरे मित्र श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन ने इस का बड़ा सुन्दर उत्तर दिया है। आज चाहे कांग्रेस में कुछ दोष आ गए हों, कुछ स्वार्थी घुस गए हों, लेकिन इतना होने पर भी मेरा यह दावा है कि आज भी जितने अधिक त्यागी, जितने अधिक देश भक्त कांग्रेस संस्था में हैं, उतने इस देश की किसी संस्था में नहीं है। मैं ने दुनिया के प्रायः देशों को घूम कर देखा है और मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि केवल इस देश में नहीं, संसार के किसी देश में आज कांग्रेस के सदृश संस्था नहीं है।

आज दो प्रधान देशों में प्रजातन्त्र चल रहा है, एक इंग्लैंड में और दूसरा अमरीका में। इंग्लैंड की कंजरवेटिव पार्टी, लेबर पार्टी और अमरीका की डिमाक्रटिक पार्टी और रिपब्लिकन पार्टी, इन पार्टियों से कांग्रेस का कोई मिलान नहीं हो सकता। तो आज इस देश का शासन नेहरू जी और कांग्रेस संस्था ही चला सकती है। यह कृपलानी जी भी जानते हैं, यह श्री हीरेन मुर्कजी भी जानते हैं और जितने विरोधी दल के दूसरे सदस्य हैं वह भी जानते हैं इस देश का बच्चा बच्चा इस बात को जानता है, और इस देश के ही नहीं संसार के लोग भी इस बात को जानते हैं। अभी हाल ही में लन्दन के "टाइम्स" ने और वहीं के

[श्री० गोविन्द दास]

“डेनी टेलीग्राफ” ने नेहरू जी और कांग्रेस के लिये क्या लिखा है। कृपलानी जी उस को पढ़ने की कृपा करें।

श्री० कृपलानी : मैं ने पढ़ लिया है।

डा० गोविन्द दास : दूसरे लोग भी पढ़ने की कृपा करें। लन्दन के “टाइम्स” और “डेनी टेलीग्राफ” शायद कभी भी कांग्रेस या नेहरू जी के मित्र नहीं रहे। दोनों ने इस बात को स्वीकार किया है कि इस देश में ठीक शासन नेहरू जी ही चला सकते हैं, कांग्रेस संस्था ही चला सकती है।

श्री राम सेवक यादव: आप को वहाँ की जनता का सर्टिफिकेट नहीं मिल सकता है।

डा० गोविन्द दास : इस संकट काल की स्थिति में यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव तो मुझे बहुत दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण दिखता है। आज तो हमें यह चाहिये था कि जब हमारे देश पर लड़ाई के बादल मंडरा रहे हैं, जब देश पर संकट आया है, कम से कम हम उस में पूर्ण रीति से एक व्यक्ति के साथ होते। और वे जानते हैं इस बात को कि अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव वहाँ पर स्वीकृत होने वाला नहीं है, बहुत बुरी तरह से फेल होने वाला है। जैसा मैं ने आप से कहा, ऐसी संकटकालीन परिस्थिति में इस प्रकार का अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव रखना मैं बहुत दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण घटना मानता हूँ।

सरकार के विरुद्ध जो बात कही गई उन में पहली बात कृपलानी जी ने यह कही कि उद्योग के क्षेत्र में और खेती के क्षेत्र में, दोनों में ही हमारी उन्नति नहीं हुई। मेरे मित्र श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन ने इस के सम्बन्ध में आंकड़े उपस्थित किये। मेरे पास भी वे आंकड़े थे, लेकिन मैं उन की पुनरावृत्ति और पुनरुक्ति नहीं करना चाहता। देखें कृपलानी जी और दूसरे हमारे विरोधी मित्रगण कि उद्योग के क्षेत्र में और खेती के क्षेत्र में इन तीन पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं में, इन पन्द्रह वर्षों में

कितनी उन्नति हुई है। मुझे आश्चर्य होता है य देख कर कि इतने बड़े बड़े बांध, इतने बड़े बड़े कारखाने, जिन को देख कर विदेशी चकित हो जाते हैं, वे कृपलानी जी और उन के दूसरे मित्रों को नहीं दिखाई देते। और क्यों वे उन को नहीं दिखाई देते? वे जानबूझ कर उन्हें नहीं देखना चाहते क्योंकि उन्हें तो व्यक्तिगत टीस है। सरकार को किसी तरह से नीचा दिखलाना और बदनाम करना उन का कर्तव्य है अब इस तरह की बात उन को दिखलाई कैसे देती।

फिर उन्होंने ने शासन के सम्बन्ध में कहा और उस के सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने ने कुछ बातें आप के सामने रखीं।

**Acharya Kripalani:** I gave you quotations from the Congress President who said that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer.

डा० गोविन्द दास : जहाँ तक उन के मुझाव हैं, मैं श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन से बिल्कुल सहमत हूँ कि उन में से कई ऐसे हैं जो हमें स्वीकृत हैं। उन में क्या आपत्ति हो सकती है? लेकिन उन्होंने यह नहीं कहा रचनात्मक मुझाव रखते समय कि उन रचनात्मक मुझावों को कार्य रूप में किस प्रकार से परिणत किया जाय। सारा झगड़ा तो वहाँ आता है। सिद्धान्तों की बातों में और दूसरी कुछ बातों में कोई मतभेद नहीं है। मतभेद तब उपस्थित हो जाता है जब उन सिद्धान्तों को उन रचनात्मक मुझावों को कार्य रूप में परिणत करने का अवसर आता है। कृपलानी जी ने अपने लम्बे भाषण में ऐसी कोई चीज पेश नहीं की कि जिन रचनात्मक मुझावों से हम सन्तुष्ट हैं, जिनको हम लोग कार्य रूप में परिणत भी कर रहे हैं, उन्हें और आगे बढ़ कर कैसे कार्य रूप में परिणत किया जाय।

**Acharya Kripalani:** If you agree with it, why are you criticising it?

डा० गोविन्द दास : फिर हमारी वैदेशिक नीति के सम्बन्ध में, नानअलाइनमेंट के सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने एक बड़ी विचित्र बात कही कि नानअलाइनमेंट को हम नान-वायोलेंस समझते हैं। यह तो किसी ने नहीं कहा। यह उन के दिमाग में कैसे आया। नानअलाइनमेंट और नानवायोलेंस से कभी कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं रहा। इस के साथ उन्होंने ने आगे बढ़ कर कहा कि हमारी नानअलाइनमेंट की नीति को मॉरेलिटी या नैतिकता के ऊपर आधारित किया गया है। यह भी हम ने नहीं कहा। हम यह अवश्य कहते हैं कि आज दुनिया का भला और देश की भलाई नानअलाइनमेंट की पालिसी से है। मैं उन से एक ही प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ। समझ लीजिए कि आज हमारी नानअलाइनमेंट की पालिसी न होती और हम उस पर न चलते होते और रूस ने चीन को प्रोत्साहन दिया होता, ऐसा सम्भव था। तब हमारी क्या हालत होती? कभी लोग सोचते हैं इस बात को? हमारी यह नानअलाइनमेंट की पालिसी है कि अमरीका, ग्रेट ब्रिटेन और रूस सब हमारे साथ हैं।

यह सच है कि हम ने यह आशा नहीं की थी ककि चीन हम पर आक्रमण करेगा। अगर हम से यह बात कही जाय कि आप ने युद्ध की तैयारी क्यों नहीं की तो मुझे एक बात याद आ जाती है। किसी मकान में आग लग जाय और लोग वहां जल जायें और ऐसी स्थिति में कोई कहे कि यह लोग कैसे बेवकूफ थे कि उन्होंने पहले से आग बुझाने का पम्प अपने सिलरहाने नहीं रक्खा। समझ लीजिये कि कभी भूकम्प आ जाय और लोग दब जायें उस वक्त यह कहा जाय कि यह लोग कैसे थक कि मकान में सोये, मकान के बाहर मैदान में क्यों नहीं सोये? जब चीन के आक्रमण को कोई सम्भावना नहीं थी तब हम उस के लिये तैयारी कैसे करते? आप देखिये कि जब श्री चाऊ एन लाई सन् १९५४ में यहां आये थे तब उन्होंने एक प्रेस कॉन्फ्रेंस में क्या कहा था। उन्होंने कहा :

"The Chinese Prime Minister reiterated his belief that on the basis of the five principles laid down in the Tibet agreement, "all nations of the world can peacefully co-exist, whether they are big or small, strong or weak, and no matter what kind of social system each of them has. The rights of the people of each nation to national independence and self-determination must be respected," he declared. "The people of each nation should have the right to choose their own State system and way of life without interference from other nations. Revolution cannot be exported: at the same time outside interference with the common will expressed by the people of any nation should not be permitted."

जब श्री चाऊ एन लाई इस तरह की बात स्वयं यहां पर कह गये, जब कि लगभग दो हजार वर्षों का हमारा और चीन का ऐतिहासिक और मित्रतापूर्ण सम्बन्ध रहा, तब हम यह आशा नहीं कर सकते थे कि इस प्रकार से हम को धोखा दे कर हम पर आक्रमण किया जायेगा। और चूंकि मैं तैयार नहीं थे इस लिये जब आक्रमण हमारे ऊपर किया गया तब हम हारे भी। सन् १९१४ की लड़ाई में भी यही हुआ था और सन् १९३९ की लड़ाई में भी यही हुआ था। इंग्लैंड और योरप के दूसरे देश जर्मनी के इस तरह से आक्रमण के लिये तैयार नहीं थे। उन की हार हुई। लेकिन उस के बाद क्या हुआ? जर्मनी की हार हुई। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे इस समय हम हारे हों, लेकिन वह दिन आ कर रहेगा, चाहे वह आज हो चाहे कल हो या परसों हो, जल्दी या या देर से, हम अपनी भूमि की एक एक इंच जमीन चीन से वापस लेंगे और चीन को यहां से खदेड़ कर रहेंगे।

सभापति महोदय : श्री यादव, आप खामोश हो जाइये। एक आध दफे इंटरप्शन ठीक है, लेकिन हमेशा इंटरप्शन करने से मुश्किल होती है। आप माननीय सदस्य को बोलने दीजिये।

डा० गोविन्द दास : इस के साथ ही साथ जो हमारी नानअलाइनमेंट की पालिसी है वह हमारी संस्कृति से सम्बन्ध रखती है। भारतीय संस्कृति संसार की सब से पुरानी संस्कृतियों में से है। चार संस्कृतियां संसार की सब से पुरानी संस्कृतियां हैं। भारतीय संस्कृति, मिस्र की संस्कृति, चीन की संस्कृति और यूनान की संस्कृति। भारत का मैं रहने वाला हूँ, मिस्र, चीन और यूनान को मैंने देखा है। यदि आज आप उन देशों में जायें तो आपको उन देशों की प्राचीन संस्कृति के दर्शन वहां के जीवन में नहीं होंगे, आपको उस के दर्शन केवल वं के खंडहरों में और अजायब घरों में ही होंगे। केवल भारत ही सारे संसार में एक ऐसा देश है जिसकी हजारों वर्ष की प्राचीन संस्कृति की परम्परा आज भी यहां के जीवन में दिखायी देती है। इस लिये यह जो हमारी नानअलाइनमेंट की पालिसी सब से मैत्री की और किसी से शत्रुता न करने की है। यह हमारी संस्कृति की चीज है।

गांधी जी इसी लिये कहते थे कि अंग्रेजों के राज्य से हमारी लड़ाई अंग्रेजों से नहीं। चीन के सम्बन्ध में भी हमारा यही कहना है कि चीन की इस समय जो हुकूमत है उससे हमारी लड़ाई है, चीनी प्रजा से हमारी लड़ाई नहीं है। यह हमारी संस्कृति का मूलमंत्र है—'निर्वोभ सर्वभूतेषु।' तो मैं जो इस नानअलाइनमेंट और इस विदेश नीति का अनुयायी हूँ इसका एक कारण यह भी है कि यह भारतीय संस्कृति की एक देन है, और मैं उस संस्कृति का एक छोटा सा पुजारी हूँ।

जब हम परतंत्र थे उस समय भी हमने इस का अनुसरण किया और स्वतन्त्र होने के बाद भी। और चीनी आक्रम के समय भी किसी गुट में शामिल न होने की हमारी नीति ठीक है इसमें किसी भी निष्पक्ष

व्यक्ति को कोई सन्देह न होना चाहिये। इसी लिये अमरीका और इंग्लैंड तक ने हमारी इस नीति की सराहना की है।

अभी मेरे मित्र श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन ने कुछ अमरीका के विद्वानों की बात यहां पर कही। मैं इंग्लैंड के कुछ विद्वानों की बात कहता हूँ।

"The policy of non-alignment has been supported by eminent Englishman including noted political historians Prof. G. E. G. Catlin and Mr. Kingsley Martin."

