

SPEECHES BY
PRIME MINISTER
JAWAHAR LAL NEHRU
IN PARLIAMENT
(1957–1964)

VOLUME II

Published By
LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

© 2024 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of
Business in Lok Sabha (Sixteenth Edition) and Printed by Lok Sabha
Secretariat, New Delhi-110001

FOREWORD

PREFACE

CONTENTS 1957–1964

| Sl. No. | Year/Date | Subject | Page No. |
|---------|------------|---|----------|
| 1. | 16.05.1957 | Reply on Motion of Thanks to President's Address | 3 |
| 2. | 24.07.1957 | Demands for Grants | 19 |
| 3. | 02.12.1957 | Statement on Reported Refusal of Iraq Government to Permit Use of Habbaniya Airport by I.A.F. Aircraft | 26 |
| 4. | 02.12.1957 | Statement on Attempt on the Life of President Soekarno of Indonesia | 28 |
| 5. | 18.02.1958 | Reply on Motion of Thanks to President's Address | 30 |
| 6. | 19.02.1958 | Motion regarding Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Affairs of the Life Insurance Corporation | 43 |
| 7. | 24.02.1958 | Obituary References to Maulana Azad, Shri B. Das and V.M. Obaidullah | 53 |
| 8. | 09.04.1958 | Demands for Grants | 57 |
| 9. | 08.09.1958 | Statement Regarding Informal Meeting to Discuss Food Situation | 71 |
| 10. | 09.12.1958 | Motion regarding International Situation | 75 |
| 11. | 19.02.1959 | Reply on Motion of Thanks to President's Address | 92 |
| 12. | 13.03.1959 | Statement regarding Agreement for Military Aid Between USA and Turkey, Iran and Pakistan | 110 |

| Sl. No. | Year/Date | Subject | Page No. |
|---------|------------|---|----------|
| 13. | 27.04.1959 | Statement regarding Situation in Tibet | 114 |
| 14. | 07.08.1959 | Resolution regarding inclusion of English in the 8th Schedule of the Constitution | 121 |
| 15. | 19.08.1959 | Proclamation in respect of Kerala | 132 |
| 16. | 28.08.1959 | Adjournment Motion Regarding situation in India's Northern Border | 148 |
| 17. | 04.09.1959 | Motion regarding Report of Committee of Parliament on Official Language | 154 |
| 18. | 04.09.1959 | Motion for Adjournment Regarding situation in West Bengal | 164 |
| 19. | 04.09.1959 | Talks between the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India | 170 |
| 20. | 04.09.1959 | Resolution regarding Reference of the Tibet Issue to the UNO | 173 |
| 21. | 12.09.1959 | Motion regarding White Paper on Indo-Chinese Relations | 185 |
| 22. | 21.12.1959 | Statement regarding Sino-Indian Relations | 198 |
| 23. | 22.02.1960 | Reply on Motion of Thanks to the President's Address | 205 |
| 24. | 26.04.1960 | Joint Communique of the Indian and Chinese Prime Ministers | 229 |
| 25. | 01.08.1960 | Statement regarding the Naga Hills and Tuensang Area | 237 |
| 26. | 10.08.1960 | Motion regarding Report of the Department of Atomic Energy | 244 |

| Sl. No. | Year / Date | Subject | Page No. |
|---------|-------------|---|----------|
| 27. | 22.08.1960 | Motion regarding Third Five Year Plan-A Draft Outline | 251 |
| 28. | 03.09.1960 | Motion regarding Situation in Assam | 266 |
| 29. | 30.11.1960 | Statement regarding Incidents in Congo | 283 |
| 30. | 05.12.1960 | Statement regarding Discussions between the Central Government and Government of West Bengal regarding Transfer of Berubari to Pakistan | 290 |
| 31. | 23.02.1961 | Reply on Motion of Thanks to President's Address | 307 |
| 32. | 01.04.1961 | Demands for Grants | 325 |
| 33. | 01.04.1961 | Lifting of ban on Trade with Goa | 331 |
| 34. | 14.08.1961 | The Constitution (Tenth Amendment) Bill: Integration into the Indian Union of Territories of Dadra & Nagar Haveli | 333 |
| 35. | 21.08.1961 | Motion regarding Third Five Year Plan | 337 |
| 36. | 28.08.1961 | Statement regarding Talks with Sant Fateh Singh | 350 |
| 37. | 29.08.1961 | Discussion regarding Statement on Punjabi Suba | 355 |
| 38. | 14.03.1962 | Constitution (Twelfth Amendment) Bill | 370 |
| 39. | 19.03.1962 | Reply on Motion of Thanks to President's Address | 379 |

| Sl. No. | Year /Date | Subject | Page No. |
|---------|------------|--|----------|
| 40. | 24.04.1962 | Statements regarding : (I) Proposed Resumption of Nuclear Tests by U.S.A.; and (II) Airmen Captured by Naga Hostiles | 396 |
| 41. | 30.04.1962 | Alleged Muslim Concentration on East Pakistan Border | 401 |
| 42. | 02.05.1962 | Reply on Motion of Thanks to President's Address | 403 |
| 43. | 11.05.1962 | Statement regarding Firing on Policeman from Chinese Trade Agency | 419 |
| 44. | 04.06.1962 | Statement regarding Disturbances in East Pakistan and Subsequent Migrations | 421 |
| 45. | 18.06.1962 | Statement regarding Firing by Pakistani Armed Police on Evacuees from Rajshahi District | 425 |
| 46. | 06.08.1962 | Statement regarding Situation in Ladakh | 434 |
| 47. | 28.08.1962 | Constitution (Thirteenth Amendment) Bill and State of Nagaland Bill | 438 |
| 48. | 08.11.1962 | Resolutions regarding Proclamation of Emergency and Aggression by China | 444 |
| 49. | 14.11.1962 | Resolution regarding Proclamation of Emergency and Aggression by China | 461 |
| 50. | 19.11.1962 | Statement on Situation in NEFA and Ladakh | 477 |

| Sl. No. | Year / Date | Subject | Page No. |
|---------|-------------|--|----------|
| 51. | 21.11.1962 | Statement regarding Reported Chinese Offer of Cease-Fire | 486 |
| 52. | 10.12.1962 | Motion regarding Border Situation Resulting from the Invasion of India by China | 495 |
| 53. | 23.01.1963 | Motion regarding Colombo Conference Proposals | 503 |
| 54. | 25.01.1963 | Motion regarding Colombo Conference Proposals | 516 |
| 55. | 27.02.1963 | Reply on Motion of Thanks to President's Address | 543 |
| 56. | 23.03.1963 | Concentration of Chinese Troops in Tibet | 567 |
| 57. | 23.04.1963 | Industrial Licensing Policy | 572 |
| 58. | 24.04.1963 | Official Language Bill | 576 |
| 59. | 07.05.1963 | Statement on Discussion with Foreign Dignitaries | 593 |
| 60. | 13.08.1963 | Statement on Indo-Pakistan Talks | 601 |
| 61. | 14.08.1963 | Statement on Agreement with Voice of America | 606 |
| 62. | 16.08.1963 | Chinese Troop Concentrations along the India-China Border | 608 |
| 63. | 17.08.1963 | Statement regarding Enquiry Made by Justice S.K. Das into Certain Transactions of M/S Serajuddin & Co. | 619 |
| 64. | 22.08.1963 | Motion of No Confidence in the Council of Ministers | 629 |
| 65. | 25.11.1963 | Obituary References | 647 |

| Sl. No. | Year / Date | Subject | Page No. |
|---------|-------------|--|----------|
| 66. | 29.11.1963 | Statement regarding India's Representation at Funeral of President Kennedy | 649 |
| 67. | 11.12.1963 | Motion regarding Report on Mid-Term Appraisal of Third Five Year Plan | 651 |
| 68. | 13.04.1964 | Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs | 665 |

SPEECHES BY
PRIME MINISTER
JAWAHAR LAL NEHRU
IN PARLIAMENT (1957–1964)
VOLUME II

REPLY ON MOTION OF THANKS TO PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

16 May, 1957

During this debate, which has been going on here for the last two days, many old scholars have spoken and some new ones have also expressed their views, I am happy to hear that different types of views and thoughts were presented. Acharya Kripalani ji, as usual, has raised various important issues encompassing almost all the aspects of agenda of the debate. Our friend, Brajeshwar Prasad ji, also highlighted some important issues. A new leader from our opposition party also raised some issues which seemed to be trivial ones. It seems that he is still being haunted by the election hangovers. His way of speech did not suit Lok Sabha but an election meeting. There is a gem present in our House who has taken us back to the old days - a king, who has still not realized that India has won her freedom. In fact, he even said that India is not free and is merely a tool of the British Government. Now, it is a bit difficult for me to comment anything on such thoughts, because it is beyond my ability to transform the mind into which the old colonial practices are so deeply engrained. We have to adopt the modern approach and not to be shackled into the old mindset. Today's era is new era – both in India and outside it. The world that existed 20, 30 or 40 years ago has ended. It is written in history, whoever wants to know about it, should go through it. This Lok Sabha is entrusted with the responsibility of not only governing today's India but also taking steps for better India in the coming time.

Our President's address contains some important points. People complain that there is no mention of other things in it, for example, there is no mention of Goa, or there is no mention of any serious issue. This is correct and this is a valid objection, but at the same time the President's speech is not a questionnaire. You would have noticed that in it, special attention has been drawn to Food grains which is perhaps the biggest part of the speech, because it is an important question for us. This issue has got a lot of attention from all the Members who have spoken here during the last two days. Because that is a fundamental question. The President has also made statements about it.

Acharya Kripalani ji said that the President's speech was highly focused on and restrained. It is a good thing that it was well restrained and that the President's speech should be rules oriented.

It is not appropriate for the President to get carried away at times. The Lok Sabha is also aware that the President's speech is not his own thought, although it is delivered from his auspicious mouth. It is prepared by the Government.

One more thing happened, which hurt me. Regarding the President's address, Shri Dange said that the President got trapped into the issue of regionalism. He has become parochial, because, he has mentioned the eastern districts of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh and has forgotten the rest of India. I think what Shri Dange has said is an unreasonable thing and it is not only unreasonable but it is also far from reality. What has been said in the President's address is a straight forward thing that there has been more damage in these two regions and there is no doubt that it has happened. This does not mean that there are no problems in other parts of India. They are definitely there. So the most important question before us at present is about the production of food grains and their supply to the people. I would not like to say much about this because my colleague who is the Minister of Food and Agriculture will speak in details in this regard. But one thing is clear which is also evident from the address of the President that this question is of great importance. This is important not only for the present time, but has great importance for the future as well. The progress of our country depends on what and how much we produce in India through farming. So as far as the importance of this question is concerned, it is undoubtedly important. Now, since there are problems associated with it, I cannot answer this question all of a sudden. I am not denying that there has not been any negligence or mistake on the part of anyone, it very likely to have such negligence. This is not only our problem but also of the other Governments in our neighbourhood. I would like to draw your attention to one point. India is not a single country facing such problems at this time. Even if you set aside the current year and the recent few years, there would have been problems even in the past. China is our neighboring country. It is a very big country and definitely they have a very good system. They are also facing the same issue at this time. Our colleagues from the opposition party cannot say that their system is faulty, as we all are aware that they have a proper system. Despite their robust system they are also stuck in the same problem, because, these things are not completely under their control. Although, I accept that mistakes would have been committed from our side, but we should restrain ourselves and I would like to request the honorable members to highlight the mistakes committed by us. We should consult them and incorporate their advices as applicable for the better outcomes. But it is important to understand that situation is not completely under control at this time but I hope that thing will be better in the due course. China is also one such country which largely depends on agriculture. The yield of agriculture depends on rain and absence of any other calamity. We can increase the network of canals and thus bring the situation under control. We can and should control that by promoting trades. But I do not have any magic stick through which I could make this happen. You are already aware that Bihar and the area near Delhi faced calamities and they lost all their crops due to hailstorm. I do not want to cover up anything. If any mistake or error has been made then we should take note of it and you have every right to point out those mistakes and it is our responsibility to make the most of your valuable suggestion. After all, the task before us neither belongs to any particular party nor that of the opposition parties. We all have to address the bigger issues of India, for that I will

urge and request you to make critical comments but try to solve those problems altogether through coordinated efforts.

I have given the example of China before you. I can also give you more examples, where this issue and low yield has caused great troubles. The east European countries which are communist countries are entangled in a lot of trouble and despite trying their best to overcome it, they are still stuck in the trouble. During the last year and the current year, there has been gentle efforts made to address it. You will be surprised to know that when one of the east European countries which is a communist country continued to face this problem for about a year, they were advised by their experts economists to follow the measures taken by India. They were advised to emulate India's five year plan and other similar economic measures. By saying this I do not intend to cover up the mistakes that we have committed. I am showing you the bigger picture. It is fine that you selectively pick up some point and start discussing this but we have to see the whole picture also. At the end, a burning question before India and the other countries of East Asia is how to come out of the quagmire of poverty wherein we all are deeply stuck. Now, in a country of humongous population with scarce resources, there is no way to overcome these issues immediately or in a magical way be it in India or anywhere else. No matter how many revolutionary methods you try, it still takes time, because, unless wealth is created in the country the poor cannot be taken out of the quagmire of poverty.

One of our colleagues from the opposition party said that socialism is not going to be achieved merely through some slogans or statements. I completely agree with him that socialism is not just about slogans or statements and I also want him to keep this thing in his mind. We have to erect such a huge building from the base, we have to build millions of houses and raise millions of households, we have to shape minds and change the structure of our society and do thousands of important works. Let our country get the ability to produce more wealth and food grains, take advantage of it and then distribute it properly. Our colleagues want to bring socialism by dividing, but what should this division be done for? I do not know what he wants to divide? Do they want to bring socialism here by distributing the poverty of the country?

One of our colleagues to show the poor condition of India, said that the number of street vendors, peanut vendors and rickshaw pullers is increasing day by day. Now, I could not understand that how they drew a conclusion from the rise in the numbers of street vendors or the rickshaw pullers that the condition of India is pathetic. There may be something new about this in their opinion, but I would like to make one thing clear that these street vendors and rickshaw pullers are also respectable people.

I would urge them to have a broader vision and look at these questions, whether they are inside India or outside India, as a whole and then consider them separately. I do not deny to this fact that thousands of mistakes have been committed and our entire country is grappling with several weaknesses and shortcomings. I do not want

to discuss much about food grains on this occasion, but I strongly feel its importance and our President also accorded much importance to it. In that regard, there is problem which often arises before us that there are many states in our country and they have their own policies which are different from other states. The lack of uniformity in their policies induces several challenges. We should try to formulate a uniform policy on this question through the Planning Commission and other concerned institutions.

Let me say one more thing that I myself have a strong displeasure about the fact that the states have not implemented the policies in a desired manner and I will accept, if someone complains about this. What we need to notice that it should be implemented immediately, I don't remember it properly and my friend has also mentioned to further investigate it. Our intention is to find more ways and to know fully what is being produced, why not adequate yield was produced in those areas where we expected more to be produced? Now we also have more ways and means to carry out this task, particularly through statistical means.

Earlier too we had some statistical data, but we were highly dependent on the statements of *Patwaris*. How can we rely so much on that? And there were many other problems. Now, we are getting the proper data, which will help us.

Leaving this aside, you should concentrate on the questions before us. I think your mind must be somehow occupied with what happened yesterday evening during the Budget speech. This is not the time to say anything on my budget. There will be many opportunities to think and discuss about this by consulting one another, but I have mentioned this context so that we can understand the real issue being faced by the country. We need to take such steps which are serious. Although it is difficult to initiate this but we have to take those steps. You may ask why to take those steps? This is so, because either we fulfil the greater commitment which we call the Five Year Plan to take India forward or whatever we say, let it be fulfilled, or we remain stagnant, let it decline and with it ,let the country fall. We are caught in the midstream. We mustered our courage and jumped into the river, now there are no other ways left to us, either we remain stuck there or reach the other side by using your optimum strength. So what is meant by budget, such a budget? The thing which matters is our intention, our commitment, our firm belief that we will swim to the shore, we will reach there with full force, no matter how much difficulties we have to face.

You yourself can understand that no Government likes to increase the burden on the people. Generally, the Government itself is hesitant about this. We did not do this with pleasure. We present our opinion for your consideration, not with pleasure, but this compulsion that unless we take strong measures, we cannot get rid of the problems and will be standing nowhere. This is to be contemplated that if we initiate some measures, some corrective changes in the course is likely to take place later on. But it cannot happen that we let the today's situation continue. It is said, and it is rightly said, I have no objection to this that the income of the farmers should increase,

new pay commission should be constituted, all these things are said. There can be a very reasonable debate on this issue, I am not denying this that it cannot happen, there can be a lot of debate, especially our people who work hard, their income should increase. Who can say that it should not increase? But if you take any step at this time in an attempt just to get transitory benefits by destroying the foundation of our entire five-year plan, then it is not a prudent step. You can understand yourself. Wherever necessary, help should be provided, income should be increased, but if we make it a populist practice, then the country which is trying to progress somehow or the other and is raising itself from the ground zero, with its own strength, will be failed by increasing more burden on its back. This will ultimately become difficult for the country to rise. This is a tricky question, you should consider it. But what I would like to request you with great respect is that you should look at the whole picture and do not see this country separately, but try to observe all those countries which are in a similar poor condition and is trying hard to move out of it. It is a strange matter that the big questions that are troubling us here are troubling those bigger nations although their circumstances are different compared to ours. Although, their social structure is different. The same question being faced by all those countries, be it China, or India or other eastern European countries. So there is no use in making empty remarks. This is our wish and also the wish of the opposition party that India should progress. Please tell us happily where we have made mistakes in the matter of India's progress. And one thing I would like to appeal to all the honorable members is that it is my wish that the work that you do here in the Lok Sabha, like asking questions here or drawing attention to some important matters, if you have any complaint against any ministry, you should take your complaint directly to that Minister. You are most welcome for this. You express your complaints in writing or verbally so that some discussions be made with you and your genuine suggestion could be incorporated. The point is that we want this kind of relationship to exist. A lot can be accomplished with this kind of cooperation. I do not say that everything that is promised will be possible to fulfill, but on the one hand we compete with each other, as is the custom of Parliament, and on the other hand, we should also help each other in achieving those bigger mutually consented goals, this is also the tradition of Parliament. And who does not agree in taking India forward?

Acharya Kripalani said that this time there is more focus in the President's speech on the condition of the country and less on the condition of the world. This is correct. In fact, as I mentioned earlier, the most focus is on the condition of the country, especially on matters related to food and water because that is a question before us. It is obvious that it is our work, yours, and that of the Lok Sabha to pay attention to the condition of the country. You make laws for this place but you do not make laws for other countries. And in terms of foreign countries as well, we can only exert as much power as we have in our country. This is a significant point. Matters relating to foreign affairs come to us. I have already mentioned that it is not the desire of our Government to get entangled in foreign matters but there is a

compulsion of circumstances and the realities of today's world. You, gentlemen, are mindful of this matter. You occasionally mention it as well. But because my connection is with this Ministry, nowadays, due to the situation in the world, I feel burdened. It means I am concerned that nothing should happen in the world that disrupts our household affairs, that leads to instability in our household affairs, and we get entangled in the affairs of the world as well. We face the threat of a hydrogen bomb. Our approach to this issue should not merely be intellectual comprehension but should involve a deep understanding so that we realize how close the world is to destruction nowadays. If by some coincidence even a slight opportunity arises, we cannot predict where the world might end up. We are interested in this. We need to use whatever influence we have to promote peace and reconciliation. I'm not saying, and if anyone thinks so, they misunderstand that we have a tremendous force. Our power is significant. Our voice is small. We cannot create noise and we cannot exert pressure on anyone. Nevertheless, whatever strength we have measured, we need to direct it towards peace. That's why we have decided and are following the policy that in today's world, where there are major armed factions, we should maintain friendly relations with them but refrain from getting involved in conflicts which are referred to as military alliances or military relations. We want to stay separate from such alliances. This has been our policy and I believe that the Lok Sabha has continuously accepted it. Now, the gentlemen from the opposition who do not like this policy or say that we should do something else should clearly state what kind of discussion they want to have. I want to know this. They can say that we should join a major faction in the world and then they will support us. People say that regarding Kashmir, who has supported you in the Security Council, what is your policy? I believe that although the Security Council is not a map of the world, it is not a model. But what conclusion do you draw from that? Do you want that like our neighboring country Pakistan, we too should be tied behind a chariot and go wherever that chariot goes? This is a serious matter and it should be clearly understood that if we do not do these two things - as I think we should not do - then we have to tolerate its consequences and I think that the consequences of that will also be good in the end. Not just from a theoretical point of view but from a practical point of view. If you like this basic policy of ours, as you have repeatedly said, then the result is that at times we suffer losses and the countries which are bound by big agreements get angry with us and at times, they give opinions against us. But my opinion is very strong that there is no other path for India other than the policy we have followed. I would just like to say that by following that policy, we benefited ourselves, gained some respect for ourselves and also helped to some extent in maintaining peace in the world. There have definitely been three - and perhaps more - occasions when even a small weight and a small voice of India made a difference in the history of the world, that is, in matters of war and peace. I would say that by following that policy, we got some benefits, our respect increased and it has also helped to some extent in maintaining peace in the world. There have been three or perhaps more than three occasions, when a small step of India has made a difference in the history of the world, i.e. in the context of war and

peace. But whatever happens we have to do our duty, we have to try to run our country in such a way that we do not fall into a market bargain. That is, if someone comes and tells us that they will give us something and for that, we should support them, we should not get involved with that. No great country can progress like this. My concern and effort is that whatever India stands for, it should be of high quality and excellent because we have to look far and take our country forward.

Several gentlemen asked why Goa is not mentioned in this. Mr. Gore, who has personal experience of Goa, said one thing - and he said the right thing - why do not you say clearly about the policy regarding Goa? I thought that we had clearly stated what our basic policy is in this regard. We have said that we will not send any military to Goa or we will not conquer Goa with any weapon. I would like to talk about why we will not do that. We will not do it because it will be against the policy we have laid down till now in world affairs. Apart from all the principles, we will get into a thousand problems due to this. The place we have created in the world will be destroyed. We will lose our place in the matters of the world. We will fall into conflicts from which it will be difficult to escape. Apart from the principles, this will have practical consequences.

Apart from this, it is not strange that India is doing it and no one else is doing it. I have said earlier also that this is the exact question of Macau in China. That too is a small Portuguese base.

China is a superpower as well as a powerful country and there is no doubt that it can take down by force whenever it wants. Why didn't they do that? Because they are far-sighted. They look far ahead and do not want to suffer a huge loss for a small temporary gain.

I have shown you that it does not make sense for us to get excited and talk about one thing and then get into trouble and abandon our policy. I have repeatedly said that it is important that Goa should be annexed by India.

You have accepted this and every Indian also says the same and I have no doubt that it will happen but it is a matter of time. We should not do any work in a hurry and should not do it because we are enthusiastic. We should consider what results such action could lead to. If we do not attack there with the army, should we allow a major military attack to take place there or not? You know this question has arisen. What will be the result if a major attack takes place there without military? If we are forced to deploy troops again, then it becomes a wrong thing. Often people do not know what they have said. First, it was said that we are doing this to force you to bring in troops. So if you see, you will know that then we get stuck in the same rut. The issue of Goa is an unsettling question merely because there are only disrespectful and wrong talks against the Portuguese rule there are excesses that go against India and undermine its dignity - that's there - but the thoughts of the people there, especially

their concerns, the burden upon them, the pressure they face, the injustices happening, these things also distress us. I'll clearly say that I am stuck in a big dilemma. Some of the financial actions which we call sanctions, had some impact on the Portuguese Government, and certainly it was there and it was alright but it affected the common people there, they were troubled and perhaps they were even more troubled than by the Portuguese Government itself. So I do not want those poor people to be troubled. They are already troubled enough under Portugal's rule. But when our actions increase trouble then, this becomes a matter of consideration. So what should we do and what should we not do, these are all dilemmas. I once said that I want a couple of main things to be understood and keeping those in mind, we do not want to take any military action. What kind of turmoil may happen in the world, what its repercussions might be, it's not a trivial matter. What do we want to do then? We want to do what goes with our principles. This thing, undoubtedly, belongs ultimately to the people of Goa - it belongs to us too, I do not deny that - but primarily it belongs to the people of Goa. Whether they live in Goa or outside, it is theirs. Nearly a million Goans live in Mumbai and it saddens me to say that they mostly fight among themselves and hope that the Government of India will help them. They have not even tried to stand on their fee, and I am saddened by this fact. I want this week or this month, I asked the Members of the opposition party and the members on this side, and they told me and we all come together to discuss and think about what we should do in this matter. If they agree, then we will definitely participate in the meeting. I want honorable members who are interested in this issue to also participate and shed some light.

I also want to remind you of one more thing about Goa. There is a case in the International Court of Justice filed by the Portuguese Government and you know what it is about. Actually, it pertains to Dadra and Nagar Haveli. This issue is not devoid of complications either and there are complexities involved. Our response to this has been presented in court. Portugal has requested time to respond to our reply and this dispute is merely about whether the court has the right to consider this question or not. These are all complications that I wanted to present before you.

There has been much debate about Kashmir and I do not feel it appropriate to say anything further about it now. Dr. Yaring came here recently and presented his reports. Most likely, within a few days or a week - I do not know exactly - there will be a debate in the Security Council. Therefore, I do not feel it appropriate to say much about it at this time.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am always glad when this House discusses these broad questions of policy, whether domestic or international. We want as much criticism as possible on governmental policies. We want hon. Members, whether on this side or on the other side of the House, to help us with their views, criticisms, etc. Because, in spite of the fact that there are various parties opposing each other— there is the government party, there are opposition parties, and naturally we have occasion to oppose each other in this House—I have always in mind that this Parliament has to function as a

whole for the good of India; and while we may criticize each other, as we should when that is necessary, we have always to remember that we are engaged in a common undertaking. So I welcome criticism. Sometimes, of course, when the criticism is, to my thinking, irrelevant or far fetched, then perhaps my welcome is not quite so warm.

It is a fact that we are facing, in India and the world, problems of tremendous significance. It is a trite saying that we are passing through grave periods of transition, in the world or in India. It is often repeated. But I rather doubt that, although we repeat this very often, we quite realize the crucial nature of this period through which we are passing. These days, months and years that pass, whether in the international sphere or in our domestic sphere, are of the most vital importance. In the international sphere we have lived during these past terrible years, almost on the edge of disaster and catastrophe. The fact that it has been avoided thus far need not make us complacent; we still live on it. It is an extraordinary state of affairs, what you read about daily in your newspapers —what is happening elsewhere, whether it is the hydrogen bomb, the test explosions, the piling up of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. They are being spread out in other countries too; they are being given to other countries. It is a terrible prospect.

We talk of disarmament, and sometimes one feels that the world is making some progress towards dis-armament. And then we come back to the hub and realize not only that we remain where we were but we have perhaps gone back a little. Hon. Members opposite said that the fault lies with a certain group of nations, not with others. Now, it is not our function to find fault with any nation. We have to express our opinions—sometimes even though they might be disliked by some country—but we avoid finding fault with nations or quarrelling with nations. We want to be at peace with them. If our opinions differ, naturally we have to express them. But it is a somewhat extraordinary state of affairs: take this question of the building up of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. Almost every intelligent person knows and says that if there is a war in which these weapons are employed, it may mean almost extinction of humanity or a large part of it. That being admitted, what is done to prevent it? They build up these very weapons and go on experimenting with them. So far as experimenting is concerned, it is admitted that there are known dangers with each experiment. The extent of danger is argued about. True. But, the fact that they are dangerous is admitted by every one. Whether we have passed the extreme danger point or not may be argued about. Then, there are the unknown dangers about which nobody knows. They are unknown dangers. Yet, this thing goes on. Most countries say that there are at present two major blocs in possession of a large number of these bombs and a third, namely, the United Kingdom which presumably, has some atomic bombs and in the course of experimenting with hydrogen bombs. I should like this House just not to consider this merely on the intellectual plane, important as that is, but just try to understand this picture of great countries, respected countries going ahead with their preparations for what can only end, if this thing continues in world disaster on a tremendous scale. I am not referring to the amount of money that is

being spent or wasted over this tremendous arma-ment race. I was told only yesterday that our Five Year Plan with our thousands of crores of rupees is just a few months expenditure on the military budget of a great country. Eighty days, I believe, was the figure Our Five Year Plan with all this development work and everything included in this country is 80 days military expenditure in peace time. In war, of course, it will be much more. Here is this world hungering for development. Asia, Africa, etc, and these vast sums of money being spent not on building up anything but on weapons of destructions. It is an extraordinary state of affairs.

There is another aspect. We see in the Middle East today a number of very odd developments taking place—last year all this has been happen-ing:—first in connection with the Suez Canal, then intervention in Egypt, invasion of Egypt and other matters, then Jordan. Once I said in this House, I remember, though I used the word unthinkingly at that time, that the various changes in the Middle East have led to the creation of a temporary power vacuum there. I did not think then that my words would lead people to think that peo-ple should come from outside and try to fill the vacuum. Surely, if there is a so-called power vacuum, the only way to fill it is by the peo-ple of that country and not by the imposition of some external agency. I think it is a very dangerous theory of nations, whatever nation it bloc of I think it is a very dangerous theory of nations, whatever nation it might be, whether it belongs to one bloc or the other bloc of these great blocs. But, this idea of thinking that the world has to be in some way under their sphere of influence and they have to fill the vacuums which are created by the withdrawal of old colonial powers, obviously, so far as our thinking goes, is entirely opposed to our way of thinking. Apart from our thinking, I submit it is not a practical approach. It does not lead even to the results aimed at. It crea-tes difficulties and fresh problems. If one person tries to fill the vacuum, others try to do so and a place which should develop peacefully becomes an arena of conflict as we see it happening. We cannot, I sub-mit, afford to ignore the international scene because it affects our own development, Five Year Plan and everything.

Having said that, I come back to our real and main work. Our main work is the building up of our country and not interfering with other countries. Our main work has broadly been stated in the Five Year Plan. Hon. Members can, I am sure, criticise our Five Year Plan and give us ideas, where it is wrong, where it should change. It is not a rigid Plan. We decided even at the time of the framing of the Plan that it should be a flexible Plan. We have changed it since then; we may have to change it again. But, we do intend to continue with the basic framework of the Plan and the basic idea. Because, I do not think there is any other way out of it. If we give it up, then, we give up any major scheme of development in this country and we are not likely even to remain where we are. We will get submerged by the various forces, economic forces and other for-ces that our own activities have produced in the world. So that, we have to go ahead with this Five Year Plan.

Some hon. Members opposite may think that the Five Year Plan is not adequate or is weighted wrongly. That is a matter for discussion. The adequacy of it reflects on the adequacy of our resources. The House has some idea of the effort that this Government is making to find these resources from the Budget statement of the Finance Minister yesterday; that is, to say that we are going to do our utmost to go through with this Plan—minor things apart—major things in the Plan. Because, the whole future development of India depends on the success of that Plan. An hon. Member said, why not extend it to six or seven years. Minor matter may be extended or left out even. So far as the basis of the Plan is concerned, the House should remember that extension is not such an easy matter. Because, the more we extend it, the more difficult it becomes to deal with the situation. Suppose we delay, let us say, our iron and steel works, we delay production, we delay the growth of industry in this country, we delay every process that would help us to deal with the situation, and the situation meanwhile gets worse. It is not a question of delaying something by a year or two. We lose all the productive capacity of that year and thereby we permit the situation to worsen and become much more difficult to handle later. That is the problem. It is *easy* enough to say, stretch it out by a year or two. We may stretch out some relatively less important thing; but we cannot in regard to major things; we cannot in regard to the machine-building plants. We have to build machines here. How long are we to depend on machines from outside? There are so many other things which we cannot stretch out; we cannot, above all, in regard to agriculture and agricultural produce, which is of the highest importance. Because, however important industry might be, industrial growth will depend on a stable agrarian economy, on a stable food position in the country. Therefore, agriculture will now and always be No. 1 however much stress we may lay stress on industry. Yet, we may lay stress on industry, heavy industry. Because if this country is to be industrialized, it cannot be industrialized without the growth at heavy industry here. That is a patent thing, and an obvious thing.

Now, building up heavy industry means a great burden. It means a burden which the country has to bear without recompense till that heavy industry begins to produce. For three, four, five or six or seven years, you spend hundreds of crores of rupees in building up a steel plant, a machine-building plant, with nothing coming out of it. Yes; after that, much comes out of it; after that, wealth flows from it. That is why we build it. But in these initial years, any country that has to go through this process, whether it is India or China or any other country of Asia or Europe, must necessarily go through that process. There is no way to escape it. You have to pay the price for industrialization, for development. And then, you get back, of course, returns afterwards. And it is for us to determine whether we are prepared to pay that price or not.

In other countries which may be termed authoritarian, they have to pay the price too—do not imagine they do not—and sometimes a heavier price. Only, perhaps, they do it by a decree, and they can do it even without the consent of many people there, or too many people—I do not know. Anyway, we cannot do it that way.

Whatever planning and whatever activity we may indulge in, we have to carry our people with us. We have, first of all, to have the goodwill of this House, of Parliament, second-ly, the goodwill of all the State Assemblies and the State Governments, and finally, of our people right down to the panchayat level.

I have talked about heavy industry and other matters. And yet, I do think that, perhaps, the most important thing that is being done in India, whether from the point of view of food production, agriculture or from the point of view of small industry—not heavy industry—is the community development scheme which has spread now as the President has said, to about 220,000 villages. I do not mean to say that these 220,000 villages are all up to the mark. But I do think, and I do say with some confidence, that the average level of this Community development is high, remarkably high, considering that we started just a little over four and a half years ago.

This community scheme will, we hope, change, and is, to some extent, to our knowledge, changing, the face of rural India, changing the people of rural India, not only the face of rural India.

Acharya Kripalani said that India was a slum. It is very largely true a statement. Of course, it is a slum. A poverty-stricken nation is a slum. There is no doubt about it. But how do we get over this difficulty? How shall we convert rural India? Leave out the slums of Delhi, Calcutta and Bombay; how do we convert the face of rural India? No purely governmental effort or governmental expenditure can do it. It can only be done by the people of those villages being organized and helped to do it themselves, by getting that spirit in them to do it. I believe that spirit is coming in them. I have seen with my own eyes how villages are changing. It is not so dramatic a change, obviously. But, it is dramatic, if you compare it to what it was. And it is through these community development schemes, I think, that ultimately our agricultural production will really go up. It went up in those areas.

Shri Frank Anthony, I think, threw some doubt on statistics. I can quite understand that feeling. But I think, I can say with some confidence that the statistics we are getting now through our sample surveys are fairly accurate and reliable. Of course, we are making them more and more accurate. And we propose, and we are, developing our statistical apparatus to get accurate statistics of every crop, as well as other matters, of course.

There is no doubt about it that in these community development areas, food production went up by 25 per cent., that is, in the First Five Year Plan, not in all the areas which are now under the community development scheme, because they have not had a chance yet. Now, 25 per cent., to my thinking, is a substantial increase. I think it should go up much further; that is a different matter. But if we can go up to 25 per cent. too, that is a fairly substantial increase. I shall leave the figure fixed at 28 per cent. for the next Five Year Plan, because we shall cover much more land. I think we can do it.

May I say that I agree with the criticism made by some Members that in a number of States, land reform legislation has been slow, much too slow? It should have been much faster, and I hope it will be speeded up.

Personally,—or rather, not personally; this is what the Planning Commission has laid down, and, I believe, this House has approved of—I do think that the way for progress in agriculture is through agricultural co-operatives, agrarian co-operatives. I do not believe in very large co-operatives. I think probably the best size would be a village co-operative. I do not mind if there are two in a village, because I want intimacy, people knowing each other, the personal factor—not the impersonal one.

Take even this matter of agrarian co-operatives. It can only be introduced, naturally, by consent, by the democratic method. We cannot force them down. But I do think that that is necessary in our country, where holdings are so small; we cannot take advantage of many modern methods, modern techniques with a holding of one acre or two acres. We do not want large holdings. We want to limit those holdings. The only way out, therefore, becomes the development of co-operatives in this field.

And yet, I am surprised that in spite of the Planning Commission having said so, in spite of this House having agreed to it repeatedly, yet doubts are raised, and people say, 'Oh, this kind of thing may be good enough for other countries, but is not suited to India'. I can understand someone like our friend Shri Mahendra Pratap saying that, because he lives in some distant vision of the past, where raths used to go about and work and so on and so forth. That one should challenge this fact surprises me. Agrarian co-operatives are necessary for the development of our peasantry, and our villages, and our production, and otherwise. I recognise that we cannot develop them by a decree; and we cannot develop them very rapidly, because we have to convince people, we have to bring them round, and we have to get their agreement. Maybe, we shall have to start in a relatively small way *and as* results come—and they are bound to—others will follow, because, fundamentally, I think, the Indian farmer, the Indian peasant, is a wise person. If we approach him rightly and explain things, I think he will accept this.

Now, there are so many things that we try to do. There were questions today about oil and other matters. Here is oil extraction going to take place, which, in the course of a few years—two years, three years, or four years, I do not know—would make a fairly considerable difference to us, because oil is vastly important. The mere fact of our non-dependence for oil on foreign countries would make a great difference, apart from the other benefits that will come to US.

I would beg, therefore, this House to consider these matters in this broad perspective, and to remember that we have undertaken this great burden, and we have to discharge it; we have to keep the promise we have made to our people and to ourselves, and to go ahead with it, even though this might involve carrying a heavy burden for some time. And I would beg of Members here to criticise anything to their hearts' content, but to approach every question in a constructive spirit.

Acharya Kripalani mentioned some-thing about corruption, and in this connection mentioned two cases con-nected with my Ministry namely the Ministry of External Affairs. The first was about money being borrowed for three consecutive years for the pur-chase of cars. It *was* very improper. But we do not lose any money there-by; if it is borrowed, it is paid back. But, nevertheless, it was a very improper thing. And other improper things—one or two were mentioned by him—also come out. That is what the Public Accounts Committee and other Committees are for, and we want the help of Members to deal with such instances. But I would beg of the House to remember that because a number of such instances comes up and is dealt with—and should be dealt with—we must not imagine that this kind of thing is prevalent everywhere, that everybody does it.

Let us take our foreign services. There are hundreds of officers serving abroad. If something bad happens, we take steps. Let us punish them. I do not say that everybody is above error or above doing wrong things. But I do know that a great number of them, these young men and some young women who are in our foreign service, are a fine lot of people.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX¹....

If the hon. Member tells me of a case where action has not been taken, I will look into it. But I think that whenever such things happen, steps are always taken and where it is proved, punish-ment awarded. It may of course be that in a particular case the hon. Member may think that the punish-ment ought to be heavier. That is a different matter. The difficulty is that our procedures are so complicated. Enquiries—departmental and other-wise—go on. Then there is reference to the Public Services Commission. It takes years really to get over these. Sometimes, in order to avoid this complicated procedure, we take some steps and award some punishment which is lighter but which is sudden. That is done. Otherwise, for the heavier punishment, we would have to wait for two or three years and it goes backwards and forwards.

This is a matter for this House to consider.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX²....

Anyhow, as I was submitting, we are wide awake as far as we can be. We want the help of this House, we want the help of the Public Accounts Committee and other Committees to deal with these matters. But in deal-ing with these matters, the House should remember that we should not try to tar everybody with the same brush. We are being served, I think, faithfully, by large numbers of our public servants efficiently and honestly I think our public services can compare with the public services of any country. I do not say that every-one is good. But the general standard is a high one. Any one who knows about the public services of other countries will probably agree with me in this. Those who have come from other countries and have compared their public services with ours have generally formed this opinion.

In connection with this debate on the President's Address, may I repeat that it is, of course, not a personal Address by the President? It represents broadly the Government's policy. Acharya Kripalani stated that it was too formal an Address. It has to be formal; it is its function to be formal. It cannot be informal. We can be informal in the House. The President has to be formal and has to deal with major matters. May be we may have left out some matters, because we cannot deal with every matter there. We try to bring up some major matters. I submit that whatever statements are made in the President's Address are factually accurate. For instance, in regard to the food situation, they are absolutely accurate. There is no attempt to slur over the situation. In fact, grave concern has been shown in regard to that situation in the President's Address.

Then Acharya Kripalani said that it did not tell us what legislation there was going to be for this session. As a matter of fact, there is going to be very little legislation in this 15-day session. Apart from the two debates— Railway and General— there are going to be three or four very minor Bills which will be brought before the House, and, I hope, passed. Because there was no major legislation, it was not mentioned. It will be mentioned in future, whenever there is any major legislation. That is all I have to say.

BACK NOTE

I. Reply on Motion of Thanks to President's Address, 16 May 1957

1. ACHARYA KRIPALANI (Sitamarhi): May I interrupt for a moment? It is not that such things do not happen. They happen. But the unfortunate thing is that nothing is done about them and the persons who are responsible for those things occupy the same position or even better position.
2. SHRI S. L. SAKSENA (Maharajan): Is there a proposal to simplify procedure?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The matter has been considered. The House can consider it. I shall welcome if procedures are simplified.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

24 July, 1957

Mr. Speaker, Sir in the course of this discussion, almost everyone has emphasized the necessity for us to go ahead as far as we can in the development of atomic energy in this country. The subject is naturally one which rather excites the imagination of everyone, and there is a feeling, as someone has said, that in this matter at least we should not lag behind, as we did, when the industrial revolution took place. I can say nothing more about it except that we have no intention of lagging behind, in so far as resources etc. permit.

Apart from the theoretical as well as practical necessity of keeping abreast of this new realm of knowledge and discovery, there is this aspect that from the power point of view, it is likely to be of the utmost importance for us in India to utilize the atomic power for peaceful purposes. We hear a lot about the use of iron and coal and oil for purposes of power. But it is rather a sobering thought that if by any chance, we used our power supplies at the rate, let us say, that the United States is using them at which is a tremendous rate-, they disappear in a very short time, and we finish them up in the course of a generation or more-I forget exactly how long.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX!....

So far as we know about the coal we have, and the oil we have-we now hope to have more oil than we thought first, and I believe that we are likely to discover oil in several parts of India-the fact remains, however that our power resources potential, considering our population, is not great, for we cannot merely deal with the present generation, but we have to build for the future.

Now, therefore, as far as one can see, the main source of power, apart from the conventional sources has to be atomic energy. So, it becomes a question of extreme practical importance for us to develop power from atomic sources.

It is curious that only about, perhaps, three or four years ago, people talked rather vaguely about using atomic energy for power purposes, and there were hardly any definite plans in almost any country, although, no doubt, in the United States and England and the Soviet Union, there were some efforts being made to that end. But the progress since then has been so rapid in some of these countries, that now, it is taken for granted, which it was not then. Then, it was a kind of adventure in the sense that it could be used for civil purposes. But it was not an economic proposition. Today it is recognised that it is an economic proposition; and it is likely to become more and more so.

Of course, at the present moment, at any rate, no one would think of our going to a coal-field, let us say, and putting up an atomic energy plant there. That is, if you are near the source of power, that is, coal, or some hydro-electric concern, you would not put an atomic energy plant right there. That will be wasteful. But where you go away from the source, go away some distance from the coal-fields or from hydro-electric power, where, in fact, you may have to take vast quantities of coal to create power, there, even today, it might well be cheaper to have an atomic energy plant.

Take Delhi. We have to put up something here. We have to bring coal from 800, 900 or 1000 miles away. There is the question of transport and so much of cost.

I would make two points. The first is that India must have some additional sources of power, apart from conventional sources, if it is to go ahead; and give higher standards to our people. Secondly, it is possible to do it through proper development of atomic energy now. Therefore, the third point comes out and you must try to do it. Indeed, we are trying to do so.

Many hon. Members who have spoken have congratulated the atomic Energy Department on the work they have done. Some have criticized them or said that they ought to do much more than what they ought to do much more than what they have done. It is not very easy to have a correct measurement of what one can do and one could have done if we had proceeded differently. But the fact remains that the development of atomic energy work in India has been remarkably rapid and, if I may say so, remarkably good. Both facts have to be borne in mind. As to whether it could not be better or whether we could not be more rapid, it is open to one to have an opinion. But the Atomic Energy Department as such was started three years ago in August, 1954. Of course, before that there was the Atomic Energy Commission, which also did that work.

In August, 1954, I think we spent about Rs. 1.1 crores on atomic energy work here. Money is not much of a test, but still it helps us to understand what we are doing. Two years after, that is, in the current year, we are spending 12 times that amount. It has increased twelve-fold, and we are spending about Rs. 12 ½ crores.

I may inform the House that nobody in the Government of India—neither in the Government of India—neither the Finance Ministry nor any other Ministry—anxious as we are to have economy to save money has ever refused any urgent demand of the department. Sometimes, it may be that we may suggest to them that a particular item may be spread out. I saw the other day a very big figure for a huge wall round the whole area, mile upon mile of it, which, I suppose, is necessary because one has to protect these things; but it may be that the wall might be postponed for a little while. But we have not come in the way of the development of this department and of the work it does from the financial point of view. We do not propose to do so.

Naturally, there are certain limits beyond which we cannot go. Anyhow, we realize completely the importance of this work both in the present and even more so for the future. It is really because of that that in India and in some other countries, it is usual for the Prime Minister to be in charge of it. Not that the Prime Minister of India or any other Prime Minister is supposed to be peculiarly brilliant or suited for that purpose, but in order to show the importance attached to it. Therefore, the Prime Minister takes charge of it.

In doing atomic energy work, there is of course the side of research and there is the practical side of the application of that research. So far as research work is concerned, the Tata Institute is the principal institute. Of course, research work is done in Universities and Colleges etc. I entirely agree with an hon. Member who said that this kind of work should be encouraged in the Universities, though I would add that what is necessary in the Universities is a sound grounding. Sometimes there is a tendency for a person to try to do higher research work without an adequate grounding in the basic position in various sciences, especially atomic physics. That is not, I think, a very good way of proceeding but we must have a broad foundation in the Universities necessarily for training in atomic physics etc. out of which specialists will come. Apart from that, we have, as you will have seen from the printed paper that has been circulated, increased the number of people being trained by the Atomic Energy Department. I believe the present number is about 260; it will go up to about 1,000 very soon.

One must remember that this training is not some kind of simple training but rather high class training of high class men who are chosen. It is a fairly good number which will go on growing. I think that the work we have done, both in the realm of theory and research and in practice, has not only been appreciated in various centres of atomic energy work in the world-important centres-but there have been many references to it elsewhere.

Whenever I travel abroad, I am particularly asked often enough by scientists of the countries I visit about our work. I am told by them how much they appreciate the rapid progress that we have made. Only about a month or six weeks ago, I happened to meet more than once a person who is almost the father of all this business, Prof. Neils Bohr, in Norway. He has spoken in the highest terms about our work. He has not been in India; naturally he keeps himself informed. In the field of atomic physics, he is a kind of semi-god or high guru. He is an old man who has done so much and is highly respected. He spoke in the highest terms to me about what we were doing. He was very pleased and he sought to make out that they in Norway were trying to do something which we had already done. That may be just pure compliment, but I do not think it was. It is a fact that we have done rather well. That does not mean that we should not do better.

I wanted to say this because we have got very fine young men doing this work, not a question of one or two or three top men. I am talking about the considerable number of young men, some of them quite brilliant.

Shri Tyabji referred to Indians being abroad and asked why they were not in India. I can give him no particular answer to that except that I would like to see our noted scientists, noted Indians, come and work in India and help us in developing various important activities. So far as scientists are concerned, we have definitely tried to do so. He mentioned two names, Shri Gupta's and Shri Chandrasekhar's. I might inform him that in the course of the past few years we have made numerous attempts to get these gentlemen as well as others and on several occasions they had agreed to come. There has been agreement, then there has been refusal, then there has been agreement and then has been refusal. I do not want to go into details. But anyhow we are well acquainted with them, and we have made attempts to get them here. But in the totality of circumstances they prefer to remain outside even after agreeing once or twice to come; they changed their mind. It is a little difficult for us to compel a person to come here. Of course, I can understand the conditions in India previously, Indian scientists not having enough opportunity to develop their talent or genius here, and their going abroad suddenly when they got opportunities. We got no opportunities. But that can no longer be said to be so. We cannot—never in the course of the near future—compete with countries like the United States in the salaries that may be given or the other amenities that can be provided. We cannot do it. India has not got the finance. They can give very big salaries; they can afford it. But, we cannot. I recognise that the labourer is worth all his hire—rather, I mean the other way about that he should be paid enough to live, to do his work, comfortably, not with financial worries. We recognise that scientists or other people of that type should be paid adequately. That I recognise; but we cannot compete with others and ask someone who may be getting some kind of salary in America to come here, and say: We will give you more than that; come over here. That we cannot do. We cannot compete in that way.

So, we do want our young men to work here, to come and work here even if they are working abroad and there is plenty of room here in our various National Laboratories—apart from Universities—in our National Laboratories and other national institutions.

Then, Shri Tyabji asked, how many research papers have been contributed. Well, I could not give him the exact number. But the fact is that quite a considerable number of papers indicating research done have come out of the Tata Institute. I am told some of them are rather of a high class. Of course, it is obvious that you do not judge of an Institute or of an individual by the quantity he writes but rather by the quality. A person may write a hundred papers and they may be second-rate or third-rate. Another may write ten and they may be first-rate and they may be acknowledged as such. I do not say that more cannot be done. But the fact remains that in this realm of atomic energy good work is being done in research, in theory and in practice.

The putting up of the Swimming Pool Reactor, which was opened by me last August—to which we gave, I think, a very proper name 'Apsara'—was built entirely by

Indian scientists and Indian engineers and that was a good piece of work. Now, two other reactors are being built, the Canada—Indian reactor and the other one.

I believe, in our research work at the Tata Institute, among other things, at least one new elementary particle has been discovered. At the Institute, at least one new decay process for an elementary particle has been discovered, apart from helping in establishing a number of other processes. The Tata Research Institute, the Institute of Fundamental Research is recognised the world over as one of the leading research institutes in mathematics and physics.

An hon. Member asked something about fellowships. I am told that there had been a response to fellowships for Indians offering Rs. 200 to Rs. 400 per mensem. But there has been no response to fellowships for foreigners. This is because the amounts are much less than those offered by other countries. It is, I believe intended to raise these amounts.

The Atomic Energy Department is planning for the next 15 years looking ahead. We have Uranium here, though not at present in very large quantities. But, we have vast quantities of Thorium. Thorium is of big importance and can be used for working reactors, but only in the second stage. In order to reach the second stage, you have to go through the first stage with Uranium reactors. And, it has become necessary, therefore, to start with these natural Uranium reactors so that later you may get to the next stage of Thorium which you have fairly in abundance, not only Kerala, as we all know, but, even more so than there, in Bihar now.

There is one aspect which I should like to mention, which has some kind of political bearing. That is, how necessary it is for us not to depend too much on outside sources. If we depend too much for fissionable material or the rest, then, inevitably, that dependence may affect us; or other people may try to affect our foreign policy or any other policy through that dependence. It is not good, in a sense, to depend on others. That is why, when discussions took place about the formation of what is called the International Agency for the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, we had this especially in mind. If we have to depend too much on some central pool which contains these very special fissionable materials like Uranium 235, Plutonium 233, to be used for future atom bomb programmes, then, we have to submit to all kinds of safeguards. These very things are necessary to make the atom bombs. We do not now make atom bombs or anything like that. In fact, we have declared quite clearly that we are not interested in and we will not make these bombs, even if we have the capacity to do so and that in no event will we use atomic energy for those most destructive purposes. I declared that and I was quite sure in doing that that I represented every Member of this House. And, I hope that will be the policy of all future Governments whoever is in charge. But, anyhow, the fact remains that if you develop adequately and get these fissionable materials and if you have got the resources, then, you can make a bomb too, unless the world has

been wise enough to come to some decision previously to stop this kind of production of bombs.

Therefore, there is a grave danger that if this fissionable material is kept in the hands of a particular agency which is more or less controlled by a particular group of powers—all other countries to that extent are dependent—what might be called atomic colonialism might grow up. Something of that type. One wants to avoid it. Of course, one can never wholly avoid the fact that a strong country is strong and a weak country is weak and a country financially or militarily strong throws its weight about and does throw it about. But, nevertheless, we do not want that, as far as possible, to come into this. There was some reference to one or two other matters. One thing was about the Travancore Minerals Company Limited. This Company was established by an agreement between the Government of India and the Travancore-Cochin Government to take over the Travancore Minerals Concern and was operated by the T.C. Government so as to improve production methods and increase the production. The shares of the company are held in equal amounts by the Central and the T.C. Governments. It is run by a board of directors—these are the old rules—comprising three representatives of the Government and three representatives of that Government with a Chairman nominated by the Government of India Dr. John Matthai was appointed the Chairman of the Company.

Now, since the redistribution of the States, what has happened is this. After the partition of the T.C. State, the southern part, Chavara (Quilon) is with the Travancore-Cochin State whereas the other part, Manavalakkurichi passed to the Madras Government. The former company has been taken over in essence by the new company, that is Kerala Company. The Madras Government wants one of the Travancore-Cochin directorships on the board while the Kerala Government is of the view that that directorship should be in addition. The Government of India has agreed to the Madras Government in this matter, because, the Government of India's share has not been affected by these changes; it is the same. It is the other's share which has been divided up and therefore, it seems reasonable and logical that the Madras Government should share in that. This matter has been negotiated.

I do not want to take up any mere time of the House. I am sorry if I have forgotten to reply to any particular point. Much has been said about the use of atomic energy, isotopes, etc. being used for medical, agricultural and other purposes. Naturally, they are being used and we help in every way; they will be used. There is no difference on that I believe considerable progress is being made in that respect and I can assure the House that the atomic energy department is fully alive to its responsibilities and the Government also realises the importance of the atomic energy department and the work it is doing.

BACK NOTE

II. Demands for Grants, 16 May, 1957

1. SHRI NAUSHIR BHARUCHA (East Khandesh): Thirty-five years.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It may be twenty-five or thirty-five years. It does not matter.

**STATEMENT ON REPORTED REFUSAL OF IRAQ
GOVERNMENT TO PERMIT USE OF HABBANIYA
AIRPORT BY I.A.F. AIRCRAFT**

2 December, 1957

Sir, I should like to make a brief statement to clear up any possible misunderstanding that might have been created by newspaper reports. Reports have appeared in the Press that Iraq Government have refused permission to I.A.F. aircraft to use Habbaniya Airport and thus created an impression that Iraq have discriminated against India.

The fact is that in connection with the ferrying of certain military aircraft from U.K. to India, a request had been made to the Iraqi authorities for permission to land at Habbaniya since our aircraft could get certain additional servicing facilities there, if necessary. The Government of India were informed that Iraq did not allow any country to use Habbaniya airfield and regretted her inability to make an exception in respect of India. The Iraq Government have, however, agreed to the use of Baghdad civil airport for the landing of our aircraft. In the past also some of our aircraft have used that airport. We have also since been informed by our Ambassador in Baghdad that the Iraq Government have offered special assistance at Bagdad civil airport. In view of this, there will be no delay or difficulty in the transit of our aircraft from the United Kingdom through Iraq.

BACK NOTE

- III. Statement on Reported Refusal of Iraq Government to permit use of Habbaniya Airport by I.A.F. Aircraft, 2 December, 1957

NIL

STATEMENT ON ATTEMPT ON THE LIFE OF PRESIDENT SOEKARNO OF INDONESIA

2 December, 1957

Sir, there is one other matter which, with your permission I may mention to the House. This was the tragedy that occurred at Djakarta the day before yesterday. The tragedy was bad enough in the sense that it was an attempt to assassinate President Soekarno of Indonesia; but it took place at a Children's gathering. It was a miracle that the President escaped. But a large number of children did not escape. In fact, the first hand-grenade that was thrown actually killed a policeman standing near the President saluting him, and three other hand grenades were thrown. The President fortunately escaped. But I think five children were killed among whom was an Indian boy eleven years old, and 49 children were seriously injured and ninety hurt. I think, Sir, this House will wish to express its deep sorrow at this tragedy and our gratitude that President Soekarno escaped.

BACK NOTE

- IV. Statement on Attempt on the Life of President Soekarno of Indonesia, 2 December, 1957

NIL

REPLY ON MOTION OF THANKS TO PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

18 February, 1958

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, during the last few days' debate on the President's Address, a very large number of topics have been referred to and it is a little difficult for me to touch on all of them. With your permission, Sir, I shall deal with some of the more important matters; and, inevitably, I have to deal with them in a rather general way.

So far as the general economic situation of this country is concerned, I shall say something about it. But the House knows that we are going to have various discussions in connection with the Budget in the course of this session. Further, as I think I have stated previously, it is proposed to lay a paper or a memorandum before the House in regard to the Second Five Year Plan explaining the present position and what we are doing and what we propose to do. It is difficult to deal with the matter in bits. So, we thought that a full memorandum on this subject will be more useful to give some idea to the House and to the country as to our present position and our future prospects. So, these matters are going to be discussed and it may not be particularly helpful for me to take them up in bits now. Nevertheless, I shall say something on this subject.

Criticism has been made on the part of the Opposition that the President's Address lacks imagination; there is lack of reality and there is a sense of utter complacency. Well, I do not know if any hon. Member in this House feels or thinks really that the Members of this Government who have the honour to advise the President are complacent. No one, whether this Government or any other, who has to face the tremendous problems which this country has to face can ever be complacent. He may occasionally err, as Governments may make mistakes, as anyone might. But for any one to feel completely happy at the state of affairs would indicate that there is something very wrong about him, whoever he might be.

Now, there is no question of complacency and more particularly during the past year or two when we have had to face enormous problems, enormous difficulties, many of them at least not of our making—some may be of our making. There has been a continuous effort on our part, on the Government's part, as, I believe, there has been on the part of this House in Parliament, to face these difficulties realising what they were, whether they were domestic internal difficulties or in the international sphere. So, if it is necessary, I should like to assure the House that there is absolutely no sense of complacency anywhere. But, it is one thing not to be complacent and another thing, shall I say, always to take a view which is on the verge of panic and to think in terms of slogans, or merely to denounce various things in the country. There the plenty of things in this country which nobody likes which we struggle against. I realise also that it is the normal duty of the Opposition to object, to denounce and generally to find fault I do not complain. But, I would only beg the House to consider these matters in proper perspective with the least complacency and also for the moment to look at it—

not from the point of view of a particular party or Government Party or Opposition Parties but as Members of Parliament representing the great Indian people in this House looking at this tremendous and exciting process of history in the making. Because we in this country are making history, whether it is good history or bad history, it is for the future generations to judge. And the world is making history perhaps in a more concentrated way than it has done in the past. So, I would beg this House to approach these big questions taking this perspective into view.

Now, I think that the President's Address has by no means taken a complacent view but a realistic view of the situation and pointed out certain definite hopeful factors. I do submit that nobody can deny that those hopeful changes have taken place in the last few months in this country and are still taking place. That again does not mean that we should rest content with that. It is right that we should point them out as it would be right to point out if the changes were for the worse.

Broadly speaking, the economic situation has improved noticeably and it may be said that the Government are in much better control of it than a year ago. Inflationary pressures have abated and the rate of drawal of foreign exchange reserves has significantly declined.

These are all problems that worried us last year both in regard to credit policy and import policy. The reins are being fairly tightly held and the outlook of availability of external assistance is much better. These are important factors or tendencies.

The President's Address has referred to the index of wholesale prices. I did not quite understand how some hon. Members challenged that unless they took some figures which were for a slightly different period. The index of wholesale prices in the last five months or so has gone down by nearly five per cent. Food prices have come down by eight per cent. The index for rice has fallen from 111 to 101, that of wheat from 94 to 86, of jowar from 126 to 104 and of bajra from 137 to 114. I do not say these are very wonderful changes but they are definite trends in a right direction and they have been brought about at a moment when the previous trends were all in the wrong direction. That is to say, not only have wrong trends been stopped but they have been reversed somewhat, undoubtedly, not because of any new harvest coming or anything like that but because of the various policies adopted by the Government in the course of the last year or so.

But, I repeat that while we have a right to be a little hopeful because of this change in trends, we must realise completely that we have to be very careful and cautious and not allow this matter to slip away again in the wrong direction.

There is always with us the problem of internal and external resources. External resources can come, broadly speaking, from our exports or from such loans or credits that we may get from abroad. I think that the policy we adopt in regard to our exports will bear fruit. To what extent, of course, I cannot prophecy because it takes a little time to develop this but it is not right to say, I think, as some hon. Members did, that attention is not being paid to our exports. Attention is certainly paid to the best of our ability and intelligence.

One hon. Member, Shri Naushir Bharucha said I quote "I accuse this Government that it is holding back vital information which is of the utmost importance to the nation". He was referring to funds, etc. available to us and how the gap in the Second Plan would be filled and so forth. I do not know; I am not aware of the fact that we have held back any vital information on this subject. Because, how does it profit the Government to hold it back. It is obviously essential for the people to know what they have got to do and what the position is.

The difficulty is this Take, for instance, the external assistance. We cannot, while we discuss matters, say anything definite about it. Therefore, we have to wait till a definite decision is arrived at. As a matter of fact, many items of information in regard to this have been made public in this House and in answer to questions and otherwise in the public Press and so forth. One knows.

But it is true that these separate items of information do not perhaps convey a connected picture. That connected picture is being drawn up to be placed before the House. As I just told the House a little while ago, we intend placing a memorandum dealing with the entire subject, dealing with the Plan, dealing with the gaps and also dealing how we hope to fill that and so on. The present position, as I said, is somewhat more hopeful or, if I may use the word, considerably more hopeful than it was a year ago.

When I say that I am not guaranteeing the future. I am merely saying that it is more hopeful for the present. That is to say, during this year that we are beginning, we hope to go through it, that is, to go through the major works of our Plan as intended. We are not going to slow down on that. And we hope that in the next year also, we shall be in a position to do so. We have not got hoards and we cannot say about the next five, six or seven years. That will depend on many factors: our own policies, our internal resources and the external resources that we hope to get. Anyhow, we propose to put before this House in the course of this month or probably in the month of March a full memorandum on this subject.

There have been, as usual, a number of references to corruption in the Government apparatus I do not wish to take the time of the House much now. But I should like to say that the apparatus that we have created last year or the year before to meet this question has worked with considerable success. It is improving daily. Nobody can deny that. Nobody can say that here or in any country in the wide world, everything is all right and there is absolute freedom from corruption. There is that though I think that perhaps there is less of it, much less of it, than most other countries. So, there is no justification for this. I am merely pointing out relatively because it is sometimes made out that we are the big sinners in this respect. I do not think we are I think we stand rather high compared to many countries, but it is there undoubtedly and we have to make every effort to remove that. And, I submit that the special arrangements we have made, the O&M Division, the Special Police Establishment and others have met with quite a considerable success. I have been going through the various steps they have taken, the number of cases they have started, the success they have attained, and I was impressed by them. Of course,

there are difficulties and as the House knows, the real difficulties are that it is never quite easy to get real proof which would satisfy a law court. One may have suspicions, one may even have some kind of moral feeling that it is wrong, but the rules as they are and the law as it is do not make it particularly easy to deal with it. Nevertheless, we have met with considerable success, and we are constantly pressing every Ministry, every department to be particularly wide awake in this matter and to be in very intimate touch with the O&M Division whose special function this is, that is, not only greater efficiency but also greater integrity, lack of corruption etc.

May I add—it is not a subject I am discussing now, because this will come up tomorrow that this report about the life insurance matter has been sometimes referred to here as an instance of corruption. Well, I have read the report fairly carefully as most Members must have done. I have not found any such charge in it. There may be here and there vague doubts thrown out but, anyhow, whatever else that may be, it has not brought out any such charge.

Then, again, some hon. Members complained, I think Shri H. N. Mukerjee, that there is no mention of rehabilitation in it, or of the Danda-karanya scheme. True, there was no mention in it as there have been no mention of many other important matters. Unless there is something new to be said about it, it was not considered necessary to mention it, not that the question of rehabilitation is not important; of course it is important. Obviously it is, anything which involves the future lives of large numbers of people is of great importance. As for the scheme, it is a very vast scheme as the House knows, and it will take a little time to develop. We are trying to develop it in a small way in a small area first and then in a larger way.

About the food position may I say well, I cannot say that the food position is to our liking that it is satisfactory in the limited sense of the word, in the sense that we have built up some stocks. It is a difficult situation, and it can only ultimately be met when we get the results we are aiming at, far greater production. And, I would still submit my own humble opinion that we hope to reach the target of self-sufficiency. I am not prepared to accept—I may be mistaken, of course, but I do want the country to aim at self-sufficiency as the President has said in his Address, not immediately I realise that—and I think it is somewhat a pessimistic view to take that this will take a very long time. I have no doubt that, well, if I may say so, looking at it theoretically, or practically too, it can be done. Whether we do it or not 'we' meaning the people of India, the agriculturists depends on so many factors apart from nature's vagaries that it is difficult to be definite about it. But I do not think there is any reason for us to be pessimistic about it. I think we can do it, and I think that we will do it.

Another subject that was touched upon was that the public sector is not doing well. I do not quite know what this criticism meant, because it is the public sector that is being built up in a big way. All these steel plants, all these machine building plants and all that are the big foundations of the public sector, not the odd little bits being done. It is the burden of that, that we have to carry today, and the tremendous amount of imports of machinery etc. coming are really for the public sector; the private sector comes in in quite a relatively small way in regard to that matter.

Now, some hon. Members talked about atomic energy, and some said that we must immediately start atomic power stations. I am afraid that that kind of progress cannot be made. It is not merely a question of money, although money comes in, but it requires a good deal of preparation before we can think of starting atomic power stations. In the President's Address some reference has been made to it. That is true. That does not mean we can start them in the course of the next year. The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission has been speaking about these matters on several occasions and discussing the economics of it because, after all, it is the economical aspect that counts. The factory can be built; that is known. You can build it, but it is frightfully expensive nobody is going to build it. We are not going to waste money over atomic power station if the power that is produced is much more expensive than the power produced through ordinary methods. That is the main thing.

Apart from future progress, that is to say, probably it may become cheaper in the future, even now some factors are established that in areas far away from the coal fields, far away from hydro-electric power, it will be definitely economical to have an atomic energy station to supply power. There are many such areas in India. Of course, the matter has been considered. Naturally, we can only start one at a time, we cannot start several before our first effort. Where we can start it I do not know nor does anybody else know, but among the places that have been taken at present are the Punjab, Western Uttar Pradesh, South India, Rajasthan and Bombay, that is parts of these areas which may fit in. You cannot just choose any area. It has to fulfil certain needs before you can decide, and then you can calculate the economics of it. Anyhow, this matter is under consideration.

Then, Shri Mukerjee said something about cooperative agriculture, that that is not making progress. That is partly so. I presume he meant by 'cooperative agriculture' cooperative farming. That is so. I am myself of opinion that we should encourage cooperative farming wherever we can. But it is obvious that that can only be done, well, of course, with the consent of the people concerned, the farmers concerned, and in a process of development. You cannot suddenly go to a place and say that the people must have cooperative farming. The people will not understand, it simply will not fit in. You cannot do it like that. You cannot compel them. Nobody can compel them, not only a Government like ours but an authoritarian Government cannot do it ultimately and production will suffer.

What we aim at today is to spread cooperatives in regard to various services, cooperative services, provided that it will later lead to cooperative farming wherever that is considered feasible at first. You cannot do it otherwise. You may and you should have cooperative farming where it is feasible,—where, for instance, Government has a new land or where Gramdan villages exist, because, there, you have a fairly clean slate. You may do it and I would like it generally, but the most immediate thing that appears to me is service cooperative, not merely credit cooperatives but service cooperatives.

May I repeat here, what I have often said previously, that cooperatives in my thinking have to be intimately concerned with the people. I mean to say it is not some

kind of official imposition, officially run. I do not think a cooperative which has too much of an official element in it is a real cooperative. It must depend upon the people, upon the people's initiative and because of that I think the cooperatives should be relatively small.

I know, only yesterday or the day before, I saw a criticism from an eminent foreign observer, commenting about some organisation pleading for large cooperatives. The eminent foreign observer served in the civil service here in those days. Well, from his point of view, what he said may be correct, but then his point of view does not appeal to me, because my point of view is entirely based on developing the people there, getting their support, cooperation and their self-reliance and all that, and not merely by some official change from above bringing about a temporary result.

The real aim is the growth of our people, their cooperation fitting in with, that and their self-reliance. Therefore, I do believe more firmly than ever that the cooperatives we have should be relatively small, that is to say, village cooperative, or a cooperative of two villages, where people know each other more or less and can easily function together, if you like, as a large family. These small cooperatives have to be linked up naturally to form, if you like, larger entities, 20, 30, 40 or 50, and they can form a larger council for other purposes. We should concentrate on these service cooperatives, that is to say, fertilisers, manures, good seeds, marketing and there are so many other things that the cooperative could do, and always keeping in view that cooperative farming should be aimed at wherever you can get the consent of the people.

Now, I talk about cooperative farming. Why do I do it? Not because I think it is some kind of ideal which is obvious. I am not at all sure that cooperative farming of that type will suit every part of the country. I do not know whether it will suit a rice field or a wheat field; certainly a wheat field, I do not know. But the main point is this. Where you have got these very, very small holdings, as inevitably in India you must have, there are a great number of people who have an acre or two acres and they cannot make much progress with their resources and with the two-acre farms. They have to function in a very small way, and therefore it becomes essential that either you have to have a big farm, you do not want big farms owned by an individual or a cooperative jointly looking after a bigish area of land when they have some resources.

So, for me, there are two reasons to think of joint farming. One is this reason that I have said. The other is that it is a higher form of social organisation for the land. It is not merely farming, but a cooperative spirit coming in their various type of activities.

I should like to say a few words about international affairs, but before I do that, there is one matter I should like to mention just to indicate the curious types of problems that we have to face in this country and how nobody can ever go anywhere near complacency in this country. Recently, we have had the problem of the official language for India. This House will discuss it and I am not going to discuss that problem. I have no doubt in my mind that when the matter comes before this House, by the Committee which has been appointed by this House some suitable proposals will be made by agreement this House will gladly accept them.

So, it gave rise to this thinking, this Europe-centred thinking of foreign affairs. Then the United States of America came into the picture. They had come in gradually of course. Till then, they had an isolated life. Now, by force of circumstances, and by various historical developments, they began to play a tremendous part in the world. We began to think after the end of the war of this century that it is American-centred. The world view becomes American-centred view. Others are nothing. Europe is an area attached to it.

Now, all those view-points have some justification in them; I do not deny it. They have their great problems; I do not deny them. Other factors can intervene, apart from it. Of course, the development of the Soviet Union is a very vital and important factor, which did not fit in with the Europe-centred view or the American-centred view. Here comes a new picture of the Moscow-centred world.

Now, apart from all these great developments, other developments have taken place during the last dozen year or so, resulting in the independence of many countries in Asia. Therefore, there has developed a new angle in Asia of looking at these problems. We are even now a good deal impressed and conditioned by the European thinking, because we have ourselves been brought up in that way, or the American thinking, or sometimes Moscow thinking, whatever it may be. I am not talking of communism. I am talking of political thinking.

So, this development of the independent nations in Asia naturally leads to, what might be called vaguely, the Asian way of looking at the world. I do not say there is one Asian way; Asia is a big continent, and there are different ways of looking at it. It is a change from the European-centred view or any other view. Of course, the right view, ultimately, I take it, will be neither European, nor American, nor Moscow, nor Asian, but a proper world view, which can be developed.

But, because of various factors, it is a painful process, the adjustment of the mind. Many difficulties have arisen and are arising in other parts of the world, because they cannot quite adjust themselves to this thinking, that there can be a so called Asian view, see conditions of Asian countries in a way which is somewhat different from their own view. They talk about it and express some resentment at that fact.

Let us take India. It is unaligned, uncommitted. It has not fallen into line with their policy. Their policy or approach takes for granted that the policy must emerge from Europe or America or Moscow, whatever it may be, and that the other countries cannot develop their own view points, which they have to develop, apart from everything else, because of geography. Because, geography counts a great deal in these matters. A country develops its world view or its political or international view, not only because of other factors like history, tradition etc. but because of geography.

Since India has to take a world view from Delhi, naturally it looks first of all to the countries round India, then further afield and so on. It approaches the problems that way. The view of a country in the North Pole about the world may be different from that of a country near the Equator. So, there is this development, this new angle, this new approach, which might vaguely, broadly, rather incorrectly be called the

Asian approach. Anyhow, it is a movement which is different from the European-centred view or the American-centred view or the Husaian centred-view. Not that these views are against somebody; I am not saying that.

It is not hostile. Because we do not align ourselves with the European-centred or the American-centred view, it does not mean that we are hostile to Europe or America or Moscow. We are thinking on slightly different lines, sometimes in line with them, sometimes not. Anyhow, the view point, the approach and the way in which we look at the world is somewhat different.

Now, there is one basic fact which I have said previously, and which I repeat now, about this European-centred or other-centred view. To us, the attitude that has been taken in regard to China is really a thing which really cannot be logically explained. It is practically I am not talking ideologically a fact that a great country like China being bypassed, ignored which, in a sense, seems odd, unrealistic. So also in the case of so many other things that are happening in Asia. These problems are judged, not from the point of view from which Asia might do, regardless of policies and others, but from some other European-centred or American-centred or some other-centred view point.

In other words, a number of new forces have gradually developed since the last war in Asia. They do not fit in with those other viewpoints which have been traditionally held by other countries. We talk about 'anti colonialism. We know very well that in many countries in Asia colonialism has ceased to be a force and countries have become independent; in Africa too. Well, we welcome it, and we think this trend will continue. And we realise that sometimes it may take a little time to bring about that change. It cannot be brought about quite suddenly.

But, nevertheless, the fact remains, as we see it, how some colonial countries stick on, adhere to, their colonies, in spite of everything. Of course, the most glaring example of the present day is what is happening in Algeria; other places too. Our attitude always has been one of friendship with France; friendship, of course with other countries too. But we have admired so many things in France, their high culture and there are so many other things and we were happy to come to a peaceful agreement and friendly agreement with France in regard to Pondicherry. I am very sorry that *de jure* transfer is still not being done. I do not know what to do about it, except to remind them from time to time. I am told, whenever I remind them, that it will be coming soon. But in spite of our friendly feeling for France, a country with its history, with its struggles for freedom, with its high culture and high intellectuality and all that, it does come as a deep shock—what has happened and what is happening in Algeria.

Only a few days ago, an incident occurred which I think is likely to be numbered among those relatively few instances of horror which affect the whole population, which is numbered, if I may say from Indian history as something like the Jallianwalabagh here. Many worse things have happened in India since then, much worse than Jallianwalabagh, but nevertheless Jallianwalabagh was a thing which very powerfully

impressed the whole generation of India and possibly changed the current of history in India. Now, about this bombing the other day by French planes of that village in Tunis—Tunisia near the Algerian border—I think it is called Sakiet—we are not depending upon partial accounts, 'because people from other countries have given full accounts including French journalists, American journalists, British journalists and other Red Cross people and the facts are pretty well known. The facts are shocking beyond almost belief that such a thing could be done. Apart from the horror of a 100, 200 or 300 persons being bombed and I think, 20 or 30 being killed and the whole village being wiped off, the fact that this should be done in this way is itself more important than the unhappy deaths. It has a powerful effect—it is bound to have—in countries in Asia and Africa. Of course, even in Europe and America it has had very powerful reactions. I do not know what to say except that if this kind of policy is to be persisted in and approved of, then there is only greatest disaster ahead in Africa.

The House knows that certain rather remarkable developments have taken place recently in Western Asia, in what is called the Middle eastern region—the Union of Egypt and Syria and possibly as a consequence of that, rather as a reaction of it, the Federation or Union—I am not quite clear which—between Iraq and Jordan. We heard of the Union between Egypt and Syria and it was obvious that this was a popular union; that is the people in both those countries were eager for it and celebrated it when the first news came in a big way. Well, naturally if the people of both the countries want this union, we are happy and congratulate them and the representatives of those two countries. Now this has set in motion some forces which I do not quite know yet where they might lead to. If the Iraq and Jordan people want union, we are happy. But if it is merely a political counterpoise, then one does not quite know what the result of that may be.

There is a third aspect of it of which we do not quite know what might happen. There are ominous sounds coming from Israel I say "ominous" because there is some danger that as a result of what has happened here, Israel might precipitate action, might take precipitate action, which would be bad, because one never knows, when that kind of thing happens, where that might lead to.

I have talked about many things. But, the most important problem and subject in the world today is the basic subject of disarmament and cold war, that is, the relationship between the two major military groupings. That is the basic thing. Everything depends upon that. That has become even more an urgent matter since this new phase in the world, the Sputnik era, the Explorer era, all this has come in. Because, now, a false step or even an accident might give rise to that tremendous disaster from which there may be no escape afterwards. Therefore, it has become the most urgent and important matter that something has to be done.

The other day, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom said that it was something that we had kept the peace, even this peace, a fevered peace. No doubt, it is something better than war. No one can call this very satisfactory peace. It is hardly peace except that killing is not being undertaken on a large scale. Therefore, this question of disarmament and the question of some kind of settlement or approach to

a settlement of the various big problems which affect these two great military groupings has become of high importance.

This has been discussed in the United Nations repeatedly and the present position there is that talks on disarmament have ended. No progress was made after they had raised high hopes last year. Another Disarmament Commission of 35 was formed. Nobody quite knows whether it can function satisfactorily or not because no Disarmament Commission can function with any hope of results unless the two super powers are in it obviously. Basically it is for the United States of America and the Soviet Union to agree I do not mean to say that others can be left out. Not at all unless these two agree, there is no disarmament. Therefore, this Commission of 25 can only function satisfactorily if both of them accept it and function there. If either party goes out, it is an one sided affair.

As you know, there has been talk of a high level meeting, summit meeting and the like. There have been many letters exchanged between the authorities in the Soviet Union, the United States of America and other countries. We would welcome a high level or summit meeting. Not to have it or to refuse to have it would be harmful. But, it is obvious, at the same time, that one does not meet with a blank mind. There has to be some kind of mental or other preparation for it. It has been suggested that a Foreign Ministers' meeting should take place. Now, we are not opposed to it. But, we feel that a Foreign Ministers' meeting, constituted as things are today, might not lead us forward, but might even lead to more rigid positions being taken and thus make it more difficult for the other high level meeting. Therefore, some kind of thinking has to be done. It is being done, I believe, everywhere, perhaps on an informal level, private level, so as to prepare the ground for a high level meeting which ultimately, I think, has to be held. A high level meeting has also big psychological reactions in the world, good reactions, unless, of course, they quarrel—that would have bad reactions—which a Foreign Ministers' meeting can never have and what is wanted in the world today are these psychological changes, this gradual relaxation of tension, freedom from fear, which can be brought about if this matter is dealt with from a high level, but, as I said, that has to be preceded by some quiet informal talk, meeting etc.

I believe it is true to say the everywhere today, whether it is in Europe or whether it is in the United States of America or whether it is in the Soviet Union or indeed in many parts of India, minds are in a State of ferment; they have come out of their old grooves and they feel that something has got to be done, that it is not good enough repeating the old slogans. And you see instances of this.

When the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom came here, he talked about a pact of non-aggression. What exactly he meant by it he has not clarified, but even some talk about it shows that people are coming out of the old ways of thinking.

Then you know there is a proposal, originally from Poland, for an area in Central Europe comprising several countries being made atom free, that is, no atom bases, no atomic weapons there etc. It does not take one very far, from a military point of view it does not make very much difference if Poland and Czechoslovakia, or East Germany

and West Germany and may be one or two other countries, are made free of atomic weapons, but even such a step would create a new atmosphere and lead to other steps.

Then there is an American who delivered a series of lectures the other day in England, Mr. Kennan, a man of considerable experience in his own line, who advocated an area of disengagement, that is more or less the same, but he went further than the Polish proposal, he wanted all armies to be withdrawn—not only atomic weapons, but all armies. Again, that by itself will not solve the problems of the world, but this indicates the way people are thinking more and more, people who thought otherwise previously.

All these are hopeful signs, and so far as we are concerned, we naturally would like to help in every possible way in easing the path to some kind of a settlement, or some kind of a conference. We do not want to push ourselves in anywhere, in a conference or elsewhere; we made it perfectly clear that we do not want to go to a conference unless other parties concerned want us to go. If we can help, we will help. So that, while on the one hand, the dangers have become much greater in the world, on the other hand, there is a much keener awareness in the world of these dangers and a keener desire to meet them some way, and a coming out of the old ruts and grooves of thinking, which are hopeful signs. What will happen in future I do not know. We can go on working to the best of our ability.

We work in the international sphere, but everyone knows that we can only function with any kind of effect there if we have the powerful backing, and a backing supported by understanding, of the Indian People. Of course, these subjects are not party questions in India. May be some people differ here and there, but broadly speaking, they are not party questions.

Also much will depend upon how we function in India itself. If in India we become a party to conflicts, internal conflicts, internal disintegration, then obviously our voice does not count for much abroad.

People have talked about, in connection with our Five Year Plan and all that, the financial element. Obviously it is a very important element which cannot be ignored. But in the final analysis, it is not the money that is counted that is so important but the element of human energy and human faith that we can put in the country's work. That ultimately is a thing that can move mountains, and that can get us over present difficulties. It was in the measure that we brought that human faith and human energy in our previous difficulties, whether it was in the struggle for freedom or later, that we succeeded. I cannot measure, nor can anybody measure nor can any statistical apparatus measure human faith, but we can feel it, and we can help it on, and we are ourselves influenced by it. I firmly believe that our country has that human energy and human faith which will help us to overcome all the obstacles that face us.

BACK NOTE

V. Reply on Motion of Thanks to President's Address, 18 February, 1958

1. SHRI JAIPAL SINGH (Ranchi West Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I am sorry to have to intervene. But, from year to year I have been raising one particular problem, and now the Leader of the House has made it so definite about territorial aggrandisement or whatever language he may care to use. Does it mean that we will no more demand the Chittagong Hill Tracts?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It raises a new point. My answer would be that we cannot make any change to the Chittagong Hill Tract except by agreement, if it ever carries. At the time when partition took place, it was accepted even by the partition-makers that Chittagong Hill Tracts did not or should not have, gone to Pakistan. They did go and we do accept it as a fact. It was a wrong decision and we accept it as a fact. If by agreement it can come to us, well and good, not that I want a part of a territory, but because the people, Buddhists chiefly, do not fit in elsewhere.

**MOTION REGARDING REPORT OF THE COMMISSION
OF INQUIRY INTO THE AFFAIRS OF THE LIFE
INSURANCE CORPORATION**

19 February, 1958

I beg to move:

“That the Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the affairs of the Life Insurance Corporation of India be taken into consideration.”

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is just about two months ago since this matter came into my ken when it was first raised in this House. I was not present in the House then or in Delhi. Since then naturally all of us have been much concerned and have followed developments from day to day. This has been a somewhat painful ordeal for some of us, and these two months have made us sadder, a little older and perhaps a little wiser.

But that experience or a little bit of wisdom has been purchased at a fairly considerable cost, for it has cost us the services of an able and distinguished Finance Minister at a time when they were most needed.

Let me say, however, at the very outset that whatever the penalties that we or others have paid or may suffer, this inquiry has demonstrated to India and to the world the democratic way we function. It has established the dignity and majesty of this Parliament, and of the procedures we follow in maintaining high standards of public life and administration. That is a great gain and an example to be remembered by all of us in India.

In accordance with parliamentary procedure, this House heard yesterday a statement on the resignation of Shri T.T. Krishnamachari. He has resigned and paid the penalty for what had happened and so far as this House is concerned, there is nothing more to be said about it.

In the course of this inquiry, much has been said about public ownership as opposed to private ownership, about nationalised Life Insurance Corporation as opposed to private insurance companies, about civil servants or businessmen in charge of large undertakings. Not only some witnesses but the public press have discussed this matter and some individuals have expressed their opinion about the failings of nationalisation. This was not a question for enquiry before the Commission. However, it is good, I think, that these facts have come out before the public.

I do not remember any such criticisms being made of the serious failures of a number of wellknown private insurance companies. Apparently, such failures of private concerns were almost taken for granted and required no particular comment. It might be remembered that one of the principal reasons for nationalising the life insurance was the fact of such failures and the gross mismanagement of such companies. They were not managed or controlled by civil servants; businessmen were in charge of them. I am mentioning this so that we might consider these matters in proper

perspective, and not in any way to slur over or to try to minimise the events that took place in connection with the purchase of certain shares by the Life Insurance Corporation, which have been the subject of enquiry.

