

Mr. Speaker, Sir, first I should like to start by explaining why this morning my colleagues and I did not stand in support of the admission of this motion. That attitude arises from the conclusion to which we came as far back as about two years ago that these motions of no-confidence moved at the opening of every session have become very sterile, routine things; not only that, they become self-defeating, because having challenged the Government on the opening day and almost inevitably taking a defeat, the whole of the rest of the session tends to become something of an anti-climax. I believe that this is bad parliamentary strategy, and therefore we certainly do not want to take part in the responsibility for following this path. But, Sir, the motion has been admitted by the House, and now it becomes necessary to go into its merits.

Mr. Madhu Limaye gave three grounds for his motion. The first is the Kerala situation. I do not think I shall deal with it, because those who have spoken already have dealt with it to some extent. I am quite prepared to listen to both the warring groups of Communists giving us diametrically opposite facts from which we will have to choose! I would rather save my time and turn to other matters.

The second ground given by Mr. Limaye is a good one -- concentration of power. I am very glad to find that so many gentlemen on both sides of me have now become aware of this concentration of power. One would imagine this is the first time it has happened. It is not. This concentration has existed for twenty years and has been slowly increasing year by year. It is part of the system or economic theory which they have adopted -- the system of State Socialism. If anyone believes that State Socialism can co-exist with decentralisation of power, I think what has already happened and what is going to happen will provide some useful education to those who have not been able to see things clearly. Acharya Vinoba Bhave mentioned concentration of power in five or six hands in Delhi ten years ago. It is not very important whether it is five hands or ten hands or two hands. It is bad if the number of hands gets smaller and smaller. But concentration of power even in five or ten hands in Delhi for the whole of India is bad enough. I am very glad that this greater awareness is coming over all of us. I am glad that Mr. Madhu Limaye has drawn attention to it.

Undoubtedly the importance given to the Intelligence Services of various kinds in the Cabinet reshuffle that took place recently did draw a lot of attention. It was out of place. Prime Ministers of democratic countries have not shown any interest in the Secret Service or secret police. That interest is shown by fascist and communist dictators. It is a great pity that the Prime Minister of this democratic country should have shown so much interest in a subject which should have been left to an underling.

The other point that Mr. Limaye makes is even more valid -- bureaucratisation of administration. Quite right. I am glad he has now come to realise that State Socialism must end in bureaucracy. When you hand over power to the hands of officials big and small in place of free citizens, whether you like it or not, bureaucratisation sets in. You cannot have State Socialism, you cannot have nationalisation and then complain of bureaucratisation. It is an inevitable price you have to pay. If we do not want bureaucratisation, let us join intelligent socialists in other parts of the world and realise that nationalisation, State industry and State enterprise are not the best way to social justice. There are other paths which are faster and more effective. I very much welcome the fact that a radical socialist like Mr. Madhu Limaye has realised that bureaucracy is setting in. If I may say so, he will have to re-think a little more. Dr. Lohia was a pioneer in that thinking. Let us give credit to him. He was an old friend of mine. He saw that State Capitalism which we are practising in India in the name of Socialism is as reactionary as any other kind of capitalism could possibly be. Therefore, he moved away from one camp as from the other. I am very glad that Mr. Limaye, by including this point in his

grounds for the no confidence motion, is carrying on the work of educating the people.

There is nothing new in all this. Gandhiji had sensed it. Gandhiji said long before Swaraj came that Swaraj must not mean the replacement of the white bureaucrat by the brown one. This is exactly what Swaraj today under this regime has come to mean -- replacement of a white bureaucracy by a brown bureaucracy. Therefore, for these two reasons, we support the motion. But the reasons why we shall vote for this motion, because we shall, are much broader.

We believe that the totality of this Government's domestic and international policies is disastrous for this country. We believe that everything or almost everything they do is hurting the country's vital national interests. Take their economic policies. Ever since the disastrous Second Plan devised by Dr. Mahalanobis and his communist colleagues from Russia, Poland and other countries at the Institute of Statistics in Calcutta was imposed on this country, the economy of this country has gone down from bad to worse. The Second Plan Frame was imposed on the Third Plan, which also became a failure like the Second. And the Fourth Plan which we are undergoing today is nothing but a magnified version of the Mahalanobis Second Plan which has brought this country to ruin.