मिस्टर कैटलिन कहते हैं :

"My feeling is that the leadership of India in at least a part of South-East Asia would not have been practicable if Mr Nehru had aligned himself decisively on either side."

और मिस्टर मार्टिन कहते हैं :

"...although the motive behind the Chinese aggression on India was still a puzzle he thought the Chinese wanted to have an undisputed control over Ladakh and to show to the Communist world that India was part of the Western camp. China had, however, miserably failed to prove it. And, therefore, the policy of non-alignment pursued by several countries and by India is the correct policy."

खुद कृपलानी जी ने इस सम्बन्ध में क्या कहा था वह भी मैं उनको बतला देना चा ता हूँ। सन् १९५६ में उन्होंने लोक सभा में ही कहा था :

"Therefore, I have no hesitation to say that I support the general principles of our foreign and international policy. Our Prime Minister has enunciated the principles that should guide all nations in their dealings with each other

if world tensions are to be reduced and if peace is to prevail."

यह कृपलानी जी का खुद का कथन है, किसी दूसरे का कथन नहीं है।

और इसी सम्बन्ध में जो रूस से सब सर्वश्री खूबचेव साहब हैं उनका भी कथन अगर मैं आपके सामने पढ़ दूँ तो शायद उचित ही होगा। वह कहते हैं :

"Defined simply, non-alignment is a refusal to join military alliances and equally a refusal to assume that a conflict between the Communist and non-communist worlds is inevitable. For the rest it is inconsistent neither with receiving military aid nor with exercising its right of self-defence.... India's policy of non-alignment has won great moral and political weight in the world."

अभी श्री अजित प्रसान जैन ने ठीक कहा कि हमको जो कुछ अपनी इस पालिसी से हासिल हुआ है, उस को देखते हुए आज हमारी यह पालिसी केवल पालिसी नहीं रह गयी है बल्कि विश्वास बन गया है। मैं तो इस बात को स्वीकार करता हूँ कि केवल हमारे देश का ही नहीं सारे संसार का भला इस नान-इलाइनमेंट की पालिसी से ही हो सकता है।

अब मैं आपको केवल उन देशों के नाम बतला दूँ जिन्होंने हमारी इस नीति को ठीक माना है और इसके सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहा है। मेरे पास इतना समय नहीं है कि जो कुछ इन देशों ने कहा है उसको भी यहाँ पढ़ सकूँ। अफ्रीका के हाल के स्वतन्त्र हुए देशों में घना, केनिया, युगांडा, मोरक्को, लेबनान और सीरिया ने इस नीति की सराहना की है। एशिया के देशों में सीलोन, बर्मा, जापान, नेपाल, हिंदेशिया ने और यूरोप के देशों में यूगोस्लावोकिया और फ्रांस ने हमारी इस पालिसी को ठीक समझा है।

837 (ai) LSD—7.

यह खेद की बात है कि भारत के कुछ राजनीतिक नेताओं को हमारी वैदेशिक नीति और यह नान इलाइनमेंट की पालिसी अच्छी नहीं मालूम देती। मैं फिर यह कना चाहता हूँ कि यह बहुत दूर तक पंडित जी से और कांग्रेस से जो उनका द्वेष है उसके कारण ही ऐसी नीति जिसको सारा संसार कल्याणकारी मानता है, वे उसका विरोध करते हैं।

फिर मैंने जैसा आपसे निवेदन किया, हमारे इन नेताओं को कोई निर्माण कार्य नहीं दिखायी देता। ये बड़े बड़े बांध और बड़े बड़े कारखाने जिन्हें देख कर दुनिया के लोग चकित हो जाते हैं, उनको नहीं दिखायी देते। युद्ध की तैयारी तो वे चाहते हैं, पर साथ ही यह भी चाहते हैं कि टैक्स न बढ़ाया जाए। फिर युद्ध की तैयारी कैसे हो यह वही बतलावें। यदि हम युद्ध की तैयारी करेंगे तो टैक्स बढ़ेंगे और हमें उनके लिये तैयार रहना चाहिये। फिर अगर कहीं जरा सी भी कीमतें बढ़ जाती हैं तो चिल्ल पों मच जाती हैं। जरा सी कोई बात हुई तो चिल्ल पों मच जाती हैं। अष्टाचार दूर करने में हम सब लोग उनके साथ हैं, लेकिन उसके लिये कोई रचनात्मक सुझाव नहीं आता। तो मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन सब बातों का इस समय होना जब जब कि संकट-कालीन परिस्थिति है। यह भी खेद की बात है।

और सब से विचित्र नारा तो यह लगता है कि नेहरू जी इस्तीफा दें। यह नारा वे प्रजातन्त्र के किस सिद्धांत के अनुसार लगाते हैं मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। अभी ग्राम चुनाओं को केवल डेढ़ वर्ष हुआ है और इन चुनाओं में कांग्रेस इतने प्रचंड बहुमत से जीती जिसके परिणाम स्वरूप पंडित जी और उनके साथी यहाँ बैठे हैं। अगर अमरोहा आदि तीन क्षेत्रों में कांग्रेस हार गयी पतो यह नारा लगया जाता है कि नेहरू जी इस्तीफा दें। कुछ जगह

[डा० गोविन्द दास]

हार होने से मैं ने तो दुनिया के किसी प्रजातन्त्र में ऐसा नारा नहीं सुना है।

इन सब का कारण क्या है? अन्त में मैं एक बात कहूंगा। अंग्रेजी में इसे फस्ट्रेशन है और मैंने इसका हिन्दी में इस प्रकार अनुवाद किया है :

भग्न मनोरथों से उत्पन्न नैराश्य

“फस्ट्रेशन” के अन्तर यह सब चीजें नहीं आती लेकिन इस के अन्दर फस्ट्रेशन आ जाता है। इन सब बातों की बुनियाद में भग्न मनोरथों से उत्पन्न नैराश्य है। और उसी के सबब से यह सब हो रहा है।

मुझे इस बात का विश्वास है कि प्रचंड बहुमत से हम इस प्रस्ताव को यहां अस्वीकृत करके सारे संसार को बतला देंगे कि यह देश नेहरू जी के और कांग्रेस के साथ है।

**Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot):** On rising to speak in this House after an interval of a year and a half, I think it is appropriate that I should commence by trying to share with this House, in the first two or three minutes, the feeling that prevails in my constituency in regard to the issue we are now discussing. I shall try to do so as objectively as possible, and in doing that, I cannot help saying that taking the constituency by and large, among all classes of people, peasants, workers, Government employees, shop-keepers, middle class people, the feeling is one of exasperation, of having reached the limit of endurance. My Gujarati friends will follow me when I say that the words that met me in the villages and in the bazars were:

“*Hamē thaki gaya chhaiye,  
Have nahin khammatu, Yaha tak  
aiya chhe.*”

That is, ‘We are tired; we cannot stand it any more, our cup is filled

to the brim’. This is the feeling of nine out of ten people, however they may ultimately have voted to their party. Party loyalties undoubtedly are very strong, but inside there is this feeling of exasperation and exhaustion, of a loss of patience, of the limit of patience having been reached, and this impatience is about the mal-administration and the corruption in public life and in Government. It is not that the basic policies are always understood, but the lack of honesty of purpose in carrying out their basic policies is very strongly felt the gulf between profession and practice, talking of one thing and doing another. If I may summarise the verdict of the constituency, it is not that the Congress should go—let me be honest about it—it is, “change your policies and mend your ways or go”. There is a *locus paenitentiae* in the mind of the electorate—it is not in my mind because I do not see any chance of improvement, and that is I why am supporting this motion of no-confidence. But the electorate still has an open mind. It wants to watch. It has given a warning and it wants to see if this warning is heeded or if it is ignored. It is because of this feeling in this constituency of mine, and also in the country generally—because I do not think that my constituency is unrepresentative—that today I identify myself with this vote of no confidence in the Cabinet.

15 hrs.

It has been suggested that the motion will be defeated. Of course, it will. We know it long before the motion was tabled. But let me say this with all respect to this House, I feel that the House as at present constituted does not accurately reflect public opinion in this country today.

**Some Hon. Members:** No, no.

**Shri M. R. Masani:** Even a year ago, as Acharya Kripalani pointed out, only 44.72 per cent of the elec-



torate in the elections to the Lok Sabha voted for the Congress. It got 361 seats.

**The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas):** How many voted for the Swatantra Party?

**Shri M. R. Masani:** It therefore needed 142,000 votes to elect a Congress M.P. to this House. My Party—to give an example, and it is, I think, true of all other parties on this side of the House—polled over 9,726,000 votes and got 25 seats. It needed 389,000 votes to elect a Swatantra Party M.P., nearly three times as many. I have calculated as accurately as I could in respect of the 72 Members who stood up in support of this motion the other day that the parties, groups and elements they represent polled in all 45 million votes—39 per cent of the electorate in this country. If we had a system of proportional representation, such as is common in many democracies in the world—if we had not followed the British pattern—it is not 72, but 316 as opposed to your 361. Therefore, let us not bandy figures and numbers. Let us realise that 40 per cent of the country is behind this vote of no-confidence, and that the position has changed further in the last twelve months. The Chinese attack and our disastrous defeat, the Gold Control Order, the last Budget and rising prices have further shifted public opinion as recent bye-elections have shown.

Now, the Government's policy, broadly, is one of socialism at home and non-alignment abroad. Let us examine dispassionately to what extent these objectives have succeeded during the last fifteen years. Socialism, I take it, and the House will agree with me—means moving towards a more prosperous, a more free and a more equal society, an objective with which I am hundred per cent in agreement. But to what extent has this objective been furthered during the last 15 years? Is there more

prosperity in this country today? (An Hon. Member: Of course.) It is a matter of opinion.

Let us consider different classes of society. Let us consider the landless labourer. Has anyone got the courage to say that the lot of the landless labourer, in terms of real income, has improved? The reports of Government committees do not show anything of the kind. I think it would be right to say that even the small peasant with a small holding has not materially improved his lot. The industrial workers have certainly been compensated by dearness allowance and you may say, therefore, that their real wages today are what were when Independence was achieved. The Labour Minister, Shri Nanda, has conceded that there has been no real rise in the standard of living of the Indian working class.

Then we come to the backbone of the national, the middle class. Is it not patent to all of us—because we all belong to that class—that that class today finds itself ground between the two millstones of constantly rising prices on the one side and rising taxes on the other? This middle class, which is the backbone of the community is being crushed today between rising prices and rising taxes. Industry and business complain that they are being cribbed, cabined and confined by endless regulations and, finally, by the super profits tax.

Then I ask, who has benefited? Who is better off today than before Independence? There is only one class that has improved its lot. That class is the class of some politicians in office, some officials and a few businessmen who work hand-in-glove with these politicians, and these officers. The combination of Malviya and Serajuddin is the only vested interest in this country. It is this class which Djilas, the Yugoslav communist, has described as the *New Class*, which talks of socialism in Russia and Yugoslavia and feathers its own nest. It is

[Shri M. R. Masani]

this New Class that is the only beneficiary of fifteen years of so-called socialism in our country.

Are people more free or equal? I would venture to say not. People are tied up in a mass of red-tape. All classes are subject to bureaucratic exploitation. Businessmen have to make trips to Delhi in aeroplanes, while the poor peasant has to walk or go by bus to the taluka headquarters to get some wretched form filled or completed.

And Government employees? Their rights have been truncated. Two attempts have been made in this House to take away their right to strike, which is a fundamental right of a free society. We on this side unitedly opposed those attempts. Today I venture to say that the misuse of the Defence of India Rules in Bombay in a labour dispute is a shame and a crying shame on this country. Rules which were made to fight the enemy, the Chinese are being used against patriotic Indian workers who have the right to ask for a higher dearness allowance, and to go on strike if no redress or arbitration is offered to them.

Why has the socialist pattern failed to create more prosperity, equality or freedom? I venture to say that while the objective was noble, while the objective is acceptable to all of us, the method was hopelessly wrong—the method of Statism, of State capitalism, of believing that the people could do nothing, that Government must do everything for them, the carrying on of that *ma-baap sarcar* mentality of the British raj, which has been the bane of this country during the past fifteen years. We never gave the people the feeling of freedom, of saying 'do it for yourself', the feeling of faith that made West Germany great when, under Erhard, they said, 'Let the men and the money loose and they will make the country strong'. We trust neither men nor money. We only trust Government.