One thing I should like to mention here, and that is that the Life Insurance Corporation has been doing rather well in recent months and it is, I believe, transacting far greater business than it has ever done before. After the initial few months, which were taken up in problems of reorganisation, when the quantum of business fell, it has made rapid progress. The amount of business done by the various life insurance companies, which have now been brought under the umbrella of the Corporation, in 1955 was Rs. 258 crores. Then came the change and there was a great deal of disorganisation due to the change. So, in 1956 this business went down to Rs. 200 crores, that is, Rs. 58 crores less. In 1957, that is last year, it jumped up to Rs. 273 crores. That is to say, not only did it make up quickly the loss owing to disorganisation, but went considerably ahead of the previous peak figure.

So, judging from this, one would say broadly that the Life Insurance Corporation has done remarkably well, and that the officers who run it deserve credit for the way they have done it. That does not mean, of course, that we should not pay adequate attention to any wrong thing done, or that this record of good work justifies any wrong. But it does help us to look at this matter in perspective and to judge any individual case as an individual case, and not in large terms of generalisation about nationalisation or not.

Now, before I proceed very much further, I should like to say right now, on behalf of the Government, that we are of the opinion that the transaction resulting in the purchase of shares of the six companies was not entered into in accordance with business principles. I am also opposed to its propriety on several grounds. We accept, therefore, the Commission's findings in regard to this transaction. A major part of the Commission's report deals with this matter.

Also, I should like to say, as the Chairman of the Commission remarked in the course of the inquiry, there are several facts in this for which I have no explanation, and even the inquiry has not elicited all the facts which would enable us to form a clear opinion in regard to a number of these factors. Why the normal precautions were not taken in buying the shares and in fixing the prices and why the Investment Committee was not consulted, and why the prices of the transactions raised no protest, I fail to understand all this. It has still remained obscure. Whether it is possible to elicit further information now or in the future, we do not know. But, an attempt would certainly be made and perhaps we may be in a better position to understand one of these strange developments then.

A number of officers of Government, or of the Corporation, are concerned in some way or other with these transactions. We feel that insofar as the officers responsible for putting through these transactions are concerned, appropriate proceedings on the basis of the findings of the Commission should be initiated.

But, I should like to remind the House that while that is necessary and should be done, it is not right for us to come to final conclusions in regard to people who are

not here to answer or to defend themselves. There are procedures laid down for this purpose and they should be followed. It has been a convention of this House and it is a right convention that no decision should be arrived at and no one should be condemned, who is not given an opportunity to defend himself That is specially so in regard to public servants.

It is even more necessary to remember that if an individual is held responsible, it does not follow that the whole group of persons are at fault or are to be condemned. It would be a bad day if we generalise from a particular case, more especially in regard to the body of civil servants.

I should like to say that I consider the great majority of senior civil officers serving in India as a body of men and women of high ability and integrity, who have served their country well. I have been connected with many of them personally since the responsibility of Government fell on our shoulders. I cannot say, of course, that everyone of them is able or of high integrity, but as a group, I am sure, they can be compared to their advantage with any similar group in any part of the world; and I am grateful to them for the work they have done.

They had to face a new situation and new types of work. They have done their utmost, often with success, to adapt themselves to this new situation. Our work has grown enormously and our fields of activity have spread more and more we have become a State, engaged in social and industrial undertakings. I cannot say that all is well everywhere; but we are constantly trying to bring about a greater efficiency and higher standards of work and of integrity.

I should like to say here that in the course of the inquiry, though not in the report itself, mention was made of some persons wholly unconnected with these transactions in a way that might be disadvantageous to them and to the positions they occupy. In this, way, the Governor of the Reserve Bank was mentioned. He was entirely unconcerned with this purchase, and I regret that anything should have been said which reflects on a man of high integrity and ability who occupies a position of great responsibility.

In this inquiry a question has been raised about the employment of officials of the Civil Service in our nationalised undertakings and our big projects. It has been suggested that businessmen of experience would be more suitable. I would welcome businessmen or other non-officials, if they have the ability and integrity that is required for such responsible posts. But there is another consideration to be borne in mind. A person serving in a nationalised undertaking should agree with the objective of nationalisation and of State control. A person who is opposed to it will find it difficult to fit in. It is interesting to remember also that quite a number of our senior civil servants, after retiring from service, on reaching the age of retirement, have been offered and have accepted high posts in private business and are then supposed to be experienced businessmen. They are paid much more than, of course, what they were paid while in service.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

This talk about public servants and businessmen in this connection requires much greater examination than has perhaps been accorded to it. The fact of the matter is that we should naturally search for and employ the best men for the job whether they are public servants, non-officials or businessmen, whatever they may be. As our work increases and the demand for high class and trained men with experience grows greater and greater, we are finding it very difficult to find the right kind of men.

That is a matter which has been considered repeatedly by the Planning Commission. Hon. Members, if they read the Second Plan report, will find a good deal said about it, that is, how to train insufficient numbers people to occupy these high posts if we could get them. In that, we have further stated that it is not merely training from the bottom up, but taking a young businessman if he is good, into service and giving him special training or training our civil servants in a special way. In other words, we have left the door open to get people and give them training and experience and thus prepare them for the larger responsibilities that are coming our way.

Then, the question has arisen as to what part the Government should take in the working of an autonomous corporation. Obviously, this requires earnestly consideration. The Commission has recommended certain principles. We shall certainly examine their recommendation in regard to these principles very carefully. Broadly speaking, we agree that autonomous corporations should have autonomy subject naturally to such limitations as may be prescribed.

Let us, however, look at the Act which gave birth to the Life Insurance Corporation. It should be remembered that the entire capital of the Corporation has been found by the Government. According to the Act, the Government has the right to appoint the entire Board, the right to lay down the rules, the right to approve the regulations that may be made by the Corporation itself and the right even to wind up the Corporation. Thus, although the Corporation was meant to be independent and autonomous in its day to day functioning a machinery was provided for the Government to give guidance to the Corporation in various ways. Parliament in its wisdom imposed upon the Government the responsibility that this business should be properly conducted through a Corporation and authorised the Government to give directives when they found such necessary.

Shri C.D. Deshmukh, the then Finance Minister, stated in the Lok Sabha on the 18th May, 1958 that there is the further safeguard that the Central Government has the right to give directions to the Corporation in the matter of investment. Investment does mean not only investment generally but specific investments. To lay down as a principle, therefore, that the Government must keep aloof from the Corporation completely would be to challenge the decision of Parliament.

Having made this point clear, I should like to add that we entirely agree that an autonomous corporation should not be generally interfered with. Indeed, it is our belief that there must be more and more devolution of power and authority subject to certain safeguards. No complicated system of Government can work if it is too

centralised. Even in our other departments of Government, we are moving towards greater decentralisation.

This inquiry has raised very novel questions. Indeed, it is not in India only, but also in the United Kingdom that similar questions have arisen in regard to a recent inquiry called the Bank Rate inquiry.

After that inquiry was over, many doubts were expressed as to the proper mode of a public inquiry in such cases. It is, I believe, the practice in inquiries in England to hand over the case to the Treasury Solicitor and he is given the assistance of the Chief of Police to make investigations. Upon the investigations being completed, all the information is put before the Inquiry Commission. The Commission does not, as a rule, take part in the examination of witnesses, but leaves it to the Attorney-General who is furnished with statements obtained by the Treasury Solicitor. The Attorney-General conducts both the examination and the cross-examination and in doing so and presenting the case, he acts only in the interest of bringing out facts.

It may interest the House if I quote from a leading article in regard to these matters which appeared in the *London Times*. I shall read some extracts from it only. There were, in fact, two or three articles on this because the matter exercised British opinion greatly, as indeed here in India this particular inquiry has exercised Indian opinion. Of course, the two inquiries are not of the same type; the matters involved are not the same. Nevertheless, there is a certain similarity, and the same questions have arisen.

I should like to say why I am explaining this, because it really is a matter for the future, not for the past. The other day I stated elsewhere that the method of inquiry was not very satisfactory. Some people thought that I was criticising the Chairman of the Commission. It was far from my thought. I was not criticising the Chairman at all, but rather the whole approach. The fault really and principally lay with us in not thinking this matter out beforehand. As a matter of fact, if I may say so with some hesitation and in all confidence, we were hustled by Parliament.

Parliament did not order us. What I mean to say is that it was Parliament's eagerness, a very legitimate eagerness—I am not denying that. We are asked—even now I believe there are questions in the Order Paper—did some Members of the Cabinet want to delay the inquiry? Did they want to postpone it? With this kind of atmosphere surrounding us, we must take action immediately, and of course, we were anxious. From the very first day, we were anxious to have a full inquiry to elicit all the facts and take steps. But we were not quite clear as to the best way of doing it, and because of our lack of prescience or lack of thought given to it, difficulties arose, as they arose in England in a different context.

Therefore, it was not in criticism, certainly not of the very eminent Judge who presided over this, that I said that. Rather it is for us to consider, for Parliament to consider at a later stage—and for Government to keep in mind—as to what type of procedure we should follow.

Now, quoting from this newspaper, it said that 'the whole question of the propriety of the whole tribunal procedure from its first origins in Parliament has come up before us, and what happened in the method that is adopted, what happened from a certain date always has caused considerable misgivings'. Again another point—The first doubts concerned the question asked about a certain gentleman. In view of the categorical statements made by Mr. Wilson and Sir Leslie Palmer, that these questions were not intended to convey any allegation against him, it must certainly be wondered whether the way in which the questions were framed was proper, more especially. Then it referred to some particular question whether Mr. Thorneycroft did or did not do something. 'should questions be asked in Parliament carrying innuendo of this kind.'

Then it goes on to say that 'the question has even arisen whether there should be some kind of restriction on the privilege of Members of Parliament', but comes to the conclusion that 'this would be undesirable. Even though the privilege may be misused, it is important to keep that privilege intact'—something with which I entirely agree. 'It is Parliament's duty, however, to do what it can to discourage Members from abusing that freedom.'

Then it goes on—'Possibly, the recent episode may tempt some Members on both sides in Parliament to indulge in exploratory innuendo as a harassing tactic'.

Then another difficult question arose, that 'before referring the matter to a regular Inquiry Commission, is it to be inquired into in a smaller way? If so, will that smaller inquiry be public or private?' All kinds of questions are considered. 'If a public inquiry is decided upon, is the tribunal, the child of the 1921 Act, the right body? Clearly, Parliament itself cannot conduct such an inquiry. The next alternative is the Select Committee. The last time a Select Committee was used for an inquiry at all comparable with this, the Members divided strictly on party lines, and this was only one of the many bad features which prompted the 1921 Act as a remedy. Though this Act was hasty, its principle of referring such matters to an independent judicial body with the powers of the High Court seems unquestionably right'.

The 1921 Act, however, did not provide at all for the membership of a tribunal or their proceedings, and both have evolved by experiment. 'After two Members of Parliament had taken opposite views as members of a tribunal in 1928, the membership was thereafter confined to the legal world. This has worked much better'.

'As regards the procedure, upto and including the budget leak inquiry of 1936, the tribunal did their own inquiry. 'The Attorney-General confined himself to summarising evidence and to taking witnesses through their statements, while the cross-examination was done by the tribunal themselves'. 'However, the 1936 tribunal complained that the testing of the witnesses' stories by way of cross-examination or otherwise by the tribunal might have created the impression that they were from the start hostile to some of the witnesses who appeared before them. From that arose the practice of the Attorney-General stating the case in more pointed terms and himself conducting the cross-examination. But this change may have undesirable consequences

of its own. The Attorney-General starts with a role which, to the laymen's eye, is one of hostility. Being himself a member of a Party Government, but acting in a non-party capacity, he must take special pains, so it is suggested, not to fall short in severity. In the exercise of this severity, although the luckless people to whom every sort of impropriety seems to be imputed are constantly reminded that nobody is accused of anything, he is apt to make a long connected statement of the case which somebody has explained away without a corresponding opening statement being made by that somebody's counsel. Further, the increased need for those involved to be represented by counsel imposes a huge expense which few private people can reasonably bear.'

I need not read all. The first thing is that such an inquiry should not be instituted without sufficient cause and without adequate preliminary inquiry. I merely read this out to indicate how complicated questions arose in these matters, how they have arisen elsewhere—they have, in fact, arisen in different ways. It is not a question of criticising any particular procedure. It is, of course, not necessary for us to follow the British practice in this or any other matter. But since in many ways we do follow the British practice in Parliament, we can learn much from what has been done elsewhere and I certainly think, subject to further consideration that when such an occasion arises for the appointment of a Commission, some preliminary step should be taken and some preliminary investigation should be made to be placed before the Tribunal to help them.

There is another aspect of such inquiries. The inquiry, like any judicial procedure, must necessarily be conducted with great decorum and dignity and without public interference in it. Now, it is right and natural for the public to be greatly interested and for my part, I think as a rule public inquiries are better than private inquiries. But if, as was stated in fact elsewhere too, the whole atmosphere of the court becomes surcharged by public excitement and public exclamation and interference, it is not the normal atmosphere which one wants to prevail in a judicial court or in a like inquiry. As a matter of fact, I know that the Chairman of this Commission, Mr. Justice Chagla, was much distressed at what was happening in his court and protested many times about it, because it is embarrassing to the Judge or to the Presiding Officer of the Tribunal. It is exceedingly embarrassing to the witnesses who appear there and every effort should be made to prevent this kind of public excitement from overflowing into a court room.

Then, there are questions relating to ministerial responsibility and like questions. They are important. Of course, they are hardly within the purview of the Inquiry Commission; they are really for Parliament to determine and usually such questions are matters of convention. I do not propose to go into this matter here except to say that we accept the broad principle of ministerial responsibility. But to say that the Minister is always responsible for all the actions of the officers working under him may take this much too far. May I say that this inquiry had obviously nothing to do with the broad principles of the policy of the Government. It is not for such inquiries to criticise, comment or object to the broad principles of policies which Parliament

has laid down. But there has been so much reference in the Press and elsewhere about these broad policies and an attempt made to run down those broad policies because of this not only in regard to insurance, but even in regard generally to the public sector, that I feel it is necessary to state quite clearly and positively here that so far as Government's policies are concerned, in regard to the public sector, in regard to increasing the public sector, they hold completely; there is not a shadow of doubt in our minds that those policies are right and should be pursued and this particular matter has nothing to do with them.

Further, I have already stated that Government accept the Commission's findings to the effect that the transaction resulting in the purchase of shares of the six companies was not entered into in accordance with business principles and was also opposed to propriety on several grounds. Further, Government intend to initiate proper proceedings on the basis of the findings of the Commission in respect of the officers responsible for putting through the transaction. Government also intend to examine carefully certain principles recommended by the Commission for adoption by the Government and the Corporation.

I am placed in a slightly difficult position, because I have got up to move a resolution which I have placed before the House that this report be taken into consideration. That, of course, is not a matter which can be voted upon, unless we stop consideration. With your permission, at a later stage I propose to put forward a substantive resolution for this House to consider and adopt. That resolution runs as follows:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

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

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

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

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

BACK NOTE

VI. Motion Regarding Report of the Commission of inquiry into the affairs of the Life Insurance Corporation, 19 February 1958

1. SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): That is for services they rendered while they were in office.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Hon. Members opposite have very special sources of information which have nothing to do with reality and fact. They live in a world of imagination and make statements without the slightest foundation. If there is anything, let them bring up the facts. It is no good making generalisations.

SHRI NATH PAI: They have been brought to the notice of the Government more than once.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am merely saying that generalisations of this type are no good. May I enquire why then senior officials who have been retired are in office in international organisations in India, in Europe, in America and all over the place? Because they were considered good enough for that.

ACHARYA KRIPALANI: (Sitamarhi): Is not the Prime Minister himself guilty of generalisation from a few cases?

MR. SPEAKER: He was only answering what was said here by way of generalisation.

SHRI NATH PAI: That was only with regard to the private employment. We accept they have integrity. We do not dispute that part of the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Members will have an opportunity to speak. The debate is not closing now.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I do not wish to enter into an argument because these are side issues. But, they have become important issues because unfortunately all kinds of charges and insinuations are flung about in the press, in the lobbies of Parliament.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): Rightly sometimes so.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member says, insinuations are rightly flung about. That is unfortunately the way of some Members of the Opposition; I hope not of all. Because, I have high regard for many Members of the Opposition.

SHRI JAIPAL SINGH: (Ranchi West-Reserved-Sch. Tribes): May I ask, on a point of order, is it correct for the Leader of the House to tell us what happens in the lobbies?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: If I may say so, I myself do not frequent the lobby as much as many others. But reports do reach me and I am amazed at the kind of insinuations and charges made there which, I should say, I do not mind their being made publicly if they can be dealt with. It is unfortunate that this kind of thing is said outside and it spreads like bad gossip and scandal from mouth to mouth and ear to ear.

MR. SPEAKER: Sometimes newspaper report what they do not hear in the lobby as lobby correspondents.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: There is one rather interesting fact in regard to the Life Insurance Corporation, that the person chiefly and most intimately concerned with the question of investment, the particular matter that arises here, was and is a person who is considered an old experienced businessman. He is not a civil servant. He has had experience over a generation. I do not know how long, in one of the biggest life insurance companies previously.

ACHARYA KRIPALANI: He was paralysed.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I know; unfortunately businessmen get paralysed when they have to function adequately.

OBITUARY REFERENCES TO MAULANA AZAD, SHRI B. DAS AND V.M. OBAIDULLAH

24 February, 1958

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it has fallen to my lot often to refer in this House to the death of a colleague or some great man. I have to perform that duty, a sad duty, again today in regard to one who was with us a few days ago and who passed away rather suddenly producing a sense of deep sorrow and grief not only to his colleagues in Parliament, but to innumerable people all over the country.

Now, it has become almost, if I may say so, a common place, when a prominent person passes away, to say that he is irreplaceable, that his passing away has created a void which cannot be filled. To some extent that is often true; yet, I believe that it is literally and absolutely true in regard to the passing away of Maulana Azad. I do not mean to say that no great men will be born in India; certainly not. We have had great men and we will have great men; but, I do submit that that peculiar and special type of greatness that Maulana Azad represented is not likely to be reproduced in India or anywhere else.

I need not refer to his many qualities which we all know his deep learning, his scholarship and his great oratory. He was a great writer and he was great in many ways. But there are other scholars; there are other writers; there are other orators, but there was this combination in him of the greatness of the past with the greatness of the present. He represented and he always reminded me of what I have read in history about the great men of several hundred years ago, say, if I think of European history, the great men of the Renaissance, or in a later period, of the encyclopaedists who preceded the French Revolution, men of intellect, men of action. He reminds me also of what might be called the great qualities of olden days the graciousness of them. There were many bad qualities, of course, in the old days, but there was a certain graciousness, a certain courtesy, a certain tolerance, a certain patience which is sadly to seek in the world today. There is little of graciousness in the world, even though we may become more and more advanced in scientific and technical ways. Even though we may seek to reach the Moon, we do it with a lack of graciousness, with a lack of tolerance, with a lack of some things which have made life worth-while since life began. So, it was this strange and unique mixture of the good qualities of the past, the graciousness, the deep learning and toleration with the urges of today that made Maulana Azad what he was.

Everyone knows that even in his early teens he was filled with the passion for freeing India and he turned towards ways even of violent revolution. And, then, he realised, of course, soon after that that was not the way which would gain results.

He was a peculiar and a very special representative in a high degree of that great composite culture which has gradually grown in India. I do not mean to say that

everybody has to be like Maulana Azad to represent that composite culture. There are many representatives of it to various parts of India; but he, in his own venue, here in Delhi or in Bengal or Calcutta, wherever he spent the greater part of his life, represented this synthesis of various cultures which have come one after another to India, rivers that had flowed in and lost themselves in the ocean of India life, India's humanity, affecting them, changing them and being changed themselves by them.

So, he came to represent more specially the culture of India as affected by the culture of the nations of western Asia, the Iranian culture, the Persian culture, the Arabic culture which affected India for thousands of years especially Iran as every one knows. So, in that sense, I said that I can hardly conceive of any other person coming who can replace him because there was already a change in the age which produced him and that age is past. A few of us are just relics, who have some faint idea of that age that is past.

I do not know if the generation that is growing up will even have any emotional realisation of that age. We are functioning in a different way; we think in a different way; and a certain gap in mental appreciation and understanding separates us, separates the generations.

It is right we change; I am not complaining. Change is essential lest we become rooted to some past habit which, even if it was good at some time, became bad later. But, I cannot help expressing a certain feeling of regret that with the bad, the good of the past days is also swept away and that good was something that was eminently represented by Maulana Azad.

There is one matter I should like to mention here a curious error to the expression of which I have myself been guilty about Maulana Azad's life and education. Even this morning, the newspapers contained a Resolution of Government about Maulana Azad. The error is this, that it is stated as I have stated sometimes that he went and studied at Al Azhar University. He did not do so. It is an extraordinary persistence of error of wide circles. And, as I said, I myself thought so. Otherwise, I would have taken care to correct it in the Government Resolution which has appeared today. The fact is that he never studied at Al Azhar University. He went, of course, to Cairo; he visited it as a visitor, to see it; but, he never studied there. He studied elsewhere. He studied in fact, chiefly in Calcutta, in the Arabic Schools as well as other schools. But he spent a number of years in Arabia. He was born there and he visited Egypt as he, visited other countries of Western Asia. That is a different matter.

So, we mourn today the passing of a great man of course a man of luminous intelligence and a mighty intellect with an amazing capacity to pierce through the problem to its core. I used the word 'luminous'. I think perhaps that is the best word I can use about his mind a luminous mind. When we miss and when we part with such a companion, friend, colleague, comrade, leader, teacher call him what you will there is inevitably a tremendous void created in our life and activities.

It is possible that the initial reaction may not be a full realisation of that void. The initial reaction is one of shock and sorrow. Gradually, as days pass, the void appears deeper and wider and it becomes more and more difficult to fill that place which was filled by a person who has passed away. But that is the way of the world and we have to face it. We have to face it not negatively but positively by devoting and dedicating ourselves to what he stood for and trying to carry on the good work which he and others who have left us captains and generals of our peaceful forces who have worked for Independence and progress and advancement of India who have come and who have gone leaving their message behind. And so, I hope though he may go, he will live and his message will live and illumine us as it did in the past.

BACK NOTE

- VII. Obituary References to Maulana Azad, Shri B. Das and V.M. Obaidullah on 24 February, 1958.

NIL

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

09 April, 1958

Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs. In doing so, I should like particularly to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Ministry of External Affairs not only deals with external affairs but also with many important activities which might be called domestic in India. In fact, from the expenditure point of view, if we take the last year's figures may I say here that all this is given in the booklet that the Ministry has prepared for the Members of Parliament—the expenditure was Rs. 1,772 lakhs in round figures. Out of this Rs. 1,772 lakhs. Rs. 1,167 lakhs were for individuals unconnected with the External Affairs proper. For instance, there were the Tribal Areas, the NEFA, the Naga Hills and Tuensang area and there was a fairly considerable expenditure on the Assam Rifles, which really is an extension of the army, which deals directly with the External Affairs. This, naturally, is rather an expensive item. Then there is Pondicherry. Then there are contributions to numerous international organisations and International Armistice and Supervisory Commissions in Indo-China, expenditure on demarcation of boundaries etc. etc. The point I wish to make is that in effect the expenditure on External Affairs proper last year, according to the revised estimates, came to Rs. 605 lakhs, a trifle over Rs. 6 crores.

Now, I do not wish to say much about the quality and the extent of our work abroad and our missions abroad. It is rather difficult to judge these things. But we may make comparisons to some extent with missions of other countries, from the point of view of expenditure. That is easier to compare; quality is rather difficult. If we compare it with any important country, the rate of our expenditure is far less. I do not mean to say that whatever we spend, every rupee, is well utilized. I do not mean to say that there is no wastage on our side and there is no need for economy. Of course, there is need for economies; there always is. There is always a tendency for wastage, if one is not vigilant. What I wish to submit is that compared to any country, our foreign affairs are conducted in a much, well, less expensive way.

In this connection I would also say that I am not defending high salaries or anything broadly speaking, the rate of payment to our staff abroad is far lower than what other countries give to their Heads of Missions and others employed in their offices. There again, I do not wish to generalise. What we may say may be often inadequate to keep up a certain status which our Embassies and Legations are supposed to keep up. On other occasion it has been found that the money we pay them for this purpose is not fully and properly utilised. It is not spent. Therefore it would indicate that we are paying them too much. But these are rather rare cases. I am putting both aides of the picture to the House.

Naturally I cannot say that a large number of people employed in our foreign service are all of the same high level as we like them to be, but I do say that the quality

of our Heads of Missions serving abroad is a high one compared to any diplomatic service that I know of. There are also people who are not so good and who do not come up to that standard. Naturally in a large Service we have occasional difficulties. We have to take some kind of disciplinary action. But taken all in all, I would submit to the House that our Missions abroad have carried out their functions with dignity and ability and, broadly speaking, at a much less cost than the diplomatic service or the missions of the major countries.

In this connection may I also say, although it is not part of external affairs, that in the NEFA two or three years ago we constituted a special cadre of political officers, who were specially recruited for that purpose. It is very difficult to deal with that situation and a very special type of officer was needed for it. It is a hard life. It is an isolated life a life with practically no amenities of civilised existence, no people sometimes to talk to even and hard work. Therefore we require a very special type of person who likes that kind of jungle life and who is physically and mentally tough, who could get on and be friends with the tribal people he was meant to serve. So, we chose a number of people our selection boards selected them and I am happy to inform the House that most of these people who were chosen, have done remarkably well.

I should like to mention here in this House that not only in our foreign missions but also in a case like the NEFA. It is not merely the officer who counts but his wife also counts very much. People do not often realise that in employing an officer, we are really, in effect, employing two persons the officer and his wife.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

I am particularly thinking at present of these officers' wives in remote and tribal areas, NEFA and elsewhere. Only recently I had a report of one officer and his wife. That lady in that remote area had done a very fine piece of work, apart from her husband doing well, because she had gone out of her way to deal with the tribal people, serve them, make friends with them, make friends with their children, play with their children and help them in many ways. She really created a much better impression than what any formal work by the officer would have done. So for these people, in these remote areas, I should like to put in a good word and I am sure the House will appreciate the fact that these officers in remote areas, NEFA, tribal areas, Naga Hills and Tuensang area deserve well of us because they are doing their work under very difficult conditions with marked ability.

It is about ten years now since we started building up our Foreign Service in our Missions abroad. There were a very few missions before independence. There was India House in London and there was some kind of representation in Washington and a few others mostly dealing with commercial matters or educational matters sometimes. When we started with our career after independence we had this whole wide world to deal with. We started as a country in a big way I do not mean to say that we are a big country, but we did not suddenly sort of creep in the international scene furtively. We came almost with a bang and people's attention was directed to our country. Many countries wanted to exchange diplomatic representatives with us.

We were quite agreeable, of course, but it was no easy matter to do so, *i.e.*, to build up the Foreign Service and to build up all the apparatus that goes with it. Foreign representation is not merely a question of good and educationally qualified men. It requires experience. Just as in the Army all the individual ability of a man is not quite enough to replace the experience of a General Staff which has inherited and accumulated experience the experience of a General Staff cannot be produced by an individual, however brilliant he may be so also in the Foreign Service of any country, the accumulated experience of a Foreign Office is a very useful thing, not perhaps quite so important, may be, as the General Staff in the Army, but it is important and this is regardless of the broad specific policy that you might pursue. This is a kind of background experience which helps one to judge a programme.

All hon. Members read a newspaper and come to some conclusions about some incident. I acting as the Foreign Minister, naturally have greater access to facts as they occur. It has often happened that I come to certain conclusions quickly but when I go deeper into it and find out the records in the Foreign Office as to how the problem arose and what had happened previously, I have to change my opinion not on matters of high policy but on other matters because there is the accumulated experience and facts. We started from scratch and gradually in the course of these ten years we have built up that experience and we are building it up.

We have now 41 embassies, seven high commissions, eleven legations some of these are duplicated 26 consulates and vice-consulates and sixteen commissions, special missions and agencies. Altogether we have 101 missions of some kind or other situated abroad apart from a considerable number of Indian Information Units abroad. Now, this is a fairly large number. I cannot, as I said, say that every unit, every person abroad is a brilliant officer. Naturally, there are various types. But, taking it all in all, they have preserved a fairly high level and there can be no doubt about it that they have a high reputation among the diplomatic personnel of the world.

As far as our relations with other countries are concerned, they are at a remarkably friendly level. Unfortunately, we have not been able to maintain the same cooperative and friendly level of intercourse with our neighbour country Pakistan. As the House knows, we have no relations with Portugal because of Goa. We have no diplomatic relations with South Africa. Also the reasons are known to this House. Apart from these, our diplomatic personnel are spread out directly or indirectly all over the world.

I do not propose to discuss at the present moment the question of broad policy or world affairs. I wish to refer briefly to some matters. Our broad policy in international affairs has, I believe, the cordial approval of a very large section of this House not all and of the country. There are criticisms, legitimate criticisms about particular aspects, emphasis, of some minor importance as to how things are done. But, the broad policy has had that approval and this approval of the House and of this country has naturally given great strength to the Government in carrying out this policy. Because, if we went abroad, whether to the United Nations or to other Chancelleries and put forward some policy which was a matter of dispute in this country in a big way, naturally, the

effect we produce would be very limited. I will not say anything about that broad policy.

At present, taking the big world questions, obviously, the most important thing is disarmament, which is likely to affect the whole future of the world as to what steps are to be taken. In this connection, many things have happened in the course of the last few months. The outstanding event in recent months or weeks has been the proposal made on behalf of the Soviet Government not a proposal, but the decision not to have nuclear test explosions. This has been criticised on the ground that having indulged in a vast number of tests, they can well afford not to have them for some time. That may be true. But, such criticisms can be advanced about any action taken. The major countries today, the United States and the Soviet Union, both probably have got a vast stock of atomic or hydrogen bombs. It is not necessary for them, from any point of view, to manufacture more, probably. Nevertheless, if they decided not to manufacture any more, it would be a great thing even though they do not actively require them. Therefore, a good step is a good step, however it might have come into being. We must welcome and indeed the country has welcomed this step of the Soviet Government in regard to stoppage of nuclear tests. In saying so, they have added a proviso or rather a warning that if others do not stop them, we shall resume them more or less to that effect I trust this contingency will not arise.

There has been a further development. It has been said on behalf of the Soviet Government that they are prepared for control and supervision. That is an important factor. Because, the real thing that comes in the way is fear and it has often been said that there can be no certain way of detecting an explosion. I am not a scientist enough to say whether that is right or wrong, because scientists differ. The obvious course seems to be for the United Nations or some other organisation to appoint some scientist of high repute in these matters and ask him to find out how detection can be made certain if some kind of test explosion takes place.

Then, there is, on the side of the United States of America, a proposal made by President Eisenhower, the use of atoms for peace, that fissionable material should not be produced for war purposes, which is an important proposal. Here are all these proposals which, if taken together and acted upon together, would make an enormous difference to the present atmosphere of strain and fear in the world. I do not say that accepting any of these proposals means the solution of any major problem in the world. But, I do say that accepting them and acting up to them produces conditions which help in solving these problems of the world.

There is talk, as the House knows, of what is called the summit conference or high level conference. As far as we can judge, I speak from no secret information, but from what is available to all Members of this House the chances are that some such high level conference will be held in the course of this year. I have said often that while every country is interested in this matter, naturally, because the whole peace of the world depends upon it, the real two countries in whose hands lies the final issue of war and peace today are the United States and the Soviet Union. Therefore, any agreement must involve an agreement between these two apart from other countries.

Any disarmament conference which leaves out one of them is no disarmament conference. It can produce no adequate results. Sometimes, India's name has been put forward for attendance, for participation in the high level conference. The question when put to us has rather embarrassed us. Always our reply has been that we do not wish to push ourselves into any conference, but if our presence is wanted by the principal parties concerned and we feel that we can help, we want to be of help. These are world problems which affect us tremendously as they affect the whole world.

Only one thing more I should like to say about world problems and that is this. If the people are desirous of putting an end to this cold war, it seems to us that the approach should not be hostile, an approach of condemning your opponent. There is no doubt that countries differ in their policies, in their structures of Government, in their economic approaches. There is that difference. You cannot put an end to that difference by war, because you rule out war. Now, it is recognised that war will exterminate, not put an end to that difference. How then are we to approach? Surely, if we approach these questions with the mentality of war and with the language of war, then again, you are not likely to succeed. Therefore, while maintaining whatever opinions we may have in regard to our policy, while also it is natural for each country to think in terms of its security because no Government of any country can forget its security, while doing all that, yet the approach should be not a hostile approach, but a really friendly approach. Hold to your security, hold to your principles, but recognise the fact that we have to live in this world together in peace even though we differ from each other. We have to find a way to that, and the only way we can do it is by these peaceful methods, and not by thinking or action in terms of a cold war, which really means constant appeals to hatred, violence and fear. That, I think, is important because there is no other way of doing it.

Now, these are big world questions. So far as India is concerned, we are concerned with the world questions, but the questions of the most immediate concern to us are, if I may say so, two or three, the matters relating to Pakistan, our neighbour country, Goa and, in quite different category, the question of racial discrimination in South Africa and the treatment of people of Indian descent there who are mind you, not Indian nationals but who are South African nationals. The question of treatment of Indian nationals has not arisen in South Africa because there is no Indian national there. They are all of Indian descent who are South African nationals. Our interest in it is not only because we are against racial discrimination, but because there is a long history behind this, going back, I do not know, 50 or 60 years or more, and before independence and since independence we are intimately involved.

I will not say anything more about it except this, that in a deeper consideration of the world's problems today, there are many conflicts and many dangers, but probably something of, well, at least as much importance as any other matter is this question of racial conflict in South Africa. There are racial conflicts elsewhere in the world. There is not a racial conflict in that particular sense but something near or alike to it, in our own country when we suppress one people because they are called untouchable or depressed or this and that. Let us not imagine that our hands are clean in these

matters. Of course, they are not clean, and we cannot merely condemn others without looking after our own house.

There are racial conflicts in the United States of America and elsewhere, but the thing that distinguishes the South Africa matter is this. In the United States of America efforts have been made—and made with growing success—to ease the racial problem. I do not say they have solved it, but the Government want to solve it, they try to solve it, they have succeeded, public opinion is helping, there is a progress in a certain direction; so also elsewhere. But in South Africa it is the deliberate, acknowledged and loudly proclaimed policy of the Government itself to maintain this segregation and racial domination. That is why the South African case is unique in the world. While there is racial trouble in many places in the world, and conflict, in South Africa it is the official policy, and if that is the official policy of a Government, well, that is a policy with which obviously no country, no person who believes in, let us say, the United Nations Charter—leave out other things—can ever compromise, because it uproots almost everything, whether it is the United Nations Charter, whether it is your ideas of democracy or anything else.

Then there are other matters which come up in questions here, about people of Indian descent in Ceylon. I will not go into that. It is a complicated problem. These problems become difficult, and they become more difficult, because of growth of population, unemployment, economic difficulties. You will find usually at the back of it there is some economic difficulty and unemployment. That is there. And the problem is, in the main, that of the Ceylon Government because these people, according to our showing, are not Indian nationals. Whether registered or not, we feel they are or ought to be Ceylon nationals. It is their problem. We are interested in it again because of past history. We are interested in the solution of this because we are friendly with the Ceylon Government. We are interested because of cultural contacts and all that. And it is unfortunate that it has dragged on for so long, but I would beg this House to remember that we should not be too eager to condemn any Government, or the Ceylon Government, merely because it has not solved it quickly. They have their difficulties, and they should realise our position just as we are perfectly prepared to consider their difficulties, but it is obvious that we cannot accept large numbers of people who have lived there, who have been born there, and just ask them to walk across to India, or accept them as our nationals. Fortunately, in spite of this complicated and difficult problem, it is increasingly realised in Ceylon by the Government and others, and by us of course, that we should not treat it as a political problem or dispute, but as a human problem, because, ultimately, the welfare of large numbers of human beings is involved and I do hope that, however long it may take, it will be settled in a friendly way and to the advantage of this large number of human beings that are involved.

Now, I come to this collection of problems and difficulties which represent Indo-Pakistan relations now. I do not propose to go deeply into this matter, and right at the commencement I would say that we can make a long list of our problems. There is Kashmir, there is canal waters, there is the exodus from East Pakistan, there is this

question of displaced persons and rehabilitation, there are financial issues, and there are so many other matters. All seem to drag on. Sometimes some small matter is discussed and settled, some little progress is made, but by and large, none of our major problems go towards a settlement. It is most surprising because I think one thing that should be recognised by all of us, by every Indian present in this country, and I hope in Pakistan, is that the perpetuation of conflict or even any kind of a cold war between India and Pakistan is very bad for all of us and all of them. Whatever approach ours might be, except just the approach of an angry person which is not a good approach, whatever approach we might make, whether it is geographical, historical, cultural, past connections, present, future, it is patent that India and Pakistan should live co-operatively not interfering with each other's policies. They are independent countries; we may separate, we may become independent countries as we have done, but we cannot deny geography, we cannot deny history, we cannot deny a hundred things which exist, the other facts of life of our countries, and so it is inevitable that we must come together, and we must live co-operatively and carry on in our own ways. We cannot force them we have no desire to force them to adopt any particular policy, even though we may consider their policy wrong. Now, these are the facts of life, as I said. And because of this it is terribly distressing that we cannot make much progress in developing what is natural and, I think, inevitable between our two countries.

And yet, there is one more hopeful factor, and that is so far as the common people are concerned, in India and in Pakistan. I believe that the old feeling of bitterness and suspicion and fear is infinitely less than it was ten or eleven years ago. That trail of bitterness which followed partition and these huge migrations most terrible killings has died down. It is only in the political sphere that passions can be roused or with the help of religion, sometimes these communal feelings may be roused whether in Pakistan much more so, or to some extent in India also; let us remember; it is no good our pretending that our hands are lily-white all the time, and our minds are lily-white, because they are not. We have made errors.

I believe that the major difference between Pakistan and India is not because we are better folk than they are—I mean the common people. We are the same lot. We have the same type of virtues and the same type of weaknesses and failings. But I believe that the major difference has been that we as a Government and not only as Government, but I would say, leaders of parties, all parties or nearly all parties have deliberately aimed at avoidance of conflict, by creating better relations with the people of Pakistan, while in Pakistan the leadership has not done that. I am not criticising them. I do not wish to criticise them and have a match of mutual criticism. But circumstances in Pakistan have been such that, the very creation of Pakistan, that is, on the communal basis and all that, and the way it has continued, have been such that, unfortunately, they have been driven, the leadership there has been driven, to lay stress on conflict with India, on hatred of India, on carrying on the old tradition of the Muslim League which they inherited. Therefore, while neither of us is free of blame as a people, as a Government, we have at least tried to go the right way. That attempt has been absent from the other side. Again, I am not criticising any individual

but circumstances, the circumstances which led to this Partition, the policy of the Muslim League and all that.

When you consider this unfortunate fact of the strained relations between India and Pakistan, curious strained relations because, when you and I meet or anybody meets, a group of people from India meets a group of people from Pakistan, we are friendly, we hardly meet as strangers, as people of two countries; we speak the same language; we have common friends, common memories and a hundred and one things, and yet there is this tremendous strain which does harm to both of us when you think of this, people tell you some people say "Oh, you go and settle this Kashmir issue, and all would be well." this is the normal criticism or advice offered to us in foreign countries or 'Settle this canal waters issue.' Well, obviously, if we settled any issue which is in conflict, it creates a good atmosphere naturally. But I do submit to this House that all this that the strain and the feeling of conflict between India and Pakistan is not due to the Kashmir issue, are not due to the canal waters or any other issue, but that all these issues are due to another essential conflict, something else. These are the outcome of that, not the origin of the conflict; of course, they overlap, and it is rather difficult to draw a line between the two. But it does mean this, that if this type of approach, this type, of anti-India approach, hatred of India, bitter dislike of India which is propagated in the press, in the statements of leading people in Pakistan, continues, and if that is the basis of their foreign and internal policy, then it just does not matter what you settle and what you do not settle, because that is the basis of policy. If by any chance the Kashmir issue was out of the picture as a matter of conflict, it will have, no doubt, a very good effect; I have no doubt. But unless that basic approach is changed, the thing will continue in other forms. That is our difficulty, so that I feel very unhappy about this matter, and it is no pleasure for me, no desire of mine, to say words, any words which might accentuate our difficulties. I do not like much that is happening in Pakistan. I do not want to criticise it. It is none of my business unless it affects me.

I read only in yesterday's paper or was it the day before a former Prime Minister of Pakistan openly saying that 'We must march Pakistan troops into Kashmir'. Now, what is this? Is this reasonable, sensible? Even if it is a reaction just in an angry defiant way, it is not good; it creates that atmosphere of bitterness and hatred and fear and cold war which we want to get rid of.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²

All these years, hon. Members know that there are noted personalities in Pakistan who have made it their business openly proclaimed to train people to commit sabotage in Jammu and Kashmir State. In fact, forget the number, but at least a hundred bomb outrages have taken place in that State; many people have been killed, and all that. This has been deliberately done there. How can one go towards solving a problem when that is the attitude when *jehad* and all that is talked about? I do not think that is the attitude of the people of Pakistan as a whole. And I would not even say this; for, who am I to go about criticising the leaders of other countries? But I would say, we have got into such a tangle that the only positive policy of theirs is a negative policy,

which is a contradiction in terms, that is, a negative policy of hatred of India. And they go about repeating some of them that India will crush them and swallow them up, and that India is out to undo Partition. For anyone to think of that is foolish; for anyone to do it or try to do it would be criminal folly. And looking at it, apart from the larger view-points, from the stand-point of India and India alone, from the narrowest opportunist point of view even, it would be criminal folly.

Nobody wants to undo Partition. It will be terrible; we will go down; everything that we try, whether it is our Five Year Plan or whatever it is, the whole thing will collapse; instead of doing any good to anybody, the whole structure of our economy, the political and economic structure would suffer. The only way is for each country to go its way, and I hope, come nearer to each other co-operatively in thinking and action, of its own free will. That is the way and retaining its independence and freedom of action.

Now, there are these two major problems. One is the canal waters dispute, dragging on interminably. Some of our best engineers are practically spending their lives, sitting in Washington, discussing this matter with representatives of Pakistan and the World Bank. We have spent vast sums of money just in these discussions. I do not know the figure, but it runs into crores, I think. We would have built a fine scheme or project or canal here or in Pakistan by the amount of money we have spent merely in talking. Talking is sometimes useful; naturally, it serves some purpose; it is better than quarrelling. Anyhow, here is this problem of canal waters which, essentially, it not a political problem and should not be considered as such. It is a human problem. We do not want to deny Pakistan any water that it can have. We do not wish to make the Pakistan peasantry suffer for lack of water. Obviously, we are not going to deny our own people what they need so badly. We are not going to deny something for which we have been preparing almost for generations, not to mention the last ten years or so, something for which people in Rajasthan, in parts of East Punjab and other areas have been preparing for generations. We are not going to wipe all this out because some people do not like it. Mind you, all these schemes are pre-independence and pre-partition schemes and you can judge them.

Anyhow, our approach and I want this approach to be carried out is a friendly approach to Pakistan, is a human approach to this problem. Let us do our best. It is no good Pakistan telling us 'Give us Rs. 1,000 crores'. It is fantastic such huge figures being thrown about, as if any country can do that. But we do not want Pakistan to suffer; at the same time, it is obvious that we do not want ourselves to suffer at all.

Finally, take this problem of the Jammu and Kashmir State. Recently there has been a report by Dr. Graham. Dr. Graham had been here previously and all of us who have had the privilege of meeting him, respect him. He is a man beaming goodwill and good intentions, and it is really a pleasure to meet a man like that. He came here on this occasion and he was our honoured guest, although we had informed the Security Council when they passed that resolution, that we could not accept that resolution, nevertheless, if Dr. Graham came, he would be welcome. So

he came and he had some talks with us. In this report, he himself has stated the nature of our talks. I am not at the present moment going into this Kashmir question. It is too big and too difficult, and apart from that, this House knows very well what our position in regard to this issue is what we have said in great detail in the Security Council and in India. And in this matter, I believe there are no two opinions in this House or in the country. There might be slight variations about emphasis, but broadly speaking, there is none.

The trouble, according to us, in considering this matter has been that from the very beginning certain basic factors and basic aspects have not been considered by the Security Council, and because of that, the foundation of thinking and action, has been unreal and artificial, and all this tremendous lapse of time has occurred without achieving any result.

When Dr. Jarring came here representing the Security Council that was before Dr. Graham came he presented a brief report. In that report, the House may remember, there was a recognition of certain factors, certain developments, certain facts of life which could not be ignored. He merely hinted at them; he did not go into that matter; it was difficult. Anyhow, this is the first glimmering that you see of what the problem is today. You can consider this problem in terms of 1948 and 1949 or in terms of today. You cannot consider it all the time, every little phase in between. I say 1948 and 1949 because it was in those years that certain resolutions of the Security Council were passed, which we accepted. The very first thing in those resolutions was that Pakistan and India should behave in a certain way, that is, peacefully and not curse each other, not create conditions of conflict. The second thing was that Pakistan should withdraw from the occupied part of Kashmir and so on and so forth. Remember, the basis of those resolutions was the recognition of the sovereignty of the Jammu and Kashmir State over the whole territory, that is to say, that the State was part of India and therefore, Indian sovereignty. I am not going into that. Now, after that, much happened. A great deal has happened during these ten years, and even the papers that we have I forget the exact number run into 20, 25 or 80 volumes in connection with this Kashmir affair.

Now, we come to today. Keep if you want to keep those resolutions that we accepted, in mind; we do not want to go away from them. But remember that during all these ten years, the very first part of the thing has not been given effect to by Pakistan neither the first, nor the second, nor the third—and all discussions begin in the Security Council ignoring all this, with something that is at the far end of the resolution, which was only to be thought of after everything else had been done.

Now, Dr. Graham has been good enough to put forward certain suggestions. One is that we should reiterate solemnly 'we' meaning India and Pakistan what we had said previously: we should make a new declaration in favour of maintaining an 'atmosphere of peace. I was perfectly prepared to make it, and I will make it once, twice, three times, a number of times more. But with all humility—I submit again that I am prepared to make it we drew Dr. Graham's attention to the type of declarations that were being made in Pakistan from day to day while he was there in Karachi.

The declarations that were made there had no semblance of peace; there was the very opposite of it and all these bomb explosions organised from Pakistan are taking place in the Jammu and Kashmir State. So nobody can object to what Dr. Graham has said. Let us have by all means declarations about maintaining an atmosphere of peace. But let us look at the facts, what is happening, what a former Prime Minister of Pakistan has just said, which is in yesterday's papers, and so on.

Then Dr. Graham said the second thing let us also declare that we shall observe the integrity of the ceasefire line. I do not think anybody has accused us during these ten years of a breach of that ceasefire line. There it is. We do not recognise Pakistan occupation on the other side as justified in any way, but we gave our word that we would not take any offensive action against it, and we have not done so. On the other hand, you see, what I have referred to several times, organised sabotage across the ceasefire line in Kashmir.

The third suggestion of Dr. Graham was about the withdrawal of Pakistan troops from the occupied part of Jammu and Kashmir State. Certainly, it is not up to us to withdraw; it is up to them to withdraw. It is not a question of our agreement to their withdrawal; we have been asking for their withdrawal all this time.

The fourth proposal was about the stationing of United Nations forces on the Pakistan border of Jammu and Kashmir State following the withdrawal of the Pakistan army from the State.

Now, the proposal was or is for the stationing of U.N. troops, not in any part of Jammu and Kashmir territory, not in the part which is occupied by Pakistan now, but, these forces should be stationed in Pakistan territory proper. Obviously, Pakistan is an independent sovereign State, if it wants to have any foreign forces, we cannot say, 'No' to it. We cannot prevent that. We, for our part, do not like the idea of foreign forces anywhere. And more especially in this connection we felt we did not see any reason why the U.N. Forces should sit in Pakistan on the Kashmir border. But, that is our opinion. It does not carry us anywhere because what is proposed is to be done in the territory of Pakistan. It is for Pakistan to agree or not to agree; we have expressed our opinion.

Then, finally, Dr. Graham suggested that the two Prime Ministers, that is of India and Pakistan, should meet under his auspices. Now, it has been our practice or convention always to be prepared to meet not only as Prime Ministers, but anywhere in any conflict to meet our opponent, to meet our adversary, to meet, of course, our friends also. So, there can be no difficulty and no objection on our part, or for me, to meet the Prime Minister of Pakistan. But Dr. Graham says that we should meet under his auspices; that is to say, the three of us should meet. That produces an entirely different type of picture. I need not go into it. Obviously, that is there.

First of all, it places us in a position of, let us say, equality in this matter with Pakistan. We have always challenged that position. Pakistan is an aggressor country in Kashmir and we are the aggrieved party. We cannot be treated on level. That has been our case right from the beginning.

Secondly, for the two Prime Ministers who meet, it would almost appear as if they have to plead with Dr. Graham, under whose auspices they meet, as advocates for certain causes which they represent. This kind of thing does not lead to problems being considered properly or solved. So, we told Dr. Graham that while we are always prepared to meet, this way of meeting with a third party present, even though the third party may be so eminent as Dr. Graham, was not a desirable way.

I have ventured to say something about Dr. Graham's report because there has been a good deal of talk about it, and a good deal of criticism, rather ill-informed criticism, in the foreign Press on the subject. Anyway, it is open to our friends or those who are not our friends to criticise us. I make no complaint. But I do wish that they would realise our position in this matter and what exactly of Dr. Graham's report we rejected.

I told you the first point, broadly speaking, is to make a declaration of good neighbourliness. Nobody can oppose that and there is no question of its rejection. Our submission is that this thing has been totally lacking from October 1947 onwards and, even after we had made this statement, Pakistan has not. In fact, it is our primary case that the old resolution of 1948 the very first part of it has not been given effect to by Pakistan.

The second point is about the ceasefire line. There is nothing to reject there.

The third was about the withdrawal of Pakistan troops. It is none of our concern. We want that to happen. We do not reject the withdrawal of Pakistan troops.

The fourth was the placing of UN troops in Pakistan territory. Well, I have told you it is up to Pakistan to agree or not to agree. If they want our opinion we can give it.

And, lastly, this question of the two Prime Ministers meeting. If my opinion is asked for I would say that a meeting should take place. Any meeting can take place when, if I may use the word, the omens are favourable, when the atmosphere is helpful. Otherwise, it is not likely to do much good. But, apart from that, I am prepared to meet whatever the omens may be. But, as I said, I do not think it in the right way to approach this question, to meet in the manner suggested by Dr. Graham, that is, under his Chairmanship, discussing this matter between us. So, that is the position.

Now, I should like to say a sentence or two before finishing in regard generally to the Demands for External Affairs. In the past, during these debates and sometimes during questions, many points have been brought out and many criticisms have been made; and we have profited by these criticisms at any rate, we have tried to profit by them and we welcome them. We are not afraid of criticisms and we welcome those criticisms; but I would say only one thing.

Sometimes an approach is made which entails, without much obvious good, a great deal of labour. For instance, after 2 or 3 years of effort, labour and concentration we formed the Indian Foreign Service B. It involved tremendous labour, all kinds of committees of selection and consultation with Public Service Commission and all that.

I do not know I forget that now but probably 7,000 or 8,000 persons applied. I get complaint after complaint that so and so has been improperly rejected or so and so has been improperly chosen. It is not possible for me as the Minister to consider 7,000 applications. Some impartial committee has to consider them. Most of these came from people in service; they were taken in or they remained where they were. I suppose some of the persons who did not happen to get it or who were not chosen go about from Member to Member with their complaints. Then, I get long letters, letters of 3, 4 or 5 typewritten foolscap pages. I have them examined, of course; I send them answers. But, I would submit that it is impossible, when we are following these procedures greatly—I cannot guarantee that—that absolutely 100 per cent correct decision is always made. Who can guarantee that? But we make a certain procedure where the personal element does not count or counts very little and when we go through this procedure if any obvious error takes place, one tries to correct it. But it is quite impossible for us to go after these 6,000 or 7,000 people continuously and repeatedly because they go and complain of something that might have happened to them.

BACK NOTE

VIII. Demands for Grants, 09 April, 1958

1. An Hon. Member: What about those who are bachelors?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: We do not have the wife always—that is true but in fact we expect the wife to play an important part on the social and human side.

2. SHRI BRAJ RAJ SINGH (Firozabad): It is meant for consumption within Pakistan only.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It may mean that. But that is an important point. It creates that atmosphere in Pakistan and abroad.

STATEMENT REGARDING INFORMAL MEETING TO DISCUSS FOOD SITUATION

8 September 1958

I am grateful to you for permitting me to make a brief statement about a matter which concerns all the Members of this House. This morning, in the course of the discussions, you were good enough to suggest to members of the Government that they might consider conferring informally with Members of this House of all parties in regard to the food situation. We will gladly do so. As a matter of fact, also in pursuance of a previous suggestion of yours, I invited some leaders of parties in this House from the Opposition, a few of them also from the other House, and we met for the first time on Friday last in this informal meeting to discuss this food situation. And we met again this afternoon-I mean that this is a continuing committee and not just one discussion. The idea is that we should keep in view not only the immediate situation but the short and even the long-term remedies. That is, the committee though informal, should continue. We thought it better to have this informal committee because it is much easier to discuss matters with informality than under strict rules and regulations.

May I say that in the course of these two days' discussions, personally speaking for myself, I have found it very profitable to hear the viewpoints of various Members and their suggestions. And, I hope, that they have also profited somewhat from the information that we could place before them. That small informal committee will continue meeting from time to time.

But, Sir, in view of the suggestion you made, we have decided to convene a much larger meeting. I cannot say the numbers; but I may say about 30 or so-25 to 30 Members of all parties will meet on Thursday, the 11th September, i.e., 3 days from today. I might indeed have asked them to meet earlier but for the fact that an eminent personality is coming here tomorrow and some of us will be rather occupied in talks with him. The 11th was, therefore, the earliest date we can find for that. So, we hope to meet- as I said about 30 or 50 Members from both Houses- we thought it better and I hope that all the Members who are more specially interested, from all parties, in the subject will cooperate in this task. We shall gladly have that cooperation and we shall gladly supply them with all the information we possess on this subject and listen carefully to such suggestions as they make. Now, Sir, as I said, Government wish to share the information they have, past and present-what we have done and what we are doing- and to discuss with them any novel, new approaches and suggestions also.

Apart from this, if at that meeting on the 11th, or after that meeting has taken place, it is the desire of this House or your desire, Sir, we are prepared to have subsequently, on a suitable date, a two-hour discussion in this House. I do not wish

I would gladly go to Lucknow; it is my own State but I am in a slight difficulty. I am in constant communication, I may say, by letter and sometimes even by telephone and I hope the situation will improve rapidly. But I am in a personal difficulty because I am rather tied up about going to Bhutan within a few day's time.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX⁵....

I have publicly stated that I hope that all State Governments - I was not thinking of this bigger conference, but the smaller informal committees - would convene such meetings and invite opposition leaders to such meetings. I have suggested that to the State Governments already.

BACK NOTE

IX. Statement Regarding Informal Meeting to Discuss Food Situation, 8 September, 1958

1. SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD (Nasik): The hon. Prime Minister has said just now that the representatives of all parties have been included on this committee. As far as my knowledge goes, a representative of the Republican Party has not been included.

2. MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Prime Minister's statement has received much of the tension. The hon. Members will kindly forget all the instances that may have happened, the talks and other things that have occurred in this House. It is not the desire of any one here or elsewhere to disturb the already disturbed situation. Therefore, I hope and trust in this informal conference much of the things will be settled or almost everything will be settled. In an adjournment motion it is rather difficult and one has to be a little technical. In the other discussion on the food subject, not only the constitutional aspect such as whether we have jurisdiction or not, whether, food being a very important thing, the Centre can also have jurisdiction and whether it has any obligation under the law or under the Constitution, etc., can be discussed. We can have a wider range. With respect to an adjournment motion, the situation is rather difficult: if the Government is not responsible, ought there to be an adjournment motion or not?

In the general discussion on the food situation, I hope and trust that some concrete suggestions will be made and I would say that if any discussion arises here, let it not add to the tension that exists elsewhere. Let it, as far as possible, relieve the tension that is existing there and relieve the distress wherever it may be. I shall fix up a suitable day, if necessary, after the hon. Leader of the House informs the House and there are some more outstanding major problems which ought to be given the attention on the floor of this House.

3. SHRI NATH PAL (Rajapur): We welcome the spirit though we do not yet know what it will do. But may we know if he would use his good offices to influence the Government of U.P. to show the same spirit so that in that State matters are not aggravated there?

4. SHRI RANGA (Tenali): It may be a good thing if Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, not necessarily as the Prime Minister, would hold a similar conference with the cooperation of the local Ministers at Lucknow at the State level also.

5. SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): My suggestion was, if you could possibly make a request to the Chief Minister of U.P. through the Prime Minister to call a similar conference in U.P. and try to relieve the tension there.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure he will also take steps.

MOTION REGARDING INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

9 December, 1958

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the debate yesterday on this motion dealt chiefly with Indo-Pakistan relations, and more particularly, with border disputes. There were many other matters also referred to undoubtedly. I should like, therefore, to say something again about these border disputes and about that agreement which is sometimes referred to as the Nehru-Noon agreement. But before I do so, I shall deal with some of the broader questions again.

The hon. Member, Shri Jaipal Singh, used language which created a good deal of confusion in my mind, and perhaps in other people's minds too. He began by saying that he was in general agreement with our policy, our foreign policy, but he did not agree with the policy of non-alignment. It was rather an odd thing to say, after saying that he agreed with our policy, that he did not agree. Then he said that yet he agreed with the Nehru policy. About this, I am not quite clear in my mind, if he was speaking seriously or was just what is called in French *jeu d'esprit*.

I do not know myself the various distinctions and differences between our general policy, the policy of non-alignment and what might mistakenly be called the Nehru policy. I thought they were much the same, all these three.

Anyhow, I would submit in order to clear up any misapprehension that, first of all, when we say our policy is one of non-alignment, obviously, it means non-alignment with military blocs. You cannot have a negative policy. The policy is a positive one, a definite one, and I hope, a dynamic one, but in so far as the military blocs today and the cold war are concerned, we do not align ourselves with either bloc. That is all. That itself is not a policy. It is only a part of the policy. And that is clear enough, and we have to lay stress on that because, unfortunately, in the world today, countries talk and act so much in terms of this cold war and in terms of military blocs and of fear of one or the other, that one has to lay stress on the fact that we are not parties to the cold war and we are not members of or attached to any military bloc.

Having said that, of course, the policy can only be a policy of acting according to our best judgment, and furthering the principal objectives and ideals that we have. Every country's foreign policy, first of all, is concerned with its own security, with its own progress, and one has tried to protect that. Now, security can be protected in many ways. The normal idea is that security is protected by armies. That is only partly true; it is true, no doubt, but security is protected by policies; if you have friendship, you, to some extent, gain security; if you have hostility, you are slightly or somewhat endangered. Therefore, a deliberate policy of friendship with other countries goes further in gaining security than almost anything else. It may not succeed, of course; that is a different matter.

Apart from this, from the larger point of view of the world also we have laboured to the best of our ability for world peace. We realise that our influence in such matters can only be limited. Naturally, because we are not in possession of, nor have we the capacity to possess, weapons like the modern atomic nuclear weapons. But still our influence has not been negligible not because, as I said, we ourselves are influential in such matters, we do not make such a claim but because we do believe that what we have said in regard to peace has found an echo in people's minds and hearts in all countries, because, in fact, it was the right thing. And in spite of governmental policies and cold war and the like, people have appreciated what we have said and reacted to it favourably.

As to what our influence has been on governments, I hope we have been able to impress them with the urgent necessity of this matter. Anyhow, I cannot say definitely about it, but I can say with some assurance that our influence on peoples generally all over the world in regard to this particular matter of peace has been very considerable, and any hon. Member who happens to go to any part of the world, in Asia, Europe, America, Africa or elsewhere will always find India's name associated with peace. That brings a great responsibility upon us. It is a privilege to be associated with peace, but it brings, as I said, a great responsibility, that we should not only try to live up to it and function so that we may advance the cause of world peace but in our domestic sphere also we should work on lines which are compatible with peace. We cannot obviously have one voice for the world outside and another voice and another action internally which conflicts with that.

Therefore, our foreign policy has this positive aspect of peace. It is obviously the positive aspect of an increase, of an enlargement of freedom in the world, of colonialism being replaced by free and independent countries, of a larger degree of cooperation and all that. So I hope that Shri Jaipal Singh on further reflection will see that there is no conflict between the various appellations and various descriptions of our policy that he gave. But anyhow, it is completely incorrect, if I may say so, to call our policy 'Nehru' policy. It is incorrect because all that I have done is to give voice to that policy. I have not originated it. It is a policy inherent in the circumstances in India, inherent in the past thinking of India, inherent in the whole mental outlook of India, inherent in the conditioning of the Indian mind during our struggle for freedom and inherent in the circumstances of the case today. I come in by the mere accidental fact that during these few years I have represented that policy as Foreign Minister to foreign countries and in this country, and I have spoken about it many times. Personally, I am quite convinced that whoever might have been in charge of the foreign affairs of India and whatever party might have been in charge of the foreign affairs of India, they could not have deviated very much from this policy. Some emphasis might have been greater here or there because, as I said, it represents every circumstance that goes towards making the thought of India on these subjects.

I say this because some people in foreign countries imagine that this policy has suddenly grown out of nothing and it is merely a policy, as Shri Jaipal Singh himself described it I hope not very accurately of sitting on the fence. I do not know what fence he had in mind. There is no question of sitting on the fence or trying to woo

this person or that person or this country or that country. Or, if you like, we are always wooing every country. We want to be friends with them. We avoid, as far as possible, running down countries, even though we might differ from them, although we do not hide our sentiments, because we have felt that there is far too much running down of countries one by the other and creating bitterness so that people's minds are closed. You do not open a person's mind, normally, by running him down. He reacts violently in thinking or action.

So we avoid doing that. There are many things happening in this world which we dislike very much. We do not talk about them except sometimes as a moderate expression of opinion. If they affect us intimately, of course, we have to talk about them. But generally we avoid talking about things which do not affect us intimately or which do not affect basic causes like world peace etc. Then we have to talk. So that I have no doubt that this House, barring perhaps Shri Jaipal Singh, has no doubts about this matter.

But this talking of sitting on the fence does involve an attitude of mind which, I think, is not correct. It is said there are only two ways of action in this world today. One must come down this way or that. Now, I repudiate that attitude of mind. If there are only two ways if you accept that then you certainly have to join the cold war, and, if not a military bloc, at least a mental military bloc if not an actual armed bloc. I do not understand that attitude at all. I just do not see—I speak with all respect to the great countries why the possession of great armed might or great financial power should necessarily lead to right decisions or a right mental outlook. I do not see how that follows at all. They may be right, they may not be. But the fact that I have got the atom with me does not make me any the more intelligent, wiser or more peaceful than I otherwise might be. It is a simple fact but it needs reiteration.

The greater a country in armed might, the wiser it must necessarily be in action I do not think it follows. I said that with all respect to the great countries. I am not criticising anybody, but I am not prepared even as an individual, much less as the Foreign Minister of this country, to give up my right of independent judgment to anybody else in other countries. That is the essence of our policy.

It may be, as Shri S. A. Dange said, 'Oh, you are friends with all, but sometimes you are more friendly with some people than with others'. That reminds me, of course, of that famous saying that 'all men are equal, but some are more equal than others'. It is true; it may be that occasionally because of some of our activities or some of our expressions, people, who themselves feel strongly about these matters this side or the other, feel that we are inclining too much on this side or that side. The fact of the matter is that we follow our own course of action as we judge right and incline on every side, whenever an opportunity offers itself, to be friendly with them. But it is true that in various matters let us take economic matters and some other matters, to which I shall refer we have past contacts which we certainly carry on. In the past, our economic life, rightly or wrongly, in trade, commerce etc., has gone in a certain direction. We have not tried to uproot it. We have tried to develop other directions too, but we have not tried to uproot the old directions, old contacts, old

trade ways; we have tried to develop them as well as new ones, and that may give an impression that we have emphasised one and not the other. But, that is the point which Shri Dange laid stress on. He objected to our Chiefs of Staff going to England for certain conferences of military officers there and he thought that that meant some kind of lining up with the military apparatus of some countries of the Commonwealth. He also objected to our Navy joining in manoeuvres with some Commonwealth Navies, or chiefly the British Navy.

I do not think he is justified in objecting to that even, if I may say so, from his own point of view. I think it must be due to some misapprehension of what is done and what happens. We send our Chiefs of Staff to London occasionally to participate in what is called a joint exercise. We send them because it is a very good opportunity for gaining wider knowledge of modern methods in so far as one can get them there. I do not say that there are no other places where you can get that. But, it is not taking part in manoeuvres; it is not thinking of defence policy *vis-a-vis* other countries.

For instance, whenever there is a Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference and I attend it, there is, usually, side by side with it a conference about defence matters. We do not attend it. I forget now whether there is any other Commonwealth country which has not attended. I think Ceylon does not attend it. Certainly, it has not attended it. We have not attended because we have nothing to do with the defence approach or the peace and war approach of the United Kingdom or the Commonwealth countries.

But, it is quite another matter for us or for our representatives to see an exercise. An exercise means really discussing modern methods of war, usually in a room, how old methods have been affected and so on. We have not got too many of those opportunities to do that by ourselves in this country. Where an opportunity offers itself as it sometimes happens in a limited way, we have to take advantage of that even in other countries apart from Commonwealth countries. But, in the main, here is an opportunity; we come into touch and we take advantage of it.

Then for the Naval manoeuvres. A Navy or an Army must have some kind of practice. You cannot keep a Navy or anybody in trim without active practice, of mock battles, mock wars. Manoeuvres are mock battles. Our Navy is not big enough to be divided up into two forces fighting a mock battle, one with the other; it is not big enough for that purpose. May be the British Navy, may be the American Navy or the Soviet Navy can do that internally; we cannot. So, we take advantage of these naval manoeuvres and participate in these mock battles, try to reproduce very very imperfectly, of course, the conditions of warfare and our people learn from them. It is of the highest importance that our sailors, or for the matter of that our soldiers, should have practical experience in so far as it can be given; and we take advantage of that, whenever an opportunity comes our way.

Then the question a question almost always mentioned in the past of our Commonwealth relationship— on this occasion was hardly mentioned. If I remember correctly, it was rather a Member from the Congress side that mentioned it and not from the opposite side. That is, the desirability of our continuing as a Member of the Commonwealth. I have tried to explain our view point many times. I will just say a few words about it.

The House knows that our membership of the Commonwealth has not led us to forsaking any policy of ours being proceeded with. It has, in fact rather helped us occasionally to put that policy more strongly and more impressively, if I may say so, on others, whether they are members of the Commonwealth or other people. It has helped us, therefore, in trying to put across our policy more, perhaps, than otherwise it might have been the case. Of course, this does not take us very far, I admit to other factors. The argument that is advanced is that because South Africa, for instance, is functioning in a particular way, a racial way, apartheid etc. and South Africa is a Member of the British Commonwealth I am sorry for the use of the word 'British'; it is an old word and it came in connection with South Africa—therefore, it is somewhat below our dignity or not in keeping with what we should do to remain in the same group of nations to which South Africa belongs.

I can very well understand that sentiment and that feeling against the racial policy of the South African Union. It is I believe among the many questions that trouble the world today. It is, I think, more basically wrong and dangerous for the future than for anything else. You can talk a great deal of other conflicts, ideological conflicts, communism, anti-communism and so many other things. It surprises me that those countries, particularly those who stand for the democratic tradition, those who voted for the United Nations Charter and for the Human Rights Convention may I remind this House that tomorrow happens to be the tenth anniversary of the passing of the Human Rights Convention it surprises me that those great countries, express themselves so moderately or do not express themselves at all about this racial policy of the South African, Union. It is not a question of policy only. I say it is the greatest immorality, international immorality for a nation to carry on in that way. We have no desire or reason to interfere with what a country does. The South African Government can do what it likes in its internal policy. But I say, even apart from the fact that in South Africa people of Indian descent are concerned and these people went under certain guarantees and that therefore we have a special concern, even apart from that, even if we do not have that special concern, nevertheless, we would have held these strong views about the racial policy of the South African Government.

As I said, it has been a matter of some distress to me that from others, who stand for the democratic tradition, who stand for the dignity of the individual, who have condemned this South African policy, not a voice can be heard elsewhere. Some do. The House will remember that the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker, when he was here spoke strongly and effectively against this racial policy. But some other countries do not do so.

It is this to which I referred in another context yesterday. It was the context of Pakistan. And, I wish to make it clear again that I am not criticising the internal affairs of Pakistan or martial law. It is up to any people to have the kind of Government they choose and it is not our concern unless that Government threatens us or unless that Government functions, as I say the South African Government functions, against the canons of recognised international morality. That is a different matter, and we have to do it. But what, naturally, has been a matter of some concern to me

is how the democratic outlook, the democratic tradition is gradually disappearing or is being gradually converted into something, shall I say, a matter of some verbiage or words, and not of a dynamic view of life and action. It is from this point of view that I have watched carefully the reactions of other countries to what, had happened in Pakistan. When I found a constant apology in these other countries for what had happened in Pakistan and almost an attempt to show it as something not far removed from democracy, it really amazed me. There can be no greater, well, attempt to delude oneself, and it showed me how far this type of mentality which the cold war is developing has gone.

We are not interested really in any principle which we hold dear; we are interested only in knowing whether this country is with us in a cold war or not, or is in a hot war. That is the chief test.

Take the case of Goa. Take the case of Portugal. What Government of Portugal has is none of my business or none of the business of this House even. But everybody knows that Portugal has, what is termed, a very authoritarian Government some kind of a dictatorship. Let them have a dictatorship. But Portugal again becomes the strong pillar of peace and democratic principles from another point of view. It does not fit in my mind, it does not flick in my mind this kind of thing. It shows that we have all, whether in the Communist countries, whether in the non-Communist countries, become so apt to use words in meanings which are not the dictionary meanings; we simply distort them in some way to fit in with our approach to a particular problem. Here is Portugal quite apart from the question of Goa; Goa we know well enough and what they do there. There is not the remotest question of any civil liberty or freedom in Goa. Nobody well, I won't say 'nobody'; I am talking about not 'nobodies', but important bodies, important people and important countries they say little about Goa or Portugal, and what they have said in the past has been rather an encouragement to Portugal in Goa. We saw recently, some months ago, an election in Goa I am sorry there are no elections in Goa; it was in Portugal. It was one of the most odd election that one has read about. We have seen criticisms of other elections in other countries, but the Portuguese election, apart from some newspaper scribes, was calmly passed over.

So the point is not what policy, what programme, what the objectives and ideals of a nation are; but, in this present cold war conflict, where does this nation stand, is it with us or not with us.

Again, a simple fact is forgotten, that it does not necessarily follow that a government of the day in these matters, major matters, has popular will behind it. Whether it is war or peace people count. Today even people who are not free, even in colonial countries, count. In war they will count still more. And, deals are made with governments forgetting that the deal may be worth nothing at all unless the people of that country approve of that deal or, at any rate, do not resent it. So, all these confusing situations arise.

One of the major examples of this kind of thing is what happened in Iraq, one of the chief founder nation of the Baghdad Pact. In fact, the very name of the Pact was taken from the capital city of Iraq. Suddenly the country changed, because all that was superficial, because all the deals were with a group at the top which did not represent the country, the people, and the people threw out the group at the top; and, there you are, the Baghdad Pact high and dry, one day thrown out from the mansion it had built for itself. Where it is I do not know, except in speeches and writings.

So we live in this odd world where, to use another phrase, there is so much doublethinking, so much use of language in a double way, that if none is confused it is not surprising. I do not pretend to possess any peculiar wisdom or intelligence, but I do try to avoid to be wholly confused by this situation. I cannot lay down what the future will show. So far as we in India are concerned, I should very much like not to stray too much from the right path and to serve the cause of peace in India and outside, not only from the larger view point of the world but from the narrowest, opportunist view point of my own country.

We try to do that, and in doing that take the question of our neighbour country, Pakistan I have tried to be fair. As this House knows, I have acknowledged often enough what I thought was wrong on our part. I have said only yesterday that in regard to these border troubles sometimes we are in the wrong, sometimes we emphasise things which should not be emphasised. I have said all that in my attempt to be fair I do not know if I can be fair because nobody can be perfectly fair in matters which affect us so intimately; but I have tried to be fair and it has been a matter of grief to me that in spite of all these efforts not too much change is visible on the other side. I did not make those efforts waiting for a change; whether a change comes or not I think we should function in the right way. That is not only the right way, but it is a way of strength not of weakness whether it is Pakistan, whether it is South Africa, whether it is some other place.

Hon. Members sometimes ask me, why don't you act with strength. The hon. Member, Dr. Subbarayan, said that in South Africa and Ceylon we must do this and we must do that. Where do these 'musts' come in, I should like to know, in international politics? I do not understand it. Where does 'must' come in regard to South Africa. Am I to declare war against South Africa? Obviously not I can only take the matter up in the United Nations or I can express my opinion, that is all. So, why all these fine gestures of definance which you cannot give effect to? It has no meaning, and ultimately it becomes a sign of weakness if we talk in that way.

Ceylon of course, Ceylon is in a completely different category. It is a friendly nation It is our neighbour, and it is very closely aligned to us in cultural and other matters. We want to be friends, and I am quite certain the people of Ceylon want to be friends with India. Yet, we have inherited this problem of a considerable number of people of Indian descent in Ceylon, apart from the Indian nationals. There it is, one of those problems which with all the goodwill in the world is not easily solved. Essentially, it should not be treated as an Indian problem or a Ceylon problem, but as a human

problem affecting a large number of human beings. I am not arguing that point. But I say, what is the good of telling me "Go and solve it immediately"? How am I to solve it immediately? I cannot. Am I to threaten Ceylon and make the lot of those people and everybody much worse? It might satisfy some kind of ambition on our part to display the strong hand, the fist. We do not normally, when we are in the right mood, display the first to anybody. So, one has to see this matter in that context. One has to see the Pakistan matter in this context. One has to see the border troubles in this context.

It is true; I think Acharya Kripalani said yesterday that these border troubles will continue. That is to say, so long as there is friction between India and Pakistan, it is likely to be reflected on the borders. To some extent, it may become a little less, but it will be reflected, because it is the basic atmosphere, the basic relationship between India and Pakistan that is wrong. That is taken advantage of not only sometimes by good people, but certainly by bad people on both sides. On the Pakistan side specially and sometimes may be on our side too, the bad people are protected; they are not stopped from doing it, because there a feeling of nationalist pride comes in: We must protect our men. The same thing happens somewhere in the middle of Rajasthan. It is only some evil doers misbehaving.

Coming to these border matters, Shri Jaipal Singh talked about Chittagong hill tracts. I must confess that when I first went through Justice Radcliffe's award, in which he awarded the Chittagong hill tracts to Pakistan, I was considerably surprised, because according to any approach of principle, I saw no reason for that. But there it was; it was a clear decision and not a question of interpretation. I could not interpret it in any other way. What were we to do? We had accepted soon after partition Radcliffe as arbitrator, in a sense, arbitrator. However much it went against my thinking, against our interests, against India's interests. I could not break it; we could not break our word. We had to accept it, although we thought it very unreasonable and devoid of any approach of principle. There it was and that has been the position till then.

The matter has been raised from time to time, notably by Shri Jaipal Singh. I can very well understand his feeling in that matter. I share that feeling. But what am I to do? I cannot denounce the Radcliffe award, which definitely, deliberately, in a clearly defined manner, gave that to Pakistan. We can negotiate with Pakistan if a proper atmosphere is present and consider it. But the House can well realise what the answer would be, if we suggested negotiation about the Chittagong hill tracts, which have been given to them precisely and definitely by the Radcliffe award. It would lead us nowhere, when there are difficulties about much simpler matters with Pakistan.

We could hardly raise this matter previously in the United Nations. I do not see how we can raise it in the United Nations. The obvious answer is there: The Radcliffe award and all that. So, there it is. I do not know what I can do about it, however much Shri Jaipal Singh or I may feel about it.

There is a calling attention notice from Shri Premji Assar. In that notice, he has said that a spokesman of the West Bengal Government had said that it would be physically impossible to prevent the exchange of enclaves by the target date. There is

some misapprehension about this matter. So far as the Cooch-Bihar enclaves—enclaves in the old Cooch-Bihar State are concerned, there is no target date at all. There can be none, because their exchange can only take place after legislation has been passed by this Parliament. There was some doubt as to the method we should pursue. It was clear that this required at least legislation by Parliament. Some people said that it might even require an amendment of the Constitution. But all the legal luminaries we consulted have agreed that this does not require an amendment of the Constitution, but it does require legislation by Parliament. Naturally, we will come before this House sometime or other with proposals to pass that legislation and the House will consider it. So, there is no question of target date there.

The target date was fixed for the other exchanges, not the enclaves. That target was fixed some months ahead so as to allow for demarcation and settlement to avoid any confusion afterwards. That demarcation was started and then it was interrupted. According to us, it was the fault of the Pakistani people. However, it was interrupted. Now, lately it has started again. The West Bengal Government approached the East Pakistan Government and they agreed to start it again. The West Bengal Government has suggested to them now that in order to expedite this matter of demarcation, more than one survey party should function and there should be several survey parties. To that we have had no answer, so far as I know. But one party is functioning now.

A great deal was said yesterday from both sides of the House about the Berubari Union. May I give the facts? One hon. Member enquired when this question arose about the Berubari Union becoming a matter of dispute. In the Radcliffe award, the boundary for the Berubari Union was not very clearly described. There was a map too. But the matter at that time was not referred to Justice Bagge, which came soon after. Bagge finished his work in 1950, but in considering the second Bagge award, then fresh problems arose and there were two interpretations.

It was in 1952 that this question of the Berubari Union became a matter of dispute and discussion between India and Pakistan, that is, about six or seven years ago. It is true that so far as possession is concerned, it had been in our possession since independence. The House may remember that although possession was ours, Pakistan claimed a large part of the area round about Sylhet-Karimganj as an interpretation of the Radcliffe award. It is amazing how much difficulties this Radcliffe award has caused us in interpretation. They claimed huge areas and Justice Bagge had to deal with this matter together with an Indian judge and a Pakistani judge. The decision of Justice Bagge plus the Indian judge in regard to a large piece of territory in Karimganj was in our favour. That part was disposed of. But, nevertheless, after the Bagge Award again difficulties arose in interpretation of what Bagge had said and what Radcliffe had said. The difficulties arose chiefly because first of all they laid down a rule that we shall accept, broadly speaking, the boundaries of districts or taluks or administrative areas. Now the administrative areas inside a country does not matter. But when the boundaries become international frontiers, it makes a difference. Sometimes it is said as the other side of the river. Then they attach maps to the description, and the map does not tally with the description. Sometimes they name a river and there was doubt as to which river was meant.

Anyhow, my point is that after the Bagge Award several other matters arose on interpretation and we have been holding to certain interpretations of our own and Pakistan to some others. It was after the Bagge Award, after at least 1952 that Pakistan raised this question about Berubari Union. We contested their claim and in our opinion, we said, the whole Union had been awarded to India. The dispute has gone on. I am merely referring to it. It is not a new dispute. This was finally considered at the Prime Ministers' meetings. I may as well say that the Prime Ministers did not consider it, because I am not an expert on revenue boundaries, but we considered it at the official level, with Secretaries and revenue authorities advising us. And the whole agreement that was arrived at between the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan, which was really arrived at the official level by various parties advised by Secretaries and revenue officials, was accepted by us after closely examining it. One of the parts of that agreement was that this Berubari Union, which both claimed as an entirety, should be broadly divided into two parts, northern and the southern, the northern remaining with India and the southern going to Pakistan. I cannot obviously enter into the merits of the case. Large maps and charts and revenue records of what this meant and what that meant becomes highly complicated. I am merely venturing to place before the House the procedure that was adopted. So, we accepted the advice chiefly of the revenue authorities and others of West Bengal that this might be done.

Now I should like to point out that in these various matters of interpretation and dispute, well, there were some matters in which one could say with confidence that our case was strong. In some matters one felt that our case was not very strong. Naturally when we have a dozen such matters some points are strong and some weak, and we had to take all these matters into consideration in coming to a "give and take" agreement.

A great deal was said even by Shri Jaipal Singh and other Members that we show weakness in dealing with these matters, our case goes by default and we accept everything that Pakistan says. Well, that is not correct. Even in the present case, it might interest the House to know that as a result of the so-called "Nehru-Noon Agreement" I want to give the figures; I have got them here as a result of the agreement in regard to the exchange of territories the total area which comes to India is 42.4 sq. miles; the total area that goes to Pakistan is 4.8 sq miles. And when I say coming to India, a part of it is in India now, but that is taken out of the area of dispute and agreed to that this is India. The total area in dispute in this area was 47.2 sq. miles. As I said, of this 42.4 sq. miles definitely comes to India. So, it is not a question of handing over territory to Pakistan and accepting what they say. The total area of Berubari Union is 8.75 sq. miles, and the agreement was that about half of it should go to there and about half of it should come to India.

Reference was made to Hili. As a matter of fact, the whole area, a large area of 34.86 miles comes to India, and Pakistan admitted that it should go to India, although they have been claiming it.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

It is a fact that whatever you may decide, it causes some inconvenience, some upset to some people. We wanted to see that it is as little as possible.

One thing more about Tukegram. Tukegram has been all the time since independence in India's possession. The dispute about Tukegram as such only arose this year, that is, Pakistan raised this question. In another sense, Tukegram is part of a larger area about which there was some dispute, a continuing one. But by itself there is no dispute about this and it was undoubtedly, according to our thinking, our territory. I say this because some statement made on our behalf in answer to a question, I think in the other House, has slightly led to some misapprehensions. In fact, our Deputy Minister made a statement in the other House, clearing that misapprehension, today.

Some Hon. Members suggested that a Joint Judicial Board be constituted to deal with these problems and that the chairman of that Board should be neither an Indian nor a Pakistani, but some outsider and I believe he suggested someone from another Commonwealth country. That kind of proposal, I say, is a completely wrong one and we are not at all prepared to consider it. We are prepared to consider a Tribunal to take up such matters; some matters can be referred to it, because after all finally there is no way of settling these matters except either by agreement or by an arbitrator or by a tribunal.

We suggested this in regard to some other matters to Mr. Feroze Khan Noon, but he rejected that. He did not accept that. I think some hon Members actually read out yesterday from what he said on that occasion when he went back to Karachi. I do not see any other way of settling them. It is our misfortune that two tribunals, the Radcliffe and the Bagge, still left matters vague.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²

Tukegram is not mentioned at all. The question of vagueness is not there. Normally it is in India.

An hon. Member I think it was probably Shri Dange, or may be someone else said that it was not safe for our pattern of armaments to be linked up with one particular power. Broadly speaking, I agree with that statement. We should not be tied up to any big power. To some extent it becomes a little difficult for us to spread ourselves out all over the world and the real answer to this question is to produce things oneself in one's own country, except any special thing which we may buy here or there; broadly speaking to increase our defence production capacity. We are trying to do that to the best of our ability. It is not an easy matter and we cannot, however much we might produce things ourselves, build up that enormous equipment for research and advance which the great powers have. We do not intend doing it; we do not want it. We are not aiming at any kind of competition in this matter. But we want to be self-sufficient in this respect in regard to our normal defence equipment.

Finally, Sir, I should like to say something in regard to some remarks which Acharya Kripalani made. First of all he said that our Military Department must be

above a suspicion in regard to contracts, etc. I entirely agree with him, of course. And not only the Military Department, but all Departments should endeavour to do that. I cannot say honestly that every department of Government here, or in fact anywhere else, is hundred per cent, perfect. There is trouble, there is misappropriation and all that sometimes. But I do believe that the kind of opinion that is sometimes held apparently about so-called corruption etc. in Government departments is much exaggerated.

As I said, we are functioning today as Government over a sphere which is probably a hundred times bigger than in pre-independence days. It is a tremendous domain and new territories are being included I mean to say the public sector and all that. Everything is tremendous. If I may use a word each department of Government, each Ministry, is an empire in extent! Now this very extent raises difficult problems and we are constantly struggling and endeavouring to make our apparatus of Government more efficient, more economical and to have people of integrity. I think that marked progress is being made in this direction.

