

leave things like that but would recover every inch of the lost land. The policy of non-alignment had stood the test of time and the Government had been rightly following it. In 1956, the mover of the motion himself had supported our foreign policy based on non-alignment.

The demand for the resignation of the Prime Minister on the basis of the results of only three bye-elections was against all principles of democracy. The motion was born out of a sense of frustration on the part of the mover and his supporters.

Shri M. R. Masani: The feeling among the people today was one of exasperation, of the limit of patience having been reached and that impatience was about maladministration and corruption in public life; the lack of honesty of purpose in carrying out the basic policies was strongly felt. The results of the recent bye-elections should serve as a warning to the Government that the people wanted that they should either mend their ways or quit.

The House as at present constituted did not accurately reflect public opinion in the country today. If figures were properly calculated, one would see that about 40 per cent of the people in the country were behind the motion of no-confidence.

The Government's policy was one of socialism; the objective of socialism was a more prosperous, free and equal society. But it had failed to achieve that objective. The different classes of society had not been benefited. The middle class which was the backbone of the community was crushed between soaring prices and rising taxes. Industry and business complained that they were being confined by endless regulations. The only class which was better off after independence was the class of some politicians in office, some officials and a few businessmen who worked hand-in-glove with those politicians and officers.

While the objective of a socialistic pattern was noble, the method of state capitalism that the Government must do everything for the people, was absolutely wrong. We never gave the people the feeling of freedom and the feeling of faith.

The result of all that was that our productivity was among the lowest in the world. The money that we needed to have more irrigation, seeds, implements and other things was going into wasteful projects. Instead of producing more food and sinking capital into land, we spent endless time on discussing distribution, controls, zones etc. The Government had failed to create a prosperous agricultural base on which our whole industry was based. No planning would succeed if the very foundation of economic life was weak as it was in India today.

Similarly, in industry, there was the same picture of false priorities. The State sector was being forced upon the country against its interests. We wanted economic democracy in our country and not that some persons sitting in Delhi should dictate to the people what they should or should not produce.

The return from the public sector enterprises was extremely poor and yet our national capital was being wasted in those projects. Instead of creating a climate for incentives, savings and production,

As regards distribution, attempts were being made to see that the increased income was equitably distributed, and the increased wealth was increasingly going towards the poorer sections.

The policy of non-alignment was a creed with us; we had accepted it after understanding its implications. It was a policy which we had evolved in the pre-independence days. India did not want to enter into military pacts with any nations of the world. That was the correct policy and, if it was ever vindicated, it was vindicated today. When leaders of the West and the East were praising the policy, it was unfortunate that our own people did not appreciate it. There was a time when the mover himself was opposed to the increase in defence allocation because he also thought that there was no fear of any attack on us. But today he was criticising lack of preparations and all that. He had talked about unity in the country but by his utterances he was certainly not preparing the country to meet the challenge.

The party or parties which wished to bring forward a no-confidence motion should be in a position to assume responsibility for Government but that was not the case. In fact, there was nothing common between the groups which had joined to oppose the Government. The motion which was bound to fall through was an attempt not only to wreak vengeance against the Congress and its leader but was also an attempt to demolish the image of Mother India.

Dr. Govind Das: The opposition parties which had joined together to put forward the motion had nothing in common between them; it was a strange combination of elements which believed in different ideologies and principles. In bringing the motion before the House, the mover had perhaps been motivated by animus against the Prime Minister and the Congress party. The bringing of the motion at a time when the country was in a state of emergency was most unfortunate.

In spite of some failings that might recently have crept into the Congress party, everybody in the country—even the parties in opposition—realised that that was the only party and the present Prime Minister was the only person who could run the administration of the country efficiently and successfully.

If any one said that the country had made no progress in the industrial, agricultural and other fields it only meant that he had closed his eyes to facts. We had made tremendous progress during the Five Year Plan periods—massive dams and huge factories were coming up all over the country.

