

5855

Speech of Mr. M.R. Masani, M.P., in the course of the discussion on the motion of No Confidence in the Union Government, in the Lok Sabha, on August 19, '63

Mr. 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 bazaars were: "Kame 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. 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 maladministration 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 these 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 penitentie in the mind of the electorate -- it is not in my mind because I do not see any chance of improvement and that is why I 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.

It has been suggested that the motion will be defeated. Of course, it will. We knew 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.

Mr. M.R. Masani: Even a year ago, as Acharya Kripalani pointed out, only 44.72 per cent of the electorate in the elections to the Lok Sabha voted for the Congress Party. It got 361 seats.

Mr. A.M. Thomas: How many voted for the Swatantra Party?

Mr. 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 by-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 fifteen 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 they 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 nation, 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 of 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 officials. The combination of Malaviya and Serajuddin is the only vested interest in this country. It is this class which Dhillon, the Yugoslav communist, has described as the New Class, which talks of socialism in Russia and Yugoslavia and feathers its own nest. It is 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 in 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 sarcaar 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

but, our productivity, given the resources. Then why is it not done? Not because of the wickedness of one Minister or another, because ⁸⁹two or three Food Ministers have complained, the Planning Commission 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 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 Gosplanners 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 know, 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 should.

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? 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 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 laws 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 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 2.65 million applicants on the live register of the employment exchanges 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 capable, 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: Hu soni chhu. Barbad thai gaya. He was in utter despair and helpless. 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 for what purpose? Because 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 pF, 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 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 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 implementation that is not so good." It sounds very good. But let us consider a brilliant general in a battle who makes a scheme to surprise 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 says: "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 planning 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 judgement - 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 judgement 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 or for a pro-communist 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 "sovereignty" 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 done 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 Jyama 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 countries 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.

Panchsheel and co-existence are good. But you cannot co-exist with those who do not believe in co-existence with you. Mao Tse-tung had 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 him. 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, a Minister of State went to Berlin and recognised the Wall for what it is and did not shrink 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: Can we 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 our 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 criticism of the "Hindi-Chini bhai-bhai" slogan and said: "we will do it again if the occasion arose and shout the slogan of bhai-bhai." 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. 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 agressed into and occupied our territory in Aksaichin, a fact which is admitted in a letter to 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 those 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 the 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, acceptance 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 a new Government in its place. The result therefore is that in 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 practised non-alignment: Turkey, Iran, Philippines, Japan, Thailand.

An Hon. Member: Pakistan.

Mr. 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 like 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 psychological war. It is a war of propaganda also; every communist war is a propaganda war. So, propaganda is as important as military 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 stations 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 sanctions 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 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 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 the 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 thus: "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 never 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 an 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 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 B.C., that great orator, Demosthenes, addressed the Athenians who were fighting a war against Philip of Macedon. 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 Thermopylae, you run there; and if he 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 that 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, writes 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. Boom marches on."

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

Mr. Tyagi: Your party may do the same.

Mr. 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 Razaraj 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 with 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 if 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 dhali topiwala 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, 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 Kharaj 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 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?

Mr. 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 three years and a half. 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 people of China rise in revolt every few months and weeks all over the country against the hated dictatorship. So 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 Mahatma 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 the 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.