With what result? Take agriculture. Our productivity is among the lowest in the world. Official figures show that we raise it by 1.5 per cent every year, a very miserable ratio, because the Food Minister has admitted that we can triple our productivity, given the resources. Then why is it not done? Not because of the wickedness of one Minister or another, because two or three Food Ministers have complained, but because the Planning Commission's and its false order of priorities have neglected agriculture, because the money that is needed to put irrigation, water, seed, implements, fertiliser into the soil is going into top-heavy, wasteful projects which where the return is very much lower.

The other day, on August 2, the Food and Agriculture Minister admitted, while addressing the State Ministers of Community Development, that 50 per cent of the outlay on major agricultural programmes, minor irrigation and soil conservation still remains to be spent over the last two years. In other words, the money is allocated. But even that is not given. It is only on paper that the money is given; the funds are not available for investment in the land. Another Minister, Shri S. K. Dey, complained a few days before the other Minister to whom I referred that the lack of progress in the rural sector is traceable to too much centralised planning. A former Minister of Agriculture, Dr. P. S. Deshmukh, has blamed land reforms, while Shri A. P. Jain, who spoke earlier, blamed the Planning Commission for becoming a parallel government, always interfering with the Ministry of Agriculture in carrying out its obligations.

So, instead of producing more food, giving money and sinking capital into the land, we spend endless time on discussing distribution, controls, zones and cordons. That is not going to make food. If the object is to produce more food, the Government has signally failed to create a prosperous agricultural base on which our whole

industry may be based. No planning will succeed if the very foundation of economic life, which is land, is neglected and weak, as it is in India today.

Turn to industry. The same picture of false priorities, a wrong order of priorities. The State sector, for doctrinaire reasons which have nothing to do with reality, is being forced up against the interests of the country. In the First Plan, investment in State enterprises was 46 per cent. In the Second Plan it was 54 per cent. In the Third Plan, it is estimated to be 61 per cent and if our planners have their way, which God forbid, they will raise the State sector to 65 per cent by the end of 1970-71 and 68 to 70 per cent by 1975-76. Who decided how the balance of the sectors will go? Is it not the people of India who by their consumer preference, by deciding what they want to buy and what not to buy, have the right to decide? Do you want to have economic democracy in this country, or do you want six or eight people sitting in Delhi, like the Government planners in Moscow, to dictate to the people what they should produce and what they should not produce, what they shall buy and what they shall not buy?

And what return do we get on the capital that is being extracted from us by taxation and pumped into State enterprises like steel and other industries? The Finance Minister in his Budget speech of February, 1962—I have not seen more recent figures—admitted to the House that the average return on Government enterprises had dropped from 0.5 per cent to 0.3 per cent, but he encouraged the House by giving it good cheer that in the coming year it would rise to 0.4 per cent! If any industrialist or businessman tried to float shares on the market and offered those whose money was wanted 0.5 per cent, he would be considered insane. And yet our national capital is being wasted on projects, sunk in projects, which do not give us any return at all.

Hindustan Steel is the biggest white elephant in the country. Official figures published in the *Financial Express* show that while the total capital invested in this company up to March 31, 1962, was Rs. 664 crores, there was a loss of Rs. 19.5 crores. If you allow for previous depreciation which had been written off of Rs. 17.7 crores, Hindustan Steel has lost for the nation up till now 40.1 crores of solid rupees. This is why I call it a false order of priorities.

It is not true that some of us do not believe in State enterprises. We stand for a mixed economy. We stand for a mixed economy of private and State enterprise working side by side to serve the needs of the community, but this must be on a basis of free and equal competition, of allowing the consumer to decide whether he wants to buy these goods or those goods, and not State monopoly capitalism which is becoming increasingly the pattern of our socialist economy here.

So, instead of creating a climate for incentives, savings and production, exactly the reverse is being done. Our vital productive forces have been crippled in the last fifteen years. It is a tribute to the vitality of the Indian people that our agriculture and industry have not died by now under the burdens and restrictions imposed on them.

Look at our taxes. They have far exceeded the point of diminishing returns. We have gone to the point where we tax more and more and get less and less, because as you now 50 per cent of Rs. 10 is much less than 10 per cent of a hundred rupees. We are trying to get more and more out of the people, with the result that we are getting less than we would have.

Stable prices and an honest rupee, a rupee that means today what it will mean ten years from now, should be the basic foundation of our economic policy. What is our record in preserving the stability of the rupee?

[Shri M. R. Masani]

Our Government has almost consistently gone in for inflationary policies, deficit financing, customs and excise duties on the necessities of life, and above all, investment in expensive low-return enterprises like steel where the money supply is inflated but the goods and services that should come out of the factory do not come out. Inflation is the result of too much money chasing too few goods and services. The way to check inflation is to invest money where the return is quick and ample, and that is agriculture first of all. Then there are fertiliser, road transport and a hundred other things where, if you sow a rupee, you can reap a rupee back, but we go and dump that rupee in a steel plant which does not give even four annas for many years to come. This is the basic fault.

Then we come to controls—the main bane of our economy. It is said we should stop prices rising by putting on controls. If I may say so, that is flying in the face of the laws of economics. Nothing can stop prices rising if the supply and demand position warrants it. A British economist has said that to try to stop prices by control is like a lady going to a surgeon to remove her double chin, and the thing comes out at the back of her neck in a bump! In other words, you treat a symptom, you do not treat the disease. The disease of inflation is because of the policies of the Government. Until these are changed, no amount of controls are going to succeed.

Two days ago, I read that the L. K. Jha Committee having failed to stop the rise in prices, the matter will now be referred to a committee at a higher level of Cabinet Ministers, as if the level of the committee decides whether controls would be effective or not! Suppose the Ministers' committee fails, where are you going any higher? Who is going to form the next committee to stop prices rising

if the committee of the three Cabinet Ministers fails where Mr. Jha and his colleagues have failed?

You cannot defeat the law of supply and demand. Prices, like water, will find their own level, and no amount of juggling will stop the laws of hydrodynamics or the law of economics from having play. And that is why the team of the World Bank which visited India in February or March this year—let me remind the House that the World Bank is our biggest foreign benefactor today, generous, friendly and helpful—singled out for particular castigation Government's present policies, which in its opinion make for inefficiency and high costs, and controls which hamper industry at every turn.

What, Sir, is a control? A control is giving an official, even a small one, the power of life and death over a peasant, a shopkeeper or a businessman. Human nature being what it is, is it a matter for surprise that our public life is now riddled with corruption? I am not putting on any cloak of moral superiority. We are all the same under the skin, whatever party we may belong to. But the danger is that when you combine economic and political power in the same hands, you are creating opportunities for corruption that should not be created. I would not entrust anybody, including my own party, with the unlimited power that you give to the bureaucracy and politicians to exercise controls. I would recognise that human nature being what it is, there must be checks and balances, a division of power. Why do we have a division of power between the judiciary, executive and the legislature? Similarly we must have a division of authority, political and economic. The day on which you give economic power to those with police power, you have surrendered the liberties of the people, and that is what State capitalism as practised by the present Government means.

Controls involve bureaucracy. Let me give you a few findings of the studies made by the Organisation and Methods Division of the Government itself. Official files in the Union Ministries increase at an annual rate of three lakhs; 21 lakhs of files are awaiting screening and destruction; 22 to 45 per cent of the working space allotted to the staff on an austerity basis is occupied by undisposed of files. In the Central Public Works Department, 18 to 25 months are needed for a proposal to reach the stage of execution. And in that particular Ministry the study cites the case of the Land and Development Office where the allotment of a piece of land involves no less than 370 steps from the beginning till the end. This is the controlled economy.

I was very glad that my friend the Minister for Steel and Heavy Industries, speaking in Delhi on August 6, at a seminar, confessed that we are now over-regulated, and he has stated that our framework of detailed control needs alteration, and the multiplicity of points at which they operate needs to be reduced I am quoting him now:

"It is a painful but inexorable fact that today an industrial manager spends more time getting across or around controls than in the task of management."

This is a very laudable discovery, however belated it may be, but the removal of controls is not so easy. The Minister for Steel has already found that out in his very laudable desire or attempt, which has so far failed, to decontrol steel. That is because every control breeds a new vested interest. Vested interests on the business and the official side creep up which resist the abolition of the control, and it needs a very stout heart and great guts, like the late Shri Kidwai, to scrap the whole lot and go back from control to decontrol as Mahatma Gandhi advised.

Let us take another index—employment. Employment is a crying need. We have heard a great deal of what

the Government is doing, but no results. In fact, there is a definite deterioration in the situation in regard to employment. After ten years of planning, industries in India only employed 4.6 per cent of the population in 1960-61. The Planning Commission estimates that in 1961 there were a million unemployed people and 18 million more under-employed, and this unemployment is growing. At the end of May, 1963 there was a total of 2.63 million applicants on the live register of the employment exchange as compared to 1.98 million a year earlier, and this in spite of the emergency recruitment to the armed forces and the defence industries which has been going on during the past twelve months.

Instead of creating employment, this Government has created more unemployment. I refer to the Gold Control Order. It has thrown lakhs of industrious decent people in this country out of a job and on to the streets. Nothing in my month of campaigning in Rajkot was as sad as going into a shop and finding a man looking utterly desolate, with nothing in the shop. I would ask him what was wrong, and he said: *ihu soni chhu Barbad thai gaya*. He was in utter despair and helplessness. This is a new proletariat you have created in this country—lakhs and lakhs of good people with nowhere to go. You are crucifying them on a cross of gold. And to what purpose? Shri Morarji Desai, the Finance Minister, says that hoarding of gold must be stopped, smuggling of gold must be stopped. This is not the way to stop it. It is a meaningless and perverse measure. So long as your rupee is debased, so long as the rupee note in your pocket is worth 20 p, you cannot stop people hoarding gold, land or anything which has got real and intrinsic value. It is your inflationary policies, your spoiling the money of this country and debasing it into a false coin that makes gold sell at a premium. It has nothing to do with social habits and

[Shri M. R. Masani]

being reactionary. In any part of the world, destroy the currency and you will get people hoarding gold or land or anything which they think to be of a better standard of value. If people in India hoard gold today, they are being good economic animals. They are patriotic and decent people who know that their money is worthless and that gold has worth today and will have worth in 25 years.

So, one comes to the conclusion that all this talk of socialism, however well-intentioned it may have been, has been a cover for setting up state capitalism and bureaucracy benefiting a new class and exploiting the mass of people.

The Prime Minister once told a group of visiting experts: "our planning is good but it is only impiementation that is not so good." It sounds very good. But let us consider a brilliant general in a battle who makes a scheme to surpise an enemy for which he will have to make his artillery climb a steep cliff. Ultimately, he finds that his troops were unable to carry the guns to the top and so they are massacred. But he say: "my policy was very good; my planning was excellent, but the troops did not implement my policy." An objective observer would say: "the planning was rotten. Planning should not ask people to do what they cannot possibly do or what they are not made to do".

That is why the targets of our Plans are hardly ever fulfilled. Now the country has come down from pianning in cloud cuckoo land with a big thud to firm earth and people are swearing at those who have been responsible for it.

Let us now turn to international relations and defence. Is the record any better? Non-alignment has been our key word. When this policy was first formulated under a different phrase— independence of judgment—in August 1947, I had gone on record publicly as supporting it because the policy was claimed to be one which would judge

each issue on its merits, a policy that would keep us free from entanglements, free to judge everything on merits. Nobody can quarrel with that concept. By 1950, as Acharya Kripalani pointed out, it was clear that our policies were not motivated by independence of judgment at all. The betrayal of Tibet was the first indication, within three years of that policy being formulated that non-alignment was a cloak for appeasement of communism for a procommunist policy. Not only did we not rush to help a neighbour attacked by a bandit, but we went out of our way to justify the claim of the bandit who attacked that neighbour country and occupied it under the cloak of "suzerainty" and "sovereignty", words for which we never cared when they were applied to the Congo or Algeria or any other part of the world. One of the very shameful deeds that this Government has on its record is the throttling of the appeal of the Dalai Lama when he went to the Security Council of the UN for help. We instructed our representative to get up and say: "there is no need for the United Nations to interfere; everything is all right;" and there were the British always ready to plead: "if India says so, we support India." That item is still on the agenda of the Security Council—a crying monument to our cowardice.