In the field of foreign affairs the policy of non-alignment that we had been following was the correct policy. The policy was a part of India's traditions and culture. The critics of the policy failed to realise that if we had given up that policy we would not have received the support which we got from all countries at the time of the Chinese aggression. What would have been the position if Russia had sided with China when the latter attacked us? The leaders of the West and the East had expressed their appreciation of the policy of non-alignment and they were all with us. The Chinese had launched a sudden and treacherous attack on our borders and therefore there were no preparations. But there was no doubt that we would not

Shri Thirumala Rao: The motion had been sponsored by a conglomeration of opposition parties which were not bound by any common ideology or programme. If they really wanted a change in the present Government, the best way for them was to strive for gaining a majority in the House. There was no occasion for bringing forth the present motion.

Not so long ago the mover himself was a supporter of the policy of non-alignment but he had since shifted his stand. That policy of ours had been supported by the leading statesmen of the world. The Swatantra Party could not put the clock back and make the country aligned to a power bloc.

Planning was essential for running efficiently any institution or organization not to speak of a country. It was not known why the Swatantra Party was allergic to the concept of planning. They were against controls; as against that the other opposition party viz. the Communist Party pleaded for control. Government had to strike a *via media* between the two extremes.

The condition of our agriculture could not be changed in a moment. It was a slow progress for which the country had to go through a long range programme.

The communists were hunting with the hound and running with the hare. On the one hand, they supported the Prime Minister while, on the other, they were supporting a no-confidence motion against the Council of Ministers of which he was the leader. Their attitude towards China was also ambiguous.

Foreign aid was essential for our economic development which could take the country out of despondency. A motion of that type was not an answer to the situation; it had been brought forth for political propaganda.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The danger on our borders had become greater at the moment because of Pakistan's collusion with China. The present Government lacked courage and was incapable of thinking and acting. It had to be replaced by a more determined, dedicated and disciplined Government if we were to face the situation as it stood.

Government had failed correctly to assess the nature of aggression; it had vacillated in the implementation of foreign and defence policy. Secondly, Government had shown utter neglect of the problem of national security and it had failed to learn lessons from the past and to take adequate measures in terms of the mandate of Parliament for defence and development. Thirdly, Government had misused its emergency powers for party ends and had failed to effect economy, remove inefficiency and eradicate corruption and to gear up the administrative machinery to meet the requirements of the emergency. Fourthly, Government had been reluctant to introduce socio-economic measures to break the benumbing social order, the concentration of wealth and the monopoly of a few over the country's economy and administration. It had put more burden on the peasants and the working class by way of taxes, compulsory deposits, rise in prices and had thus failed in making the defence efforts purposeful.

exactly the reverse was being done. Our vital productive forces had been crippled in the last 15 years. The Government had almost consistently gone in for inflationary policies, deficit financing, customs and excise duties on the necessities of life and investment in expensive low-return enterprises like steel.

The bane of our economy was controls. Inflation was there because of the policies of the Government and, unless they were changed, no amount of controls would succeed. It was because of controls that our public life was riddled with corruption. If economic and political powers were in the same hands, corruption was bound to be there.

All the talk of socialism had been a cover for setting up State capitalism and bureaucracy benefiting a new class and exploiting the mass of people.

Our foreign as well as defence policies had not been motivated by independence of judgement. 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 or procommunist policies. Government's attitude in throttling the appeal of the Dalai Lama when he went to the Security Council for help was deplorable. What had been wrong with our foreign policy was that it had failed to recognize the nature of international communism. One could not be neutral between right and wrong, between slavery and freedom. The policy of the Government had been evasion of that moral issue.

The highlights of the Government's policy had consisted in hiding from the Parliament and the people the fact that Chinese troops had occupied our territory in Aksai Chin. Secondly, a crypto-communist had been kept in charge of the defence portfolio. Thirdly, there had been acceptance of unilateral ceasefire and, fourthly, the acceptance of the Colombo proposals was a mistake.

Our humiliation last year had been the direct result of the failure of the Government.

The agreement with Voice of America had been properly entered into. There was no reason why Government should resile from it. If they did, what value were the words of our Government going to have in future?

The Kamaraj Plan was not going to put an end to corruption in Government. That was not an answer to what the country wanted.

Let the Congress Party assert itself and let them make a pragmatic rather than a doctrinaire approach to the problems. Let them provide the country with a clean and decent government. We were as great a country as the Chinese, with many advantages. We could inflict a crushing defeat on them.

Let our armed forces have the political leadership they deserved.