Remember today how many eyes are on Government departments. Every Member of this House or the other House if not every Member, a large number of them are vigilant guardians. They are vigilant to see and if anything happens down they come upon them: quite rightly, they should. There are so many people looking at them. In previous days nobody looked upon them, if a mistake happened, it just happened. Our newspapers also are eager to pick up anything that might savour of some scandal. So that there are enough eyes and ears at work and the smallest thing that happens is brought out either by question or in newspaper, or otherwise. One must remember also all this background and see the enormous range of governmental activity. If you pick out something and if something happens, you must see it in relation to it. And do not—if I may say so with respect—because of one case or two or ten cases think that 10,000 other cases are wrong. We must have some perspective in view.

My hon. friend Acharya Kripalani mentioned defence. And defence, remember, is in such a matter the most difficult department of all, difficult, that is to say, so long as it deals with foreign firms. If we produce our goods ourselves then it will be on the same level as others. Nothing is more difficult than purchasing armaments from the big firms abroad and elsewhere. There is no real competition in that matter. Deals are not done normally in public. They can more or less fix their own prices and we try to argue with them and accept them or not. So defence is always a dangerous thing and in every country it is in deals connected with defence that wrong things happen. I entirely accept that in defence we have to be very careful.

Unfortunately, the first year after independence, 1948 was a very critical year for us. Soon after independence the Kashmir trouble started and nobody knew in 1948 at what time the Kashmir trouble might not extend to an all-out war with Pakistan. Those who held responsibility then found it rather a heavy burden to carry, *i.e.*, about our security, about a possible major war as to what might happen. A little later came the Hyderabad problem. It was a small affair as it happened. But we saw it in terms of all this, *i.e.*, what was happening in Kashmir, what was happening in Pakistan—

and just soon after Partition when we had very few arms, very few vehicles and all that in proper condition. We were anxious to buy and certain contracts were made.

The first contracts were made—the very first—by the new department at India House. Till then every contract was made through the India Office, *i.e.*, through the British agency. The early contracts were made when no proper establishment was built up and all that and here we had a violent hurry because of this acute dangerous situation which might result in sudden war with Pakistan and we would not have this or that. Certain contracts were made then which led ultimately, as the House knows, to enormous trouble and still pursue us, *i.e.*, what is called the jeep scandal and all that. So, see the context of it.

We have gone into this matter very, very thoroughly and we are convinced—I cannot say honestly that some people in England or some people elsewhere did not make money out of it; some people did because we have lost the money and obviously it has gone somewhere, but I am simply speaking after all the long enquiries that have been made—that people in India House were by these circumstances and not by anything else hustled in agreeing to certain terms, etc., which normally they would not have agreed to or to deal with certain firms which they might not have dealt with. Considering everything we thought that it was our misfortune that we have got caught in that way and not that any person is deliberately at fault. That was our firm opinion and of those who examined it.

Now, remember again the enormous scale on which Defence purchases things from abroad. It is a very big scale and I beg you to consider that dealing in this big way how few instances have arisen which have been challenged in this House. Maybe, of course, some misappropriation was not caught. That is quite possible. It does not necessarily follow that because it was not challenged it was all right. But still what I am venturing to point out is that by and large if you look at this picture it has been a picture of straight dealing and care taking. Sometimes, a mistake has been made. Even now we are enquiring into some matters which really go back to—I think the story goes back probably about four or five years 1954. We are enquiring into it. We have taken action to occasionally dismiss some high-ranking people and all that. So, we are trying to do what we can. But, again I would beg this House to consider one aspect of this. We have to be vigilant, we have to be careful and we have to take action and firm action—whenever necessary. But it is a wrong thing and a dangerous thing to create an atmosphere.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX³

Hon. Member, Shri Tyagi, knows about those matters and his advice is always valuable. He may be right. He may be right that firm action is lacking but what I am venturing to say is that wherever necessary or when it is proved we come down with a heavy hand. But one thing is dangerous as it is wrong and that is, first of all, to condemn large numbers of people in Services because somebody had erred. The person who has erred— cut off his head, if you will. Certainty, but do not colour the whole Service with that. It is a bad tiling, it is bad anywhere whether it is civil or anybody. It is worse when the military and those people are concerned.

Secondly, do not do anything which discourages the bright people—the scientists, the technicians and others. Thus far they had no chance or very little chance of doing anything special —they had to work in routines, in grooves. The best of them become affected by this and become dull. That unfortunately is sometimes the result of too much bureaucracy. People are promoted by virtue of years of service and not that they have got greater intelligence in their heads. They go on being promoted one after the other and at a certain stage they are asked to quit, whether they are good or bad. I think it is quite illogical and insensible. This may be all right for your lower grade clerks but for intelligent men, when you spend a large sum of money and when you get them trained, to be asked to quit when it is the best time of service, it is quite absurd. Of course, in the educational field it is fantastic. In other countries I have seen the professors reaching the hundred years standard and nobody kicks them out— they are 95 or 92 years of age—because they all are respected, whatever be their age. It is not a civil service kind of thing—the rotation of coming and going.

So, with this bureaucratic approach the brilliant person is treated like a mediocre, on the same level. That may not matter so much in the normal governmental administration. It does matter, of course, but not so much. But it matters ever so much where you have to deal with scientific and other discoveries and progress. The scientist cannot function in that atmosphere. It is possibly, if all the time he is pulled up and told not to do this and not to do that, just a madness for a man of acute intelligence who is trying to do a bit of high intellectual work. We have got some very fine men in our Defence installations—good scientists and good technicians—and they have been doing a particularly fine work in the course of last year or two and you have seen some examples, Why? Because they are enthusiastic now. They have been given free play—do something I do not want this House to create an impression on them, “We do not approve of your doing them”.

Now, Acharya Kripalani mentioned Kashmir and said that it is not safe to rely completely on one person and he referred to certain previous incidents. We should rely on the people.

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX⁴**

I think, for once I completely disagree with Shri Tyagi. So long as there are many Shri Tyagis in this country that cannot happen and fortunately there are many such persons.

But about what Acharya Kripalani said—and he said it in all earnestness I should like to remind him that one has to see these things not in a vacuum but in particular situations. Here is Kashmir, it has gone through such an ordeal for many years, which today has armies on the ceasefire line on either side and which in the last year or two, as the House knows, has had to face a secret and deliberate campaign of sabotage. Schools—and I speak with some knowledge—being started to teach people how to commit sabotage and people sent across just to commit that sabotage—on the other

side of the border it started not in our territory—sent deliberately. This is difficult situation to face. It is not a normal situation. And difficult situations have to be faced sometimes in abnormal ways. Nevertheless, in spite of all this elections have been held in Kashmir twice. You may say and you may perhaps be right that the elections are not of that high standard as we would like them to be or as they have been held in the rest of India. Nevertheless, whatever be the standard, it does give a great opportunity to the people there. It has given them that opportunity. There are those difficulties. We cannot have it in ideal conditions anywhere. In these conditions, the situation throws up men to deal with those situations. And the present Prime Minister of Kashmir, Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed, is a person who undoubtedly has shown quite remarkable qualities of organisation and leadership. He has done something. I am quite free to confess here that sometimes he has acted in ways which I have not liked at all—just as all of us may act in some ways and I have ventured to draw his attention to these too. But the fact is that here is this great problem and this great responsibility which he is shouldering and carrying this burden.

Now, Acharya Kripalani referred also to the case of Mridula Sarsbhai. I do not think it would be proper for me, since he has referred to her case, to pass it by and say nothing. That would be unfair to the House. Well, all of us or nearly all of us have known her well. I think I have known her for a trifle over forty years, since she was a child, a girl. And there are few persons in India, man or women, whose courage I have admired so much as hers. She is a brave, courageous young woman. But there are also few persons whose judgment I have disputed and thought wrong, often enough I mean that wrong judgment is alike to courage. It often produces very wrong results, because she has the courage to go wrong, and repeatedly wrong and not to be cowed down by anybody into any other course of action. Speaking for myself, I can assure Acharya Kripalani or anybody else, and for myself, I have never doubted her own motives, her *bonafides*. But I have been amazed to see how she can persist in wrong doing and harmful doing to her country. Almost every member of this House has received no doubt vast bundles of papers from her frequently. It is amazing that type of propaganda being carried on and I had that examined repeatedly much of it baseless, without foundation. I do not say that she deliberately tell a lie. But she believes every liar that comes to her and puts it across to the people with her own imprint and gives publicity to that. We talked to her, tried to reason with her and tried to explain to her but it had no effect.

So it is not a question of Mridula Sarabhai being guilty of high treason I do not say that at all. But under an unfortunate set of circumstances her courage and her capacity is being utilised and exploited for wrong and dangerous purposes. She got far greater publicity in Pakistan than in India. That is no argument, I know but I merely say that her whole activity not that she meant it became so anti-national, so harmful to India that it became rather difficult to leave it where it was in fact for months and months, in fact for a longer period, we did allow matters to remain where they were I do not think we would have acted in this way with any other person in

India for so long, whoever he might have been but because of our high regard for her and because of her known courage we did that, and if I may quote some lines that come to my head:

And to be wrath with those we love
Doth work like madness in the brain.

Now, one thing else. He referred to the case of Mr. Balraj Puri, his treatment I enquired into this matter. I cannot say what the exact facts were except to say that the lengthy reports that have come to me after enquiry did not wholly support Mr. Balraj Puri's own account in the sense that and it is quite possible occasionally that varying reports may come and people are excited here was a crowded court room and this Jammu when Mr. Balraj Puri entered it and rather threw his weight about.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁵

It is not in the physical sense. I am not complaining, I mean to say that even the Magistrate noticed this pushing about and he commented upon it and he was asked I think, by a police officer to go out. I am not for a moment judging this incident. All that I say is that here is a crowded room where a person comes in and he said something and I am sorry that he suffered any inconvenience. But the conditions were peculiar. In a crowded room this kind of thing happens.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁶

As I said it is difficult for me, I have spent some tune over this enquiry and I have no doubt that some things that Mr. Balraj Puri says are correct, but I do get the impression that some other things that he has not said are also correct and there are exaggerations on all sides.

That is all, Sir I am thankful to the House for the patient hearing it has given me.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁷

As regards the amendments to this motion, I am prepared to accept one of them, Shri Jaganatha Rao's. I do not particularly mind if there is no amendment. There is no necessity for an amendment. But, naturally in sheer selfdefence I have to accept that amendment.

BACK NOTE

X. Motion Regarding International Situation, 9 December, 1958

1. SHRI RANGA: What about the population. How many are there?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: You mean Berubari Union? The total population of Berubari Union is 10,000 to 12,000 I think half of it remains there. Roughly half of it goes there. But I do not know the density of population in each part. About 3,000 to 8,000 may be affected by this.

SHRI RAGHUNATH SINGH (Varanasi): May I know the area occupied by India now?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I cannot give the exact figures. But, as I said just now, this includes some parts which are at present in the possession of India. Now, if you go into the details about this, it is a highly complicated matter in which for months and months our experts have been struggling with revenue records, maps and all that, and finally in regard to these particular matters they felt that it would be advantageous, not only from the national point of view but from the point of view of the people of those areas, who were subjected to this constant indecision and conflict, to recommend this settlement of these particular disputes, and we accepted that, rightly.

2. SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati): Nothing was vague about Tukegram. They did not leave anything vague about Tukegram.

3. SHRI TYAGI (Dehra Dun): I must submit that firm action is lacking.

SHRI BRAJ RAJ SINGH (Ferozabad): It will always lack.

4. SHRI TYAGI : That is what they are doing in India too.

5. SHRI GORAY (Poona): Mr. Balraj Puri is the last man who can throw his weight.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): Sir, you have seen the man. He is not a man who can throw his weight. All that he did was that he raised his hands.

6. SHRI NATH PAI: I may be excused for interrupting the Prime Minister, because Mr. Balraj Puri won't be having a chance of defending himself and the Prime Minister's version will go before the country. There is a medical certificate that he has produced of the beatings he has received in the police lockup, which he has brought to the notice of no less a person than the Prime Minister himself. Mr. Balraj Puri will not be having an opportunity of saving his honour. He was illtreated and maltreated and beaten up for the offence that he raised his hand in the court when Sheikh Abdullah was being tried in the court.

7. RAJA MAHENDRA PRATAP (Mathura): On a point of order, Sir, There is some confusion in my mind on your speech. How do you think that non-alignment and Commonwealth can go together? That is one thing and how do you explain that non-violence and the preparation for war can go together? It means that non-violence cannot protect us, army is needed.

MR. SPEAKER. Order order.

REPLY ON MOTION OF THANKS TO PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

19 February, 1959

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I must begin on a note of apology for not having been present here throughout the discussions on this Motion, as I was absent from Delhi for one day and heavily occupied on other days. I was present for some time I have however, tried to remedy that lapse by reading the official verbatim record of the speeches made by hon. Members, more particularly the leading Members, on the other side of the House. I have read specially the speech of Shri S. A. Dange with its seeming profundity and light cynicism, the speech of Acharya Kripalnai with all its earnest appeal, and the warlike saga of Shri M. R. Masans.

The first thing I should like to say as and I say this almost every year on such an occasion—that there appears to be some misapprehension as to what the President's Address to a joint session of the two Houses should be. I think Shri Dange said that the Address was lifeless and not inspiring, Shri Khadikar said that the speech utterly lacked urgency, vigour and vitality; it should be more analytical and critical, showing where Government had gone wrong and so on. Now, I fear nothing that I can say is likely to inspire the hon. Member, Shri Dange. His inspiration is from sources not available to me. But what Shri Khadikar said presumes that our President is more or less in the position of the President of the United States with his State of the Union message which he sometimes gives an analytical survey. It is obvious that our President is not constitutionally or otherwise in that position and it would not be fair to him or fair to this House for the President to function in any other way than is laid down in the Constitution. Therefore, his annual Address is necessarily not an analytical and critical document, except very broadly speaking; it is to be rather a simple narration of what has been done; giving some idea of the major things that Government is going to undertake. If we have to start some other convention in this matter, I do not know how it will fill in with such ideas of our Constitution and the President's position as have thus far been accepted by us.

In the various speeches made in this House, many matters have been referred to. I think there have been several references to the case of Shri Mathai. Many other subjects have come up too, and more particularly there has even been mention of something which had not been previously mentioned in any context in this House, that is, the possibilities of civil war in this country. So the debate has covered a wide field. I should like, if I may, to refer to some of these matters because to refer to every point raised would make what I have to say much too discursive and without much point.

I would rightaway say a few words about Shri Mathai's case which seems to have agitated a number of Members opposite and to which reference has been made in the speeches. Now, I welcome any kind of inquiry that can be made about any matter which raises doubts in Members' minds. I have always been willing, if ever I am approached, to

give such information as I have, whether outside the House or in answer to questions. When questions were asked in this House and in the other House, I endeavoured to give answers to the particular questions. Naturally, I could not go into the history of it or give a long account of all connected matters. When I found that because of public interests, because of the interest of Members in this House and because of the importance of certain charges and insinuations made it was desirable to have this matter considered in its wider context as a whole comprehensively, I decided not to give information piecemeal which did not seem to satisfy Members, because some of the questions put to me were rather extraordinary, extraordinary in the sense that they were hardly questions; they were something more than questions. And in the speeches made too, it seems to be almost accented that something very grave has happened without waiting for all the facts. Therefore, I decided that it was better for this matter to be considered in all its fullness by some one who could prepare a report on it to be considered end at that time it will be for us to decide what, if any; further steps should be taken in this matter. So I asked our Cabinet Secretary to ascertain all the facts that he could in this matter from the various allegations and charges made, whether in any question in this House or in the Press, if it was available, and report to me so that I would be in a better position to submit such a report or my own report on it to you Sir. I have done that. And because these matters involve these charges involve financial matters, it is my intention when the Cabinet Secretary sends his report or note to me on these subjects, to send it to my colleague the Finance Minister and separately to the Comptroller and Auditor-General so that they may judge the financial proprieties and improprieties of any action that had been taken.

When a person has been in fairly intimate contact with another, then, two consequences flow. One is that he is presumed to know him better and more intimately and to be in a better position to judge that man. The other possible consequence is that he might be rather partial to him. One is an advantage; the other is a disadvantage. In any event, I decided that this matter should be considered without my own opinions coming in the way. And, therefore, as I said, I decided that when the Cabinet Secretary submits its report, I shall request my colleague the Finance Minister to look into it and to give me his advice in the matter and separately I shall ask the Auditor-General to consider whether the proprieties were observed or whether any improprieties were committed in this matter. Because I want these to be considered rather fully and because I want it to cover the period since Mr. Mathai joined me and that was 12 years ago—it will take a little time to get all these facts to be ascertained.

I am not interested in what Mr. Mathai did before he came to me; but, ever since he came to me, naturally my interest begins I may point out—hon. Members may not perhaps know it that he came to me very considerably before there was any talk of my being in any Government, I forget exactly, about a year and a half before, I think, and there was no question of his coming to a prospective Prime Minister or any government official. And so, I have asked the Cabinet Secretary to do this, that is from the time he came to me, to have some broad knowledge of the situation and more precisely in regard to the actual allegations made.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

Yes, Sir, that is precisely what it means. I am not going to enquire into that; that is a separate matter whether it is to be gone into by somebody. I cannot go on enquiring into everybody's previous life. But, I am interested and the House has a right to be interested in what has happened since he has been connected with me or in government service.

Now I would like to add again that I welcome the interest that Members of this House taken in a matter which creates any doubt in their minds and where they feel proprieties have not been observed. That is right But, I would with all respect say that I have been a little surprised at the manner in which this question has been pursued, and almost an element of persecution has come in that approach outside and here, because that I think, is the last thing which hon. Members would desire. They want the truth; they want justice to be done. They want the standards of integrity to be maintained. I am sure no one here wishes that a kind of witchhunt should take place whenever some such thing comes up to our notice. There has been, in the Press, Sir and I am not for the moment complaining of anybody but I am stating a fact—a tendency for matters to be sensationalised.

May I mention another simple instance? The other day, in a periodical not famous for its reputation for responsibility or truth, a letter was reproduced which Mr. Mathai had written about 9 years ago. The letter was addressed to Mrs. Rameshwari Nehru. Simply because Mr. Mathai's case is 'before the public, it was published. I do not know where the paper got this letter from; it was hinted that it was got from a sweetmeat seller; the sweetmeat was wrapped up in it. It may be. In this letter which was reproduced, for example, Mr. Mathai had said: The Prime Minister has asked me to send you a cheque for Rs. 5,000 for relief. He regrets he may not be able to send it to you regularly.

Most hon. Members of this House probably know Shrimati Rameshwari Nehru, one of the respected persons in Delhi city who, at that time more especially and since, was devoting herself to the relief of the displaced persons from Pakistan, especially women. She was an honorary Adviser of the Ministry of Rehabilitation. Of course, the Ministry was helping these people. In cases where there was urgency she came to me and said: I can't always wait for governmental slow processes when urgent help is needed. So, I used to give her some money for which he gave me long accounts. And this Rs. 5,000 I gave her for relief. This is the kind of thing that is reproduced in this periodical—to suggest that since she is the wife of a cousin of mine. I was giving her a sort of pension from government funds.

I think I should like to go on now to Mr. Masani's speech. I regret I was not here, but I have read every word of it in the official report because in the course of a varied experience in this House for the last 11 years that was a novel experience. That was a novel experience and I believe it is the first time that any hon. Member of this House has talked and threatened a civil war if something was done.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²

I am not interested in a particular word, If I may submit, if the hon. Member thinks that a word has been left out his word should be taken and the word should be put in because some times words are left out. But I have to deal with the more basic position. I was, I should confess, distressed at this lighthearted reference to the possibilities of civil war. Previously, I have heard of this word being used not in this House but outside. Now from different channels it has crept into this House and I think that is a bad development because however strongly we may feel about questions and argue about them in this House and outside, there are certain basic things which we must keep in mind and we must not, I submit, say things which aggravate the situation which lead people's minds into wrong directions. There is enough. We have to face enough difficulties—all of us, I am not talking about the Governments but the country. And while it is right that we should criticise each other's policies, to refer to this kind of thing is, I submit not to be encouraged.

Now, why did the hon. Member, Shri Masani, get rather worked up? Because of certain resolutions passed at the Nagpur Session of the Congress among them being one on land reform and cooperatives. There, in those resolutions, it was said that our aim and objective is joint farming, that we should aim at that but for the present, for the next three years, we should concentrate on service cooperatives. It was further emphasised that this business of cooperation in the very nature of things is a voluntary business and if joint farming comes it will be with the consent of the people concerned. Now, Shri Masani in his speech stated that he had always been in favour of the cooperative principle but the ways and what has been said in the Congress resolution has nothing to do with cooperation because the moment the idea of joint farming comes in it means deprivation of the land from the peasant and therefore it is not cooperation. Further, that, if there is jointfarming at any stage, it must necessarily lead to collectivism. That is his argument. Collectivism then leads to that horrible state of affairs which, according to him, exists in Russia and China and elsewhere. Therefore, this is the slippery path which leads down below to the lowest depths. This is the argument, I hope I have put it correctly.

Now that argument of course presumes so many things which do not exist that it is a little difficult to answer it. He starts with this assumption that where there is joint farming, it ceases to be cooperation. I have heard of many criticisms of joint farming but this is the first time. I have heard this principle enunciated. Then if there is joint farming, he says that it must lead necessarily to collective farming which also seems to me rather an odd statement to make speaking for myself, I do not broadly speaking agree with collective farming. I do not and I wish to be quit frank but if some people want to do it, let them do it. I will not come in the way but I shall not encourage them. But I do believe in cooperation and I do, firmly and absolutely believe in the rightness of joint cultivation. Let there be no doubt. I do not wish to hide my own beliefs in this matter. I shall go from field to field and peasant to peasant begging them to agree to

it. Knowing that they do not agree. I cannot put it in operation That is a different matter. It is for them to agree. I am not saying that in this or any other matter any common principle can be applied to every country in the world. I have come to believe firmly that to try to generalise about all countries about one policy, is not right. We may have some general principles, naturally of approach, but each country's facts and conditions have to be judged as they are and something else from another country should not be imposed which may not fit in and, if I suggest something for the peasantry of India—whether I am right or wrong, of course, is another matter it is because I think that the conditions of India that thing is desirable and profitable. I cannot say in this changing world what I may think or others may think a few years later, because we live in a terrific period of change.

Now, Shri Masani said somewhere that he objects to anything being done to change this traditional way of doing things. He said somewhere that he wants the traditional way of family farming, individual farming, to continue. Now, I am not against tradition as such, but I think that the one thing that we want in India is to get out of tradition as much as possible. We have had enough of traditions here I do not mean to say about all traditions—that would be absurd for me to say—but we have become in some ways traditionalists, fundamentalists and all that. And, I must say, however much I may differ from Shri Masani, I did not think he was a fundamentalist and a traditionalist in that sense.

So let us consider this question on the merits, realising that whatever we have to do in this sphere of cooperation must come from the willing ascent of the people concerned, otherwise, apart from being good or bad I agree with Shri Masani it is not cooperation it is something else. If that is agreed to then most of the arguments that Shri Masani gave us falls to the ground.

He also stated with great vigour that nowhere in the world has this kind of farming yielded better results. Now, again, I think that it is very unsafe to make these general statements. I can give him instances where it has been known to be a success, but leave that out. He gave examples. He gave us what had happened in Yugoslavia and Poland. The examples were that collective farming was given up. There, again, he will see that, first, he combined two quite different things. He gave the example of one and applied it to the other. That is a curious way of argument. That is, firstly, he says that joint farming of the kind we have suggested is collective farming, and then he says that collective farming failed somewhere else and therefore joint farming will fail here. That indicates a tremendous confusion in his mind, whether it is some kind of an unconscious confusion or conscious confusion, I do not know.

I am not judging Yugoslavia or Poland or Soviet Union or China. I do not like many things that happen in other countries. I like other things. Sometimes in the context of things one expresses one's opinion but I am always reluctant to do so because unless something is a matter of high principle. I honestly do not consider myself competent to judge other countries. I do not know all the facts and circumstances and context, and to judge by some odd facts that appear in newspapers or a report is not enough. I do not want others in other countries also to fall into the

trap of judging my country by some odd facts or reports. Therefore, I cannot say whether Yugoslavia, Poland, Soviet Union or China for that matter is acting rightly or not, profitably or not. They know best.

But in India we have to deal with a situation where the average holding is very very small. The average for India is I do not know one acre, maybe two. Certainly, quite a vast number of people do not even have one acre of land. What are you to do with that? It will be a completely different proposition if the average holding here was let us say, 20 acres or 50 acres. That would make us think differently. I am not enamoured of joint farming or anything because of the name of it. You get some foothold to work there, to improve the land. But what can a person who has a holding of one acre or so, as most people have in India, do with that land. Of course, he can improve it. And, as Shri Masani has told us, we can give him better seeds, give him water give him fertilisers, give him better tools. Certainly, gradually we can give them to him, and in any event he ought to be given those things. But having given all these, what? Then there are certain improvements in the land which he can profit by if he had larger pieces to plough, to cultivate. A one acre land will always keep its owner in semistarvation. If it is a good season he may get a little more to eat but, then again he relaxes. There is no future for him in that. Of course, we have at the present moment too many people on the land and they must be engaged in other occupations, namely, industry, whether it is big industry, middle industry or cottage industry that is another matter. But they have to be engaged and the burden has to be lessened. That is true, and everything has to be done to help in greater production in the land. But I do submit that whether it is from the point of view of a theoretical approach or otherwise in the conditions in India joint farming is the right objective to aim at.

Again, I add definitely that means by consent, not otherwise, and, apart from the theoretical view, if you examine the practical question here you will be led to the same conclusion. I know very well that peasants are conservative, farmers are conservative and they do not easily change their own habits if I want them to change. I will have to put examples of success before them, not a theoretical speech. If I tell them that their neighbour is succeeding in this, that will convince them more than anything else. So, ultimately this question lies in the hands of farmers of India, not in my hands or Shri Masani's hands. I should do my best to convince them of a certain course of action.

But, in the meanwhile, when we say that for the next three years we should concentrate on service cooperatives, that itself indicates that we are proceeding not hurriedly. Give the full time. They must have their service cooperatives. No Act is going to be passed by Parliament. If they themselves want to change it, who can prevent them. Indeed, I ask you, who can prevent a cooperative society today from deciding that they shall do joint cultivation. Nobody can prevent it. There is no question of concern. There is no question of a new law. The society itself decides to do it. In fact, many have done so, quite a number of them. So, I do not understand this. The subject of cooperative farming may be discussed, whether there is virtue in it or not. You may even say, well, it is suited to wheat farming and not so much to rice farming. These are matters to be considered I can understand that. But what has

say that it is a precise target and it must be attained. But it is arrived at after some calculation and you put a target 20 per cent or 30 per cent more whatever it may be. If we can put it on an individual field, why cannot we put it on 10 or 20 fields joined together and call it a cooperative? I do not understand it. Otherwise, one must say that one can never put a target, regardless of cooperation, on any piece of land, as to what they are going to produce. That is surely an extraordinary statement to make, opposed to all scientific, statistical, and every kind of approach.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁵

Either the hon. Member believes in planning or he does not. I submit that today there is none that, I know of, whether in the capitalist world, the socialist world or the communist world, who does not believe in planning. The approach to planning may be different; it is admitted. But the moment you plan, you must have targets. The targets may be attainable or not.

If I may rather give an example to the hon. Member, nobody can say whether the next child of a certain married couple is going to be a son or a daughter. But statistically, you can say that in India, there are likely to be so many sons and so many daughters. In each individual case, you are completely uncertain. Therefore, targets are put to know what we want to do. It involves some calculation to some extent as to what can be the produce by the use of so much better fertilisers or better seeds, better manure, more labour and all that; this can be calculated, though not with accuracy. But when you spread this out over a large figure, then the inaccuracies become less.

What Acharya Kripalani says in this House or elsewhere always has to be listened to with respect, because he is not only one of our most respected elder statesmen, but a dear colleague and comrade of ours in the past and I hope in the present too. Acharya Kripalani said that I had made appeals for cooperation, but this kind of appeal had no particular value, because the appeal was for cooperation at the level of consultation and not at the level of execution. He said:

“Opposition parties cannot be asked to make themselves responsible for policies in the execution of which they have no part or lot.”

He said on his own behalf he made it perfectly clear and not on behalf of his party that there should be, therefore, a National Government. I have no doubt that under certain circumstances, a National Government is desirable to a larger measure, because after all, when we consider these tremendous problems that face us, I hope no one can allow himself to be narrow minded enough to think on party lines. It has been our privilege to work on mighty tasks and it is our privilege now in this House to face enormous challenges and problems and work out solution. And, we must adopt the method which takes us farthest. That is the only test or yardstick.

But when I consider Acharya Kripalani's proposal of a national Government, my mind is not quite clear as to what he means and what this thing itself called 'national Government' is supposed to be or is likely to be. He himself in the course of his speech, talking about his own party, the Praja Socialist Party, said that the PSP has a policy

that if our production goes up by 2 per cent per annum that is just enough to keep us where we are, that is to prevent us from sliding back. Therefore for any real progress it has to be beyond the 2 per cent increase per annum. I believe our average has been about 6 per cent in the past few years.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹¹

Yes, before that. During the last two years it has been pulled down, but I think if you take the whole period it may not be less. During the last two years it has been less, specially agriculture. Anyhow, there is a basic fact that we have broadly to go ahead at about 6 per cent, per annum, both in the average of agriculture and industry.

In regard to industry, one can fairly easily calculate it, in the sense as to how much investment you put in and you get back. In regard to agriculture, it is a little more difficult to be precise. But from all indications, apart from the indication, of good harvest which we have, the work we have done in the past is bearing fruit now. The community development movement has now been geared up to agricultural production specially and it is producing results, and otherwise also. More important than all, I think, is our efficiency in the States. Our State agricultural departments have I say so with hesitation become at last very fully alive to what they have to do which, perhaps, they were not previously. So, broadly speaking, it is clear that one has to make a certain effort in order to go ahead. About the details therefor we may differ but if we lessen the effort, far from going ahead we will perhaps remain where we are.

Secondly, the resources in India are there and even by the experience of the past few years it is certain that we are likely to do that, but obviously all this requires a tremendous effort. Shri Khadilkar, I think, said about a new perspective. It is not merely a question of doing the same thing with a little more effort, but of a new perspective because that perspective is required not only in industry but in land too. It was more with the idea of giving that new perspective in land that the Resolutions relating to this matter were passed by the Congress.

Now, I want to say a word or two about the so called public sector, sometimes I have criticized the private sector—not really the private sector but some persons who said that they spoke on behalf of the private sector. There are some people who, perhaps, in spite of what they do, are not very helpful to the private sector, perhaps they create prejudice against it by their public utterances. I mean to say some people in the private sector.

I merely say that by their activities they sometimes create an adverse impression on the public mind. They are welcome to do that as anybody is. There is freedom of speech in this country even though the speech may not be logical or intelligent. But I do believe that on one side everything seems to be judged by this fact, namely, have you nationalised this or are you going to nationalise this. With great respect may I say that these are rather immature approaches to these problems?

Nationalising a few more things may be good or bad. We do not know. It depends on the things themselves. But today, as I understand it, we have to increase

That is a different matter. When we say “compulsorily”, it simply means a law is passed to that effect. In bringing it into effect there should be cooperation, understanding, talking to them and all that, because the hon. Member will understand that consolidation does not mean depriving a person of land, but bringing his piece of land together with others in the same area. Of course, this should be done with a great deal of mutual cooperation and goodwill, but there has to be a law behind it; otherwise, it could not be done at all.

BACK NOTE

XI. Reply on Motion of thanks to President's Address 19 February, 1959

1. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY (Basirhat): Does it mean that the period prior to that will not be enquired into—that the Rs. 2 lakhs or Rs. 3 lakhs which he built up while he was in the establishment of the United States Army will not be enquired into?

2. SHRI M. R. MASANI (Ranchi East): The Prime Minister will give me a moment. Will he read the verbatim text? There was no sign of threat; it was a caution. This is what I said:

“If Members feel I used a harsh term, if I mentioned civil war, that is what I feared. If any serious attempt is made to come to the peasants of Ranchi and Chota Nagpur and tell them to give their land, I say, whether we like it or not, blood would be shed. It is to warn the Government against taking such a step, to warn against taking steps which may lead this country to a horrible thing like this that I am raising this question.”

Surely, threat has nothing to do with it.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have also got a quotation in inverted commas from his speech with me. He referred to the question more than once. He said that if this thing is done, that is cooperative farming, it can only be by threat or by coercion.

“I do not hesitate to say that if a serious attempt is made it will lead to civil war and bloodshed and the death of thousands of people in this country. We will never accept such a commitment.”

SHRI M. R. MASANI: One word is missing 'unfortunate'. It is missing in the Prime Minister's text.

I wish the Prime Minister discusses cooperative farming and not draw this rod hearing across the trail.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The second one was what the hon. Member has ducted about his constituency where he is so intimately connected with the Adivasis. He has said:

“Such people will never give up their land with whatever slogan you may approach them. If Members feel that I use a harsh term, if I talk of civil war, I mean this.”

Shri M. R. MASANI: It is an uncorrected text; I have got it corrected

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It goes further:

“If any serious attempt is made to come to the peasants of Ranchi and Chota Nagpur and to tell them to give up their land and to get into the big cooperatives as in China, I may say, whether you like it or not, blood will be shed.”

I am glad to notice that he is in a more chastened mood and wants to correct his previous speech.

MR. SPEAKER: No hon. Member is entitled to put a new word into his speech.

SHRI JAIPAL SINGH (Ranchi West Reserved—Sch. Tribes) May I point out that any hon. Member may recite only the corrected text because as you know things are sent to us for correction certain words are missing.

MR. SPEAKER: It was not brought to my notice. The hon. Members will kindly look into the rules. No hon. Member is entitled to put a new word into his speech or to correct any expression which he has used. Whatever it may be, it is left to the Speaker, if it is objectionable, to expunge it, it is not for him to say after second thought that he ought to have said so. So, he must take the consequence of whatever he has stated here.

SHRI M. R. MASANI: The text is incomplete. The word 'unfortunate' was missing. I put it in because I uttered it.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA: Some of us were present when he talked of civil war.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: May I continue.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not necessary to pursue this matter.

3. ACHARYA KRIPALANI (Sitamarhi): Are these credit societies or service societies?

MR. SPEAKER: Multipurpose.

4. SHRI M. R. MASANI: Mr. Gomulka has specifically proved that you cannot have targets when you want it to be voluntary, because you are then planning the rate of growth of human consciousness.

5. SHRI M. R. MASANI: The target I referred to was the target that 3,000 cooperative farms should be brought into existence by the end of the Second Five Year Plan and 600 must be brought into existence by the end of the financial year 1958-59. It was that target of the rate of cooperativisation that I mentioned, and not any target of production.

6. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: May I submit here that there is more difference among Congressmen about some of the dominant policies that are adopted at the Congress than some of those who are on this side?

7. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: He does not go out of the Congress. He is a drag on the Congress.

8. SHRI P. R. PATEL (Mehsana): May I submit that is not done at the district level. That is the monopoly of the Congress people. How can you say there is cooperation by others?

9. SHRI BIMAL GHOSE (Barrackpore): It is there.

SHRI JAWAHAR LAL NEHRU: Bagge Award is here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Exchange took place this year?

10. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: The point we would like to know is whether Pakistan ever raised this question of Beruban as a dispute before title Bagge

Tribunal at all and if it did not do so, why this matter was raised as a dispute or accepted by our Government as a dispute to be resolved.

11. SHRI BIMAL GHOSE: Before the last two years.

12. RAJA MAHENDRA PRATAP (Mathura): You must be tired, Sir, but do not finish without saying a word for World Federation.

13. SHRI JAIPAL SINGH: May I seek a clarification from the Prime Minister on his exegesis on cooperation in the field of agricultural production. He has stressed, I am glad to hear, that it has to be on the basis of voluntary cooperation. Now, I find in my own State, the Government of Bihar have what they call the Land Consolidation Act where compulsorily they have sought, without any success whatever so far, certainly not in the south of Bihar, to consolidate, with the result that they have had to withdraw it. Is consolidation a precursor to the future pattern of cooperation?

Why is it not being done on voluntary basis? I am talking of Bihar.

14. SHRI JAIPAL SINGH: But people are resisting. What do you do then?

STATEMENT REGARDING AGREEMENT FOR MILITARY AID BETWEEN USA AND TURKEY, IRAN AND PAKISTAN

13 March, 1959

I have a statement here and as promised yesterday I shall place it on the Table of the House. Would you desire me to read it or place it on the Table of the House.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

This statement relates to the in re-agreement for military aid signed recently between the USA and Turkey, Iran and Pakistan.

A meeting of the Baghdad Pact Council was, held in London on the 29th July, 1958. This meeting was held soon after the revolution in Iraq. At this meeting, a Declaration was issued on behalf of the Prime Ministers of Iran, Pakistan, Turkey and the United Kingdom and Mr. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, USA copy of this Declaration is attached to this statement. The concluding paragraph of the Declaration contains an undertaking given on behalf of the USA. The paragraph runs as follows:

“Article I of the Pact on Mutual Co operation signed at Baghdad on February 24, 1955, provides that the parties will co operate for their security and defence and that such measures as they agree to take to give effect to this cooperation may form the subject of special agreements. Similarly, the United States, in the Interest of world peace, and pursuant to existing Congressional authorisation, agrees to cooperate with the nations making this Declaration for their security and defence and will promptly enter into agreements designed to give effect to this cooperation.”

2. In pursuance of this undertaking given on behalf of the USA, consultations took place at Ankara early in March, 1959, and three agreements were signed on March 5th, 1959, between the U.S.A. on the one hand and Turkey, Iran and Pakistan on the other. These three agreements signed on March 5th, 1959, are identical. A copy of the Agreement between the U.S.A. and Pakistan is attached to this statement.

Article I at this Agreement of March 5th, 1959, runs as follows:

“The Government of Pakistan is determined to resist aggression. In case of aggression against Pakistan, the Government of United States of America, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States of America, will take such appropriate action, including the use of armed forces, as may be mutually agreed upon and is envisaged in the Joint Resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East, in order to assist the Government of Pakistan at its request.”

It will be seen from this Article I that the United States of America agreed to assist the Government of Pakistan, at their request, in case of aggression against Pakistan by such appropriate action, including the use of armed forces, as would be:

- (i) in accordance with the Constitution of the United States of America, and
- (ii) as envisaged in the Joint Resolution to promote peace and stability in the

Middle East (This is commonly known as the Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East).

Under the Constitution of the United States of America, US armed forces cannot be used to assist any other country without the specific authority of the United States Congress. The Mutual Security Act authorises the U.S. Government to give military and economic aid to foreign countries but does not authorise the use of United States forces in support of any other country. The use of the U.S. armed forces in support of any other country without specific sanction of the United States Congress, is, however, possible under the authority given by the Joint Resolution of the Congress of March 9, 1957. A copy of this Joint Resolution, generally known as the Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East, is attached to this statement

Section 2 of this Joint Resolution reads as follows:

“The President is authorised to undertake in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programmes with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance. Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the preservation of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any such nation or group of such nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: provided, that such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Constitution of the United States.”

A study of the documents attached to the statement and, particularly, the portions to which attention has been drawn above, shows that under the latest Agreement signed between the United States of America and Pakistan, the Government of the United States have undertaken that they will not only continue to give economic and military assistance to Pakistan, but will also, on request, use the armed forces of the United States in order to assist the Government of Pakistan, in case of armed aggression against Pakistan from any country controlled by international communism.

The spokesmen of the Government of Pakistan have, however, given a wider interpretation to the latest agreement.

In view of this interpretation on the part of Pakistan and the doubts that had arisen because of this Agreement, a request was made to the United States authorities for clarification. We have been assured by the U.S. authorities that their latest bilateral agreement with Pakistan has no effect other than the extension of the Eisenhower Doctrine to cover Pakistan and that the Eisenhower Doctrine restricts the use of United States armed forces to cases of armed aggression ‘from any country controlled by international communism. We have been specifically assured that this Agreement cannot be used against India. We have also been assured by the United States authorities that there are no secret clauses of this Agreement nor is there any separate secret supplementary agreement.

Spokesmen of the Pakistan Government have on various occasions stated that their objective in entering into a defence aid agreement with the U.S.A. and in joining

BACK NOTE

XII. Statement Regarding Agreement for Military Aid between USA and Turkey, Iran and Pakistan, 13 March, 1959

1. MR. SPEAKER: Is it a long one?

MR. SPEAKER: If it is an important matter, portions of it may be read.

MR. SPEAKER: He may place it on the Table of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: In as much as the matter is important, if it could be read in the House, I would like to have it read.

2. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY (Basirhat): The hon. Prime Minister stated that this bilateral agreement has been arrived at in the context of the Constitution of the USA and its treaty obligations. So, I would also ask our External Affairs Ministry to make available to us the actual texts of SEATO as well as the Mutual Security Act of USA, so that we may ourselves be able to go into the details of those clauses. It will help us in our debate on External Affairs, specially because Foreign Office spokesmen of USA have specifically stated that in addition to the Constitution of USA and the Eisenhower Doctrine, they will be bound by certain other treaty obligations—it was specifically mentioned in one of the newspaper reports—such SEATO and certain other treaties. So, we have to look into all those treaties and copies may be made available to us.

3. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: That is more or less a short summary of the various treaties to which we are a party. Normally I do not think it contains treaties in which we are not a party.

STATEMENT REGARDING SITUATION IN TIBET

27 April, 1959

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have made several statements in the House in regard to the developments in Tibet. The last statement was made on April 3, in which I informed the House that the Dalai Lama had entered the territory of the Indian Union with a urge entourage. I should like to bring this information uptodate and to place such additional facts as we have before the House.

A few days ago, the Dalai Lama and his party reached Mussoorie, where Government had made arrangements for their stay. I have had occasion to visit Mussoorie since then and have had a long talk with the Dalai Lama.

The course of the last few days, reports have reached us that considerable. We numbers of Tibetans, numbering some thousands, have recently crossed into the Kameng Frontier Division of the North-East Frontier Agency and some hundreds have also entered the territory of Bhutan. They sought asylum, and we have agreed to this. Such of them at carried arms were disarmed. We do not know the exact number yet. Temporary arrangements are being made in a Camp for their maintenance until they can be dispersed in accordance with their wishes and the necessities governing such cases. We could not leave these refugees to their own resources. Apart from the humanitarian considerations involved, there was also the law and order problem to be considered. We are grateful to the Government of Assam for their help and cooperation in this matter.

So far as the Dalai Lama and his party are concerned, we had to take adequate measures on grounds of security and also to protect them from large number of newspaper correspondents, both Indian and foreign, who, in their anxiety to obtain first hand information in regard to a matter of world importance, were likely to harass and almost overwhelm the Dalai Lama and his party. While we wen anxious to give protection to the Dalai Lama and his party, we were agreeable to giving these newspapermen suitable opportunities to see him. I had received an appeal from nearly 75 representatives of news agencies and newspapers from Tezpur requesting me to give them such opportunities. A senior officer of the External Affairs Ministry was, therefore, deputed to proceed to Tezpur in advance to deal with the press representative and photographers who had assembled in that small town of Assam. This officer made the necessary administrative arrangements to meet, as far as possible, the wishes of the newspaperman to see the Dalai Lama and to photograph him. Soon after entering India, the Dalai Lama indicated his wish to make a statement. We were later informed that this statement would be released at Tezpur. Our officer made arrangements for the distribution of a translation of the statement to the newspaper correspondents.

In view of certain irresponsible charges made, I should like to make it clear that the Dalai Lama was entirely responsible for this statement as well as for a subsequent

brief statement that was made by him from Mussoorie. Our officers had nothing to do with the drafting or preparation of these statements.

I need not tell the House that the Dalai Lama entered India entirely of his own volition. At no time had we suggested that he should come to India. We had naturally given thought to the possibility of his seeking asylum in India and when such a request came, we readily granted it. His entry with large party in a remote corner of our country created special problems of transport, organisation and security. We deputed an officer to meet the Dalai Lama and his party at Bomdila and to escort them to Mussoorie. The particular officer was selected because he had served as Consul General in Lhasa and therefore was to some extent known to the Dalai Lama and his officials. The selection of Mussoorie for the Dalai Lama's stay was not finalised till his own wishes were ascertained in the matter and he agreed to it. There was no desire on our part to put any undue restrictions on him, but in the special circumstances, certain arrangements had necessarily to be made to prevent any mishap. It should be remembered that the various events in Tibet, culminating in the Dalai Lama's departure from Lhasa and entry into India had created tremendous interest among the people of India and in the world press. After arrival in Mussoorie, steps were taken to prevent the Dalai Lama from being harassed by crowds of people trying to see him as well as by newspapermen. Apart from this, no restrictions about movement were placed on him. He has been told that he and his party can move about Mussoorie according to their wishes. It should be remembered that the Dalai Lama has recently not only had a long strenuous and dangerous journey, but has also had harrowing' experiences which must affect the nerves of even a hardened person. He is only just 24 years of age.

These are some bare facts, but behind these *facta lie* serious developments which may have far reaching consequences. Tragedy has been and is being enacted in Tibet, passions have been let loose, charges made and language used which cannot but worsen the situation and our relation. With our northern neighbour. I am sure that the House will agree with me that in considering matters of such high import, we should exercise restraint and wisdom and use language which is moderate and precise. In these days of cold war, there has been a tendency to use unrestrained language and often to make wild charges without any justification. We have fortunately kept out of the cold war and I hope that on this, as on any other occasion, we shall not use the language of cold war. The matter is too serious to be dealt with in a trivial or excited way. I would, therefore, appeal to the press and the public to exercise restraint in language. I regret that occasionally there have been lapses from this on our side. In particular, I regret that brave discourtesy was some days ago to a picture of the head of the Chinese State, Chairman Mao Tsetung. This was done by a small group of irresponsible people in Bombay. In the excitement of the moment, we cannot allow ourselves to be swept away into wrong courses.

It is not for me to make any similar appeal to the leaders, the press and the people of China. All I can say is that I have been greatly distressed at the tone of the comments and the charges made against India by responsible people in China. They have used the language of cold war regardless of truth and propriety. This is peculiarly

distressing in a great nation with thousands of years of culture behind it, noted for its restrained and polite behaviour. The charges made against India are so fantastic that I find it difficult to deal with them. There is the charge of our keeping the Dalai Lama under duress. The Chinese authorities should surely know how we function in this country and what our laws and Constitution are. Even if we were so inclined, we could not keep the Dalai Lama under some kind of detention against his will, and there can be no question of our wishing to do so. We can gain nothing by it except the burden of difficult problems. In any event, this matter can be easily cleared. It is open to the Dalai Lama at any time to go back to Tibet or wherever he wants to. As the Panchen Lama has made himself responsible specially for some strange statements, I have stated that we would welcome him to come to India and meet the Dalai Lama himself. Should he choose to do so, every courtesy will be extended to him. I have further said that the Chinese Ambassador or any other emissary of the Chinese Government can come to India for this purpose and meet the Dalai Lama. There is no barrier for anyone to come peacefully to India, and whether we agree with him or not, we shall treat him with the courtesy due to a guest.

Another and an even stranger allegation has been made about "Indian expansionists" who, it is alleged, are inheritors of the British tradition of Imperialism and expansion. It is perfectly true that British policy was one of expansion into Tibet and that they carried this out by force of arms early in this century. That was, in our opinion, an unjustified and cruel adventure which brought much harm to the Tibetans. As a result of that, the then British Government in India established certain extra territorial rights in Tibet. When India became independent, we inherited some of these rights. Being entirely opposed to any such extra territorial rights in another country, we did not wish to retain them. But in the early days after Independence and partition, our hands were full, as this House well knows, and we had to face very difficult situations in our own country. We ignored, if I may say so, Tibet. Not being able to find a suitable person to act as our representative at Lhasa, we allowed for sometime the existing British representative to continue at Lhasa. Later an Indian took his place. Soon after the Chinese armies entered Tibet, the question of these extra territorial rights was raised and we readily agreed to give them up. We would have given them up anyhow, what ever developments might have taken place in Tibet. We withdrew our army detachments from some places in Tibet and handed over Indian postal and telegraph Installations and rest houses. We laid down the Five Principles of the Panchsheel and placed our relationship with the Tibet region on a new footing. What we were anxious about was to preserve the traditional connections between India and Tibet in regard to pilgrim traffic and trade, our action in this matter and whatever we have done subsequently in regard to Tibet is proof enough of our policy and that India had no political or ulterior ambitions in Tibet. Indeed, even from the narrowest practical point of view, any other policy would have been wrong and futile. Ever since then we have endeavoured not only to act up to the agreement we made, but to cultivate the friendship of the Chinese State and people.

It is therefore a matter of the deepest regret and surprise to us that charges should be made which are both unbecoming and entirely void of substance. We have

conveyed this deep feeling of regret to the Chinese Government, more especially at the speeches delivered recently in the current session of the National People's Congress in Peking.

I stated some time ago that our broad policy was governed by three factors: (1) the preservation of the security and integrity of India; (2) our desire to maintain friendly relations with China; and (3) our deep sympathy for the people of Tibet. That policy we shall continue to follow because we think that a correct policy not only for the present but even more so for the future. It would be a tragedy if the two great countries of Asia, India and China, which have been peaceful neighbours for ages past, should develop feelings of hostility against each other. We for our part will follow this policy, but we hope that China also will do likewise and that nothing will be said or done which endangers the friendly relations of the two countries which are so important from the wider point of view of the peace of Asia and the world. The Five Principles have laid down, *inter alia* mutual respect for each other. Such mutual respect is gravely impaired if unfounded charges are made and the language of cold war used.

I have already made it clear previously that the charge that Kalimpong was the centre of the Tibetan rebellion is wholly unjustified. We have a large number of people of Tibetan stock living in India as Indian nationals. We have also some Tibetan emigrant in India. All of these deeply respect the Dalai Lama. Some of these have been exceedingly unhappy at developments in Tibet; some, no doubt have anti-Chinese sentiments. We have made it clear to them that they will not be permitted to carry on any subversive activities from India, and I should like to say that by and large they have acted in accordance with the directions of the Government of India. I cannot obviously say that someone has not done something secretly, but to imagine or say that a small group of persons sitting in Kalimpong organised a major upheaval in Tibet seems to me to make a large draft on imagination and to slur over obvious facts.

The Khampa revolt started in an area of China proper adjoining Tibet, more than three years ago. Is Kalimpong supposed to be responsible for that? This revolt gradually spread and, no doubt, created a powerful impression on the minds of large numbers of Tibetans who had kept away from the revolt, fears and apprehensions about their future gripped their minds and the nationalist upsurge swayed their feelings. Their fears may have been unjustified, but surely they cannot be denied. Such feelings can only be dealt with adequately by gentler methods than warfare.

When Premier Chou-En-lai came here two or three years ago, he was good enough to discuss Tibet with me at considerable length. We had a frank and full talk. He told me that while Tibet had long been a part of the Chinese State, they did not consider Tibet as a province of China. The People were different from the people of China proper, just as in other autonomous regions of the Chinese State the people were different, even though they formed part of that State. Therefore, they considered Tibet an autonomous region which would enjoy autonomy. He told me further that it was absurd for anyone to imagine that China was going to force communism on Tibet. Communism could not be enforced in this way on a very backward country

and they had no wish to do so even though they would like reforms to come in progressively. Even these reforms they proposed to postpone for a considerable time.

About that time, the Dalai Lama was also here and I had long talks with him then, I told him of Premier Chou-En-lai's friendly approach and of his assurance that he would respect the autonomy of Tibet, I suggested to him that he should accept these assurances in good faith and cooperate in maintaining that autonomy and bringing about certain reforms in Tibet. The Dalai Lama agreed that his country, though, according to him advanced spiritually, was very backward socially and economically and reforms were needed.

It is not for us to say how far these friendly intentions and approaches materialise. The circumstances were undoubtedly difficult. On the one side there was a dynamic, rapidly moving society, on the other, a static, unchanging society fearful of what might be done to it in the name of reform. The distance between the two was great and there appeared to be hardly any meeting point. Meanwhile, change in some forms inevitably came to Tibet. Communications developed rapidly and the long isolation of Tibet was partly broken through. Though physical barriers were progressively removed, mental and emotional barriers increased. Apparently, the attempt to cross these mental and emotional barriers was either not made or did not succeed.

To say that a number of 'upper strata reactionaries' in Tibet were solely responsible for this, appears to be an extraordinary simplification of a complicated situation. Even according to the accounts received through Chinese sources, the revolt in Tibet was of considerable magnitude and the basis of it must have been a strong feeling of nationalism which affects not only upper class people but others also. No doubt, vested interests joined it and sought to profit by it. The attempt to explain a situation by the use of rather worn out words, phrases and slogans, is seldom helpful.

When the news of these unhappy developments came to India, there was immediately a strong and wide spread reaction. The Government did not bring about this reaction. Nor was this reaction essentially political. It was largely one of sympathy based on sentiment and humanitarian reasons. Also on a certain feeling of kinship with the Tibetan people derived from long established religious and cultural contacts. It was an instinctive reaction. It is true that some people in India sought to profit by it by turning it in an undesirable direction. But the fact of that reaction of the Indian people was there. If that was the reaction here, one may well imagine the reaction among the Tibetans themselves. Probably this reaction it shared in the other Buddhist countries of Asia. When there are such strong feelings, which are essentially not political, they cannot be dealt with by political methods alone, much less by military methods. We have no desire whatever to interfere in Tibet, we have every desire to maintain the friendship between India and China, but at the same time, we have every sympathy for the people of Tibet, and we are greatly distressed at their hapless plight. We hope still that the authorities of China, in their wisdom, will not use their great

strength against the Tibetans but will win them to friendly cooperation in accordance with the assurances they have themselves given about the autonomy of the Tibet region. Above all, we hope that the present fighting and killing will cease.

As I have said above, I had a long talk with the Dalai Lama three days ago at Mussourie. He told me of the difficulties he had to face, of the growing resentment of his people at the conditions existing there and how he sought to restrain them, of his feelings that the religion of the Buddha, which was more to him than life itself, was being endangered. He said that up to the last moment he did not wish to leave Lhasa. It was only on the afternoon of the 17th March, when, according to him, some shells were fired at his palace and fell in a pond nearby, that the sudden decision was taken to leave Lhasa. Within a few hours the same day he and his party left Lhasa and took the perilous journey to the Indian frontier. The departure was so hurried that even an adequate supply of clothes etc. could not be brought. When I met the Dalai Lama, no member of his entourage was present. Even the interpreter was our own. The Dalai Lama told me that the two statements which had been issued were entirely his own and there was no question of anybody coercing him to make them. Even though he is young, I could not easily imagine that he could be coerced into doing something he did not wish. All my sympathy goes out to this young man who at an early age has had to shoulder heavy burdens and to face tremendous responsibilities. During the last few weeks, he has suffered great physical and mental strain. I advised him to rest for a while and not to take any hurried decisions. He felt very unhappy at conditions in Tibet and was especially anxious that fighting should stop.

BACK NOTE

XIII. Statement regarding Situation in Tibet,
27 April, 1959

NIL

RESOLUTION REGARDING INCLUSION OF ENGLISH IN THE 8TH SCHEDULE OF THE CONSTITUTION

7 August, 1959

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this debate has gone on for a fairly considerable time and I had intended not to participate in it. Not because I am not greatly interested in the subject but right from the beginning, I had felt that in this particular debate, every Member should be free to express his views and give his vote as he chose without any, if I may say so, party pressures or whips or anything like that. And I thought that, even though I had made that clear and it is clear, perhaps, if I spoke, that itself might be some kind of indirect pressure, although I do not want it to be so. But during the last session, friends pressed me to participate in this debate and I promised to do so and I am, therefore, fulfilling my promise.

To some extent I have tried to prepare myself for this by reading last evening Mr. Frank Anthony's speech when he moved this Resolution and also some other speeches. Then I went back to the records of the Constituent Assembly when these language matters came up and among other speeches, I read my own which I made almost exactly ten years ago in September, 1948. If I may be permitted to say so, I was rather surprised to see what a good speech I had made there. And I find that really I have little to add to it or to vary it in any way.

My approach to this question is not hidden. I have repeated it on various occasions. It is not an approach of those worthy colleagues of ours whom I would call the Hindi enthusiasts, nor is it the approach of the other colleagues who are the English enthusiasts. Personally, I am an enthusiast for both: Hindi and English—when I say Hindi, I mean the Indian languages also provided they function in their proper domains and spheres. I do not see any real conflict. There may be overlapping. Necessarily, languages overlap. That is not harmful. They have a good effect on each other but we should avoid this approach of conflict, as if the advance of one language somehow crushes the other. I recognise that in the past of India, English was undoubtedly an imposed language by the power that dominated over India. Therefore, while on the one hand it brought and opened out windows of knowledge, etc. it also had that sting in it—of being a language, sitting on the top of our own language and our own Cultural traditions. That is true. To some extent that memory lingers though we should try to get rid of it and consider these matters more objectively and impersonally.

In the course of the debate, many aspects of the language issue have been referred to although it is well to remember that Mr. Anthony's Resolution only touches one small aspect of it; it does not cover the rest. It is true also that the moment you touch these matters, immediately you shake up a hornet's nest and all kinds of things—not only language but all kinds of suspicions in people's minds, fears come up and rather come in the way of calm and logical thought. One cannot

help, therefore, looking at this relatively small matter in this larger context. Nevertheless, let us consider it in the smaller context.

Shri Nath Pai, who was just speaking, appealed with eloquence for our helping the Anglo-Indian community to maintain their individuality and all that I am all with him. I just do not see, however, how this particular amendment this way or that way helps or hinders. It is a very-very minor matter from the point of view of maintaining their individuality. I am all for it. There are other forces that play in India which will help in maintaining it and other forces which will come in the way; because, naturally, all kinds of forces came to unify India, came to mix us up with each other, and I hope I am not talking of the Anglo-Indian community, but all of us—that these forces which mingle and co-mingle us will grow and not keep us in water tight compartments as they do still, and compartments of caste, and the like will actually vanish. If that happens, no doubt, that kind of thing will affect the Anglo-Indian community also, and I think it is a good thing if it happens, not by any pressure but by the natural process of racial integration and all that.

This particular resolution really has no real effect on that, because I recognise that English is and should be considered the mother tongue of the Anglo-Indian community. By putting it in this list you do not make it more or less a mother tongue, it is that. And, as the House knows, our policy is to encourage education in the mother tongue, whatever it is. We go about in the North-East Frontier Agency teaching people in their tribal languages. Some of them are very imperfect, not developed, nevertheless, we think it important to start their primary education in their own language. If you start in any other language, Assamese, Hindi or whatever it may be these languages come at a later stage? There is an element of difficulty, of forgiveness to the child. If you do that in the case of the tribal languages, surely in the case of the more developed languages that is even more important. Surely, in the case of English it is very important. For people who consider English as their mother tongue, well, it is for them to decide—it is their mother tongue and they should be given every facility for that.

Shri Anthony referred in his speech, I think, to the so-called Anglo-Indian schools. I do not personally know much about them, so I dare not say much; but without knowing much I would say this, that any facility for Anglo-Indian education should be maintained, should be continued and should be facilitated necessarily.

Now, it must be remembered that the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution containing the list of 14 languages is certainly not an exhaustive Schedule of Indian languages. Obviously, not. There are other languages which are not mentioned there, quite a number. In fact, in the amendments to this resolution I see odd languages mentioned saying that they should be included. Therefore, you must not consider that the non-mention of a language means that it is not an Indian language or is not a language used in India. That is not correct.

Take another language not so much used in India. There are plenty of Indians who have French as their mother tongue in Pondicherry and elsewhere. We have promised to honour French in Pondicherry and to encourage it. We are encouraging it, and it is

the language of that little State of Pondicherry today; education, law, judiciary, medical, teaching and other matters are done in French there. What will happen in the distant future I do not know. It may be that before too long a very considerable number of Portuguese speaking people will also be within our country. Many are within our country today, outside Goa. But, no doubt, Goa will come, and we have even now given the assurance that the Portuguese language of Goa will be honoured. We respect it and it will be a language of India in so far as those people are concerned.

So my outlook is somewhat different. I am not referring, of course, to all the other languages which are more typically Indian all over the place. There is Sindhi, a very important language. Sind may have gone, but a large number of Sindhi speaking people of eminence have come here with their language. Because of that, you know, so far as the Sahitya Akadami is concerned, deliberately we have included English and Sindhi in our list, because we were dealing with a practical problem of encouraging the publication of book in languages which we considered to be of importance to India. We had the whole list, of course, of the Eighth Schedule, and we had English and Sindhi. That is all right. It shows our friendly attitude to encourage English; not at the expense of the 14 or any other—of course not—but we felt that English had a peculiar importance—not because, if I may say so with all respect, the Anglo-Indian community considered it their mother tongue, but for wider reason; because it has been and will continue to be a window to us to all kinds of activities, thinking etc. Therefore, we included it, and one of our chief purpose in the Sahitya Akadami is to translate from one Indian language to another, translate from English to an Indian language, translate from an Indian language to English etc., and quite a number of translations have come out.

Now, therefore, my first point is that the Eighth Schedule is not an exclusive list of Indian languages. It is a list of the more widespread, if you like, Indian languages, spoken by large number of people. There are quite a number which are not included, which are very much Indian languages. Secondly, so far as education etc. are concerned, we may stress on the mother tongue, not on the 14 languages but on every other mother tongue that is in India—certainly on English, certainly on French, certainly on Portuguese, leave out the typical Indian languages, and certainly or the tribal languages—so that there should be and there is no burden on the Anglo-Indian community or anybody who consider English or any other language as their mother tongue.

Now, there is article 347 of the Constitution. It says:

“On a demand being made in that behalf, the President may, if he is satisfied that a substantial proportion of the population of a State desire the use of any language spoken by them to be recognised by that State, direct that such language shall also be officially recognised throughout that State or any part thereof for such purpose as he may specify.”

“Any language”, not a language of the Eighth Schedule. It is the right of people speaking any language, if they are sufficient in numbers, to request the President to

Take another aspect of it. Whether you like it or not. I like it. The medium of instruction in India is becoming an Indian language, of a region or of the State, call it what you will. There is no doubt about it. The real importance of English in the past was that it was the medium of instruction. Many of us have grown up learning it as a medium of instruction. We cannot get out of it, but the next generation is getting out of it. The generation after that will be completely out of it, and that is the real change that is coming, not your Schedules and all that. The medium of instruction is Hindi or Tamil or Telugu or Marathi or Gujarati or Bengali or whatever it is. Progressively it is coming like that I do not wish to force the pace anywhere.

My friend Dr. Subbarayan talked about university education with one language. I do not know. I should like that. But I do not want Parliament or the law to force the pace. I want things to develop naturally, imbibing the good things of the past and the present, because I dislike pressure in the case of language. I dislike imposition in the case of language. Therefore, I dislike Hindi enthusiasts trying to impose Hindi. I dislike it. Well, equally I dislike the idea of imposing English. I feel all these things should be allowed to grow naturally, giving a certain help and direction now and then and allow things to be developed.

Now, the major change that has come over India is that the medium of instruction has become in the schools, high schools, it has already become—the language of the State English is used certainly, a good thing too and I am all for it especially in the universities. But the medium of instruction in the regional language is a big break linguistically from the past. It does not matter where you put it in, in what Schedule, or what the Official Language Commission says or does. They are important for their own reason but the real thing is that the medium of instruction has changed. Therefore, you can only consider English as a secondary language, or if you like, a compulsory secondary language; if you like, a highly important language, a language which is not the medium of instruction but which is learnt as a separate foreign language. That has become inevitable. I think it is right.

There are certain risks and dangers in all this linguism or the languages developing and becoming rather autarchies or developing certain separateness. There are certain risks. We cannot ignore them and we should deal with them. We should fight that tendency; but, mind you, we cannot fight it by trying to come in the way of the developing of the regional languages, that is a wrong way. We must encourage their fullest development because I believe it is through that development that they can come together and come nearer to each other; not by one language trying to push the other like the exceedingly futile debate for a generation or two generations or more that took place in Uttar Pradesh or the old United Provinces about Hindi and Urdu and each so called language, the languages may be more or less the same with minor differences not trying for its own growth but trying to smother the other, trying to sit on the other and trying to blame and condemn the other. It is an amazing thing, but it goes on still to some extent. Some Hindi enthusiasts get angry if somebody speaks of Urdu not knowing that they cut their own hands and feet by talking against Urdu, because Hindi and Urdu help each other. They do not hinder each other; they

help each other, add to the growth of each, and the moment you try to hinder the one you hinder yourselves from growing.

Therefore, I think we have to take that risk, the risk of language separatism. There is no help for it. I think we shall get over it undoubtedly, but we should get over it if we encourage the right tendencies and not impose our will on others.

Now, take Hindi. Hindi is at present objected to by many people in the South. Why? Well, because of a feeling of imposition and not because they are against Hindi. As a matter of fact I think there are vast numbers of people in the South learning Hindi and learning it very well. The process is going on, but the moment you talk of any kind of imposition, quite rightly they get angry. And, therefore, all talk of imposition must go. I should go further and tell them, if they do not want to learn Hindi let them not learn Hindi. Let us gradually, if they want to, make this approach and thereby you would bring them nearer to each other.

There are, of course, many other things I am not discussing the whole question of language, but again I repeat that the big thing that has happened in India is that the medium of instruction has changed from English to the regional languages. Other things are secondary.

Also, it was right and essential for this medium of instruction to change and for our education to be in those languages if we have to deal on a level with the masses of our people. There is no other way. Now, remember, I repeat, I am partial to English, and I will say something about that presently. But I am also partial to our people, the masses of this country, not because of my partiality for English or foreign knowledge or scientific and technical knowledge—I am partial for them, but I just can not forget that we have to carry 400 million people with us and not an elite, a few thousands or even a million or two if you like, and you cannot carry them practically, psychologically, emotionally in anyway except through their language. So you have to deal with those languages, you have to deal not only with them but ourselves too.

Therefore, it is for all these reasons that, although Mr. Anthony's resolution does not make a mighty difference this way or that way, I do not think it is a wise resolution or a wise step to take I do not think it will make any difference. It would not help the Anglo-Indian community but it may very well hinder not the Anglo-Indian community, but the process he wants to encourage by bringing in another bitter dispute, fears and apprehensions. I want to avoid that I want natural processes and not make a constitutional amendment. Suppose at the time of framing the Constitution, the Constituent Assembly put in English there at that time, there it would have remained. But now to go out of our way to put in any language will obviously open the doors to so many other languages coming in. Apart from that, it will open the door to infinite controversy and conflict.

It will be injurious to English in the end, because, remember, in the final analysis, it is no good forgetting that it is the non-English-knowing people who will decide the fate of India, I do not say. "Hindi-knowing", but "non English-knowing" because they are the vast majority in this country. Naturally, how can we escape that? We can help

them, we can to some extent mould their thinking and direct their, but the moment you make them feel that you are up against them, then you are lost, you will be swept, with all your English and everything. Therefore, I do not think it is wise to raise these things.

But I do think that essentially we have to encourage our languages, our education and our work must be progressively in our languages to keep in touch with the people and to bring them into the emotional contact with what is happening in your Governments and elsewhere. It does not matter I am speaking in English, it is because I am habituated to it, and it does not matter. But I know that the right thing to do is to speak in a language understood by far more people. So, I think that has to be done.

Dr. Subbarayan referred to the official language. Our Constitution has laid it down, for a variety of reasons into which I need not go, that Hindi should develop progressively as that, not because Hindi is better or more powerful or whatever it may be, than the other languages, but for certain very practical reasons of extent etc. I believe, that this should be done.

I believe also two things—As I just said there must be no imposition. Secondly, for an indefinite period—I do not know how long—I should have, I would have, English as an associate additional language which can be used not because of facilities and all that, though there is something in that, but because I do not wish the people of the non-Hindi area to feel that certain doors of advance are closed to them, because they are forced to correspond—the Government, I mean—in the Hindi language. They can correspond in English. So, I would have it as an alternate language as long as people require it and the decision for that, I would leave not to the Hindi-knowing people, but to the non-Hindi-knowing people.

I will repeat what I mean Hindi progressively develops; I try for that, but I love English to come into the picture to be used as long as people require it. Some States have followed it; they can go on using it and gradually allow languages to develop and to replace English.

Having said that, I should like to say a few words about English itself. Really the question of Hindi versus English is a very minor issue; it is not the real issue at all, although there is so much argument, if you look at it from my point of view, the way I have put it I come to English and its importance. It is not important, if I may say so, because a number of people know it in India, although it is a factor to be remembered. It is not important because it is the English of Milton and Shakespeare, although that also has to be considered. There are also great poets in other languages—French, German, Russian, Spanish, etc.; apart from Asian languages. It is important because it is the major window to the modern world for us. That is why it is important and we dare not close that window. If we close it, it is at the peril of our future.

We talk about our Five Year Plan, industrialisation, science and technology. Every door of that is closed if you do not have foreign languages. You need not have English; you can have French, German or Russian, if you like, but obviously it is infinitely simpler for us to deal with a language we know than to shift over to German

or Russian or Spanish. It is a tremendous job. Certainly we want to learn Russian, German, Spanish or whatever it is, because we deal with them in business, trade and science. Every competent scientist today has to know two or three non-Indian languages.

People imagine that by coining a large number of words in Hindi or Bengali or Marathi or Tamil—technical and scientific words—and may be by translating some textbooks, you provide the background for scientific teaching. Certainly, for high schools you do it and may be it is right that you should do so, although this business of coining words seems to me to have been carried on to rather absurd limits, making a noble language progressively more and more artificial and ununderstandable. It is terrible and I think the chief persons guilty are, not all, but some of the Hindi enthusiasts. They make it very difficult really. Leave out the question of literary forms and graces; in my own small way, I too am a lover of languages and it hurts me, it hurts my aesthetic sense, my conception of language, to see these artificial monstrosities thrust upon me, put up at crossroads and stations—huge long words, which nobody understands, not the public I do not know if the man who invented it understands it.

It is a terrible thing and it is more dangerous for the Hindi language than anything else, because you are tying up Hindi with steel bonds, which will prevent it from growing. The creativeness of a language goes if you impose these things. Language is a delicate flower which grows in beauty. You can feed it in various ways; you cannot pull, tug or twist it about and think it will grow.

..... XXX XXX XXX³

It is all the worse; I am sorry. It is a bad thing.

It is inevitable that in the present stage of our development, with our Five Year Plan, industrialisation, mechanisation, scientific progress and research, you cannot progress by all the Indian languages put together. I say that definitely today and if you want to stick to them only, without foreign languages, you do not go ahead. You may have enough science to teach in high schools, you may even get some books for your elementary university course. All that should be done, but science is not the BA or the B.Sc. course. Science today goes into the jet age, atomic energy, space travel, automation and all that. It is a new age and this House should forgive me if I say something, not derogatory to the House, but still rather critical, and that is this House does not represent in numbers I mean, the scientific outlook. That is to say, we represent more the literary outlook, the lawyers' outlook and so on and so forth.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁴

The peasant's outlook too, which is important I do not challenge that. But I will say this I was reading a lecture delivered in the Cambridge University a few months ago by an eminent man. The lecture was called "the two cultures" He was dealing with the English scene, mind you, not India. And he was saying how in England two cultures have developed which were far apart from each other, which did not understand each other, the two cultures being the literary cultures and the scientific culture.

And he gave examples. He said in the hall of the big college at Cambridge there were dons sitting— the scientific dons, the mathematical dons and the literary and the classical dons and they glared at each other; they did not talk to each other, the literary and the classical people, Greek and Latin and all that, on the one side and the scientific and the mathematical people on the other side. They looked with contempt at each other and he said it is extraordinary these two cultures developing: —the literary man, he knows nothing about the modern scientific age and the scientific man knows nothing about the treasures of literature. If that can happen in a country like England, in a city like Cambridge in a college gathering, people glaring and not understanding each other, professors of a single college, transport yourself to India. We are backward in science Our scientists apart, our own thinking is not scientific. We use some of the products of science in industrialisation undoubtedly. We travel by air, we talk about space travel. May be we read some fiction, what is called “science fiction” or space fiction or something. But essentially we are far away from this age, the atomic age in our thinking. Naturally, it is not surprising. If the English literary men who live in a highly industrialised country cannot fit into that mentally, how much more difficult will it be for us who are industrially backward scientifically backward and in other ways not used to that.

We have some professors teaching science. We have some technologists. They are growing, of course, and there we are on the threshold of an industrial revolution in India. Now that industrial revolution cannot, in the present age—I am not talking of the future ages—be carried out, because we have no literature, no language. We have some books on elementary physics or biology or chemistry, but this higher mathematics and all that is really quite beyond our languages, at the present moment. And you cannot have an industrial revolution unless people have access to these and are taught these books in various languages. You may translate some. You should. But it is not enough. So, without the knowledge of the foreign language the doors of the new age are closed to you, without the knowledge of several foreign languages. I would say, and inevitably the language which is easier to you is English, to come back to it.

There is another aspect. When I talk of the industrial age and all these other scientific developments, and when we talk about language, a totally new language is developing in the world, a language, if you like, of the elite, the language of the mysterious, the high priests, which average people do not understand. But it is developing with amazing rapidity among the technical people, among the scientific men, a language largely of mathematical formulae. There is very little of the rest there. It is chiefly mathematical formulae which are accepted and as only mathematicians and physicists will understand and for you and me we do not just understand it. And this is developing at a terrific pace, because it has to keep pace with the development of technology, development of so many other things of science and there surely is going to be, I hope, one language in the world, the language of the mathematical formulae. For that we cannot have a separate language; otherwise, the world is lost.

We talk about one world today in theory because of scientific advance, communications and all that National boundaries hardly count. And I have no doubt

BACK NOTE

XIV. Resolution Regarding inclusion of English in the 8th Schedule of the Constitution, 7 August, 1959

1. MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pandit Braj Narayan "Brajesh".
2. AN HON. MEMBER: There is a feeling.
3. SHRI NARASIMHAN (Krishnagiri): This disease is spreading to regional languages also.
4. SHRI HEM BARUA: The emotional too.
5. AN HON. MEMBER: That is a signal for you to stop.
6. SHRI NATH PAI: The hon. Prime Minister stated that Portuguese is the language of Goa. Konkani is the language both of the Hindus and the Christians in Goa. Portuguese is the language of the forces of occupation.

PROCLAMATION IN RESPECT OF KERALA

19 August, 1959

Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, I shall endeavour to the best of my ability to avoid the present excitement and distemper that comes from Kerala and to adhere to certain basic consultations which we have to consider. Many things have been said here on both sides of the House which perhaps were not wholly relevant to this debate. It is difficult to draw hard and fast lines in such a debate. Nevertheless a great deal has been said.

Shri Dange, who spoke with his usual fluency and ability—and spoke for a fairly considerable time—said many things. But then I wondered and thought how much can be said with what little content. I tried to catch hold of what he had said. There were long disquisitions about democracy, about various other matters, about conspiracies but not too much about the points in issue. The whole argument is—and to some extent. Shri Gopalan's has been—of a deep laid conspiracy to put an end to the Kerala Government.

The word democracy has been used a great deal here on every side of the House, more especially on the opposite side. Shri Dange accused us of being—I forget his words, but he said something to the effect of being—the murderers of democracy. A story comes to my mind of an unfortunate youngman, who went and killed his father and mother. When he was hauled up before the court he asked for clemency on the ground of being an orphan.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

Shri Dange was good enough to say some very nice things about me and to condone with me that I had been removed from the pedestal on which our people had put me. I do not personally believe in people being put on pedestals and if any persons had mistakenly put me on a pedestal it is a good thing that they have removed me. It is good for me and good for them.

Shri Dange referred also to the great deal of disquiet among various people in India including the members of the Congress Party about the step taken in Kerala. He was perfectly right in referring to it or rather in mentioning this fact. He probably knows because the newspapers have recorded it that the Congress Party of Parliament met for three long sessions confidentially to consider this matter and people spoke there frankly and fully without any inhibitions as they should. Why? And what was the meaning of that? The meaning was because the Congress Party, being wedded to democracy and constitutional procedures, having been conditioned by them, was anxious to understand and know why something has been done which was criticised as being undemocratic. It shows the texture of the Congress Party. Even when its own Government had taken a step of this kind—a big step, an important step—it did not take it for granted. It wanted to argue. It wanted to criticise. It wanted to get out all the facts and then to decide in their individual or in their group minds. We found in

the Government. That is a different matter. But I knew that no word of mine would suddenly stop this movement where it had gone at that stage. And they knew it too very well.

So the impression left on my mind was that the sooner this is done the better, the sooner this proclamation is issued the better.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁴

May I also say that when this proclamation came out—naturally I am referring to my own impressions—as I have said, there was a fair amount of disquiet in the minds of many of my colleagues in the Congress Party, but there was great relief in the Communist Party and this is natural; this is quite natural. I do not mean to say that they wanted Central intervention all along I do not say that. But I do say that a situation had arisen which it was becoming exceedingly difficult for them to face.

I was told it meant, might have meant, well, very serious consequences, largescale killing, something. And no Government—communist, non-communist—likes doing that. It is obvious. Therefore they were in a great difficulty. I can quite appreciate that difficulty, because any Government would have been in that difficulty if it had arrived at that stage. And there was no way out of it, either this or to face it and those tremendous consequences, apart from the tremendous damage done, I mean to say lives lost, etc., the consequences and the ill-will raised among the people, i ill-will that would last a long time, maybe till the elections and after, which obviously as reasonable politicians they did not like. Therefore, what were they to do about it? What could they do? There was no relief for them except by Central Government action.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁵

I am not justifying it I am analysing as much as I can.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁶

I would like to know his repudiation, so that I may know what it is.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁷

The actual words used, to my recollection, were “If you cannot stop all this, the sooner you act the better”. These were the words used the sooner you act the better I am not saying.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁸

What the hon. Member said also were the words used: not exclusively of course, he used those words too. My reply, as he has already stated, was that we have not come to a final decision, but everything is driving us in that direction.

I do not wish to enter into verbal exchanges, because the matter is beyond merely verbal cleverness. But, I do submit that round about the time when this Proclamation was issued, we had arrived at a stage when there was no other way out except disaster on a big scale in Kerala holocaust or something like that I do say—this

is my impression—that this was not only the view of a large number of other people, but by the compulsion of events, many of our Communist friends had arrived at the same conclusion, not willingly, but by the compulsion of events.

Coming to the stage when this Proclamation was issued, I may well say, it was issued not only because there was no other way out, but because there was almost unanimity that it should be issued.

I am prepared to admit that the argument is, and it should be met, it is all very well to issue it at the stage it was done, what about the preceding stages? I am putting the hon. Member's question. What about the preceding stages? It was a conspiracy and instead of stopping it, under article 352 or some such thing, you encouraged it in various ways?

Just a little while ago, Shri A. K. Gopalan was good enough to quote from numerous speeches of mine, which I said at Press conferences again and again condemning the direct action that was going on in Kerala, condemning the picketing of schools, condemning the stopping of buses, condemning the so-called direct action in Government offices. I said that on three or four separate occasions I may say, of course, this was not enough I should have said so more often and more forcibly.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX?

I started by saying that I hope to avoid bringing in the present Kerala excitement and distemper here. In so far as I am concerned, I shall still endeavour to do so.

The cases may be isolated from the final act which had become inevitable and the preceding six weeks or six months or one year or two years or whatever you like.

We are accused of some kind of deep laid conspiracy to get others to do things which would bring about a situation which would enable us to act in this way. I hope that is a correct representation. The conspiracy goes back according to them to within 48 hours when the Kerala Government into power, when, according to S. A. Dange, Shri Shriman Narayan went there and gave out his opinion that there was insecurity and law and order was in danger. Shri S. A. Dange is not quite correct about that It is true that Shri Shriman Narayan went there because of a previous engagement to attend a meeting there of the Kerala Pradesh Congress Committee. He did not make these remarks then he made some such remark five or six months later.

On the first occasion, what he referred to was—I have enquired from him and on the strength of what he said. I am saying—on the first occasion, just at that time, large scale releases had taken place of people convicted of murder, etc. About that he said, this is causing a food deal of apprehension. Five or six months later, he went again and then he said that there was a widespread feeling of insecurity. As a matter of fact, I forget when, about a year ago, last year, some time, I also ventured to say that it had come to my knowledge that among the people in Kerala there was this feeling of insecurity. There was no doubt about that. I am not saying about what the position was; but many people felt that way: that is what I say. I cannot say; I do not know. But, many people felt this way; this was a widespread and growing opinion.

Then, Shri Dhebar is brought into the picture as another villain in the piece who excited I am sorry the way his name is repeatedly brought out, because I think that Shri Dhebar is a man of the highest integrity for whom I have the greatest honour.

Hon. Members who laugh at this would do themselves no credit by laughing when I refer to an honoured person and a man of integrity. It is not a laughing matter. You may agree or disagree. There are certain conventions to be observed in decent society.

I cannot go into those details, but I will say this. The House knows, last year the matters came up here on the motion of a Member from the opposition and as has been pointed out, the Government's attitude, my hon. colleague, the Home Minister's attitude was not to encourage that matter here in the House discussion, etc. Ultimately I do not quite know—it has sort of faded out—what happened to it. Not that we were not getting disquieting reports about various happenings there. The Home Minister's personal file is full of letters from the Governor and of letters to and from, not so many, but a number—to the Chief Minister he wrote friendly letters—who asked why was not a warning sent under some article of the Constitution before the Proclamation. As a matter of fact, many times friendly letters were sent pointing out something which could be done. Sometimes his suggestions were accepted by the Chief Minister, sometimes not. So things were going on.

So, we were disturbed. But, the idea, the whole conception of intervention never came into our mind. It was quite remote. We had not thought of it. The thing that we did consider when the matter came up here was, when so many charges are brought, would it be desirable or advisable to have an enquiry into this. But, the question of intervention, never came into our mind.

To skip over a lengthy period, I do not wish to go into details, two months or three months ago, I forget, when we were at Ooty. I had been reading in the papers and got some broad reports about friction in Kerala but I had no real idea of how much the situation had developed. The first intimation I got about this new Kerala situation was from a Minister of the Kerala Government. It was then that I realised from his words how serious it was and how big it was. In fact, I remember some rather odd words he used. He said that 'We have been used, in the past years, to what we call the Nehru crowds, which attracted so many people, but now we see the opposition people bringing these crowds on us. He said this is amazing, this is surprising. That remark and a lot of other things he told me impressed me that something unusual was happening there and I had not realised it. Later on of course, other facts and impressions came to me from other sources, from Congress people and others.

But the first impression I got was from a Minister of the Kerala Government, first of all, a personal report I had a vague idea that perhaps by visiting Kerala, I might be able to do something at that stage.

Then, when the matter came up, the question then was, I think, that this gentleman, Mr. Mannath Padmanabhan had announced or threatened to have picketing of schools or rather to stop the opening of schools by picketing and other ways. This was the

sole matter which came up before us; some Congressmen had brought it. We said this was utterly wrong and absolutely wrong, and 'on no account can you participate in it'. That was the advice that we gave. There was no other issue before us.

We began to realise, however, that whatever advice we may or may not give, events that were happening in Kerala were gradually getting beyond any reasonable advice. It was just then that I issued, I believe, a statement, coming down from Ooty or from Coimbatore, in which what I said was—I think Shri A. K. Gopalan has already read out a part of that statement—(and this was the first time that I used that word) that this was a big upsurge. There it was I came back.

Later we found to our surprise that this thing was growing bigger and bigger, and one thing which I had not expected, none of us had expected, was that some of the Congress people there had been prohibited from picketing of schools, they did not do so. I cannot speak about individuals. Individual Congressmen might have done so I cannot say but officially they did not do so. They did not indulge in this business also. They did what the call token picketing, six persons performing some token picketing of Government office. I did not approve of this at all. None of us did. But I confess to you and it may have been wrong thing for us to do that we were in difficulty. When the matter came up later here, some days later, we were in a difficulty because people had got entangled in this thing. And here was this thing growing bigger and bigger; and what we were anxious about very much was, in so far as it was possible, to check this movement, so far as direct action and all that was concerned, and by progressive limitation or something of that kind, because we realised that just a command 'Don't do it' had no effect in those circumstances.

So, what was said, if you remember, in that resolution of the Congress Parliamentary Board was a fairly strong condemnation of picketing buses etc. etc. and all direct action of any kind, in fact, but there was a proviso—and you may agree or disagree that proviso ought not to have been made; that is a different matter; but in the circumstances, and considering the situation as it was, there was this entanglement; we said, get out of this entanglement, the most you can do for the present is to gradually withdraw, is to carry on your token thing and then withdraw. That was what we said, because we wanted them to get out of it completely and to influence others also to do so. We said, you can have any other demonstrations if you like, public meetings if you like and such like things, but not this; because, speaking, for myself, as I stated previously, I was against all this direct action. It is a wrong thing.