Many of us warned against that step. Acharya Kripalani was there, professor Ranga was there; Mr. Anthony was there. Two others who are not in this House today—Pandit Kunzru and Shri Shyama Prasad Mookerjee were there. There were nine speeches made in this House: please do not give up Tibet, because the next one will be you. We were called alarmists. Today, who is right on this issue—we who were being called alarmists or those who were selling out the freedom of Tibet, and being escapists?

This double standard of morality, one for the democracies and a very lenient one for the communist coun-

tries, has been practised consistently ever since. The next clear example was Hungary, six years later, in 1956. There again we could not say what was right and what was wrong; we could not judge who was the aggressor for many many days until after everything was over.

Panchasheela and co-existence are good. But you cannot co-exist with those who do not believe in co-existence with you. Mao Tse Tung has made his intentions perfectly clear in a hundred quotations that he did not believe in neutrality or in co-existence. We went and signed a panchsheel pact with them. You can sign a panchsheel pact with an honest man but you cannot sign a pact with a bandit regime which is what you are dealing with.

If I may say so, what has been wrong with the Government's foreign policy, which has invited disaster and defeat on our country, is its failure to recognise the nature of international communism. That has been our misfortune; that has been my personal misfortune. People throughout the world have been divided on this great moral issue of our time: the issue of freedom versus totalitarian tyranny. Unfortunately, in our country, there have been many good people who have not been able to see this issue clearly. President Kennedy referred to this the other day in Berlin on July 5 when he said: "There are many people in the world who really do not understand or say they do not understand—what is the great issue between the free world and the communist world; let them come to Berlin." I am very glad that from our country, the Minister of State went to Berlin and recognised the Wall for what it is and did not shirk the issue but said that the wall was a symbol of tyranny and oppression. I compliment her on that understanding which, of course, any human being should show.

That is the issue that divides the Government and some of us, the great

moral issue of our time: to be neutral between right and wrong; between slavery and freedom? This is unthinkable. One can be neutral as a State but one cannot be intellectually neutral when such moral issues are involved. Yet our foreign policy has been an evasion of that moral issue.

People may say now: "we have learnt the lesson; why bring up the past"? But has the lesson been learnt? For a brief moment, there was a confession of "living in an artificial atmosphere of our own creation... out of touch with the realities of the modern world", and we became hopeful. We responded and we offered co-operation. I was one of those who hoped that at last we are free from this nightmare, this failure to understand what we are up against. But that did not last. We have gone back, in the last six or eight months to the bad old path of confusion and appeasement. On February 26, the Prime Minister angrily rebutted the criticism of the "Hindi-Chini bhai-bhai" slogan and said: "We will do it again if the occasion arose." A few days later," he said to a foreign correspondent: "I stand by my statement that communism has nothing to do with the Chinese attack on India. It would seem then that, like the Bourbons, the Indian Government has learnt nothing and forgotten nothing, and that the whole sorry state of affairs is likely to be repeated so long as this Government is in office. Never since the days of Ethelred the Unready in 1013 A.D., who refused to believe that the Danes would invade England and he would lose his throne, has a Government so wilfully refused to see the signs of danger and attack.

The record is too long to enumerate. In my time being limited, let me recall four or five highlights of this policy: The first was, as Acharya Kripalani pointed out, hiding from Parliament and people of this country over a number of years the fact that Chinese communist troops had in fact aggressed into and occupied our territory in Aksai Chin, a fact which is

[Shri M. R. Masani]

admitted in a letter to Mr. Chou En Lai, the Chinese Prime Minister, under the excuse or reason that we do not want to cause excitement among our people. So, the people of India must be kept doped, bandaged and their eyes shut so that they may not know that their territory is being eaten up because they will get excited. Let us not have these tranquilisers. Let us thank the people of India for being excited when they come to know that the enemy is on their soil.

The second thing is putting a well-known crypto-communist in charge of their defence portfolio at a time when the country threatening our security was a communist country. It can never be dreamt of in any part of the free world. Thirdly; acceptable of the unilateral cease fire. Fourthly, acceptance of the Colombo proposals. And now, a year later, being faced once again with an accomplished fact. We are told: this is what they have done. But why have we not stopped it? We have been caught out a second time with our intelligence deficient or facts not brought to our notice. I have no hesitation in saying that in the view of my party, the Chinese attack last year and our defeat and humiliation were a direct consequence of the criminal neglect of our defences by the present Government. The refusal two days ago to make available to us the report of Gen. Henderson-Brooks on the NEFA debacle strengthens our feeling that there is a story there to be told which is being suppressed from the Indian people. In any other country, such a Government would have been dismissed; the party in office itself would have put in a new Government in its place. The result therefore is that the pursuit of peace and non-alignment we have brought war on our territory.

Somebody asked what would have happened if we had not believed in non-alignment. Let me give the example of some of our neighbours

who have not practical non-alignment: Turkey, Iran, Philippines, Japan.

**An Hon. Member:** Pakistan.

**Shri M. R. Masani:** Pakistan; there may be others. Not a hair of their head has been touched. Has Soviet Russia or China worried them at all? Has anybody else touched them at all? They are unmolested today because they have the gumption to be aligned. Why were we chosen? Because we were non-aligned. It is a very interesting thing. The one country which made friends with China was the first to be attacked! Why? Because,—I say this sadly—the enemy had sensed our fear of fighting, our unreadiness to fight. Fear has lain under many of the policies of this Government in its international relations. The betrayal of Tibet was the first. The refusal, even today, to break off diplomatic relations with Communist China is another. There can be no other justification except "Let us not annoy them further." No country has allowed its territory to be occupied, its men to be slaughtered, its prisoners to be indoctrinated and humiliated, and yet kept an ambassador at its court.

Thirdly, the refusal to have diplomatic relations with a small and friendly country, Israel. We recognise and have diplomatic relations with our enemies even after they attack us, but with a friendly neighbour who has done us no harm, which means us well, we do not have any diplomatic relations. Why? Because of fear, because we are frightened of the Arab countries. We are frightened of something or other and we do the wrong thing.

And finally, there is the resiling from the Voice of America agreement, the latest example of fear. This war is not a military war; it is a military and a psychological war. It is a war of popaganda also; every communist war is a propaganda war. So, propoganda is as important as mili-



tary force. The people on our tribal borders today are exposed to a flood of anti-Indian and communist propaganda from China. They have transistor sets in large numbers. Our short wave station in Gauhati and Delhi cannot reach them. A medium-wave station is required. Our Government rightly looked for a medium wave station. They took the only one that they could find available in a reasonably short time. There was nothing unusual about it. Today there are several countries, aligned and non-aligned, which have similar agreements with the Voice of America; the United Kingdom, Greece, Liberia, Morocco, Philippines and Ceylon. All of them have similar agreements about the sharing of time as was in the agreement that was signed by our Government. The United Kingdom also has similar arrangements with other countries. There are United Kingdom transmitters today in West Germany, Malta, Malaya and Singapore working on the same basis. Nobody has said anything about them. Nobody has thought that Ceylon was not non-aligned or was not a genuine Colombo Power because it relays the Voice of America broadcasts. The Prime Minister has to his credit admitted his full responsibility for it. He was party to the whole agreement and to this clause which he knew, which he discussed and which he accepted. Then why have we gone back on it within ten days of signing? The agreement, Sir, was properly signed; it was not improperly processed, as has been made out. There is a Rule of Business of the Cabinet that permits the signing of an agreement by this country without Cabinet sanction provided the Prime Minister sanctioned it. The Prime Minister had sanctioned it, and it was properly entered into.

Why have they resiled from an agreement properly entered into? Because of a belated discovery that it violated the concept of non-alignment! All I can say is that if the architect of non-alignment could not

see that there was something wrong with this agreement in terms of non-alignment, then that very word has lost its meaning in the present context. In fact, it has lost its meaning because,—as Shri Kripalani pointed out—we cannot have non-alignment in our own war. We cannot be neutral against ourselves. We are not going to help anyone; we are asking for help. We are not obliging anyone by taking the transmitter. We wanted the transmitter to combat enemy propaganda on our borders. Because of the noise made by a few Communists and fellow-travellers, the old agreement has been dismissed by those who have entered into it. I am quite sure that if the Government had stood by the agreement and said it was in a national interest, nothing would have happened. The country would have cheerfully accepted it. Today, we are in a pathetic position that before the ink is dry on an agreement signed by our Government, we have gone back on it.

In February last, a British commentator wrote from London:

“Very few people in high office have any real confidence in Mr. Nehru not turning round, making up with the Chinese and leaving them in the lurch.”

That was a very shocking thought. We can ever do anything of the kind. I repudiate this suggestion, but, after what we have done about the Voice of America, how can you quarrel with that correspondent? That is exactly what we have done. We invited people to help us. We agreed to take their help. We signed the agreement, and then we were frightened because it would upset Mr. Khrushchev! What value will our Government's word have in future? How can any country come to our assistance if they cannot trust us to carry out that agreement? And even assuming for the moment that this agreement was a bad one, which it was not, should we not have stood by it? What does it

[Shri M. R. Masani]

matter if there was a slight inconvenience about it so long as the word of honour of this country was carried out?

Now, one of the other basic faults of our defence posture has been that we never take the initiative. It is always the Chinese who do something, and then we react. If they advance, we fight. If they retreat, we let them go. If they attack us again next time, we will again try to resist. We sit like petrified rabbits waiting to be attacked without taking the initiative. It is something that never leads to success in war.

In 351 BC, that great orator, Demosthenes, addressed the Athenians who were fighting a war against Philip of Macedonia. Philip won the war for the reason mentioned by Demosthenes which very much applies today:

"Shame on you, Athenians... for not wishing to understand that in war one must not allow oneself to be at the command of events, but to forestall them. You make war against Philip like a barbarian when he wrestles... If you hear that Philip has attacked in the Chersonese, you send help there; if he is at Thermoplae, you run there; and if turns aside you follow him to right and left, as if you were acting on his orders. Never a fixed plan, never any precautions; you wait for bad news before you act."

I do not think this is an unjust judgement on the record of our Government up to now.

It is no good saying our motives are noble. Of course they are. Nobody denies that our motives are noble and that the Chinese Communists are ignoble, but the way to hell is paved with good intentions.

Mr. Churchill, a very great war leader, says in his *Memoirs* about good intentions when dealing with an enemy like the Chinese communists. He says:

"Virtuous motives, trammelled by inertia and timidity, are no match for armed and resolute wickedness. A sincere love of peace is no excuse for muddling hundreds of millions of humble folk into a war. The cheers of weak, well-meaning assemblies soon cease to echo and their notes soon cease to count. Doom marches on."

On the eve of this debate, a red-herring has been tailed across our path. We are told today: "everything will be different because of the Kamaraj Plan." I fail to understand...

**Shri Tyagi:** Your party may do the same.

**Shri M. R. Masani:** I would like to follow that; yes; for my party but not for the nation. I fail to understand how bad Government, delays in Government and corruption, can be removed, by the Kamaraj plan. As I understand it, it is a plan to salvage the Congress Party from the mess into which it has got. God knows they need it! I wish them well. But how does it strengthen the administration, to take away some good and competent senior Congressmen and put them in charge of the party? It is putting the party before the State which is a wrong thing—putting the party before the country. Certainly, you strengthen the party; there is nothing wrong in it. Every party would like to strengthen itself. But how does it strengthen the Government? How will it create less corruption if four Cabinet ministers resign and four other Congressmen come in their place? I take it that it is agreed that the people who are being thrown out are not corrupt people. Otherwise, they would not

be put in charge of the Congress machine! You put out four or five good ministers who are doing a good job and bring in other people who might be equally good, but how will that stop corruption? Corruption, as Mahatma Gandhi said, is the result of controls. Every control leads to corruption. So long as you do not wind up the system of controls and red-tape in which you have tied India, you will not get rid of corruption. Gandhiji saw that, and it is still true. Gandhiji also saw that when the Congress Party, when it became the Government, became the rulers of the people instead of being the servants of the people, the people would turn against them. In Rajkot, Sir, the popular slogan was *aboi topkwalī ko nikalo* which means: "Throw out the wearers of the white cap". It gave me no pleasure to hear it because I had proudly worn the white cap, gone to prison with it. I am sorry that a wonderful thing like that should be degraded and lowered to this extent in the people's eyes. There again Gandhiji had a great fear. He foresaw this and he said at a prayer meeting not long before his death, talking of the white cap:

"It took a great deal of selfless service and sacrifice for the Congress to win the confidence of the people, but if Congressmen betray the people and instead of serving them become their masters, then, whether I live or not, I can from my long experience warn them that the country will be aflame in revolt against the wearers of the white cap."