The fiscal policies of government, putting aside the Plans for a moment, are equally bad. On the one hand, there is excessive taxation, both direct and indirect, and on the other hand there is the constant resort to inflation. Many of us have warned the Government at the time of the last Budget and the Budget before that their measures were inflationary and would result in rising prices. Sri Madhu Limaye gave the figures. In spite of all their protestations, a price rise as forecast by us has taken place and I predict it will take place further.

So I was very sorry for Shri Chavan, when I read the Cabinet reshuffle picture as it has emerged. He is the fall guy; he is the man who has been put on the spot. Because let me tell him that, unless he changes radically and fundamentally the policies of this government, those policies, the fiscal policies and the planning policies are going to doom this country and its economy to greater and greater depression. There is going to be a continual rise in prices, there is going to be greater and greater unemployment during every year that we pass, there is going to be increasing misery for the people, and I do not rule out ultimately food shortage, starvation and famine in this country. This is the path of ruin that this government is following and Shri Chavan has taken up the stewardship just when the ruin is becoming more and more visible, more and more inevitable. This is one reason why this Government must go and should not be allowed to survive.

The other reason is political. All the home and international policies of this Government reek of the subservience to the Soviet Union and the dictatorship there. The foreign policy of the present government is one of complete satellitism to the Soviet Union. I would like the Prime Minister to tell us of any single major issue on which she has taken a position contradictory to that of the Soviet Union. I do not think even one such instance exists. Whether you go eastwards to Cambodia and Vietnam or westwards to West Asia and Czechoslovakia, the result is the same -- complete subservience to the Soviet line. May I recall that in this very House when Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani -- I am glad she is sitting on our side now -- when she was a member of the Prime Minister's party and moved a simple resolution condemning the brutal Soviet attack on Czechoslovakia, the Prime Minister refused to accept that amendment and got it defeated. That is why I say that the entire foreign policy of this government is one of satellitism to the Soviet Union.

The latest example of this, of course, was the impropriety and breach of diplomatic and international law which was perpetrated when the Naxalite No. 1 from South Vietnam was entertained in this country as the guest of our government. What would we feel if a Naxalite from Bengal were to be received in a country with which we are friendly and was entertained as a guest of their government? So I would say that the entire range of the Government of India's international policy is one that does no credit to the independence and sovereignty of our country.

Simultaneously, at home there is the consistent infiltration of Communists and

- 3 -

crypto-Communists in key positions in every walk of life.

The continued sufferings of the people of Bengal is perhaps the worst evidence of this trend. When the Communist-dominated government of Bengal was removed and President's rule came, the people of Bengal naturally heaved a sigh of relief. They felt that at last some relief was coming their way and their rights and liberties would be safe. Nothing of the kind has happened. I have visited Bengal more than once and I have talked to numerous people from all walks of life. All there are in agreement that violence has not abated, that terrorism is still there and as far as Naxalite violence is concerned, it is probably even worse than it was under Shri Jyoti Basu! Now, how does this happen? Obviously, New Delhi is primarily to blame. President's rule means rule by the Home Ministry. Of course, the instrument through which you rule is the Governor and the Governor is such a person that no one could be considered to be more unfit to be the Governor of Bengal at this juncture. Today, even the Prime Minister's own party in Bengal has demanded his recall.

Sir, there is no reason to be surprised if Shri Dhavan has proved to be the kind of Governor that he is. The entire responsibility is that of the Government. In this House on the 23rd of December, 1967, when the Prime Minister was exactly where she is sitting now, I recalled to her the record of Shri Dhavan, whom she had then appointed as High Commissioner designate in England.