Acharya Kripalani in the course of his speech two days ago said a number of things in praise of satyagraha and direct action. I am not competent to argue metaphysical and philosophical matters with him. I do not know if I can say honestly that any kind of satyagraha should be prohibited; I am not sure in my mind; there may be occasions when it is justified. But when we use the word 'satyagraha', surely, we should have in mind the basic elements of what is satyagraha. Surely, this House will remember that in the old days, when satyagraha and all these direct action movements were pretty common, how Gandhiji stopped the whole movement, because he thought that it was going wrong; he stopped it. He even said that he was the one

and only man in India who could perform satyagraha, nobody else. That was what he said. Others were not competent; or they could come in individually, one by one. With all deference to everybody concerned, I may say that if what I have said is satyagraha, then there was no satyagraha in Kerala, none at all, because I have seldom seen any place so thick with hatred and incipient violence; it is amazing; it was a case of thick walls of hatred everywhere, group hatred. I say so with all respect, not being, or considering, myself as expert in this; but if there is so much hatred and so much bitterness about it, then it is dangerous to conduct any satyagraha; you may call it by some other name; it is not satyagraha.

Shri A. K. Gopalan referred to my going to Kerala. I might say that I had vaguely thought of going to Kerala earlier. But the Chief Minister said publicly that for the moment he was not anxious that I should go there. So, I did not take up the question of my going there. Shri S. A. Dange is not here at the moment; he asked 'Why did he not go there at the invitation of the Congress or what not?'. Well, as a matter of fact,— except for any very special reason, I do not know, I cannot think of it, I do not visit any State except on the invitation of that State Government, whether it is a Congress Government or a PSP Government or a Communist Government. So, the question of my going there did not arise. Shri Namboodripad said that I need not go. But later in the month he wrote to me that he would like me to go there. So, for three days, I think, for three clear days. I went there. Shri A. K. Gopalan referred to an organised demonstration when I had gone there. Of course, it was an organised demonstration. I know that much of politics and that much of demonstrations as to know that But organised demonstrations are also of various types, sizes, tempers and all that. And to some extent, I judged by them, but not much of course. I could realise that it was conceivable that a rival demonstration could also be organised. If not on that scale,—may be a little smaller, but big enough, it is quite possible I spent those three days there, talking to lots of people, hundreds of people, I met them in groups and as individuals almost every person concerned, and I had long talks, of course, with the Ministers of the Kerala Government. But more than these talks, I was trying to sense in some capacity, to sense public feelings, public events, public meetings, crowds and demonstrations, I was trying to sense them, and the impression grew upon me that the situation in Kerala was much worse than what I had thought worse in a particular way, that there was absolutely no meeting ground left between these rival groups big or small, and the bitterness and hatred and anger at each other was prodigious, I was amazed, I did not know how I could get a move on with all this, and this movement going on I criticised direct action etc. whenever I spoke. I spoke to the Congress there and I told them too, but the problem before me was not to give a philosophical opinion but how to deal with a particularly difficult situation I suggested rather as a side issue, which might do some good, in regard to the Education Act why not talk to the critics of this. Act in regard to the controversial clauses? I was glad that they agreed to do so. Thereafter, I met the managers and bishops and various people concerned, the Nair Service Society and others— the Congress had nothing to do with this because the Congress as such was not concerned with the schools at all.

Those people—I regretted then—were not enthusiastic about this proposal to have talks. The reason they gave was not without force. They said that previously they wanted to have talks, but they did not take place, and now with all this controversy when the atmosphere was so thick with suspicion, how could they have talks, there must be something in it.

Nevertheless, I reminded them that the lesson I had learnt from Gandhiji was always to be prepared to talk even with the enemy. Do not give up. You need not give up what you consider your principles, but talk. However, I could not convince them. I am sorry. But I realised that was not the major issue. The Education Act had long ceased to be the major issue. Therefore,—I saw no way out—I suggested to the Chief Minister and the other Ministers of the Kerala Government that their only way was an election. Mind you, not Central intervention. There was no question of Central intervention, but an election asked for by them. That was a proposal I said that I thought that this position could not be dealt with merely by admonition or by strong language because—I use the word for both sides—it was a hysterical position. Everybody was in a state of hysteria. I am leaving out the question of justification or otherwise. There was this hysteria, anger and hatred and incipient violence, breaking out of violence which may I say—a fact when I did not quite know—that people in some parts of Kerala are in the habit of carrying about long knives with them and they are not averse to using them if their tempers rose. This kind of thing was happening from day to day, we heard of stabbing.

So I suggested elections I did not expect elections—of course, I am not so simple minded as to expect it—to solve this problem. But what I was aiming at was—to use a word which has been used in connection with European and world problems—some disengagement. This word, as you know, has been used in Europe about Germany and other problems. I said I wanted some disengagement and if they decided to have elections, then the situation would change. They would not set about to embrace each other, but this bitterness would change, people would, in a month or two, begin to think of the elections and start preparing for them. No doubt, they would use strong language, but it would be a different thing. This movement etc. would also be over and then it would be time to talk about the Education Act and other matters. This was the suggestion I made before I came away.

After I came back, here on two or three occasions I repeated this either in Press conference or, I think, in a letter to the Chief Minister and in various ways, because I felt that was the only thing one could do. After all, what else could one do? There were two courses open. One was to try to crush this agitation by coercive methods. I did not think it was feasible; it was possible with the help of the police and the army to crush any agitation, however big, but the cost would have been frightful and the consequences would have been even more frightful. Maybe, I am wrong in this. The Kerala Ministers said that if this happened the whole thing would fade away. But I think they were quite wrong, at that stage any way; I do not know about some early stage.

The other alternative was for the agitation etc., to continue and continue and continue; which also was terrible, because Government, as it was, became impossible.

people's expression? But let it be apart from this kind of direct action. Nobody listened to me; and, probably, nobody would listen to me in those circumstances. It has been repeatedly said that under some article or otherwise we should have come to their rescue.

About a year or more than a year ago, that is just after a year of the coming into power of the Government in Kerala, the Chief Minister delivered a speech which attracted a good deal of attention at the time simply because in his speech the words 'civil war' came in. It was not really important. But, nevertheless, it was an interesting speech, interesting in the sense of the working of the mind behind it I have got a note about it.

"The Chief Minister of Kerala warned the opposition parties that if they jointly tried to oust the communist Kerala Government, it would divide the people into two camps and create disruption in the country. This, Mr. Namboodripad felt will inevitably lead to a situation in which the two contending groups will be forced to embark on a policy of mutual annihilation leading to a national tragedy. It was a similar situation, he added, that led to the protracted civil war in China."

This speech was delivered on the 31st May, 1958, more than a year ago. But now forgetting as to whose fault it was, the fact is that in Kerala a situation arose when not only all the opposition groups but, if I may say so, all the people, the people who belong to no groups, the neutral people—they are non-political people— all of them joined together against the Government and its supporters. And this very thing, in a sense, the then Chief Minister referred to that there will be two contending groups facing each other. This situation was, in fact, created. Sometimes, even leading members of these groups talked in amazing terms of annihilating the other group as if it was conceived at all possible, as if the communist party or Government could annihilate the rest of Kerala or as if the opposition groups put together could annihilate all the communists and their sympathisers. They are both ridiculous propositions. But it shows to what extent the feelings had gone when people talked in this way.

Now, I read this little speech of "Shri Namboodripad, which, in the context of civil war, he subsequently explained somewhat. But I attached really no importance to it, the civil war part of it, at that time, that is 15 months ago in May—to his thinking of everybody else combining against his Government. This way of thinking of the communist party and its supporters being one group against the world, against everybody else, one the selected and the elect and the other having the presumption to come together to oppose it, is a line of thinking which seems to be slightly odd.

When I met some of the members of the Kerala Government I put it to them. How is it that you have managed to make everybody against you— everybody meaning apart from their own party and supporters—all parties outside your group and your supporters, even some people—I do not know who they are—who call themselves Marxists or Revolutionary Marxists or Socialists, the RSP. I asked. By what alchemy have you made all these people your opponents. I used this word in this context. They were, as usual, taking it out of the context and putting it in the papers in their

anger with oath other, polarisation of two groups and so on. Leave out for the sake of argument which is the bigger and which is the smaller. I have no doubt that in the circumstances one was much bigger than the other but leave that out. Here was a situation and a tendency to use knives—not only a tendency, but the actual use of knives. Now it is a grave danger. One could see it happening. This would go worse and worse and in fact stabbing all over the place, this man stabbing that man and thus a situation arises which it is not easy for even the best of police to deal with. You cannot deal with this, if all individuals have to stab somebody else. It is not a question of crowd. Because of this we felt that something had to be done to stop this and we took this action. We advised the President rather to take this action. We might as well, as I said before, waited because every day that we waited would have made the justification of that action more. But that would not be proper because that would have been at the cost of the people of Kerala and at the cost of greater bitterness and conflict. As a matter of fact, ever since this action has been taken—I do not say that there is complete peace all over Kerala, but—the situation is infinitely better. Occasionally, something happens in two or three districts. But broadly speaking, people have quieted down and they are getting out of the terrific condition in which they were in. As I said, I cannot expect them suddenly to develop an exceeding love for each other quickly.

Now, in the course of the debate, reference has sometimes been made to communism and communist party and all that. In connection with the Communist Party in Kerala or the Government in Kerala, naturally that subject has to be considered. But I do not think that this is the time or occasion for us to discuss communism or Marxism or even the wider implications of the communist parties in the world or even here. Not that I am averse to any talk on the subject but it must take place in the proper context, but not tied up to an important local issue like Kerala which arouses so much passion. I do not agree with much that has been said on this side or on that side. I am no communist I do think, if I may say so with all respects, that what may be called communist theory is rather out of date. I do feel so. One big virtue in it—not so much the communist theory—is the normal socialist approach, being for the underdog. That is the normal socialist approach. Whether you come up to it or not, that is a big thing. There is much good thing in communism that people should learn and certainly in the advanced communist countries. Nevertheless, I think that the communist theory is out of date and more especially, the application of it in various odd countries, the application based on some other application, is utterly wrong.

Shri Dange accused or rather said that he objected to being told that he had no roots, in this country—he, meaning, a communist. Now that charge, not referring to Mr. Dange or to any particular individual, has a very great deal of relevance to the group. I am not for a moment criticising anybody. But I say it almost inevitably follows—this kind of thing and that is the basic difficulty. It is not the communist theory, the economic theory. We may agree with it; we may not agree with it. It does not matter. We may vary it as even communist countries are varying it— but not the communist outside the communist countries. This business of not having

of giving in. But this approach that some people have of trying to annihilate and crush the other, this approach to which reference was made in Mr. Nambudiripad's speech which I read out to you—this is the phrase used, that each party try to annihilate each other—that is not an intelligent approach in modern life. You may like or dislike it, but you have to accept some ways of dealing with them apart from the normal jungle way of breaking each other's head or shooting each other down. It is from that point of view that I would like you to consider this.

I can also give you another, in Communism or Marxism. Those of us who are interested in history read about crusading religions often full of vitality, full of the desire to conquer and convert the whole world. Well, they show considerable results. But they gradually tone down. The world still remains multireligious; no single religion has conquered the world inspite of the army, the faith, the energy and the crusading spirit. They tone down. If you go to the letter of the religion, it is: "Go; convert everybody with the sword if necessary". But you see in practice they are quite individuals professing that religion, may be liking others to be converted but not at the point of the sword or lathi or conflict.

So these great impulses that come to the world from time to time for doing good, sometimes they upset things, sometimes they may bring in a bit of evil, but gradually they adapt themselves, they become less and less fierce, if I may say so with all respect, less crusading, less upsetting. They adapt themselves wherever they are, in their own countries or elsewhere. This process always go on and they are going on now, whether it is communism or anything else; and it is only people who take to narrower view of this, whether they are Communists or anti-Communists, who prevent the growth of these normal and natural forces.

So far as we are concerned, we have tried to follow our own policy, international, national or domestical. We approach such things as we consider wrong, national or international. But we do not make our policy one of fighting an opposition to everybody who does not fall in line with us. That certainly has not been the genius of the Indian people. The genius of the Indian people has been "live and let live" and not give in wrongly. But I do think that nowadays, not when political and economic matters arouse passions to a high level, we should stick to what we believe right, we should discuss and come to terms, but finally we should "live and let live" and not try to solve them by annihilating each other.

We live in the present. But, obviously, we live in the present thinking of the future. We want to have a stake in that future. We won't have that future at all if we, more or less, in the present put an end to ourselves, if not to ourselves to much that we stand for.

Sir, before I finish, may I say a word about something quite irrelevant that was brought into the picture? I think Shri Khadilkar brought in my colleague, the Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, what happened in Bombay and so on. Now, much can be said on that subject, but, surely I would say there is no time for it, and I do not think it is quite fair of Shri Khadilkar to bring that in and in the way that he did it.

BACK NOTE

XV. Proclamation in Respect of Kerala 19 August, 1959

1. SHRI SADHAN GUPTA: Do you ask for the same after killing democracy?
2. SHRI PUNNOOSE: The hon. Home Minister referred to it.
3. MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps hon. Member did not follow what the Prime Minister said. He said that is the impression left upon him. It is on him that the impression has been left not on the hon. Members.

SHRI TANGAMANI. How does he know our mind?

4. SHRI PUNNOOSE: The sooner you condemn the better.
5. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: So it is being justified?
6. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: Analyse it yourself without bringing in others.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order. Shri Gopalan is all attention, but the other Members are going on interrupting. I should think that the Deputy Leader should exercise his influence on the others.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: The Deputy Leader is not saying anything because he does not want to do it now. I wanted to repudiate and say it was not correct.

7. SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: The repudiation is that even now you are saying that we have said "please intervene to relieve us". That is what you are saying.

Several HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: He has not said that.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: I was present with Mr. Ajoy Ghosh. What he said was not that...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order, perhaps he has not understood the Prime Minister correctly. So far as I could understand, he has not said that.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: I did not talk anything, because the situation was repeated and I wanted ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order.

8. SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: The actual words used were "Can you tell us what is the decision you have taken. Are you going to intervene"? That is the actual word that he said, "What is the decision that the Central Government has taken"? We wanted to know the decision taken by the Central Government.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order Now I will request hon. Members on both sides to have patience. Let us listen to the Prime Minister.

9. SHRI ASOKA MEHTA: We are here to hear the Prime Minister, not to hear the communists. It is time they stop.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order. I will request the hon. Members. Majority of the House is anxious to hear the Prime Minister. They are not interrupting the Prime Minister alone but the whole House. They want to listen. I will request them now, Order, order.

I should warn hon. Members now that I shall have to take severe action if this is not stopped. I will make an appeal to all others also.

SHRI JADHAV (Malegaon): Shri A. K. Gopalan was not interrupted.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would make an appeal to all.

10. SHRI C. D. PANDE (Nainital): Danger of losing.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: And they would not be able to blame the Central Government so much 'We will stick to the end'. The think will come. But then we can hold the banner of democracy against the Central Government. That is a clear and unvarnished account of things that happened. Here we were struggling for preventing this thing happening, trying to find some way out, because, naturally, not merely because of our love for theoretical democracy but because of the practical aspects of this and the possible consequences of it. We did not want that.

Now, think of another little thing. But it is important. It would have been greatly to the advantage of the Central Government, if it wanted to put the Kerala Government and the Communist Party more and more in the wrong. It would have been greatly to its advantage to have stayed this action a few days, because by so doing the situation in Kerala—I have no doubt—would have become much worse. It was going forward towards disaster. That would have forced this Government there to take more and more action, suppressive, corrective action.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: You talk of saving the Communist Party at every stage]

11. An HON. MEMBER: Wrong.

12. SHRI TYAGI: Not the toddy tappers.

An HON. MEMBER: Except the toddy tappers.

13. SHRI V. P. NAYAR: He is also called Kambi—kambi means telegram—Namboodiripad, which means that he is capable of sending any number of telegrams.

14. SHRI PUNNONEE: Is it our fault that we look to Delhi from Trivandrum?

An HON. MEMBER: Not to Moscow? They look more to Moscow than to Delhi.

15. MR. DEPUTYSPEAKER: Is it our fault that we look to Delhi from Trivandrum? that is what he is saying.

16. ACHARYA KRIPLANI: They do not accept you are not an anti-Communist.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION REGARDING SITUATION IN INDIA'S NORTHERN BORDER

28 August, 1959

Sir, I can very well understand the anxiety of the House to have information as fully as possible about this situation on our border areas. It is rather difficult for me to deal with these various adjournment motions as they are often based on wrong names, wrong areas, wrong locations. So, instead of my endeavouring to deal with each adjournment motion. I shall give some specific information.

Shri Hem Barua's motion is completely upside down—one name here, one place there—and has no connection with the events or anything. He has derived it from some paper. Sir, may I continue?

In the course of the last two or three years, sometimes, not very frequently, there have been cases of some kind of petty intrusion on our border areas by some platoon or something of the Chinese troops, which was nothing very extraordinary, because there is no demarcation at all and parties sometimes may cross. We drew the attention of the Chinese Government in 1957-58 to this and they withdrew, there the matter ended.

One instance I have already quoted, which was a more serious one. In Ladakh last year, a small police party was apprehended by them, and that matter is still under dispute or under correspondence. Now, in June this year, the Chinese Government protested to us that Indian troops had shelled and intruded into Chinese territory by occupying a place on the border, Migyitun, and some other place along the frontier—this is Tibet NEFA—and they accused us that our troops had entered into some kind of collusion with the Tibetan rebel forces or “bandits”, as they call them, carrying on illegal activities against the People's Government of China. We replied that there is no truth in this allegation, and we expressed surprise that the Chinese Government should give credence to these wrong allegations. Ultimately, nothing happened there. We stayed where we were, and there was some dispute about the line.

Now, there are two matters that I would particularly like to mention, one, of course, is of very considerable importance and it is topical now I shall come to it later. The first one is that on the 7th August an armed Chinese patrol, approximately 200 strong, violated our border at Khinzemane north of Chuthangmu in the Kameng Frontier Division. When requested to withdraw, they pushed back, actually physically pushed back, our greatly outnumbered patrol to a bridge at Drokung Samba. Our people consisted of ten or a dozen policemen and they were about 200, about ten times us. They actually physically pushed our men back. There was no firing. Later on, the Chinese detachment withdrew and our forces again established themselves. All this was over a question of about two miles I might say, according to us, there is an international border. Two miles on this side is this bridge and two miles on that side is our picket or the small force. So, our patrol party was pushed back to the bridge and two miles away they stood facing each other. Then both retired. It is not quite

clear to me why they did so, it is a mountain and perhaps during night time both the forces retired. Whatever it was later on the Chinese withdrew and our picket went back to the frontier and established a small picket there. The Chinese patrol arrived later and demanded immediate withdrawal of our picket and lowering of our flag there. This request was refused. Then there was some attempt by the Chinese forces to outflank our people, but so far as we know our people remained there and nothing further happened, that is, on the border itself. That is one instance which happened about two weeks ago.

The present incident I am talking about is a very recent one and, in fact, is a continuing one. On the 25th August, that is three days ago, a strong Chinese detachment crossed into our territory in the Subansiri Frontier Division at a place south of Migyitun and opened fire. Hon. Members will remember, I just mentioned Migyitun in connection with the Chinese protest that we have violated their territory and were in collusion with some Tibetan rebels. That was then protest made in June last, and there the matter ended. Now, round about that area, a little further away but not far from it, this Chinese detachment came and met, some distance away, our forward picket of about a dozen persons. It is said that they fired at our forward picket. They were much larger in numbers, it is difficult to say in what numbers, but they were in some hundreds, 200, 300 or, may be, even more. They surrounded this forward picket which consisted of 12 men—1 N.C.O. and 11 Riflemen of the Assam Rifles. They apparently apprehended this lot. Later, apparently, 8 of these 11 Riflemen managed to escape. They came back to our outpost. The outpost is at a place called Longju. Longju is about 2 or 4 miles from our frontier between Tibet and India as we conceive it. Longju is five days' march from another post of ours in the interior, a little bigger post called Lunekmg. Limeking is about 12 days' march from the next place behind it. So, in a way, this Longju is about three weeks' march from a roadhead. I merely mention this to give the House some idea of communications, transport, distance and time taken. I was saying, on the 25th they captured this forward picket of ours, but 8 of them, having been captured, apparently, escaped and came back on the 26th the next day. The Chinese again came and opened fire and practically encircled this picket and the post. In fact, they came forward and encircled this post, Longju, and although there was firing for a considerable time, we had no account of any casualties. Our people apparently fired back too. When those people were more or less surrounded at Longju they left that picket and withdrew under this overwhelming pressure. This has happened only the day before yesterday evening. So, we have not been able to get any exact particulars of what has happened.

The moment this information came we immediately protested to the Chinese Government about it and took certain other steps in that area to strengthen our various posts, Luneking and others, as we thought necessary and feasible. We have, in fact, placed all this border area of NEFA directly under our military authorities. That is to say, it was dealt with by the Assam Rifles under the Assam Rifles Directorate which functioning under the Governor and the Governor was the agent of the Government of India in the External Affairs Ministry. The Assam Rifles will of course

BACK NOTE

XVI. Adjournment Motion Regarding Situation in India's Northern Border, 28 August, 1959

1. SHRI BRAJ RAJ SINGH (Firozabad): I think we must have a two hour discussion for this subject.

SHRI GORAY: The point is this. It is not a question of taking any alarmist view of the position or anything like that. The real issue is about what is happening in Ladakh, Bhutan, Sikkim and in NEFA. The Prime Minister said that these localities are separated from each other by hundreds of miles. It is true, but it seems that the guiding hand behind them is the same. Therefore, the question is, what is our evaluation of the Chinese policy towards us. As I said, it is not a question of the effect it produces on us. If India fails to do its duty. I suppose the next will be Burma after that, it will be Indonesia. It may then be Laos. All these South east Asian countries' look to us for guidance, and if we fail to protect our borders, do you mean to say that smaller countries will derive encouragement? Therefore, the question is, what is our evaluation of the Chinese policy towards us. As I said, it is not a question of the effect it produces on us. If India fails to do its duty, I suppose the next will be Burma. After that, it will be Indonesia. It may then be Laos . All these South east Asian countries look to us for guidance, and if we fail to protect our borders, do you mean to say that smaller countries will derive encouragement? Therefore, I want this House to discuss this matter thoroughly and the House should be taken into confidence.

SHRI KHADILKAR (Ahmednagar): Are all these incidents an indication that there is a Chinese design to determine the border as is shown in the map of theirs by saying that they have come under their occupation? If one studies all the incidents—I have tried to study them—it is an indication that this is part of such a design. Their maps show that all these portions are theirs,—a transgression of the so called Mac Mahon line. So, is it an indication of the Chinese design to occupy them and say “This is the border between India and China?”

SHRI B. DAS GUPTA (Purulia): In view of the incidents off and on in Ladakh, etc., may I ask whether any proposal has been sent to the Chinese Government for any talks regarding this matter between the two Governments?

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH (Sasaram): Regarding the check post, the Prime Minister said that it is very difficult to drop para troopers. May I know whether it is possible—I do not want to suggest that it should be done straightaway—to bomb that area in order to extricate it from Chinese heads.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati) May I know whether this incursion into NEFA which has been repeated in quick succession is due to the cartographic inaccuracy in the maps about which we have complained to the Chinese Government and the Chinese Government have told us that this is the handiwork of the Chiang Kaishek regime?

MR. SPEAKER: That is the same as Shri Khadilkar's point.

PANDIT GOVIND MALAVIYA (Sultanpur): Our Prime Minister has clearly indicated the general attitude of the Government in this matter. We are in a delicate

situation where, on the one hand, China is a friend of ours and we have a broad foreign policy which has the approval of every section of the House, and on the other we have got to safeguard our frontiers. I wonder whether this going into minute details will help anybody or the Opposition. Why should we raise questions about these details and small things here and there? The problem is a big one. Can we not at present leave matters to the Government in such big questions and can we not have one policy on such big matters? In internal matters, we may have different policies but on matters of national honour, let us maintain a unanimous stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member may kindly leave it to the hon. Prime Minister.

2. SHRI VAJPAYEE: May I suggest that the Government should issue a White Paper detailing all these developments, our border dispute with the Chinese and this cartographic aggression, so that world opinion may be well-informed.

MOTION REGARDING REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENT ON OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

4 September, 1959

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, after the minor excitements that we experienced a little while ago, it is a little difficult to come back to the calm atmosphere of a debate on language. Although perhaps this debate on language has not been quite as calm as it might have been and there has been some excitement and some passion introduced into it, yet, even while this debate has been going on and important questions were considered—because the question of language is very important—I have had a vague feeling that the debate was slightly out of date or will soon be out of date. Why do I say so? Because this whole debate, this whole approach is governed by a static conception of India, as if India was not changing and India is not what it is. We carry on in the old way. What is happening in India? Apart from the rest of the world, a new world is growing up. It is coming in upon us with giant strides, even though many of us may not quite realise it. In two ways it is coming in upon us, and both ways are such that they will affect the question of language more than, if I may say so with respect, any decision of this House; or, rather, the decisions of this House will be governed by these forces.

What are those forces? One is the obvious fact of the growth of, call it democracy, education, vast numbers of people coming into the field of political decision. Whether it is by means of elections or otherwise, all these people come in and a vast number of them, a great majority of them have no background of a foreign language in them. That is a fact of life. It is not a question of choice. It is so. And the more they come in, the more they will change the scene—for good or bad is a different matter, opinions may differ. We who sit here, many of us, belong to a generation which was brought up differently, that is, brought up through the medium of English, through English as a medium of education. Obviously, that is not being repeated even now in India, and will still less be repeated in the future, so that the whole context of this argument is changing.

The second point, which I think is important to bear in mind, is that the new world that is growing up in India is going to be a scientific, technological and industrial world. We talk about Five Year Plans and all that. We talk in terms of some project here, some there. But if you look at the whole picture, it is a picture of an entirely and absolutely new world growing up in India. It is the industrialisation of India, it is the industrial revolution coming to India in the middle of the twentieth century, rather belated no doubt, and trying to catch up with the developments of the twentieth century.

Now, may I ask, what has all that got to do with language? I say it has everything to do with language. We seem to think of language as something either writing in government files, may be for the primary or secondary schools, or may be for a *mushaira* or *kavi sammelan*. It is all that of course, I do not deny it; but it is something vast and something basic which moulds the people, and it has moulded all the activities

and occupation of the people. If this industrial revolution comes here, as it is coming and it is bound to come, it changes the texture of our thinking and it introduces words without number which you have to use in these new occupations, and all the efforts of Dr. Raghu Vira and Seth Govind Das cannot meet that situation, whatever it may be. They may produce volumes after volumes of artificial words, so called translations. Nobody will accept them, you can take it from me, because that language of science and technology will not come out of your classroom or translator's room. It will arise from the people who are working there.

These are two major developments that, I say, will affect language, because they affect our entire life, and the decisions that you may make will really be governed far more by these vast developments than by some technical resolution that you may or may not pass. I just wish to say that this is the background with which I should like to approach this question, with which I should like the House to approach this question, because, if I may say so with the utmost respects to this House, we Members of this House are able men, experienced men, but by and large we do not represent the scientific, technological, industrial world; "industrial" not in the sense of ownership of industry, but of the engineering side of it.

This is the world we are entering into, and this revolution is coming on. That revolution, as it has affected other countries, powerfully affects language, thousands and thousands of new words coming every year from technology, science etc., and those people who suggest to set up some translation bureaus for it. I respectfully say, have no conception of the meaning of those words. Translations of some scientific words and symbols which have grown out of certain contexts and conditions cannot be done so easily as if it is an artificial thing coming out from some slot machine; it is important to remember that.

Now, having said that and unburdened myself to that extent, I should like to say that this Committee of which my friend and colleague the Home Minister was the Chairman has done I think quite a remarkable piece of work. I do not pretend to agree with every line that they have written and I do not want anybody here to agree with every line that they have written. It was, after all, a very difficult problem, people thinking quite differently being brought together in a large committee and miraculously agreeing, except for one or two or three or two and a half, whatever it may be. It really is remarkable that this measure of agreement was brought about. Of course, when you seek such a measure of agreement you give up something here, something there, which I may like, which many of the hon. Members may like. I agree. But, broadly speaking, it was rather a remarkable feat and a feat which I doubt if anyone else except my colleague the Home Minister could have brought about. As I say, I do not like some emphasis here or some lack of emphasis there, but broadly speaking, in the way it has come out, I think it is a worthy report.

Now, some days ago or some weeks ago I had occasion to speak in this House on Shri Anthony's resolution on the English language, and it was my good fortune to say something which pleased Shri Anthony as well as some others. I am grateful to him for that. Whatever I said then—of course, I hold by it completely—I was not

laying down any statute or law, I was emphasising an approach, a mental approach. I was not considering what words to use in a Bill or something like that, but a mental approach to this problem.

Let us consider the facts apart, from our wishes, one of the basic facts today is that the medium of instruction has become the language of the region, the great language of India, whether it is Tamil, Telugu, Marathi, Gujarati, Hindi, whatever you may like. That is the basic fact, and the basic change that has come over India is coming over India which will produce a generation utterly unlike the generation to which I belong to is this, that education will be through an Indian medium and not English apart from some people who may consider English as their mother tongue, which is a different matter, that is the basic change.

I do not understand the importance, the relevance or the significance of this argument about Hindi—English etc. I am coming to that but once you grasp this basic fact that the great regional language of India are now progressively the medium of instruction, then you will appreciate the revolutionary change that is coming over India—for good or bad is another matter. It is an inevitable change which has to come, and I think it is a right change, although I realise that there are certain risks and dangers in it—I mean to say risks and danger of a certain measure of separatism. I realise that but you could not put an end to those risks by ignoring a problem, you have to face it.

So, the first thing is this major fact and it is that major fact that produces a certain result on the position of English in India I want you to realise that it is not a question of Hindi-English, it is a question of the 14 languages—or more than 14, if you like, even though they are not in the Constitution—principally, for education being carried on through that media that creates a situation which is broadly different from the time when many of us who went through schools or colleges got our education through the medium of English. That is the basic truth. Therefore, English inevitably becomes in India a secondary language. It is no longer the primary language. It does not matter what you may say about it, it becomes that the House knows very well the importance I attach to English, and I shall come to that presently. The basic fact is that English becomes a secondary language in India It is not the medium of instruction. It is a language to learn as a secondary language, may be some learn it as a compulsory secondary language, but it is a language which is a secondary language and it can never quite occupy that place in our mind because it has lost that place in our educational system except for a few. That is the first, basic fact to be remembered.

The second is, obviously we require some kind of common language link and the Constitution has said that Hindi should be that common official language link. Remember it is for official correspondence or whatever it is—official work—between the States having found, apart from any decision in the Constitution, that the position of English is bound to go down in that way, it will come up in another way as I would point out. The argument that may be advanced for English to be this kind of official language for India really becomes very weak if you realise the first fact Today, as

somebody has said, there are plenty of arguments in favour of English. In fact, the fact is, we do much of our work in English as everyone knows, and by a decree you cannot change it, because we have grown up into that tomorrow it may not be the case and the day after tomorrow it will still less be the case. These are the facts, you cannot ignore them, whatever your likes or my likes may be.

Therefore, you have a variety of reasons into which I need not go, but you have to have that common binding link for the language of India. You may again criticise Hindi; it is not good enough, it has not developed enough. It is there I will for a moment accept all your criticisms. Still, the fact remains, and it can reasonably be argued that no other Indian language, other than Hindi, would be more suitable mind you, I do not say that Hindi is in the slightest degree better than any other Indian language. In fact, I firmly believe that some of the Indian languages are richer in content and have a better literature than Hindi but that does not take away from the fact that all the languages have to develop and to influence each other.

Now, the real basic opposition, I take it, comes from a fear that Hindi, if it comes in, will mean a disparity for the non-Hindi knowing areas I say undoubtedly it will be a disparity. Let us face that. Let us not try to get over it and say anybody can learn it in a fortnight or in a month or a year. It will be a disparity for a considerable time I say a rule must be laid down by which we do absolutely nothing which creates a disparity for non-Hindi-speaking areas, in regard to matters like services and other things. Let that be quite clear I am quite clear about that.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

I am sorry I do not know what the quota system is, and I cannot accept anything. I do not know or understand. Take services I am perfectly clear in my mind that for any foreseeable time there should be no compulsory bar— compulsory knowledge of Hindi—to the recruitment of people in the services. None at all. If a man does not know one word of Hindi, still, he ought to be able to come in at that stage. But I would certainly have him learn Hindi. Of course, I want him to learn it at an earlier stage too. Very probably he will. I am merely saying that this feeling of disparity should vanish. Shri Frank Anthony said, “Oh, the Prime Minister said that there will be no imposition of language. Therefore, there should be no compulsory test in Hindi after coming in”. I do not see how that follows. It is not a question of a compulsory test in Hindi. We may very well have compulsory test in English. Do you object to that? I think every person who comes into the All India Services ought to pass a compulsory test in English. Will Shri Frank Anthony object to that? Probably not. I want that wider knowledge.

Suppose, an All India officer is going to Madras I would insist on his having a compulsory test in Tamil. These are the normal things that are done for convenience of administration and everything. The man for the All India service ought to know the language of the place he works in. He normally tries to learn it. Whether he knows it well or not I do not know. We send people abroad. To whatever country we send them, people in the Foreign Service are required, as a compulsory thing, to

learn certain foreign languages. Each person has to choose one or two or sometimes three foreign languages. So, you must not look upon it as an imposition. When I said that there should be no imposition of Hindi, what I meant was this. Whether it is Madras, Andhra, Kerala or whatever part it may be, I do not wish to impose a language on that State in the sense in which the State will take it. I know if they have a sense of pressure or imposition they react against it I do not want that if the State of Madras says, "We do not want compulsory Hindi", let them not have compulsory Hindi in their schools. As a matter of fact, there are more people learning the language voluntarily than perhaps in any other place in any other way. So I want to remove this sense of compulsion. I want to remove this idea that they will suffer in service or in the work or whatever it is. I want to remove that sense. I want all these things to develop voluntarily and in a spirit of cooperation and it is for us to adjust ourselves from time to time to these developments.

In this matter, as I said on the last occasion, we have to be flexible in our approach; no rigidity. I do not like dates and all that. We start movements and processes working which lead in certain directions and which we gradually adjust ourselves to.

I come to English. I had said that English should be an associate or additional language. What exactly did I mean by it? Well, I meant exactly what that means. That is to say, English cannot be, in India, anything but a secondary language in future. In the nature of things mass education will be in our own languages. English may be taught as a compulsory language—I hope it will be—to a large number of people; it cannot be to everybody but to a large number. It remains as a secondary language. But I say that Hindi, whenever it is feasible, comes into use progressively more and more for the inter-State official work. But English should have a place there; not a limited place. That is to say, English can be used by any State in writing to the Government or writing to each other. Remember that this internal State work will be done presumably in the State language. English comes in only on the question of dealings on the All India scale between States. To that, it should be open to anybody and to any State to do that in English. There is no limitation on that. We encourage them to do it in Hindi; if they can they can do. But there is no limitation. I say there is no limitation of time even to that, except when People generally agree,—and I had said that those very people in the non-Hindi speaking areas who might be allocated should agree. I am perfectly agreeable.

I would submit to this House and more especially to our colleagues from the Hindi speaking areas that if there is one thing—there are many forces at work in favour of the spread of Hindi and they are spreading Hindi and it is becoming richer—that is going to come in their way, it is sometimes their over enthusiasm and the way they approach this subject which irritates and rightly irritates others. It irritates me. I do not know about the non-Hindi-speaking areas.

Then there is another thing. The type of Hindi they produce is really a most extraordinary one. I am not worried about it; it is only irritating. Because I said that Hindi or any other language that will come up in India will come up from the masses; not from literary coteries.

But there are those gentlemen living in Lucknow who insist on calling it 'Dwichakri' is a very good translation.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX³

You could translate many things like that but every villager knows what a bicycle is. You go about translating it and say, “No; bicycle comes from some foreign language”. That approach is not good enough.

This is a very important matter— your absorbing this vast number of technical words in the form, as far as possible, that they are used internationally. It does not matter if they come from Greek or Latin. It does not matter if they come from English. But the point is, it is a body of language which you are not using for show. You want that knowledge; you want to advance industrially, technically, technologically and scientifically. You want to advance fast and every obstruction in the way will delay your advance or progress in that direction, which is essential for us to make good.

I need not say again about numerals. It is absolutely essential that we should use the international numerals. We might use any flowery way of writing we like, but in business, in science and technology, generally the international form of numerals should be universal in India in all the languages and should be the common factor for foreign languages too. Not that I object to any other form being used, but one should encourage in every serious work—I do not mind novels having anything—in every statistical work, the use of international numerals which immediately puts us on a line with others. You can take a book in almost any language— Russian, German or Japanese. You do not know the language, but it is a statistical book and you can easily understand it, because all the figures are in that form which you know. You understand the numerals. The headings you can change and you can marginally note it, so that you can use the world’s statistical tables. In Japan, they have adopted this; almost everywhere in the world they have adopted this. Immediately the door opens out to the world’s numerals, to the world’s statistics and everything; if you keep your statistics in that way, the world looks at your statistics. If you insist on keeping it in a particular way confined to you, you are cut off from the rest of the world. So, these things are obvious.

Language, of course, is a very vital thing. But behind it is something much deeper. It is the reaction —action and reaction and counteraction—of two powerful pulls. One is the pull of the past, which is important and which we have to maintain. The other is the pull of the future. The pull of the future means the pull of what might be called the modern world, of science, etc. I do not think that it would be right at all for us to ignore the pull of the past. It is vital to us; we have grown up in it. For all that India is after 5,000 years, we cannot cut it off. Among other things, that is where language comes in.

I have on a previous day expressed my great admiration of Sanskrit. There are many things, of course, but I do think that there is one thing which can embody the greatness of Indian thought and culture in the past; it is Sanskrit, which has been built up. We do not talk Sanskrit now no doubt, but the Indian languages of today have

either directly descended from Sanskrit, or the Southern languages have been closely allied with it. The background of thought of culture, whether it is Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and what not is closely allied to the background of thought and culture of the northern languages because of Sanskrit and its effect on the whole of India. I do not say all of it is good; we have to change it; we have to discard something, but there are the roots on which India has grown up. I think if we cut away those Roots, it will be very very bad for us; we become superficial human beings. Therefore, with all my admiration of foreign languages or English,—I want English to continue for a variety of reasons, as I have said—I can never ask our people to transplant their roots to English roots. It cannot be done and it would not be done under our democratic adult suffrage. It does not matter what you argue about it but this would not be done. Therefore, it is important. Language comes in as an important and as a continuing link for ages past, and that link has transferred from Sanskrit to our modern Indian languages. That is one thing, the great events of the past and the heritages that we have. The other is the future to which we look forward, a future which may be called, to a large extent influenced by modernism and the like, the modernism of the future, the spirit of the age, call it the *Yuga Dharma*, which is science, which is technology and the like. And I say so with all respect that all the languages of India put together cannot produce it in the foreseeable future, unless you have recourse to something else, to some other languages—of course, our language will be growing rapidly and our languages, I hope, will be developed with heavy books and thinking in science—because we have to spend millions and millions. Because, the moment you go to higher regions, it cannot be reproduced by artificial translations and textbooks. It is something entirely different.

Therefore, the real conflict in the mind of India today is—language is only a part of it—how to bring out a synthesis from this past, from this heritage of the past to what we want in the present. That is the conflict and it is a basic conflict. I do not know what the ultimate result of this will be.

I referred on the last occasion I spoke here to a lecture delivered by a very well known author and scientist about the two cultures. He was talking about England and the two cultures were literary culture and the culture of modern science. He said there was conflict even in England. I imagine, if that is so in England, what about this country where we are just barely entering the age of science. We glibly talk in terms of science. We are out of that age. Our minds are out of it. If I use industrial words, a rich man may buy up a textile mill and may make money out of it—rich people go on becoming richer and richer—but he understands nothing about industry. He can buy an expert and make money out of it, but he is not an industrialist; he knows nothing about science.

So, that is the basic conflict in the soul of India and many other countries too—this past that we value and that must be valued and the future that we ought to have if we want to survive. Because, we cannot survive with all the past that we have got, unless we add to it the future, the future of science, of technology and all that. How far we can bring about that synthesis, the future will show. I hope it win, because there is no other way.

Now, in our approach to language, broadly speaking, we should be flexible, because the moment rigidity comes in, difficulties come in, opposition comes in. And if we adopt this approach which is given, I think we shall succeed both on the issue of language and on that basic issue, the synthesis between old and the new.

BACK NOTE

XVII. Motion Regarding Report of Committee of Parliament on Official Language, 4 September, 1959

1. SHRI MAHANTY (Dhenkanal): Will you accept the quota system as was recommended by the Commission?
2. SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati): For the European language Greek if the common pool. What is the common pool here?
AN HON. MEMBER: Sanskrit.
3. SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (NOMINATED— ANGLO-INDIANS): Longer than that.

MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT REGARDING SITUATION IN WEST BENGAL

4 September, 1959

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Yesterday, after the question hour when you were pleased not to allow those adjournment motions, some hon. Members of the house on the other side approached me and spoke about this Calcutta situation. They said that the food situation there was very good now.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

That Prices had come down and that the harvest was very good, a promising one in other words, there may be some difference of opinion in the measure of improvement, but there was no doubt that prices had come down by as much as Rs 3 to Rs 5 or Rs 7 per maund. This was not said by them, I am saying this prices had come down. There is no doubt about it, that is, about these facts whether they said them or not, that the prices have come down by Rs 3 to Rs 7 per maund in that area, that the harvest is a very good one, and perhaps that is the reason why the prices have come down.

Further, in Bengal, even previously, about 50 percent of the people were rationed, they got ration cards, the entire population of Calcutta and a good part of the rural population that was so some time ago now, even this area has been expended, it is much wider, that is, rationing has been extended in the rural areas, to the smaller peasants or farmers. Now, that is the position I do not mean to say that everything is well in Bengal on the food front. But I would submit that it is not only improving, but is somewhat better than in some parts of India. That is, of course, nothing for me to be proud of, but it is so.

But I would submit that at the present moment we are not considering the food situation here only, the food situation is going to be considered in a big way tomorrow in Delhi by the national development council. We cannot consider the food situation in every bit of India, forgetting the rest of India, therefore, all the Chief ministers of States are coming here, along with their Food Ministers, for we consider it important to discuss this matter, not only from the point of view of the separate States but in its organic unity of India. There it is but the present position to which the hon. Member objects is relating to what is happening in Calcutta, part of Bengal. As a matter of fact nothing of the kind has happened. The army was called in yesterday I said at mid-day yesterday the army had not been called in. It was called in at 6 pm yesterday to Howrah, parts of Howrah, because there was a very bad trouble there I might mention that till three days ago the Chief Minister of Bengal deliberately did not issue firearms

to the police, because he did not want the use of firearms. When ambulance cars, milk vans were burnt, apart from buses.

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX²**

Ambulance cars do not even belong to the Government. Ambulance is not a government organization, It is a private organization. Milk vans which were distributing milk, large numbers of them, were burnt, apart from other damage and arson done. When the situation had become so bad, then only the Chief Ministers, under great pressure, agreed to the issue of firearms to the police, because the situation was getting bad with regard to arson, destruction, etc., not to mention other cars and buses which were burnt.

Yesterday in Howrah at first, in the course of the morning, there was some dispute between two sets of workers, one set, a large number of workers, who wanted to continue to work in the mills – and they did not approve of the hartal and, what is more, they did work for some time, for a good time – and another set which objected to their working. There was some trouble between them. And those workers did work in the mills for some time, I say. It was only after that ..

It was only after that, when that set of workers finished their work that day, that the trouble became worse in Howrah, Howrah town and the neighbourhood of Howrah, and the forces were sent for, the army was called on in aid of the civil power, and they went only to Howrah.

And what they have done thus far is this it is not a question of taking over the administration; very far from it. The troops carried out the following two things. They patrolled the Howrah police station area in vehicles, they laid a cordon round the jute mill in Dashnagar area etc. to enable the police to arrest miscreants suspected of causing loot, arson and murder the police arrested a number.

May I say that people die in these things, and it is not for us to shout too much about it but it is a manner of doing things that is sometimes even worse than that. Today's paper announces that a policeman was killed. Well, a policeman was killed. There it is, but how was he killed? He was pulled out and an attempt was made to cut, it decapitate him with a sword, that is utter brutality. I say (Several hon. Members: Shame) and I say it is utter, naked brutality and this is the kind of brutality that is being encouraged by this behavior and this action in Calcutta.

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX³**

It is not necessary for me to say much because the hon. Member opposite has confessed that he lost his equilibrium and I think he lost it unnecessarily because I would be inclined to agree with him even in respect of great deal that he said. Nobody likes, or does not deplore, what has happened in Calcutta. I brought a case

to the notice of the House because it was a very brutal and callous one; it is not a clash of people and people dying, which is unfortunate of course.

Now, the question is, there is a situation in Calcutta which has arisen because of a movement, - if you like, I am prepared to admit it; it is not a matter for discussion. The hon. Member may be right in saying that the attitude of the west Bengal Government is not good or bad in regard to food. That is a matter for discussion. You can discuss it, if you like but let us keep that separate.

The point is, that a movement was started the reason for that movement, if it was the 'food' reason, no longer exists that is my submission. Not finally, of course, but for the moment, it does not exist because the food situation is much better.

Now, certain conflicts have occurred between the government police forces and the rest, which is unfortunate always. We might really deplore them but it passes my comprehension what the Government is expected to do in these circumstances when large-scale arson is being done all over. I do not know whether it was done more than necessary, I am no judge at the present moment. Anyhow, I do submit that even though it may be said - as has been said- that many of the leaders of the Communist party of other groups who started this agitation are in prison or are detained, there are hon. Members opposite who can withdraw the agitation.

BACK NOTE

XVIII. Motion for Adjournment Regarding Situation in West Bengal, 4 September, 1959

1. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY (Basirhat): Who Said That?

SHRI TRIDIB KUMAR CHAUDHURI: I Repudiate that

MR. SPEAKER: Let the hon. Prime Minister go on in the end, hon. Members can have their say.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: They said -I say so firmly - that the food situation had greatly improved.

SHRI PRABHAT KAR: That was not said by us.

SHRI TRIDIB KUMAR CHAUDHURI: That is completely wrong (Interruptions)

2. SEVERAL HONORABLE MEMBERS: Shame

SHRI MUHAMMED ELIAS: From them they were shooting people throughout the city

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Did the hon. Member say that ambulance cars were shooting people?

SHRI NAGI REDDY (Anantapur): Is it not a fact that ambulance vans were used as police vans?

SHRI MUHAMMED ELIAS: It has been agreed by the Mayor of Calcutta and he has agreed that he will make an enquiry into the matter.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Honorable members have helped me- I thank them – that because the ambulance vans had policemen they had to be burnt, according to them. It that the argument of hon. Members opposite?

SHRI NAGI REDDY: When policemen began to shoot the people, naturally the people got angry. Are ambulance vans to be used as police vans?

3. MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order

SHRI NAGI REDDY: The Shooting of People is responsible for all these things.

MR. SPEAKER: I would request hon. Members to work as a team or as a party or as a group, the leader to command the rest of his following. Otherwise, I won't recognize the party as such.

SHRI TANGAMANI: You need not tell us about it.

MR. SPEAKER: I am here to tell it, Order please, otherwise we cannot control the House any organized group, one after the other, the leaders are here, let them elect a leader for the day and speak through him, and if he wants some other person to speak, I have no objection, if he is in possession of better facts. If all of them jointly want to speak, whom am I to call from the communist group? All of them simultaneously? Shri Hiren Mukerjee what does he wants to say?

SHRI H.N MUKERJEE (Calcutta Central): Sir, on behalf of our Group

MR. SPEAKER: Just a minute. Let the Prime Minister Finish.

AN HONORABLE MEMBER: What has he got to finish?

SHRI NAGI REDDY: He has made the last insinuation.

SHRI M. P. MISHRA (Begusarai): I want to ask a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order

SHRI M. P. MISHRA (Begusarai): I want to ask

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. Member is irrepressible. I will have to ask him to go out of the house, Shri Hiren Mukerjee

SHRI H.N MUKERJEE: Sir, you have permitted the Prime Minister to make certain circumstantial references on the basis of whatever information he has got in his possession, and that is why I am constrained also to have to refer to certain other things, and I hope you will permit me to make a reference to them.

The Prime Minister has referred particularly to one case where a policeman was dragged out or something like that happened and he was killed under circumstances which, from the paper reports, were certainly very regrettable and gruesome, I might add but, Sir, the Prime Minister chose to omit any reference to the fact that in only two day's time as many as twenty-seven people have been killed in Calcutta and in Howrah. If this account has any claim to veracity, in a few hours' time eleven people were killed in a small town which has not more than a population of three hundred to four hundred thousand people.

Now, what I want the government of this country always to bear in mind is this, that when in any particular part of the country, especially a strategic and a very important place like Calcutta, the greatest, city in this country, when in that area there is a movement - for good reason or bad reason, it is not for us at this moment to decide upon- when in that city there is a movement of which the leaders are taken away altogether, it is completely decapitated of its leadership by means of Preventive Detention, the West Bengal Security Act and a hundred other devices which are in

the armoury of the Government, the leadership is completely out of the picture, and second, third and fourth rank leaders have also been taken away, government itself in its press note says that as a result of the leadership not being there, the movement has got into the hands of anti-social elements- it may or may not be true-but the situation has arisen on account of a basic dissatisfaction with the food policy of the government, and particularly the personal vanity of one particular Minister, the Food Minister there, who refuses to follow the example of Shri A P Jain in Calcutta, as I said the other day in a parenthesis which perhaps escaped you, even Congress newspapers like Jugantar are saying that a shameless policy is being pursued I am not going into the details of that policy, because at this point of time it is not for me to say anything about it but I am astounded to see the attitude that is being displayed by the Prime Minister of this country when twenty-seven people are killed in two days' firing in Calcutta, which shows that he is completely callous in this regard and I remember how in regard to Bombay he has come with sack cloth and ashes to give Samyukta Maharashtra and Gujarat after he has killed more than two hundred people in the agitation over there. And he is supposed to be the most sensitive individual whom we are supposed to respect. We respect him a great deal, but he is forfeiting the respect of his country if he is going to adopt the attitude which he has done in this present debate.

I tell you, I beg of you to remember this, that in a part of our country which you cannot ignore—you cannot wish Bengal off the map of India, you cannot desire Calcutta to be wiped out at the map of India, you cannot wish it, it is there, and we are here by the mandate of the people—I wish you, I beg of you to bear in mind that in Calcutta there is agony, there is distress, there is torture and if we in Delhi sit and do nothing because a policeman has been killed in gruesome circumstances, because Communists have got to be made the scape-goats, because the vendetta has to continue till the Kerala elections happen, then I say good-bye to all hopes of democracy and progress under the leadership of the Prime Minister.

I beg of you to allow discussion of this in calmer circumstances. But I have lost my equilibrium because of the attitude displayed by the Prime Minister.

TALK BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT OF PAKISTAN AND THE PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA

4 September, 1959

The President of Pakistan reached Palam airport on the 1st September, 1959, soon after 11 o'clock in the morning. He was received by the Prime Minister and stayed at Palam about an hour and a half. For the greater part of this time, the President and the Prime Minister met by themselves and discussed various matters. Towards the end of this meeting, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, the High Commissioner of Pakistan in India, the High Commissioner of India in Pakistan and the Commonwealth Secretary of India were also invited to join in these talks. At the conclusion of this meeting, a joint statement was issued, a copy of which is attached.

The talks between the President and the Prime Minister were informal in nature and were very friendly throughout. The President of Pakistan expressed his strong desire for neighbourly relations between the two countries and said that there was no problem between them which could not be solved in a friendly way. The Prime Minister entirely agreed. No Particular subject was discussed in detail. Casual reference was made so some of the problems between the two countries and the President pointed out that if friendly relations could be established between the two countries and fears and apprehensions of both of them removed, this could result in a reduction, on both sides, of expenditure on armament and thus help in releasing moneys for economic development. The Prime Minister agreed and added that in India the primary objective that they had before them was social and economic development and that they have embodied their programmers in their Five Year Plans. They felt that from every point of view this social and economic development, resulting in the betterment of the people of the country as a whole, was an essential and urgent task. This involved necessarily a very heavy burden and any saving on Defence expenditure would be welcome indeed. Some reference was made to the discussions going on the Canal waters issue with the assistance of the representatives of the World Bank and the hope was expressed that these would lead to a satisfactory settlement.

Both the President and the Prime Minister expressed their great concern at the continuation of disputes and incidents on the eastern border. These incidents, often resulting in firing, had absolutely no justification and could do no good to anyone. They only harassed the local people concerned and vitiated the atmosphere between the two countries. It was agreed that everything should be done to put an end to these disputes and a procedure should be evolved for this purpose. Recently a Chief Secretaries' Conference had been held and the statement issued after this conference was a good one. The difficulty was not so much in laying down good principles, but

in implementing them. The President suggested that a high level conference should be held for this purpose. This conference should be at Ministerial level and senior Army Commanders and Chief Secretaries as well as representatives of the State Governments concerned should attend this conference. Attempt should be made to remove the causes of disputes wherever possible and demarcation of boundaries should be expedited. A procedure should also be evolved to deal immediately with any incident that might arise on the borders in the eastern region. Prime Minister entirely agreed with this proposal and it was decided that steps should be taken to have such a conference.

Reference was also made to the India Office Library in London and it was agreed that a joint approach should be made on behalf of India and Pakistan in regard to this Library.

A similar approach should be made about the old Embassy and Consulate buildings which had been financed from the revenues of the undivided Government of India, but which are still in the possession of the United Kingdom Government.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

The only reference to Kashmir was a single one. I think President Ayub Khan said that all our problems, even Kashmir, were capable of peaceful settlement. I agreed.

BACK NOTE

XIX. Talk Between the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India, 4 September, 1959

SHRI BRAJ RAJ SINGH (Firozabad): May I ask to know whether the Prime Minister has decided finally about paying a visit to Pakistan while on his way to Afghanistan or on his way back?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: There is no question of my deciding it. I have not considered it. It is not that I have any objection to doing so but in fact it is difficult. It is not on my way and it does not fit in with the programme which is a very tight one.

SHRI SUPAKAR: May I know if there were any talks or discussions about the Nehru-Noon agreement?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: No. There was no reference to it.

SHRI VAJPAYEE (Balrampur): The President of Pakistan is reported to have stated at Dacca that the question of Kashmir was raised at the meeting. May I know if it was really referred to and if so, the nature of the discussion held about it?

RESOLUTION REGARDING REFERENCE OF THE TIBET ISSUE TO THE UNO

4 September, 1959

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, The Resolution moved by the hon. Member appears to be a fairly simple one, simply-worded. But as the course of this debate has shown, behind that Resolution lie high international issues and big problems with big consequences. Now, I suppose everyone in this House has a feeling of the deepest sympathy at the sufferings of the Tibetan people. There is no doubt about that, as everyone knows, we have given refuge and asylum not only to the Dalai Lama but to nearly 13,000 others. In fact we have given refuge to everyone who came. I cannot remember the case of a single person whom we denied refuge in this case, in regard to Tibet. That itself was evidence of our feelings in this matter.

But feeling apart, our sympathy for the Tibetans apart, what exactly should we do about it? What exactly should we do even, let us say, to give expression to those feelings of sympathy? Some hon. Members have delivered rather brave speeches as to the evil deeds perpetrated by other countries. It is easy enough to talk about them and it is easy enough to find many faults in the ways the countries behave. But, if a country like India has to function, we have to function in a mature way, in a - considered way, in a way which at least promises some kind of results. It is absolutely—I should say respectfully—pointless for us to make brave gestures and it is worse than pointless if these brave gestures react and rebound on us and injure us or injure the cause which we seek to promote.

So far as this question of Tibet is concerned, we may look at it from many points of view- historical, cultural and other contacts with India, China, etc. It is a long and chequered history and one need not go into it. When a country has had a long and chequered history, it supplies enough material for any party to support any claim. The Chinese claim that Tibet was subject to their sovereignty or suzerainty—I do not know what word they use—for hundreds of years. The Tibetans claim that they were independent for many periods except when they were forced into some kind of subservience. Now, really this may be interesting to the historical students, but it does not help us. It is a fact, of course, that for a period of 40 years or so, for all practical purposes, ever since the Manchu Dynasty fell or a little after that, Tibet was practically independent; even so not hundred per cent, even so China never gave up her claim. But in effect it was independent.

As I said, it does not help us very much. Of course, if this question arose in the International Court of Justice at the Hague—of course, it will not; such questions do not arise there because national States do not take them there and China, anyhow,

believe, that we had received some assurances from the Chinese Government that they wanted to settle it peacefully by negotiation, and therefore the inclusion of this item on the agenda be adjourned. This suggestion was supported by the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Australia, Soviet Union, and for its own reasons no doubt, even by what might be called Kuomintang China in Formosa. The item was postponed. The postponement was agreed to.

On what basis did the Jamsaheb say that we had received assurances from the Chinese Government? I am sorry I have not got the exact papers with me, but so far as I can remember, we had received a message from the Chinese Government in answer to our representations and to our requests to the effect that they wanted to settle it by negotiation and in a peaceful way. In fact, I think they had stopped the march of their army somewhere near the eastern borders of Tibet.

Also, some representatives of the Tibetan Government sent by the Dalai Lama were to proceed to Peking to discuss this matter. In those days, until quite recently, the easiest and simplest way for a person going from Lhasa to Peking was via India. It was much more difficult to go via the Gobi desert and all that. In fact, even after the People's Government of China came into power, on several occasions they sent their representatives or their other people via India to Tibet. It was simpler from Calcutta right up to Gangtok in Sikkim and through Nathu La onwards. The Tibetan representatives, on their way to Peking, came to Delhi. It was more or less natural. Also, I suppose, they wanted to consult us. This happened ten years ago, and I have no very clear recollection of the sequence of events. I know they remained in Delhi for rather a long time; why exactly it was not clear to me. Anyhow they did. It was this sequence of events that led us to make that suggestion in the United Nations, and the matter was not discussed.

Afterwards, as a matter of fact, there was no proper negotiation with the team that the Tibetans sent. Long before they reached Peking, the other developments took place in Tibet. I think the Chinese army started marching again and the Dalai Lama and his representatives came to an agreement with them. Maybe, of course, the agreement might have been under compulsion of events, under pressure, but it was an agreement signed in behalf of the Dalai Lama, etc.

May I say this in this connection? The hon. Member Shri Vajpayee stated that the Dalai Lama came to the 17-point agreement with China because of certain assurances that I gave him and further that this was after the Chinese Prime Minister's visit to India. He has got these things rather mixed up. There was no question of my giving any assurance, and the Chinese Prime Minister had not come to India and I had not gone to China, I had not met the Chinese Prime Minister at the time of this so-called 17-point agreement between the People's Republic of China and the Dalai Lama's Government, whatever it was so, the question of any assurances from us does not come in at all. The only thing that we accepted was—based on the message received

from the Chinese Government— what the Jamsaheb said in the United Nations Security Council, namely, that the Chinese said they wanted a peaceful settlement of this question and on the basis of that, it was not considered.

After that, there was this 17 point agreement in which some stress was laid on the autonomy of Tibet. Again it would be wrong to say that this stress on autonomy was included there because of our pressure and our desire. Certainly, it was our desire undoubtedly but when the agreement was concluded we were not there, we were not asked to express our opinion. It was between the Chinese Government and the Tibetans. So it is not correct to say that they had given us an assurance which they broke later.

What happened was that, several years afterwards, when Premier Chou En-Lai came here, we had talks about Tibet and the Dalai Lama too was here at that time. The talks I believe were really initiated by Premier Chou En-Lai and he wanted to explain to me—he did explain—what their position was in regard to Tibet, not because he was answering some charge made by me or because he thought that it was incumbent on him to do so, but because he felt—I take it—that we had friendly relations and he had to try to convince me of China's position and case.

He began by telling me that Tibet had always been a part of the Chinese State 'always' meaning for hundreds and hundreds of years. Occasionally when China was weak, that sovereignty was not exercised properly, but he said Tibet had always been a part of Chinese State. That was his case. He further added but Tibet is not China proper. It is part of the Chinese State. It is not the Hun people there Chinese are the Hun people, but these are the Mongols, Manchus Tibetans, etc. Tibet, he said, is not a province of China, it is an autonomous region of the Chinese State and we want to respect that autonomy. That is what he told me. In fact, he went on to say that some people imagined that we want to thrust communism on Tibet. That is absurd, because the Tibetans socially speaking, are so backward that communism is very far from the Tibetan state of affairs now. But he said, certainly it is a very backward State and we want to make them progress socially economically, etc.

Even then that is, three years ago, some trouble had started internally in Tibet or rather on the eastern border of Tibet particularly in an area which was not in Tibet proper, but it was Tibetan really in population—the Kham area which was on the eastern border of Tibet but inhabited by Tibetans. The portion had been incorporated in China a little while ago. I forget when—not now anyway, but previous to all this. The Tibetans there, the Khampas, did not take kindly to certain Chinese measures, because although the Chinese Government left Tibet proper more or less untouched in the sense of any so called land reforms or any other reforms politically they held Tibet firmly. But they did not interfere— that is what Premier Chou En-Lai told me “We do not wish to interfere, let them gradually develop themselves”. But in this eastern part which was considered a part of China—they treated it as a part of China—

this ultimately led to the Khampa rebellion there, a kind of guerilla rebellion, which had already lasted for a fair time a year or more, when Premier Chou En-Lai came here three years ago. We did not discuss that. But he referred to it and said, we do not wish, to interfere with the Tibetans, with their internal structure, internal autonomy, social custom, religion or anything; but we would not, of course, tolerate rebellion and foreign interference etc Well, I do not know what he meant or thought when he said foreign interference or imperialist interference, but I find that they had some kind of a kink in their minds, not so much, I think, of India having anything to do with it, but of foreign countries, United Kingdom or America somehow making incursions into Tibet, because they had got those countries in their mind. They have not quite realized that the United Kingdom has absolutely no interest in Tibet since they left India. They just cannot reach it. They have no means, no representative there, they have nobody there even to give them any news and, to my knowledge, neither has the United States, in fact. The only representative in Tibet of any other country is that of India, the Consul-General, probably the Soviet Union also, possibly also Mongolia. But what I meant to say was there were no Europeans or Americans. Anyhow this is what he told me the rebellion is going on. So, we had this talk and you may call it what you like. But it was more an explanation to me. It was not some kind of an assurance extracted by me from Premier Chou En-Lai. I say this because people might say oh, you did this because of that guarantee given to you. It was not a guarantee in that sense. It was certainly something which, when I heard, pleased me, about the autonomy of Tibet etc. But I have no business to call him to account saying “you guaranteed and you are not doing it”, in that sense, though I must say that I was pained when, because of other developments, the structure of the autonomy broke down completely.

Well, this internal revolt in Tibet gradually spread month after month, year after year. It spread slowly from the east westwards. And I have personally little doubt that the great majority of Tibetans, even though they did not during this period participate in it, sympathised with it; I have no doubt about it and that is for obvious reasons, not on any high grounds but for the simple reason that the Tibetans, like others, have a strong nationalist sense, and they resented those whom they considered outsiders coming in and upsetting their life and all the structure in which they lived. So, this spread and then other things happened.

One need not go into the detailed history but the trouble in Lhasa itself, partly of course, I think, may have been caused by various activities of the Chinese governors. Where a ruler, an outsider, an alien ruler has to deal with the population which is not friendly, well, the relationship can well be imagined. It is not a healthy relationship. The ruler is afraid, the people are afraid, both of each other. And when fear governs the relations of two parties, it is likely to lead to bad results. In fact, wherever a country is a subject country, which is an unhealthy relationship. Well, that led to this upheaval in Tibet and the Dalai Lama's flight from Lhasa, coming to India and so on and so forth. After that I have no accurate news of what has happened.

I think we may broadly say that there has been strong military pressure on several parts of Tibet and the Tibetans enjoy far from autonomy under the military government there. It may be that the stories that we hear about happenings inside Tibet are exaggerated, because most of the stories inevitably come from refugees, and refugees, however good they may be, having suffered themselves, are apt to give rather a colored picture, and the picture is not of what they have seen or what they have heard. So, it goes on increasing. So, it may be that the stories are exaggerated but as a responsible person I cannot repeat those stories till I have some kind of a proof. But whether they are exaggerated or not there can be little doubt that a great deal has happened in Tibet which is deplorable and that the people of Tibet have suffered much and that it can certainly not be said that it is a happy family living together.

Previously when this matter came up before this House I said that our -approach to these problems was governed by two or three factors. Among these I mentioned two—our sympathy for the Tibetan people and our desire to maintain friendly relations with China. Now, that may appear to be something contradictory and it does in the present context slightly contradict each other. That is the difficulty of the situation. But that does not get away from our basic approach which is governed by these two factors. The third factor, of course, is and always will be the integrity of India and the freedom of India. It is our first duty to protect that. Why do I say that? Because I want to repeat that any step that we may take now cannot be taken in a huff, if I may say so, because we are angry and we do something regardless of the consequences of that step. We work not only in the present but for the future—for the distant future. I have always thought that it is important, even essential if you like, that these two countries of Asia, India and China, should have friendly and as far as possible co-operative relations. It is a remarkable fact of history—and I do not think you will find it duplicated elsewhere at any time—that during these two thousand years of relationship between India and China they have not had any kind of military conflict. It has been a cultural relationship. It has been to some extent a trade relationship. It has been a religious association. Throughout these long periods, they were not passive countries. They were active, positive countries. They went in those days, not like the later days in India when we did become a passive, inert country, tied down by caste and do not cross the seas and do not touch this man and do not see that man—that type of country we developed—our people went on adventures. They went all over the south eastern seas. They established colonies. They established, not empiricist colonies, but independent colonies. In fact, the effect of India all over the south eastern region was tremendous. You see it today. So also was the effect of China there. So these two great big powerful countries were constantly meeting and yet there was no conflict. It is a remarkable fact of history. Certainly nowhere in Europe will you ' find such a thing or, for the matter of that, in Asia.

Now it seemed to me that in the future it would be a tragedy not only for India, and possibly for China, but for Asia and the world if we develop some kind of

permanent hostility. Naturally friendship does not exist if you are weak and if you are looked down upon as a weak country. Friendship cannot exist between the weak and the strong, between a country that is trying to bully and the other who accepts to be bullied. Whether it is an individual or a group or a country that does not happen. It is only when people are more or less equal, when people respect each other that they are friends. So also nations. But subject to that we did work for the friendship of India and China. May I say that in spite of all that has happened and is happening today, that is still our objective and we shall continue to work for it. That does not mean that we should surrender in anything that we consider right or that we should hand over bits of territory of India to China to please them. That is not the way to be friends with anybody or to maintain our dignity or self-respect. But, in the long run, it is of importance for these two great countries, whatever their internal structures and policies might be, to be friends.

I know that, sometimes, it is difficult it to feel friendly when one hears things that irritate, that anger, when we see that our people have not been treated even courteously, when we receive communications from the Chinese Government, which are singularly lacking in even ordinary politeness. All that is irritating. But, then, it is easy enough for anyone to get angry and irritated. It is necessary for people who hold responsible positions not to allow themselves to be irritated, certainly to maintain the dignity of the country and the continuity of our policy too.

Many people charge us. "What about your famous Panch Sheel, where are those five principles, dead and gone and buried or cremated?" Call it whatever you like. That indicates a completely wrong approach to this question. What is Panch Sheel? Panch Sheel or the five principles,— they did not become principles because they were embodied in a treaty between India and China—they stand by themselves, principles of international relationship which we hold to be correct and we shall hold to them even if all the world says 'no' to them. Of course, it is obvious that if the other party does not agree to them, that relationship does not subsist. The principles remain true all the same when people are wise enough, they come back to them. Therefore, there is no question of Panch Sheel failing. It may be, if you like, the question of India failing or China failing, but, the principles remain. This is the outlook.

If you will permit me to go slightly outside the purview of this Resolution, we have to face certain difficult situations on our borders and elsewhere the treatment accorded to our people in Tibet by the Chinese authorities. I may inform the House that the first thing that I do every morning is to open a bunch of telegrams, a pretty big bunch. I should imagine that in every bunch there are at least five or six dealing with this affair either from Peking or Lhasa or Gyantse or Yatung, just the latest happenings, the latest developments. Of course, the telegrams we get from Gyantse, Yatung and Lhasa cannot tell us about the happenings in Tibet, because they have no communication with the rest of Tibet. They can only see more or less round about the Consulate or the Trade agency and tell us what are the happenings today. There

are petty problems arising. Almost every morning, usually, at least, I start the day not in a too pleasant mood, because of these messages. I try to overcome that I am getting accustomed to some extent to do that.

We have got to deal with these difficult problems these border incidents. If anyone asks me, as they sometimes do, what do the border incidents indicate frankly, I do not know what might be in the minds of the other party whether it is just local aggressiveness, or just to show us our place, if I may use a colloquial phrase, so that we may not get uppish or whether it is something deeper I do not know.

I might inform the House that only last evening we received a fairly long reply from the Chinese Government. That is a reply to the protest. I had sent a few days ago about these incidents on the North East Frontier border. It is a fairly long reply. It will, naturally, require very careful consideration. But, broadly speaking, the reply is a repudiation of our charge that they had come on our territory, that they had started firing on our patrol there and charging us with having come on their territory and having opened fire on them that is, complete conflict in the facts, reversal of the facts here.

Of course, we shall examine that reply carefully because it is a long and more or less argued note, with lots of places mentioned and other things. And we shall send them a reply fairly soon, that is, in the next two or three days.

May I also repeat what I said here that before this House rises in this session, I hope to place a White Paper before the House containing correspondence between the Chinese Government and our Government ever since the treaty between India and China in regard to Tibet, that is, during the last five years, so that the House may have the background of what has been happening?

Now, all this is there. We have, on the one hand, naturally to protect our borders. And when I say that, I want to hold myself and somewhat restrain my powerful reactions so as not to go too far, in, let us say, military measures and the like, because, when nations get excited and all their prestige is involved, then, step by step, they are driven often in wrong directions. So we try, at any rate, to balance in the sense of a firm policy where we think we are in the right, nevertheless, with always a door open to accommodation, a door open to a settlement, wherever this is possible.

Broadly speaking, in regard to this border, that is, the border incidents, as I have just mentioned, they say that we have committed aggression. Now, it is a question of fact, whether this village or that village or this little strip of territory is on their side or on our side. Normally, wherever these are relatively petty disputes, well, it does seem to me rather absurd for two great countries or two small countries immediately to rush at each other's throat and to decide whether two miles of territory are on this side or on that side, and especially, two miles of territory in the high mountains,

did it. As people do not live there, by and large, it does not make any difference. It did not make any difference. At that time, nobody cared about it.

Now, the question arose. We are prepared to sit down and discuss those minor things. But discuss it on what terms? First, treaties, existing maps etc. Secondly, usage, what has been the usage all these years. Thirdly, geography. By geography, I mean physical features like water-sheds, ridge of a mountain, not a bit of plain divided up. Those are convenient features for international boundaries.

I have gone out of my way to refer to these various matters in connection with this Resolution which deals with a simpler issue. Coming back to this particular Resolution, quite apart from the sympathy which the hon. Mover and some other hon. Members feel for the Tibetans, if we take an action, it should be justifiable in law and in constitution and we should hope for some results, some results which will help us to achieve the objective aimed, at.

Looking at it from the point of view of justification, the United Nations may come into the picture for two reasons. One is, violation of human rights and the other, aggression. Now, violation of human rights applies to those who have accepted the Charter of the United Nations, in other words, those members of the United Nations who have accepted the Charter. Strictly speaking, you cannot apply the Charter to people who have not accepted the Charter, who have not been allowed to come into the United Nations.

Secondly, if you talk about aggression, aggression is by one sovereign independent State on another. As I told you, in so far as world affairs are concerned, Tibet has not been acknowledged as an independent State for a considerable time, even long before this happened—much less after. Therefore, it is difficult to justify aggression.

Now, you may say that these may be rather legal pleas. But I am merely pointing out a constitutional aspect of and the difficulties and the procedures involved.

Then, I come to a certain practical aspect. And that is what good will it achieve? Suppose we get over the legal quibbles and legal difficulties, it may lead to a debate in the General Assembly or the Security Council wherever it is taken up, a debate which will be an acrimonious debate, an angry debate, a debate which will be after the fashion of cold war. Having had the debate what then will the promoters of that debate and that motion do? Nothing more. They will return home after having brought matters to a higher temperature, fever, heat, they will go home. They have done their duty because they can do nothing else.

Obviously, nobody is going to send an army to Tibet or China. If that was not done in the case of Hungary which is in the heart of Europe and which is more allied to European nations, it is fantastic to think they will move in that way in Tibet. Obviously

not. So, all that will happen is an expression of strong opinion by some other countries denying it and the matter being raised to the level of cold war—brought into the domain of cold war—and probably producing reactions on the Chinese Government which are more adverse to Tibet and the Tibetan people than even now. So, the ultimate result is no relief to the Tibetan people but something the reverse of it.

The question, both from the constitutional and the legal point of view, is not clear. In fact, persons who have examined it think that it is difficult to bring it there. And, from the practical point of view also there is no good result. Then, what exactly is the purpose of taking that subject, except maybe to satisfy some kind of urge to show sympathy or to show that we are angry. I can understand that urge certainly. But we must not allow the urge to take the reins into its hands and take us away with it to unknown regions and dangerous regions. Therefore, I am unable to accept this resolution and I would suggest to the House also not to accept it.

BACK NOTE

XX. Resolution Regarding Reference of the Tibet Issue to the UNO, 4 September, 1959

1. AN HON. MEMBER: That is a fact.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That is a fact. I am talking about the sequence of events; that I am speaking from memory.

2. DR RAM SUBHAG SINGH: What is the boundary, according to the latest report? What is the boundary which they have indicated according to the latest reply that we have received from them?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: How can I say that without a large map, all kinds of little things about villages and all that? The present dispute about that matter is relatively a small matter whether it may be two miles this side or that side is not a very big thing, but I do not know what their map is, here, there and elsewhere. So far as I am concerned, I have often stated how our frontier from the Burma border right up to the Bhutan border is the MacMahon Line, we hold by that.

SHRI ACHAR (Mangalore): Do they...

MOTION REGARDING WHITE PAPER ON INDO-CHINESE RELATIONS

12 September, 1959

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this debate has brought out a large number of points and I should like to deal with many of them. Yet I feel that it would perhaps be better to lay stress on the highlights of this debate, if I may say so, rather than lose myself in a lot of detail.

The recent letter which I received from Premier Chou-En-Lai raises many points and naturally we shall have to reply to it after full consideration and not in a hurry, and that consideration is being given to it. I do not propose to deal with that letter here in this discussion, partly because this House does not require to be convinced of many of the things that perhaps premier Chou-En-Lai might require to be told, and partly also because that would mean losing myself in a great deal of detail.

Now, first of all, let me take up one simple but very basic point that Shri Karni Singhji has raised. He made a rather remarkable statement that he believed in Panchsheel provided that it was with people whom you agreed with. That is really, if I may say so a perfectly remarkable statement. I believe in being tolerant provided you agree with me. Otherwise, I will not knock your head",— this is his idea of toleration and tolerance. This is his idea of Panchsheel. Some hon. Members said "We must stand on our own feet." Some other hon. Members said "You must seek the help of others" Well, people who say this seem to be, in spite of all their gallant language and brave behaviour, weak, timid, panicky and alarmist. That is not how a nation meets the challenge—looking around, seeing "How can anybody help me, who is going to help me". How is anybody going to help you, if you are not strong enough to face the challenge? I say, let this be clearly understood I as Prime Minister, and my Government, stand on it—that we will stick to our policy of non-alignment. We will stick to our policy call it what you like. It is not my policy, it is an axiomatic truth—the Panchsheel—whether we agree, or China does not agree, it is immaterial— it is an axiomatic position, I say and I challenge anyone to show it is a wrong position. You may say "If somebody lies, you break his head." That is a different matter. You may say "Oh, don't tell the truth because the other fellow lies." Is that your position?

Some of the observations made this afternoon here, I venture to say were quite extraordinary, even in excitement I can understand a measure of excitement, even warm feeling and a desire that no one should touch or sully the honour of India, the integrity of India, the selfrespect of India—I can understand all that. But Dr. Ram Subhag Singh's talk about bombing hillsmen in the mountains seems to show that he has lost his balance and there is no balance left. He neither understands bombing, nor mountains, nor human beings, nor anything. It is only an exhibition of petulant excitement and anger. And if this country is going to behave in petulant excitement and anger, how would it face a crisis? Is this Parliament going to behave in this way.

It is a most extraordinary thing and I am wondering what would happen if we took some of the suggestions made here. Exactly where would we land ourselves if everybody is to break the other's head? And many hon. Members said: not an inch of our territory, not an inch of our territory. All these brave gestures, if you would permit me to say so, have very little meaning. Certainly, not an inch of our territory or anything, if somebody forces or compels me, because we must never submit to compulsion or force in a matter of this kind. It is not a question of an inch, or yard or a mile, it is a question of submitting to compulsion, submitting to force, and we will never submit to force, whatever happens to our country.

But what do these gestures mean? I dislike this flamboyant language of an inch of territory and all that, sitting here in Parliament, not realising what it means. I dislike this business of going about bombing everybody, because you dislike his face or what he has said or done. There are many things said or done which one dislikes. Acharya Kripalani has accused me of some things. He may be right in his accusation. But I do hope he is not right when he accused me of over-politeness. I am not normally accused of that.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹

He talked about Gandhiji. Whatever Gandhiji might have said, he did not shout as some of us do. His action was strong undoubtedly and firm but his voice was gentle-gentle to the opponent, gentle to the enemy, gentle to everybody, always trying to win over the other person. We do not pretend to be Gandhis, because we are hardly fit to be even distant followers of his. But I do believe that at any time in International affairs, it is the gentle and firm voice that should be raised, not this shouting voice that we have got accustomed to, this cold war voice, this just cursing each other, closing everybody's mind—where nothing counts but the bomb of Dr. Ram Subhag Singh. Dr. Ram Subhag forgets.

..... XXX XXX XXX²

I accept that completely. But Acharya Kripalani said something more. He said: you must shout; you must speak in a loud voice.

..... XXX XXX XXX³

It is a small matter. But I would submit that we are dealing with very serious issues, end such issues are not solved by mere exhibition of excitement. Certainly and obviously, at any time, more especially in such moments, we have to be firm. And we have to be firm, realising where one has to be firm. It is not being firm in the air or being firm about everything, good, bad or indifferent. There are important things and unimportant things. One has to be firm about important things and one sticks to that, come what may.

But if one tries to be firm about everything it means one is not firm at all. That is only talking firmly which is not acting firmly because there are certain physical and actual disabilities, which you cannot survive. Nobody can. A great country, the United States of America, a great country like the Soviet Union—they are the super powers—

know the limitations of firmness. They are very firm countries but they know the limitations of firmness and they stop at a certain limit otherwise they would have gone in for a war by this time and would have destroyed the world. We talk loosely. This kind of talk, namely, let us be firm, let us do this, let us fight and let us shed every drop of blood—this kind of thing, may I say, rather takes us away from the main questions that we are discussing, which are difficult. The position is a serious one.

Now I say that Premier Chou-En-Lai's last letter in some parts is worded in relatively soft language and in some parts he talks about the *status quo* being kept, talks, negotiations etc. But basically that letter raises some issues which are very serious and which have been raised in that form officially almost for the first time.

As I was sitting here, I was reading certain reports of discussions in Peking in some Congress that is being held there where Premier Chou-En-Lai spoke more or less on the lines of this letter and where other people spoke. Of course, it does not require any particular brilliance to know that everyone spoke on those same lines, supporting Premier Chou En Lai, namely,—

“Express their great surprise to find Mr. Nehru defending British Imperialism So and so asked Mr. Nehru. On whose behalf was he speaking in defending British imperialism? Now Prime Minister Nehru and the Indian Government treat the aggressive plot of British Imperialism against China in the last century as an accomplished fact Does this accord with the five principles advocated by Mr. Nehru. ...” and so on and so forth. There is plenty of it. Just as many hon. Members have said something about the MacMahon Line strongly saying: stick to it: do not budge an inch etc.—I forget who said it, but I seem to have lead it somewhere—they were equally strong against the MacMahon line there. So, here we are.

Obviously a question like this cannot be solved by resolutions in Delhi and in Peking or by strong language hurled at each other. Other ways have to be found—either peaceful or war like. Every sensible person here and elsewhere wants to avoid war in such matters or in any matter. It is quite clear. The most powerful nations in the world are trying their utmost today to find a way outside war, and for us to think and talk of war seems rather ridiculous in this context of things.

It is perfectly different for us to say and for the weakest and the smallest nation to say and for an individual to say: I will not submit to evil, come what may. It is quite a different thing I will not submit to it. I will not submit to coercion. I will not submit to dishonour. That is quite a different thing. Even a single individual can say that, according to Gandhiji's teachings or any teaching. Any country can say that That is different from a country in the pride of its might saying, “Oh! we shall do this or that with our armies and bombs etc.” It is a very different thing. The two approaches are completely different.

Now, what is happening in China today? And I say so, I do not wish to use strong words, but it is the pride and arrogance of might that is showing in their language, in their behaviour to us and in so many things that they have done. It is that.

And it is not a question of this mile on this side of the MacMahon line or that mile on that side. They are small matters, I say again. But it is not a small matter, the other thing, that they showed in their maps a large tract of Indian territory and called it Chinese territory. That is not a small matter because—you may say that you will not give an inch of the MacMahon Line, I will give it if I find that it is" wrongly there, what is the good of saying these things—the MacMahon Line is a broad line between Bhutan and the Burma border and it goes on to Burma. In some places it is quite definite, in some places it is not definite, it is not marked in some places. And you have to go by other indications. The broad approach of the man who drew that line was that it should be on the watersheds. It was a good approach. But we have deliberately left the watersheds in one or two places. Therefore, when I say I stick to the MacMahon Line, what I mean is that I stick to that broad approach. But if by evidence or facts, whatever it is, a slight deviation in the alignment is necessary, it is not a major matter. And that has to be decided by facts and not by anybody's coercion.

And when I talked about so-called mediation and conciliation—and I even used the word arbitration—what did I mean? I meant that in these minor alignments, etc. or in these minor questions that have arisen, wherever they may be, whatever it is—I forget the names of these places, Longju and Hoti and other places, these are the alignments. Hoti is not of course on the MacMahon Line, it is on the UP side—these alignments can always be talked about in a peaceful way, in a friendly way, and slightly altered here and there if there is enough evidence.

But that is not what we are considering today. We have always been ready for that. We are considering something much bigger, and that is a claim, the claim laid down in the Chinese maps which for the first time, mind you now in this last letter of Premier Chou-En-Lai and the speeches delivered now in their Congress is taking shape more definitely. At first, whenever the maps were referred to, it was said, "Oh, these are old maps, we will revise them." It was a totally inadequate answer. Well, it was some kind of an answer, postponement of an answer if you like. But now the real thing is that this is held out as something more definite. They hold by it, not the exact line, we do not know exactly where their line is, and it is impossible to discover large tracts of Indian territory. That kind of treatment or behaviour does seem to me, if I may use the word, very improper for one nation to treat another, even much more so when the nations have been friendly. And that is the point that has arisen.

The question is, again I repeat, for the moment do not worry about these petty spots. A petty spot is important if coercively and aggressively even a yard of territory is taken from us. Because, it is not a yard of territory that counts but the coercion. But all those petty spots are capable of, sitting down and some kind of solution. Because, it makes no difference to China or India whether a few yards of territory in the mountain are on this side or on that side. But it makes a great deal of difference if that is done in an insulting, aggressive, offensive, violent manner, by us or by them. All that counts.