Sir, but there are many good people in the Congress Party, many patriots, both in the House and outside. I want to make an appeal to them before I sit down. The Kamraj plan is not an answer to what the country wants. I appeal to them to assert themselves and save the country. Let me concede Sir, that for the next three years it is easier for them to save the country than anyone on this side

because of the fact that this Parliament is constituted as it is. We have no ambition to form a Government. Let the Congress Party assert itself as others have done, as the Conservative Party did in the time of Chamberlain, and choose a new government from their own ranks. Let them create a government that will make a fresh start—with no pre-conceptions; with a pragmatic approach, without doctrinaire conceptions, with all the background that is behind it. Let them provide the country with a clean, decent government, and then I offer from those on this side that we will give them a hundred per cent support for defeating the Chinese and driving them out from our soil. The whole country will rally round such a Government if they will set things right. There are many Congressmen who, I think, would respond to my plea. Let them take up courage and say to their leaders who are today in office:

"You have done your best. You have had a long innings. You have done the best within your capacity. It is time for a change. The times require new ideas, new leadership, from within the Party. Please step aside, and let a new Congress Government be formed."

**An Hon. Member:** Shall we invite you?

**Shri M. R. Masani:** No, I am talking of the Congress. Let them tell their leaders: "Do not drag the country down to destruction as you will do if you cling to office any longer". It is in your hands to do that in the next 3½ years. If you do not do that in spite of all our efforts, none of us may be able to save it. On the other hand, if you do, I believe we can defeat the Chinese.

We are as great a nation as the Chinese. Communications and logistics are on our side. The Chinese Communists have an Eastern border to defend from their own compatriots. China today is in the grip of a famine. And, what is most important, the

[Shri M. R. Masani]

people of China rise in revolt every few months and weeks all over the country against the hated dictatorship. We on this side have a democratic government based on the will of 44.72 per cent of the people. We have an army of undaunted calibre and proven worth. As Acharya Kripalani pointed out, it has fought successfully against the Japanese and the Germans and defeated them with greater courage than any other army. If you allow this army to act without interference from politicians and to obtain from some friendly countries arms and equipment they need in full measure, I believe our army can inflict a crushing defeat on the Chinese. We can all stand behind them in the struggle that is to come. Let the Chinese dictators tremble at the might and courage of our forces.

Sir, we are a great country with a great history. Let us face the invaders and throw them back where they belong. Let those who have faint hearts stand aside. Let our armed forces have the political leadership they deserve. Then, I have no doubt, we shall triumph and India will be secure and free.

**Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am not surprised at the unique step of moving a No Confidence Motion moved by a conglomeration of individuals and parties that have only one thing in common, namely, the capacity to stand up in this House against the Congress. This is a group of individuals and parties that is not united by any common ideology or principle. It is strange that the only common thing of their being opposed to the Congress has made them strange bed-fellows to move the Motion of No Confidence. It is unique in the history of this country.

Sir, there is the Socialist Party, there is the Praja Socialist Party, there is the Muslim League. All these parties which hate the Congress on the one hand and the most reactionary on

the other have combined without any common ideology or purpose except to move this motion and get cheap popularity in the eyes of the public and in the Press. I am surprised to see that the Communists also could not resist the temptation of joining them because they are afraid that they would lose their identity. But their courage has stopped short of voting for this motion. They want to exploit the situation. They want to separate the Prime Minister of this country from the party which has elevated him to this position. Their technique has always been to praise the Prime Minister and to complain against the Congress Party. They are now trying to single out individual ministers of a Cabinet against whom this No Confidence Motion has been moved.

Coming to our leader, Shri Kripalani. He has been one of the very ardent supporters of this non-alignment policy. In 1956, in his speeches in the Lok Sabha on 28-3-1956, he said:

"I have no hesitation to say that I support the general principles of our foreign and international policy. Our Prime Minister has enunciated the principles that should guide all nations in their dealings with each other if world tensions are to be reduced and if peace is to prevail."

What a change has come over my hon. friend now, in whose mouth these words were laudable and respectable, to characterise those very words as 'nonsense'. The very tongue that uttered these words has come down to the level of condemning them as nonsense. What has happened? It is because he has found a new company, a new asylum in my hon. friend Shri Masani and others of the Swatantra Praty whose one purpose is to denigrate the Congress Party, to run down the Congress and to run down the Congress ideology. I tell you, when the Congress idea is one of democratic socialism and non-alignment and also

safeguard of our sovereignty, the Swatantra Party has been conceived against all these three principles and they have managed to get some seats here and there.

What is the immediate provocation for this No Confidence Motion. Probably, in the last summer three hens laid three sparrow's eggs in some parts of the country and it is said that the whole country is on fire, the Congress has lost its confidence of the people, the people have lost their confidence on the Nehru Government etc. All this was said because three tailors of Tolley Street have been advertised and their pictures put in the papers for which they have their own motives. They want like Don Quixote to tilt the lances at windmills and say that this Government is going out of existence. And, by a strange arithmetical calculation Shri Masani converts defeat into success. He says it is the system of electorate which he has accepted. If 44 per cent of the votes gave you 70 seats, why did you not get 44 per cent of the votes and run this government with 70 seats. A girl said: "I would not have married you if I did not like you". "If you were not born, then I would have married your mother" said the boy. Therefore, if you want to stick to these rules and constitutional procedures, try by all means to get a majority and form a government but do not try to quote false figures with a view to evoke the sympathy of the people saying that you have a majority of votes and yet you are not able to form the government. There is a family in which the father is the Hindu, the wife is Muslim, the son is Christian and the daughter is Sikh. What is the progeny of this family? It will be an atheist. In the same way, all the opposition parties want to combine into a united front and attack and change this government. But what is the principle behind it? Do you want the country to go back to the old days? Do you mean to say that you do not want all that the Congress Government has achieved during the last fifteen years?

I can understand my hon. friend, Shri Masani. From his white cap, from his socialist idealism, he has slipped into rank reactionism and an agent of big business. But I cannot understand Shri Ranga's politics though we have been good friends. He has always been one step below luck. Every time he was about to become a Minister he used to make a false step which will change the prospects of his getting into the cabinet. Every time his political prospects are bright he used to form a new party or accept the leadership of a wrong person. Now he finds himself in the happy company of the octogenarian Rajaji, as the second leader of his party. Where is he leading or trying to lead this country to? I am not able to understand what they are pleading for. Of course, I can understand Acharya Kripalani, because he has always been a lone figure in politics. Wherever he goes, he has got the Irish habit of being in the opposition. An Irishman was stranded in an island and he saw there were not many people there. So, he said that if there is a political party here "I will be the leader of the opposition". So, wherever he goes, he will be the leader of the opposition, irrespective of whether he is in the Praja Socialist Party or any other party. Even if there is no opposition party as such, he becomes the leader of the opposition. Therefore, he does not represent anybody except his changing modes, attitudes and philosophies.

What does he say now? He runs down the policy of non-alignment. Now, the representative of a foreign country, late Mr. Dulles had, some years back, stated that non-alignment was immoral. But, the President, and another representative of that very country, Mr. Averell Harriman, and other people have stated that, at the present moment and under the present conditions and circumstances of India, non-alignment is a policy that should be upheld and supported. The same thing is repeated by British and American papers like *Washington Post* and *Newsweek* and British papers like *New Statesman* have stated that non-

[Shri Thirumala Rao]

alignment is the best policy for India, as it is at present situated, when we have been stabbed in the back by a treacherous enemy.

What is our foreign policy? Of course, it is true that *Hindi Chini Bhai Bhai* has failed. Similarly *Russia-Chini Bhai Bhai* has also failed. Does it mean that the foreign policy of Russia has failed? Or, does it mean that Indian foreign policy has failed? Now, at a time when people who were previously opposed to this policy are coming round to the view that this is something good and valuable for the welfare of the people, for the peace of the world, our friends from the Swatantra Party with the help of their associates want to put the clock back. I can say with confidence that they can never do it. They can never change the economic pattern of this country, they can never change the political alignment of this country, as long as the progressive forces of this country are with the Congress and the Government.

Coming to the Communist Party, I am very much surprised by the speech of my hon. friend, Shri Hiren Mukerjee, whose air of professional authority and high-sounding phrases have always impressed this House and earned some respect for him. But the rope dance he has been performing of running with the hound and hunting with the hare does not cut much ice. Everybody knows what they are out for. By all sorts of manipulations in their speeches they have created a kind of respectability for the Communist party. But they have always been trying to praise the Prime Minister and run down the Congress. I can tell you a story in this connection. There was a mother who was very angry with her daughter-in-law. She wanted that her son should have a large number of children but the daughter-in-law must become a widow, because she was angry with her daughter-in-law. I would invite your attention to the comments in the so-called left

wing papers. They want the Congress to die, the Congress to disappear but they want the Prime Minister to live long. Because, when we leave out these things, our friends want to wear these clothes and be the followers of Panditji. They want his leadership and influence to instal them in office.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** Does he appreciate that?

**Shri Thirumala Rao:** He understands it, he knows it. I need not speak more about Panditji. It would be awkward for me to do so. He understands everybody, talks with everybody but never gives his mind to anybody. That is his habit. Therefore, we understand him all right. He also understands us.

Now, what is the point of my hon. friend, Shri Hiren Mukerjee? He wants a change in the composition of the Council of Ministers. He supports the no-confidence motion against the Council of Ministers, whose leader is the Prime Minister. He says that the Council of Ministers should go but the Prime Minister should remain. It is very unfair. Then, he has been singing the song of love for individual Ministers.

Here I am reminded of a story. There was an agriculturist who had two daughters. One of his sons-in-law was owning a brick kiln and another was carrying on agriculture. One of the daughters came to him and said "father, please pray that there should not be any rain so that my husband's brick kiln work may prosper". The other daughter came and told him "please pray that there should be rains because my husband's fields are drying up". Now Government is in the same position as that of the farmer I mentioned. On one side, Shri Masani says that there should be no control.

**Shri M. B. Masani:** Minimum control.

**Shri Thirumala Rao:** On the other hand, my hon. friend, Shri Mukerjee, says, either impose control or get out of the Food Ministry. It is a difficult job and Government has to strike a *via media* between these two extreme views. So, it has to follow policies which are necessary and useful and good for the country.

I have some experience of the Food Ministry. Even now I have not left my study of that subject. Recently I was in Orissa. I went on tour and travelled more than three hundred miles by car. I saw plenty of rain water and canal water in that area. All the same, they cultivate only one crop of paddy. When it rains, the water simply goes waste. Then, when rain fails, they pray or curse their fate. In Andhra, on the other hand, if there is water, the agriculturists try to get two crops and sometimes even three crops in a year. My hon. friend, Shri Mukerjee, comes from West Bengal. Has he seen the agricultural situation of his State and how much water of DVC is being wasted? Still, the Bengal Government comes to the Centre and asks that some arrangements should be made so that they can have enough of water and thereby increase their agricultural production. Bengal has got 70 inches of annual rainfall and yet the ryots of that State are backward and they do not produce enough rice. There are only certain areas which produce sufficient rice for the whole State. Sixty lakhs of people converge on Calcutta, there is great demand for rice and the price of rice goes up. That is not a happy situation, yet it is obtaining in many parts of the country. Even if you convert your agricultural cadre into an All India Service, you are not going to produce more unless you improve the capacity and financial position of the cultivator. That is a very big problem. No Government, however capable and efficient it may be, would be able to change or alter the position of the farmer in the countryside in one moment, or in a short time, either by propaganda or by spending some crores of rupees. It is a slow process.

337 (ai) LSD—8

If the farmers produce well in one year, next year they will not be able to produce so well. It is a long-range programme that the country has to face. There is no doubt that 50 per cent of our income has to be derived from agriculture.

It is a matter for satisfaction that our plans have gone according to schedule and so nicely. In the Third Plan period we are spending Rs. 11,000 crores. Of course, in some sectors we are very successfully reaching financial targets but not physical targets. That has to be looked into. We have also to see whether the money is properly spent or not. In the Fourth Plan we are going to spend Rs. 22,000 crores.

Does my hon. friend, Shri Masani, run his house without planning? Will his wife permit it? Can you run a family without planning? Can you run even a small village without planning? Can you run a municipality without planning? What is his allergy against planning? I am not able to understand it. The Swatantra Party cannot survive long if it does not have proper planning. It is only by planning that everything can succeed. Because of planning, our employment position has improved, our standard of literacy has gone up and many schools, colleges and technical institutions have sprung up.