I had read out the whole record then; I will not do so now. It is in the records of Parliament of the 23rd December, 1967. I had suggested that that gentleman was unfit to represent this country in Britain. I shall now repeat only one quotation from Shri Dhavan to show how utterly unfit he was later on to be appointed Governor of a State when Communist infiltration was going on, when an attack on India's security and unity was in force, when people who owed allegiance to Mao Tse-tung were functioning.

What did Shri Dhavan say when our neighbour, Tibet, was overrun by the Chinese? This is what he said in the National Herald then:

"The interests of India are not directly involved, and the question of making a protest simply does not arise. The propaganda about Chinese 'aggression' in Tibet is completely baseless."

Then he went on to explain what happens in his view when Communists take over a part of Asia. This is very crucial. He went on to say:

"I have no doubt that the people of Tibet will benefit greatly as a result of closer contact between Tibet and China. Tibet is one of the most backward countries in the world....All this will change under Chinese rule. Tibet will now share the benefits of civilisation like all the other countries in Central Asia which have passed under Communist rule."

It was exactly predictable, if such a person, holding these views, were to be made the Governor of a State where the Chinese "front paw," as Mao Tse-tung put it, had landed on our territory, what would happen. Was this the man who was going to resist this infiltration and attack on our sovereignty and unity or was he going to say that the poor people of Bengal will also come to enjoy the "benefits of civilisation" when Mao Tse-tung through the Naxalites takes over the State? The entire guilt lies on the gentleman and the lady sitting opposite who, in spite of all these warnings, appointed this man, the most unfit in India, to be the Governor of Bengal at the present juncture.

There can be no question of elections in Bengal. There can be no question of going to the people until the people of Bengal are freed from the terror under which they are living. My Party has no hesitation in saying that until the Communist Parties in Bengal are outlawed, the possibility of a free election does not exist.

That is why, for all these reasons, we believe that this Government is a

danger to the security of our country, that it should go and, therefore, we shall vote for Shri Madhu Limaye's motion.

We want a change of government, but there are ways and ways of changing the government. There is a democratic way of changing the government and there are some doubtful ones. The undemocratic way of changing the government has been practised in many countries. It was practised in Britain in the days of Sir Robert Walpole, who was a very corrupt Prime Minister, who bought up members of the Opposition and who said that "every man and woman has a price." It happened in the Fourth Republic of France where, with constant defections, France came to have no stable government until the people of France turned to DeGaulle and instituted him as President with superpowers which were not there under the Constitution. This has been happening in our country and we call it "toppling." It is a rather indecent game which we have invented.

"Toppling" has nothing to do with democracy. That is not the way in which self-respecting people come to power. Democratic people come to power after an appeal to the people and a mandate of the electorate in the way that Mr. Ted Heath came to power in Britain a few weeks ago. That is the way we want to come to power, as we did in Orissa. We want to come to power by the mandate of the people. We will not listen to the advice of people who say: "Let us topple Shrimati Indira Gandhi and then see what comes to India."

You cannot fight something with nothing. You have got to fight something with something better. I do not want to remove Shrimati Gandhi until I can put in her place a better Prime Minister and a better government. I do not want to bring chaos to the Centre as there was chaos in the States of North India under the SVD. We want, therefore, an alternative government to come into existence before we remove this government. That is why I believe this country needs above all an alternative government, a shadow Cabinet, which the people can judge and see sitting on these benches and say: "Do we prefer that lot of people or do we prefer this lot?"

That is why when, on the 28th June, the AICC of the Opposition Congress passed a resolution putting a platform and a programme of action inviting other nationalist, democratic and socialist parties to respond, we responded, because we believed that that resolution met the needs of the time... (Interruption). The fact that some members of that party may have developed second thoughts and hesitations has nothing to do with it. They did the right thing on the 28th June. So far as we are concerned, we shall be glad to respond to that kind of an appeal because that is the way in which we can create a force in this country which can challenge this Government, drive it to go to the people either in the coming months or not later than the time when an election is due, defeat this Government and then cross the floor. That is how the democratic change of Government must take place. For that we must work from now on till the time for an appeal to the people comes.