Now, I have been accused, with some justification, that I have kept matters from Parliament, these important matters. (An Hon. Member: Why some?) I beg of you,

mediation, conciliation. There can be no mediation, conciliation or arbitration about these demands of the Chinese about large chunks of territory. It is quite fantastic and absurd basing their demand on what happened in past centuries. As I said in the other House the other day, if this argument is applied, I wonder how much of the great Chinese State would survive these arguments. How did the Chinese State, this huge State, mighty State, build itself up—by the doctrine of Panchsheel or what? In the past it built itself up by conquest obviously, all parts of it. Whether it was a few years ago, a hundred, 200 or 500 years ago, it was built up by conquest, as all great States have been built up by conquest, violent conquest, and if you apply that theory, the Chinese State was not born complete in itself when civilisation began. So, that argument of British imperialism can well be countered with past, if not present. Chinese imperialism which obviously functioned. One might say, as I said the other day, in the old days Asoka's empire, the Kushan empire and Chandra Gupta's empire spread over half of Central Asia and Afghanistan and all over; therefore, we should lay claim to that. It is an extraordinary argument, this kind of thing. The whole reason of that argument simply takes you back to past ages of history upsetting everything. It really is the argument of a strong and aggressive Power. Nobody else would use it. I have a feeling that as there is a certain paranoia in individuals, sometimes there is a paranoia in nations, and one sees that, so that in this matter let us come to basic facts.

The basic facts are these. Number one, that this Chinese claim which was vaguely set down in maps etc., is becoming more definitely stated now. That is a claim which it is quite impossible for India or almost any Indian ever to admit whatever the consequences. That is quite clear. There is no question of mediation, conciliation or arbitration about that, because that is absurd. As somebody said, Shri Khadiilkar I think, it involves a fundamental change in the whole geography of it, the Himalayas being handed over as a gift to them. This is an extraordinary claim. This is a thing, whether India exists or does not exist, cannot be agreed to. There the matter ends.

Now, having said that, so far as lines of delimitation etc., are concerned, these are matters always for argument provided the approach is a Peaceful one. Take Long Ju. We have said so, you have seen the letter. We think that Long Ju is on our side or the line, just on our side within about half a mile of it. They say it is not. We think we have a good case, but I leave that out. We have said we are prepared not to go out to Long Ju. You get out too and then the matter can be considered by maps, charts, whatever it is, because it is a minor rectification and it does not make much difference provided it is peacefully done. Or, any other minor point like that we are prepared to consider in this day, but not this light demand of handing over the Himalayas to them. That we are not prepared to consider.

Again, there is this MacMahon Line that I referred to. There is the border of U.P., Himachal Pradesh and Punjab. There, when we had this treaty about Tibet in 1954, a number of passes were mentioned, that is passes meant for pilgrims and others to go over, and traders. Those passes themselves in a sense laid down the frontier, and the claim now made here and there, at in the letter, to the Shipki La pass etc., is undoubtedly a breach of that agreement of 1954 in so far as the passes are concerned.

Then there was one question which was put to me—I am sorry to repeat Dr. Ram Subhag Singh's name. It was a very interesting question. In Premier Chou's letter, he had referred to a telegram which we received from Tibet—from Lhasa—in 1947. It is true The point which Premier Chou made was that even then, in 1947, that is, soon after we became independent. Tibet claimed territory from us. That was his argument. It is that we received a telegram from the Tibetan Bureau in Lhasa, which was forwarded to us by our Mission in Lhasa, claiming the return of Tibetan territory on the boundary of India and Tibet A reply was sent by us,—it did not say exactly what reply was sent by us in 1947— demanding the assurance that it was the intention of the Tibetan Government to continue relations on the existing basis until new agreements are reached on matters that either party may wish to take up.

Now, what the telegram means, I do not know. But this House should remember that when we discuss these small border disputes, whether it is Migyitun or this or that, all these are standing disputes with the old Tibetan Government, even in British times certain small areas which were points of dispute between the then Government of India and the Tibetan Government. There were some new disputes too. It may be that this telegram refers to those areas in disputes, relatively small areas.

Here is another instance of what we call the new approach of the Chinese Government to us, or, perhaps, an intensification of that approach. We received a complaint and a protest from them a few days ago about the violation of their territorial waters. I was surprised because the report was that it was one small ship—a frigate, I think—which was taking supplies to a ship called Magar—crocodile—(its name is Magar). This frigate was taking supplies, and passing near by Hongkong, it did undoubtedly pass across the territorial waters of China, say within 12 miles or so—whatever it was. They protested and said it was challenged and it did not listen to the challenge. The Magar has no come back yet. But we have received a report and it said that there was no challenge when they came across and they did not know and they went on. That is curious enough—petty incident of the Magar going there and being challenged.

But, in this connection another incident is quoted:

"Last year your cruiser 'Mysore' also did the same thing, passed through our territorial waters."

Now, the cruiser 'Mysore' had gone last year on a visit of goodwill to China among other countries. That is, it went to Honkong, China, Shanghai and it went to Japan and, maybe, it went to some other places also. I do not know. It certainly went to Shanghai. It is very surprising that it should be quoted and quoted a year after. Certainly last year it came to within 6 or 12 miles. The affair is rather extraordinary.

There are a multitude of questions that arise in this connection and we shall have to deal with them with all care, patience, firmness and forbearance and I am sure that this House will show that firmness coupled with forbearance.

If I have erred in the past in some delay in placing the papers before the House, I shall not err again. It is too serious a matter. At that time one wanted the situation not to be worsened by publicity when we were dealing with them, corresponding with

them and their answers come after months. This very answer from Premier Chou has come 6 months after my letter of March. One waits and times goes on. But, anyhow, the situation is such that we have to keep the country, and especially the Parliament in full touch with the developments. I do not expect, and I do not want the House to imagine that something very serious is going to happen on our frontiers. I do not at all expect that to happen. It is not such an easy matter for it to happen either. But the basic difficulty is this apparent change in the attitude of the Chinese Government when it has come out quite clearly with a demand which it is absolutely and wholly impossible for us to look at. But, if you will put that aside, the major demand aside—they themselves say, the House will notice, that they are not, in a sense, pressing for that now and that they are prepared for the *status quo* to continue but there is the demand, just as the maps were a constant irritant and a reminder to us that something may happen and it is now much more obvious—it is only in that sense the situation has worsened and not in the sense that something is going to happen in the border or the frontier suddenly

I would beg of you not to put this matter in the category of communist or non-communist. The House must have been the statement issued more or less on behalf of the Soviet Government and this House knows the very close relations that the Soviet Government has naturally with the Chinese Government. The issue of that statement itself shows that the Soviet Government is taking a claim and more or less objective or dispassionate view of the situation considering everything. We welcome that It is not far us to divert this major issue between these two great countries, China and India into wrong channels; it will be completely wrong for us to do that and we must maintain our dignity and at the same time deal with the situation as firmly aa we can. It is a difficult situation, difficult in the sense, physically difficult, apart from other difficulties, remember, if the physical difficulties are on our side as they are—hundreds of miles of mountains and forests with no roads—the same difficulties are on the side of any person who rashly tries to come in. So you can balance the difficulties either way.

Anyhow, our Army and our Defence Forces are fully seized of this matter and they are not people who get excited quickly. They are brave people, experienced people and because they have to deal with a difficult job, they deal with it in a calm and quiet way but efficiently. I am sure they will do that.

There are a number of amendments. Naturally, I am not prepared to accept any amendment which is a condemnation of our policy.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX**⁹

I have not referred to the question of Tibet or the Dalai Lama, partly because, although it slightly touches these issues and it has affected them, it is a separate issue. So far as the Dalai Lama is concerned, I do not know what is meant by 'subsidy'. We have spent some money over his remaining there but we have given him no special subsidy. But some money has been spent naturally on his stay at Mussoorie and we are spending money on the other refugees.

BACK NOTE

XXI. Motion Regarding White Paper on Indo-Chinese Relations, 12 September, 1959

1. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: When we are concerned?
2. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: If the Prime Minister would not mind, I never said that he should go on abusing every-body. I said we should be firm and we should make our meaning clear.
3. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: I submit I was making only a comparison.
4. DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: If it does not belong to India, then, there is no question of bombing.
5. SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARYA: The same statement of our Prime Minister on a previous occasion has been used by Mr. Chou Enlai in his letter to prove that this area belongs to them.
SHRI JAWAHAR LAL NEHRU: May be.
SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARYA: A similar statement is used in his present letter in justification of his claim.
6. SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati) : May I submit one thing? About Long Ju, it is said that that MacMahon line was delimited up to a length of 850 miles by Sir MacMahon Long Ju is on this side of the MacMahon line. So, how can they claim Long Ju now?
SHRI JAWAHAR LAL NEHRU: Long Ju is 800 miles.
SHRI HEM BARUA: The Macmahon line had delimited the border up to 850 miles The delimitation was done by Sir MacMahon himself.
SHRI JAWAHAR LAL NEHRU: Who says that?
SHRI HEM BARUA: And Longju is on this side of the border.
7. SHRI BRAJ RAJ SINGH : May I submit one thing. Was it not brought to the notice of the Prime Minister that just after the occurrence of the incident. It was disapproved by the Socialist Party then and there.
8. One HON. MEMBER: I think Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, referred to Bhutan and Sikkim I am glad he did so.
SHRI GORAY: He is being bombed all right.
9. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: Before you deal with the amendments, may I ask a question? Shri Dange has said that the Dalai Lama is being subsidised by your Government. Is it a fact?
10. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: Can this help be called a subsidy to the Dalai Lama?
11. SHRI HEM BARUA: The people inhabiting NEFA, about 30,000 sq miles of whose territory are claimed by China as shown in their map, still preserve, due to the

British policy of isolation, a sort of separatist psychology, and during all these years of freedom, we could not create in them a comprehensive Indian mind and as such those people are easily susceptible to Chinese propaganda. May I know from the Prime Minister what steps do the Government propose to take to see that this thing does not happen in NEFA?

12. SHRI P. K. DEO: I am grateful to the Prime Minister for the firmness with which he has spoken and dealt with the Chinese situation. He has rightly diagnosed this Chinese malady to be the arrogance of might. Imperialism is no longer the monopoly of the West. It can also spread to the east though it has got a different name. They call it liberation. We have seen what liberation means to Tibet. Whatever be the imperialism, this imperialism should be nipped in the bud. Unless it is nipped in the bud it will grow because it has got a cancerous and malignant growth.

From the analysis of history we have seen that all policies of appeasement have failed to stop the growth of imperialism. Sir Nevaolk Chamberlain has failed in his policy of appeasement to stop Hitler from his aggressive imperialist designs at Munich in 1939 or so. In this particular case also, I think our Prime Minister will deal with the Chinese situation firmly and the whole country will stand behind him.

Lastly, I would like to express my thanks to my friend and comrade, Shri Dange for the guarantee he has given on behalf of China, that there will be no aggression I would like to know what he is to China. Is he the accredited agent to China and whether it is the Chinese or the Indian speaking. Anyway, I request him to be more realistic and more patriotic in his approach to the situation.

STATEMENT REGARDING SINO-INDIAN RELATIONS

21 December, 1959

Mr. Speaker, Sir, three days ago, on the 18th December, I received through our Ambassador in Peking, Premier Chou En-lai's reply to my letter of the 16th November. This latter has already appeared in the Press and so I need not give any details about its contents.

I read this letter with regret. It does not accept the reasonable and practical proposals which I had made to Premier Chou En-lai in order to secure an immediate lessening of tension along the Sino-Indian border and to create the necessary atmosphere for a peaceful settlement of the border problem. It is merely a reiteration of claims to extensive areas in our territory which by history, by custom or by agreement have long been integral parts of India. It does not contain any reply to the detailed letter which I had sent to him on September 26 and the note of November 4 in which some salient facts bearing on the situation had been mentioned. Premier Chou En-Lai has stated in his letter that he would send a reply to his previous letter and note of mine in the near future.

I have today sent a reply to Premier Chou En-Lai referring to the above facts and stating that I am sorry to find that he had based his claim on recent intrusions by Chinese personnel into parts of Indian territory. It is, in fact, these intrusions which had brought about the present situation and created apprehensions. I have further stated that I cannot accept the allegation that Indian forces had occupied any part of Chinese territory, or committed aggression at Kongka Pa or at Longju, where our established check-post was attacked by Chinese troops.

Premier Chou En-lai in his letter has spoken of the 'friendly manner' in which Indian personnel who were captured in the Chenmo Valley were treated. I have referred him again to the statement of Shri Karam Singh about the treatment that he and his colleagues received while they were prisoners in the custody of the Chinese border forces. This statement clearly indicates the deplorable treatment to which the Indian prisoners were subjected.

Premier Chou En-Lai had suggested that he and I should meet on December 26 so as to reach an agreement on the principles which are presumably to guide the Officials on both sides in the discussion of details. I have repeated what I have said previously that I am always ready to meet and discuss with him the outstanding differences between our countries and explore the avenues of settlement. I have, however, pointed out that I do not see how we can reach an agreement on principles when there is such complete disagreement about the facts. I would prefer to wait for his promised reply to my letter of September 26 and our note of November 4 before we discuss what should be the next step. I have added that it is quite impossible for me

to proceed to Rangoon or any other place within the next few days. In my reply I have expressed my agreement with him to the sentiments which he had expressed in the last paragraph of his letter, to the effect that the principal concern of our two countries should be-I am quoting "with the programme of long term peaceful construction to lift ourselves from our present state of backwardness, and that we should not be parties to the increasing of tension between our two countries or in the world." India has welcomed the fact that there is some lowering of world tensions and that-again I quote -"the world situation is developing in a direction favourable to peace". It is for this reason, even apart from the imperative need to improve the relations between our two countries, that in spite of recent events, I have continually stressed the need for a peaceful settlement of our problems.

...XXX.... ...XXX.... ...XXX¹....

I have given the substance of the letter. It may vary a little here and there. It will be released to the Press after two or three days so as to allow it to reach him.

...XXX.... ...XXX.... ...XXX²....

The letter was issued in Peking to the Press and to the radio there. In fact the message that I received from our ambassador in Peking containing Mr. Chou En-Lai's letter stated at the end of it that as soon as I received that letter, they would release it to the Press. They have released it to the Press.

...XXX.... ...XXX.... ...XXX³....

Sir, the House knows that I am always anxious, at any rate willing, to have discussions about any important matter arising in connection with foreign affairs, more especially a matter of this kind. We have discussed it on two occasions. But quite apart from the question of the House or you finding time for this discussion I really do not understand the argument of the hon. Member that time is passing and somehow the passage of time will be arrested by discussion. Time will nevertheless pass in spite of a discussion.

...XXX.... ...XXX.... ...XXX⁴....

That is exactly the point I was going to suggest. The hon. Member has said that it is not good to negotiate and that is a trick for time to pass on the part of the Chinese Government. Well, do not know what the hon. Member has in mind. But so far as I am concerned and so far as this Government is concerned, we will negotiate and negotiate and negotiate to the bitter end. I absolutely reject the approach of stopping negotiations at any stage. That, I think, is not only a fundamentally wrong approach, but, if I may say so, with all respect to the hon. Member opposite, it is fundamentally anti-Gandhian approach. That does not mean that any action which is necessitated should not be taken. That is an entirely different-matter. But negotiations will go on so long as this Government functions, to the end.

...XXX.... ...XXX.... ...XXX⁵....

That does not mean, as I said, any action that we intend should not be taken. If the hon. Member means a declaration of war, well, the hon. Member, if I may suggest to him, might consider the question a little more carefully as to what war involves and how we attain our object by a declaration of war.

Therefore, Sir, I am in your hands. I merely state what I think of a further discussion at this stage, when we are obviously in the middle of this correspondence. The correspondence may not be to the liking of the hon. Member or to my liking, the letters that we receive, but that is the way how countries function short of war. There is no other way. The other way is war, and that way is to be avoided as far as one can avoid it. That has been our policy and that is the policy, at any rate, the declared policy of every civilised nation. For us to jump into something without exhausting all possibilities, something which will be disastrous not only for the countries jumping into it but for the whole world, is not a matter lightly to be undertaken, and we know this Government will not undertake it in that way.

But there are many other things which this country has to do in the way of preparation, in the way of strengthening our defences etc., and those things certainly should be expedited, undertaken to the best of our ability and as speedily as possible.

There is one thing more, that it is up to you and the House to decide whether they want a discussion, but I regret I shall not be here day after tomorrow as I have important engagements which I cannot forego; as the House is ending tomorrow I have made those engagements.

....XXX.... XXX.... XXX⁶....

Sir, I am a little alarmed by the endorsement of the hon. Raja Saheb, but I would this House to consider one thing. There are, I would again repeat, only two ways in which nations deal with each other, diplomatic or war; there is no third way.

....XXX.... XXX.... XXX⁷....

It is by war, nothing else than war.

....XXX.... XXX.... XXX⁸....

There is no other way. Diplomacy has many shares, many ways, but if it is diplomacy it is communication, it is talking till talking stops when there is war. Till there is actual, absolute declaration of war there is diplomacy.

....XXX.... XXX.... XXX⁹....

I do not know. Therefore, I should put it to the hon. Member to think a little clearly on the subject. Clear thought is necessary and clear thought leads to only one conclusion. There is no alternative to ceasing talking but war. It does not matter what it is. The hon. Member is thinking that time is being wasted. How, I do not know, time is wasted. It is not all the clear to me how it is being wasted; I think it is very profitably employed.

....XXX.... XXX.... XXX¹⁰....

But I can't pit my wits against the hon. Member, but I think I would suggest to him to consider what he himself was saying and what the consequences are. I do think that frequent discussions on the same thing will not help. There is no additional fact before us at the present moment. We have discussed it. We are committed, naturally, to take such steps as we can, as the country can, with such speed, as we can to strengthen our defences. The hon. Member referred to some infiltration or subversive activities in our borders. I do not know where subversive activities are taking place (Interruption). I can't answer for any odd individual, but I think our newspapers sometimes rather exaggerate rumours which they get in Kalimpong Bazaar, in Kathmandu Bazaar or some other bazaar, and we need not accept everything that comes by way of rumour. We have to be vigilant and all that, but some things, I do submit, are not always desirable; to exaggerate them creates a wrong impression in the country.

There is the position, Sir. I am entirely in your hands and in the hands of the House in this matter. One thing I may add-I am sorry I forgot to say so-we have asked our Ambassador in Peking to come to Delhi for consultation and he will be arriving here in about four days time.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX¹¹....

How to make it clear, I do not know. I thought I had made it clear. Every plane of ours that flies from there, the report goes that it is an enemy plane. How am I to repeat that they are looking up at a plane and are not able to recognise what kind of aircraft it is? Our planes are flying all the time all over the place.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX¹²....

No foreign plane is there, I repeat. I should like to have proof from anybody to counter my statement. We know it definitely. We get an account from the hon. Member opposite in his motion for adjournment we enquire and we find that our planes are flying and they are doing good work. How am I to explain this?

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX¹³....

I did not say at any moment that we should not believe anything that appears in the press. I said that occasionally Kalimpong Bazaar rumours appear there. Take this particular fact which has its humorous side - that we get a number of adjournment motions day after day, and I go on saying that, after due enquiry, we find not a single aircraft coming from outside. Please let me proceed. I am not referring to some other previous things. I am talking of the last few days. The fact is that our aircraft are functioning there very adequately and very efficiently. Nobody, no laymen, can possibly find out, when an aircraft is flying at about 20,000 or 30,000 ft, what its markings are and what its country of origin is. They cannot. About that particular area, during these days, I can say with the greatest certainty and definiteness that no foreign aircraft is coming, because we have been in the air all the time doing work that has been allotted to our people. I do not say that every statement in the press is wrong. That would be ridiculous for me to say.

BACK NOTE

XXII. Statement Regarding Sino-Indian Relations, 21 December, 1959

1. SHRI BRAJ RAJ SINGH: Premier Chou En-Lai has been publishing everything which he has been sending to our Prime Minister. May I know whether this letter which our Prime Minister has sent to Chou En-Lai will be published here or whether a copy of it will be supplied to us?
2. SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARYA (West Dinajpur): May I know whether Mr. Chou En-Lai's letter was sent to the Press from the Chinese Embassy or from the Government of India?
3. ACHARYA KRIPLANI (Sitamarhi): Sir, as you know, I and some leaders of the Opposition Parties have given notice under Rule 193 of the Rules of Procedure that we are desirous of having discussion on the latest letter received from the Chinese Premier in reply to Prime Minister's letter dated the 16th November, 1959.

The reason for this is that the latest letter received from the Chinese Premier rejects *in toto* the proposals made by the Prime Minister in his letter of 16th November. Further the Chinese Premier asks for our withdrawal from a number of places all along the frontier and lays claim to places that are indisputably in India and agreed to as such by China in the treaty signed with us in 1954. From the reply, it appears that our territories in Ladakh have not been occupied by China but are being effectively colonized.

Parliament must have opportunity to discuss the reply received and consider the situation arising out of it before it adjourns. In view of the urgency and the great importance of the matter sought to be discussed, we hope time will be found for discussion in the two days left. If this is not possible, I think we can prolong for a couple of days the sitting of the House and discuss this matter.

I am anxious to have this discussion because I find that they (the Chinese) have rejected the Prime Minister's proposals which were favourable to the Chinese and unfavourable to us and the other conditions laid down for a meeting. Further, I say that we seem to have forgotten what we knew before—the importance of time. Time ripens a fruit but if not properly picked up, then time also rots the fruit. One good thing that we had learnt from Gandhiji was that he took action at the proper time. When the psychological time is past, then of course, it cannot be recovered. And even the Chinese Prime Minister has reminded us of what he calls an 'eloquent proof'. For many years while aggression was going on in Ladakh, we did nothing and he calls that as 'eloquent proof' of our having accepted the Chinese contention. So, I submit that all along we have made the mistake of not taking into consideration the factor of time and I believe the correspondence on the part of China is only to waste time. They yet claim the very same things that they have claimed in their maps. There is no

basis, I believe, for talks but time is being lost. Why is time lost? I humbly submit—because they (the Chinese) want that turmoil in the Himalayan regions should continue and they want to organize subversive movements on our Himalayan borders. Further, they want to frighten the people and the small kingdoms that are on the borders. Therefore, it becomes very necessary that we must in time decide what we propose to do because I feel that the tone of the letter and the contents of the letter are such that there seems to be no possibility of any negotiations. They (the Chinese) have not even left a basis for negotiations. They have even told us that what Karam Singh said is wrong and what they say is right. There is no point that we have raised which has been answered in the letter. So, I think, it is very necessary that we do not allow time to be wasted by this fruitless correspondence. Therefore, I think a discussion upon the matter is very necessary and essential and I hope you will find time and the House will find time to discuss the matter before anything further is done.

4. ACHARYA KRIPLANI: The House will give its opinion whether the time should be allowed to pass or not.

5. SHRI JADAV (Malegaon): Adopt the 1942 policy of Gandhiji.

6. ACHARYA KRIPLANI: I did not want to interrupt the hon. Prime Minister, but every time to bring in the plea that this or that will lead to war and war is very disastrous, I think, is not very fair. I think that I know enough of Gandhiji, that he always negotiated, but the time came when he said that action must be taken. What action the Government takes is another question. Let them take any action but it should not be that time should be lost and in the meantime subversive activities should go on our borders and our friends should be intimidated in every way. That is all that I wanted to say.

RAJA MAHENDRA PRATAP (Mathura): I strongly endorse the statement of our hon. Prime Minister.

7. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: Is there an end to diplomacy ever?

8. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: There are many other things that can be done.

9. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: But if the other party wants to waste time, what is to be done?

10. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: If there is a discussion you will be able to understand.

11. SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati): Sir, the information demanded from Shillong about airspace violation and all that is surely not a bazaar thing. The Press carries news about airspace violation and all that.

12. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: Then let us say that the airspace is free for everybody? Everyday violations are there.

13. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: In answer to a question it has been said that places have crossed.

SHRI NATH PAL: Sir, I have one little point to make. The Prime Minister just now said that we cannot go on acting on Press reports which are bazaar reports. In fairness of the House and the Press we have got to say that on a previous occasion when some reports emanated from Kalimpong the Prime Minister angrily repudiated them but, unfortunately, to a point, regarding Tibet and Ladakh they proved right. Secondly, if the House is kept informed from time to time we shall depend not on what the Press tells us but on what he tells us, but we are very often informed too late.

Regarding the remarks, how does a discussion stop passage of time, I must say that a discussion does not stop the passage of time, time keeps on marching, but if we have a discussion definitely the Government knows the mood of the country and, far more important, China also is informed how this country is feeling about it. It is for this reason, Sir, that we plead that we be given an opportunity of discussing this.

It is unfair to suggest every time that we demand that we be firm we are asking for war. Nobody wants war. It has been made innumerable times clear that in your pursuit of peace we are with you. It is unfair to stand behind, that is what we want to suggest. Nobody wants you to go to war. There is a charge against us that there are war-mongers in this country. Who wants war? We are not in war so far as Peking is concerned. You do not know where to laugh. Sir, this is a very unfair thing and you should not allow that. Acharya Kripalani is the last person in the world to demand that. We are standing by him. He never meant that the country should go to war, but that China should not be allowed to proceed further. Only a week ago the Prime Minister told us that there was no road. I had asked the question whether the road was constructed without our knowledge and why we were prevented from noticing it. He told us that there was no such thing as a road, it was only a question of removing a stone or building a culvert. Mr. Chou En-Lai now says that 3,000 people were working for a period of two years. It is this thing that worries us, this passage of time. Therefore, he should make a reply in that context and not indicate that others are wanting to start a war.

REPLY ON MOTION OF THANKS TO PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

22 February, 1960

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this subject has been under debate in this House for a full week and a large number of Members have spoken on it, some in favour of the motion and some in opposition to it. There are, I believe, about 240 amendments tabled; and, in the course of discussion, a large number of subjects have been touched upon. But, by and large, it may be said that this discussion has been almost a discussion on foreign affairs; and in regard to foreign affairs too, rather limited to our border issues with China and even that has been further limited to the invitation I have issued to Premier Chou Enlai in this connection. Therefore, Sir, I think, perhaps, it would be better for me also to concentrate on a few of the important issues raised, more important points raised—rather than perambulate over the whole field of these 240 amendments.

I do not deny that some of the other matters which have been mentioned in this House in the course of the debate are important from certain points of view; but, I cannot, within any limited space of time deal with these scores of matters. Now, therefore, I, shall begin by dealing with this very important issue relating to foreign affairs, relating to our border, relating to the intrusion of Chinese forces on our territory and recent steps which we have taken in regard to this matter.

The way this debate has been conducted, and some of the statements made in this debate, have raised other matters too in relation to this particular subject. That is to say, it has been said by hon. Members—I only repeat—that there has been a change. Not only a charge of reversal of policy has been advanced; but, rather it has been said that the Government, and particularly I suppose I, as being the Foreign Minister, have been unfair to Parliament, and have not been quite honest, that we are dying down, we have surrendered, we have submitted to some kind of national humiliation. It has even been said that there is no instance in history like this and our sincerity has been doubted. That, of course, raises the matter on to a different level from the criticism of a certain policy. I hope to deal with that criticism, but I wish to point out, at the commencement, that if the Government is charged, as it has been charged by some hon. Members opposite, with submitting to anything that may be considered “national humiliation” or “surrender”, then it is a matter of the highest importance for this House and this country to be clear about it.

No Government which even remotely is responsible for anything that may be considered “national humiliation” is deserving of continuing as a Government. No Foreign Minister or Prime Minister who is even indirectly connected with anything which means dishonour to India in any respect has any business to continue in his office. Therefore, it is a matter of very serious importance what the view of this House and of the country is on this subject.

Now, may I add something which was not said in this House in this connection and which is reported in this morning's papers by the Press? I do not wish, normally, to quote from the Press without verification, but as I have to speak on this subject now, and it is relevant, I am taking the liberty to refer to this matter. It is a report of a speech by one of the respected Members of this House, of the Opposition side, Acharya Kripalani, who, it is said, has said that India had been "betrayed by leaders of the present Government". Further it is stated he has said: "How can we do anything when our honour is in the hands of dishonourable people?"

Now, Sir, that is a clear charge, and if there is, as I said, even any remote justification for that charge, then, it is not for me to stand up here and take the time of the House but to retire to my shell and leave it to others who are more honourable to conduct the affairs of this country. I know that our respected friend, Acharya Kripalani, sometimes allows his words to run away with him; sometimes he says things which he might perhaps regret later, and I do not know if this was one of his outbursts at the spur of the moment or a definite charge after thought. But even a thing like this said at the spur of the moment from a person in his position has implications of far reaching character, and no Government, nor can this House treat this matter as a light utterance said at the spur of the moment. Sir, it is no matter of joy to me to refer to this, coming from an old colleague, but the House, I hope, will appreciate that to be charged with dishonourable motives and to be charged to be parties to "national humiliation" is something that is very painful. Individuals apart, there are people in this House, many of them, who have spent a good part of their lives in trying to uphold the honour and freedom of India, and if in the afternoon of their lives they are told that they have betrayed the honour of India and submitted to humiliation their country, which they sought to serve with such ability and strength as they had, then the matter goes beyond parliamentary debate into some other field.

It will hardly be suitable or fitting for me to stand up before this House and claim its indulgence for a defence of my motives or honour. After, broadly, 50 years of being 'connected in some form or other with India's service, if that kind of charge can be made, well, it is open to anyone to make it and it is open to anyone to believe it: I do not propose to say anything about it.

Now, Sir, it is said that I have been unfair to Parliament, that I did not say anything about this to the Rajya Sabha, I did not say anything about this invitation and this was not mentioned in the President's Address. First of all, may I say, as the House knows, that the President's Address is a statement of policy of the Government? It should be remembered, it is the Government that is responsible for it, and it is not right or proper for our respected President's name to be brought in debates like this. If the President's Address has anything wrong in it or objectionable in it, it is the Government to blame not the President, and it is open to hon. Members to criticise or condemn Government because there is some such statement in it which they disapprove of.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

I am venturing to say that it should be realised because—nobody has criticised the President, but the President's name is brought into the picture and, incidentally or accidentally, it becomes a subject of controversy—it is not right.

Secondly, Sir, I propose to give some dates, because it seemed to me that some people had in their mind that we have been juggling about with dates or with one occurrence following the other and trying to suppress the facts, sometime in the Rajya Sabha debate or in the President's Address. Now, apart from what I am going to say, I hope the House realises that it would be extraordinarily folly for me to say something and to say something else a week later or five days later. It is ridiculous. I could not consciously be guilty of it; of course, I might make a mistake or something. I could not, according to all the canons of propriety and diplomatic procedure, say something in this House or the other or refer to it in the President's Address, when that matter has not borne fruit by delivery of a letter to the person to whom it was addressed. I could not do it. It is highly improper. I tried my very best to get these procedures through of sending a reply so that I should be in time to place those papers on the first day this House met, the Parliament met. Unfortunately, there were delays right through. A good part of the month of January we worked on the subject, and the result of our labours is embodied in the note that was presented to the Chinese Government earlier this month. Many people were involved in these labours. The month of January is a very heavy month for us. In the middle of the month, there was the Congress Session and other things happened and then came the Republic Day celebrations and in the course of these Celebrations, eminent guests came here. There was Marshal Voroshilov; there was the Prime Minister of Nepal; there was, later of course, Mr. Khrushchev and then the Prime Minister of Finland. It was a very heavy month for us and I was very anxious to expedite this matter. It required a great deal of investigation—not to justify our claim to ourselves—but to state the facts in an organised way so as to bring conviction to any person who read them, and, we hope, even to the mind of the Chinese Government. The result of that was the note. That was considered. As Foreign Minister I had naturally to consider it on several occasions. Later, it was put up before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Cabinet which Considered it at length on several occasions. Having considered and finalised that note, the question arose about the answer I should give because the Chinese note contained a repetition of the invitation to Premier Chou En Lai for us to meet. We gave thought to it and we came to the conclusion not to—I refer to it as such in that note because it was thought, after considering the whole case from our point of view, that a separate letter should be sent. Now all this was finalised—the note was finalised—round about 31st January and about the same time it was decided to have this letter sent. It was considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Cabinet. I do not exactly know the date but it is immaterial. Within those two or three days all the papers were ready together. Naturally, they were parts of the same process of consideration and decisions and I signed that letter on the 5th February. I was not going to sign the other paper because it was going to be signed by our Ambassador, prior to delivery to the Chinese Government. We could of course have sent that note

and letter by telegram but then we thought it better that the 'Ambassador should deliver it himself and therefore, the Ambassador had to take it from here. It was given to the Ambassador and he ultimately took it and the matter was; finished so far as I was concerned on the 5th of February. The Ambassador took it—I am not quite sure; I think he went for a brief visit to Madras for a day or so and he came back and took it on the 8th and he left Delhi on the 9th and delivered this letter on the 12th in Peking the note and the letter. Therefore, the note is dated the date of delivery although in actual fact this was a single transaction. In fact, the note preceded in a sense the letter. If you read that letter itself, you will see that it refers to the note which was going to accompany it. Now the letter is dated the 5th and the note the 12th because it was signed there but it emerged from here at the same time.

Some people imagine that this was some kind of a very deep diplomacy, good or bad, so as to arrange the dates in such manner, before Mr. Khrushchev's visit or overlapping it or something like that. I confess that I am not so clever in these matters. I was anxious that this should be, as I said, finished before Parliament met and I might place all these papers before this House and the other. But the decision that it should not be sent by telegram but rather the Ambassador should himself take it inevitably involved a few days' delay to reach there. This House met on the 8th February. That very morning our Ambassador took it from us and we gave him a few days to reach and he delivered it. The moment we knew he had delivered it the Prime Minister of China was not available and it was as a matter of fact delivered to the Foreign Minister because we did not wish to lose time we placed it, on Monday next, before this House and the other.

I might mention another thing here. Mr. Khrushchev was coming here a little later; I think he arrived on the 11th of this month and my first talks with him were on the 12th. It had absolutely no relation to this matter of delivery or writing; it had been previously considered and settled. In the last few weeks we have had the privilege and honour of welcoming very distinguished and very important leaders, world leaders President Eisenhower, Mr. Khrushchev, Marshal Voroshilov, Prime Minister of our neighbour country, Nepal, and the Prime Minister of Finland. All kinds of speculations appear in the news papers as to what I dismissed with President Eisenhower or later, with Mr. Khrushchev. Now obviously, I cannot, in answer to questions here or elsewhere, give out the content of confidential talks; it will be impossible for any talks to take place with other leaders if those talks were reported in this way, publicly. Nevertheless, I shall go some distance, to some extent, in telling the House about the approach I made to these talks, not the content of the talks.

For instance, I had many hours talks with President Eisenhower and naturally we discussed a large number of questions beginning always with the world situation, the prospects of the summit meeting, disarmament, lessening of tension in the world and going on to individual areas of the world and discussing them. Fortunately for us, we have no problem with the United States to discuss; we have no problems with the Soviet Union to discuss—no controversies or problems. So we discussed broad issues.

I was asked the moment President Eisenhower went away. Did you ask him help for the Five Year Plan? These matters are being discussed by our representatives with

the representatives of other countries and of the United States. They are more or less public matters. But so far as I am concerned, I thought it highly improper that I should embarrass our distinguished guest by asking him to do this or that for us. That is not my way of approaching these questions. And although some people did not perhaps believe it, it is a fact that we discussed everything including our Five Year Plans I did not ask him precisely and definitely to come and help us. He knows exactly our needs. At that moment it was not the right thing for me to do. It is a minor matter because we have understood; he understood me and I understood him, I do not normally go about making demands, especially from distinguished guests who come here.

So also with Mr. Khrushchev. Our talks lasted I do not know—for three or four hours or may be it was more than that; five hours altogether, and we discussed every subject within our kin. Again, we started all our talks always nowadays with the summit, what is going to happen there, with, disarmament, the prospects of disarmament for the reduction of world tension, plus, both with President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev, the tremendous revolutionary upheavals happening in Africa, a most important thing in the world today, and with other world questions with which we are not directly related but we are related because they affect the world.

People thought no doubt that I would talk at length with Mr. Khrushchev about our troubles with China and that I would appeal to him or beg of him or request him to come to our help or bring pressure on China. I am rather surprised that people should think so. At any rate, that is not my idea of diplomacy or of treating a distinguished guest in this way. As a matter of world survey and our own problems, I did refer to our border troubles, with him, and very briefly in half a dozen sentences perhaps. I told him that this is our case; it is all for your information. Because I felt that not to refer to it was itself wrong when we were discussing our problems. But I did not ask him to do this or that for us; I did not ask him to bring pressures to bear. That, I thought was none of my business. It is for them to consider what they are going to do and how they are going to do it. There the matter ended. It was a brief talk on this subject, maybe lasting a few minutes.

The only thing that I can say about these talks is this. Whether it was President Eisenhower or whether it was Mr. Khrushchev, they were good enough to be exceedingly friendly to India, to us, and to our aims and objectives. That is all that I wanted and it would have been embarrassing for me, and for the other party, to try to put questions to either of them and demand an answer. That is not the way, I think, the right way, to behave.

So, this question of our answer to the Chinese Government had no relation to Mr. Khrushchev. It so happened that the answer had been sent three or four days before. Naturally the letter and the note had already gone, and it was delivered just about that time.

I should like to refer to another matter. In the course of the criticisms, some hon. Members referred, and referred repeatedly particularly to one item, to the failure of our diplomats in China and the failure of our defence, not now, but in the last ten years. I would wish that our diplomatic personnel were not mentioned in this

way in our debates. They cannot of course say anything nor indeed can we say very much or lay on the Table of the House as to what were the reports that they sent or not. It is not quite fair. I would however say this; that broadly speaking, persons in our diplomatic service, more especially our senior diplomats, have a very high position in the diplomatic world. They compare very favourably with their brother diplomats from other countries. They are respected everywhere and respected not merely because they convey messages from us anybody can do it but because they are men of worth, of understanding, understanding our point of view and understanding the other point of view, and they have done great service to us.

I would say this. So far as China is concerned, because we have always attached great importance to the relations of India and China, we have sent our senior most and best men there. It is a record of our highest pass men going there. One of them who was there at the crucial moment if the change of Government there, with the success of the revolution, is now a Member of Parliament. The ones who went before him or after, specially after, have been our senior and experienced diplomats, and we are very grateful to them for the very the work they have done in exceedingly difficult circumstances.

So far as our defence is concerned, that is a larger issue. But during this period of ten years or so, that have elapsed, the responsibility of defence for anything that has happened is of the smallest. In fact, it is not at all their responsibility. Whatever task policies we have followed are the responsibilities of the Government, or, to limit them still further, they are the responsibilities of the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister; if you like, of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Cabinet, but in the final analysis, certainly they are responsibilities of the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister. Therefore, while this House is completely justified in criticising the Foreign Minister on the ground of policy, I do not think it is quite fair to drag in others who had no responsibility and no immediate contact with that policy.

Now, one thing has surprised me; that in the course of this long debate, reference has been made so often to this letter of invitation. I do not remember I may be wrong of course any hon. Member referring to the long note which accompanied that letter. The note was, as I said, dated the 12th of February, and signed by the Ambassador on that date. The letter contains no policy. It is the note that contains the policy of the Government of India in regard to this 'affair. It is a long note which took weeks of consideration, hard thinking, revision, etc., and finalising. No reference was made to it. You talked about reversal of policy; you talked about national humiliation and all that But the paper that contains that policy was not referred to at all in this House. It was a carefully drafted document and that has been set aside, and the mere fact taken that we have invited Premier Chou En-Lai. It seems to be very odd. That letter was just a kind of addendum to the note. It is the note that contains the policy, that contains our clear enunciation of where the Government of India stands in this matter. Now, as nobody has referred to it, I presume.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²

should never be closed. That is my experience from such history as I have learnt and such experience as I have gathered.

I have met many of the great leaders political and other of the world and tried to learn from them I have read some books also about this subject and most of all, during the last half a century, I have lived through historic epochs. To no small extent, many hon. Members here and I have ourselves been actors in the great drama of India. So, with such experience as we have got, we have to face issues. We have to face an issue today of a greater magnitude than any we have faced previously. It is not casual talk I am indulging in, because as I said, in the context of history, two of the biggest countries of Asia and of the world, I say, have come face to face with each other, angrily face to face with each other. What are going to be the consequences? I do not know. I cannot peep into history, into the future. But I do know that when such a thing occurs, it requires all the wisdom, all the strength and perseverance of a nation to face such a contingency. I have pleaded for that wisdom and at the same time, tact and patience.

What have I said about this matter previously? Hon. Members quoting my previous statements, have said that I would meet him when a meeting would bear fruit. Even there, I never denied that I will not meet him. I said on the 5th November:

“This business of meeting. My general approach, our general approach, again if I may refer to my dim and distant Gandhian past, is always to meet, always to discuss, to avoid strong language, but to be prepared always for strong action in so far as one can be prepared, and above all avoid, getting excited and afraid.”

With all respect, I would venture to present these sentiments of mine to some hon. Members opposite.

Then, on the 16th November, I wrote to Premier Chou Enlai:

"I am always ready to meet and discuss with Your Excellency the outstanding differences between our countries and explore avenues of friendly settlement ... It is necessary, therefore, that some preliminary steps are taken and the foundation for our discussions laid."

On that very day, 16th November, I spoke in the Lok Sabha as follows:

“Premier Chou Enlai also suggested in his letter that the Prime Ministers might hold talks in the immediate future to discuss the boundary question and other outstanding issues between the two countries. I have always expressed my willingness to discuss any matter in dispute. But, if such a meeting is to bear fruit, as We want it to, we should first concentrate our immediate efforts at reaching an interim understanding, as suggested.”

So, I should like the House to observe that at no time have I said that I will not meet. It always depends on certain circumstances, in a changing situation.

I have listened to strong language from the opposite side, objectionable language and unparliamentary language, if I may say so, and I would beg of them now to listen to some parliamentary language.

On the 27th November, I said in the Lok Sabha: “It is true that, much as one might desire a meeting, that meeting itself, unless it is held under proper circumstances

or a proper atmosphere, with some kind of background and preparation, may lead to nothing. It may fail; it may do harm. It is a matter of judgment. It is true that any such meeting which has the faintest resemblance to carrying out the behests of another party is absolutely wrong. I do not wish to delay anything. I am not trying to escape from the very idea of a meeting. I want it. I welcome it as early as possible, but there must be some preparation, some ground for it”.

In the Rajya Sabha, I said on the 22nd December: “The point that is brought out throughout that letter (the letter of Premier Chou En-Lai) is a strong desire to meet. So far as I am concerned, whenever the time comes, whenever it is suitable, I shall avail myself of that opportunity, because the issues are too serious for any other course to be adopted.”

In my reply to Premier Chou En-Lai on the 21st December, I said:

“I am always ready to meet and discuss with your Excellency the outstanding differences between our countries and explore the avenues of settlement. How can, we Mr. Prime Minister, reach an agreement on principle, when there is such complete disagreement about the facts? I would, therefore, prefer to wait for your promised reply to my letter of September 26 and our note of November 4, before we discuss what should be the next step. I wish to add that it is entirely impossible for me to proceed to Rangoon or any other place within the next few days.”

Then, at a Press Conference, on the 8th January a question was asked of me:

“Do you project a meeting between yourself and Chou En-Lai at some date near enough?”

The answer was:

“I am not projecting the meeting at present, but I cannot rule it out. It depends on circumstance because, as I said, we do not, I hope, act in terms of closing any doors which would help. I don’t rule it out at all but, at the present moment, that is not in view”.

That is to say, the meeting. I was asked further about the conditions for a meeting. My reply was:

“I don’t think it will be proper for me to lay down conditions 1, 2, 3 and 4, this must be done, this kind of thing. When the countries take up those rigid attitudes, then any question of considering a matter becomes difficult. All kinds of things happen. National prestige is involved, apart from other things”.

Finally, a straight question:

“Does it follow that you would be prepared to meet Mr. Chou En-Lai unconditionally?”

My answer:

“It means, first of all, that I am prepared to meet anybody in the wide world. There is nobody whom I am not prepared to meet. That is number one. The second is, one wants to meet people when one thinks that the meeting will produce results. Good results, and not bad result. These are the two main considerations. One does not rush to a meeting simply because a meeting is talked about. A meeting may be

mistimed, misjudged and therefore, produce bad results. On the other hand, if there is any chance of a good result, a meeting should be agreed to.

So, it is difficult for me to say, precisely when, where and under what conditions, a meeting might take place, but I cannot rule it out.”

Here is a series of quotations from what I have said in the Lok Sabha, in the Rajya Sabha and in the press conference, and you will see the same stream of thought running in my mind-never refuse the meeting and try to get the meeting in the best at circumstances, as good circumstances as possible and consider from time to time whether it is more desirable or less desirable.

When Premier Chou En-Lai invited me to meet him within a week or so at Rangoon, apart from the physical difficulty of my going to Rangoon, I reacted against this proposal. I did not like it-for a variety at reasons. I did not quite see why I should go to Rangoon or anywhere else for that meeting but, above all, I did not like this, well, shall I say, “come next week” business; and above all, the invitation to the meeting was contained in a document, in a letter which laid down the Chinese viewpoint, and it wanted some principles etc., settled so as to meet to discuss some principles. Now, if I had accepted that meeting, it would not have connoted me, of course, to anything, but the background was the Chinese letter to me. That would have been the background, although I was not committed to it. I wanted to clear that up. I was not going to him with that document, because I did not agree with that document, and I wanted to wait as I have said, for a subsequent longer letter in reply to my letter of September 24th. That is why I said “I shall consider this question later”. So, when the letter and other papers came and we considered this and we drafted a reply to be sent, we felt-I felt and my colleagues in the Cabinet Committee felt that since we have discussed this for a considerable time, it would be desirable in the balance to propose a meeting in India between Premier Chou En-Lai and myself. Now, my letter to him does not commit him to anything, that is our case, just as his letter has not committed me. But it does make a difference on the basis “after this letter we meet”, a considerable difference, to my meeting after his letter.

..... **xxx**

..... **xxx**

..... **xxx**⁴

What I said was this. I should like to explain myself. Some hon. Members-I am not referring to all hon. Members of the Opposition, but certainly some individuals here-are so passionately committed to the cold war attitude. That is what I call a vested Interest, that is, this cold war attitude of Shri Masani, for instance. Shri Masani and I, regret to say, are farther removed than any two human-beings can be, in thought. Shri Masani dislikes any kind of a step taken by any country, not by India alone, which might reduce tension. You see it is a basic attitude. While I proceed with this, I will say this. It is not a question of vested interest of property and money but of mental commitment to certain ideologies. Now, for instance, take another vested interest of the other kind, that is, of the Communist Party ... [Interruption].

They quite fail to understand a national movement, a national feeling, a national upsurge in the country.... [Interruption]. Here are two.... [Interruption]. That is

what I meant. This cold war attitude, I think, not only now but always is a wrong attitude.

I am making a general statement that the cold war approach is always and, I say, inevitably a wrong approach whatever happens. That does not mean weakening in meeting an opponent or an enemy. Of course, not. But that mental attitude towards cold war is the one basic lesson that I, and I hope others, learnt from Gandhi Ji. I do not mean to say that I have acted up to that lesson always. That is my failing. I lose my temper and do all kinds of things.

But I do believe, that is a right attitude when dealing with individuals, group or nations. More particularly when you have to deal with the conflicts of big nations that attitude has very far-reaching consequences. When you have to think of that in the context of the world today you have to be very careful. Any man with the least sense of responsibility should realize this attitude, which increases tension, bitterness and hatred, is not a good attitude. It may end ultimately in the destruction of the world and so on. So, I was venturing to say that this mental attitude is wrong. It may be honestly held. I do not say that people who indulge in cold war are dishonest. But it is an attitude which comes in the way, apart from its being basically wrong. Because the cold war is based on violence and hearted. This hatred may be justified in the sense that the other party may be wrong. But nevertheless it is a wrong attitude.

Secondly, apart from being a wrong attitude, it closes one's mind and prevents considering a changing situation as it changes. We have got a fixed mind which was fixed. Let us say, five or ten years ago. The situation may change but we apply the same canons of interpretation to it. So, I would venture to say that in regard to these border issues if this House approves of the note that we have sent that it is the policy. That is the policy note. I take it, if I understand it. That people do approve it. I am not quite sure of hon. Members of the Communist Party as to whether they approve it or not. I do not know because their approach is somewhat different. But there it is.

The Communist Party has been carrying on a big propaganda that the two Prime Ministers must meet. If there is anything which would prevent any meeting it is that propaganda of theirs so far as I am concerned, because it is obvious that their objective in their propaganda is something entirely different from my proposal. They are trying to hide, if I may use the word without disrespect, their opinions and feelings on this subject, not to express them clearly enough—some of them, not all—by shouting, "Let the two Prime Ministers meet". Then they need not say anything about the question. But it is not on that basis or on that argument that I have proceeded. After all, I have to explain

I do not know if this meeting will take place. I hope it will. But anyhow I thought it is my duty and in the Committee my colleagues thought it our duty to take this step. We took it after full consideration of its consequences. Then if we took that step people objected to it saying, "What? You say that he will be our honored guest." What else, may I ask? How else can we treat anybody whom we invite to this country? How else? Here again comes that cold war mentality of hatred. No reason, no logic,

no graciousness and things are said here which, if I may say so, bring little credit to India. It brings little credit to India to say these things, which could be repeated, about the leaders of great nations with whom we may be in conflict. How do we speak of those leaders?

May I say what I have just now said, that we must never speak ill of a whole people. So also, we must not speak ill of the leaders who represent those people. For the moment they are not Individuals. They represent those people. I may be a person with many failings and you may condemn me. You may do many things. But I feel sure that even those who have not a particular soft corner for me will resent it if any outsider insulted me, the Prime Minister of India, because then I become a symbol of this Parliament of India apart from my failing. So, others are also symbols and something should not be said which bars any consideration of any problem, which closes people's mind and which brings in too much passion and anger. That is all that I have to submit. That does not mean our not criticizing the policy of another Government or opposing it or fighting it.

I think it was Shri Masani and perhaps some other hon. Members too who talked about forming a block of South Eastern Asian countries of Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia and India. I do not know if this is some kind of revival of the old idea of a third force.

Whatever it may be, I should like the House to consider that this kind of thing means nothing at all. First of all, I am happy to say, we are in the closest friendly relations with these countries, with Nepal, Burma, Indonesia, Ceylon etc. This kind of reference to other countries in this fashion is often found rather irritating by those countries as if we want to dragoon them into something. They do not like it. They are independent countries, very friendly to us often with common interests. But the moment any element comes in "Oh! They want to exercise some pressure on us, Oh! They are in trouble; they want our help"-whatever it may-be there is this element of making them do something which they may not like to do. That is never a right approach to any country, if I know anything about relations between two countries. There is all kind of pressures-pressure on all countries, on our country, on their countries. To imagine that they would yield to some pressure, is not correct. They have to judge according to their situations, internal and external politics. The main thing that we aim at is friendly relations, cooperative relations and I am glad that we have got them.

I do not wish to say much regarding defense, that is, the border question. We have already informed the house that we have to adopt in regard to defense not only a short view, the immediate dangers, to protect ourselves, but the long view also. We cannot exhaust our energy, our strength, in some short view and have nothing left for the long view. So, both views have to be taken, and undoubtedly they involve burdens on us, and I am sure the house will agree to our carrying those burdens because, after all, the basic policy of every country, the basic foreign policy of every country is to protect itself; other policies come later. I have talked about various

approaches to foreign policy, but the basic approach of foreign policy is always to guard the interests of the country, there things follow it. Of course, we want to guard those interests, not in a narrow way, not in that type of ultra-nationalist way which does not look at the world, but we want that to fit in with world developments and world peace and all that; and in fact, in the long run it is those world in largest that also come to our help. So, looking at defense from this point of view, it is not for me to tell you, and I cannot tell you, what exact steps we take on our borders, because that kind of thing is not said in the public, but we are taking all the necessary steps available to us on our borders. We are trying to build roads, airports etc. Whatever it may be.

I think it was Shri Bhakt Darshan who again repeated this business of foreign aircraft flying over our territory. I believe he said that some Ex-servicemen, Ex-soldiers had told him so. Now, I can assure him that our Air Force is very vigilant in this matter, and our Air Force have assured us that no such thing has happened. Apart from the fact that our own aircraft are flying frequently there, it is very difficult for an average and to distinguish aircraft at 30,000 feet, no doubt, it is 30 to 40 thousand feet – apart from that, this is a route by which the Soviet Service flies to India twice or three times a week, I forget how often-the TU 104-and they see the strange thing coming. Apart from that, when Mr. Voroshilov and Mr. Krushchev came here, there were so many flights in that connection to bring them, their parties, to bring things for them, take back things, constant flights, and therefore they probably mistook this for some kind of foreign, enemy aircraft which was intruding on our air space.

I need not say much about the situation in the Naga Hills Tuensang Division. I think that certainly it is infinitely better than it has been in the past. Nevertheless, it is true that sporadic troubles take place and it is exceedingly difficult to put an end to them. But the major improvement there is not more or less of this kind of sporadic trouble, but a change, I think, in the mind of the Naga people, which is the real, basic, helpful thing that is happening, and I hope that will bear fruit.

Now, I should like, this House to consider our problems in that larger context of the world. We can never forget the world, we are too closely knit to it to separate ourselves, and in the world today the major thing that is happening is this approach of the leaders of rival countries trying to find a way out, trying to go ahead with disarmament and solve or lessen the tension which exists. This is of tremendous significance because, if this is not done and if the world continues in any other way, then all our problem, will be solved by vast destruction which is not the destruction of war but practically, if these atomic and nuclear weapons are used curse on the world team which it cannot recover even this atomic radiation spreading out and creeping everywhere. Therefore, these part of the utmost importance and therefore we should Endeavour in our own way to help. We cannot do very much, we are not among the World Powers in the sense of military powers of financial powers, nevertheless it is so happens that we have gained some prestige in the world as a people, as a country which is devoted to peace, and that is one reason also why the problems affect us, whether they are of Pakistan, or whether they are of China. We

have to face these problems bravely, we have to face them with strength, not giving in, not surrendering, but we have always to remember that our language and approach fits in with the temper of the world which aims towards peace today. So we have today to look at it in this big way.

One of the big things that is happening today in the world, one of the very big things, is the revolutionary ferment in Africa. Recently we had this French atomic test in the Sahara. Well, it is a deplorable thing, I think deplorable by itself, deplorable because it begins another series of atomic tests and we must regret it, and we have tried our best, and the United Nations, indeed, have expressed themselves previously against it. But far bigger than this French atomic test in Africa is what the people of Africa are doing today, rising up, sometimes rightly sometimes wrongly if you like, but nevertheless in a state of tremendous upheaval. That is what is happening, and it is obvious that so far as we are concerned, our hearts and our good wishes must go out to them in this tremendous upheaval.

In this connection, all kinds of new problems will arise in Africa affecting the world. One of the biggest problems has been the racial problem. The House knows how the South African Union Government has fixed its policy on the basis of racial discrimination and a master race and apartheid etc. We have suffered, the people of Indian descent have suffered from it, but far more the Africans have suffered from it. Now what is going to happen in Africa when the greater part of Africa consists of independent nations standing on their dignity, not accepting in the slightest degree any kind of racial discrimination, well, the future will show. But obviously, things will not remain as they are today.

In this connection, may I say that I welcome the recent statement made by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Macmillan, addressing the two Houses of Parliament in Cape Town. It was, in so far as policy is concerned about racial discrimination, a clear and forthright statement. Naturally we feel strongly about this, and I earnestly hope that what Mr. Macmillan has said will be the firm policy in all the countries over which Britain holds sway.

I would wish that some of the leaders of the African people who are in detention or in prison, leaders of note, leaders of influence without whom no settlement can be made, are released, because unless they are released there can be no settlement of these problems.

Then I would say just a word about Goa. The first thing is that I should like to assure the House, because there appears to be some mis-apprehension that we are going to take no steps which in any sense might prejudice the liberation of the Goan people. We have been, to some extent, rather restrained from taking any further steps, because we have been waiting, to some extent, for the decision of the World Court. The problem before the World Court has nothing to do directly with Goa; it has to do with Nagar Haveli. Nevertheless, it has been a restraining factor in our consideration of this important problem. That decision, I hope, will come within a month or so.

Another subject which has been dealt with at some length in the debate, or at any rate, referred to repeatedly, was the question of corruption. Now, if you deal with the question of corruption, there can be no two views about it, that every possible and feasible method should be employed to deal with it, to suppress it and to put an end to it.

Shri Asoka Mehta seemed to imply that I denied that there was corruption. Of course, he has got a very wrong impression. What I have said repeatedly is that while there is a good deal of corruption in our administrative services and elsewhere, I do think that the references made to it give it greater importance, that is, it appears by these references to be more widespread than actually it is. I certainly think that in the higher services the standards are fairly high. I do not deny that cases occur. In fact...

In fact, since we established a Special Police Establishment to deal with this matter, they have had a good deal of success in this. I do not know if hon. Members pay much attention to monthly hand-outs that are put in the Parliament Library from the Special Police Establishment as well as annual reports. Anyhow, a new annual report will be coming out, I think, in a month or so.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁵

Anyhow, I should like to give some brief report. I am placing a note on the Table of the House, a note called 'Review of the Work done during the Year 1959' by the Special Police Establishment.

The number of cases relating to bribery, corruption etc. was 917 in 1959, including pending cases from the year before. 1671 cases were investigated during 1959. Of these, 264 were sent for trial. 501 were reported for departmental action, and 101 were dropped for want of proof. Of the cases sent to trial, 190 resulted in convictions of the 363 sent for departmental proceedings, 325 resulted in punishment, 1164 public servants, including 207 gazetted officers were involved in the new cases of 1959. 118 Government servants were convicted in courts, including 10 gazetted officers. Among private persons convicted, as the House well knows, were Ramkrishan Dalmia and Haridas Mundhra. Monthly press releases are being issued about the work of the Special Police Establishment, and copies of these are sent to the Library of Parliament. I shall place a note on this.

The question that was really arising is about the proposal to have a tribunal, standing independent tribunal. I have ventured to say in the other House and here too in answer to questions that I do not think this is desirable or feasible. Some very eminent people with high qualification, judicial and other, have also advised me that this is not a feasible proposition even under the Constitution of India. Apart from the constitutional difficulty, I cannot understand there may be other way show this particular proposal can be said to be a helpful one, I think that if a tribunal sits down and invites application from all over, then complaints will simply paralyze the administration, and there will be hardly any work done, and all the mind of the country and everything will be involved in these arguments, charges and counter-

charges. So, I cannot understand that particular proposal. I can of course, understand any specific charge which has been made being investigated by any suitable tribunal, whatever it may. That is a right thing.

You have, at the present moment, a certain apparatus, whatever it may be, police etc., the law and so on. Anybody can take a person to a court for it. Although I must confess that that apparatus is a slow-moving one. We want to expedite it. We want your help, your suggestion, to do it. If any other proposal is there for us to consider, let us consider it. But one thing I cannot understand in this. A specific proposal, a specific charge, can be investigated. But one cannot investigate charges which are not charges but just vague declamations.

I remember, I hope I am right, that my hon. friend Shri Tyagi many years ago talked about corruption and my old colleague Shri C. D. Deshmukh replied to it saying it is no good making these vague charges, bring the specific instance, and I shall enquire.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁶

I had forgotten about that matter. So, I am grateful to my hon. friend. When this matter was raised, as is usually done by me, I immediately wrote to the Chief Minister and to the Minister concerned and others. While we were enquiring into this matter, which enquiry I continued, a case for libel or a kind of defamation was started against the persons who made the charges. Those cases are still going on. This matter was also referred, I think, to the Election Commissioner in a slightly different context. That is also going on. However, I proceeded with my own way of enquiry. Whether it is satisfactory or not, it is for the House to judge. I did not wish to interfere when the case was going on in the law courts, but I got all the charges, with such evidence as could be stated by those who made the charges; I had answers to these charges; I did not look into them; I did not think myself competent to do so. Having got all that, I sent them to the Law Minister, and the Law Minister examined them very thoroughly and wrote a long note on it which I sent to the Chief Minister; and it was shown to the people who made the charges; it was shown to the Governor. I was in a difficulty. I could not publish it because the case was going on. That is my difficulty. And it is still going on. But, in that particular note, I must say, since I am asked, although I do not wish to come in the way of the law

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁷

The other day a leader of the Swatantra Party, Shri V. P. Menon, said that he knew of partiality and impropriety occurring in the case of Congress Ministers. Whenever I see any such thing, I write to the party concerned: 'Give me some information'. Immediately I had a letter sent to Shri V. P. Menon to enquire what this was about. He did send a reply which was not very helpful. He said, 'I would like to look at the file etc.' as it is, he is prepared to make a statement without looking at the papers! However, I have inquired into this matter. This matter is twelve years old-the matter to which he referred-that is, 1948. It was a matter connected with his own

Ministry, of which he was Secretary and Sardar Patel was the Minister. I think it referred to some Ministers of the old Madhya Bharat Government and Vindhya Pradesh Government. I won't go into details. But we inquired into it. We decided to start prosecutions; in fact, I am not quite sure if they were not started. The matter was then considered fully. I think it was referred to the Solicitor-General and the Attorney-General. It was considered by Sardar Patel, of course, and Shri Rajagopalachari. They both sent up a note to me, a final note, saying, we considered fully these cases; there is no substance in them. This was the report of the Attorney-General too, and they should not be proceeded with'. I accepted their advice, the advice of senior colleagues and the Attorney-General. What could I do? They were all rather petty cases, petty in the sense that there was some confusion about travelling allowance etc. They were withdrawn.

Another case was about a gentleman of the name of Sardar Narmada Prasad Singh. He was later involved in a much bigger case about insurance scandals and he absconded, and remained absconding for a long time. Then he was apprehended and he spent some time in prison.

I mention this, that here after twelve years Shri V. P. Menon makes a statement.....

Here Shri V. P. Menon, a prominent member of the Swatantra Party, throws out this charge of how Ministers have been misbehaving and committing improprieties. And when we go into this matter, we find it was a matter of twelve years ago when Shri V. P. Menon was Secretary of that ministry, Sardar Patel was there, Shri Rajagopalachari was consulted, so was the Attorney-General, and a certain action was taken. It does seem to be rather unfair that these charges should be bandied about-thrown about-in this way.

I have taken a lot of time, but there is just one major matter about which I should like to say something, that is, planning. Shri Asoka Mehta said that the President's Address had given no indication about the outline of the Third Plan and when it would be available to the House. The National Development Council meeting is going to take place on the 19th and 20th of March. It is hoped that before the end of April, the Planning Commission will publish a Draft Outline of the Third Plan for consideration by Parliament. Meanwhile, as the House knows, there is an Informal Committee of Members of Parliament of all Parties which meets sometimes to consider the Third Plan. The tentative approaches to the Third Plan-I would repeat they are tentative; some of the information has appeared in the Press; I am repeating it more authoritatively -the tentative approaches of the Third Plan are (1) increase in national income of at least 5 per cent. per annum; (2) total investment of Ra. 9,950 crores; (3) in the public sector investment of about Rs. 5,950 Crores, with a total developmental outlay of Rs. 7,000 crores. The latter figure compares with Rs. 4,800 crores of the Second Plan as originally drawn up. In the private sector, including agriculture, small industry, housing as well as organized industry-investment of about Rs. 4,000 crores. This compares with the present estimate for the Second Plan of Rs. 3,300 crores.

At this stage, the plan for industry is being drawn up from the point of view of the economy as a whole, not public sector-private sector. What we require are physical targets. Distribution as between public and private sectors would come later, keeping in view naturally the broad policies of Government in regard to such matters. Our approach broadly is that there is a broad policy, but then there is a pragmatic approach. We want to do the job and the sooner we do it the better, keeping in view that broad policy. Now Government are considering the lines along which the general public should be given an opportunity to contribute to a limited extent to the capital of State enterprises in industry and allied fields.

It is obvious that this requires a very great effort, and I repeat something the Planning Commission has said-it is so obvious, but still I repeat it because it is important-namely, the following conditions have to be fulfilled: (1) increase in agricultural production, (2) all public enterprises being carried out with economy and efficiency, yielding the maximum returns feasible, (3) in construction programme, the cost being kept to the minimum, (4) administrative efficiency and speed, and (5) maintenance of prices at reasonable level .

Now, Sir, I really am ashamed to take up so much time of the House, but they will bear with me for little while more. We have come up against problems in a particular Context for which there is no parallel. There is a parallel of industrial development, there is a parallel of planning in the Communist countries, but there is no parallel of this kind at combination, of a measure of planning, with this apparatus. That creates certain difficulties. In the highly developed countries, it was institutional reforms leading to the Welfare State; including a system of progressive taxation which is able to defeat growth of inequality, because normally when industrialization takes place, if it is left unimpeded and unchecked it leads to greater inequality. The rich become richer, the poor may not become poorer, but the gap widens.

I am saying this because, it is very obvious, in this House some persons quite unconnected with modern thought and modern conditions talk about laissez faire and going back to an economy where there is no kind of planning or control. As I said, in those western countries and highly developed countries-I mean 'western' or anywhere-there were institutional reforms leading to the Welfare State, these including a system of progressively high taxation, because, otherwise, without these checks the inequalities would have increased. The pressures from trade unions and this and that are supposed to keep down these. Otherwise, the contrast between riches and poverty would have grown. That is why we are compelled. If we leave things to chance, we would grow industrially in a sense; but we would grow at the expense of the gap between the rich and the poor widening and not lessening. Therefore, come in the various types of institution changes and controls.

Of course, in a nation we can control whatever the difficulties. But in the international sphere-I am talking about economy in the international sphere-obviously, there is no controlling authority and so international inequalities are growing. In spite of our efforts, rich countries are getting richer and richer and poor countries are making much slower progress.

In the communist countries, the main thing we have seen is the relentless and cruel mobilization of man-power, they mobilizes their people and achieve results undoubtedly. We do not wish to do that. But, now the question before us is nevertheless the mobilization of man-power not to that extent but to a considerable extent.

In the course of this debate, reference was made by some hon. Member to the speech delivered by the Governor of the Reserve Bank. I think the question the Governor raised is an important question and we have to bear that in mind because this spiral of wages and prices, etc. is a dangerous thing for us to get into. Not only our Plans are affected but there can be practically no planning at all. We can only deal with these matters by evolving social policies, not by leaving things to chance, by evolving social policies aiming at desired ends. That is planning. The free market that is talked about by Shri Masani and his colleagues and laissez faire are just primitive ways of dealing with complicated situations.

Just a word. I think Shri Braj Raj Singh referred to the Nalagarh Committee Report and...

Anyhow I should like to assure him that I am informed by the Planning Commission that it has been accepted broadly and It has been included in the next year's programme, I do not know how far in detail.

I think Shri Asoka Mehta referred to an article by Mr. Lipmann, an American columnist...

Yes, Shri Khadilkar. That article was a very interesting one, as often Mr. Lipmann's writings are. I should like to read two or three sentences from that article because they do pose a problem for us to consider. He says, writing about India:

"What troubled me was the disparity between the revolutionary objectives of the Third Five Year Plan and the mildness, the almost Victorian mildness and the normality of the Indian political system. I asked myself whether the gigantic economic revolution can be carried out by Parliamentary politicians and civil servants without the dynamism and the discipline or an organized mass movement."

It is an American conservative liberal rather, not any firebrand who is writing, this. And, this is a problem which is before us and we shall have to solve it.

We have to face gigantic problem, tremendous enterprises. We plan for them and the planning, itself, I venture to say, is not bad. It aims at big things. But the question comes, is this apparatus of ours-I am not referring for a moment to the basic parliamentary apparatus but rather to the way it functions-is it adequate? I think that the basic apparatus is adequate or can be made adequate. But I think we must realize that the way it is at present functioning is not adequate. I say so with extreme respect to the way we function in this Parliament-I am all for parliamentary democracy and I do believe that, apart from minor changes here and there, that is a good system specially suited to us. So, I am not challenging that basis. But I do wish to say that we are functioning, more and more in a-what Mr. Lipmann says-Mid-Victorian way, not realizing the urgency of our problems and are arguing, throwing our problems like shuttle-cock from one place to another.

Our other apparatus too is a good apparatus but a slow-moving apparatus. We are trying hard to think of how we can expedite that apparatus-our administrative apparatus-how to give more responsibility to people so that they can decide quickly. In the old days, the British days, the problems were simpler and they evolved their perfectionist apparatus with checks and counter-checks and all that. Now, we have got the same apparatus with unpleasantly complicated social problems and the checks and counterchecks are so much that tremendous delays occur. The only way to deal with this-and in this matter ultimately the communists and the capitalists both agree-is to expedite matters by giving a responsibility to people dispersal of responsibility. It may go wrong; it may be a loss; but there is no greater loss to a nation than delaying. Even the cost in money is very great but the real cost is that you do not come to grips with the major problems you are dealing with.

I have ventured to take a lot of time of this House. On various matters, in the ultimate analysis whether, it is the border trouble or whether it is anything else, it is our economic growth that counts. That is the only thing that gives us strength to face danger from abroad and danger from within. And that lead can only be given by this House unitedly, not by trying to pull each other down, but, in these basic matters, by giving a united lead to work for the benefit of the country.

BACK NOTE

XXIII. Reply on Motion of Thanks to the President's Address, 22 February 1960

1. SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): Nobody has criticised the President.

2. DR. SUSHILA NAYAR (Jhansi): No reference was made by the Opposition, but it was referred to by us.

SHRI JAWAHAR LAL NEHRU: I am sorry; I stand corrected.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI (New Delhi): If I may say so, even Shri Masani had a word of praise for it.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): It was referred to generally, but there was no disagreement on the contents of that note.

SHRI BRAJ RAJ SINGH (Firozabad): Because it was appreciated.

3. SHRI RAJENDRA SINGH (Chapra): Who has condemned? To whom are you referring?

4. SHRI HEM BARUA: Where is the difference in facts?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Hon Members opposite, well, I do not challenge their greater wisdom in these matters.....

SHRI HEM BARUA: I am not referring to our wisdom. I want to make one submission. Whatever the Prime Minister has read, is that a vindication of the criticism leveled by the Opposition? We said that no purpose would be served by a meeting to discuss the principles unless and until differences on facts are resolved. Till then we should not meet. Where are the differences on facts: we wanted to know that. We did not say that he should not meet Premier Chou; but at the same time, facts are there to be resolved.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am very sorry that my reading out all this has not been completely absorbed by the hon. Member's mind yet. That is my difficulty. My difficulty is, and I am quite frank with you, that there are certain vested interests opposing any Settlement between India and China. I am quite frank. (Interruptions...)

SHRI RAJENDRA SINGH: I condemn it.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Where is the question of vested Interest? (Interruptions...)

SHRI GORAY (Poona): The only vested interest is our love for this country. There is no other vested interest....

SHRI TYAGI (Dehra Dun): It is a Political Interest...

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: By vested interest I mean mental, psychological interest, and not vested interest...

SHRI HEM BARUA: The Prime Minister has failed to clarify this Issue. Whenever he accuses our wisdom or our intellect, we have not yet, submitted to that accusation. He failed to make the issue clear before us.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Am I, Sir, I have done in fact, meekly to its ten to charges of dishonor and unfairness?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame. (Interruptions)...

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Is it the idea of the opposition that I should patiently listen when they say that I am bringing about national humiliation? I would rather be unwise than be a traitor to this country. These are charges brought against me and if I speak calmly on this subject in this House, it does not mean that I do not feel strongly about this subject. I honor this House and its conventions; therefore, I speak calmly. I am angry at the kind of things that have been said in this House, not only angry at what has been said from the other side but from this side too. I think it is unbecoming.

SHRI RAJENDRA SINGH: You concede that now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Let him go on.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am endeavoring to reply....

SHRI RAJENDRA SINGH: We concede that you are the first patriot in the country. We do not challenge your patriotism.

AN HON. MEMBER: Order, order.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Why should they say order order?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I did not interrupt a single Member when he spoke, except.... (Interruptions) I cannot understand why hon. Member cannot listen patiently when they do not like something.

MR. SPEAKER: I have always said that the hon. Minister must be allowed to go on, and if they have any serious points of doubt, at the end of the speech, if I consider that any clarification is necessary, I shall allow or two questions.

SHRI HEM BARUA: rose—

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: There is no question of any clarification. I am not giving in to anybody. Sir, I appeal to you, if I do not give in, can another hon. Member get up and go on interrupting me?

MR. SPEAKER: No.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: For six days or five days I have listened to this debate, and except once....

MR. SPEAKER: I can only say this much. No side should cast aspersions on the honesty or the motives of the other side. All of us are engaged in the common endeavor to see that this matter is amicably settled.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: May I enquire, when we are called dishonorable persons, when we are said to betray the country, is that an as person or not?

MR. SPEAKER: It is.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I did not dispute the honesty. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. I am anxious that neither side need attribute motives to the other side. The doubt is as to what are the changed circumstances which have necessitated such a kind of policy of requesting that he may come here. That is a legitimate ground and the hon. Minister may explain it beyond that to say that the Hon. Minister has let down the country, or done something else, or attributing motives is not right, nor is it necessary for this side to say that others have a vested interest.

5. SHRI RAJENDRA SINGH: I submit that the integrity of the Police Department, however high it may be, is not above suspicion.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member may also suspect sometimes the judiciary. I am not saying that only the police should deal with it, but it is the police that starts cases, our Intelligence Departments. If they are not good, change them, but you cannot deal with them in an ad hoc way.

6. SHRI TYAGI: I was on these benches then, not a Minister.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Naturally, if he had been a Minister, he would not have said that. But there it is. Wherever it is, one can enquire into charges that are made. There are procedures. This Government, and this House, in fact, have taken action in regard to enquiries about big action, in the past, involving some of the most important persons in the land.

SHRI BRAJ RAJ SINGH: Certain charges have been made during the course of the debate. Is the Prime Minister prepared to constitute some sort of tribunal for enquiring into those charges?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am glad the hon. Member has reminded me of what he said. I remember he referred to the U.P. Minister, and a contract being given to his son. Is that the case?

SHRI BRAJ RAJ SINGH: Of course. I was not allowed to name the Minister.

7. SHRI ESWARA IYER (Trivandrum): On a point of order. It would be unfair for the Prime Minister to say anything about a matter which is pending in the court. If he says that there is nothing in the charge, then the court may be influenced.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That has been my difficulty during all these months. Otherwise, I would have said many Things. But I am merely saying this.

SHRI RAM KRISHAN GUPTA (Mahendragarh): May I know whether any such case has been received from the Punjab?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have received. In the past year or two, quite a number of things have come and they have been examined. And reports have been issued. It is true one or two cases have come fairly recently-by 'recently', I mean in the last few weeks-and they are being dealt with now.

SHRI TYAGI: I wonder if the Prime Minister, has the authority to investigate cases which are forwarded to him by private persons about Ministers in the States. It is only a private matter.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is not a question of legal authority. My investigations only go to the extent: is there a prima facie case to be dealt with or otherwise? I cannot go beyond that. I cannot punish person.

MR. SPEAKER: I may say at once that it is the responsibility of the Centre to constantly. Watch-not to interfere-the manner in which the constitutional machinery works in the state.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Yes.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE OF THE INDIAN AND CHINESE PRIME MINISTERS

26 April, 1960

I beg to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the joint communique issued last night as a result of the conversations that I have been having with Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China.

Last night, soon after the issue of the joint communique, Premier Chou En-lai held a press conference. It was a very prolonged press conference which, I believe, lasted for about two hours and a half. There is some reference to it in this morning's papers, but they have been unable to give a full report, which possibly may appear tomorrow. I myself have not seen the full report of that, but such things as I have seen indicate that he had naturally stated and given expression to his point of view, which, very often, is not our point of view, of the Government of India. It is possible some misapprehension might arise occasionally.

The hon. Member-refers to the six points. We do not agree to them. The points were-

I am reading from the script which he gave to the press:

"1. There exist disputes on the boundary between the two sides."

Of course, there exist disputes. That is the first point.

"2. There exists between the two countries a line of actual control up to which each side exercises administrative jurisdiction."

..... XXX XXX XXX¹

"3. While determining the boundary between the two countries, certain geographical principles such as watershed, river valley and mountain passes could be applicable equally to all sectors of the boundary."

It is a principle laid down that water-sheds are applicable, and we naturally agree that watersheds are very important factors; it is the most important factor in mountainous regions, river valleys etc. It does not carry us anywhere.

"4. A settlement of the boundary question between the two countries should take into account the national feelings of the two peoples for the Himalayas and the Karakorum mountains."

I take it as a response to the fact that the Himalayas are an intimate part of India and Indian culture and all that.

..... XXX XXX XXX²

“5. Pending settlement of the boundary question through discussions, both sides should keep to the line of actual control and should not put forward territorial claims as preconditions, but individual adjustments may be made.”

Whatever the explanation of that may be, it is rather an odd way of putting it. Presumably it means that they will not discuss anything unless the territorial claim is accepted. It may be that; it is not quite clear.

“6. In order to ensure tranquility on the border so as to facilitate the discussions, both sides should continue to refrain from patrolling along all sectors of the boundary.”

This is what he has said. This is not something that I agreed to. In fact, he said before stating this, that:

“On the boundary question, it is not impossible for the two sides to find common points or points of proximity, which in my view may be summarized as follows:”,

and then he has summarized them. He has given his view; it has not been clear, but there it is. Anyhow, I am not agreeable to this particular approach, but I should like to make one or two things clear.

I believe he was asked something like ‘Were you asked to vacate?’ In what form, I do not remember. He said, ‘No’ or something to that effect. I think his answer was.....

He said that he was not asked to vacate or something like that.

The Prime Minister of the Chinese People’s Republic presumably came here because something important had happened, the important thing being that according to us, they had entered our territory, over a large area of our territory, which we considered aggression. That was the whole basis of his coming here. And if hon. Members may remember, in one or two public statements I made at the airport and at the banquet, I had repeatedly referred to something having been done which should be undone.

The whole argument was based, our argument was based, on the Chinese forces having come into our territory. Their argument was based on the fact that they have always been there, that is to say, not those particular forces, but that the Chinese authorities either of Sinkiang in the north or of Tibet have been in constructive or actual possession of those areas; not now, but for two hundred years. That was such a variance, such a tremendous variance in the factual state that there was no meeting-

ground, when, according to us, and we repeat that now too after all these talks, that their forces came into this area within quite recent times; naturally, they did not enter a broad area on one date, but in the main, they had come to this area in the course of the last year and a half or so. That is our position. Some may be even less than a year, some may be a little more than a year, and some may be a little more than that. I am talking about the western sector. That is our case, to which we hold.

Their reply to that was that they have been in constructive and actual possession or actual possession of this for two hundred years. Now, there is some difference, factual difference between the two statements, a very considerable difference, and there it is. And naturally, in the course of our long talks, we considered various things they had to say and I had to say. We listened to each other. May I remind the House that in talking with interpreters having to interpret Chinese into the English language, it is a very laborious process? Broadly, it takes three times the amount of time that a normal talk takes, that is to say, an hour's talk will become a three hour talk with interpretation into Chinese, not double but three times. And so, very prolonged talks took place. And this basic disagreement about historical and actual facts came up again and again.

Now, we are quite clear in our minds about our facts, and we are prepared to, and we did state them, and we are prepared to establish them with such material as we have got. The Chinese position was, as I said, basically different facts; historically, actually, practically, they are quite different.

Also the attempt was made, it was frequently stated, to equate the eastern sector with the western sector. That is, according to the Chinese, although in the eastern sector, we had no right to be there, we had nevertheless advanced gradually in the course of the last few years, last six or seven or eight or ten years, to the present boundary line which we call the MacMahon Line. They equated it to the western sector, although the conditions are quite different and the facts are quite different.

So, the position emerged that apart from friendly sentiments and all that, the actual discussion came against a rock of an entirely different, set of facts. If facts differ, inferences differ, arguments differ; after all, every argument, every inference, depends on a certain set of facts. If the basic facts are different, then, there is no meeting-ground at all, unless some slight clarification takes place about certain basic facts.

Therefore, it was suggested and ultimately agreed to, that these facts should be explored from the material available with us and with the Chinese Government. I had suggested that it might be done here and now, but, to that, while we were prepared to do it, they said they did not have most of their material here, so that we could not advance much on that line.

Thereafter, it was suggested that this pure examination, factual examination might be done on an official basis later, that is, after our talks, and this was agreed to.

It is obvious that the officials who might do it have no authority or competence to deal with this problem in the sense of suggesting anything, in the sense of dealing with the political aspect of the problem or suggesting any solution or recommending anything; they cannot do it. It is not their function. All they can do is to examine such facts, and as is stated in the communique, to more or less list the facts that are agreed to, the facts on which there is a difference of opinion or such on which perhaps some further inquiry may be necessary. Anyhow, I do not imagine that this process will clarify the situation and make it easy of solution. I do not think so, but it might somewhat make some basic facts clear or at any rate, we would know exactly on what evidence their case stands. For the moment, we do not know that except what they state. They know to some extent our evidence, not all of it, because when they could not produce all their evidence, there was no reason why we should produce all of it. Anyhow, that is the position in this communique that a committee or a set of officials-to call it is committee was not correct-some of our officials are going to meet some of their officials with our set of facts, material, documents etc. and to examine their set of material, maps, documents, and all these-there are such things as revenue reports, revenue records, collection of taxes and all kinds of things. They will give an objective report which, presumably, would not be a report in which both agree. But anyhow they will draw up a list.

That is as far as we have gone at present-to present that report. Then presumably that report will be considered by the two Governments and they will decide what other steps might be taken.

There are two things which I would like to clear up. As I said, I have not seen the full report of Premier Chou En-Lai's Press Conference.

..... XXX XXX XXX³

In the Communique itself, a period of four months has been fixed for this process, for the meetings which are going to take place in Peking and New Delhi-two centres-for examining these papers. Probably the first meeting will take place right at the beginning of June, the first week of June. No exact date has been fixed.

Broadly speaking, the position, therefore, is that after these prolonged talks, which consisted of our stating fully whatever we thought about our respective stands and positions, we were unable to convince each other and we-both parties-remained un- convinced at the end of it- we standing for what the House knows we stand for, and they standing for something entirely opposite and based on an entirely different set of facts. We thought that in the circumstances it was desirable from many points of view to pursue this line of inquiry at the official level, without any authority to the officials to come to any decisions, and then take this up. Meanwhile, obviously when this is being done-and otherwise too-we have to avoid clashes on these border areas, because these clashes do not help anybody.

That is the position. I would gladly have answered any further question that is asked of me but for the fact that we are very much short of time for discussing these various things.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁴

As far as I remember, I said 'good faith'. Obviously when there is a conflict, one of the elements which helps in removing it is good faith and, of course, peace. We were always coming against this hard rock of an entirely different set of facts. This House accepts a certain set of facts which we have ventured to place before it with some confidence that they are correct and which we have believed. Now they produce an entirely different set of facts relating to what had happened for 200 or 300 years plus what has happened in recent years.

So it becomes a little difficult to discuss. If one is fairly clear about some basic facts, one can draw inferences and discuss. But when the basic facts are so completely different, some kind of an attempt should be made to find out what the basis is for those facts.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁵

In two or three sentences, I will place it before the House now.

Their case is that from immemorial times, you might say, or at any rate, for hundreds of years, their border has been the Karakoram Range upto the Kanakla pass. Unless you have maps, you will not be able to understand it. If you accept that border, a large area of Ladakh is cut off. They say that of this area, the northern part pertained to Sinkiang, not to Tibet at all, and the little lower part to Tibet. That is, broadly, their case. They say that they came there- not the present Government but the previous Chinese Government-previously. They referred to something that I had said in Parliament here which some hon. Members perhaps did not like. They took advantage of that from their own point of view. They said, 'How is possession there in an area which is an arid area where nobody lives?'

They said that most of this area is like the Gobi desert. You do not have normal administrative apparatus in such areas. You have constructive control; in addition, sometimes an administrative officer goes there, occasionally some tax collector goes there. They do not sit, there. It is because it is so deserted. During winter periods, nobody can go there at all; nobody can move about there. They said, 'But we have been in constructive and actual possession of this all along, long before the present People's Government came, before that too'. That is their case, and they gave this boundary.

But one thing which is worth noticing is that throughout our correspondence or talks, the boundaries have never been given precisely by them, as we have latitude, longitude, mountain peaks, this and that hon. Members will see how even in the

White Paper we have given very precise boundaries. But in spite of our efforts to get a precise boundary we did not succeed except these broad ranges.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX**⁶

There was a question-I think somebody asked about Premier Chou En-lai's invitation to me. My answer to that was that it is not time when I can give an answer. In fact, I said that we must await developments, await the report of this official committee, then we can consider that.

The hon. Member asked me, as far as I understood, about patrolling.