Not only that. I think, my hon. friend, Dr. Sushila Nayar will tell us what efforts she is making about birth control. We have got an additional economic growth of 2.5 per cent and there is 2.5 per cent population growth to swallow up that economic growth. Therefore there is nothing left at the end of the calculations. That is the major problem. Bengal—I think, Bombay too—is the greatest contributor to the population problem. You must control it.

16 hrs.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** Do not blame any Province... (*interruption*). Why this regionalism?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member cannot sit and talk like this.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** This is integration.... (Interruption).

**Shri Thirumala Rao:** Shall I tell Shri Priya Gupta, through you, that this is a propaganda stunt of the Opposition groups because a great event has happened. A gentleman who could not enter the Parliament for the last 15 years, who is notorious for saying that the Prime Minister of India spends Rs. 25,000 a day on his person, has come. They want to celebrate that event. Tomorrow you will see the performance of that gentleman. But nobody is afraid of these things. We are accustomed to my hon. friend, Shri Priya Gupta.

You have a way to refuse supplies to Government. But this no-confidence motion is a rare event.

With regard to my hon. friend, Shri Mukerjee, he gives a Communist slant to his whole speech. Whatever agrees with the Communist Party he accepts. If we cannot agree with the Communist Party, the whole Government should go.... (Interruption). If we cannot toe the Communist line, the Government loses all this majority! Is that the argument of Shri Mukerjee? He cannot replace this Government. He could not have even 50 persons to stand in support of his motion. He could not get the support of anybody. He is afraid of them. They would swallow him. He wants to wound but he is afraid to strike. That is the position of the Communist Party.

I do not want to go into the merits of the Voice of America Deal. There also, Shri Masani wants it but the other hon. friend does not want it. But here is the Government which is to think whether we could make use of such a powerful machine to counteract the mischievous and lying propaganda of the Chinese. Open your radio set any time. At times they will successfully block Russia and

Washington and you only hear Peking and nothing else. Therefore this has to be counteracted. This is one of the tactical necessities of this country. It should be safely left to the Government of India to see that a proper use is made of these things without violating our basic principles of non-alignment or without doing any violence to our friendly relations with America.

A stray remark by my hon. friend, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, does not escape the notice of my august friend, Shri Hiren Mukerjee. She said something about the Berlin Wall. He said that she had not done the proper thing. Have I not the right to say what is being done there? Most of us have seen what the Berlin Wall is. We have been detained at this wall also. What sort of behaviour is there on the other side of the wall? If you have got some opinion to express, at once comes the mouthpiece of the Communist Party criticizing you. This is not the way of doing things.

What is the attitude of the Communist Party towards China? He said that the Defence of India Rules must go, but how can they go? There are two parties within the Communists; some of them are in jails and some of them are outside. Every time they accuse Shri Morarji Desai when he has gone abroad for money. But they go to Moscow for spiritual inspiration and physical repair. How many of them go there? Everyone of them falls conveniently sick for medical treatment that lasts for six months in the year. You can go there as leaders of communist movement. You go to China; you go to Moscow; you go to Yugoslavia. All that is permitted. If in the interests of the Plan we go out, what does it matter? We have to cover Rs. 2,600 crores of foreign exchange in the Third Plan. Who will give money? People who have got money will give it. People who give less derive the greatest advantage of propaganda by giving a little charity



and putting it in the papers that that man has given a big charity. Certain countries are enjoying good name like that. Where money is available, our country has to go to and get it and pull up this country from slough, slough of despondency, slough of despair, as my friend, ex-leader, Acharya Kripalani has said. How can you raise this country without money? You co-operate and give us constructive ideas. But do not try to replace a Government for which you have no capacity. It is only a propaganda. Nothing else.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, when I rise to speak in support of the No-Confidence Motion, I am conscious of the danger at the frontier. This danger has become graver today on account of Pakistan's collusion with China. But the sense of duty requires that if we really want to face this danger, it is necessary not to divide the country. No patriot would like to divide the country at this juncture. But it is all the more necessary and it becomes a patriotic duty to point out whether, situated as we are with a Government which by all tests have failed to rise to the occasion, it will be able to face this danger. We want to bring home the real situation prevailing in this country both at the governmental level and at the popular level. I feel, when we discuss the No-Confidence Motion, we are to take into account certain important factors, the more important of which is that when the call came, when the enemy attacked—the Government may have faltered—the country as a whole, the entire Indian people responded so magnificently. We, political parties, having differences, sitting on the opposite side, without demanding any share in the Government. Even Acharya Kripalani would criticise us saying that we forgot differences and were frightened at the critical juncture, offered our unstinted support to the Government and put in their hands emergency powers. But have the emergency powers which are vested in the Government been utilised for

the purpose of making the country strong and united? We know how the people have responded. We know why the Chinese retreated. We know because of the united response of the people, the fifth columns in the country also became immobile. My complaint is that at the present moment the Government, as it is constituted, has failed totally, not a section of it here and there. I give no importance to the statement made or to the points which my hon. friend has made that if two Ministers go, everything will be all right. The two so-called leftists have gone and yet the character of the Government has not changed. It is not one Minister here or one Minister there. It is a failure of the party, of the Government, and the leadership. It is not confined to any individual as such. Therefore I think the present Government has not the courage and is incapable of thinking and acting at the moment and it has to go. It has to be replaced by a more determined, dedicated and disciplined government if we are to face the situation as it stands today.

I would confine my criticism to these four basic points. One is the failure of this Government to correctly assess the nature of aggression and the wrong and vacillating implementation of foreign and defence policy; secondly, the utter neglect of the problem of national security and failure to learn lessons from the past and to take adequate measures in terms of the mandate of the Parliament for defence and development; thirdly, gross misuse of the powers vested in it for national Emergency for partisan ends and failure to effect economy, remove inefficiency and eradicate corruption and gear administrative machinery to meet the requirements of the emergency, thus spreading frustration amongst the people and disunity in the country; and, fourthly, reluctance to introduce socio-economic measures to break the benumbing social order and concentration and monopoly of a few over the country's economy and adminis-

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy.]

tration, and for putting more burden on the peasants, working-class and the middle section of the population by irrational taxation measures, the ill-conceived Compulsory Deposit Scheme and Gold Control Order, rise in prices of daily needs of the people, and thus fail in making defence efforts purposeful.

If you take into account the present temper and mood of the people, there is utter contempt and dissatisfaction about this Government. I do not think there can be any worthwhile mobilisation of the people when people look at this Government in this manner. You may remember that some time back the Prime Minister—not in this House—some years back probably while asking his party to relieve him of his responsibilities had stated, "I have become stale and flat". What I see today is, if there is any evidence of this, it is in the Government itself.

If one takes into account the sordid episode regarding the AIR—VOA deal it is because of this staleness and flatness. I cannot for a moment imagine such a deal being concluded first and then the Prime Minister saying here in his statement "I want to revise it in consonance with our basic policy". So, what is that basic policy? Even the Prime Minister does not know what it is. Even those who conducted these negotiations did not know what it is. If after sixteen years of working of this policy there is still doubt and still mistakes and blunders are committed at this moment of crisis, then there is something very wrong in this policy. I think that is a split mind (*Interruption*) and I think basically the thinking is also wrong; the approach and thinking, both are wrong.

Times without number we, the Praja Socialist Party, have made it perfectly clear that the policy of non-alignment is a sound and basic concept. We have no quarrel with that policy. The policy mainly was meant

to further national interest and to ease tension in the international field. I am not going into the question of our achievements in the international field or how by following this policy we today stand rather isolated. Even our neighbours have gone further away from us. I do not like to refer to Tibet and Hungary which have been referred to here before. But the main point is that while implementing this policy, you had certain inhibitions in your mind, and you were always trying to avoid and face realities. The main defect of this policy, and a very great one too, is that it was never security-oriented. Any Government worth the name, whether despotic or dictatorial, whatever its form may be, must take into account first its national security. That is the fundamental responsibility of this Government. They have gone round the whole world; the Prime Minister has trotted round the world chanting this *mantram* of non-alignment. But I ask him and I ask his ex-Defence Minister: Have they even anywhere in the world focussed our problem of defence requirements? Have they ever brought to attention that problem anywhere in the world? The first primary duty was neglected. That has been their record.

I do not want to go into the details. But if really you want to follow this non-alignment policy to a success, you have to remove these mental and psychological inhibitions in your mind and state clearly where you stand, so far as the defence of this country is concerned. Even today, the Prime Minister is not clear in his mind as to what we want for the sake of our defence.

Members of Parliament met the Prime Minister on the eve of the session.....

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Foolish.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Dada may say 'foolish', and I would say that it was a waste of time. Whatever that may be, we did not get a clear picture as to how this Government is going to face the immediate danger. Probably, they have no plan for themselves. They took six months to conclude an air agreement or the agreement about these joint air exercises. I cannot for a moment imagine this. If they really want to defend this country, what is standing in their way in taking help from friendly countries when they offered and in giving them suitable terms to see that we got it as early as possible for our purpose?

The Government play a hide-and-seek game with the Parliament. That is another complaint of mine against this Government. They should have unfolded the whole plan in this House. The Prime Minister should have come forward with such a statement, and this session of Parliament would really have proved a great success if we had been told how in the light of the lessons that we had learnt in the past we were going to meet those defects and meet the present danger, and how in view of all those lessons that we had learnt, we had planned for defence and development. There is no such plan, and Parliament it only asked to sanction money, and the administration goes in its own way to spend money as it likes. That is why they are afraid even to place the NEFA reverses inquiry report on the Table of the House. That is the main reason why they are doing like this. Therefore, they are suffering from a false sense of dignity. Because of this false sense of dignity, they even want to conceal things from Parliament. I do not think that in a matter like this when the nation's security is in danger, any Parliament would ever excuse a Government like this.

Again, I want to put this to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has often said that this Chinese attack is an attack on our way of life. Apart from those military aspects and defence problems, I want to know what he or his party has done in this

country to cultivate the people's opinion in the sense of educating the public on the evils of communist dictatorship and the merits of Parliamentary democracy. That has never been done. The people have to be psychologically trained if we want really to turn it into a people's war.

You may remember that in this House, after the Chinese aggression, I had the honour to move a non-official resolution which I later on withdrew after the Prime Minister had stated that he was in agreement with the basic principle but he was not prepared to accept it in that form. This resolution asked Government to take immediate measures to effect economy in the administration and at the same time to amend the Constitution even for suspending the posts of Governors etc., and reduce the size of the Council of Ministers. Nothing has been done as yet. And we are now seeing that there is a plan very much discussed about the reshuffle. Reshuffle is not being made to effect economy or to eradicate corruption or to introduce efficiency. But this is being made mostly to avoid some of the difficulties that have arisen inside the party. That is not how this very serious problem can be tackled.

We have also raised the question of corruption. The question of corruption has taken the attention of the House for a good deal of time. Charges of corruption are being levelled not only by us but by others; even by Congressmen against Congressmen. Congressmen have brought several charges against Congressmen. It is time that an Anti-Corruption Commission with high powers was appointed. But the Prime Minister has always spurned this idea. But that is the only thing that can give satisfaction.

Even in this matter of the Serajudin affair, of which so much is known in this House, I want really to give credit to the Special Police Establishment which unearthed this evil of corruption so successfully. Because the attitude of the Prime Minister

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy.]

even in the beginning has been that this is all personal malice. Again, he has started saying that all these charges of corruption are brought in with a view to character assassination etc. I may humbly put it to him that there is no question of witch-hunting. At the same time, one should not be sorry, as he seems to be, if in the course of investigation somebody is caught and punished. That should not be the attitude.

Take the Serajuddin affair, as an instance. The whole question should be investigated. That is why we wanted a judicial inquiry. We did not want that they should refer the case of Shri Malaviya only and let Malaviya be punished. That is not how the matter should be proceeded with. It is not a matter for the personal satisfaction of the Prime Minister. Even today, what has happened. Shri Malaviya has gone. But they have started a campaign. Although on the 7th May it was the Prime Minister who said that Shri Malaviya had welcomed the idea that Justice Das would hold a private confidential inquiry for the personal satisfaction of the Prime Minister, that it would be a *prima facie* inquiry—all this was known—still Shri Malaviya now complains that no evidence was called for, his witnesses were not allowed to appear before him, lawyers were not allowed to appear for him. The Prime Minister, I am sorry to say, says that on the *prima facie* evidence, he does not think and he is not convinced that any reflection is cast on Malaviya's integrity and impartiality. Is this not a reflection on the Judge? The report is not made public. But the Judge is criticised. By the reference that Shri Malaviya has made, the very protection which the Prime Minister wanted to give to the Judge is negated. He is being criticised and suspicion has been created about him also. He has placed himself in this unfortunate position by taking this unusual step of giving an opinion to the Prime Minister pri-

vately. The Prime Minister in this case says that on two matters, his opinion was unfavourable to Shri Malaviya. What are those two matters. It is known that the matter concerning the receipt of Rs. 10,000 which Shri Malaviya admitted, was not referred to Justice Das. Amongst the two matters, one is the confessing statement made by Shri Nayyar, ex-Private Secretary to Shri Malaviya that Rs. 50,000 was brought by him from Serajuddin for certain purposes. Is that amongst the two on which Shri Malaviya's guilt has been established? I think he should have no objection to tell us what are those points referred to Justice Das. On four the Judge exonerated Shri Malaviya and on two he was really found guilty.