If the hon. Members will see, in this communique it is said that every effort should be made by the parties to avoid friction and clashes in the border areas. That is a general direction which we take and which we give. We found that it is very difficult and partly undesirable to be precise about it. I think we cannot immobilize people so that they can go and sit and not go to the right or left. I think it was right anyhow to tell them that they should not take any step which obviously brings them into conflict.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX**⁷

I am very sorry. If there is one point that should be clear even to an average mind-and the hon. Member is not average; he is a super-average mind- it is this that you either have war or you have some kind of, call it talks or steps; you cannot have something in between the two. We cannot declare war on the frontier and, at the same time, talk about discussions or sending official teams. The two cannot go together.

BACK NOTE

XXIV. Joint Communique of the Indian and Chinese Prime Ministers, 26 April 1960

1. SHRI KHUSHWAQT RAI (Kheri): Because that is what the Defence Minister said.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It may be very important, it is very obvious too. It is obvious, I do not know where the importance of it is.

SHRI MAHANTY: I may be pardoned for interrupting, but does the Prime Minister draw a line of distinction between the area under administrative control and the geographical area? That we would like to know. We have our sovereignty.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: There is no question of administrative control or any control. What it says is, not very happily, not correctly, but broadly, that there is a line of actual control broadly meaning military control.

SHRI HEM BARUA: That would mean that Long Ju and part of Ladakh would be in their hands, and the *status quo* should be maintained.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Long Ju is in their hands, that is under military control. It is military control, it means military control.

2. SHRI VAJPAYEE: What about Karakorum?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: If the Chinese feel strongly about the Karakorum, they are welcome to do so, I have no objection to it.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Do they mean plebiscite there?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: There is no reference to a plebiscite anywhere. I do not know where the hon. Member got hold of the plebiscite. We cannot have a plebiscite of the mountain peaks in the Himalayas.

3. SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI (Kendrapara): Is there a time-limit fixed for the discussion and submission of the report?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Yes, the hon. Member will find that mentioned in the Joint Communique.

4. SHRI VAJPAYEE: We want a discussion on the question.

SHRI KHADILKAR (Ahmednagar): Apart from these claims and counter-claims based on either historical data or actual possession, as the Prime Minister suggested in his speech of welcome, namely, that the primary issue was the restoration of the atmosphere of peace which had absolutely disappeared, was there any reciprocation of that sentiment from the other side during the course of the talks?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: How am I to answer that?

5. SHRI BRAJ RAJ SINGH: view of what has been said by the Prime Minister about our attitude—he also said that both have remained unconvinced on these matters—I want to know whether he is convinced that these meetings of the officials at Peking and New Delhi, our officials and the Chinese officials, will bring in any fruit? Or will it be some sort of a roving commission which will not bring about any result? Does he not propose to take some immediate steps?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: How can I say? I just said that they may—I hope they will—throw some light on the factual situation. But by themselves they cannot take us very far. That is all they can do. But in a state of affairs of this kind, one naturally tries every method which might prove helpful.

SHRI TYAGI (Dehra Dun): I wonder if it would be possible at any stage during these negotiations to make the people of India aware of their facts and their claims.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Neither their facts nor our facts are secret. Our facts are well-known; so are theirs except in minor matters.

6. AN HON. MEMBER: Did Chou En-lai invite you to Peking? (Interruptions).

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH (Sasaram): What is the distance between our territory which has been occupied by China and our administered area in the remaining part of Ladakh? As it has been agreed, and as our Prime Minister has also said that we have agreed to avoid clashes, does it mean that our patrol personnel will not go to patrol our territory?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I did not understand the Questions of hon. Members. But I will try to answer them to the extent I understood.

7. DR. RAM SUBHAR SINGH: That is not my point. My point is this. There is a long distance between the Chinese occupied area of Ladakh and our actually administered area in the terms of what the Government of India has been saying. Therefore, I want to know, if that is possible, what will be the situation, if our patrol personnel are not allowed to go to patrol the territory because whenever they went to patrol our territory they were arrested by the Chinese.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Our people will be completely free to move about these areas without coming into conflict.

SHRI VAJPAYEE: Does it mean that Government has committed itself that pending factual investigation, no steps will be taken to eject the Chinese from Indian soil?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I should think that it was absolutely clear. Is there any doubt about it in the hon. Member's mind?

SHRI VAJPAYEE: Yes, Sir.

STATEMENT REGARDING THE NAGA HILLS AND TUENSANG AREA

1 August, 1960

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have on many previous occasions referred in this House to the problem of the Nagas. As hon. Members are aware, we have always regarded the territory inhabited by the Nagas, as by other tribal peoples all over India, as part of Independent India as defined in our Constitution. We looked upon all these tribal people as citizens of independent India having all the privileges and obligations of such citizenship.

The Nagas are a hard-working and disciplined people, and there is much in their way of life from which others can learn with profit. We have had for many years Nagas in the Indian Army, and they have proved to be excellent soldiers. Our policy has always been to give the fullest autonomy and opportunity of self development to the Naga people, without interfering in any way in their internal affairs or way of life.

Unfortunately, the process of devolution of local autonomy could not be implemented in full because troubles arose in the area as a result of the hostile activities of a section of the Nagas. The ostensible object of this hostile section was to carve out an independent Naga territory entirely separate from India. This was demand which no Government in India could ever agree to. These hostile elements among the Naga people thereafter took to violent methods, and we had to take steps to meet these illegal activities. The hostile Nagas indulged in arson, loot and extortion of money from their own fellow Nagas. They also committed a number of gruesome murders. It became our duty to give protection to the large number of other Naga residents of these areas and to meet the menace of this continued violence. The help of our Army and the Assam Rifles was taken in this conflict, and various steps were taken to give the necessary protection and to maintain law and order. This conflict inevitably caused much suffering to the people of those areas, most of whom were anxious to live a peaceful life and carry on their avocations. The story of the last five or six years has been a sad and depressing one. Gradually, there was an improvement in the situation and, over large areas in the Naga districts, peaceful conditions were established. One bright feature was the extension of our development work and the establishment of schools, hospitals and communications. But in spite of this considerable improvement, a hard core of the hostile elements continued their violent activities, even though they were driven back into the remoter parts of these Hills.

The leaders of all the tribes of the Naga Hills representing their people, who had suffered so much from this conflict and the depredations of the hostiles, decided to make an effort to put an end to the conflict. They called representative Convention of the Naga people, drawn from every tribe and area of the territories then forming

part of the Naga Hills district of Assam and the Tuensang Frontier Division of the North East Frontier Agency. This Convention met from the 22nd to the 25th August 1957, at Kohima in search, as the Convention put it, of a solution to end the infinite sufferings and bloodshed. This Convention passed a number of resolutions. The principal one requested the Government of India to constitute a single administrative unit consisting of the Naga Hills district of Assam and the Tuensang Frontier Division of the NEFA, under the External Affairs Ministry of the Government of India. This unit was to be administered by the Governor of Assam as the agent of the President of India, under the Ministry of External Affairs.

I received a delegation of the leaders chosen by the Convention on September 25th and 26th, 1957. We considered the Naga request for a separate administrative unit as a reasonable one. In order to give effect to this proposal, the matter was brought before Parliament, and the Naga Hills- Tuensang Area Act, 1957, was passed. This area thus became an administrative unit and the necessary Regulation was promulgated by the President, making detailed provision for the administration of the new unit. It has since been administered by the Governor of Assam as the agent of the President, under the Ministry of External Affairs.

The Naga people hoped that the formation of the new unit would give them an opportunity of developing their area in the way they considered suited to their needs. Some progress was no doubt made, but the activities of the hostile elements stood in the way of normal development.

Another Convention was, therefore, held at a place called Ungma in the Mokokchung district of the Naga Hills-Tuensang Area in May 1958. This Convention appointed a liaison committee to contact the underground elements and win them over to support of the Convention's policy of securing the maximum autonomy of their area and finally settling the future of the Nagas. Though some among the hostile elements appreciated this approach, broadly speaking, the response was not encouraging.

The leaders of the Naga People's Convention, therefore, decided to draft their own proposals and place them before the Government of India. A third Naga People's Convention met at Mokokchung in October 1959 and prepared a 16-point memorandum for consideration by the Government. The main demand formulated by the Nagas at this Convention was for the constitution of a separate State within Union the Indian Union to be known Nagaland, under the Ministry of External Affairs, with a Governor and administrative secretariat, a Council of Ministers and Legislative Assembly. Provision was also made for the constitution of the Village Council, the Range Council and the Tribal Council to deal with matters concerning different tribes and areas. These bodies were also to deal with disputes and cases involving breaches of customary laws and usages.

A delegation of Naga leaders presented the 16-point memorandum, on behalf of the Naga People's Convention, to the Governor of Assam in April last. The delegation expressed a wish to meet the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister informed them that

he would gladly meet them but, as he was leaving for England soon for the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, the meeting desired by the Naga leaders would have to be held after his return from abroad.

On the 26th July 1960, the Prime Minister received a delegation of 15 Naga leaders led by Dr. Imkongliba Ao, President of the Naga People's Convention. The delegation placed before him the 16-point memorandum to which I have already referred. The proposals contained in the memorandum were fully examined. The Prime Minister reaffirmed the Government's policy to give the maximum autonomy to the Nagas in their internal affairs. He accepted their request for the constitution of the Naga Hills-Tuensang a separate State within the Area as Indian Union, but pointed out to the Naga leaders that the extent of this territory, its population and its financial resources are such that it would not be able to bear the weight of a heavy super-structure in the administration. The details were discussed with the Naga leaders and a broad agreement has been reached on the following lines.

A new State to be called 'Nagaland' will be established within the Indian Union comprising the territory of the existing Naga Hills and the Tuensang Area. The same person will be appointed as the Governor of Assam and the Governor of Nagaland and the existing jurisdiction of the Assam High Court over the area comprising the new State would continue. There will be a transitional period during which an interim body will be constituted with representatives from every Naga tribe to assist and advise the Governor in the administration of Nagaland. The Governor will have special responsibility for law and order during this transitional period and for so long as the law and order situation continues to remain disturbed on account of hostile activities. Since the financial resources of the new State will be extremely limited, and large grants from the Central Government may be necessary, not only for the development schemes, but also to maintain the efficiency of the administration, the Governor will have general responsibility for ensuring that the funds made available by the Government of India are expended for the purposes for which they are approved by the Central Government.

There will be a Legislative Assembly to which the Council of Ministers of the new State will be responsible. Certain safeguards, as in the existing Sixth Schedule of the Constitution, will be provided for the religious and social practices of the Nagas, Naga customary laws and procedure and the ownership and transfer of land. Otherwise, the existing laws relating to the administration of civil and criminal justice will continue to remain in force. Jurisdiction of the High Court of Assam will also continue. Special provision will be made for the administration of the Tuensang district in accordance with the wishes of the people inhabiting that district. There are some other matters of relatively lesser importance on which also full understanding has been reached between the Government of India and the Naga leaders. It is hoped, therefore, that there will be no room for any misunderstanding in future about the Government of India's intention and what they propose to do to implement the understanding reached during the recent discussions.

It is now the intention of the Government of India to give effect to the arrangements reached with the Naga leaders without delay. This will involve amendment of the Constitution and a Bill will be placed before Parliament for approval in due course.

I take this opportunity to express our satisfaction at the agreement reached with the Naga leaders. We have always regarded the Nagas as full Indian citizens. I have said to the Naga people several times in the past that there could be no question of independence for the Nagas. India achieved her independence thirteen years ago and the Nagas are as independent as other Indian citizens. We have not the slightest desire to interfere in the tribal customs and usage of the Nagas or in their distinctive way of life. The Nagas have been anxious to have a separate State within the Indian Union. The agreement now reached with them should enable them to find the fullest opportunity of self-expression and we sincerely hope that the new arrangement will result in the rapid restoration of normal conditions in the area. I must, however, make it clear that no Government can permit hostile activities on its soil, and while we are ready to give our fullest support to those who will cooperate in giving effect to the agreement just reached we shall continue to deal firmly with the hostile elements. This is an unpleasant but necessary task and I trust that the Naga leaders will cooperate fully in putting an end to the disloyal activities of a minority of their people.

....XXX.... XXX.... XXX¹....

It is true; but that word was accepted because of the strong desire of the Naga Leaders to have it.

....XXX.... XXX.... XXX²....

This is not a constitutional matter. No amendment of the Constitution will lay down the administration in charge of an area. The Government of India looks after it; and it is a matter for the President, acting through his Prime Minister, to decide as to the allocation of work between the Ministries. But, it has been stated here that two years ago, in 1957, it was the request of this Convention that the Ministry of External Affairs, which is generally looking after the NEFA area should continue to do so. Since it was their request, and, in fact at that time we were going to continue to have it, we said so. It is again their request. As I said, this is not going to be put down in the Constitution; and it is a matter entirely for to determine. But, since it is their wish we have mentioned it here.

....XXX.... XXX.... XXX³....

I have endeavoured to explain the causes historically The North East Frontier Agency region has been directly connected with the External Affairs Ministry. The NEFA is as much a part of India. And, in fact, the House may know that in the Budget estimates of the Ministry of External Affairs very large sums of money are provided for the Assam Rifles even. So, it has been dealt with in that way because it was considered rather a special region requiring special treatment. I am not justifying it. I am merely stating the historical background of it.

Later on, a special service was started which was quite a different service from the other services. There was the Political Service which was also put under the Ministry of External Affairs. In these services people were taken on special experience, on special aptitude, special toughness to live in isolation and away from the normal amenities of life and all that. They were taken from the Army, from the Civil services and from outside, so that it has been connected in that way. And, when in 1957 this Convention of people expressed a wish that they should be one unit, they expressed also the wish that the External Affairs Ministry should be in charge. In fact, we told them that this is a matter entirely for us to determine. But since they were anxious to lay stress on it we put that in. But, it is not, as I said, a matter of the Constitution or anything. We can change this by agreement or whatever it is, later. But, for the present anyhow, it will continue in that way.

....XXX.... XXX.... XXX⁴....

But, at the present moment, this unit is under the External Affairs Ministry, and it is really a continuation more or less of that. Of course, a change is made that the officers and others that serve there are from that political service that has been specially recruited.

....XXX.... XXX.... XXX⁵....

This State will be the sixteenth State, as the hon. Member says, subject to certain provisional arrangements, etc. The period is indefinite because much depends upon other factors, law and order, etc. Naturally, it is the sixteenth State. By virtue of its size etc. It will function without, I hope that complicated structure of administration which the other States require. Now, the agreement arrived at is an agreement between the Government of India and the representatives of the Naga Peoples' Convention. That has to be translated in legal, constitutional terms. The agreement itself is not a legal document in that sense that but it will have to be translated in proper terms and drafted properly. The essentials of it have to be included in the Bill - not the smaller matters. The basic things will have to be included and the Government of India hope and trust that these essentials would be accepted by this House. Minor things of course do not much matter.

....XXX.... XXX.... XXX⁶....

Agreement means Agreement- nothing else.

....XXX.... XXX.... XXX⁷....

Agreements are made between any two parties, subordinate or not. We need not quarrel about the language used. If this House approves it, it will become in a legal and constitutional form a part of our Constitution - not as I have read it but the basic thing. The basic thing is the creation of a certain State. Obviously, this House will have to approve it before it becomes so. If it approves of it, it becomes a part of our Constitution. This agreement cease if it is a part of our Constitution. But certainly Government is bound to put it forward as such and endeavour to get it through the Parliament.

BACK NOTE

XXV. Statement Regarding the Naga Hills and Tuensang Area, 1 August, 1960

1. SHRI BRAJ RAJ SINGH (Firozabad): Sir, the Prime Minister was pleased to say that the Government of India will be dealing strictly with the hostile elements. Now, Dr. Phizo is reported to be approaching the United Nations Organization, perhaps. May I know what is the attitude of the Government of India with regard to the activities of Dr. Phizo and how do they want to meet the situation?

SHRI RAGHUNATH SINGH (Varanasi): What is the relevancy of this?

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH (Sasaram): I only wish to point out one thing. I fully support the agreement. But I do not clearly understand the meaning of the word 'Nagaland'. I, therefore, request the Prime Minister and the Government to carefully name that area. It may be named Naga State or Naga Pradesh; Nagaland is something bigger.

2. SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARYA (West Dinajpur): Do they want to have an outlandish name? Nagaland is outlandish.

SHRI RAGHUNATH SINGH: It should be something like Naga State or Naga province.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA (Baloda Bazar): It has been reported in the Press that the affairs of the Nagaland, by convention, will be looked after by the Ministry of External Affairs. We want to know why this special provision by convention is being established so that this new State in the Union will be looked after not by the Ministry of Home Affairs but by the Ministry of External Affairs. We are rather concerned about this new procedure that is being evolved. And, we would like to have a clarification from the Prime Minister about it.

3. SHRI TYAGI (Dehra Dun): Is it also part of the agreement that we can never take it away from the Ministry of External Affairs to the Ministry to Home Affairs? Is it a commitment?

SHRI ASOKA MEHTA (Muzaffarpur): We can understand the Prime Minister looking after that area. The Ministry of External Affairs deals with external matters and this is an internal matter. Why should this internal question be looked after by the External Affairs Ministry and why should we be a party to that kind of agreement? I can understand that they would have liked to be looked after by you as the Prime Minister of India. But I cannot understand how this idea came to be entertained today.

4. SHRI BRAJ RAJ SINGH: What about my question?

5. SHRI TYAGI: I want to seek further clarification. I want to know whether this agreement is as such a formal agreement and will go into the Constitution or whether it is an informal talk with the Prime Minister and certain conclusions have been arrived at in some talks with a non-official body and also whether Parliament will have the final say with regard to the changes which have to be effected in the Constitution. Will this agreement go as a legal document or is it a type of treaty?

SHRI ASOKA MEHTA: How can there be a treaty? I cannot understand.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. Member consider the desirability of reserving all this for the Bill?

SHRI ASOKA MEHTA: But we must surely understand what is being done. If I have understood it clearly, a sixteenth State is going to emerge in the Indian Union. If it is going to be the sixteenth State it will have a same status as the other fifteen or it may have a different status. If it has a different status, there must be reason why a different status is given to it. We want to understand whether as a result of this agreement, a sixteenth State is going to be born in the Indian Union or there is something different. Again, wherein does this External Affairs Ministry come in if it is the sixteenth State?

6. Dr. M.S. ANEY (Nagpur): May I ask one clarification? Would it be necessary to have another agreement with them to make any changes in this agreement, if it is incorporated in the Constitution as it is and if a change is necessary later on or this House, on its own authority, can change it?

SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN (Kumakonam): I take it that this agreement is an understanding or arrangement and not agreement proper.

7. SHRI TYAGI: How can there be agreement between the Government of India and the people of India? The Government of India cannot come to an agreement with the people of U. P. or of Punjab. They are subordinate to the Government of India.

MOTION REGARDING REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY

10 August, 1960

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in taking part in this discussion, I feel as if I was in a quandary. To begin with the Department of Atomic Energy has produced a report which is a remarkably comprehensive report and says all that any Minister can say about it and much more, because a Minister, like many other Members, is rather ignorant of this subject and slightly apprehensive lest some questions be put to him which he cannot answer. So, there is this full report, and all the hon. Members who have spoken here have spoken not only in commendation and praise of the work of the Atomic Energy Department but have urged it and urged the Government to go ahead even at a faster pace in this direction. So, in view of this, what am I to say, Mr. Speaker? That is my difficulty.

It is a curious circumstance which strikes me often that here in India, we live in a variety of ages and centuries at the same time. Without any offence, I once said that we live in the cow-dung age in India, and I meant it in the sense that even now, the principal source of power in India is cow-dung. It is an extraordinary thing, but there it is. And at the same time, we are, if I may say so, among the more or less advanced countries in regard to the development of atomic energy. So, we span not only centuries but Millennia in this.

I have no doubt that the attention we have paid to atomic energy has been right and very worth-while. It is worthwhile from the point of view of the practical advantages that are beginning to come to us and will come to us in greater measure. But it is worth-while from an even deeper point of view, one of longer perspective, because there can be no doubt that in this fast-changing world, a new age began with the bursting of the atom bomb at Hiroshima, at any rate, with this power coming into use. And ever since then, -it was only a few years ago- this has made considerable progress in both directions, both for destruction and for construction.

In that sense, therefore, this atomic energy is a real symbol of the modern world which Janus-like faces two ways, vast destruction and annihilation and great speed in construction and progress, all facing us at the same time, that is, the possibilities of both.

So far as we are concerned, we are determined not to go in for making atomic bombs and the like. But we are equally determined not to be left behind in this advance in the use of this new power. It is true that in the ultimate analysis, a country which has that power fully developed can use it for good purposes or evil purposes. And no declaration that I can make today will necessarily bind people in the future, but I do hope that we shall create an atmosphere in this country which will bind every Government in future, so that it may not use this power for evil purposes. But it is the symbol of the future, together with many other things. In past years, we rather slipped back in the

development of science, technology and the like, and we are trying very laboriously to catch up. In this matter, let us not be left behind now. We should keep ourselves in the forefront from now onwards. Therefore, apart from the immediate use and good that it may bring us, from this very important future point of view, it is of the utmost importance that we should go ahead. We may calculate that a power station costs this much and that much, but there is something deeper than a power station; it is the future that we are trying to grasp and get hold of, and, therefore, we are trying to take advantage of it today. Therefore, it is something satisfying, and it is giving a measure of satisfaction that in this matter we are keeping ahead, and that we are making regular progress.

The report itself gives a full account on this. Hon. Members have spoken and congratulated our Department, or rather the Head of that Department, Dr. Bhabha, quite rightly, but I would like to lay stress on this that our congratulations are due to a brilliant set of young scientists who are working there. No big work can come out of one or two or three men. The great work that the Atomic Energy Department has done, and is doing, is to pick out able scientists, young people, and to give them the requisite training and experience. So that we have built up now a very fine set of very young or youngish people. In fact, I remember some very eminent scientists, I think, from England or America or some foreign country, referring to this. When they all go there to Trombay, one of the remarks they make almost invariably is about the youth of the men there occupying very responsible positions. I wish in other departments of our activity we could have that youth also.

Many hon. Members who spoke gave us plenty of information, no doubt, from this Report or from some other reading. There is not much that I wish to say. But I would perhaps repeat some things. One is that India is now among the very few countries in the world which has developed the technique of fabricating fuel elements. It is known to all Members here, but I wish to repeat it. It is an important thing, an important achievement. In doing this, one of the results is that we are exchange. I have not got the exact figures. They vary; the more we do, the more we save. From the figures I have, I find that after having spent Rs. 81 lakhs for this fuel fabrication facility, of which Rs. 40 lakhs was foreign exchange, we are saving annually Rs. 45 lakhs in foreign exchange and could save more with bigger production.

Then so far as our Apsara is concerned, it is interesting to note how the level of operation has gone up annually from 17,840 kwh to 1 million kwh last year-in four years. Now it is known that the Canada-India Reactor achieved critically on July 10. This is going to be one of the biggest isotope producers in the world. ZERLINA has yet to come; it is being built.

One of the things to which I should like to draw special attention is the Electronics Division of the Trombay establishment. We are building big electrical plants, electronics and all that. But the Trombay establishment really as a side issue-it is not actually a side issue; it is a very important issue, but still it is one of the aspects of its work-has built up a very big Electronics Division which is producing all kinds of electronic

instruments etc. And electronics definitely is a part of the future, for which we are working.

Then a question was asked about training-I forget which hon. Member raised it. Training is being given. Apart from the fact that we are helping numerous Universities, schools etc., and we are specially helping the Meghnad Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, there is a proposal in the Third Plan for two Inter-University Atomic Centers, one in North India and one in the South. We felt that confining it to one University would not be so advantageous as making it in a sense available to Universities in a particular region.

The fact of the matter is we have neither the resources to have these reactors everywhere nor, till now, have we got the trained personnel for that. This difficulty has pursued us in the past in regard to any high-class research. Though, usually, our universities may have one, two or three very fine and able men-they do good work-yet they are spread out, one here, two there or three somewhere else; while nowadays this big scale research requires a team of high-class men, we seldom have that team in one place. And, one of the reasons why the Trombay establishment has done exceedingly good work is because a big team works there. If all these very persons were spread out in all the universities of India the result would not have been so good although the men were the same. Therefore, instead of spreading out in different universities, we want to have, to begin with, two centers, one in the north and one in the south, inter-university centers where the universities in that region would have access to go and work. I do not know where they would be situated-maybe in some university or near it. But, anyhow, they would be opened.

These, presumably, will have reactors and the like and other facilities and a team of people drawn from those universities will work there. All that because we want the universities to give all this basic training and even some higher training. But, at the present moment, the real high-class training is being given at Trombay itself.

I think some hon. Members have mentioned, and I repeat it, that 200 graduate scientists and engineers a year are being trained there and we are training not only our own people but people from other parts of Asia and elsewhere.

Thus, all these various developments are taking place. But the attention of most people, I suppose, is attracted to these atomic power stations that are being built or are going to be built. Shri Bharucha, evidently, wants this part of the programme to be expanded considerably and speeded up. I would very much like to do so. Though I do think we should go fast, we should go on sound foundations. Therefore, we have decided to provide one power station; and we are considering the establishment of two more similar nuclear power stations, initially with an installed capacity of 150 mega watts, each capable of doing double shift. I hope that we shall be able to do this.

People may calculate the advantages of having a power station-a conventional power station and atomic energy station-calculate the cost etc. Even from that point of view, I feel it is advantageous to have atomic power and I shall give some figures.

But, apart from that, it is something far more than this business of cost. It is, as I just said, keeping a grip on the future. It is difficult to describe it. But I feel it strongly that by any of these means we are getting a grip on the future. By and large I say in any humility and without an element of criticism of other people that, broadly our outlook in India—not of individuals, not of my hon. friends in this House, but broadly our outlook is not scientific. It is rather static. We calculate everything from things as they are not realizing that we live in a world where nothing remains what it is, that everything changes the next moment. We read about it; but we are not emotionally or intellectually conscious of this changing world. The result is that we do not see in this atomic energy work just the reflection of the changing world and the way this really stretches itself out into the future, and makes our position securer than it might otherwise be. That apart—I think it was referred to by some hon. Members one very important factor about these stations is that they have a dual purpose: producing power on the one hand and plutonium on the other. Plutonium is of the greatest importance as it is not available from outside as a commercial commodity. Its production is essential in order to enable the country to set up breeder power stations using thorium which we have in ample measure. From all these points of view it becomes very important for us to build up these power stations.

About the cost of it, there is some misapprehension. From time to time some kind of a leading article appears in the newspapers dealing with the cost and saying that it is an uneconomic proposition to build up these atomic stations. Well, the country has to go the farthest with the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. I have not got any particulars about the Soviet Union. But here is the British Government's White Paper on the Nuclear Power Programme to which they are committed. Let me correct a mistake in People's minds who think that they had given up this power programme or have reduced it. Nothing of the kind. The fact of the matter is that they are going ahead but for the moment they have got large quantities of coal and oil and there has been an abundance of oil and coal being produced in Sahara and elsewhere and they are trying to use them. Anyhow, I shall just quote a few sentences about costs. The cost of electricity has gone down. That is true. But it says:

“The nuclear costs in which capital charges are the major element are falling even faster in stations designed today.”

The way things are going down is surprisingly fast.

“In the long run we shall, therefore, need increasing supplies of nuclear power. In about ten years' time it should be cheaper to generate a base load in nuclear stations than in conventional stations provided that we achieve the technological progress that is expected. To secure this we must continue to build nuclear stations on an adequate scale.” The point to remember is that you have to carry on to achieve something. You cannot wait for America or Russia or somebody else to achieve it and then try to imitate the benefits of that. We can get the benefits but we are lagging behind and not relying on ourselves and we are not training our scientists to do that firstclass work but make them imitate what others do. Therefore, we have to build up

in order to keep in front all the time. The moment we give it up and wait for a better opportunity when say, the United States, has perhaps made some further improvement and then take advantage of it, we have lost the foothold. We can get it back but we have lost that time. The British White Paper says:

“In these circumstances, the Government has decided, in agreement with the parties concerned that the national interest would best be served by continuing, for the time being, to place orders for nuclear station at the rate of roughly one every year.”

Then here is an interesting lecture given by Mr. Christopher Hinton at the recent Royal Society's Tercentenary Celebrations. This shows again how the cost goes down. There is a chart here and the stations in UK are mentioned. At Berkely the cost was £ 160 per KW, at Bradwell £ 159; at the third station about £ 133 at the fourth about £ 123 and at the fifth, about £ 110. Every new one makes it cheaper. It goes on because of experience gained and technological progress. There is also an interesting diagram here. May I also say that India is very favorably situated so far as costs are concerned more favorably situated than England or America? The difference here between conventional and other things will be greater because of the distances for coal or other elements to be transported here for conventional use. According to this chart, the nuclear costs and the conventional costs are both falling. A coal fire plant and a nuclear plant are shown here. In the case of the coal fire plant the costs fall gently whereas in the case of the nuclear plant the costs fall much more rapidly. For a 75 per cent load factor the two lines cross in 1966 and then the costs of atomic energy go down and it becomes less and less expensive as compared to coal.

My point is, it is generally admitted now in other countries where conditions are less advantageous than in India from this point of view that nuclear power stations are becoming and will soon become definitely economic propositions and cheaper, three or four years later, than conventional ones. In India, as I said, which is a big country with long distances, far from coal, far from hydro-electric works and other things, it is even more necessary. Also, inspite of an apparently large supply of coal in India, the supplies are not really large enough for the future so far as we know and we have to protect the future. Therefore, there is no doubt that we should lay the foundations for this and go ahead from now on. If we start a power station now it will be four years before it is ready, and if we do not take steps now for the second and third stations progressively, then we are thrown out, in the future we will be left rather far behind.

Now, as you perhaps know, we have decided to have the first power station on the west coast of India between Ahmadabad and Bombay. This place was chosen entirely from the point of various facilities. The place chosen is a place called Tarapore which is in Maharashtra but near Gujarat border, not far from i (*Interruption*). It is totally immaterial whether it is in Maharashtra or Gujarat, because it will supply in equal measure power to both. That has been settled and in fact, the power distribution

will be controlled by a committee or something like that where Gujarat, Maharashtra and the Atomic Energy Department will all jointly be represented. It is a very important plant, but it is not a kind of a plant which gives employment to very large numbers of people. It gives employment to some very able people, but not large numbers.

Shri Mukerjee said something about the disposal of atomic or radio-active waste. As a matter of fact, this is a matter which is one of great concern. I am not quite sure whether the scientists know what to do about it. It is a great nuisance. One does not know where to put it. Wherever it goes it is a nuisance. Anyhow, the International Atomic Energy Agency at Vienna have set up a number of panels on the disposal of radio-active waste and handling and transport, of radio-active material etc. Indian scientists have been invited to be members of all these panels, and one Indian scientist, Mr. Sethna, was a chairman of one of these panels on the transport of large radio-active sources.

About training, I want to say one other thing. We are starting at Trombay refresher courses for Scientists in universities to come and have refresher courses in atomic energy, etc.

I think there is really nothing more that I can say. It is all given in the books that have been supplied. Some hon. Members probably know as much or even more than I do about it. I am grateful for the appreciation shown by hon. Members for the work of this Department. I think this atomic energy Department may well be said to be unique in that respect. Because no other department of the Government of India has had this unanimous appreciation.

BACK NOTE

XXVI. Motion Regarding Report of the Department
of Atomic Energy, 10 August, 1960

-NIL-

MOTION REGARDING THE THIRD FIVE YEAR PLAN—A DRAFT OUTLINE

22 August, 1960

I beg to move:

"That the Third Five Year Plan—A draft outline laid on the table of the House on the 1st August, 1960, be taken into consideration".

I confess that I feel as if I was carrying rather a heavy burden in moving this motion for consideration by the House. Even this Draft outline is an outline only, but it covers a multitude of activities in India; it covers, in fact, the whole progress of the Indian nation. It is a continuation of the Second Plan, and for me to deal with this matter in a brief or even a long speech can hardly do justice to it in that sense.

Hon. Members are presumed to have read this Draft outline. It will serve little purpose for me to go into the large number of figures which are given in the book, and which can perhaps be grasped more easily by reading it than by my saying anything about it. I shall, therefore, try to deal with some major aspects of this Plan, what I would call the strategy of the Plan, and invite the consideration of the House to those particular matters as well as others.

I may mention that although a great deal of thought has been given to it by the Planning Commission, and the Commission has consulted all manner of folk, certainly in India, and hon. Members in Parliament here too, but advisers, experts and others in this country and from outside, although all this has been done, we do not approach this question or this report with any sense of finality or with any desire to appear rigid in our approach to this problem.

There is, in some of us, so far as some of us are concerned, certainly a sense of rigidity about the ideals we aim at, because there must be some fixity; they may change—it is a different matter, on account of the changes in the changing world. If we want India to progress, and if we want India to be prosperous, and if we want to raise the standards of India, if we want a socialist society in India, we are strong in that; there is no weakness; there is no lack of firmness in that. I do not mean to say that I want to impose that idea on hon. Members who do not like the word 'socialism'. That is for hon. Members to determine. I am talking about those on behalf of whom I am speaking. We do aim at a certain thing which can be described in many ways, but most briefly, we aim at socialism in this country. Let there be no doubt about it, because, sometimes, we are told that this word or this idea is merely for show purposes or is put aside from time to time. But we do not aim at any rigid or doctrinaire form of socialism, and, therefore, we describe more or less the things that we are aiming at.

So far as this particular Plan is concerned, it flows from the Second Plan which came after the First. It is a projection of that. The Second Plan was roughly double the

First Plan. This, again, is much bigger. Most of the objectives mentioned in this Plan will be found to be mentioned in the Second Plan. Therefore, so far as our objectives are concerned, they have been consistently placed before this House and the public.

Very briefly, I shall read them as they are repeated in this Draft Plan. They are: a rise in national income of over 5 per cent per annum, to achieve self-sufficiency in foodgrains, and increase agricultural production for industry and export; to expand basic industries like steel, fuel, power and machinebuilding; to utilise the man power resources of the country and expand the employment opportunities; the reduction of inequalities in income and wealth and a more even distribution of economic power. All these, in somewhat different language, were mentioned in our Second Plan.

Broadly speaking, I suppose everybody, almost everybody in this House, will agree to these objectives. They may not perhaps approve of the steps to be taken, or there may be difference of opinion, but broadly speaking, I take it that excepting for a very very few in this House, hon. Members accept the principle of planning, and I do not quite see how even the backward few who do not accept it can do so in any intelligent way which can be understood by intelligent people; for, planning is the exercise of intelligence. It is the exercise of intelligence to deal with fact as they are, situations as they are, and intelligently trying to find a way to solve a problem. Everybody plans, and ought to plan, whether he runs a shop or an industry or a plant or a State.

I am not going to enter into this question because it is rather difficult to make people see something when they are unable to open their eyes. But it is generally accepted that in every country, practically every country, this is the only course. And in this world today, where everything is more and more governed by developments of science and technology, the idea of things happening by themselves, the *laissez faire* theory etc. is almost considered the verge of absurdity except by a few who profit greatly under it at the cost of the many. Nobody in this House, I hope, stands for the profit of the few at the cost, of the many.

Therefore, we have to think today leave out the word 'planning' in terms of this tremendously changing and revolutionary phase of human history controlled by science and technological developments. I do not mean to say for an instant that life consists only of science and technological developments; there are many other things too, many things which perhaps science has not dealt with yet, many things which technology cannot touch, call them what you like, spiritual, moral, or ethical, many to which we must attach the greatest importance. So I am not by any means ignoring that phase, but the fact remains that modern life is Governed by science and technology, and as science and technology advance and change, life changes, and will continue to change at a rapid pace, sometimes change for the good, sometimes for the bad. And so, we arrive at the strange state of affairs, science and technology having advanced so much in certain countries as to assure what is called an affluent society, a welfare State providing the good things of life to everybody in that State, and potentially providing the good things of life to everybody in the world, having done that on the one side, also having produced on the other side, conditions which may suddenly destroy all the good in the world.

So in such a situation, even more than in any other, we have to think in a planned and intelligent way how to achieve the results we are aiming at. Thus planning, and this Third Five Year Plan, in fact, become for us not some kind of a book to read but a picture of a vast country, a vast nation, advancing forward in certain predetermined directions to predetermined goals. Planning, therefore, is having an objective, not only an immediate objective for tomorrow but a more distant objective, because you cannot plan for tomorrow only; you have to plan for years and in the case of a nation, you have to plan for generations. Therefore, planning means an objective and perspective planning. Then you come nearer to plan for tomorrow and today.

In approaching this question then, we have to take into consideration what steps have to be taken first, what should be considered in the order of preference as second or as third; because a country which wants to progress, wants to progress in a hundred ways. There are so many things we want to do in India, and we want to do those things quickly and passionately. Then we come to the question of resources and not only resources. There are steps to be taken. We cannot go to a place unless we take a number of steps. So this question of finding the proper way to reach a certain goal becomes important. If you want to build a steel plant, of course, you can buy it; you have to train the people who have got to run it, train the persons and so on. Now, experience teaches us that the affluent society of the west has come into being because of technology, because of improvement in modern techniques of production, distribution etc. plus, of course, the technical personnel who lie behind it, who can do it. This applies to both agriculture and industry, because it should not be thought that technical process are only meant for industry and are not meant for agriculture; modern techniques are meant for agriculture also.

This means that if we have to do this in a big way, we have to change the whole atmosphere in India, whether in the field or the factory, and make it amenable to modern techniques such as are suited to India. I do not say that every modern technique is suited to India or such as are suited to our conditions. It becomes of the greatest importance to have that atmosphere. I say this because when many people talk glibly of a steel plant or any new technique, really their minds have not got into the climate of new techniques; their minds still live in the climate of ancient usages and ancient ways of doing things. So we have to have that done; we have got to train our personnel in the fields as in other places.

Now, we shall find that this affluent society has come through this advance in technology. If that is so, it would appear essential for us to advance in technology, in order to get it. Advance in technology means a general advance in such training and education as are necessary for the purpose in a widespread way. It is not a question of putting up a plant here or there; it is a question of building up from below a nation used to thinking in terms of technical change and technical advance. It becomes a problem of mass education. Mass education is given in many ways, but I am only venturing to say from the point of view of this industrial progress etc. the mass education becomes essential. The countries which had the Industrial Revolution had perforce to go in for free and compulsory education, not that they liked it at all. We

like it; they did not; they were forced to go in for it because they could not support that structure of industrialisation without mass education.

I am merely saying some obvious things the House will forgive me for it just to develop a certain argument. Therefore, we have to industrialise our country from the point of view of industry and from the point of view of agriculture, and introduce new techniques. Now, how are we to do this? We can do it, in a way, by buying the machines from abroad, buying technical experience from abroad and asking them to put up the machines and work them here. That has been the normal individual method. They buy some machines from America or Russia or Germany or somewhere else and they put them up; they buy the technical skill and work them. May be it does some little good. It is the beginning of a process, just like the railway trains which came here a hundred years ago, which was the beginning of a process, which changed the face of India. But if we want to do this rapidly, then that is not good enough. We can only do it rapidly if we can do it ourselves and we do not always have to buy from America or Russia either the skills or the machines. We have to build up the skills and we have to build, up the machines here. Therefore, it becomes of primary importance if we are to industrialise that we must have the heavy industries which build machines, which industrialise.

There is an argument that we must not go in for heavy industry but for the lighter one. Of course, we have to go in for the lighter one too. But I venture to suggest that it is not possible and I rule that out absolutely; I do not say it is less likely; I say it is not possible to industrialise the country rapidly without concentrating on heavy industries that is to say, the basic industries which produce industrial machines which are utilised in industrial development. This must be borne in mind.

I am free to confess, as I have perhaps confessed before, that we lost a good deal by not putting up a steel plant or trying to put up a steel plant, under the First Five Year Plan. It was a heavy thing and we did not have the courage to take that burden then; but if we had shown a little courage then, it would have been well for us in the Second Plan and now. In the Second Plan, therefore, we were forced to have three new plants, very big concerns which have been a tremendous burden for us. We have borne it and of the three plants, one or two are completed and the other—nearing completion. There are also some other heavy plants that we have put up, more particularly the machine building plant which is gradually taking shape.

The beginning of industrialisation really can now be seen in India. A number of textile mills in Ahmedabad or Bombay or Kanpur is not industrialisation; it is playing with it. It is a good thing to have textile mills. We want textile mills; I have no objection to that. But our idea of industrialisation is limited, cribbed, confined and cabined, by thinking of these ordinary textile mills and plants and calling it industrialisation. Industrialisation, therefore, is a thing that produces the machines, it is a thing that produces steel, it is a thing that produces power and two or three other things. That is the base. Once you get the base, it is easy to build. It is true, building such a base may be a difficult task, specially for a backward country. We have now I will not say

finished building the base but we have put a good part of the base and therefore, we can now look forward with some confidence to a more rapid advance which could never have happened without that base, however much we might have built the smaller industries. We would always have to depend on outside without that. Indeed we have had troubles in regard to foreign exchange and we are likely to. We can never get rid of the foreign exchange troubles without heavy industry in this country. So, we have to start from the base. We cannot build a third or fourth storey. We can advance in minor sectors of our economy but if we do not build up the basic structure, it will not make any difference to the hundreds of millions of our people. Therefore, the strategy governing planning in a case like India is to be industrialisation. Without it you may improve here and there but you cannot, on the whole. So, that leads to the basic industries. From that flow other things.

Having laid great stress on industrialisation, immediately, we have to look in the direction of agriculture and find that this industrial progress cannot be made without agricultural advance and progress. So, we come back. The fact of the matter is that you cannot isolate the two. They are intimately connected because agricultural progress is not possible without industry, without tools, without the new things, new methods and techniques which modern industrial technique produces and without the man to deal with these tools. We can always advance a little here and there by greater effort. The two are inter-allied—agricultural progress and industrial progress—and they cannot be separated. There is no question—some people say—of giving agriculture priority. There is no question of that. Neither can advance without the other. Of course there may be, internally, some priorities but it is a different matter. Everyone knows that unless we are self-sufficient in agriculture—and more—we cannot get the wherewithal to advance in industries. If we have to import food, then we are doomed, absolutely doomed, so far as progress is concerned. We cannot import both food and machinery and everything; we just cannot get on. Therefore, there is the importance of both, allied together and looked at as helping each other. There are other connected things that come up.

Inevitably, whether it is agriculture or industry, training of personnel—trained personnel—counts. In the ultimate analysis it is the trained human being that makes a nation—not all the machinery in the world. It is he who makes the machines—not the machine, the man. So, we come to widespread training—general training and of course specialised training, technical training etc. We cannot live on iron and steel. We have to produce other commodities. For this purpose, we have to encourage, in every way, the small and medium industry. I am glad to say that in spite of our concentration on basic industries, small and medium industries are spreading fast in India. It is of very considerable importance.

If that is the broad strategy, the rest becomes considering each matter in some detail. Take agriculture, for instance. There are not many differences here, I take it, as to the methods for improving agriculture. We all agree. Anybody can put them down as one, two, three, four, five, six; seven and so on. The question is of implementation or the application of these methods in a big way or getting the peasantry to accept

those methods and to supply them with the wherewithal, better tools, manure fertilisers, better seeds and the like. In fact if I may say so, we may discuss these as we will no doubt and point out the difficulties and shortcomings. There may be many shortcomings. We do not put forward this as something perfect. We put forward present outcome of such thought and consultations that we have had. It is a tremendous problem—dealing with this mass of human beings in this country at a time of great revolutionary changes in the world and I doubt if anybody can presume to say that he can give the last solution to it. So, we struggle forward with all our efforts and doing our best and hoping and accepting gladly any advice that seems to us suitable.

The Plan should be looked at in this way. I accept that we may change the Plan here and there; it is possible. But in the ultimate analysis it is not that that counts very much and I think in the ultimate analysis the hon. Members here and most people outside accept broadly the strategy of the Plan and even most of the details of the Plan. They may criticise its implementation and say, for instance, that the community development scheme, very good though it is in theory, is not functioning in practice as it should or they may ask: why is not agriculture, on which we spend vast sums of money, not showing results in production as we want or why is there delay in production in our industries? All these are legitimate criticisms. But you will find that broadly speaking, the criticisms are of implementation and we have to face this. The real problem before India is one of implementation and not constantly laying down policies and talking about the subjects, talk is often good but it is implementation that is needed, Every man in India, every officer, small or big must realise that it is a question of implementation and not talking about things that has to be done.

So, it is important not merely to lay down policies but have satisfactory audits of performance. We have often measured it and in this House we have stated that Rs. 6 crores out of the Rs. 10 crores allotted had been spent and hon. Members ask: why Rs. 4 crores has not been spent? Or we may say that the whole of Rs. 10 crores had been spent. But the real thing is not the spending of Rs. 10 crores but what that has produced. That is the whole substance. It becomes an audit of performance. It is important. In doing that, it becomes necessary—for other reasons also—that responsibility should be given to the person who has got to do the job. We have been struggling for years to somehow allot the responsibility and not keep everything concentrated in the centralised way. It is still too much concentrated. It is far better to take risks and face losses and not have this centralisation because in a rapidly moving scheme, delay is the most fatal of all things and it is caused by references from one place to another, from below to up. We have been trying to do that and we have succeeded in some measure. But the point is that responsibility is spreading out. We should hold people who are made responsible and test them and they must be held responsible if they do not do certain things and we may punish them or if they do we may praise them. It is not good enough for us to go on in a loose way that everybody is responsible for everything, which means nobody is responsible for anything. I am laying stress on this because the future seems to me a question of implementation above everything, far less a question of policy-making although policy-making has always to be done.

There is another thing that we have to pursue. We say the record of the first two Plans, even though sometimes it is criticised, is a fairly remarkable record of achievement. It did not come up in some way, in some matters to what we wanted it to be, but it is nevertheless, a very creditable record—whether it is transport, communications, steel, fuel, power, scientific and technological research. In fact, the whole of Indian economy has arrived at a stage, at the threshold of accelerated growth and now can grow much faster if we keep it going and pushing, because in a moment of this type if we slacken at all at any place we do not merely go slowly but we lose the advantage which we have gained by our previous efforts.

Now, as you know, presumably in 1961 our population would have gone up by about 70 millions since 1951. Why has it gone up like that? Because we are a much healthier nation. The expectation of life ten years ago was 32. Today it is 42. It is a big advance in a big country like this, to raise the level of expectation of life by ten years. It has made a big difference in our population figures. And, no doubt, that difference will continue to be made as our society becomes healthier and healthier.

Again, it is said that the national income over the First and Second Plans has gone up by 42 per cent and the per capita income by 20 per cent. Now, a legitimate query is made, where has this gone? It is a very legitimate enquiry. To some extent, of course, you can see where it has gone. Apart from statistics, one can see where it has gone. I sometimes do address large gatherings in the villages and I can see that they are better fed, better clothed, they build brick houses and they are generally better. Nevertheless, that does not apply to everybody in India. Some people probably have hardly benefited. Some people may even be facing various difficulties. The fact remains, however, that this advance in our national income, in our per capita income has taken place, and I think it is desirable and I am sure it will meet with the pleasure of this House that we should enquire more deeply as to where this has gone and appoint some expert committee to enquire into how exactly this additional income that has come to the country or per capita has spread.

The point is, we have to avoid and prevent too much accumulation of wealth, because if after all this additional income that has come to us or the additional national income or per capita income that has come only, let us say, 5 per cent or 10 per cent of the population have benefited by it and 90 per cent have not, well, that is not a good way, that is not a good result. We cannot, of course, even it out. That is not possible. But it is desirable to make the benefits spread. There are several ways of spreading. You cannot make it spread evenly because human beings are not the same; a person works harder than the other. A nation works harder than the other and goes further. But I regret to say that we in India have not learnt the lesson of hard work yet. We can, but we are not mentally thinking in terms of hard work, not realising that it is only through hard work that a country progresses whether it is America or China, whether it is capitalist, communist or socialist. It is only through hard work that a country goes ahead. Here complaints are made if holidays are cut down although India has more holidays than any country in the wide world, probably. Yet complaints are made. So, the countries are not same, individuals are not the same, it depends on their intellectual

capacity, their physical capacity, their desire and habit of work. Nevertheless, one has to produce opportunities for all of them to progress or to work.

Therefore, it is really the fault of the type of atmosphere one creates. And, that is another big thing about this Plan or any Plan—the atmosphere we create in a country. Now, it is our misfortune that in this country—I am not referring to anybody in Parliament for the moment attempts are constantly made to hamper, obstruct and create a fog all round which prevents hard work being done. The attempt may be sometimes justified I am not going into that, but I am merely pointing out the fact that constantly in this country some people, of course, directly and patently oppose and obstruct this type of thing. But I am not referring to them, but rather to those who are so wrapped up in local troubles, local problems, local quarrels, where they represent some form of provincialism or linguism or all these other isms that come in the way—communalism and the like. They are thinking in terms of some narrow objective, which may be good in their view but which comes in the way of the larger objective.

See what is happening, this tragedy, in Assam. It is a deep tragedy. It is a tragedy in itself, but it is a deeper tragedy that such mentality should occur and such conflicts should occur in this country. See the agitation that is going on in the Punjab. It seems to me quite amazing that intelligent people should indulge in these agitations when these mighty problems are before the country.

Can we face these problems with some effort of the mind or is it merely like secondrate individuals who have no minds, who can only shout slogans? It is a big problem for us to consider. If we are to give in to this kind of sloganraising ideas, whatever the cause behind it may be—because so far as my Government is concerned I hope it will never give into this kind of thing—I am not referring to any particular thing—then it simply shows that we are incapable of facing issues fairly and squarely.

But the House should realise how much we lose in this Plan by this constant diversion of effort, by constantly bringing issues before the country in some form or the other, which may be good or bad but which are secondary, tertiary, whatever the place may be—they are not primary issues—so that that comes in the way and it is an enormous obstruction. It would not matter very much if our Plan said something here or something different there. You may change them or not, but what does matter is the whole climate of thought and activity in the country. If the thought and activities turn to petty quarrels on a provincial basis, on a language basis, on a caste basis, on a communal basis or some other like basis, then, indeed, we cannot make great progress, because it must be realised that this Third Plan or any Plan that is worthwhile requires the most tremendous effort. If some people ask, “Why make such a big plan? Make a small plan,” that is not a good enough answer, because, there are certain minimum objectives that we have to reach. There is no escape from them. As a matter of fact, there used to be some people who used to talk that this is ambitious planning and criticise it. Hardly anybody says that now. As this realisation has gradually come, that inevitably, by the compulsion of events and circumstances and our own needs we

must plan in a relatively big way, there is no escape from it. Even the toughest and the most cautious of people in the western world have come to the conclusion that our Plan is not ambitious; it is rather on the low side.

So, though from the point of view of the advancement of India the Plan is not very big, yet, from the point of view of our resources it is big undoubtedly, and it requires a tremendous effort on our part to raise those resources and to work hard to achieve our aims. If all kinds of other conflicts come in the way, then naturally the Plan will suffer.

Now, it is proposed that almost the least that we should have is an advance in the national income, of five to six per cent per annum. It must be over five; if it goes below five, it does not catch up; and the rate of investment should be stepped up from 11 to 14 per cent. All this, as I said, requires some social development. You must not divorce industrial or agricultural improvement from the development of society as a whole, educationally and in many other ways. I repeat this again and again, because it is imagined that money-making is concerned with putting up some steel structure and calling it a Plan. It is the building up of man that it needed. It is true— and I must confess—that some people who have no social sense at all do happen to possess a very strong sense of making money and they do make money. That is true, and I am almost amazed at the kinds of activity of making some money that some individuals have. But, obviously, this House should not like money-making activity to be encouraged at the cost of social sense. It is not a good thing for society. Once you do that, you will have to build up the whole society.

Take, for instance, education. It is proposed in the Plan to spread out education—free and compulsory education—to all boys and girls of the agegroup 6 to 11. Under our Constitution it should have been much more. It should have been done within the first ten years. Up till now we should have done it and it should have been up to 14 years. But it was an impossible proposition; we have been unable to do that although, the spread of education has been vast.

Many people have criticised education here and their criticism is, I think, justified. In fact, in every country almost, there is this criticism of education today in some way or the other. Our schools are not properly equipped and our schoolmasters are not properly paid or trained. All these criticisms are justified, but really the effort we have made and the success that has come to it is nevertheless very big. At the present moment, there are, I believe, 45 million boys and girls in the schools and colleges in India. It is a very large figure. If at the end of the third Plan, what we intend doing comes off, we shall have 65 million or thereabouts, and if we could do what we intend to do in regard to education in India, we would have 100 million teachers and taught in India. That is about 25 per cent of the total population. See the enormity of the problem; a quarter of the total population being either teachers or the taught. It would have to come in this country sometime or the other so that this advance has to be made at a fairly rapid pace.

Then we want to spread out this advance, as far as possible, regional and otherwise. It is not easy regionally except in one way. Somethings cannot be done regionally; we

cannot put up a steel plant everywhere, but there are some things that can be. Many kinds of industry can be put up in almost any region and which can be spread out. But we should try to give certain minimum amenities to every village, that is, to the rural areas, of course in the shape of food, drinking water, clothing, education, health, sanitation and housing and, progressively, work. Our pattern of investment should be designed to assist the achievement of these objectives.

The question is often raised: you talk about socialism and yet you permit these grave inequalities of income; that you want to limit and put a ceiling on land and you oppose ceiling in urban or other incomes. There is that contradiction, of course. Of course, it is there. But if we try to remove that type of contradiction, we put a stop in many ways to the type of progress we are aiming at. You cannot advance in these lines, industrial lines, by the application of some methods, unless you are prepared completely to change the structure of society. That is a different matter: to change the whole basis of society completely. If you are not prepared to change that suddenly and quickly, you have to leave enough incentive for people to work. You have to give certain amenities for that type of work which may not be necessary for other types of work. You can, even by taxation and otherwise, reduce disparities; have heavy taxation and have many ways of doing it. But putting a ceiling like that may well result in a slowing down of the process of development and it is of the utmost importance that this process of development and production should not come down. After all, production comes first, before any kind of equalisation or division. There is no point in having an equal measure of poverty for all.

Take another thing, which is much talked of and discussed: the private sector and the public sector. Obviously, many persons who believe in a socialist pattern must believe in the public sector growing all the time. But it does not necessarily mean that the private sector is eliminated even at a much later stage. It does not mean that thing at all. I do not know, and I am not a prophet enough to say what will happen 20, 30 or 40 years later. But I can well imagine the private sector functioning, but naturally in limited ways. It does not seem to be necessary that every little shop should be a public sector shop. It does not seem to be necessary that every patch of land should be publicly owned or owned at all by the public. But I do not know—these things depend so much today not on abstract theories but on scientific and technological developments which govern our lives.

Many of us perhaps here in this House think in terms of theoretical advances and theoretical solutions, the fact being that we are conditioned by scientific and technological advance so much that our theories have to undergo change because of it.

In regard to the private sector and the public sector, I think the criteria should be basically two. One is to have as much production as possible by all means at our disposal and the second is prevention of accumulation of wealth in individual hands and also of economic power in individual hands. If I have only the first one, it may lead subsequently to unsocial, undesirable and harmful consequences. Therefore, we must aim right from the beginning and all the time at the prevention of this accumulation of wealth and economic power. I do not mind how much the private sector spreads

out. I want it to spread, subject always to prevention of monopoly. Why? Apart from other reasons, your Constitution says so. Read your Constitution. It says, so precisely that there should be no monopolies and accumulation.

All these may be laid down, but to draw lines may be sometimes difficult. One has to judge in each case, but those two broad facts must be remembered. If by any step that we take, production goes down, then we are cutting at the root of our advance and progress. If, on the other hand those private monopolies are built up, then we are encouraging a process which will come in our way badly which will be harmful now and later, both. Certainly, it will take us away very far from any kind of progress towards socialism.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX**¹

Therefore, we must encourage production, which is one of greatest importance and encourage the social motive more and more. If anyone tells me that incentives are necessary, I agree. But there are many types of incentives, some incentives that are good to society and some that are bad to society. It may be that we cannot get rid suddenly of all the bad incentives that are today functioning. But anyhow, we should aim to get rid of them, because the acquisitive society, a society in which the main incentive is acquisitiveness at the cost of the other is already getting out of date everywhere, because social urges are coming up and I do not want to encourage acquisitiveness in India beyond a certain measure, because a certain measure of acquisitiveness perhaps many of us have to have in our lives and in our activities. But I do wish that our social policy should be such as not to encourage acquisitiveness. If you keep that in mind, you will see that many of these activities—speculative activities—are bad and poisonous from the point of view of the nation and the social development of the nation. We are wrapped up in many things and we cannot suddenly abolish many of these things. But we must always keep in view that that type of mental approach is bad.

All this depends upon resources, obviously resources domestic and resources coming from outside. Our whole object in the third Plan is to arrive at a stage when we do not depend upon outside countries for any kind of help, whether financial or mechanical, machines, etc. That is what is called, broadly speaking, the takeoff stage. But at this stage, it is always inevitable to have to depend somewhat on supplies from outside, whether they are machines, financial help, loans or credits. We can, I suppose, perhaps in theory, do without them, but practically that will prolong our agony so much, make it so long and so many things may happen before we reach that stage that it is difficult to contemplate and to foresee what might take place.

Therefore, every country, situated as we are, trying to industrialise fairly rapidly, has to depend on outside help. Every country has done so. Every country in Europe or America has had to do so in the past. It is difficult for me to say what measure of outside help we can get. We are grateful for the help we have got from various countries, from the USA most of all, from the Soviet Union a good deal and from a number of other countries. They have been generous. It is not for me to complain

It is a very necessary and excellent method provided always, as with everything else, it is kept in control.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁴

And that is why at the present juncture of India deficit financing has to be kept in control. May be, at a somewhat later stage we may be able to stretch out a little more.

Now I should like to mention a few words about community development. As the House perhaps knows. I have attached great importance to this and often praised it, not praised its working everywhere but praised the whole conception of it. I have no doubt that in spite of all that has happened, and our numerous slips, the community development scheme has changed and is changing the face of rural India; I have no doubt about it, and that is more important in the final analysis than any number of factories put up for changing the conditions of life of the peasant. More particularly, recent developments in the direction of giving more power to panchayats—what is called panchayati raj—I feel, is going to make a revolutionary change and is making it basically. I should like this House to appreciate that, because that is a very important part of our plan, especially in regard to the rural areas and especially in regard to agricultural production. Because, ultimately it will come for the agriculturist himself has advanced to a certain stage of understanding.

Here again there is the question of cooperatives. For some odd reason the word “cooperative” rather frightens some people.

I have tried in all humility to understand it. I always try to understand the other person’s point of view and, to some extent, I do succeed and sometimes people accuse me that I look at it from both points of view. That is true. So, I have tried very hard to understand the viewpoint of those people who have suddenly, or sometime back, started expressing themselves in pain and sorrow about the co-operatives. More especially, when co-operative farming was mentioned the pain became intense. Now, I have not been able to understand it in spite of every effort. As a matter of fact, that is acknowledged the world over by every intelligent man. But the vested interests are so great and the limited mental outlook is so limited that it cannot see what stands before it. Cooperation is the one and only way for agriculture in India. There is no other way. This we clearly understood. And this is not my saying every person who has studied agriculture in India says and said that for the last generation or more.

If you talk of cooperative farming, joint farming, again every intelligent approach to it will show to you that is the right method to do it. But it may not be the right method in every case. Conditions of land, this, that and the other come in. It may not be the right method or the necessary method when each holding is a big holding. Then it is a different matter. Where each person has 100 or 200 acres of land it is not so necessary. But where, as in India, the holdings are terrifically small, we are driven to it whatever your policies or convictions might be.

But, then, it is said that this leads to something terrible, communism. If the logic of thinking of some people is governed by this kind of ghosts and hobgoblins it is

BACK NOTE

XXVII. Motion Regarding the Third Five Year Plan—A Draft Outline, 22 August, 1960

1. RAJA MAHENDRA PRATAP (Mathura): I want to raise an important point of order. I want to say, use not law, but use those methods which Mahatma Gandhi and Lord Buddha used and people gave away wealth.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The hon. Member ought not to interrupt.

2. SHRI RANGA (Tenali): For instance, the production of paper money, which is one of the essential commodities.

3. SHRI TYAGI (Dehra Dun): Paper money, according to Swatantra party, is an essential commodity.

SHRI RANGA: He is producing it.

4. SHRI RANGA: Quite right. Why oppose them?

5. RAJA MAHENDRA PRATAP: The disparity in the time given to us and given to you is very much growing.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am sorry. I did not quite catch it.

MR. SPEAKER: He wants as much time for himself as is given to the hon. Prime Minister.

MOTION REGARDING SITUATION IN ASSAM

3 September, 1960

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have discussed during these three days a subject, which has naturally aroused tremendous feeling, more especially, of course, in Bengal and Assam, but to a certain extent all over India. It would not be surprising, therefore, that strong feeling and passion sometimes found expression here and even glimpses were seen by us of what lay inside the people's minds and hearts. Nevertheless, considering this very difficult and complex problem, we have dealt with it, if I may say so, with all respect, with a very large measure of restraint.

Indeed, if we once get out of the rather, if I may say so, superficial aspects of the problem and look deeper into it, the very magnitude and complexity of the problem is, if I may use the word, rather terrifying. It is a highly important subject today for Assam and Bengal, but as has been stated repeatedly by Members here, the problem is a much bigger, wider, deeper problem. It is not merely a question of Bengalis or Assamese; each one of us is affected and affected in many ways.

Some people here might perhaps— though I hope not—imagine that the others are rather superior and these people, the Assamese, have not behaved well and the Bengalis may be in some ways got excited, but we are a coolheaded people, not being so affected, and we can take an objective view. Well, we are coolheaded because our heads have not been hit. Probably if they had been hit, we would have been not at all coolheaded. It is easy to be coolheaded in those circumstances. But I have felt sitting here, trying to listen, that my mind slightly wandered away. I almost felt as if I was in a haunted place; not only this Chamber, but this great country itself became a haunted place for me and for all of us, with all kinds of ghosts and spectres, pursuing us—ghosts of the past, ghosts of the distant past, ghosts of the recent past, of our feelings, of our conflicts and all that, because what we are discussing here, whatever we may say about Assam or Bengal, is really about ourselves— how we behave, how we feel, how we are excited against each other, how our superficial covering of what you like to call 'nationalism' bursts open at the slightest irritation.

We forget it; whatever we may be— Punjabis, Bengalis, Madrasis or Assamese— immediately it comes out, just as in other ways. We talk so much about communalism, meaning thereby religious, political conflicts—how other things are suddenly swept away, when communal passions are roused. It is not the Assamese who are guilty here or the Bengalis; each one of us is a guilty party. Let us realise that.

When we talk so loudly of our nationalism, each person's idea of nationalism is his own brand of nationalism, it may be Assamese nationalism, it may be Bengali, it may be Gujarati, U.P., Punjabi or Madrasi. Each one thinks of his particular brand in his mind. He may use the words 'nationalism of all India', but in his mind, he is thinking of that nationalism in terms of his own particular brand of it. When

two brands of nationalism come to conflict, there is trouble, each talking of nationalism.

So also while talking about Indian unity. We want unity of our own thinking, of our own brand. It is just like each person's orthodoxy in his own 'doxy'; other 'doxies' are heterodoxies. My nationalism is the real brand; yours, if it is different, is not the real nationalism. We all tend to think that way more or less.

We talk about enquiries and causes. We may go deep down into those enquiries and perhaps discover many things which we have forgotten, because as, I think Dr. Krishnaswami said,—he talked something about our social structure, about our close society we live in, not one close society, but numerous close societies all over. Of course, that is due to caste and other things. I am not going into it, but the fact is we live in close societies and groups, not only a Bengali close society or a Marathi or a Malayalee close society, whatever it may be. You will find that when you go abroad, wherever Indians are living in large numbers—not a few, of course—you will find a separate Gujarati club, a separate Malayalee club, a separate Bengali club and so on and so forth. They do not even have a single Indian club. Where they are in large numbers, you even have in some places a separate Gorakhpuri club. I remember this particularly, because the Gorakhpuri club of Rangoon once gave me a purse of Rs. 10,000. It is ingrained in our background, in our upbringing, in our social structure. Of course, they are social structures that are changing and breaking up. That is a good thing. But let us realise how the conditions we live in are completely different. We talk about nationalism bravely, but always at the back of our mind is that particular narrow type of nationalism which we think is nationalism, not the others.

We talk very proudly and loudly about tolerance and there is the whole of Indian culture. It is a culture of tolerance undoubtedly. But as compared to, let us say, Europe, in European history, as it shows itself, it is a tolerance of people, tolerance of conscience that we always had. But where it strikes the social habits, we are intolerant, we have been intolerant. A person may believe in God or believe in the negation of God, you put up with him. In other countries he might have been dealt with very harshly. Here, no, you can believe anything you like, but you must abide by the social rules that have been laid down by our caste. If you don't, you get into trouble. You are not only pushed out and exterminated but you are pursued in a hundred ways. This does not happen so much, I suppose, in cities like Delhi and Calcutta, where things are different. But even now in the villages it is a mighty power, and even in the cities for the matter of that, whether it is our marriage or some other ceremony, everything goes not by caste but by subcaste, an amazing division. It is one thing which is unique in India, at least so far as my knowledge goes. You read in some of our newspapers here column after column of matrimonial advertisements. It is an astonishing thing. Whenever a foreigner comes he is surprised for he has never seen a thing like that— somebody, an Aggarwal, this and that of some subcaste wanting a bride or bridegroom. My education having been somewhat

restricted and limited, I do not even know the names of all these castes and I get confused.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

That is a pertinent question. Fortunately, I do not reach them much, but sometimes they come before my eyes. As a matter of fact, it has come to my notice, not by reading them directly. I have seen them quoted in some English newspapers, a matter of great amusement for them. I have read it in a foreign paper.

The other point that I was trying to make was that we are sliding on the surface of things and we talk of nationalism and Indian unity. Of course, there is truth in it. There is truth in our nationalism. There is truth in our belief and conviction of unity. That is perfectly true. But I do say that the conception of Indian unity and that conception of nationalism is a peculiar one, limited to each individual or groups of one way of thinking. It is not the common idea of nationalism. My idea of nationalism or my group's is different from that of somebody. It is largely conditioned by our social system. For generations we have been brought up in our social structure of caste system and the like. It is not an easy thing to get out of them. And it pursues us wherever we go.

People talk that linguistic provinces have given rise to this. It may be that the idea of linguistic provinces has encouraged this idea. But it is much deeper than any linguistic province, and that is why I gave you the example of an Indian living in Rangoon, Singapore or Ceylon, places where there are many Indians—a few, of course, cannot easily separate like that—who always go by their caste group or language group. They hardly meet each other.

It is an amazing thing, and it is a terribly weakening thing. And if one good thing this tragedy in Assam has done, it has brought this skeleton out of our mental cupboard. At least, I hope it has brought it out so that we could see this very ugly thing, what it is. It is a bad thing, and it is there in our minds and hearts. It is no good any of us taking pride that we are above it, and we get excited. We may get excited about many things. We get most excited when that corner of our mind is hit. Then we get frightfully excited.

Our friend, Shri Hoover Hynniewta, yesterday delivered a very interesting speech, I do not know what about. He was so frightfully excited when he quoted the famous American: "give me liberty or give me death". Now, I do not know where death came into the picture. I suppose the context was what the Assamese should have as their official language but he put it in the level of liberty and death.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²

You are perfectly right. Liberty of thinking of course, is necessary. Nobody, not even the greatest tyrant has ever succeeded in taking away the liberty to think. Sometimes what the tyrants have done is to prevent the expression of the thought,

the public expression of the thought. Thinking, nobody has been able to check yet, at any time.

Now, where is the question of liberty to think, or liberty just coming in at all! His conclusions may be right or wrong, but I am merely saying that if we are thinking of these petty matters, relatively petty matters we lose all our standards, all our mental equilibrium; we become unbalanced almost in our . . .

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX³**

I am not criticising the hon. Member. I am merely pointing out a certain tendency. I can mention several hon. Members too, though not in criticism but to show how one is apt to be swept away. If he says he wants to adhere to a certain language he believes in, I accept that. If he says "I do not want a language to be imposed on me" I accept that. That is a different matter. But it is the context in which these things are said that matters, and sometimes, I venture to say, it becomes all wrong and all too narrow, an intolerant context, a context in which it becomes curious and, curiously enough, the idea of tolerance becomes converted into intolerance over another language. It is a very curious thing, and even in this language question, if Shri Hoover says "I want the right to use or speak in my language" well and good. But, if he says "I am going to prevent the other fellow from doing this" there he is all wrong.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX⁴**

I know that. I agree that the degree is limited.

But my point is,—honestly, I am not dealing with this matter in a frivolous way—what I am venturing to submit to this House is this. The Assam-Bengal trouble is a very-very serious aspect of our national problem, a basic thing on which the whole future of this country depends. In this matter everyone of us has to blame himself, and I gladly include myself. I do not know what I am. I cannot judge of myself, how narrow I am in my thinking. How can I say what I am when one cannot judge oneself? But each one of us is narrow, because of our traditions, our inheritance in social matters, not in high philosophical matters. When we come down to our traditions we have been accustomed to, each one, in the ultimate analysis, is confined to the little kitchen in his corner—not joining the other people, not allowing them to enter our kitchen, not eating with them or entering in marriage with them. Half of our lives have been spent in sticking to these limitations and rules. Now, is it not surprising? And that is the reason why we in India, individuals apart, of course, are amongst the most difficult to get on with a foreigner. Often, there are criticisms here, whether it is on foreign affairs or anything, why is this done and that not done, as if we command the world, as if we can order people about, not realising that sometimes the fault lies in ourselves.

People come from abroad. Sometimes they may discuss philosophical theories, but they find an odd society in India with which they cannot easily mix. They are surprised. Nowhere else, or at any rate hardly anywhere— there are one or two

exceptions—is this kind of thing found. So this mixture of the widest catholicity of thought or of philosophy which has made us great in many ways and the narrowest social life is a curious mixture. Of course, both do not apply to us fully now. We have outgrown them and we are outgrowing them. But they apply to us enough to affect us and to affect our political life. It did not matter much when we functioned in our own narrow grooves. But when we bring in democracy and open the door to every group to function as it wants, that ancient evil comes up. It comes up and comes into conflict with the other group which is coming up, the different groups each talking in its own language of nationalism coming up with the other nationalism.

What is, after all, what we call, communalism? When this question of Muslim communalism or Hindu communalism arose, you may well have described the two as Hindu nationalism and Muslim nationalism and you would have been correct. They were different nationalisms. They came into conflict with each other. The Hindus had the advantage because they grew up in this country and they could call their own communalism nationalist more easily because they were a part of India and had nowhere else to go to. The Muslims had a difficulty in that they could not put on that garb so easily. But the fact is that they were both communalism. They were both that communal type of nationalism—not everybody, I mean. I am talking about these various movements.

However, so this is the basic issue and we shall have to face this. We shall not face it by fussing about linguistic provinces and all that. It may be that has encouraged it—possibly it has. But it is deeper than that. And anyhow the linguistic provinces or whatever they are are there. We have to accept them. We are not going to cut up India again and again. We have to accept them for what they are. In accepting them we have to get used to the idea of living in peace and amity with each other and not raise this absurd bogey of language all the time. It is quite absurd, I think.

There are certain difficulties involved as Dr. Sushila Nayar said. In the rest of the world every educated man is supposed to know three or four languages. It is only in India that he resents being asked to learn a language. It is a most extraordinary thing. So it is a basic issue and it is a dangerous issue. We are not going to solve it by a debate here or by any committees or by anything else. But, at any rate, if all these events in Assam have made us think about these issues and make the country think, this is a good thing, because our first step towards taking any action is to be mentally aware to the question and then try to solve it.

I have ventured to say all this to try to create a background for our thinking because otherwise we live in an excited state and we shall not be able to take any step. My second point is this. We are dealing in this matter not with some malefactors, some mischiefmakers, some scoundrels and the like. Of course, there are mischiefmakers and malefactors. Get hold of them and punish them, whoever they may be. There can be no doubt whatever that in a matter of this kind you must respect nobody. I mean to say that you must not allow anybody because of party, because of something else or because of position to escape if he is a real malefactor. I admit it. There is no question about that. No party is going to flourish if it takes refuge in sheltering evil men. That

should be quite clear. Let us punish them. But the fact remains that evil men flourish on such occasions because they are in tune with the mind of the multitude. That is a fact to remember. Evil men flourish only on such things. The scoundrel flourishes only on such things, otherwise he is an ordinary thief or a person who commits arson. It is a Police case. But the moment he comes into tune with the mind of the multitude, it is another type of thing. That you have to see.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁵

Naturally they act and react on each other. But the mind of the multitude has been created, if I may say so, by generations not by a speech, by years and years. Even here somebody quotes somebody who delivered a speech ten years ago or thirteen years ago showing a succession of events, what Shri Bardoloi said and what the Governor of Assam said in 1947. That itself shows a certain connection. Why? Why did Shri Bardoloi say that? The Governor was Syed Akbar Hydari at that time—not an Assamese person but an outsider.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁶

Maybe, I cannot say. I doubt very much. A general sentiment may be there, but the words were his own. However, what I am saying is this. Here you go back 13 years. Why was that position 13 years ago? Let us think of it. Why was that position taken? Was it sheer cussedness. Why did that idea come into the head of apparently a good decent Assamese people and leaders. There must be some reason for that. I do not know. But I am merely pointing out these things. These are not sheer madness. When an idea comes to a good mind you have to have a reason for this. I say these things go far back. But I entirely agree with Acharya Kripalani that on such an occasion such things can be whipped up undoubtedly. Undoubtedly they were and that too in the course of several months.

I was in Assam earlier this year. I forget the month, maybe February or March or some other month. In front of the University I stopped for some kind of welcome by the students. They presented me with an address. Half the address was about language, just saying that they passionately want this language. At that time I knew and felt about it. I realised why it was quite so passionately felt. Anyhow I told them, “Well and good. It is a good thing. But this is not the time to raise this question. There are other more important things” or something like that. So this thing, of course, has “been going on and the language question for them had become a symbol not by itself the language. It was a symbol of their individuality, of their existence as Assamese, of their future and all that. When a thing becomes a symbol like this, rightly or wrongly, it becomes difficult to deal with it. It becomes above reason. It is an article of faith or something. It gradually developed.

This has swept over practically, broadly speaking, every Assamese. Every Assamese felt that way about the language issue. Some felt it more, some less. Some wise men, like Shri Chaliha, feeling that way and yet seeing the other side too, seeing the consequences of some action tried to check this, tried to reason with it and tried

to adopt a middle course because he is a man of vision and of tolerance. His attempt is always to win over people and not to enrage them. But broadly speaking this was the fact that language became the symbol of something. They passionately desired it. When this happens it is relatively easy for it to be exploited for wrong ends. That is where, as Acharya Kripalani perhaps intended, the wrong people came in and excited them, moved them to wrong action because the ground had been prepared for all that was happening.

My point in saying all this is that you must distinguish in order to deal with a situation like this between the evildoer and a certain symbol and mass opinion of a people. You have to distinguish and if you do not distinguish between them, if you feed both alike, then the evildoer becomes the hero of the people. You have to separate that. You must not allow him to become the hero of the people because anyhow you have to deal with the whole people. It is a very difficult thing and most difficult in a democratic society. You cannot do this. You cannot do it.

Many hon. Members have suggested various steps that the Central Government and other Governments should have taken. I do not think they have quite realised what the consequences of those steps might be either on democratic functioning or even on getting the results they aim at. After all, we aim at results, whatever the results are. We find, owing to a combination of circumstances, past history, peculiar feelings, whatever they are—I do not know whether they are justified or not—a certain feeling from the British times of the Assamese being suppressed, being sat upon, by the British, by others, being ignored, and then a certain release of that feeling coming. They expressed this release in curious unfortunate language. I am talking of 10 or 12 years ago as the language quoted shows. It shows rightly or wrongly this feeling of release. Why did they get that feeling which they had to express in this way? It was a kind of a resurgent limited nationalism coming up: bad because it was limited and good because it is a new spirit. You see good and evil mixed up. It is difficult to separate them sometimes. Any way, here is this problem which has led to these disastrous consequences.

In spite of being there, in spite of reading a large number of memoranda and papers, I would not venture to say positively and definitely, as definitely as many hon. Members, who probably know less than what I do about the facts, I mean, have done, about who is the guilty party. Of course, everybody knows as to what has happened. There is no doubt about that. It is a very grave tragedy, a bad thing, not only because it is an evil in itself, but because it is a novel feature of a people in one State being driven out either by force or through sheer panic, most of it by panic. I am sorry that anybody should go away by panic from anywhere, because, panic is so infectious that it is difficult to deal with it.

If I criticise the press, I do not mind if they have given wrong news or this and that. In a moment like this, one cannot balance these things because there is excitement. They may give wrong news. But I do think that what the press has erred is, they created or rather helped in intensifying a sense of panic. That is my objection. It may

be that they themselves got so angry that they did it. I am not criticising them. But, I do think that in a situation which is a difficult situation, which is a panicky situation and you want to hold it—it is on the verge; you hold it or it goes to pieces—every little thing counts. If the press wants to hold it, they can help in holding it; if they do not, they can upset and we cannot hold. That is my feeling in this matter.

Evil happened there in a big way. We have to face this situation. Hon. Members have repeatedly blamed the Central Government and the Assam Government and all that. My colleague the Home Minister took upon himself the responsibility for what the Central Government did. I am not prepared to permit him to shoulder all this responsibility. I come into the picture too. I am at least equally responsible. We are all responsible certainly. If we have erred or if we have erred deliberately or unconsciously, then, judge us and punish us: either this House or the country. But, I must confess that, looking at this picture, thinking of it again and again, I may tell you that we have given a good deal of thought to it. If any one imagined that we have thought of it casually or ignored it, it would be completely wrong. I know that my colleague the Home Minister has lived a tortured life these months, the month of July and later, because, there were so many things to trouble and disturb us. This Assam matter has disturbed him and troubled him more than anything, I know, both because it was bad and because, as I said, it was a symbol of evil, a symbol of our weakness, of our failings, disruptiveness, narrowness of mind, incapacity to function together, always a tendency to go to pieces. It was a terrible picture. It was a spectre of the old thing coming out. We felt that way.

It really is not clear to me and I do not understand what in these circumstances, the Central Government could have done: major thing or minor thing. Because, even in the latter half of June, we were worried, not too much worried. I never thought like that. After all, it was our misfortune that such events like this happen in various parts of India. Almost everyday, some odd thing happens. That certainly is our misfortune. We have become rather accustomed to reading this kind of thing. Bad as it was, we had no idea that it would develop in this way. For my part, it is only in the beginning of July that it came as a deep shock to me. Even before that, of course, we were writing as to what is happening, constantly in touch, by telephone, by letter, etc. I do not think it would be right for us to criticise, let us say, the Governor who told us on the 28th of June that he hoped that in two or three days time, this will die down. That was his judgment and he is not a man whose judgment we should not value. That was his impression. Maybe he was wrong. That is the impression he gave us. Then came the succession of events early in the beginning of July.

Immediately, the moment, in fact before the 4th of July, the Army was asked to go there. It is before the 4th of July and the Army was present in some part of Gauhati on the 4th of July and progressively afterwards, it came to other places, on the 6th to Shillong and so on. The Army was sent. That is the biggest thing that the Central Government can do.

Someone asked, why didn't you allow the Army to spread out and put an end to all these things, and why did you allow it apparently to function under the civil

administration. That means, really, why didn't you declare martial law there and hand over the whole State to the Army? That is a possibility. It did not strike us because we do not think in terms of martial law. However, there it was. But, I do not think martial law would have made any immediate difference, because, the Army moves in special ways. The Army does not take risks. It moves in large columns here, there and everywhere. It is not like the police, you put one Army man here and two army men there. They do not like it at all.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁷

The Army did function where it could. When this kind of things happen at a hundred places simultaneously.

.... XXX XXX XXX⁸

I have seen Nowgong. You are right. There is a big stretch. I cannot give you exactly an answer whether the Army was situated there or not. But, I do know that on the 4th it was in Gauhati. Gauhati is a central place. It went to Shillong on the 6th. It may be that it had not reached Nowgong then. On the 6th all this happened. You must remember that all this happened on the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th; on 3 or 4 days they happened. It may be, within a day or two it got there. It could not have got there more swiftly because of the simultaneous nature of these things.

I asked a Police Superintendent, what were you doing. Because somebody complained to me that he telephoned to the police station to come and protect him as he was being attacked or he was told he was going to be attacked that evening. He was a Bengalee gentleman, and he said that he had given notice to the police station that he had heard that he was going to be attacked in the evening or two hours later, but nobody came. So, I hauled up the policeman. He said: "Do you know, Sir, it was bedlam in my police station. Hundreds of calls coming from everywhere, and my having a dozen or twenty men at my disposal. There was perfect bedlam, what could I do?" I am merely narrating a fact, I am not justifying it. It shows that the police force was neither adequate nor competent— agreed. It shows, as has been admitted, that the administration collapsed. All that is agreed. I am merely narrating things as one found them. And all this happened practically in the course of four or five days, this intensive thing; from the 5th to about the 10th practically all this happened, and they just could not cover it during that time. Maybe, the Army could have moved more swiftly, whatever it was, I cannot judge, but there was no civil authority stopping them. In fact, ultimately the disturbed Areas Ordinance was applied to two miles of either side of the river Brahmaputra, and this was handed over to the Army.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁹

Quite correct, not the Brahmaputra. That meant really covering every city, practically every city. In fact, that was handed over to the Army.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹⁰

I could not tell you, I am sorry, but certainly when I was there, it was in the Army's possession.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹¹

No, no, not that. About the 6th or 7th or 8th, possibly in those days.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹²

Yes, that is true.

The Army wants to have fixed centres from which it can function, it wants to get places. Let us say Nowgong is a centre. It goes and sits down in sufficient numbers, then it probes out. It will not go out in small penny packets searching for people. It gets lost, it is afraid of getting lost. It is not used normally to dealing with this public kind of thing. However, I cannot explain what the Army did, I have not gone into that matter, nor am I competent to do so.

What I was driving at was this,— I am sorry. Sir, I have taken up so much time—that we have to remember that this is a matter in which evildoers have functioned, but they have taken advantage of powerful sentiments of the people which they themselves, as Acharya Kripalani said, may have incited. It is true.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹³

That is not my point. I am sorry that I have not been able to explain my meaning. I do not think so. It is difficult for me to go back again in my argument.

I have merely narrated as things came to us, and what I am begging this House to consider is this, how to deal with the situation. That is the problem before us. I am not going too much into history.

In dealing with the situation, you have to deal with the evildoer, you have also to deal with the mass sentiment, that is my point. And if you deal with the mass sentiment in the way you deal with the evildoer, then you cannot succeed. You can always succeed in the sense of martial law, that is not success, dealing with everybody through martial law. The moment you revert from martial law to something else, you come back to a worse position. That is the difficulty in dealing with it.

I speak subject to correction, and I am not for the moment including, what shall I say, Assamese Members or Bengalee Members here who may have gone to Assam, but I am rather thinking of others who may have visited Assam during these last few weeks, whoever they might be. Because they have gone there, they have probably got some reactions of the position there, or the situation there. You will find that they speak a somewhat different language from those who have not gone there. It is a fact to remember, because they have experienced something. It is not a question of reading a book, or reading Shri A. P. Jain's report. It is a feeling of sensing a situation which is highly important where masses are concerned. So, you will find every one, as

This has nothing to do with riots. What I was pointing out was how this matter has cut across party lines; that is, the party branches have been pulled this way and that way by mass sentiment in that area. That is my point. Of course, a party may by its discipline pull them up. That is a different matter. But, for the moment, they are swept by the sentiment of that place. It is quite natural; if it is a mass party, it has to feel that way. This is the position. How are you going to deal with this?

Obviously, the martial law method is basically not going to produce results. The martial law method becomes necessary and essential where there is constant disorder; you have to quell it. Ever since, roughly, the middle of August, there was no disorder on that scale. There were incidents, individual incidents happening; true; undesirable; there was apprehension, fear, if you like, in the minds of people; true. But the Army was spread out. Even apart from the Government, the Army was spread out in most places, and nothing could happen on a big scale. Therefore, even the administration, on that date, because I was there then, was functioning with a measure of efficiency; the administration admittedly had broken down previously except in two or three districts. And although the Chief Minister Mr. Chaliha was lying ill, the other Ministers, I felt, were doing a good job of work there, hard work. It was very difficult then to retrieve what had happened, to pull back; they were working very hard and fairly efficiently. We decided to give them special officers, competent officers from here and all that; we did send some officers, and we are still sending them. And we felt that the only way to control the situation, the best way rather, was through the government.