The matter can never be closed in this way. It is such an important matter. It cannot be closed. Let the Prime Minister not be accused of double-standard. He has stated: cases are being instituted against officers for their names appear in the books of Serajuddin. I would ask him if officers can be prosecuted, can Ministers who have access to the Prime Minister be left scot-free? It will create a very bad impression. Therefore, it is necessary that we apply the same standard to all. In this case, I can tell you that there are many other stories. The Prime Minister has in his possession many other facts.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** You have taken twenty minutes.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** I will take two minutes more. It is known to the Prime Minister that there are further disclosures, not made by me but by the Chief Minister of Orissa. There is a statement that Shri Biren Mitra took money and he has admitted. The Prime Minister in a letter to me has also written that so far as Orissa facts are concerned, they are not in dispute. We do not know what further facts are there.

Here is a photostat copy of a document which shows that Mr. B. Patnaik was a business partner with Mr. Serajuddin during this period, in 1954. We do not know all these matters. There may be many other things. So, the country would really be grateful to the Prime Minister, if it is not possible for him to refer it to a judicial enquiry, if he could place before the House all the material that he has in his possession on the Serajuddin affair.

It has raised another question. It is known to many Congressmen. I know that a statement has been made by the Chief Minister that the Deputy Chief Minister in the course of four years has made a profit of Rs. 16 lakhs. If corrupt administration does not like to take any action on matters like this in this emergency, is it not the duty of the Prime Minister to take emergency powers and see that such corruption is stopped so that people can have faith in the Government? That is my submission to the Prime Minister. Let him not falter at this moment of crisis.

Many people have referred to the gold control order and the compulsory deposit scheme. Not that I am opposed to them in principle. Some amount of compulsion may be necessary at a certain stage but this compulsion is being applied to categories of persons in the lower income groups who have today nothing to save. By having these ill-conceived schemes they are rather putting the people again into the hands of the money lenders. So, they should amend this scheme so that people who are getting incomes below the level chargeable for income-tax are exempted, so also peasants with uneconomic holdings.

Regarding the other matters, what are the social objectives? The gold control order and the rise in prices are there. What action have you taken against profiteers, hoarders? Do you curb the activities of the hoarders and profiteers? Nothing is being done in that regard. Secondly, Government is supremely unconcern-

ed with what is happening as a result of the Plans. There is concentration of wealth. This is a fact. I challenge the Prime Minister to put in this House the report of the Mahalanobis Committee. Why is that report not given to us? It would clearly show that there has been more concentration in certain business houses. There is no social objective of the Plan now. You are not going to have a real socialist order of society or at least there are certain difficulties in the way during normal times. But here was an opportunity which he decried as a blessing in disguise. Here is an opportunity where he could have taken recourse to administrative measures. He could have clearly defined, and said what sort of socialism is they stand for. The Planning Commission has discovered that there is a contradiction between the social objective and economic development, and they have decided now that economic development is supreme over social objectives. That is how they are proceeding. Socialism of Avadi came late in the day. Even in the First Plan it was stated that unless there was a radical transformation of society, no economic development was possible. This talk of socialism is merely on paper, and nobody has benefited from it. The Agricultural Labour Enquiry Report says that people at the lower level are suffering. The only people who have profited are the profit-earning class. The gap has increased between them and the poorer section of the community. In such a society as this, would you ever believe that the people would come forward to fight a war. They are patriotic enough, I have no doubt, and in spite of the failure on the part of the Government, if there is an attack, the people will forget everything, and will not allow this country to be again occupied by China. But if you really want to mobilise the people, if you really want to make it a people's war, not the war of a few persons, then it is highly necessary that you clearly say what your social and economic aims are, the sort of society you are going to create out of

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy.]

the plans and developments that you are going to take up in this emergency.

Therefore, in conclusion I say that this Government has lost all capacity to meet this emergency, and it deserves to be censured.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will sit uptill 6 o' Clock today.

**Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warangal):** I have been very carefully listening the whole day to the speeches made by the Members of the Opposition. Before I deal with the subject proper, permit me to welcome to this House the new Members Acharya Kripalani, Shri Masani and Dr. Lohia.

A great deal has been said on the proportion of votes, that only 45 per cent of the voters have voted for the Congress. There was also reference to the last three by-elections, and these gentlemen, just because they have been elected, feel that they are speaking for the people of India. They forget that they are not even of one party. Every one of them stands up and wants the Government to change, wants radical changes here and there, all in the name of the people of India. We are democrats and we would welcome a healthy and strong and responsible opposition. Therefore, I am glad that at least three Members have been added to the other side.

We are representatives of the people. We are not servants or masters of the people. I am surprised that even today the servant and master relationship persists in the minds of some of the so-called Socialists. We are not servants or masters. We have some responsibilities, and we have certain duties which we have undertaken, and that we are willing to and will perform. We have been elected with the backing of a programme and a policy, and that we will pursue, and if we have to take

some unpopular measures to fulfil that promise or that plan or that policy, we are not going to be deterred by the thought of what will happen in the elections. If we are not here for the programme and the policy, and are all the time watching the results of the elections here or there, then we do not deserve to remain in Government. I claim that the policies we have been pursuing in this country are to the benefit of this country and the people. There has been a great deal of talk about non-alignment. Acharya Kripalani has referred to it and my hon. friend Shri Masani who is well known for his views wants a complete, one-sided alignment and he says that the world is divided into two: totalitarian and democratic. Will he tell me how many members of the NATO are democracies? Is France a democratic country? Is Portugal a democratic country? Is Pakistan a democratic country? Where is the division? The whole concept behind this is that the world is to be divided and the nations are to be united on the basis of ideologies. This is a conception which has no basis in reality. Pan-Islamism has gone and non-communism will also go. Already you are finding a new Caliph there. Countries unite on vital national interests and they are conditioned by their geography, by their economics and by the trade pattern and security. If this NATO is formed, it is not so much to check communism but to check Russian expansion. Communism happened to be a sort of slogan. If ideology was really the objective for this alignment, then West Germany would have built a wall and not East Germany. This concept of division of the world on ideologies has absolutely no basis in reality.

16.35 hrs.

[SHRI KHADILKAR in the Chair]

I said our policy has given dividends. Of course they will come

round and ask what about China. "China has swallowed a part of our country and you still persist in your own policy. How is that? Do you not think it is time to bring about a change?" I say there is no policy in the whole world that can provide against the breach of faith, breach of trust, breach of contract and breach of understanding. If we have failed in protecting a part of our country, I maintain that it is because of the policy of peace that we pursued and will continue to pursue. The whole world knew that we had no intention of armed warfare, and that was not our policy.

Now, what would have happened if we had aligned? Let us look at the picture. In the very first instance, you would have created a frontier which had to be armed because two biggest world powers were facing you. With all the help from the United States and her allies, you would have been forced to spend such a big amount for defence that would have been ruinous. Apart from that, you would not have got the opportunity to build up your country, which through its own resources could create a potential and resist the aggression on this country. So, that is the picture. The picture would be the same if we aligned the other way about. That would not have lasted a year, because America would never have tolerated a combination of such a mass of people consisting nearly of three-fourths of the world in one bloc but would have resisted and found the opportunity to see that war was declared on some pretext—either local or any other. This policy of alignment is one of the most dangerous things for our country to follow.

Take the policy of Pakistan. Look at her. She is aligned. She has no sense of self-confidence; she has no progress to her credit and at the slightest, first opportunity, she is ready to depart from one camp to another. Would you like India to be in the position that Pakistan is today

Surely not. Look at the countries that are aligned. There are already cracks between Russia and China. On this side De Gaulle is restless and feels crabbed. England is trying to woo China as an aside. Where is this alignment. The lines are getting blurred and new lines are getting formed. Therefore, by pursuing this policy of non-alignment we have really pursued the cause of peace not only in this country but for the whole world. We formed the bridge to make it possible for the east and west to come together. The recent understanding between Russia and America about the atom bomb was only possible because we had remained non-aligned. If we had got aligned then we would have created a position of rigidity and would have created a kind of wall between two blocs. Because we had remained unaligned this understanding was possible.

Look at the countries that are non-aligned? What have they suffered? Look at Egypt. She declared that she would get hold of Suez. The Communists were put in jail because they wanted to maintain their sovereign rights. What is the result? She got Suez and you find Russia building the Aswan Dam. Look at Yugoslavia. It was considered to be isolated, not touched either by east or by the west, Russia was all the time hostile. But she pursued her policy of non-alignment and today Russia is her best friend, in fact a greater friend than she is of China. So this policy of non-alignment is really one of the wisest courses that this Government and this country has followed, and it would be infantile to suggest any change in that policy.

Sir, I must refer to the speech of Shri Kripalani. In the beginning he talked against non-alignment. But when he started giving his solution, what he considered to be the best thing for the country to do, he talked about honest men, saintly men and others, things which are seen in school books maxims. When he came to something positive he said, we are

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

not aligned against China. Surely we are not aligned against China. It does not mean that alignment means that once there is a difference with one country you rush to another country. Apart from that, he said that we must take aid from every quarter. How can you take aid from every quarter if you are aligned with one country or block.

The biggest certificate that we have got in favour of this policy of non-alignment is that today both America and Russia are persuading us to continue that policy. Averell Harriman said that he would advise India to develop more friendship with Soviet Russia and Mr. Khrushchev said that India should take arms from the United States. What is all this? Is that not an achievement? Is not that something to be proud of that we who have no arms, who are weak militarily and in a situation where it is advantageous geographically and in every other way to China, are getting friends? Aid coming today is more important than the aid that would have come as a result of alignment because today America is helping India to safeguard her vital interests and we have shifted the plane from treaty arrangements and bartering our freedom to a situation in which the condition itself forces a country to come to our help. Is that not a strength of our policy? Pakistan is feeling helpless, feeling timid, because we are getting a few guns here and there. That country is aligned with one of the biggest power in the world, more powerful than even Soviet Russia. Look at the attitude which we have. We have got the Chinese army facing us, but we have got greater self-confidence than any block in Pakistan.

Sir, I will cut down, for want of time, what I have to say and try to close. Some people are not satisfied with the achievement of this country's government. Naturally, nobody is satisfied because every one wants this country to progress as rapidly as

possible. I will not say that the intention of the Opposition is bad. They also want this country to progress. So do we. But when you say that the country has not achieved what you have proclaimed and what you have advertised, I would like the House to pause and just look back at the number of milestones that we have already crossed. We can never reach the goal in our life time. What was our position or condition when we took over the administration? A vast country but poor India suffering from the wounds of partition, blood flowing out of its body, maimed by the Indian States. We have surpassed all that, we have conquered all that, and I can say with confidence that no country in the world has solved the refugee problem with such rapidity and with such efficiency as this country and this Government has done. In fact, no country in the world was faced with such big problems. The war refugee problem of Europe remains not completely solved even today.

Mr. Chairman: He should conclude now.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: I will conclude in a minute. There are some people who, instead of attaching the policies, descent to personal attacks. That was the position in the case of Shri Muhammad Ali Jinnah who, out of spite, changed his whole outlook, his whole plan, his whole philosophy. Because he felt hurt, because he had a sort of annoying sensation, he acted in that way. Being well-bred, he did not descent to personal attacks, but his policy was based on his feeling hurt, and the result was that millions of people had to face the consequences of that. Psychologically, that was the moving force.

Today there are some people who think that by making personal attacks, reasonable or otherwise, they can shape or change the policies of Government or the loyalty of the people



of India. Dr. Lohia, when he was speaking on Friday about the no-confidence motion, made some remarks and it was clear that he was referring to the Prime Minister. I am sorry, I am speaking before him....

**An Hon. Member:** He is not present here.

**Shri Bakar Ali Mirza:** Even then he will know it. For fifteen years, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru has been under intense public gaze. He has kept an open house. Every activity of his is known to the people of India, to one or the other. They have formed an estimation of him in their minds. We have seen him in playful moods; we have seen him in fighting moods; we have seen him in places of power and responsibility. The same loyalty, the same affection has continued. So, no amount of dirt will stick on him.

**Shri Ravindra Varma (Thiruvella):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to oppose the motion that has been moved by the hon. Member for Amroha. He and the Opposition have chosen to move in this House a motion of no confidence in the Council of Ministers. It is well known that the ultimate weapon in the armoury of a parliamentary opposition is one no-confidence motion. It is not a censure motion on a particular aspect of the Government's policy, on an act of omission or commission, but a motion that expresses total lack of confidence in the objectives of the Government's policy and the ability of the Government to implement its promise that the Opposition has brought before the House. On such an occasion it is essential to discuss the fundamental policies of the Government and the achievements of the Government. It is also necessary that the Opposition should not only point its finger at the failures of the Government, but place before the House and the country a practical alternative. I expected that a leader of Acharya Kripalani's standing would put a constructive proposal before the House. Certainly he

made an attempt. But when I heard what he had to say, I could hardly find anything that is not written down in primary text books on civics about what a government should do.

References have been made to the failure of the Government in foreign affairs and in domestic affairs as well. The policy towards China was specially mentioned. Everyone knows that when the present regime in China came into existence we said that we believed in peace and friendship with China. This was accepted by every section of the country by everyone including Acharya Kripalani. I heard Acharya Kripalani say that Panch-sheel consists of five non-senses. As a man who has learnt to respect Acharya Kripalani, I believe I had a right to expect something more sensible from him than this.

Quotations have been read out in the House about what Acharya Kripalani said in 1956. But there is a very material aspect of what he said which I want to place before the House at this time. He said:—

"We have kept before the international world the principles of Panch-shila."

He did not refer to them as Panch-nonsenses.

"These principles are in conformity, if I may say so, not only with our recent traditions but also with our old traditions. They are in conformity with the teachings of our Master. They are also principles that flowed from the manner in which we achieved our independence. They are useful principles. They have been enunciated from time to time by political theorists. They are at the basis of the United Nations Organisation."

Sir, it is not Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru but the hon. Member for Amroha who said this in 1956. Are we being told today that we should have adopted a policy of suspicion and hostility towards China from the very beginning?

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

ing? Are we being told that we should have professed peace and prepared for war?

It is true that China betrayed our friendship. But are we the only ones whose friendship has been betrayed by China? Russia, who was a brother, who helped her to establish the present regime in China, who helped this regime with technical assistance, military assistance, equipment etc. and tried, in the counsels of the world, to establish the prestige of China, has been betrayed by China. China today has launched a vituperative campaign against her erstwhile brother and the benefactor, accusing Russia of apostasy to the principles of Leninism and Marxism accusing her of betraying the interests of the peoples of the world?

It might very well be argued that Russia should have known better, that Russia should not have strengthened the hands that are smitting her today. It is very good and it is very possible to be wise after the event.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** It is a fallacy which does not help us.

**An Hon. Member:** Keep quiet.

**Shri Ravindra Varma:** Armed with the amplitude of wisdom that comes after the event even to the hon. Member who interrupts my speech sometimes, though it is a rare phenomenon I admit, one can blame another for lack of foresight. But in judging the action of a government at a given time one must take into consideration what was known at that given time. So, the question is whether our Government had enough evidence to suspect China, and whether our Government had enough evidence we did build up our defences. A glance at our Budget figures would show that from the time that we could say that China's professions were hypocritical, that her attitude was hostile, we began to build up our defensive forces. It can

very well be said that we should have done more, but is it possible to argue that a substantial part of our meagre resources, more than what we spent on defence, could have been spent on programmes of development should have been set aside for defence? Would the hon. Member from Amroha have supported it?

But it may be argued that this was not enough; that in the face of the menace of China and the long preparations that China made and in the face of difficulties of organising the defence of thousands of miles of our frontiers India should have done more. There is no question that we should have done everything we could do to increase the strength of our armed forces.

Then, it was argued by the hon. Member for Rajkot, fresh with the laurels of victory, that we should have immediately sought the security of a military alliance and served notice on China. He made it look as though those who sought this security were immune from the attacks of China and the Communist world. He is talking in 1963. It is clear that if we had at that time sought the security of a military alliance, then the defence of our frontiers would have become part of the defence of the frontiers of the area of the cold war that was raging then. The cold war might have lessened today. There might be a thaw today. But we are talking of the time when we detected China's intentions. Was it possible for us then to give up non-alignment and enter into a military alliance with China? The two strongest powers of the world would then have been ranged on opposite sides and India would have had the support only of the West. The anxiety to prevent a global war might have resulted in a situation more like the one which we see in Korea or Viet Nam on the frontiers of India, and not the immunity of which Mr. Masani spoke.

To give up non-alignment is definitely to give up a part of our sovereignty. But we are not depending on non-alignment as a religious dogma. Nor are we confusing non-alignment with non-violence. Non-alignment may be given up to seek the safety of collective security or to further a common cause. But was it conceivable that a country with principles could have identified itself with either of the blocs? Could we have defended the denial of human rights in the East or the tendency to cling to colonialism and imperialism in the West?

It is often argued that many powerful nations of West have joined military alliances without losing their sovereignty. This is a very fallacious argument. Do not forget that there is a distinction between countries that have established democracies, countries that have achieved a comparable standard of living, countries that, therefore, do not depend upon the mercies of others for massive economic assistance and a country like ours. A country like India which is a part of the under-developed world is in a different position. Instances are not wanting to show that when we are more amenable to the political patterns or economic patterns that those in authority in certain countries believe in, we are more likely to get assistance. I want to ask the House and the hon. Members who argue for alignment whether they can point out to a single instance of a country that has a military alliance with the West in the under-developed world which stands for democratic socialism. Is it possible for you to point out to a single country which is a member of the Warsaw Pact which believes in a different economic and political pattern from what Russia professes? It is possible, it is quite understandable that the supporters of private enterprise argue that this would not have mattered. But this country, believing as it does in democratic socialism, could not have sacrificed its beliefs at the altar of such a false sense of security.

From the point of view of sheer diplomacy, apart from other considerations, could we have given up our non-alignment? One of the objectives of China in its tirade against India is to compel India into a camp. Those who want us to give up non-alignment, want us to walk into the parlours of China. They want us to succumb to the conspiracy of China to compel India to join a bloc. I could have understood this argument against non-alignment if it had stood in the way of India receiving military aid.

17 hrs.

**Mr. Chairman:** May I request the hon. Member to stop for a while as it has been announced that the Minister for Labour would make a statement regarding the Bombay strike exactly at 5 p.m.? If the House permits, let him conclude his speech. The House is sitting till 6 p.m. If the House permits, let him conclude his speech and then I will call the Labour Minister.

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):** It was decided that we will take it up at 5 p.m. Now, as the House is sitting till 6 p.m., let him finish his speech.

**Mr. Chairman:** All right, let him continue. I will call the Labour Minister after he has finished his speech.

**Shri Ravindra Varma:** Thank you very much, Sir.

I could have understood, as I said, the argument against non-alignment if it had stood in the way of our seeking or receiving military assistance when we became victims of aggression. One can receive military assistance without belonging to a military alliance. We have sought and received such assistance. I do not want to quote from American newspapers or from Mr. Khrushchev, but both America and the USSR realise that seeking and receiving

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

military assistance for self-defence does not go against the policy of non-alignment. I am tempted to quote Mr. Khrushchev, but I know that even Mr. Khrushchev has to bow before time and therefore I do not propose to introduce him here in my speech.

Then we come to the question of defence. It is nothing short of a travesty of truth to suggest that this Government is not interested or is not competent to defend the country. We know that the first and fundamental duty of a Government is to defend the country. But let us not have archaic conceptions of defence. I would tell the Opposition. This is not the time when as in the eighteenth or nineteenth century, for the murder of an archduke you sally forth and tilt your lance at the windmills. We have to realise today that a part of the mechanism of defence is diplomacy, that there is such a thing as international opinion which you cannot ignore, that today war itself is so complicated that it is not fought only on the battlefield, that there is diplomacy, there is propaganda and there are military operations.

Now, it is true that we were taken by surprise, not by the Chinese intentions, but by the massive and deliberate scale of the attack mounted by the Chinese. Many democracies have in the past been victims of the same kind of surprise attacks. When the surprise attack came it is true that we had reverses. Did not the West and did not Russia have initial reverses in the last war? We have to take into consideration the massive problems of our defence and the nature of our enemy and his tactics, the long frontier, the mountainous terrain, the tactics of the enemy to keep a long fluid front and minimise positional warfare. The difficulties in logistics were such that it was not possible for us immediately to turn the tide. How could we have turned the tide immediately against the enemy without building up our

supply lines, our logistics, without disrupting the enemy's supply lines, resorting to diversionary attacks and making use of aerial support? Could we have done this without extending the area of conflict and the area of vulnerability? We were not in a position to do so without building up our striking power.

The question then is whether Government is addressing itself to this task. For lack of time I cannot go into this question at length. I am sure others who follow me will do it. But it is very clear that from the moment this lesson was learnt the Government set about expeditiously securing the latest type of equipment, equipping mountain divisions and building up new mountain divisions and taking proper steps to see that the aerial vulnerability of our country was reduced to naught. The joint exercises to which the Government have now agreed will lead to a tremendous accretion of strength to our country since that is the only way in which, situated as we are, it will be possible for us to defend our skies. The hon. Member Shri Mukerjee referred to this Agreement being a forerunner to the granting of bases to other countries. When you want to see a snake in a rope you can always do so, I suppose even in Siberia. But the question is whether a piece of our territory is being given off to another country for purposes for which it desires to use that base. There is no such proposal in these joint air exercises. For lack of time I would not like to go into this question in detail, but there is nothing that compromises our sovereignty or our policy of non-alignment in the decision that we have taken to have joint exercises with the United States and U.K. and, if Russia were to come with an offer, perhaps our Government will consider it, but I am not competent to speak on that.

It is in this context that the Opposition has brought this motion of no-

confidence before the House. They agree that India should be defended; they agree that development should not suffer; they agree that our share of the needs of defence can be met only by increased taxation and collections from inside the country. They vote for these budget proposals here, but go out on the streets and organise agitations and obstruction against these very things. How is this consistent with the faith in democracy that they profess and the concern for the defence of the country which they proclaim?

I cannot but say that they have chosen a most inopportune moment for introducing this motion of no confidence. They say that the Congress has failed in the last fifteen years. In all humility, I want to say that it is not the Congress that has failed, but it is the Opposition. The Opposition has failed the country in that in the formative years of democracy when we needed parties to control the Government, when we wanted parties which could provide the people with alternatives for stability, the Opposition has failed the country miserably and failed to strengthen the concept of democracy. The Congress Government has not only tried to establish democracy and set the country on the path to socialism but succeeded in a large measure in both these objectives. Since the Opposition has failed to convince the people that they would provide a constructive alternative, every time they have gone before the electorate, the vote of no-confidence of the electorate has been on them, and there has been no question of no-confidence in the Congress at all.

The case of the Opposition, then, boils down to this. We do not agree among ourselves on anything that we have to offer; we do not agree amongst ourselves on anything that matters. Some of us want you to quit because you believe in non-alignment; some of us want you to quit because you have nationalised; some of us want you to quit because you have not nationalised

enough. There is nothing on which they agree except the thirteen words; as for the fourteenth word, it would have taken a Messiah to discover one which they could agree.

Yet, what it boils down to is this, not that the Government have failed the country, not that they have an alternative to place before the country, but that they do not like to see us sitting here. One does not like it; the other does not like it. So, they get together and say 'We have had enough of you; we cannot bear the sight of your sitting there; so, please get out'. Is this an argument that should be advanced in this House?

To call this, as an hon. Member did, a marriage of convenience will be an under-statement....

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

**Shri Ravindra Varma:** I shall conclude in a minute. At least, since I am on the subject of marriage, I hope you will allow me to go on.

I do not want to use strong language.

**An Hon. Member:** As you do always.

**Shri Ravindra Varma:** I may use strong language. But I can say that manner in which the hon. Member gives expression to his strong feelings, which is often disorderly, I cannot compete with him.

It is not a marriage of convenience, but it is a contract of political concupiscence. It is an inopportune demonstration of unprincipled opportunism. It is a numbing exhibition of the impunity that lack of responsibility breeds.

Sir, this motion must be rejected outright.