Now, it was possible to push the government out. What would take its place? Either President's rule or something else. There was no other Government there; we felt that if we did that, we have to function in almost a vacuum; that is, the support that we might get, the popular support, would be completely lacking. Everybody in Assam, every group and party was against it. Of course, we could impose our will by the Army. The Army was there, to some extent everywhere. The Government there was not opposing our will. They asked for our advice, and we gave advice to them, and they followed it. They asked the Governor for advice. The Governor would have been our agent. The Governor was working very closely with them. So, we felt that any other step would, though it might perhaps be advantageous for a few days or weeks, ultimately come in the way of all the processes that we were working for. And we decided, therefore, to carry on with this, and we thought, we were not sure at any time, when it might not be necessary to have President's rule; if it did not function, then we do it.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²¹

But that surely depends; if I had been, for instance, in Assam, and saw the picture in Assam on the 6th or the 7th or the 8th, I would have said, yes, you must come in, there must be some kind of Central intervention. As a matter of fact, you

BACK NOTE

XXVIII. Motion Regarding Situation in Assam, 3 September 1960

1. SHRI TYAGI: Why do you read them?
2. SHRI HYNNIETWA (Autonomous Districts—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I said liberty to think, the most precious of our liberties. If I do not have the liberty, then I cease to be a human being. It is better to have death rather than to lose the liberty of thinking.
3. SHRI JAIPAL SINGH: I think what he meant was liberty to think in his mother tongue, and not in Kashmiri.
SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: How does that come? That does not come into the picture at all.
4. SHRI HYNNIETWA: No, I cannot be that much mad.
5. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: He can also create the mind of the multitude. I am afraid, here the case was that the mind of the multitude was created by these people.
6. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: That was the Government's speech. Obviously he was doing it on behalf of his Government.
7. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: Are we to understand that the Army was called out on the 4th of July and between the 4th and the next eight days when all this havoc took place, the Army could not do anything?
8. SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta Central) : There is one report that for a two mile stretch there was continuous devastation of houses all over the place near Nowgong. This is the report which we have got from the Women's delegation—a two mile stretch of continuous devastation. I cannot understand why the Army cannot function.
9. SHRI HEM BARUA: Five miles on both sides of the railway.
10. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: On which date?
11. SHRI SADHAN GUPTA: After the incident.
SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: Everything was over, and then it was done.
12. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: Your version makes us even more worried, because it seems that the Army went there, and there are absolutely good roads connecting Gauhati, Nowgong, Jorhat and everything, and they cannot move, they are immobilised for days on end. It is a terrible admission.
SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (CALCUTTA SOUTH WEST): How can they move unless the civil administration order them to move?
13. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: If you do not mind my interrupting you for a little while, all your arguments come to this that this happened just like an earthquake or a flood, and such things may happen again and we will be helpless against those natural calamities.

14. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: Now the Central Executive has adopted a resolution that Assamese will be regarded as the principal State language, and that the other groups should have a round table conference to find out their opinion. It is in Shri Jain's Report.

15. SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: That was an old document, and it is only in the light of the experiences gained after that the new resolution is there.

16. SHRI SADHAN GUPTA: It is an annexure in the Report.

SHRI TYAGI: It is a revelation to us.

17. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: 17th August.

18. SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR (Thiruvella): It was 28th July, and after that in August our Central Executive passed a resolution.

19. SHRI A.P. JAIN: It is in page 8 of the Report.

20. SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: It is not a question of the Assam Branch of the Communist Party passing a resolution. The Bengalis in the Brahmaputra Valley also supported the idea of Assamese as the official language. It was not because of the declaration of Assamese as the official language or the declaration against it that the riots took place. It has much deeper roots.

21. SHRI JAIPAL SINGH: I only want a clarification from the Prime Minister. I am only trying to understand what the Leader of the House has told us. If once it is admitted that the administration has failed somewhere, but everybody says, no, do not come in, constitutionally, what is the position? Once they knew here at the Centre, are they not bound to step in? I am only trying to understand the position.

PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA (Hissar): Certainly not. The use of the word "May" in Article 356 shows it is discretionary with the President.

22. AN HON. MEMBER: That is not the position.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR: The Army could not move.

23. SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: Yesterday, the hon. Prime Minister favoured competent high level judicial enquiries immediately on a regional basis. Does he resile from that position and make it more vague?

24. RAJA MAHENDRA PRATAP (Mathura): Please send the members of the Bharat Sevak Samaj and Sarvodaya and Sant Vinoba Bhave.

25. SHRI ATULYA GHOSH: There may be a misunderstanding. We were not a party to the black flag demonstration.

26. SHRIMATI RENUKA RAY: I want to seek a clarification. The Prime Minister said in his speech yesterday that certain judicial inquiries, zonal ones, would be set up immediately. Today he did not repeat it. I would like to know what is the position.

AN HON. MEMBER: He said so.

STATEMENT REGARDING INCIDENTS IN CONGO

30 November, 1960

Sir, three or four days ago attention of the House was attracted to certain events that happened in Leopoldville in the Congo because of which some Indian officers were beaten and suffered injury. I promised then to place before the House such other facts or information as I could collect. I am not naturally at this stage dealing with the entire very complicated question of the Congo but rather with these incidents.

Certain authorities in the Congo-it is rather difficult always to refer to these authorities as to which are formal or informal, or legal or ultra-legal-decided to take steps to have one of the Ghana diplomats to leave the Congo. This gentleman, that is, the Ghana diplomat, did not agree with this order that he had received, or it may be that he was in communication with his Government. Anyhow, he did not carry out that order and asked for protection from the U.N. Force there. The UN Force apparently agreed to give him some protection. He was staying in his house with some UN Guard round about it when the Congolese armed forces came there and either attacked or tried to rush to positions, whatever it was. There was firing between the UN Guard and these Congolese forces. The firing resulted in casualties on both sides- a few casualties, three, four, five, six or something like that. Among those who were killed by that firing was a certain officer of the Congolese armed forces by name Col. Nkokulu. This Col. Nkokulu was the Second-in-Command after Col. Mobutu and no doubt the killing of Col. Nkokulu gave rise to considerable excitement in the Congolese armed forces.

I should like to make it clear, as I said previously, that India has not got any combat units there at all. India was not involved in this incident of firing either. The Indian personnel that have been sent there, although they are Army or Air Force personnel, are engaged in supply operations, in signalling and in medical work. We have opened a big hospital there and our people there are 770 or thereabouts.

After this incident there were very considerable number of sporadic attacks by the Congolese armed forces on odd people and on diplomats of many countries from the 21st November. On the 21st, 22nd, and 23rd November many of these attacks took place. Just to indicate the nature and number of these attacks, I shall mention a few but there was a large number. I think a report has been presented to the Secretary-General and by the Secretary-General it has been placed before the UN. These instances are taken from his report.

I might add that the instances where there was not much threat of violence have not been mentioned in this. The instances are where there was actual violence or a threat of violence have not been mentioned in this. The instances are where there was actual violence or a threat of violence where, for instance, many people were pushed at gun point and at bayonet point though actually bayonet was not used but there was

threat of violence. So, people were threatened and by their threats a large number of automobiles were forcibly seized by these Congolese forces. I do not know their number but some reports said they were 40 or 50 and some said they were 70. It was said that later they would be returned, but as far as I know, most of them have not been returned.

There are the instances about the Indian officers which the House already knows in which two officers were beaten rather badly and three others were not beaten but were pushed about and were made to deliver up their car and some other belongings.

Apart from these, here are some other instances that happened. A car containing four civilian UN staff, one Swiss, two Swedish and one French, was stopped by the Congolese forces on the night of 21st November. The occupants were ordered at gun-point to leave the car, beaten by rifle butts and confined in a small room with a further 24 UN personnel including two women staff. They were released after eight hours. The four UN civilian staff were beaten again after release and their cars were stolen.

A car containing three UN civilian personnel, one Canadian, one Spanish and one American, was stopped the same night. The occupants were forcibly detained and beaten. They were released in the morning.

On the same night a car with two Italian UN civilian personnel was stopped and both were beaten with rifle butts. They were released an hour later.

On the 22nd morning a Canadian Air Force officer was forced out of his car at gun-point and struck several times. His briefcase was stolen.

On the same morning a Ghana officer of the United Kingdom nationality had his car stolen. He was beaten by rifle butts. His watch was stolen and he was confined for five hours. All this happened after Col. Mobutu had ordered his release.

A Swedish House will notice the variety of nationalities involved-U.N. civilian was arrested and confined for five hours during which his life was threatened many times with guns and knives.

On the 22nd November, a senior Nigerian officer, British nationality, and two N.C.Os., both Indian, were forced out of their jeep by armed Congolese forces. The two N.C.Os. were threatened with death, but were released shortly afterwards.

A Dutch U.N. civilian was threatened with death if he returned to the Congolese radio station. On November 23rd, a senior Canadian air force officer was forced at gun point out of his car which was stolen.

All these attacks were against unarmed personnel. May be some officers carried revolvers. They were not armed people.

Lately, three other incidents happened. On the 22nd morning, an Indian I.O.R. proceeding to the airport was deprived of his personal belongings. Two Indian military police escorting a Nigerian Brigadier to the airport, took a wrong turn and they were

Now, the U.N. has accepted President Kasavubu. Naturally a certain prestige attaches to that. President Kasavubu himself was accepted by us and by every country, nobody has challenged him. The point that had arisen previously was not the fact of his Presidentship, but the question as to what functions the President should exercise, that is the point, whether the President could go out of the way or exercise only his functions. That was the matter in doubt. There it is. But nobody can say that things in the Congo are firmly established. There is an element of flexibility and all that, and in the U.N. our representatives and others are perfectly cognizant of this fact, and are trying to deal with it to the best of their ability.

There is the question of this commission, a delegation going from the U.N. I understand it is likely to go in the course of a week or so. That delegation will presumably report. So, all these things are happening, and I confess I do not see the advantage of our discussing this in the near future till something further develops.

BACK NOTE

XXIX. Statement Regarding Incidents in Congo, 30 November, 1960

1. MR. SPEAKER: I am not going to allow questions on this.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, lat time, he said.....

MR. SPEAKER: We have heard the statement of the Prime Minister. Hon. Members will read the statement once again. I will try to circulate whatever the hon. Prime Minister has said so far. He has referred to a number of details. If still hon. Members have got any desire to make any suggestions, I will consider that.

SHRI NATH PAI: Mr. Speaker, when he made the statement on the Congo, he had informed the House that immediate representation was made to the Secretary-General regarding the growing state of lawlessness resulting in violent attacks on U.N. personnel. The whole question he, therefore, posed was the upholding of the authority of the U. N., and the Government of India had seriously taken up the matter with the Secretary-General through our permanent representatives. We should like to know what is happening in that matter regarding establishment of...

MR. SPEAKER: That is what he has said. He wants to know about their security, further guarantee about their security.

2. SHRI BRAJ RAJ SINGH: (Firozabad): Col. Harmander Singh was forcibly kept out of his house by Col. Mobutu's troops and he had to go away to another's place.

3. SHRI NAUSHIR BHARUCHA (East Khandesh): May I mention, Sir, that on the last occasion, the Government said that they would permit a debate. You at least said that before this week is out, a debate will be held. The hon. Prime Minister has made more disconcerting statements since the last developments. He has distinctly stated that with the escape of Mr. Lumumba and his heading for Stanleyville, there is a possibility of civil war. We are having 770 Indian personnel there, practically unarmed in this area. In the event of the outbreak of civil war, the lives of these people will be in danger. The question is, is this Parliament not entitled to discuss this very important issue, namely safety of our personnel in this disturbed area and convey to the U.N. our apprehensions in this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Who said that this Parliament has no right? Today, the hon. Prime Minister has made a statement. I think he has given all the facts. Since the 23rd of November, no further incident has occurred. We were not the only victims. Other countries were also attacked by the mob there.

SHRI NAUSHIR BHARUCHA: That is no consolation to us.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. At present some kind of an order is being restored. Of course, one has to be careful. As and when occasion arises, certainly, this House

will always discuss this matter and give advice to the Government and also ascertain from the government what exactly is happening. Why should any hon. Member presume that we are denying ourselves all that? At this stage, in view of the Prime Minister's statement, is it necessary to pursue this matter?

SHRI NAUSHIR BHARUCHA: Very necessary.

MR SPEAKER: Today, shall we have a discussion?

SHRI NAUSHIR BHARUCHA: Not today; this week.

SHRI KHADILKAR (Ahmednagar): Has there been conveyed to the Government of India any expression of regret for all these incidents by the head of the State who was recognized by the U. N., Mr. Kasavubu?

4. SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: (Calcutta-Central): I wish to submit that there are many questions which arise in our minds: the question, for example, whether India is trying to move along with countries like Ghana, Guinea and other Afro-Asian States with whom we have proceeded together in the United Nations in regard to this matter. I am not pressing that now. My point is, last time, the Prime Minister had indicated his readiness for a discussion at the appropriate time. Many of us felt that the Prime Minister's hands would be strengthened if there was some kind of an expression of the view of Parliament in regard to this matter at an appropriate time. Today, we have got some facts which give rise to certain questions in our mind and that is what my colleagues are getting up to ask. We would like to have some kind of an understanding in regard to when if at all we will have a discussion of this matter. There are certain questions which are cropping up which have to be trashed out on the floor of the House and nowhere else. That is why I feel that the Prime Minister should give us an indication in regard to his readiness for a debate.

SHRI RANGA (Tenali): All the Governments whose forces are there in the Congo are represented at the U. N. including our own Government. Their delegation is already seated there. Is it not the proper thing for our Government, if they so wish and if the Parliament also so wishes, to make out our representations to the Secretary-General and the U.N. instead of trying to debate that matter here in this Parliament.

5. SHRI RANGA: Why discuss the broad question of the Congo here?

STATEMENT REGARDING DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT AND GOVERNMENT OF WEST BENGAL REGARDING TRANSFER OF BERUBARI TO PAKISTAN

5 December, 1960

Mr. Speaker, two or three days ago, when the House was meeting last, the question of Berubari came up, and I promised to make a statement in regard to the various matters which had been referred to. The way this question came up here and the way it has been brought up by the West Bengal Government and the West Bengal has been in regard primarily to certain legal approaches and legal issues. I shall endeavour to deal with those matters. I fear I may have to seek your indulgence and the indulgence of the House for some time in order to do so.

When a State Government and a State Assembly express their opinion challenging the legality of some step that we have taken, it is only right that we should give full thought to it and give a considered reply. Therefore, I have to deal with this matter at some slight length.

The issue of Berubari, apart from the pure merits, has various questions of legality involved - how far we have acted in pursuance of the Supreme Court's advice, and further, how far the reference made by the President in this matter to West Bengal was the correct method or not. The West Bengal Assembly and the Government have challenged that reference and I shall come to that later.

As regards the pure legality of it, the West Bengal Legislative Assembly has passed a resolution moved by the Chief Minister of the State expressing the opinion that the Acquired Territories Merger Bill, 1960 which was referred by the President to the State Legislature under the proviso to article 3 of the Constitution for expressing its opinion thereon is invalid and unconstitutional. The resolution sets out the grounds on which the State Legislative Assembly has formed its opinion. I shall deal with those grounds.

May I add that as I thought that many hon. Members might like to refresh their memory about the Supreme Court's advice on this matter, I have had it printed and sent this morning enough copies for supply to all the Members so that, when the House would be considering it here, it is available to all the Members. I know that. The House had begun sitting when it arrived. But it is available to all the Members.

In order to examine the points raised by the West Bengal State Legislative Assembly regarding the validity and the constitutionality of the aforesaid Bill, it would be helpful to recapitulate, at the outset, the events leading to the proposed legislation. With a view to remove causes of tension and establish peaceful conditions

along the Indo-Pakistan border areas, the Prime Minister of Pakistan and India discussed various Indo-Pakistan border problems in September, 1958, as a result of which an agreement was arrived at between India and Pakistan on the 10th September, 1958 relating to 10 items. Certain other outstanding disputes and doubts were also settled later by two other agreements, one dated 23rd October, 1959 and the other dated 11th January, 1960. The agreements dated the 10th September, 1958 and the 23rd October, 1959 dealt with border problems with both East Pakistan and West Pakistan while the agreement dated the 11th January, 1960 related to border problems with West Pakistan only. All the settlements made under the three agreements involve transfer by India of certain areas in India to Pakistan and the acquisition by India of certain territories in Pakistan as well as certain minor border adjustments.

West Bengal is concerned with the first two agreements only. The items in the first agreement respecting West Bengal are:

- (1) equal division of Berubari Union No. 12 between India and Pakistan;
- (2) exchange of all Cooch-Bihar enclaves in Pakistan and Pakistan enclaves in India;
- (3) adjustment of boundaries between Khulna in 24 Parganas and Jessore.

The items in the second agreement affecting West Bengal relate to the demarcation of the boundary between West Bengal and East Pakistan in the areas of Mahananda, Burung and Karatoa rivers.

A doubt having arisen regarding the method of implementation of the agreement relating to Berubari Union and the exchange of Cooch-Bihar enclaves, the advice of the Supreme Court under article 143 of the Constitution was sought, on the question, inter alia whether if any legislative action was necessary for the implementation of the agreement relating to these items, a law of Parliament relating to article 3 of the Constitution was sufficient for the purpose or whether an amendment of the Constitution was necessary in accordance with article 368 of the Constitution.

It may be mentioned that when the reference was heard by the Supreme Court, the State of West Bengal was given an opportunity to place its views on the reference, and the Advocate-General of that State appeared at the hearing for the State of West Bengal. Several political parties also intervened in the matter and were represented by Shri N. C. Chatterjee, Senior Advocate. The opinion of the Supreme Court was reported in the Supreme Court Journal, 1960. For the purposes of this, the following views, as expressed by the Supreme Court are relevant:

1. There can be no doubt that under international law, the essential attributes of sovereignty are the power to acquire foreign territory as well as power to cede national territory in favour of a foreign State;
2. Acquisition of a foreign territory by India in exercise of its inherent right as a sovereign State automatically makes the said territories part of the territory of India. After such territory is thus acquired and factually made part of the territory of

India, the process of law may assimilate it either under article 2 or under article 3 (a) or (b);

3. As an illustration of the procedure which can be adopted by Parliament in making a law for absorbing newly acquired territory, reference may be made to the Chandernagore Merger Act, 1954:

4. Article 3 deals with the internal adjustment inter se of the territories of the constituent States of India. The power to cede national territory cannot be read in article 3 (c) by implication:

5. Agreement in respect of Berubari Union involves the cession of the territory of India. A fortiori the agreement in respect of the exchange of Cooch-Bihar enclaves also involves the cession of Indian territory:

6. Accordingly, acting under article 368, Parliament might make law to give effect to and implement the agreement covering the cession of part of Berubari Union No. 12 as well as some of the Cooch-Bihar enclaves which by exchange are given to Pakistan. Its implementation would naturally involve the alteration of the content of and the sequent amendment of article 1 and of the relevant part of the First Schedule to the Constitution.

7. Parliament may, however, if so chooses, pass a law amending article 3 of the Constitution so as to cover cases of cession of the territory of India in favour of a foreign State. If such a law is passed, then, Parliament may be competent to make a law under the amended article 3 to implement the agreement in question. On the other hand, if the necessary law is passed under article 368 itself, that alone would be sufficient to implement the agreement.

I have given you a summary of the various points referred to in the Supreme Court's opinion. It will be observed that according to the opinion of the Supreme Court, India has the power to acquire foreign territory as well as power to cede part of its territory, within the framework of the present Constitution. The cession of territory has to be implemented by an amendment of article 1 of the Constitution and the First Schedule under article 368, while the territory acquired automatically becomes part of the territory of India and can be assimilated by law under article 2 or 3(a) or (b).

The Supreme Court also suggested that article 3 might be so amended as to cover cases of cession of the territory of India and after such amendment the cession of territory could be implemented by ordinary law passed by a simple majority in Parliament.

Government was not in favour of this suggestion of amending article 3, as suggested by the Supreme Court, because this would make it easy in future to enable cession of territories. We wanted this to be difficult and that it should not be done by a bare majority of Parliament because if that amendment suggested by the Supreme Court is adopted, then, the Parliament, by a bare majority, could cede territory.

We thought that the cession of territory should be made a difficult operation and not easy. The only course open then was to give effect to a cession of territory by an amendment of article 1 of the Constitution and the First Schedule in accordance with article 368 and to assimilate the acquired territory by an order relating to article 3, as pointed out by the Supreme Court.

This procedure necessarily involves two Bills: one for amendment of article 1 of the Constitution and the First Schedule and the other appropriating the added areas of the States, namely Pakistan Enclaves, under article 3. The Supreme Court itself has indicated the necessity of two Bills, one necessitating the amendment of article 1 and the First Schedule and the other involving an ordinary Bill only. The two Bills cannot be rolled up into one as the procedure for the two and the conditions for passing are different. I am saying this because the West Bengal Government has laid stress that there ought to have been one Bill and not two. According to the advice given to me and my own views, this could not have been done and if we have tried to do that, it would not have been in conformity with the Supreme Court's advice in the matter. The Attorney General of India was also consulted in the matter and he too advised that two separate Bills should be prepared.

The Bill relating to article 3, the Acquired Territories Merger Bill, 1960 was required to be referred to the State Legislatures concerned under the proviso to article 3. The order of reference was accordingly made by the President and was transmitted to the Chief Secretary to the Government of West Bengal with a covering letter in which he was requested to bring the matter to the notice of the Chief Minister and make arrangements for the reference to be considered by the State Legislature, 400 copies of the Bill were sent to the State Government for circulation among the Members of the State Legislature. 400 copies of the other Bill Constitution Amendment Bill were also sent to the State Government. Both the Bills were examined by the State Government and they submitted certain comments.

As regards the Acquired Territories Merger Bill, 1960, they stated that no comment is called for except that there was no provision relating to the citizenship of the residents of the territories acquired. The question of validity or constitutionality of the Bill was not at all raised.

The grounds on which the West Bengal Assembly had passed the Resolution that the Bill is invalid and unconstitutional may now be examined.

The first ground is a statement of fact and calls for no comment.

The second ground is also a statement of fact but it describes the agreement as one and indivisible. The agreement cannot be aptly described as indivisible as it cedes certain territories and acquires certain other territories. The provision regarding the cession of territories is separable from the provision regarding the acquisition of territories. By advising two separate methods of legislation to implement cession and acquisition of territories, the Supreme Court itself has indicated that the agreement is

not indivisible and the opinion of the Supreme Court necessarily involves two separate Bills, one for cession of territory and the other for absorption of the acquired territories.

The third ground is not in conformity with the opinion of the Supreme Court. As stated above, the Supreme Court has held that Parliament can make a law relating to article 3 for the purpose of implementing the agreement in so far as it relates to acquisition of territories. It is only in respect of cession of territories that the Supreme Court has held that the law relating to article 3 is not competent.

As regards the fourth ground, the Supreme Court has suggested two ways for implementing the agreement: and one by amending article I the First Schedule of the Constitution in accordance with article 368 to implement the agreement for cession of territory and a law under article 3 to absorb acquired territories. While passing, they mentioned another way, namely, amendment of article 3 itself so as to cover cases of cession of territory and enabling, after such amendment cession of territory by an ordinary Act under the amended article 3. The latter method has not been accepted by Government who have, therefore, adopted the former. It has not been accepted, as I have said before, as we do not wish to make it easy to cede territory by a law by a simple majority. It is, therefore, not correct to say that none of the methods indicated by the Supreme Court had been adopted in drafting the Bill.

With reference to the fifth ground, it is true that the provisions of article 3 are being utilised to give effect to part of the agreement only in so far as it relates to the acquisition of territories and this method is in accordance with the opinion of the Supreme Court.

It is said that the acquisition of territories is nothing but the result of an exchange involving cession of territories and that to give effect to the agreement by piecemeal legislation relating to matters which are inseparable is unconstitutional. It is not wholly correct to say that the acquisition territory is the result of exchange involving cession of territory. The exchange of territories is in respect of Cooch- Behar Enclaves only. The other items of cession of territory and acquisition of territory are decided on merits. It necessarily follows from the opinion of the Supreme Court that there are to be two separate laws and the two Bills drafted in accordance with that opinion are not therefore unconstitutional. Whether the agreement can or cannot be said to be inseparable is unimportant in view of the Supreme Court opinion necessitating the passing of two separate Bills.

The sixth and the last ground states that the method of implementing the agreement by two Bills is objectionable since the State Legislature is deprived of the right to express its opinion in respect of the cession of a part of its territory. Such a result flows from the provisions of the Constitution itself. While a Bill under article 368 does not require reference to the State Legislature, the Bill under article 3 alone requires such a reference. The Constitution does not give the State Legislature an opportunity to express its opinion in respect of cession of territory. Dealing with this aspect, the Supreme Court has observed that this incidental consequence cannot be avoided. In defence of such a position, the Supreme Court adds:

“The Bill has to be passed in each House by a majority of the total membership of the House...”

That is, the Central Legislature. “.....and by a majority of not less than two-thirds present and voting.”

That is to say, it should obtain the concurrence of a substantial number of the House which may normally mean the consent of all the major parties of the House and that is the safeguard provided by the article in matters of this kind.

It may be mentioned that with a view to enabling the State Legislature to have an idea of the complete picture, sufficient number of copies of the Constitution (Ninth) Amendment Bill were also sent to the State Government. It is not known if these copies were circulated to the Members of the West Bengal Legislative Assembly. It is thus submitted that the Acquired Territories Merger Bill, 1960 has been framed in accordance with the opinion of the Supreme Court and cannot be regarded as invalid or unconstitutional.

Sir, I have taken so much time over this point because they have said in the West Bengal Assembly that this is unconstitutional and I have to point out that we have acted in strict accordance with the advice given by the Supreme Court.

Now, there is another point viz., that the procedure adopted by the President was not correct: that is what they say. At the end of the Resolution of the West Bengal Legislative Assembly, there is an objection to the effect that the procedure that had been adopted in referring the Bill to the Legislature through the State Government is not in accordance with the provisions of the proviso to article 3 read with article 168. This proviso to article 3 states that the President shall refer the Bill to the Legislature of the State for expressing its views thereon within such period as may be specified in the reference. In the present case, the order of the President stated:

“Now, therefore, in pursuance of the proviso to article 3 of the Constitution of India, I hereby refer the Bill to the Legislature of each of the States for expressing its views thereon within a period of one month from the date of this reference.”

The House will remember that there were several legislatures concerned- Assam, Punjab, as well as West Bengal. The President's reference to the legislature was dated 23rd October. As he gave a month, the period of reference expired on the 23rd November last. There is no doubt that the reference was made to the legislature. It said so, and in fact, it is recognised in the preamble of the resolution of the West Bengal Legislative Assembly which says:

“Whereas the Acquired Territories Merger Bill, 1960 has been referred by the President through the State Government to the legislature of the State for expressing its views thereon” etc.

The objection taken apparently is that the reference to the legislature by the President was made through the State Government. The requirements of the introduction of such a Bill are two: namely, (a) there must be a recommendation of

the President; and (b) the President must refer the Bill to the State legislatures concerned for their views where the Bill proposes to alter the boundaries, etc. This latter requirement does not specify the procedure by which the President has to refer the Bill for the views of the legislature concerned. It is a settled principle of law that where the principle for the exercise of the statutory power is not laid down, the authority exercising the power can follow its own procedure so long as it is not arbitrary or capricious.

The procedure followed in the present case for sending the reference through the State Government for obtaining the views of the State legislature concerned was followed throughout, ever since the Constitution came into being, namely, in the case of the formation of the State of Andhra; in the case of the States Reorganisation Act; in the case of the alteration of the Bengal and Bihar boundaries; and in the case of Assam and Bhutan boundaries and so on. The same procedure was also followed when the President sent his recommendation to the Lok Sabha under article 117 which he does frequently. The recommendation is sent to the appropriate Ministry for being conveyed to the Lok Sabha, the procedure for sending the recommendation to the Lok Sabha directly not being laid down in the Constitution. There is, therefore, nothing of substance in the objection on this point.

Apart from this, how else is the President to function? Has he to write to the Speaker directly on the subject and in such a case who is to move the motion in the House? Or, has the President to send it to the Governor? If so, the Governor will have to send it to the State Government. It is only the State Government that can take action in the Assembly on such a matter. Thus, from the legal point of view as well as well as from the common sense point of view and the practice hitherto consistently followed, the sending of the reference by the President to the State Government to be placed before the legislature was correct, and cannot be objected to.

I might add that the rules of business of the West Bengal legislature even do not provide for any procedure for obtaining its views under article 3.

Thus far, on these legal matters which have been raised, I am sorry I have taken up so much time in a rather dry dissertation on the subject. But I wanted to make it clear that we have throughout taken the greatest care in taking the steps. Originally, when this matter came up, that is, after the agreement, we considered how we have to give effect to it. The House will remember that most of these things—not the Cooch-Bihar enclave were interpretations of the Radcliffe award. That is, the view of Pakistan and the view of India differed as to the interpretation. In other words, if the interpretation was a particular one, that interpretation was right from the very beginning of the Radcliffe award. It is not that any step was taken, that is to say, as if an arbitrator or some judicial authority made it clear that this is the interpretation. According to us, that interpretation really applied from the very day of the partition. It was not a cession of territory as such. Though it resulted in a cession, it was a recognition of something which Radcliffe had stated.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX!....

Berubari, as I shall presently show, was one of the matters in dispute. It is not an enclave, of course. The enclave was a separate question. The Cooch-Bihar enclave had nothing to do with the Radcliffe award. They are separate things between the two Governments - exchanged for convenience.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX²....

Berubari Union was one of the matters in dispute in regard to the interpretation of the Radcliffe award. But the interpretation of Pakistan and India differed and this has been before us for a number of years.

I was merely saying how we proceeded with it legally. So, technically, if it was not a cession in that sense, but a clarification of what Radcliffe had decided, the question about cession normally does not arise. Nevertheless, we attached value to this and we decided-

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX³....

But we decided nevertheless that this was such an important point that it should be brought before Parliament for Parliament's decision. Later, subsequently,- it was I think on the 1st of April, 1959 or later on the question of how best to do it, what was the best method to do it, there was some argument. So, we advised the President to refer it to the Supreme Court, and so it was referred and the Supreme Court gave its opinion after about a year.

Then again naturally the question arose. Obviously we had to follow the advice of the Supreme Court. And the Supreme Court gave two or three alternatives how to follow it. As I have already stated, one proposal was that we should change the whole constitution so as to enable future cases of cession to be decided by a simple majority of Parliament. They did not approve of it but they said this can be done. We did not approve of it, as I said, because we did not want to make this a simple affair.

I want to refer to one fact which has been repeatedly referred to, namely, the question how far the West Bengal Government or their representatives were consulted in this matter. As a matter of fact, a year and a half ago nearly, I made a statement in this House. Perhaps hon. Members have forgotten what I said then about this very matter. So, I would like to go into some detail as to the process of consultation that took place. This dispute about Berubari was raised by Pakistan in 1952. It had since been the subject of much correspondence, as well as discussion between the Governments of India and Pakistan. Both India and Pakistan claim the whole of the Berubari Union according to their interpretation of the Radcliffe award.

I do not wish to go into every year's correspondence and all that. The West Bengal Government of course was, as other State Governments, often participating in this correspondence. There was no two opinion between the West Bengal Government and the Government of India, because our interpretation was that the whole of Berubari Union should come to India. So was theirs in fact. We were following their advice in this matter. Then, ultimately, matters arrived at a stage when all these various disputes

Pakistan. This was agreed to by the Pakistan Foreign Secretary and the formula for the division of the Berubari Union was worked out in consultation with the West Bengal officials and incorporated in the recommendations of the Secretaries.

The above represents the facts of the case and the discussion on the 10th September at the official level. So far as the question of Berubari is concerned, according to this it is correct to say that the West Bengal officials did not recommend the division of the Berubari Union; neither did the officials of the Government of India. But the division of the Berubari Union was a part of a number of counter proposals made by the Pakistan Government and the question at issue was whether we should accept these proposals as a whole. The West Bengal officials did not object to the acceptance of the counter proposals and worked out a formula for the division of the Berubari Union which would retain the area through which the essential communications passed in West Bengal. That is to say, as stated by the Prime Minister, an ad hoc decision was taken after consultation between the officials of the Government of India and the Government of West Bengal. The responsibility, of course, for the decision is that of the Government of India. It would not, however, be correct to say that the Chief Secretary of the West Bengal Government and other officials were not asked for any opinion in regard to Pakistan's counter-proposals in respect of Berubari Union."

I should like the House to remember that these two Chief Secretaries had come here for this purpose. They were constantly discussing these matters with the officials of the Government of India and, naturally their opinions we have been asking for. But Berubari does not stand out; it is whole scheme of things that we discussed.

Now, it may be, as I said on another occasion, that certain misunderstandings may have taken place; it is very difficult to say. But one thing is quite clear that they were consulted throughout and that they gave the impression, actively or passively, or maybe they have done so because they thought this is the only way, whatever it may be, even without approving of it. But that is the impression that was given and that is what was conveyed to me. There is no doubt as to what was conveyed to me because I asked a straightforward question on Bengal as to who represented their Government, whether they were senior officials and so on. I was told that there was the Chief Secretary, the Joint Secretary of the Home Department and the Director of Land Records.

Soon after the conference with Pakistan was over, a meeting was held with the Ministry of External Affairs the very next day, 11th September, to consider the implementation of the agreement arrived at. At that time the Chief Secretary of the West Bengal Government had left but the other officials were still there. The following is taken from the minutes of the meeting in regard to Berubari Union:

"With regard to the division of the Berubari Union the Commonwealth Secretary explained that the horizontal division agreed to did not mean that the demarcation should take place along a straight horizontal line regardless of the effect of such a division on the existing system of communications etc, which should be kept intact as far as possible."

After that, it is noted: "Action to be taken by West Bengal": usually there is a note as to who has got to take action. The minutes of the meeting were sent to the State Government on the 18th September, 1958, that is, within a week of that conference, together with the documents regarding the agreement reached with Pakistan with the request that necessary action might be taken. Subsequently, a letter was received from the West Bengal Government dated October 10, 1958, from the Chief Secretary. The only question raised in this letter was whether the change in Government in Pakistan—the change had taken place just a little before—whether that change had made any difference to the implementation of the decisions reached between the two Prime Ministers. The Commonwealth Secretary replied that the new regime in Pakistan had intimated that it will stand by all commitments made by the previous government, and therefore, the implementation of these matters should not be held up. On the 30th October, 1958 a request was made to the West Bengal Government for population and other local data regarding the Berubari Union in answering questions in Parliament. On the 14th November the West Bengal Government supplied the information and added that the Deputy Commissioner at Jalpaiguri had been asked to furnish further information. This further information was supplied with the letter of the 24th November 1958. On the 15th November the West Bengal Government went so far as to propose certain amendments to the schedule to be attached to the draft Bill regarding the exchange of Cooch-Bihar enclaves on the basis of the accepted division of the Berubari Union.

I cannot go on taking too much time but I have got a number of letters, long letters, my letters and our Secretary's letters to the West Bengal Government Chief Minister dealing with this matter. It would thus be seen from all this correspondence which followed soon after the decisions taken at the conference that the West Bengal Government did not give any indication that the decisions were not acceptable. In fact, the indications were exactly to the contrary.

On the 9th December, 1958, the Prime Minister dealt with the statement on the Berubari Union in the course of a debate here in Parliament on the international situation. On the 15th December a question was put in the West Bengal Assembly by Shri Joyti Basu about the Prime Minister's statement. The Chief Minister of West Bengal replied to it to the effect that the Director of Land Records had not suggested a division. He asked me for the text of my statement and I sent it to him. I said, "I take the responsibility for this decision; it is not the Director's." I did not wish to drag the poor Director in taking such a big decision.

Then I made a statement in the Rajya Sabha on the 16th December. All that is on the record. On the 29th and 30th December the West Bengal Assembly and Council debated the transfer of Berubari Union and passed resolutions to the effect that the Berubari Union should remain part of India. Subsequently there was a good deal of further correspondence between the Prime Minister and the Chief Minister of West Bengal.

I should like to repeat that throughout this period of our talks with Pakistan the senior State officials were present in Delhi and obviously in touch with the negotiations. There was no indication at any time from them that the decisions were not acceptable

to them. So also in subsequent correspondence even though the West Bengal legislature had passed resolutions disapproving of this. But I accept entirely, of course, that the major responsibility was the Government of India's and more particularly mine. The point is that I do not think it is at all right to say that people were not consulted. I can understand that as regards giving approval or not, some misunderstanding arose and the parties were not quite clear as to what they agreed to and what they did not. But even so tacit approval was shown throughout-then and in subsequent proceedings.

The legal interpretation of the Radcliffe Award made the position of Berubari rather doubtful. If no settlement was arrived at, not only the question of Berubari but any other questions included in the settlement would have been left over. The matter would have been referred to a new tribunal. We definitely thought that the settlement as a whole was to the advantage of India and West Bengal. I should like to say frankly that we thought that it was advantageous for West Bengal and for India, of course, that this agreement should be arrived at not merely as a whole, but I would like to say even in regard to Berubari itself, that is, the division of Berubari. The other alternative was of sending it to a tribunal which may have decided either way, either in favour of Pakistan or in favour of India. If it decided in favour of Pakistan, we would have lost the whole of the Berubari Union. So we thought that it was fair both in the larger context and in regard to this. Naturally, we knew we did not like it but things which one does not like have to be agreed to sometimes. So in the balance we thought that that was right.

This took place then. Later, as I said, on the 1st April, 1959, it was referred to the Supreme Court and they gave their opinion on the 14th March-almost exactly a year later.

Looking at this matter one has to keep in view that for eight years this was a pending matter on which there was a great deal of correspondence and discussion previously. Later the discussion became rather more pointed because it so happened that both parties, that is we of course, but even Pakistan, had arrived at the decision to come to a settlement. Many of our conferences, this House knows have not been productive because the attitude taken up by Pakistan had not been helpful. In this matter they were definitely helpful. They wanted things to be done and we certainly wanted things to be done to get a peaceful frontier and put an end to it.

I should like the House to look at it in that context. This meeting takes place, each person desiring settlement-West Pakistan, East Pakistan and all that and as regards Berubari naturally we would prefer the whole of Berubari to remain with us. But it was a question not only of the larger context but of coming to a commonsense decision, which we did not like, in order to avoid something which we liked still less. I still feel, therefore, that the agreement was a right one and a worth-while one both from the point of view of West Bengal and India.

It is unhappily true that, may be, a number of people who might be affected by this would have to leave their homes. The population of whole of Berubari Union is a little over 12,000. Half of Berubari would be about 6,000. There are some Muslims.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX⁵....

I understand-I do not know the exact figures; in fact, the exact line is not drawn-there are not many Muslims. They may be some hundreds. About two-thirds of that population of this half are refugees from East Pakistan. It certainly is a most unfortunate thing, namely, that persons who have been uprooted once should have to face a contingency which might lead to their being uprooted again. I think all of us anyhow-whatever our views may be- must sympathise with them and consider it our duty to help them if any need arises to the extent possible for us.

All the history that I have placed before the House indicates not some sudden decision suddenly arrived at but after giving consideration to it repeatedly and fairly. I must say that at this conference the discussion was a fair and just one and there were no pressures from Pakistan which would compel us to do something. We agreed to it, to each thing individually and severally and having regard to it we gave our word to Pakistan. We signed that document. Later it came up before Parliament in various ways. All this history I have related.

I need not remind the House that if I functioned there it was not in an individual capacity. Obviously I functioned in the capacity this Parliament has given me, that is, of the Prime Minister of India. Every matter, obviously, cannot come to Parliament as many things are being done daily in that capacity. The word of the Prime Minister of India, apart from being the individual concerned, is not a light thing. An agreement arrived at on behalf of the Government of India also has a certain not only importance but sacredness about it. It is the word of a Government and the word of a country. I do not want anyone in the wide world to say that we do not honour our pledges and our undertakings. I have no doubt in my mind that we must hold to our pledge. I do not like, as has recently been said not in very happy terms, that we do not hold to our pledges. We have been accused that we did not hold to our pledges and our undertakings. So we have to face that issue. Of course, when there is an agreement between two parties, that agreement has to be fulfilled. The only possible way might be some agreement to vary the other agreement. There is no other way to that. Whether that is possible or not, I cannot say at the moment. I do not understand how at this stage we can just say that for this or that reason we resile from that agreement.

I am sorry, Sir, I have taken so much of the time of the House. But, the matter is important.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX⁶....

The matter before the Supreme Court was what procedure should be adopted, what steps should be taken to give effect to certain decisions. There is no doubt that the question of Berubari arises from the manner you interpret the Radcliffe Award. That is obvious. The point that the Supreme Court decided was that even so, this is the procedure that should be adopted, and not a procedure that this was ad initio part of Pakistan and therefore, nothing should be done. I submit that is a point quite clear.

We ourselves were in doubt about this and we referred it. Naturally, we accept the Supreme Court's opinion. As for West Bengal Government, as I said, in 1958 in December, I think, they expressed their disapproval, and the West Bengal Assembly passed a resolution to which I referred. Later, I do not know the dates, this time, the matter came up after the Supreme Court's opinion, when we started taking steps, the West Bengal Assemble again repeated their resolution. That is so. There is no question of approval. Nobody likes many things. But we have to do that because if we do not do that, something we dislike more comes. In the balance, one approves a thing and carries on with it.

BACK NOTE

XXX. Statement regarding Discussions between the Central Government and Government of West Bengal Regarding Transfer of Berubari to Pakistan, 5 December, 1960

1. SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-Central): Since the Prime Minister knows that Berubari was not an enclave, it is a matter for acquisition or cession. It is not a matter for negotiation in regard to the award given by Radcliffe or Bagge.

2. SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: Purely on merit, you are going to see which to cede and which to acquire.

3. SHRI TRIDIB KUMAR CHAUDHURI: Just one point.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the hon. Prime Minister go on and let him finish. Hon. Members will note down the points and I shall allow them later on to put questions if any.

4. SHRI TYAGI (Dehra Dun): Berubari inclusive?

5. SHRI TYAGI: Have you some idea of the proportion between the Hindus and Muslims there?

6. SHRI NAUSHIR BHARUCHA (East Khandesh): The Prime Minister's statement may be circulated.

MR. SPEAKER: There won't be any discussion on this.

SHRI NAUSHIR BHARUCHA: The statement may be circulated.

MR. SPEAKER: The whole speech?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI TYAGI: It will be better if the two Bills which have been sent to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly could also be circulated amongst the Members, so that we can know what they are.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall have copies of the Speeches kept in the Notice Office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

SHRI NAUSHIR BHARUCHA: We won't be able to study it. It is an important matter. It may be circulated.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members fight shy to go the Notice office which belongs to them.

SHRI NATH PAI: Why this economy?

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. I will circulate copies to all hon. Members. So far as copies of Bill are concerned, I will keep a few copies in the Library or Notice office. Hon. Members may refer to them.

There is no discussion on this matter now. For clarification, one or two questions are allowed.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: I beg of you to bear with me a little while because the Prime Minister has raised certain important questions.....

MR. SPEAKER: That would lead to a discussion. Let us understand the scope. The Prime Minister has made a statement. It is a long statement. It is not an easy matter to decide if they have got any objection to it either in law or in fact. These are two different things. On a question nothing is settled. For clarifications one question may be put. On the other hand, if he wants to have a discussion, let us consider if it is necessary to have a discussion at all, what are the matters to be discussed and how are they going to be bettered by discussion. If they write to me, normally as a matter of notice, let me see. Today, they will stop with putting one question. There will be no discussion. Let him clarify what is his doubt. What is his doubt regarding this matter.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: If I may formulate the question, since it is an attribute of sovereignty that a country which is free can acquire foreign territory or cede territory, since any internal legal complications might very well be settled by legal ingenuity, since the whole question of cession on merits of a particular area the inhabitants of which are largely refugees from East Pakistan, has come into the picture, since the Prime Minister has reiterated his determination that he is going to stand by the view which he has indicated to the then Prime Minister of Pakistan, since the matter is agitating the minds of.....

MR. SPEAKER: What is his question? What does he want?

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: I feel it is necessary for Parliament, in view of the people of the locality themselves never having been consulted and now being transferred like human cattle, to another country, to have a discussion on the implications of the statement which the Prime Minister has made. I beg of you, I tell you earnestly, to give some time after the Government also cogitates a little more carefully in regard to this matter. I do not wish that the Government should act in a huff because the Prime Minister was saying that the honour of India is involved. Let us consider this matter carefully and sympathetically and let this House have an opportunity to discuss it at some future time, as quick a time as possible, so that we will really be able to put forth the case which is felt by the people of our part of the country. I do not want any disturbance. I know very well that in West Bengal there is.....

MR. SPEAKER: He wants to discuss on the statement. Very well. Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri.

SHRI TRIDIB KUMAR CHAUDHURI: The Prime Minister, at one stage, said that this agreement with regard to Berubari arises out of the interpretation of the Radcliffe Award. I only wanted to draw his attention to this opinion of the Supreme Court in the judgment:

“.....we cannot accede to the argument urged that it does no more than ascertain and determine the boundaries in the light of the award. It is as Agreement by which a part of the territory of India has been ceded to Pakistan and the question referred to us in respect of this Agreement must therefore, be considered on the basis that it involves cession or alienation of a part of India's territory.”

The Prime Minister has said that they took it that the Government of West Bengal expressed their tacit approval. I want to know whether the Government of West Bengal or the officials who represented them at the time of the Agreement or at the Karachi Conference expressed their disapproval of this whole thing before this opinion was expressed by the Supreme Court or after this opinion was expressed by the Supreme Court.

REPLY ON MOTION OF THANKS TO PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

23 February, 1961

Mr. Speaker, Sir, so many hon. Members have taken part in this discussion and have put forward much in the way of criticism, much in the way of ideas or suggestions that I find it a little difficult to deal with all this multitude of good, and not so good, ideas thrown out. No doubt, everything that has been said here will be given careful consideration by the Ministries concerned. I feel that perhaps it would be better for me not to take up all these multitude of separate points but rather to deal with this question in its entirety, saying something about the broad features. Otherwise, we rather tend to lose ourselves in detail, even though the detail might be, and is often, important, more especially, in the world today and in India of today which is so full of problems.

Now, Sir, first of all I should like to refer to a criticism which has been made strongly and forcefully by Shri Asoka Mehta about the President's Address being odourless, colourless and generally inane. As members of the Government, who are responsible for the President's Address that criticism applies to us certainly. I am prepared to say that that criticism is partly justified. We, as a people, are apt to go to extremes often in our opinions or in our language to extremes of eulogy or extremes of criticism. I myself am often guilty of it; we, all of us, are to some extent; and one has to think, therefore, how far in a State document such as the President's Address one should allow oneself to run away with one's feelings. It is easy to do that and sometimes one has a pleasant glow in doing that. But I feel that, because of that tendency of ours, we should restrain our language on such occasions—not always—and try to be objective and even colourless. May be, it is overdone perhaps and the criticism, as I said, may be justified. But the House may remember all the past Addresses—how many are there, I forget, a dozen or thereabout or more—and the language has followed a set pattern of restraint. Whether that is good or bad, opinions may differ—and more especially when one feels rather strongly about a subject, as, I have no doubt, most hon. Members present here do, as I do, when we think of India, its problems and its future; we feel strongly about it. We are part of India; we are emotionally wound up, apart from the intellectual occupations, with the subject and because of that strong feeling, my own reaction is restraint: restrain oneself not to be led away by one's strong emotions on this subject so near to our hearts and not to be led away, even in judging a situation, by emotion. However, I am merely mentioning this, not by way of an apology but by way of an explanation. It is easy—not very difficult—to be rhetorical. But normally speaking, the problems we have to face, whether it is a problem of our economic development with all its tremendous consequences or whether it is a threat or danger on our frontier, they are easily capable of rhetoric. But rhetoric does not solve them. What perhaps helps in their

solution is a certain, rather cold logic and a cold understanding of a situation and a capacity for cold action, backed by warm emotion.

We are all engaged in this country in a task of supreme magnitude and when I think of this task which fate and circumstances have faced us with, I feel both—shall I say—both exhilarated by it and also feel the inadequacy of ourselves in facing this tremendous task. It is not a task of today or this year; it is a task of an age that we face today. It is a task in the long history of India which would stand out—not we; we are small folk before this great task. But this turn, the change that is coming in India to hundreds of millions of people, that indeed is a mighty task by any standard and no one can come up to measure that great task. We are all small folk and we only deal with it with some confidence sometimes, not because of supreme faith in our own abilities to deal with it but a certain faith in this India which has survived through the ages and a certain faith in our people, hundreds and millions of them and a certain faith in this Assembly, this Parliament which deals with it. It is that that keeps us up. Who however brilliant or great he might be, could imagine that he can face this task unaided or by oneself or by small groups? For, after all, it is a magnificent theme—the history of India for the past hundreds of thousands of years. But part of that magnificence attends even to the present age in the last generation or two who laboured and succeeded in gaining the freedom of India, and then, again, without respite, has laboured to raise India to the level that is her own right, a level in internal prosperity, in internal wellbeing, level in the councils of the world. It is not a small task and not a task which anyone can fulfil in a short period, even of years. And undoubtedly, however wellmeaning anyone might be, there will be mistakes made; there have been mistakes made, because the task in a sense is without precedent in this particular context as indeed all national developments are. There is no exact precedent for any nation because the objective conditions in everything that apply to that nation have not been duplicated elsewhere.

And so we are engaged in this task. You might consider as if all of us, the millions in our country, who are actors in this drama are weaving some grand pattern in tapestry, a many coloured pattern, in which millions of individual threads go in to give it shape and colour. We are a many coloured country, with many hues and many differences, and yet tied up also in infinite ways. Throughout history that has been so. Today, the high privilege has been given to us, of weaving this pattern in our brief lives and leave something worthwhile for future generations. It is a theme for a great poet, a great writer. How can we deal with it, and so, in our inability to deal with it properly and not to lose ourselves in rhetoric because we feel so much, we try to be matter of fact even though there might be much passion behind those simple words.

Hon. Members criticised and rightly so, because this House is meant for criticism, for searching criticism, and yet, I imagine that behind that criticism there is a vast amount of agreement about the fundamentals—about the details, of course, there is bound to be criticism, but about the fundamentals there is agreement. Perhaps, there are some hon. Members who even differ in regard to fundamentals. May be sometimes I felt, when Shri Ranga was speaking, that he differed almost about everything that we

did— external, internal, domestic or other. He seemed to think, and his party seems to think, that instead of giving thought to the problems and their complexity, all that is necessary is to tell us that he stands with God and that will convince him that everybody is in the right. I do not know exactly whether he and his party have got a monopoly in God! I shall think rather poorly of God if that is so. However, it is really extraordinary how, Shri Ranga, sweeping away Planning, sweeping away External Affairs and everything, in the full warmth of his rhetorical address, went on, regardless of facts or circumstances or reason or logic. That is not good enough for us. We have to deal with fact and circumstance.

If you think of our economic condition which is the basic thing and our Five Year Plans and the rest, again they give you a vast field for very legitimate criticism, and naturally so. Do you think that we Members of the Government, who may be sitting here in serried ranks before you, do not criticise each other or criticise our own work? I can tell you that though we do not agree with all the criticisms made, we agree with many things and many of the criticisms, and we could add to those criticisms ourselves. That is inevitable in the nature of things in this tremendously complicated business of planning for India, because, behind these five year plans, all these reports, whatever may come into these documents, lies throbbing of our humanity, 400 millions, and only a superman can deal with these problems with the assurance of certainty. We can only grope, trying to learn from others, trying to learn from the experience of our own people, trying to learn from our mistakes by trial and error, etc., and go ahead and profit by the criticisms. That is true.

But in criticising or in understanding a certain picture, I submit that we must remember that valid and helpful criticism comes only from an overall look and not taking out a bit regardless of its surrounding circumstances and dealing with it entirely separately. The whole question of planning is the interrelation of a hundred and thousand and million things in the country. It is not leaving things to chance or dealing with something or put up a *Dharamsala* here or a *Yatimkhana* there. That is not planning. You may talk of a *Dharamsala* and a *Yatimkhana* and say they are steel works or this or that. All that is not planning, even if they are steel works or anything else. Planning is an attempt to see the life of the nation as a whole. Of course, before you make that attempt, you have an objective and the objective must be seeing the life of the nation as a whole, the progress of the 400 million people here, not measured by this group or that community progressing or not.

Take the question of unemployment which is so vital for us. Of course it is vital. How are we to solve it? I am not going into that question now, but suggestions are made as if it is through the knavery or folly of the Government that the problem of unemployment is not solved or this is not done or that is not done. Now, it so happens that the unemployment problem is a problem of many countries in the wide world and not ours only which increases its population by 50 or 60 lakhs. We must consider it, but it is rather unhelpful criticism merely to wave a flag and say that unemployment is not solved.

First of all, we must have a clear idea as to where we are going to: broadly, and not in detail. Secondly, we must plan to go ahead in spite of the views which Acharya Ranga was pleased to express. We have to plan to go ahead. Everybody recognises that.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

I must challenge all this. Shri Ranga is Acharya Ranga and nothing else. Now, it is possible that we might differ about the ultimate picture. I am not quite sure about the absolute ultimate picture. But we are nowhere near the ultimate picture. So, the question of difference is rather far from us. I do not want my country to be a replica of the United States of America or the Soviet Union or the United Kingdom or any other country. Many new problems have arisen there; from the very fact that they have solved the primary problems, new problems arise, I have no doubt that new problems will arise for us when we solve the primary problems. But I would not go into that now. We can have our own ideas. But for the present we have certain basic, primary problems which are common to humanity all over, which are common to any State where you wish to give a good life or the opportunity to live a good life to every human being living in the State. That is the primary problem before us. Afterwards come other problems. We must always think, I submit, whatever Ministry or department deals with it of the 400 million people of India. The moment you forget that, you are off the track. Many of our groups forget that fact.

I repeat what I have said. When I have been asked "How many problems?" I have said, we have 400 million problems in India.' That is not a fanciful statement. Always this picture of numbers is before me numbers crushed by poverty for ages and struggling hard to get rid of it. It is an inspiring sight to see them struggling hard to get rid of it and raising themselves by their own labours. So, we have to do that.

There are various ways for that. There may be various ways. We can learn from other countries. We can learn from our own experience. But there is not a shadow of doubt in my mind and I submit in the mind of any person who thinks about it that the only way to get rid of poverty in India ultimately and to get employment is through the employment of what are called modern methods of science, industry, etc. There is no other way and I want to convince, if anybody thinks otherwise. How to do it, one may argue about it. That is the only way which succeeded in any country. You may evolve some magical method. Not believing in magic, I have to rely on logic.

We have to do that keeping in tune with our own background, our own genius, our own history, our own capacity and all that. But it is basic to profit by modern scientific technological methods. We may differ about other fields of human endeavour, but in this there can be no doubt. I repeat that you can only raise the levels of India by the use of modern technology and science, which bring greater production and greater wealth and which give you the opportunity to raise the level of the people. Otherwise, there is no opportunity.

We talk about socialism. Some of us—so far as I am concerned, I have been attracted to basic socialistic ideas ever since I was a student at college fifty years ago

or more. People argue about it, and there is room for much argument, but if you analyse it, you come back to modern scientific technological methods and there is no socialism unless you adopt them and you produce the wherewithal for people to improve. Otherwise, you do not. These are general considerations.

Coming to our economy, again many criticisms made are justified and yet, I think those criticisms somehow miss the point. In considering our economy, you may consider agriculture, industry or basic thing—human beings, that is to say, trained human beings, because once you admit the fact that scientific and technological methods are necessary, you must have trained human beings. A man who can deliver a speech and can do nothing else is not good in the world, except possibly that he can get elected to some council or other. He may be extraordinarily good at that, but he cannot build a bridge or put up a steel plant; he cannot do a hundred and one things one has to do today. So, that is necessary.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX²**

I did not refer to Members of Parliament. I referred to some council.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX³**

If you look at agriculture today—much has been said about Agriculture—I think you will notice a very marked change in our agriculture, i.e., the process of change is going on. I think that that process is the result of the past dozen years' work and facts and circumstances. I am not taking the credit for it. A hundred factors have gone into it and there it is at work. I have no doubt, in my mind that it is moving in the right direction and that we have taken a turn. There is going to be extremely difficult work ahead, but we have taken a turn in the right direction and food production will grow.

We are dependent and we are likely to continue to be dependent for a fairly considerable time on nature, monsoons, etc. We can lessen our dependence progressively by keeping stocks, resorting to intensive agriculture and so on, which we are doing. Nevertheless, we are dependent. As hon. Members know very well, a country like China is dependent, in spite of all that it has done. It has done a great deal in the improvement of agriculture and yet, it is facing one of the most terrible famines in the whole history of China today. So, there it is—certain factors which you cannot ignore, which you ignore at your peril—and a criticism without keeping that background in view is not helpful.

I think that agriculture is improving to the extent it is becoming modern, to the extent it is using better ploughs, better seeds and various other better things which everyone knows. The farmer has to become a more modern farmer. There is no other way and to the extent he is becoming cooperative, he is improving. The type of farmer that Acharya Ranga has in view and which he stresses is the self-sufficient, self-contained, isolated, ignorant man; that is the farmer of his

conception. There can never be any progress in that way. The whole experience of the world tells us that. It is all very well when there is plenty of land, plenty of everything and people had a fairly low standard of living when you can carry on like that, but no today. So, I feel that agriculture, broadly speaking, is doing well.

Coming to industry, the spectacle in regard to industry is not merely satisfying; it is electrifying and spectacular. It shakes one up—the rapidity with which changes are taking place in this country. I do not know if this House realises it or not, because we live in these surroundings and we do not quite realise what is happening round about us. We are used to it. But a person who comes and has a look at it from outside, a competent observer, is amazed at what he sees in this country in regard to industry.

One knows about the big industries more or less, but few people know about the revolutionary change that is coming over India in regard to the middle and small industries. We see the description of them by competent observers from outside.

I do not imagine that I attach more importance to observers' opinion than to our own. I merely say so because the observers are critics of ours and they are not likely to run away with the praise of us unless they were compelled by circumstances. When people like bankers, a community of people who are not normally very loveable, individuals apart of course, describe this as spectacular progress, it has some meaning.

The other day I was reading an article by a very eminent financial editor of a great newspaper and what he said astonished me. I do not know where it is now. He said about small and middle industries in India: "It is growing up everywhere in a wild rush and scramble". Observe the words "wild rush and scramble". He was astounded. He criticised in his article many things but he said the whole of India is seething with growth, dynamism. These are the impressions that outside people get. Here we are sitting, pulling our hair over our eyes and weeping and wailing that nothing is being done. It is extraordinary this missing the reality, missing the substance of things for certain superficial things which are bad, which are admitted as bad. I admit they are bad. Of course, there are bad things, infinite number of bad things in our country. But there it is.

Here we are living at this historic moment of India with enormous changes coming every day among a vast number of people in a variety of ways, whether it is the farmer or whether it is the educational apparatus which we criticise often and rightly criticise; and yet that educational apparatus is revolutionising India. We must keep this in view—our educational apparatus. I criticise it, everybody criticises it; but realise that in spite of all that criticism and the criticism is justified often nevertheless, it is playing a tremendous role in revolutionising India. All these vast numbers, today I am told—I do not know, they grow from month to month in numbers—there are 45 million boys and girls in India, which is a considerable number, growing by a million every year, which by the end of the Third Plan will be over 60 million and so on. Boys and girls, in millions—and girls, I repeat: because they are the revolutionary factor, because when the home is revolutionising everything is revolutionising. So, from a hundred directions all these are being done.

So, if we look at this question in this broad way, one feels not only a sense of elation but a sense of triumph, not one's own triumph because we are cogs in this mighty wheel—Parliament, State Assemblies, and millions of people working in factories, the field, in education and in what not. It is an enormous factory of India, if I may say so, working more and more efficiently. It is a tremendous task and I should like to convey, not merely in rhetoric but in simple language, the excitement of looking at this picture, of thinking of this picture. There is a tremendous excitement in it.

If you read the Five Year Plan report, well, certainly it is rather bald in quoting facts, and literary qualities are not found there; but, nevertheless, if you analyse it, if you look at it and go beyond the details to the skeleton, it is throbbing with life and blood of a vast number of human beings because it deals with a vast number of human beings, their progress in a multitude of fields and all that. That is an approach which may be called an emotional approach but there is something in it and if we have it and analyse these things then we are likely to get a truer picture than sticking at every small part of it which may not be to our liking.

So, I submit that our economy is passing through a very difficult stage and inevitable stage, a stage which is a welcome stage, because out of that difficulty we emerge into better times. We can never emerge into better times without passing through that difficult phase. We are doing that and it is nothing to be sorry about. No country goes ahead without passing through these difficulties, whether it is agriculture or whether it is industry. And I could go more deeply into the industrial things, what is happening in India, what gains we have made, to support my argument, but I shall not take the time of the House in that way.

I forget now, I think it was Shri Ranga who, among other things, talked about our forgetting the handloom weavers and introducing powerlooms and thus driving people out of it. Now, that exhibits two things. First of all, he did not know his facts. Secondly, he does not realise, as I wish he would, that it is through better techniques that we advance, not through sticking to old techniques. We do stick to old things for social reasons where a change-over might do harm immediately. That is a different matter. But it is through higher techniques that a country advances. Now, take this handloom business, I have some figures here. The handloom industry is an outstanding example of rehabilitation of 2½ million handlooms and handloom weavers; that is, far more people are working now than there used to be. The production of handloom cloth has risen from 850 million yards in 1951 to 1,860 million yards in 1960, an increase of about 150 per cent. 40 per cent of this increase is in the cooperative sector which shows how cooperatives are creeping up and advancing.

Then, I think Shri Dange talked about the Nagpur Resolution....

Yes, and something about our forgetting the Nagpur Resolution. He said that. Well, I can assure him that he is wrong in thinking that any of us has forgotten it. It is not only there, but it is being worked out, not only in our minds but in our actions, and cooperation is growing in India fairly fast. There are two things—service

cooperatives and joint farming cooperatives. It is true that the service cooperatives are growing much faster. We are laying great stress on them to spread them out; the other is also growing. We deliberately wanted it because the whole idea of cooperation is not a mere idea of goodwill and people have to be trained for it. We want to take them step by step because our ideal is that wherever possible and wherever agreed to, we should have agricultural joint farming. But we are quite content if for the moment we spread out the service cooperatives everywhere. And we have little doubt in our minds that many of them will take the next step. It is up to them to take that step. We are not going to compel them to do that. And joint cooperative farming, remember, does not mean their being deprived of their land because their ownership also will continue.

Take another thing. Take the production of sugar, how sugar has jumped up suddenly and provided us with enormous surplus. Take something else. Take steel. Now it reminds me of something slightly different. You may remember, some of you, what Lenin said once in the early days of the Soviet Revolution. He said Communism is Soviets plus electricity. I am prepared to accept that for India saying, not communism, but progress is panchayats plus electric power—a slight variation of the theme. Electricity is the main thing. Electric power means the motive force for changing things, for modernising things, for modern industry, modern agriculture, everything, and the panchayat is the panchayat, whether that is small panchayat or big panchayat which is Parliament, whatever it is, mainly small panchayats; that, plus electric power, will change India.

I may mention to you with some diffidence that there is one matter which troubles me about our planning and that is that our electric power is not advancing fast enough. We are trying to do so. No doubt, we are advancing, but it is not fast enough to my liking. But there it is. There is no question of my liking or anybody else's liking. We have to do so many things and balance them. We have to give up many things that we like for the time being.

I was mentioning steel. In steel, I am credibly informed that so far as capacity is concerned we have fulfilled the targets laid down for the Second Five Year Plan. Acharya Kripalani said, I think, that we had not done half of that—some such figure he gave; I forget the exact figure. He felt that we had fallen far behind. That is not quite correct. It depends on how you look at it. It is true that although we have got the full capacity, that is, the machines etc. for that full target, these machines will not produce the full results suddenly because, just like a new car, it takes a little time to tune in. But the production capacity that we had laid down is there. It is completed and in the course of next year or 18 months more and more will be produced till it not only produces that much but other factors will come in and more will be produced. So, so far in spite of difficulties and in spite of many things steel has come up to expectations. Now our chief concern must be to increase it.

Shri Dange gave some very remarkable figures. I was not here unfortunately but I read his speech in the official records. I nearly turned a somersault when I

read them. I shall try to give what he said. He said that Czechoslovakia produces 100 million tons of steel: some such thing.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁴

I have got the official record here.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁵

I am very glad to learn it. But I hope he will correct the official record. He has given amazing figures. I will read them out.

Shri Dange said: "Considering the vast size, the vast population and our needs, what is being done is nothing for a country of 400 millions. Even if you (India) go to 400 million tons of steel, what is it? 12 million people of Czechoslovakia has got 600 million tons of steel production.—"

..... XXX XXX XXX⁶

May be. He goes on to say: "The fashion is to have too many independent countries. A small country like Luxembourg produced 300 million tons of steel....."

..... XXX XXX XXX⁷

I was really taken quite aback because the total production of the world is not up to that.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁸

I know it is an obvious mistake. But this shows how even trained intellect runs into obvious mistakes.

I just mentioned power. I was sort of repeating what Lenin said. But really I would like to add that steel and power are the two basic things which will control the nation's growth. Even now some people seem to think that we are rather overdoing things in steel, I should like to say with supreme confidence in this matter that you can never produce enough steel. I do not know about a hundred years hence. I am talking about the present age. It does not matter how much steel you produce, you will be short of your requirements. It is an extraordinary thing. Here is the Soviet Union producing, I think, 71 million tons and increasing its production by several millions every year. I think by the end of their present Plan they are going up to 94 million tons or something like that and they are prepared to buy our iron and steel as much as we can sell them. There is never any surplus in a growing dynamic country. It is only where people think in static terms or, as private enterprise often does, in terms of high prices, scarcity of the commodity and the demand being greater, that this idea comes up, namely, "Oh! there will be over-production". There is no such thing as over-production except that there is over-poverty in a country and you

remain static. Therefore steel and power have to go ahead and it is absolutely essential for us here and now today to think of increasing our steel production by setting up new plants, by setting up the fourth, the fifth, the sixth, the seventh and the tenth plant. This will have to go on. I want to make it perfectly clear that it is in the measure and on the advance in our steel production will depend our advance in agriculture, leave out industry. Even today our agriculture is suffering for lack of iron and steel. Though we produce more, we consume even more because a dynamic economy means consuming much more. Therefore it is of the utmost importance for us to go ahead with our fourth steel plant. I am rather sorry that it is has not got moving as I should like it to from now onwards. We are waiting for some magical date when it will be said that the Third Plant starts today. This, I take it, is some kind of a reflex of our habit in our country of waiting for auspicious dates for doing anything.

In regard to planning, if I may say so, there are no periods of planning. Planning is a continuous process. A period only comes in for you to test how much you have done. Otherwise, there is no date. I was told only yesterday by the eminent guest from the Soviet Union who has come here, Mr. Kosygin, the Deputy Prime Minister, that they have given up their old conception of planning periods because it made people think in set periods while planning was a continuous process. It never stops. So he said, "Now we plan every year for five years and not for five years which are being reduced and become four next year and then three years, two years and one year and then we again start with another five years. No, every year we plan for five years. The five years remain. Next year the five years are four years overlapping and one year more. So you never end the five years. It goes on and on." Whether it is clear to this House or not I do not know because it is not completely clear to me. But the point is that planning is a continuous thing. If you can do a thing today, it has to be done today. You should not wait for a date to do it especially in basic things like iron, coal and power. You are always short of them.

Now take coal. Coal also has done well inspite of many difficulties in the way. I hope I am right in my figures. 60 million tons are being produced now. That is, again, the capacity for producing 60 million tons has come about now. The difficulty has arisen in transport and it is a fairly serious difficulty for the time being. Of course it will be got over in three, four or five months, but it is a present difficulty. The difficulty has arisen because we have gone ahead faster in other matters. It is an odd thing that if you do not advance equally on all fronts, you lag behind. There is a bottleneck. Now, coal is there. Last year, we got complaints that steel manufacture was suffering for lack of coal. We bustled about and tried to do our best about coal and coal came up to standard. Then, we found that there was difficulty about its transport to various parts of the country. While steel was waiting and coal was there, transport came in the way. Improvements were made. There was much swifter movement. They started moving them on Sundays which they did not use to. There were various other

things. Even so, at the present moment, there is a gap: not a big gap, but there is a gap which will not be filled fully till more wagons and all that are ready.

..... XXX XXX XXX?

That is so exactly. As almost always, the Acharya is right.

We are all human beings.

For instance, take one thing. The whole production system received a blow from the general strike. It costs us a lot of money. Apart from the money spent, in production, in iron and steel, especially in coal and railway traffic, it just put back the clock. All these things happened. It is not planned things. Sometimes, planning is wrong or some additional demands occur. It is a frightfully difficult thing to plan so as to make everything fit in exactly in a huge country like India. I admit, it may be due to somebody's mistake. But, somebody's mistake is our mistake in that. In these matters, I have given instances.

In this particular matter, if I may finally say, so far as the industrial sector is concerned, it is marching pretty fast and well. There are mistakes. Yes; there are justified criticisms. It is advancing fast. I have not the shadow of a doubt that India will industrialise itself more and more rapidly. In agriculture, there are always doubtful elements. But, I believe we have turned the corner and we will advance. One of the reasons why I say so is something not directly connected with agriculture, but the coming of the Panchayat Samithis, which, I think, is going to have a powerful effect on agricultural production.

I may deal with some foreign policy matters. First, to come back to our friend Acharya Ranga, he made rather remarkable statements about our Defence and about the appointment or nomination of the successor to the present Chief of Staff of the Army. He said, why was it done so early. If Shri Ranga had tried to find out, this is a common practice and a very right practice in most of the countries. Normally, the successor is appointed several months ahead for a variety of reasons, one of them being, the successor himself comes and overlaps. He sits there and sees for some time at the headquarters to get into the run of things. There are other reasons too. It is a normal thing. It is always done in England and most other countries. Here, it is always done. There is nothing remarkable about it.

As for appointments, I do not know how much hon. Members have gone into these matters. Most of the appointments, of course, are made by Selection Committees of senior officers. There are some, right at the top, which are made finally by the Appointments Committee of the Cabinet, at the recommendation, naturally, from the Defence. They consider the names and that is the practice followed throughout.

As I am referring to Defence, I would like to say that Shri Asoka Mehta, I believe, made a suggestion with an element of complaint in it that a proper. White

Paper on Defence or something like that is not produced here as it is in England. I am not fully acquainted with the British practice.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹⁰

My recollection is that White Papers are produced there for special things. For instance, in regard to type of weapon to be used, weapon meaning nowadays some of those very modern weapons, usually aircraft of a very particular type, without human control, which is controlled from a distance, electronically controlled, and all that. However, we should be very glad to and we shall, go into it. I have been asked to say so by the Defence Minister who will now come. He is engaged in a Committee.

We would look into this matter and present before the House such information as we can. Obviously, information about troop movements and the rest is not normally supplied. Information which may help the enemy or the prospective enemy is not normally given out to the public. That is obvious.

In the matter of Defence, we started Independence by breaking an old tradition of the Army which was that all the thinking was to be done in Whitehall, that is, United Kingdom thought and laid down policies, and further that nearly all the important production was to be done in the United Kingdom: not in India. We had Ordnance factories. Previously they practically did nothing at all. Very little. After the first World War, the exigencies of the war forced them to produce some things here. After the Second World War, again, they were forced to produce more because they could not get them. Undoubtedly, our Ordnance factories got a boost because of those wars and because of being cut off from England. Nevertheless, important things were all made there. So, both in regard to any planning and thinking, etc., it was a business of Whitehall and production was essentially the business of the United Kingdom also. We had to overcome that because modern war is essentially concerned with thinking and weapons, not merely with soldiers and parade. We had to bring about these important changes. Immediately after Independence, we had to deal with the Kashmir operations and other difficulties. All these processes of change had been going on.

One of the most outstanding developments has been the advance in our weapons production and in the scientific thinking behind them. Scientific department of the Defence Ministry is an outstanding thing now in science and especially that science related to defence. The quality of the weapons, etc. that you may produce is the basic defence nowadays. Our production programme has made remarkable progress. Presently, say, in aircraft, etc., it will be visible to all of us. Our programme for the production of military trucks in Jabalpur has gone well. They are producing, I think, 120 trucks a month, very good trucks, which is likely to go up soon to 150 trucks a month. So, there is advance on these lines, which are basic to defence.

Now, I may mention some other aspect, because I saw it yesterday only. The National Cadet Corps has grown double and quadruple. It is growing fast, and I think one may look forward to the day when practically every student will be in the National

Cadet Corps. And I might mention that a very large proportion of our officers, the new officers who are coming in, are those who have been in the NCC before.

I cannot go into our defence dispositions, obviously, but they were based originally largely on our north-western frontier, and east too. To be frank about it, they were based on our unfortunate position *vis-a-vis* Pakistan. Then comes the China trouble and we have had to think afresh. We have given a good deal of thought to it, and made such arrangements, and are making them, as are within our capacity. Take roads. We are building roads pretty fast, much faster than the normal procedures allow.

Some hon. Member said: why don't you start doing this? As Acharya Kripalani is smiling, he must have said it.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX**¹¹

I think Shri Asoka Mehta especially asked this question. His question was: when and how and during what period the Chinese aggression took place?

When the Chinese forces first entered Tibet, that is ten years ago in 1950-51, frankly we did not expect any trouble on our borders, but, naturally, looking at things in some historical perspective, we thought that the whole nature of our border had changed. It was a dead border, it was now becoming alive, and we began to think in terms of the protection of that border, that is, the border with Tibet at that time.

Our attention was first directed, naturally—at least it was directed, naturally or not—to these borders, and a high-level, highpower committee was appointed, the Border Defence Committee, right then in 1951 or 1952, I forget. This Committee presented a comprehensive report, and many of the suggestions were accepted by Government, some were not. This was ten years ago.

Also, when we thought of our border, we thought the danger was more probable in the northeast frontier agency border. It may have been a mistake of ours in calculating this, but we thought of that first, to protect it. I am talking about 1951, remember that, ten years ago.

In 1950, that is before this had happened, there were five checkposts, only five checkposts on the border— two in Himachal Pradesh and three in NEFA, along the northern border. Within a year, because of these changes that took place in Tibet, by April, 1951, this number had been increased to 25, and most of the important routes were covered. I am talking about NEFA. A little later, this number was further increased all along the NEFA border and the middle sector, i.e., Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh etc. In 1954 these checkposts moved closer to the actual border in NEFA and the middle sector. I am mentioning this, that this fact was given thought to by us even in those days.

In Ladakh, again, in 1951, some checkposts were established. This is a vast area. In these checkposts, army units were stationed at various places in Ladakh, rather distant from each other, and expeditions were sent to the farthest limits of our territory from 1951 onwards both by the police and the army. These expeditions were in the

nature of mountain expeditions, mountaineers and others a group and others, a group of ten or 15 persons of ten or 15 persons going ahead. In 1954, in order to strengthen the administration, there was no immediate threat to us, but nevertheless, in order to strengthen the administration—checkposts were taken over by the Central Government in Ladakh and further checkposts were established. The only area where we did not establish checkposts was the uninhabited area, the Aksaichin area— not that we did not want to, but we were busy with the other areas, and also it is a very difficult area. Even there, expeditions were sent. Between 1950 and 1959, 16 such expeditions were sent to various parts of Ladakh.

There were some seasonal caravan routes in the Aksaichin area which had been used for a long time past by caravans. The Chinese used them also in the past, when we did not connect it with any kind of aggression. It was a common practice. This is right in the northeastern bit, about the road which came up here. This was not supposed to mean sovereignty. It was a caravan route being used by any party. This is a central Asian route. There were very few roads or routes there, and it was supposed to be open traffic.

In 1955—we did not know this date then, we found out later—the Chinese started levelling the caravan route for the purpose of using it as a motorable tract. It took them about a couple of years. It was not clear to us then whether this proposed motor way crossed our territory. The first suspicion that this might be came to us in 1957, from a map published in Peking.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹²

Two years, probably two years.

We did not even then know definitely whether this transgressed our territory. The map was a small map, about half a magazine page. We did not know, but we began to suspect it. As we did not have proof, we did not protest then.

In the following summer, that is in 1958 summer, two patrol parties were sent to locate the two extremities of this road, about which we had heard. A patrol party which went to the south located the road as actually crossing our territory, a corner of our territory. The other party did not return for some time. We thereupon drew the attention of the Chinese Government to this party which had not returned, and enquired from them, and to the fact of the road having crossed our territory. This was first on the 18th October, 1958. The first party had returned about a month earlier and the second party had not returned. It was only when the two parties returned that it was confirmed that the Chinese were using this corner of Indian territory as a highway. Even then, no Chinese posts were established west of the highway. The route parallel to this road was used by our army expedition in 1958, and they did not detect any evidence of any Chinese intrusion. After that October letter, we were corresponding with the Chinese Government, we were waiting for their reply to our protest. Replies take two or three months in coming, and I think the first

one came either in December or January. Then this went on. In March, 1959, disturbances took place in Tibet, this uprising in Tibet; and other correspondence with the Chinese Government took place. In June, 1959, one of our patrols was sent towards Lanak La along the Chang Chenmo Valley, but no Chinese were found there. It thus appears that the major consolidation of the Chinese hold west of the highway took place between June and October, 1959. This was detected by some of our patrols which were moving north to establish posts at Changlung Lungpa and other places; this led to the Kongka Pass expedition where shooting took place and a number of our policemen were shot down.

Thus, the ordinary caravan route across the Northern Aksai Chain area was gradually used by the Chinese in the early fifties, first as a pure caravan road and then as a motorable road. Later, it was improved for motor traffic.

The real Chinese advance, however, took place after the Tibetan uprising and in the middle of 1959. This, of course, has nothing to do with the maps. About the maps, we have been protesting for a long time previously. So far as the maps were concerned, we have been protesting about those for some years past, but an actual protest was sent to them about the Aksai Chin area specifically in October, 1958, as I have mentioned, after we had received information about this motorable road. Correspondence about this was being carried on with the Chinese Government when the Tibetan uprising took place in 1959. It was about this time that the Prime Minister brought this matter up before Parliament in August, 1959.

Since the autumn of 1959, there has been no further aggression on our territory by the Chinese, even though their maps had varied.

Now, there are two points that I should like to mention. One point, as I have just stated, is that since August, 1959, the position might be said to be stabilised where it was then. There has been no further intrusion by them, and we are fairly well protected to prevent such an intrusion.

The second point is that the charge made against Government that we hid this fact of Chinese aggression, is, I submit, not quite fair or correct. The fact is that it was known to us for the first time when the two patrols returned, it became definitely known to us about that little corner, that the caravan route was being changed into a motorable road. And we wrote to the Chinese Government in October, 1958. And we were waiting for their reply. We did not wish, in a matter of this kind, to come to Parliament without investigating and finding out what their reply was. Their reply came, rather an inadequate reply came—I forget now, I think,—probably in January. We replied again, and enquired further. And then, suddenly, in March came the whole Tibetan uprising, which became a larger issue to which this was tacked on, because we were always talking about this. And in 1959, when this major advance took place we brought this matter immediately before the House.

As a matter of fact, we have been taking steps all along, from 1951 onwards, on this border. We had taken steps much more effectively on the NEFA border; it was a

very difficult border; there was no administration for hundreds of miles; and we concentrated on that, and concentrated with such effect that we have been able to prevent any incursion on that border; apart from that little village, that Longju business, otherwise, there has been no incursion, because it has been prevented. Since then, we have taken other steps to strengthen our posts everywhere, and our road programme has been getting on very well.

I have not touched upon the various other matters, and I have taken a long time already. About the Congo, the House may have seen that yesterday, a resolution was passed by the Security Council; yesterday or rather the day before, for the first time, the Security Council has passed a resolution on the Congo, since its resolution, I forget, in August or September or somewhere then. In spite of these troubles happening in the Congo, the amazing thing was that the Security Council looked on and remained silent. That was not because they were not interested but simply because in the Security Council itself, there was a tug of war, and this was reflected on the operations in the Congo, but there it was. For the first time, they have passed a resolution which, in our thinking, is a good one, in so far as it goes. In some matters, we would have liked it to go a little further, but in so far as it goes, it is a good resolution. Now, the question is how far it would be acted upon.

Unfortunately, the previous resolutions of the Security Council passed last year, to begin with, were not bad resolutions, but by what we thought as a strained interpretation of them, it was said that nothing could be done under those resolutions. I trust that the present resolutions would not be interpreted in that very limited and restricted way.

A question does arise now, and I said something about it this morning here in answer to a question, about our sending the Indian Armed Forces there. The Secretary General of the UN asked us to send some Forces some time ago, about three weeks ago or so. On the one hand, we felt that the United Nations must continue to function in the Congo; their withdrawal would mean disaster. On the other hand, the UN was actually not functioning; it was sitting there merely; we did not want to send our people there to be insulted from time to time, and to do nothing, to waste them there in a sense. So, we were in a difficulty, and we pointed out this difficulty to the Secretary General and said that if we would be convinced that the UN was going to adopt a vigorous policy there, then, we might consider sending some of our Forces. Well, that position remains the same except that the recent resolution of the Security Council has made it appear that a vigorous policy will be pursued, and, therefore, the possibility of our sending some Armed Forces has come nearer.

I am afraid that although I have taken a great deal of time, I have not touched on many of the criticisms etc. which have been made. But there is one thing more, Sir, which I might explain, if you would permit me, and that is about this trijunction between India, Burma and China. First of all, I should like to say that it is not right for any hon. Member to criticise Burma in regard to this matter. Burma has done nothing,

unless, of course, Burma could simply refuse to deal with China; that is a different matter. Burma has been carrying on these negotiations with China for three, or four or five years, I forget, for how long, since quite a long time ago. And step by step, they have proceeded and come nearer. Actually, the terms of the future treaty were fixed when General Ne Win as Prime Minister went to Peking long before the present Prime Minister U Nu came back to the Prime Ministership. And so it is a long process, a gradually developing process, till it was absolutely finalised on this occasion, and it was signed when Mr. Chou Enlai went there. We could have no grievance, no objection, to what was done there. We cannot ask any country not to make a proper treaty with China because China and we have fallen out. That would not be a legitimate reason to say that, unless that treaty affects us. But this does not affect us except to the extent that a map was attached to it. The wording of the treaty does not affect us at all. A Chinese map was attached to it, and that shows that corner with two passes; the Chinese line shown there is not as shown in our maps, in accordance with our line. This was pointed out to the Burmese Government and to the Chinese, of course. The Burmese Government made it perfectly clear to us, before the signing of the treaty, that they were not accepting that interpretation of the map; that was none of their business, that was a business for India and China to determine, and they are bound by the terms of their own treaty and their own boundary. So they adopted a perfectly straightforward attitude in this matter, and I was a little sorry to find a trace of criticism of Burma in this House because of this.

There was mention made of Nepal too. One hon. Member spoke with some warmth about recent happenings in Nepal, that is, not approving of them. Another hon. Member accused me of saying something in regard to these recent happenings which it was not right for me to do—I should not say anything about Nepal. Now, it is always difficult in such moments what to say and what not to say. All I said in this House was that I was deeply distressed at the turn events had taken in Nepal and this failure of democracy etc. That was all that I said, although, I must say, I felt much more strongly about it.

But hon. Members sometimes imagine that we should issue directives to other Governments, tell them what to do and what not to do. That is a kind of thing which obviously we neither want to do nor can do but which irritates the other Government very much. Whenever Members in Parliament say anything like that, it does no good; it does not advance the cause of India; it has the reverse effect. I hope, therefore, that hon. Members will, when dealing with our neighbour countries, with whom we are friendly, we want to be friendly and we are going to be friendly, remember this suggestion that I am submitting to them, that we cannot treat them as if the fashioning of their policies must necessarily depend on our good wishes.

BACK NOTE

XXXI. Reply on Motion of Thanks to President's Address, 23 February, 1961

1. AN HON. MEMBER: He is not 'Acharya'.
SHRI TYAGI (Dehradun): Shri Rajagopalachari!
SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARYA (West Dinajpur): Acharya Kripalani will be offended.
2. SHRI TANGAMANI (MADURAI): It is proper for the Hon. Prime Minister to refer to the Members in the way in which he has referred?
3. MR. SPEAKER: He did not refer to Members of Parliament. There can be engineers and doctors here also.
4. AN HON. MEMBER: No.
SHRI MUHAMMED ELIAS (Howrah): He said that it produces 6½ million tons.
5. SHRI MUHAMMED ELIAS: He said that it produces 6½ million tons today and that in two years' time it will go up to 13½ million tons.
6. AN HON. MEMBER: 6½ million tons.
7. SHRI TYAGI : How much per capita?
8. AN HON. MEMBER: It is uncorrected record of his speech.
9. ACHARYA KRIPALANI (Sitamarhi): Does it not mean that the planning was defective ?
10. SOME HON. MEMBERS: United States.
SOME HON. MEMBERS: United Kingdom.
11. ACHARYA KRIPALANI: You are building roads much faster than the PWD which is very notorious for its speed and integrity.
12. SHRI BRAJ RAJ SINGH: It took two years.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

1 April, 1961

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg to place before the House the Demands on behalf of the Ministry of External Affairs. At this stage, I shall Endeavour only to make some preliminary remarks. Perhaps, at a later stage, I shall be in a better position to deal with remarks or criticisms of hon. Members.

The External Affairs Ministry is a Ministry which not only deals in a sense with the world at large, in so far as India is concerned, and as such it is inevitably involved in many of the world problems, and it ill involved during a period when the dynamic of change and history is working at an unusually fast pace. The burden on the External Affairs Ministry, not merely of carrying on the routine administration of a great department of this Government but of facing novel problems, is very considerable. I should like that fact to be kept in mind by hon. Members not in excuse of any error, but because, to understand the problems that face us, some kind of a wide and large-scale view has to be taken. Naturally, there may be much in the working of the Ministry which may be criticized; errors may have been committed, but the big picture has to be seen to understand it in its full context

The Ministry's work has grown considerably and it goes on growing. It grows because of various reasons. One, of course, is that more and more countries become independent-it is a happy development-and we have to face the problems of our representation there and their representation here, more particularly, from the countries of Africa newly independent, but it grows more especially because the problems facing the world become more intricate and more difficult.

The biggest problem of all that we have in the world today is that of disarmament, and it affects us chiefly because it affects the world, not because it directly affects us so much. And also, merely because of our size and various reasons which make our country rather important, relatively speaking, we have to play a part in many matters which otherwise perhaps we might not have played.

I should like, therefore, first of all, this House to consider and keep in mind this larger scheme of things in the world in which the External Affairs Ministry is functioning, and judge of our broad policy accordingly, whether it is correct or not, whether it has succeeded or has not measured up to what we hoped for it.

Speaking for myself-I may be partial, perhaps, to something with which I have been connected for so long,-I think that in spite of the great difficulties which the world has faced, and which we have faced, the broad policy followed by us in external affairs has justified itself to a tremendous degree. In fact, even those, many of those,

who criticized it, have begun to appreciate its rightness and its justification. By a mere Test of Numbers, at the time when we talked about our being a non-aligned nation and not lining up with military blocs and powers, when we began saying so, there was hardly any other country which said so, or which acted on those lines; today, I could not exactly give the number, but I think it goes into the twenties or perhaps more, and what is more so is that the great countries which themselves are aligned or are parts of military blocks themselves appreciate, and say so, the value of a country like India being unaligned.

Here is a simple case, topical case in point. There is Laos which is one of the problems of today, and where difficulties have arisen in the few years because of pressures exercised on the Government of Laos to throw its weight on the side of one military bloc or alliance and not to remain totally unaligned, or neutral, if you like. Today, every party recognizes including the very people who are leaders of those big blocs that the only future for Laos is as a neutral country, and it is because of that recognition that it may be said that there is some hope of the question of Laos being settled in a peaceful way; I only say, hope; nobody can be certain yet, because there are so many hurdles in the way. So, generally speaking, not only has this broad policy which India has followed met with recognition and appreciation, but there is a feeling even among those who follow different policies that this serves the world in many ways, and it is peculiarly fitted for India. That is the broad approach to this problem.

Then, if we look at the actual state of the world, we have to realize two or three things, first of all, that in external affairs, we have to deal with not only a changing concept, but with, if I may say so, history being written or acted which will be written later. It is a dynamic process that is going on all over the world. Of course, even in our internal affairs, that phrase may be used, but more so in our external world. That is happening and it is happening at a stage when it is difficult, more difficult than perhaps previously, to forecast the future. New forces are at play, and a new dynamic is in action. Who could have said even twelve months ago or two years ago of the changes in Africa, tremendously rapid changes in Africa? Who can say what the new developments in nuclear weapons may bring, war or peace, or what the result may be? All these are factors which bring in not only a measure of uncertainty, great uncertainty, but at the same time consequences which may be extreme in their character. So even though we may look ahead and try to forecast the future, as one always tries to do, the actual facts which help one to forecast it are very limited and the uncertain factors are far more.

Of course, in the ultimate analysis so far as any country's future is concerned, it depends principally on itself, on its own strength and ability, and partly on the rest of the world. Both factors play their role. Therefore, whether they are external affairs or internal matters, the first thing we have to think of is to build up our own nation, build up its economy, build up the general condition of its people, so that it may meet any problem with confidence. That, of course, is always the basic position. But even in building that up, much depends on what one does, apart from the economic

aspect which will now come before the House again and again—our Five Year Plans and the rest—how one does it and what kind of relations it develops with the rest of the world. Does it develop friendly relations, broadly speaking, or at any rate, does it succeed in avoiding hostilities and enmities with other countries—which is important, because they come in the way? We may well say that at the present moment in many ways we are peculiarly fortunate in having the goodwill and the friendship of many of the countries of the world, certainly of the two super Powers, as they are called, the United States of America and the Soviet Union. I think I can say with confidence that our relations are not merely correct, as they are, but friendly, which is perhaps surprising to many people, because these two great countries themselves have not been in the past at all friendly to each other; in fact, they are the heads of great coalitions and great power blocs.

And so it is no mean achievement to carry on our policy, our independent policy, and at the same time have the goodwill and understanding of these two great countries, not agreeing with them always in what they do. But both our integrity of purpose and the means that we employ in carrying it out have impressed these countries, and therefore, what we say—they may accept it or not—carries weight with them. They consider it fully.

That applies to other countries too. In fact, the only two countries to which that does not fully apply are the great People's Republic of China and Pakistan. So far as Pakistan is concerned, again our troubles are not new ones. I believe that as between the people of India and the people of Pakistan, there is very little ill will left. But it is true that on the Government Level, there are problems which have not been solved and they create friction from time to time.

So far as China is concerned, the House knows well how recent developments have created a gulf, a wide gulf, between our relations. We have felt strongly about it and the House has also felt strongly about it. Nevertheless, we have tried to avoid in so far as we can, taking any step which may create unbridgeable chasms between these two countries. We have to look as I said in this dynamic of history not only to the present but to the future; and the future of the two countries who are neighbors to each other like India and China, two countries with vast populations, is of the highest importance to both these countries and to the world.

So we have tried to steer a middle course between our strong resentment and the steps we actually take in this connection, and not allow ourselves merely in anger to do something which may create further problems and difficulties. Broadly speaking, our attitude has been to strengthen ourselves to prepare for any contingency and not in the slightest to give in any matter which we consider important.

Some hon. Members have sometimes criticized us, because they feel strongly about these matters, and asked why we have not taken stronger action. The answer to them would be, first of all, that one takes strong action when other actions are all

matter. Not even the greatest power can control or issue commands to the rest of the world: they have to adapt themselves to circumstances. And surely even if we are capable of doing so, which we are not, of ordering the world about, it would be an unfortunate day when any country aims at ordering the world about.

Now, Sir, sometimes it is said today, some people feel that lately we have perhaps been changing our broad policy. I should like them to examine this matter a little more deeply and they will find that the changes have often come in the policy of other countries, not ours. Not that this is a virtue, but I am merely stating that there has been a consistency in the broad policies we have pursued, and we have not changed basically. We have adapted them to circumstances. There have been Changes in the policies of other countries which sometimes have brought them nearer to us.

If I may say so with all respect, take the policy of the United States of America. Undoubtedly, under the new administration there has been a marked change, a change which, if I may say so with all respect, we appreciate greatly and which has brought their policies nearer to our policies.

I would not object to changing my policy if it is for the good. But broadly speaking, it is our policy which is being accepted by other countries as the correct policy.

So far, at present I do not wish to say anything more except to point out that we in the External Affairs Ministry are constantly dealing with this dynamic of history in a changing world and in a changing India and in circumstances which are without parallel in history. And we do not get much help from the past in trying to unravel the future. The Ministry has had all kinds of new duties assign to it, new problems. We deal with the problem of Tibetan refugees. It is not normally a problem of external affairs, but we do deal with that problem. We deal with other problems also which are not external affairs exactly. But they have been connected by historical process, and we shall continue to deal with them. And I hope that this House will individually and severally give its approval to these broad policies that we have been pursuing and which have met, I suggest with all respect, with very considerable success in this difficult world of ours.

We cannot have it all our way; nor is it very fitting for us all the time, because the world does not go our way, to sit down like spoil children and cry about it. It is not suitable for a grown up or mature nation; it is rather an act of immaturity. That does not mean that we do not make mistakes. Of course, and we shall be happy for those mistakes to be pointed out, so that we may correct them.

I commend these Demands for the acceptance of the House.

BACK NOTE

XXXII. Demands for Grants, 1 April, 1961

1. ACHARYA KRIPALANI (Sitamarhi): It could have been done long ago.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am sorry our people are not quite so capable of doing these things as the hon. Member who made this interjection. Some other people who are very eminent in history and other things have complimented them, in doing it as they have done it and when they have done it. It is a matter in which I do not wish to enter into an argument.

LIFTING OF BAN ON TRADE WITH GOA

1 April, 1961

Government had indicated, in answer to a question in the Lok Sabha a few weeks ago, that it had been decided to permit limited trade with Goa effective from April 1961. Broadly speaking, only such items as are required by the people of Goa, particularly the poorer classes would be permitted export from India. Included in the list of permissible items of export are: textiles (khadi, handloom and certain varieties of Mill made textiles). Books drugs and medicines, equipment for educational institutions, tea and leather goods. Government have also decided to permit the import into India from Goa of betel nuts. The trade in most items will be against payment in sterling. Books, khadi and handloom textiles, however would be permitted export to Goa against payment in Indian rupees. All trade will be channelized via the Majali route of entry into Goa.

The resumption of limited trade with the Portuguese possessions is part of Government's policy of liberalization. As is known, movement to and from Goa has been liberalized and the baggage rules simplified. Government had also announced the opening of two additional routes, via Anmode and Lakkarkot, to Goa but so far the Portuguese authorities have not extended corresponding facilities on the Goa side of the border. If, in this matter of trade, too, the Portuguese authorities decline to extend facilities to the Goans the responsibility is surely their own.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹.....

BACK NOTE

XXXIII. Lifting of Ban on Trade with Goa, 1 April, 1961

1. SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati); In view of the fact that that area has become a smugglers' paradise.....

MR. SPEAKER: There is more of a preamble than a question. What is the question?
Shri Hem Barua: How far is this going to diminish smuggling?

MR. SPEAKER: What is the effect of this arrangement on smuggling?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I should imagine that apart from other steps that we take to control or check smuggling this certainly will diminish Smuggling.

SHRI NAUSHIR BHARUCHA: Does this Liberalization of our trade facilities mean abandonment of Government's policy of economic sanction against Goa?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Is abandonment the word used by the hon. Member?

MR. SPEAKER: Will this mean abandonment of the policy of having trade sanctions again Goa?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I would call it a variation of it to some extent. There is no abandonment of any policy. We vary these things. For some years a certain policy was being pursued. Now, after full examination and consultation with most of the people, that is, the people of Goa and Goans elsewhere, in deciding this policy, we have done this.

SHRI KHADILKAR (Ahmednagar): With a view to remove the present hardships of Goans because of trade restrictions is Government considering the opening of the steamer service between Panjim and Bombay which was plied before?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am sorry. I cannot answer that question without enquiring into it.

SHRI M. B. THAKORE (Pathan): May I know whether such trade facilities will apply to Diu and Daman Territories is on the west coast of Gujarat State?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Is the hon. Member asking whether this will apply to them?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it applicable only to Goa or to other territories like, Diu and Daman?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It would apply to all the Portuguese possessions. It will affect much more Goa, of course.

**THE CONSTITUTION (TENTH AMENDMENT) BILL:
INTEGRATION INTO THE INDIAN UNION OF
TERRITORIES OF DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI**

14 August, 1961

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, be taken into consideration".

I have to propose a very small amendment to the Constitution, but small as it is, it is a particularly significant one, and I hope and believe that it is the forerunner of other amendments of this kind.

The amendment, as the House knows, deals with the integration into the Indian Union of the territories of Dadra and Nagar Haveli. May I point out with respect that the word is Nagar and not Naagar as is often said? It is the ordinary Hindi word Nagar.

The history of this little enclave is known to all Members; I am quite sure that hon. Members are aware of how a number of courageous persons of Nagar Haveli and Dadra many years ago drove out the Portuguese garrison or police or whatever it was, the officials there, and established a free territory. Of course, we were in complete sympathy with them, and they were in sympathy with us. But as a matter of fact, as was shown in the recent case in the Hague Court, this was an act of those people and not of the Government of India. Having established a free territory, we had no intention of allowing the Portuguese to come through Indian territory and to try to suppress the people of Dadra and Nagar Haveli. So they remained free.

Thereafter the Portuguese Government took this case to the International Court of Justice at the Hague claiming the right of passage to these territories. This case was argued and it lasted for several years. In fact, because it was lasting all this time, we could not take some steps which we might otherwise have taken in regard to these territories or even in regard to Goa. Ultimately the case was decided and although the decision was not hundred per cent as we would have liked it to "be—the majority decision, I mean—that decision made it quite clear that the basic attitude we had taken up was correct in regard to these. And it followed from that that we could go ahead and incorporate these territories into the Indian Union, which had been the repeated desire of the people of Dadra and Nagar Haveli There was the Varishta Panchayat there which had passed a resolution to this effect.

So some time after the Hague Court decision, we gave further thought to this matter and came to the conclusion that we should give effect to that request of the panchayat there. That request was repeated recently unanimously, and as a consequence of that, we have brought forward this Constitution (Tenth Amendment) Bill, and a

connected Bill which has been placed before this House in regard to the representation of Dadra and Nagar Haveli in this House.

We have treated them as Union Territories deliberately because we do not want to split them up or put them in either the State of Gujarat or the State of Maharashtra. First of all, we are giving effect to the wishes of the people there in that matter. In effect, the whole procedure that we are adopting is to give effect to their wishes, and their wishes were that we should treat them as a unit. I do not know about the distant future, but for the time being, in the near future, they will continue to be treated as Union Territories. Therefore, for any hon. Member to ask us to split them up would be against their wishes, and I think it would not be right at all to do that.

Then there are suggestions made in some of the proposed amendments that we should have added Goa, Daman and Diu etc. These amendments represent the laudable wishes and ambitions of some hon. Members, "but they do not represent the facts. "We are dealing with certain facts which happened in Dadra and Nagar Haveli. Obviously that situation is different from the situation of Goa, Daman and Diu, because these places are still under the occupation of the Portuguese Government, and for us to declare them now would not be in consonance with facts. As it is, we say that from the 11th August this territory will form part of the Indian Union. But that is not so in respect of the other territories on the 11th August, because they do not form part of the Indian Union. It is our wish and our desire, which I have no doubt, will be fulfilled that these other territories including especially Goa should come into the Indian Union. But as I just said, the coming in of Dadra and Nagar Haveli, is a happy augury and a presage of the future.

I do not think I need say much about this matter, but as we are dealing with this small relic of the old Portuguese Empire, it is well to remember the odd fact that the Portuguese Empire is the biggest empire, possibly the worst too—but the biggest also—that exists today in this age of the liquidation of imperialism and colonialism. It is an odd fact that when great and more powerful empires have given way very largely, the Portuguese Empire should continue. It is, of course, in a bad way today and in its major territories in Africa, in Angola, the situation has been peculiarly horrible and painful, and probably even the past records of imperialist domination will not give us an example of what is happening now in Angola. I have no doubt in my mind that in Angola, and certainly, I think, also in other Portuguese domains like Mozambique etc. the Portuguese Empire is doomed.

Unfortunately, we do not get many facts about the Angola situation because nobody is allowed to go there.

Some little time ago, probably some English Methodist missionaries who were working there came out and they gave a ghastly picture of what they had seen. This was the first time that facts from reliable authorities came out. Even so, very little is known yet, but what is known is enough to condemn the Portuguese authorities there and the Portuguese Government completely. I do not think it is going to be

BACK NOTE

XXXIV. The Constitution (Tenth Amendment) Bill : Integration into the Indian Union of Territories of Dadra and Nagar Haveli, 14 August, 1961

1. AN HON. MEMBER: Rs. 30 lakhs.

MOTION REGARDING THIRD FIVE YEAR PLAN

21 August, 1961

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Third Five Year Plan laid on the Table of the House on the 7th August, 1961, be taken onto consideration."

It was almost exactly a year ago, on August 22nd, 1960 that I moved the motion for consideration of the Draft Outline of the Third Plan, and this House was pleased to give its approval to it. Previous to that, it fell to my lot to place before this House the First Five Year Plan, in December, 1952, and the Second Plan in May, 1956.

I am moving this motion for consideration, not on behalf of the Planning Commission, of which I have the honour to be chairman; but, as a matter of fact, this is not the work of the Planning Commission only; it has had naturally the full cooperation and support of the Central Government and their Departments and Ministries, of the State Governments, the Chief Ministers and their governmental apparatus and a large number of other organisations and specialist individuals, who are included in various panels, and organisations, even going down in many cases to pachayats and the like, so that, this is very much a Joint effort, and I should like it to be considered as that joint effort and not the work of a few eminent persons who have given a good deal of thought and labour to its preparation. Many hon. Members of this House have been associated with the consideration of this or parts of it, in various stages. I put it forward, therefore, as this joint effort, not as a party programme, but, I hope, representing, if not everybody, a very large number of individuals and groups in this House and outside.

Indeed, ever since this has been published in the press, the reactions thus far have been very largely in its favour; it has been approved of; naturally and rightly, there have been criticisms. We welcome these criticisms; but the broad approach of it has been welcomed

Now, it is true that the party out of which the present Government has come, is intimately interested in this Plan and they have given it their support, because it represents certain principals for which they have stood not today only, not for the last ten or twelve years, but at least for thirty two years, ever since 1929; and at that time, some hon. Members who sit opposite today were themselves associated with the great organisation which I have the honour to represent.

Ever since 1929, the Congress has had two objectives in view, democracy and socialism. Socialism was not put in its objective and creed and all that, but in its resolutions, it appeared. Gradually, the idea has developed, but the basic concept has been there in the Congress since 1929. I say this because some people seem to

imagine that these concepts are of recent growth. Of course, long before 1929, and long before the Congress more or less officially adopted them, there were large number of people in the Congress and outside, who believed in them and spoke about them.

Therefore, let us, I respectfully submit, treat this Plan not in a party sense, but as a national plan, in which the broad approaches have been agreed to by all, but which is always susceptible to criticism and improvement in many of its detailed applications.

It is a matter of pride to me that the organisation with which many of us have been associated, and I have been associated for very nearly half a century now, and through all these years, has laid stress on this broader social outlook which this Plan represents.

Ever since Independence, we have come to greater grips with this subject, and soon after freedom, we started on this exciting pilgrimage through Five Year Plans and the like and gradually, this concept of planning has seeped down into our people all over the country. There is no doubt about it. And the broad aspects of this planning have also gradually and progressively been understood by them and approved by them.

Indeed, it is astonishing that during these last few years, ten years or so, that we have been planning, the amount of attention that our Plans have drawn from the rest of the world has been surprising and gratifying. They have drawn attention even from countries which in their own domestic spheres have different types of economy, whether it is the economy of the capitalist variety or the economy of the communist or socialist varieties, there attention has been drawn; I do not say that they agree with all that we have said or intend to do, but they have recognised this as a matter of the greatest importance that this tremendous efforts is being made by the Indian people to pull themselves up almost to the grassroots, as it were. And they have recognised the principle, the basic principle of planning. They have recognised the basic principle and the general structure of the Plan also. I need not refer to it in any detail, because it is well known and it often appears in the public press. It is rather unfortunate that some very few of our own people still have failed to grasp these basic facts which the world recognises. As I said, I do not mind criticisms. We welcome criticisms, but not understanding and recognising what the world has begun to recognise is rather a surprising fact.

Indeed, only the other day, I was to some extent surprised, and if I have say so, pleased, to read, of all things, a Papal Encyclical. The Papal Encyclical which appeared just about a month ago, representing views of the Roman Catholic Church on social matters makes very interesting reading. It does not, of course, deal with our Plan or refer to it, but the broad approach of that Encyclical it is interesting to note how even that is changing is changing in favour of socialisation, in favour of public enterprise, in favour of so many things which the world stands for today. The Roman Catholic Church in social matters is slow to move from its original moorings, but if the Roman Catholic Church itself, in the shape of its head, the Pope, goes thus far, it shows how far the world has gone.

I invite the attention of those few Members of this House or few members outside to this matter, those who have not grasped what is happening in the world, what directions people are seeking and who are so out of step with modern thought and modern actualities that they have lost all contact thought the realities of life. Therefore, I say that our Plan, in its broad approaches and broad aspects, is a plan which is inevitably trust down upon us in the conditions as they are and which is being followed with the greatest interest by many other countries who would like to do something like it and by other countries who are much more advanced than us because they are interested, for a variety of reasons, in the results of this Plan and our progress etc.

To begin with, I should like to express my gratitude to all those people who have helped in the making of this Plan the State Governments, Chief Ministers and other and the many others whom I mentioned. In particular, I should like to mention the name of one person who has in effect embodied or represented our Planning Commission for ten years, it is Shri V. T. Krishnamachari. For these ten years, he laboured there and laboured with great ability, great endurance and great courtesy to all the numerous people who came there, and helped in giving really a foundation to all our planning. Fortunately, even though he is not the Deputy Chairman or a member of the Planning Commission, he is now, I am glad to say, Member of the other House, and we shall have the advantage of his counsel in regard to planning and connected matters.

I should also like to pay a tribute to the present Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, my hon. colleague here, the Planning Minister, who has attended to this work of planning with a crusading zeal and deep interest and, what is more, with very firm views about the social objectives that we ought to pursue. And that is important because all this planning business is not a matter of just technically putting things together, putting up factories here and there. It must be governed by the social objectives that we pursue. If we have not got social objectives, then all this planning is rather in the air. We do not quite know where we are going. We must have a picture of the organisation of society that we driving at, and it is this picture that hon. Members will see has grown with our planning. It was there in the First Plan. In the Second Plan, it was more so; in the Third Plan, it takes more and more shape.

Some aspects of planning are inevitable almost, whatever social picture you may have. That is to say, if your social picture is just greater production, you can do it in various ways without any other social objectives. Of course, that picture of greater production might lead to new problems, more difficult problems, more hiatus between a small number of people and the masses of the people, greater concentration of wealth and so on. So while achieving one thing, it will lead to other difficulties.

But essentially, planning must have some social objectives and I wish to point out that the basis of the Plan that I put forward is in accordance with our social objectives. It must be remembered that it is not merely a question of putting up a factory there or a factory elsewhere. In that, my hon. colleague, the Planning Minister,

has always laid great stress on these social objectives because he feels strongly on them.

Now, what has happened during these ten years or so of planning? We began at a time when for a long period previously, many decades, India's economy was almost stagnant. It is difficult to get a move on from a stagnant economy; it just gets stuck in the ruts. That is the most difficult part of it, to pull it out. After it gets in motion, it is easier to go on at more speed. So we had to face that position. Well, we faced it.

During the first two Plans—I shall just give a few figures national income increased by 42 per cent. During this period, the population increased by 77 millions, and yet there was an increase in per capita income from Rs. 284 to Rs. 330. This increase came through development in all sectors. In these ten years, agricultural production increased by 41 per cent, industrial production by 94 per cent and power by 148 per cent. Railways carried 70 per cent more goods traffic and the traffic on surface roads increased by nearly 50 per cent. In education, 20 million more children went to school. At present, there are altogether, I believe, about 46 million children boys and girls in schools and colleges. Very considerable strides have been made in technical training. Now, there are 380 engineering colleges and polytechnics all over India while there were 134 ten years ago. Admissions have increased fourfold. I think that this increase in education, although some people may think that it is not rapid enough and it is not rapid enough in terms of the directions in our Constitution which said that in a certain period of time we must cover the whole country—is nevertheless, quite significant. I am not for the moment considering the quality of that education because quality has to be improved very much, but the mere fact of this increase is very significant and this is bringing about, or helping to bring about, a social revolution all over the countryside. Everywhere, boys and girls who have never been to school are going there.

I should like to mention one aspect of it which is gradually being introduced and which is referred to our Plan, that is, the introduction of midday meals. The State of Madras stands foremost in this, and I should like to congratulate it on the great success of its midday meal movement. But I hope that other States will follow this. In fact, many others are thinking in terms of doing the same thing.

Another outstanding feature of these years has been the progress in scientific and industrial research. The large number of national and regional laboratories, the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, the Department of Atomic Energy, the Oil and National Gas Commission, the Geological Survey of India, the Bureau of Mines, the Central Water and Power Commission, the Indian Council of Agricultural Research—all have laid the base for rapid scientific and technological advance.

One fact which I have mentioned several times previously, which is a simple fact and which stands out without any covering showing what has happened during these ten years, is the increase in the expectation of life at birth. When I was very young, long years ago, I think (here was a book which perhaps people do not read now but which was one of the classes in those days. William Digby's Prosperous British India

("Prosperous" within inverted commas), an Englishman's book, where the expectation of life in India at birth was given as 24. It is a shocking thing. Well, now in 1941-51, the expectation of life at birth was 32. During the Second Plan it rose to 42. Now it is 47-50. It is a very remarkable increase, which represents many factors of course, the factor of better health, the factor of better food, general bettering of living conditions. This is the average, and it is, I think, a remarkable growth in these few years. It is true that in other countries this figure of the expectation of life has gone above 60 but I think for India to have gone up to over 47 in these last ten years is quite remarkable.

I should like the House to remember that during this period of ten years, we have had to face the tremendous problems of rehabilitation of displaced persons. Nine millions came from Pakistan to India.

This is a very brief account of the past. I shall not go further into it.

We have had two social objectives during all this period: (1) we had to build up by democratic means a rapidly expanding and technologically progressive economy, and (2) a social order based on social justice on offering equal opportunity to every citizen. These objectives have to be kept in view all the time because the moment we forget either of the we go astray, and therefore it is necessary for us to have not only a Five Year Plan, but a plan with longer perspectives. One interesting thing that we propose to do that hon. Members may notice is having this perspective plan approach. Of course, we have been doing that all these years, but now it will be a more definite one for the next 15 years. One of the principal activities of the Planning Commission is going to be the preparation of a Fifteen Year Plan.

We calculated the national income at the end of 1960-61, that is now, to be Rs. 14,500 crores. In 1965-66 it will be Rs. 19,000 crores; in 1970-71, Rs. 25,000 crores; in 1975-76, Rs. 33-34,000 crores. Hon. Members will see that progressively the rate of increase grows, as it should.

The per capita income in 1960-61 is Rs. 330. In 1965-66 it will be Rs. 385; in 1970-71, Rs. 450; in 1975-76, Rs. 530. This figure of Rs. 530 is not very much, we must realise, when compared to the countries which are affluent, but we have started from almost scratch, and the rate of progress goes on growing.

Then there are other things. I need not go into the rate of net investment, as a proportion of national income, which grows from 11 to 20 per cent, and the rate of domestic saving in proportion to national income which grows from 8.5 per cent now to 18-19 per cent in 1975-76.

The investment during the first Plan was Rs. 3,360 crores; in the Second Plan, Rs. 6,750 crores; in the Third Plan, Rs. 10,500 crores; in the Fourth Plan presumably it will be Rs. 17,000 crores; in the Fifth Plan, Rs. 25,000 crores. This of course, can only be possible if we make the progress which we envisage.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

These are the figures given for the perspective plan. I suppose they must be. I cannot answer the hon. Member's question straightaway. There will be no point in giving figures if they are not based on some stability in price.

It is proposed in this perspective plan which is going to be prepared to have the following tentative targets of capacity to serve as a basis for the end of the Fourth Plan, *i.e.*, 1970-71.

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Steel Ingots | — | 18-19 million tons. |
| Pig Iron | — | 3-4 million tons. |
| Alluminium | — | 230,000-250,000 tons. |
| Electric Power | — | 21-23 million KW. |
| Coal | — | 170-180 million tons. |
| Oil Refining | — | 18-20 million tons. |
| Nitrogeneous Fertilizers | — | 2-2.2 million tons. |
| Cement | — | 24-26 million tons. |
| Machine Building Output | — | Rs. 1,600 crores. |
| Foodgrains | — | 125 million tons. |
| Exports | — | Rs. 1,300-1,400 crores. |

These are our expectations, and it is proposed now to prepare a detailed plan for 15 years, so that we can keep these perspectives in view in all that we do and the Five Year Plans that we may draw up from time to time.

Perhaps hon. Members may have heard of the discussion which took place repeatedly in the Planning Commission about physical planning and financial planning, the physical programme and the financial resources available. Both have to be considered, obviously. Sometimes there is a greater stress on the one or the other. Ultimately it was decided that we should keep the physical programme in view and work for it, but not finally commit ourselves to anything which is not within the financial limits. The physical outlay in this way amounted to a little over Rs. 8,000 crores. The financial plan, however, is for Rs. 7,500 crores. The gap really is not big and subsequent studies indicate that this gap may be much smaller.

This Plan requires a great deal of external assistance and foreign exchange resources. We have been fortunate in getting considerable help for this Plan from a number of friendly countries, and I am grateful to those countries for this help. For the present help has been given to us or promised for the first two years of the Plan, but whatever help we may get, it must be remembered that the real burden lies on our own people, and the burden of even the help we get if that we have to pay it back. These are loan etc. We have to pay them back with interest.

One point I should like to refer to here, because some of our friends across the border, that is in Pakistan, have objected very strongly to the help we have got in this matter from other countries on the ground that although it is help for civil planning, it releases resources for defence, that we build up our defence and therefore indirectly it helps our defence although directly we do not take any help for defence. That is not true. Whatever we get from outside is for either specific projects or the Plan. Everything that we get from abroad means an additional burden on us in order to implement that scheme. The foreign exchange that we get today is part of a plan to build up something. Now, if we do not build it up it is a different matter. If foreign exchange does not come, perhaps we cannot build that enterprise. If we build it, then it means greater burden on us because we have to spend domestic resources for that plus that foreign part; it does not relieve us of any burden in any sense; it adds to our burden. It is true that we get some enterprise; that may be; but it does not release any money for defence at all that is the important point and we cannot transfer that money to defence because we are getting foreign help. That is completely a wrong argument. It is true of course that if our enterprises grow, as they have grown, that adds to the strength of the country and adding to the strength of the country adds to our defence. If our industrialisation grows, it is a great factor in the defence of the country. In the last ten years many enterprises have grown. Previous to these ten years we were completely dependent for any important thing on outside sources Britain or some other country. Now, as the House knows, we have got large establishments producing locomotives, wagons, carriages and all manner of machine tools and the rest and they are growing. We are now laying the foundations for huge machinebuilding establishments at Ranchi and elsewhere. All that adds to the strength of the nation. That is true. But not one of these things directly releases money for defence for the moment. Ultimately it will do us good.

I should just like to give some figures of the scale of the effort in the Third Plan as envisaged some illustrative statistics. We want to increase agricultural production by thirty per cent, food grains production by 32 per cent, industrial production by 70 per cent, steel ingots by 163 per cent, aluminium by 322 per cent, machine tools by 445 per cent and power by 123 per cent.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX²**

The rise in population is taken into account of course when I give the figure of per capita income. But when I say power is doubled, it has nothing to do with rise in population. When I say the entire foodgrain production goes up by one-third, it goes up by one third. Fortunately, population does not go up by one third.

Great stress has been laid on the matter of exports. That is obvious because the only possible way for us to pay back these large loans that we receive is through exports. There is no other way to deal with it. If our exports do not flourish—I am sure they will—then this great burden increases on us. So, it is of the highest importance for exports to increase. In the Plan report they have estimated a fairly marked increase in exports. We have been too much wedded to certain conventional exports. We have

to stick to them but we have to go outside that range. At the present moment a fresh difficulty has arisen and that is the European Common Market and what effect it may have on our exports if and when UK joins that. I am not going into that matter but merely mentioning it but that is adding to our difficulties. Anyhow, we have to find ways of finding markets other than our own for our exports; we must do our utmost to that end and get out of the old ruts.

This Five Year Plan deals with many aspects of life but it does not deal with defence, for understandable reasons. Defence has in the last ten years made rather remarkable progress. The progress of achievements, ultimately is not in bright people parading before you but in the productive capacity of defence, what it can make. After all, defence today depends more on the industrial apparatus than on merely soldiers and uniform; it is what they have behind them, producing not only arms and ammunition but a very large variety of goods that a modern army requires. So far as that is concerned, I think it may be said that our defence apparatus has increased very greatly and in important matters. It is not merely a very fine showpiece the supersonic aircraft that we make. That shows capacity. Our electronics they are highly important today and have increased and are increasingly greatly not only there but in the Atomic Energy Departments and in other places too. So also our capacity for making vehicles, which is highly important. An Army now hardly walks; it moves on vehicles. We shall be making, I hope soon, transport aircraft and so many other things and I need not go into them. Of course great improvement has taken place in defence science. Science today is the basis for all progress in any matter. Unless we have that basic science, we cannot produce much. We have made as I have just mentioned, great progress in science in our laboratories and in addition to that in defence establishments. The House knows fairly well about the Atomic Energy Department which is an outstanding example of what can be done by our scientists. It has been done, if I may try to rub in a lesson with all deference, because the Atomic Energy Department has not only got a very able head but because he has followed a policy of picking people and giving them freedom to act. That is to say, all the innumerable procedures that encumber our work even in the Government of India have been simplified very greatly. Persons are picked. Take good people and trust them to do that job. They may make a mistake; you take the risk. If they do not do it, somebody else will have to do it. It is this type of procedure of choosing good men and giving them freedom that is essential. Allot him money and let him spend it and produce the results; you judge him by the results that are produced. This has produced remarkable results in the Atomic Energy Department. I think that we may well learn these things in our other departments of the Government of India. We have discussed this matter often and we continue to consider this—this business of decentralisation and of giving greater authority, not interference and not too much reference backwards and forwards. We have to do that. No science can progress unless freedom is given to the scientists. Apart from that all our major enterprises must be given freedom. Choose a good man and give him freedom. There is no other way; I am quite sure of it. It may be that we must be prepared for losses because losses occur in everything, not

deliberately but the thing may not come off. For instance, one of our finest engineers—he is in the Army—the Defence—came to me. He wanted to do something. He said there was 85 to 90 per cent chance of its coming off, and there was 10 to 15 per cent chance of failure, and asked, “May I go ahead with it?” Normally, nobody in the Government of India will go ahead with that, because that man is also afraid that there is 10 per cent chance of failure. I said, “Go ahead, and if you cannot help it and if you fail, we will put up with that” But at the back of his mind was this, namely, that if he failed—it was an experiment in the manufacture of something—he will get it not from this House or everywhere, but if he did not do it, we fail in not doing this thing at all. Therefore, whether it is private enterprise or public enterprise, one has to take certain risks. Choose your man and give him the opportunity to work. Pat him on the back if he does well, and if he does wrongly, and if it is no fault of his, it is a misfortune we have to face in that kind of new activities.

I should like to lay stress on this fact because it is highly important how we work. I may say that we have made some marked progress in decentralisation and been giving greater authority. Our O&M Division has done very good work and it is continuing that work. But the fact remains that even now, in some of our major enterprises—and they are very big enterprises—they have not evolved a simplified system of working and giving responsibility to the man on the spot.

There is another matter to which I should like to refer because it is important. The House may remember that about a year or two ago, we put forward a paper on our general approach to scientists. That is, we wanted to give them a better deal and we wanted to increase not only their emoluments but their general status, because from British times, we have inherited an apparatus of Government where experts, technicians and the like, are slightly considered outside the pale of the select and the elite which consists of administrators, and administrators of the old Indian Civil Service chiefly. Administrators are very important, no doubt, but all the work today is largely controlled by scientists and technicians, and unless one gives opportunities for these people to function properly and happily, progress has to be limited, because an administrator administers what is there. He does not normally speaking build a new world; he builds the existing world and that is important. What we are after is to build a new world A new India; every country is doing that, whether it is capitalist or communist, and therefore, the scientists, the technicians and the technologists are being pushed to the front. So, the paper we put forward was to this effect; to some extent it has been given effect to but not wholly, I hope it will be.

But in one matter, I find a curious snag and that is in regard to agriculture. It is fairly well known that the people who go to agricultural colleges are those who can get admission nowhere at any rate who can not easily go elsewhere. That is, the agricultural course of training does not attract our best students, while we go on talking all the time about agriculture being the first priority as it is. Yet, somehow, agriculture does not draw our best students. Why is it so? Is it because the prospects of the agriculture graduates or whatever he becomes are not bright? It requires

looking into and those prospects must be improved if they are not good enough to attract good students to our agricultural colleges etc.

The general approach, if I may say so, is that we must join any work that we have to the objective. Our work should be task oriented not do a day's job, but do in composite task. That should be the background of any organisation or any department or anything, and dispose off files. Where this has been done greater results have been flowed. Other but not in the way of speed that they would come if this outlook is more task oriented.

I should like to remind the House of one thing more. I think the House has been informed previously of a committee that we have appointed some little time ago to enquire as to where and how an additional income in the land is distributed and how far concentration of wealth takes place. This is a very important and vital matter. I have tried to find out, and I met some of the members of the committee. They said they are working at it and this question has turned out to be even more complicated than even they had imagined. It is such a complicated matter that you can not dispose of it by any broad principle. You have to work it, and I hope that the committee's labours will result in some practical recommendations which we might adopt.

All this which I have ventured to place before this House is, I hope important for the House to consider. But it is patent that all this economic development, social changes, etc., depend upon various basic factors basic factors that there is peace in India and in the world. If the world blows up, it takes many things with it and takes our Plans also largely with it. In India, if our attention is diverted from this business of implementing this Plan and if we are quarrelling among ourselves one may call it communal quarrelling, or language quarrelling or caste, or whatever it is all these factors which have become a bane in our existence and which weaken us, then naturally the work we envisage will suffer; India will suffer and the future of India will suffer.

Here, I may refer to one matter, although there are many which I might refer to, and that is the trouble in the Punjab. It has nothing to do directly with the Plan but it has everything to do with it, because it shows that people's minds are engrossed in narrow, sactional loyalties and have no concept of India, no concept of the progress of India or no concept of what the modern world is. It talks about things which really have relatively small importance in the modern context of things and matters which can be settled if looked at from this modern context easily. The Punjab is a brave province with a brave people and it is a tragedy that this courage and ability to work should be wasted in internal troubles. I hope, I understand, that some kind of settlement out of this morass will come in the Punjab.

May I remind this House that this question arose because of the language issue, but there is today or there should be at any rate, no language issue involved in it. It has shifted. It has gone somewhere else because even originally it was not the language issue. It was something else. It was a pure communal issue which was raised in the guise of language. When the language part became clear, more or less it shifted its ground. But so far as language is concerned apart from the fact that they have often

stated, Punjabi is the dominant and widespread language of the Punjab. There is no doubt about it. That does not mean that there are certain areas in Punjab where Hindi is the prevalent language. But Punjabi is the dominant language and so far as speaking goes, it is spoken by vast numbers there and understood by them. There are very few people there who do not speak and understand Punjabi. Even in Haryana, Punjabi speaking people, people have come a good number of them after partition.

It is impossible to divide Punjab in any way without leaving a large number of people who do not fit in with that principle of division, whichever way you divide and you produce the same problem in a more acute form, it depends on how this is done, but if anything is done in this context of bitterness of feeling and communal outlook, the consequences are very bad.

It should be realised that so far as the language question is concerned, some little time ago, 10 or 12 days ago, we had a conference here of Chief Ministers and Central Ministers and we discussed for three days the question of language, not in regard to any State or province, but in regard to the whole country. We came to certain conclusions which largely, of course, are a continuation of what was being done previously. But there are some changes, and I think changes for the good. I believe that those decisions of the Chief Ministers and the Central Ministers have been largely welcomed in the Press and by others all over India. There have been some criticisms, but broadly speaking, they have been welcomed and I think they form a good basis for the future.

I think that the language policy of our Government, or rather of our Constitution, as implemented subsequently, has been probably the most generous policy of any country. Many countries have got into trouble over the language question. Our neighbouring country, Ceylon, has had a good deal of trouble over it. But the founders of our Constitution took a broad view, a generous view, realised the importance of language and therefore acknowledged national languages a list of 13 or 14 languages and laid down other principles about mother tongue, protection of minority languages and the rest. If we accept all that, there is no room left for any kind of dispute on the language issue anywhere in India, provided those things are implemented. If they are not implemented, then of course, it is another matter.

A matter like language should really be considered not the political level, but in the educational level by educationists and the rest, and not as a means to change a political balance or something like that. That is another question, which should not be mixed up with language. It should be considered in a different way.

As I said, we had a conference of Chief Ministers to consider this problem of national integration and they considered this question of language. Of course, problems of national integration are not limited to language; they considered some other matters too and they will go on considering all aspects from time to time, because this is a living and continuing issue. We decided then to hold a wider conference, larger in numbers and wider in its context, *i.e.*, embracing people of different parties and groups in this House as well as outside, because this question should be treated in this wider

context, in a national sense and not in any kind of party sense. It is proposed that this wider conference should be held on the 28th and 29th September plus perhaps 30th also in Delhi and I hope that all the leaders of the various groups in this Parliament will be good enough to give us their help and cooperation in this matter. Thus, this question of national integration is basic, if our Plans and everything must be realised. Unless we succeed on that front, our other efforts are likely to fail.

Before concluding, may I read a few lines from this report? I am reading from page 19 the end of the chapter on objectives of planned development:

“Planning is a continuous movement towards desired goals and, because of this, all major decisions have to be made by agencies informed of these goals and the social purpose behind them”.

It is rather important to remember that, because if the agencies pull in different directions, naturally the Plan itself will tend to crack. The principal agencies which decide the Plan and implement it must have that basic idea in view and that basic social purpose in view.

“Even in considering a five year period, forward and longterm planning has always to be kept in view. Indeed, perspective planning is of the essence of the planning process. As this process develops, there is a certain rhythm of expansion in the development of the people, and a sense of enterprise and achievement comes to them. They are conscious of a purpose in life and have a feeling of being participants in the making of history. Ultimately, it is the development of the human being and the human personality that counts. Although planning involves material investment, even more important is the investment in man. The people of India today, with all their burdens and problems, live on the frontier of a new world which they are helping to build. In order to cross this frontier they have to possess courage and enterprise, the spirit of endurance and capacity for hard work, and the vision of the future.”

BACK NOTE

XXXV. Motion Regarding Third Five Year Plan, 21 August, 1961

1. SHRI ASOKA MEHTA (Muzaffarpur): Are these figures on constant prices? Which is the base?
2. SHRI TYAGI (Dehradun): Wonder if you have taken into account the rising population. Population also rises.

STATEMENT REGARDING TALKS WITH SANT FATEH SINGH

28 August, 1961

Mr. Speaker, Sir, a few days ago, I placed on the table of the House copies of correspondence which had passed between me and master Tara Singh and Sant Fateh Singh. This Correspondence began with a letter which I had addressed to Master Tara Singh on August 10, 1961 appealing to him to give up the idea of a fast which he had previously announced and which was to begin on the 15th August. The copies of the letters that I placed on the Table of the House ended with a letter from me dated August 23 addressed to Shri Fateh Singh Ji.

On that very day, namely August 23, Sant Fateh Singh came to Delhi and met me in the evening. We also met on the 24th and 25th August. Sant Fateh Singh was accompanied during these talks by Sardar Gurnam Singh. These talks were frank and friendly, but they did not lead to any agreement. Sant Fateh Singh thereafter, on the evening of the 25th August, returned to Amritsar.

Meanwhile, the fast which Master Tara Singh had commenced on the 15th August continued and is still continuing. Other fast was started in opposition to Master Tara Singh's fast by Swami Rameshwaranand in Delhi and Shri Surya Dev in Amritsar.

Governments have been much concerned about these fasts and have made repeated requested for their discontinuance. But all the efforts of Government has thus far not succeeded in this matter.

In the course of my long talks with Sant Fateh Singh and Sardar Gurnam Singh, stress was laid by them on what has been referred to as a Punjabi Suba, that is, a partition of the state of the Punjab as it is today so as to separate the purely Punjabi speaking area which should be made into a new separate State. I was unable to agree to this proposal because it seemed to me harmful both in principle and in its application. Further, any such demand based on that coercion exercised by a fast appeared to be an undesirable and harmful method opposed to the normal concepts of democracy and parliamentary procedure. Such a method would ultimately lead to a weakening of the democratic procedures in the country and would lead to other grave and difficult Problems.

On the merits of the proposed Punjabi Suba, I pointed out that in so far as the question of language was concerned, and more particularly the advancement of the Punjabi language, there should be no dispute or argument now. A great deal had been done to further the Punjabi Language both in education and in administration up to a certain level. And, as opportunities arose, more could be done. In fact, a settlement arrived at some years ago to divide the Punjab into two regions, namely the Punjabi

region and the Hindi region, had already resulted in full protection being given to the Punjabi language.

Soon after the settlement based on the regional formula was arrived at, there was some delay in giving effect to it because it involved the training of many thousands of teachers in the Punjabi language so that they could undertake education in the elementary stages in Punjabi. These teachers were called upon to learn both Hindi and Punjabi. As this training proceeded, a change-over took place in the medium of instruction in these regions. In addition to the proposals made in the regional formula for the advancement of Punjabi, other steps have also been taken with that end in view. It has also been decided to start a University for the Punjabi language.

Thus, in so far as the Punjabi Language is concerned, everything that has been asked for has been conceded and full opportunities have been provided for the growth of that language. The question, therefore, of demanding a Punjabi Suba in order to give facilities to the Punjabi Language does not arise. This demand for a Punjabi Suba thus can only be considered as a communal demand, even though it is given a Linguistic base. It seemed to us that the acceptance of the proposal which basically was communal would be wrong in regard to the formation of the State.

Apart from this, any division of the Punjab as it would be very harmful to all the people there and come in the way of the progress of the Punjab. The Punjab, as is well known, is one of the most prosperous of Indian States, and the per capita income of the people there is the highest in India, it is an economic unit, and to break this up would necessarily injure its developing economy and progress. At any time this would be undesirable. At the present moment, when the Third Five year Plan has just begun, it would be a blow to the State from which it would take many years to recover.

A state formed on the basis of the proposed Punjabi Suba would be one of the smallest in India and it is by no means sure that it would be easily viable.

The Punjab as a province was formed over a hundred years ago. It suffered greatly from its partition at the time of India attaining independence. It has, by the courage and hard work of its people, succeeded in largely overcoming the disabilities imposed by the partition. Another partition now would cause it deep injury.

Apart from the economic aspect, the Punjab, as it has grown, has formed a definite social and linguistic unit. The dominant language of the whole State has been and is Punjabi though in certain parts of it Hindi is the mother tongue. It has developed a certain linguistic and social culture which is peculiar to the Punjab and which distinguishes Punjabis, whether there they are Hindus or Sikhs or from whatever part of the State they may come. In effect, it is a Punjabi speaking State with certain area where Hindi is the language of minority groups. Hindi is of course, as laid down in the Constitution, also the all-India language for official purposes. Most people in the

Punjab understand both Hindi and Punjabi. There are innumerable families in the Punjab some of whose members are Sikhs and some Hindu. In fact, except for fairly recent communal developments, the Punjab has been more integrated State than almost any other State in India. To split it up and break this integration would be a tragedy, both from the social and the economic points of view. Linguistically, Punjabi would suffer. The Sikhs specially would be sufferers because their wide outlook, which has taken them to all parts of India where they have made good and succeeded in their activities, may to some extent, be replaced by a narrower outlook.

For all these and many other reasons, I pleaded with Sant Fateh Singh, and previously with Master Tara Singh, that their proposal to partition the Punjab again was harmful for the country, for the Punjab and more especially for the Sikhs.

If, however, anything further had to be done in regard to the advancement of Punjabi, we were perfectly prepared to consider it, as far as I could see, nothing further could be done from the linguistic point of view for the furtherance of Punjabi which could not be done in existing circumstances.

If the regional formula was not wholly satisfactory, this matter could be examined fully so as to make its working smoother and more effective if it was thought necessary, some additional powers could be given to in the regional committees.

It was suggested by Sant Fateh Singh that the regional committees should be given powers of legislation and converted into some kind of sub-legislatures. I was unable to agree to this as it was not only not in keeping with our constitution but would produce an extraordinary state of affairs in the Punjab with three legislatures functioning there.

It was stated that the regional formula had not worked and was practically dead. On enquiry I found that this was satisfactorily and, in fact almost all its recommendations had been accepted by the Punjab assembly, but I made it clear that I was fully prepared to have this matter examined by representatives of the regions and the Punjab government so that its working could be improved.

It has been repeatedly said that there was discrimination against the Sikhs, though instances of this had not been pointed out. I suggested, however, that if there was any such apprehension, a high level enquiry could be made into this matter to find out if there had been any such discrimination.

To my deep regret, the proposals I made were not acceptable to Sant Fateh Singh, and he insisted on the Punjabi Suba or, in the alternative, of the regions having special legislatures of their own. I could not accept either of these for the reasons I have stated already. I pleaded with Sant Fateh Singh to induce Master Tara Singh to give up his fast, because whatever the result of it, this could do no good and it was a wrong method. Wrong means could not lead to right results. I pointed out to him

that the future of the Punjab would be dark if there was conflict and tension between the Hindus and the Sikhs of the Punjab. It was only on the basis of mutual goodwill and cooperation that the Punjab could make the progress which was its due and for which it was so eminently fitted. Any further partition would inevitably create a great deal of ill will and conflict. It may even break up many families. In search of something which seemed to me trivial and even harmful we would lose the precious heritage which is common to all Punjabis, whether they are Hindus or Sikhs or Muslims.

I deeply regret my failure to convince Sant Fateh Singh. The unfortunate result is that Master Tara Singh's fast is still continuing. And so, also the fast of Swami Rameshwaranand and Shri Surya Dev.

The Future of the Punjab is important not merely for one group but for every Punjabi and indeed for the whole country. Many people, both Sikhs and Hindus, have tried their utmost to induce master Tara Singh and others to end their fasts and thus produce a climate when problems can be considered calmly and through democratic processes. Unfortunately they have thus far not succeeded.

The argument that linguistic provinces have been accepted elsewhere but not in the Punjab is not valid. No State in India is wholly unilingual. The Punjab is more homogenous and integrated than many other States in India. Even from the point of view of language, Punjabi is the dominant language. This does not mean that there are not languages of minority groups as elsewhere. Even if the broad principle of linguistic provinces is accepted, it is impossible and sometimes very harmful to carry it to extreme limits. Indeed this is not possible without breaking up India into numerous small bits. I would even say that the Punjab as it represents linguistically a homogenous area with certainly some linguist's minority groups. Any artificial division would leave large number of persons on either side whose sympathies would be for the other side. Thus an element of friction would be created and this would continued and prevent harmonious and co-operative working. To partition the existing State would not only be a break with history and tradition but would cause deep injury to the economy of the State and the lives of the brave people who live there.

I would again earnestly request Master Tara Singh to give up his fast. The suggestion I have made above about an enquiry into the working of the regional formula holds. So also the enquiry, if considered necessary, into the charge that there has been discrimination.

BACK NOTE

**XXXVI. Statement Regarding Talks with Sant Fateh Singh,
28 August, 1961**

-NIL-

DISCUSSION REGARDING STATEMENT ON PUNJABI SUBA

29 August, 1961

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, yesterday in the forenoon I made a statement in this House about recent developments in regard to the Punjab situation. I welcome this discussion in the House on that statement and surrounding facts. I shall frankly say that at first I was not very anxious to have a prolonged discussion here because behind these facts lie other facts and I was simply afraid that in the excitement of the moment some hon. Members may say something which might hurt others and hurt not only people here but hurt people outside. Because, this subject has drawn a great deal of attention-and rightly so-not only in Punjab where it was inevitable but elsewhere also and it has to be tackled with some care because, whether we want to or not, it cannot be easily dealt with by reason and logic alone. There is a tremendous deal of sentiment, even passion attached to it, as it does when large numbers of people are moved by anything. And when passions are excited, then words have to be chosen with some care lest they may further increase those passions and cause hurt to people, though it does not help in the solution of any problem.

Now, sir, in my statement yesterday, I stated briefly, I hope concisely, some of the reasons that were before me in rejecting the request or demand for a further division of the Punjab in the name of Punjabi Suba. This subject, in a sense, has been before us for a number of years. Some hon. Members have gone back to pre-Independence days. I do not want to go back to past history. It was before us about five years ago, just before the last general elections came up and as a result something happened later the regional formula was devised and so on and so forth. It has been intimately before me, occupying my mind almost daily for the last years or eleven months or so. I have given to it such thought as I was capable of doing. I have naturally been constantly consulting my colleagues here in the Central Government, in the Punjab Government and our other important colleagues from other parts of India. So, whatever has been done, has been done after the closest consultation and a great deal of thought had been given to it not only because there were some principles involved but even more, as one must, because we had to think of the possible consequences of every decision that we might take. It is all very well for some hon. Members opposite to talk of high principles. I am prepared to discuss those high principles with them in so far as they might apply but whatever principle you may follow, you have to think of the consequences of that when you have to deal with human beings, large numbers of human beings, who could be roused to passion. So, we have thought of the consequences a great deal and the decisions we arrive at are after giving thought to every possible consequence. I cannot talk of the distant future but I cannot see, myself, any possible arising, any consequence arising-which will make us change this decision.

Now, Sir, we have been discussing this matter here and sometimes it is not surprising that there was a little excitement in the course of the discussion. I am not complaining of that. But there is a rather interesting fact emerging from this discussion here; that out of, I think, fourteen hon. Members who have spoken on the subject, three hon. Members gave their support to the principles of the formation of the Punjabi Suba. They had of course every right to express their opinion. But it is still interesting to note that out of hundreds of hon. Member present here, no Member coming from Punjabi or near Punjab-any neighbouring province, or State-no Sikh or semi-Sikh has supported this demand for a Punjabi Suba. In fact, they have objected to it strongly for various reasons which they gave. Those who supported this demand-they had every right to do so and I do not challenge them-nevertheless came from places far away from the Punjab. I say so because this indicates to me that their knowledge of what Punjab is and what is happening there appears to be very, very limited. It is not an intimate knowledge which does not come from reading newspapers or reading long thesis or books, but a knowledge which comes from the contact with the people so that you have your hands on their pulses and know what is passing in their minds. Otherwise, you live in a kind of rarefied atmosphere where you think you are following a certain principle which has no bearing on the aspect whether it applies to the circumstances there or not. It is I think important to note that everyone connected with the Punjab or with the Sikhs, has-whoever has spoken-given strong support to the policy which the Government have adopted in regard to this matter.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX¹....

But some people are in the habit of going wrong even without the whip. That is more unfortunate. However, it is not a question of whip. If voting comes, hon. Members will vote. But no whip has been issued for people to speak in a particular way and even when issued it is not easy to speak unless one has some feeling and some knowledge of the subject.

After all, this issue in the Punjab today is a big issue even from the point of view of all India and, of course, of the Punjab. It is right that we consider every aspect of it and the possible consequences that may flow from any step that we might take. I have welcomed hon. Members who have expressed their disapproval of Government's policy in this matter. I had hoped, however, that in the speeches they delivered they would point out logically, reasonably, the arguments against that step. I am sorry so say-and I regret-that though what has been said has been said with force no doubt, I have not been able to even grasp a point of reason or logic there.

They have started with false analogies, saying, "We have accepted the principle of linguistic provinces; we have applied it in spite of difficulties and trouble in Maharashtra and Gujarat and even in Nagaland and so on; and therefore why not apply in here?" That is completely a false analogy. I am not going into past history about the principle of linguistic provinces. It is true we accepted it and we in the Congress accepted it 40 years ago, in the early twenties, and we accepted it for a very good reason, which reason applies today also not in the administrative sense, but

because we felt,-who was I then? For I was a young man- our elders felt that it was essential for us to function in the language of the people. That was the object, whether it is education or whether it is our public conferences and congresses or other things. That was the motive. We wanted to reach the people and get out of that organisation, whether it was the National Congress or the old Liberal League, which confined itself to speaking in English, to people who understood or sometimes even did not understand English but who appeared in frock coats and top hats and the rest. That was the big revolution that came to India through Gandhiji forty years ago or more. As a result, we attached importance to this language question and therefore, we said that linguistic area would be able to develop more. Nobody than thought in terms of power politics. It was the approach to the people educationally and administratively in the language of the people, so that they might know what is happening and they might associate themselves with it. There was a deliberate attempt to break from the English Raj or the British Raj, where some Englishman and some Indians speaking the English language, writing the English language, were functioning, cut off from the rest of the people. You can understand very well, it was not particularly easy for me in those days even to speak with great fluency before large audiences, but I compelled myself to do that because of this conviction. That was the beginning of the linguistic idea.

In 1921 I think, or may be 1922, because of this, the Andhra Province as a linguistic area was accepted by the Congress not today, not because of that gentleman's fast, but in 1921 it was accepted. In the Congress constitution, it was made into a separate province. So, it was an old idea. I cannot go into all these details. We may have gone wrong here and there and taken some wrong steps, but so far as the constitution of the Andhra province was concerned, it had been decided in 1921.

But the difficulty came because of a dispute about the city of Madras, which both the Tamil area and the Andhra area claimed. All that we could say was, "You settle this difficulty; we cannot compel you. We have no power to hand over Madras to Tamil area or Andhra area. You came to an agreement." It was about that time that the gentleman started the fast. It so happened-it was a curious coincidence-that just before the fast, an agreement was practically arrived at between the Andhra leaders and the Tamil leaders and our difficulties were removed. They were working it out in detail and this fast occurred. Even before the unfortunate tragic death of that gentleman.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX²....

...the question was decided. It was not decided-I want to make it perfectly clear-because of the fast; in fact, that fast, rather came in the way of a decision. The decision had been taken previously and when the Madras question was solved, the only thing that remained was the detailed working out. That was taking place and that fast came in the way of it, of course not ultimately, because we had decided it.

Take this question of Maharashtra and Gujarat, to which reference has been made. Some hon. Members' memories are short. That is a tragic episode. May be we

are guilty of it; maybe some of us are and the Government is guilty of it. I want to remind this House that the Government's decision in regard to the problem of the Bombay State was this. We drafted a Bill and it was actually introduced which actually said that there should be three States—the Maharashtra State, the Gujarat State and the City of Bombay State. That was the Bill which was introduced by the Government; that was our decision.

Some Members of this House—many of them—were not quite happy with this. Almost at the last moment, I got a memorandum signed by, I think, 272 Members of this House. I think I am right in saying that the initiative for the memorandum was taken by Shri Asoka Mehta and others agreed. In fact, every group in this House signed it, excepting I think the communist party, 272 was a large number. When I got that, and that included, please remember, the Gujaratis, the Maharashtrians and others in this House—at least some of them—I was put in a state of quandary because we had decided and we had put forward a Bill here. At the same time, I was not very happy with that Bill, I must confess it, and when 272 Members of Parliament of all parties except one came forward with a proposal to have one State of Gujarat, Maharashtra, Bombay etc., all together, well, in my heart I welcomed the idea. I welcomed it because I thought it represented the general consensus of opinion of the House. It was a false judgment; I confess that because after that trouble occurred in Gujarat and Maharashtra. But I never expected that, after this consensus coming in. Another difficulty arose, because this sudden change in Parliament rather upset the people who did not understand what had happened here—people in Gujarat and people in Maharashtra—and trouble came.

My whole point was, originally the Government had decided on a Maharashtra State, a Gujarat State and a City of Bombay state. Further, the city of Bombay was kept apart on this understanding that later if it chose it could join the Maharashtra State. The idea was that after the municipal corporation elections etc., if the majority wanted they could join it. At that time we did not want to push it and we were not quite sure of it.

I merely referred to it. That is no analogy here. As everyone knows, whatever the argument there was about the City of Bombay, in the whole of Maharashtra it was a homogeneous unit and there was not a single person in Maharashtra who did not hold to that opinion, that he should have a separate State. Some may for other reasons prefer something else, but they were all in favour of that. So also Gujarat was a homogeneous unit. There was no question of a group in Maharashtra being wholly opposed to that or a group in Gujarat being wholly opposed to that.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX³....

The hon. Member Dr. Aney is completely right. Vidarbha or a part of Vidarbha, anyway, had always put forward a different demand.

However, I am trying to explain this, that if you compare that with this Punjab issue you will see that there is no comparison at all. There is no comparison for a

variety of reason. First of all, I do not wish to go into linguistics, but the whole of Punjab, whether it is in regard to language, whether it is in regard to the ways of living, whether it is the food you eat and so many other things, it is a unity-whether it is Hindu or Sikh or, I may add Muslim now there are not many Muslims there. There are not those differences due to religion or due to language which you find elsewhere in India. It is true.

We talk so much about language. There nobody previously talked about language. Punjabi was the language-of course, in Haryana and parts of it Hindi was the dominant language Punjabi was the language and no argument ever arose. The argument arose recently on the question of script. That is the only argument there, please remember. There is no argument about the spoken language anywhere. About script, yes. What script? All this time there was neither Hindi nor Gurmukhi. It was the Persian script that was widely used. That was the official script, that was the popular script. That was the script taught in schools there. All our friends, the leading Akali leaders, if I may say so with great respect, if they had to write anything, wrote it in Urdu. That is the script they learned. They also wrote Gurmukh, I do not deny that; but suppose they talked to me and took notes they always wrote in Urdu, I have noticed that. That is the language everybody in the Punjab has learnt all this time. But poor Urdu, if I may say so, was not treated very well in the Punjab or elsewhere-in Delhi or in UP. It is a different matter. It is a different story. Here is something which was in common use and in common parlance. Even today, I believe, the newspapers both of the Akalis and of the Punjabi Hindus, that are most successful are in the Urdu language and Urdu script. It is an extra-ordinary thing. They both hit each other and argue against each other but in the Urdu script and in the Urdu language. This is their heritage in the Punjab. It is some-what forcibly being pulled out of that position, that groove into different grooves and into that controversy. Anyhow, script apart, this language is not only the dominant language of the Punjab but, apart from the Haryana Pranth, it is the predominant, the most important and the most known language. No doubt about it, script apart.

When I say it is a dominant language, I refer to it rather moderately. It is something more than a dominant language, I would say, so far as the Punjabi homes are concerned. It may vary as sometimes dialects vary. But every man understands it just as a very large number of people understand Hindi too. The difference between the two is not very great. If I stay for a fortnight in the Punjab, I begin to pick it up- I mean the nuances and the sounds of the language. As I get accustomed to them, I pick it up, partly because in the childhood I was visiting the Punjab. I may well call myself half a Punjabi.....

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX⁴....

....in the sense that my mother came from Punjab. She came not from our present Punjab but from what is Pakistan Punjab, from Lahore. I easily pick it up. I am sure anybody can pick it up easily. It is partly Hindi-it sound slightly differently. The moment you get hold of those different sounds, you pick it up. So, really and

essentially Punjabi and Hindi are the common languages there and Punjabi is a home language which is the real test. It is not that you write it in offices, it is a home language of innumerable people.

As has been repeatedly said here, in the Punjab it is very difficult for you to divide the Sikh from the Hindu. There are innumerable families which are half-Hindu and half-Sikh. The Hindus go to Gurdwaras and revere the Sikh Gurus and the Guru Granth Sahib. They are interwoven like warp and woof of a garment. What troubles me, apart from these arguments and principles, is that we will tear that garment if this principle comes in and is applied in this way. We talk of Punjabi Suba and all that, but if you separate them you will tear a finely woven tapstry into two bits and spoil it. It is very basic thing. Unfortunately, as things have developed that is the danger.

Sardar Hukum Singh said that you must consider the position as it is today. Whatever it was in the past and apart from the past, whatever one's views may be in the present it has become almost inevitable that if any such thing is done in the present circumstances it will be the tearing up process with awful consequences. That is the consequence Shri Goray talked about the consequences. No doubt, he has consequences in view, thereby perhaps meaning some civil troubles, rioting and all that. But the kind of consequences I have been thinking over are something far more vital, namely, the tearing up of the integrated community into two. It is a very basic and a terrible thing. That is what I have in view and that has caused me concern. That is why I have resisted this idea. Hon. Members think and rightly-I accept that I am soft and give in to pressures. I accept that I want to give in to pressures wherever I can. That is, I want to win over people to my side. I do not want to stick out like a rigid stick which cannot bend. I am person of principle. I hope, not in matters of principle, I hope, not in matters which I consider important. Otherwise, I am always prepared to bend. You cannot deal with this country without flexibility and trying to bend and trying to win over people.

But, with all my desire to bend, I found it impossible to adapt myself to this idea of tearing up this woven garment of Punjab social life. Because, it means the tearing up of the social life of Punjab. Perhaps, this question has arisen now more particularly because, unfortunately, five or six months later, elections are coming. I attach greater importance to this integration of the Punjab than to the general elections and all that. What is the good of winning a few seats this way or that way in the general elections if, in the process, you tear up something which has been wrought through the ages? Over 100 years now, this State of Punjab or the Province of Punjab is continuing and has developed its own life, its own culture and its own language, of course, superimposed by the British Raj, by English, by Persian and all that. Nevertheless, it has developed in the village, in the town everywhere. What is more wherever a Punjabi goes a Hindu or a Sikh, he carries that with him. If you meet them in London, two Punjabis will always talk in Punjabi. If you meet them anywhere else, in America, in Singapore-they have gone far and wide-they have got the Punjabiness with them. You cannot divide. There is the Sikh Punjabi; there is the Hindu Punjabi. It is a good thing. Sometimes,

this Punjabiness is slightly irritating, because they stick together as Punjabis. That is a good thing so far as the Punjab is concerned. All this would lead to the breaking up of the thing built through the ages. I think it is very serious. Talking vaguely about the principle of linguistic states and all that simply shows that they have no conception of what Punjab is. It is a linguistically integrated area, as integrated as any part of India, socially integrated, by habit, by custom, by living, by meeting. In every way it is an integrated area. You want to break it up. Really this thing shocks me.

Reference was made right at the beginning to the States Reorganisation commission's report. Shri Goray swept it aside saying that it is dead and gone. It may be dead or gone, I do not know. The whole point is that the States Reorganisation Commission considered this matter of Punjab before passions had been roused to this pitch as they are now. They had some pressure as pressures come; nothing very much. What is important is the argument that they have put forward calmly after full discussion, after meeting everybody there. After that argument they are coming to this firm decision that any breaking up of the present Punjab is undesirable and harmful to everybody. This is important. Otherwise, they have not passed a decree which binds us. They were three able thinking persons who enquired into this matter at a time when pressure were not so great from any side and they came to this conclusion. I would advise hon. Members, if they have a little time, to read that chapter. It will take 10 or 15 minutes to read. Because, it is a very reasoned chapter showing what the Punjab is, how the life of the Punjabis, of the Hindus, of the Sikhs and others is inter-laced and intertwined. You cannot separate it. That is the important thing. All that has happened—not merely the question of the Punjab Suba now—unfortunately, all that has happened in the last few years has put a great strain on that unity among the Punjab people. People talk about the necessity of Hindu-Sikh unity and all that. But, the fact is that they have been behaving otherwise. I do not wish to accuse anybody. But, the fact of the matter is that both the Akali party on the one side and certain Hindu organisations on the other are equally guilty of putting strain on this. Both of them, in the name of language or something else, have raised slogans and roused passions against each other which has been very painful. And this has ended in, and this has led to this present position of this demand, on the one side, of the Punjabi Suba and an equally emphatic and strong rejection of that demand by the others, thus creating a situation that whatever the principle involved, linguistic or other, you cannot do it today. It is a patent fact; you cannot do it. In spite of what Shri H.N. Mukerjee might think or say or Shri Goray may think or say, you cannot do it, I mean in the sense that you cannot do it without creating trouble everywhere in the Punjab. There may be trouble otherwise too, and you may balance the two troubles. That is a different matter. But it is obvious that this ease is entirely different from a homogeneous Maharashtra, from a homogeneous Gujarat. Here is a place where every family is hit, or many families are hit. Here is a place where every village is hit, where you have not got a homogeneous population; you have got a homogeneous Punjabi population, I admit that, but I include the whole of the Punjab in that. I say, from that point of view, the Punjab is a linguistic area as good as any in

India, and better than some with certain minority languages; like minority languages is the Hindi language which is the home language of many people there in the Haryana Pranth. I admit that. But, broadly speaking, the whole of the Punjab is a linguistic area and it follows even the linguistic principles that we have laid down as closely as it can; you cannot separate every village or every family like that. Apart from that, it is, as I have said, a socially integrated area, which is far more deep, which goes down deeper into the people.

So, these passions have been roused. Now, at this stage, apart from the other reasons at any stage, at this stage, to try to do this is to invite trouble. I do not know, if a Punjabi Suba was formed, I certainly would not like to be in that Punjabi Suba, or, for that matter, a Minister or any person in authority, because he will have to face the opposition of a very large part of the population; in terms of statistics, it may be 45 per cent; or it may be more or it may be a little less. How could he function with 45 per cent of the population not agreeing with him, mind you, not on the question of language, because 45 per cent itself would be speaking Punjabi, but because the way it has grown up, there is no doubt about it that it has grown up not as a linguistic issue but as a communal issue; I have no doubt about it because it has grown up as a communal issue, other communities take objection? And they oppose it, and they will go on opposing it, for, Punjabis have many virtues, but yet they are very quarrelsome people. They quarrel amongst themselves. How any person, any thinking person, whatever his original views might have been, could possibly say 'Do this or agree to do it now or six months later' surprise me, because it cannot just be done.

Shri Goray repeatedly talked about statesmanship and generosity, addressing the Government. I should like to request him to apply his statesmanship to this problem and see how this can be done. I say that it is inviting disaster, and disaster to the poor Punjabi State or the Suba that might be formed, absolute disaster to it, trouble all the time; and possibly- I do not say that it will happen, but to some extent even it may happen people may start moving out from one place to another; there may be small migrations here and there. Are we going to live through this experience again? It was conceivable, whatever the consequences, good or bad, it was conceivable to split up the Punjab; you can do anything you like; Parliament can do anything, but it can only be done, even so, peacefully and by widespread agreement among the people concerned. You cannot do it because the moment you do that, you invite tremendous trouble and, if not bring ruin, at least do great injury to the Punjab anyhow, and create conditions and injuries which will take a long time to heal, economic injuries, social injuries and other injuries deep down to the heart of various communities, which will take a mighty long time to heal. Look at the consequences.

So, I should like hon. Members to see this background. I do not wish to go into details, to repeat the various arguments raised.

Shri H.N Mukerjee said something about the State functioning in its principal language. That is what is exactly happening there. He does not know the facts, he does not know what is happening there.

Take the Regional Formula. It may be good or bad; I am not going into that matter. It was in a sense good; in a sense, it was bad also, in that it encouraged some wrong tendencies. By itself it is a good thing. It is an extraordinary thing that when the Regional Formula was passed, at that time and after, the leaders of the Akalis, and Master Tara Singh, said quite clearly, 'No more Punjabi Suba.' He wrote, and he told us publicly, not in private, 'No more Punjabi Suba; we are satisfied.' Within two or three months of that, out came opposition and disagreement. I was amazed and astonished because I had gone all out and tried to bring about a settlement.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX⁵....

I speak from memory, but I think he publicly said so too. And as part of it, it had been decided that the Akali Party would give up its political aspect, and it actually amended its Constitution.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX⁶....

I say so because now it has been repeated. Shri Asoka Mehta made a statement. A promise was made. This is exactly what happened five years ago. Now we have come back. Within two or three months of the promise, it was not kept.

As I was saying, the Regional Formula was devised. I went all out with such flexibility and softness as I possessed to win over Master Tara Singh and his colleagues. Temporarily, I believe, I had produced some impression on him too. But it was not enough. Then followed this break very soon. The elections came and there was a break.

Apart from that, the Regional Formula, in so far as language was concerned, gave everything that you could conceive of. They made the Punjabi region and the Hindi region. A large number of subjects were allotted to the Regional Committees to deal with. The persons who formed the Regional Committees were members of the Punjab Legislature coming from that region. So that the Punjab Legislature became two committees.

First of all, a rather odd thing happened. For months and months, the Regional Committees would not function at all. Why? Because they were carrying on an argument about their status-what were they? Were they statutory organizations or were they Committees of the Assembly or what were they? Their Chairmen claimed that they were independent statutory organizations with nothing to do with the Punjab Assembly, although they were all Members of the Assembly. The Speaker of the Punjabi Assembly could not accept this. Ultimately, the matter was referred to us. The Speaker wrote to me. I am no lawyer. *Prima Facie*, my own view was: How could they be independent organizations? They were Committees of the members of the House, presumably connected with the House. Anyhow, I sent it to our Law Minister. He sent me, as is his custom, a long note of about 20 pages on the subject, which seemed to be very simple. In the note there were lots of quotations from text-books and what not. It said, 'They cannot be independent. They are only Committees of

Now, if you examine this position from the language point of view, there was no further question of language left. I may add that it had been decided that in the Punjabi region, Punjabi should be used for administration purposes up to the district level, and in the Hindi region Hindi should be used up to that level. That is being done.

Educationally, and from the point of view of administration at the lower levels, and progressively in the higher levels, all this was done. Every State employee in the Punjab Government, I believe, has to learn both Punjabi and Hindi, because he has to deal, he may have to deal, with papers in both. All this has been done.

I should merely like to know where any obstruction has come in the promotion of the Punjabi language, what difficulty in its promotion has come, because, apart from the subjects that had been agreed to, many other things have been done. A Punjabi university is being started. That was not referred to them. It is an additional thing. When people talk about functioning in Punjabi, that is exactly what is happening there. You cannot have it more. No question of Punjabi arises, of language arises there, that is to say in the Punjabi region which presumably would become the Punjabi Suba. It has full command over the language. Punjabi is the primary language, and Hindi is the secondary language; and in the Hindi area, Punjabi is secondary, and everybody has to learn it, while Hindi is the primary language; with the result that vast numbers of people outside the Punjabi area have to learn Punjabi today. And some object to it-I think they object wrongly to it, but they do object to it-and the influence and the spread of Punjabi has been much greater than at any time. Punjabi has made more progress in the last eight or ten years than in the last hundred years.

All this has happened. So that, it is said that it is a language issue, an issue of a linguistic province, I just want to understand where Punjabi does suffer, how it suffers. It will suffer under Punjabi suba, that is to say it will suffer taking the whole of Punjabi into consideration. Maybe that in the Punjabi region alone it may flourish. Possibly. Even so it would not flourish more than it is flourishing today. I cannot see what linguistic principle is involved.

You may say it is a contradiction of my own argument that actually today, linguistically, we have got a Punjabi region. And, I say the whole of Punjab is a linguistic one; and you may say it is a contradiction. It is partly a contradiction, not wholly. But the question has arisen because of this argument.

I would much rather that we had no regions at all and everyone in the Punjab were made to learn both Hindi and Punjabi and be done with it. And there it is and both the languages would flourish. In a sense this is happening though in a slightly inverted way. So no question of language can arise now.

I must submit to the House that there is some criticism of the way the regions are working, or in the way Punjabi is being encouraged. Let us consider it. I have given my word. Let us sit down and consider it and remove that obstruction. I cannot remove it. I suggested that this cannot be done by a fiat from Government. Let representative of the region sit down, representatives of the Punjab Government

and representatives of the Central Government; also if you like add some educationists to it. These things are educational questions—the question of language. And we shall remove the obstruction.

So, the point I wish to impress upon this House is that there is no question of language which comes up anywhere. If it is not a question of language then what is it—all this business? Obviously, as some hon. Members have pointed out, it is a communal question. It does not necessarily make that a communal question must be a wicked question or a bad question although it may be coming in a bad garb and with bad associations. Nevertheless, it may have some virtue in it. But I do not know what the virtue is so far as this matter is concerned.

Now, there is one matter which I should like to mention here. I heard today, only about an hour ago from some Members of Parliament who saw Master Tara Singh and Sant Fateh Singh that Sant Fateh Singh said that in my statement yesterday I had said something which was not true. I was rather surprised. I asked, what is it? He is reported to have said: 'I never said that there should be 3 legislatures'. You will remember I had said that Sant Fateh Singh wanted the Punjabi Suba or in the alternative two sub-legislatures, both regional committees becoming legislatures, which meant to me 3 legislatures. So, he said: 'I never wanted three; I only wanted two' if he wanted only two, it means Punjabi Suba again. It means nothing else. And the word sub-legislatures was used. So, sub-legislature means that there is some other legislature somewhere else. He explained, those friends told me, that what he was thinking of was two legislatures, not full-blooded, not having all the subjects. For instance, finance may not be in it; or maybe law and order may not be in it; but the remaining things would be there. Finance and law and order were not to be dealt with by any other government or legislature but should be the direct responsibility of the Governor.

It is a novel conception. The whole thing is quite novel; two legislatures and a third. It is a novel thing and not provided by our Constitution. When I pointed out that I was told, 'Change the Constitution'. Of course, the Parliament can do that or any-thing it likes but it is not easy to change the Constitution, and this kind of change particularly. I am sorry if I misunderstood Sant Fateh Singh and gave a wrong impression in my note. But that was the only reasonable explanation I can make of what he said. If it meant only two, it means really going back to two truncated legislatures.

I would like to point out one thing worth bearing in mind. Since Partition, that is the Big Partition, as everyone knows, large numbers of people came from Pakistan to India and went from India to Pakistan; large numbers of Punjabis went and Punjabis came and a good number of these people who have been settled in the Hindi-speaking area of our Punjab so that you have got a new integration—Punjabi-speaking people in the Hindi speaking area. I do not quite know but I am told that it runs into lakhs. Some people gave me a very big figure; I will not mention it; it is not right. All these Punjabi-speaking people, Hindus mostly, are settled in the Hindi-speaking area and naturally they are picking up Hindi. That does not mean that Punjabi ceases to be

their language. Unfortunately, an agitation was carried on before the last general elections among these people to declare in the census that their language was Hindi and not Punjabi although they spoke Punjabi in their homes. What was the purpose of it I do not know. But it was not a truthful statement and it did a lot of harm. It increased these tendencies for separation and the frictions and, as I pointed out, it was a bad thing. Because, the whole thing behind all this is-maybe power policies and all that-ultimately lack of faith of each other, lack of faith of Sikhs of Hindus and of Hindus of Sikhs. There was fear and lack of faith. This business certainly created an impression among the Sikhs: look at these people; their language is Punjabi but they want to decry their birthright in this way; how are we to trust them? It was a legitimate complaint; it was a bad thing to do. I think many of these people have gone back to Punjabi, many people who had put down Hindi at that time; now they were going back to Punjabi because that was their language. How many have gone, how many not, I cannot say. Perhaps the next census will show.

One thing more. I have not referred to it but other Members have. That is about hunger-strike to enforce political demands or any demand. Some hon. Members said that this was a legacy for which the Congress is responsible or for which Gandhiji is responsible. Well. That is partly correct. Of course Gandhiji indulged in hunger-strikes and did so for very special reasons, special objectives but never for a political objective of this type. But I admit that anyhow, we cannot judge these things from that point of view and the time of the struggle and all that. But I think that we should make it perfectly clear that hunger-strikes will not be recognized as legitimate in the solution of any problem and there has also been a peculiar difficulty, apart from the others that I have pointed out in this particular case, Master Tara Singh's hunger-strike and previously Sant Fateh Singh's hunger-strike, because if that impression grows that they hunger-strike has succeeded in achieving a certain object, then there will be no end to trouble in India. In every problem, in everything somebody may go on hunger strike and it is quite impossible. Just today we are told of what happened in Andhra and therefore it is said we must have it in this case. We have always referred to Andhra, Gujarat or Maharashtra. All these cases are completely different. We will always be told about this. Therefore, both on principle and on practical considerations, we cannot accept this method, and it must be made perfectly clear to all concerned. I hope that the hon. Member sitting opposite will not indulge in his usual habit of hunger-strike too.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX?⁹....

You are completely right, Sir.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX¹⁰....

He must have learnt the art of getting better after a hunger-strike! Anyhow, I submit that, looking at this problem from any point of view, whether it is on the ground of principle, whether it is on the ground of practical application, and more especially from the point of view of things as they are today and the dangers of any

step being taken which will have fatal consequences from the point of view of the whole of India and especially of the Punjab, the policy that the Government have followed is the right policy.

As the House know, and as may be seen from the correspondence that I exchanged with Master Tara Singh and Sant Fateh Singh. I met them, I have spoken to them and I have written to them. I pleaded earnestly, and deferentially. There was no question of my ordering anybody. But I pleaded with them and I shall go on pleading, if necessary, but pleading does not mean giving up something which I consider vital. Therefore, I hope it will be clearly understood by everybody outside this House that the policy which the Government is pursuing is not only a firm policy but a right policy, and any marked deviation from it would be very injurious to the country.

BACK NOTE

XXXVII. Discussion Regarding Statement on Punjabi Suba, 29 August, 1961

1. SHRI RAJENDRA SINGH: A whip has been issued.
2. SOME HON. MEMBERS: Potti Sriramulu.
3. DR. M. S. ANEY (Nagpur): Do not include the people of Vidarbha also in that statement.
4. SHRI TYAGI: No, no; I protest.
5. SHRI TYAGI: Did he publicly say 'No more Punjabi Suba?'
CH. RANBIR SINGH: They amended the Constitution of the Akali Party also to that effect.
6. CH. RANBIR SINGH: Yes.
7. SHRI VAJPAYEE (Balrampur): There were two cases.
8. CH. RANBIR SINGH: Both were from the Hindi region.
9. MR. SPEAKER: He goes on hunger-strike to improve his health!
10. MR. SPEAKER: I have always found him better after a hunger-strike.

CONSTITUTION [TWELFTH AMENDMENT] BILL

14 March, 1962

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, be taken into consideration".

This Bill, as the House well knows, relates to Goa, Daman and Diu, and it is a very short Bill, a simple Bill, and I take it, a completely non-controversial Bill.

Although it is short and simple, it is a Bill of considerable importance, and in placing this before this House, the whole history of 400-451, to be accurate years comes up before me, and I suppose before many Members of this House, the whole history which started when Vasco da Gama landed in India in 1498, I think. Subsequently, the fierce inquisition that took place there and subsequently so many other things that have happened in Goa during these years—I am not going to take up the time of the House in regard to that, but the House will remember that repeatedly during these 450 years there have been revolts against Portuguese rule in Goa, suppressed in a rather bloody manner. This rule came in later when the Moghul Empire was gradually disintegrating and there was no strong central authority in India to take steps against any foreign incursion. Later, the British came here and occupied India, a very large part of India. That process itself was a fairly lengthy one, and the Portuguese remained in India, parts of India, under the cover of British rule, because the British authorities thought it fit to allow them to remain. They did not remain there because of their own strength but under the shadow of British rule they remained there.

When we long, long ago started our movement for independence, obviously we thought that independence meant the independence of the whole of India, including the enclaves that were possessed at that time by the French and the Portuguese, but the enclaves were so small that our main movement for independence was directed against British rule, and we took it for granted that when British rule ceased in India, the other enclaves would also be freed. We never thought that there would be any difficulty about that. And so, when independence came, our thoughts went to these enclaves, French and Portuguese.

We had repeated discussions with the French, and it took a few years to settle this question with them. There were discussions based on our own Constitution, legal matters and the rest, but there were discussions as between two different countries. Ultimately they agreed and the physical possession of the French territories in India was made over to the Union Government.

I said just now that there were discussions as between two Governments. We agreed with something, we did not agree with something, we discussed them. With the Portuguese we tried to do the same thing. We appointed a special Minister in Lisbon to

discuss these matters and sent them a note, but they refused to take the note. Subsequently we made various attempts to raise this question before them and they did not even discuss the question. Ultimately we had to withdraw our Minister in Lisbon.

That had been the situation for the last so many years. But in India there was naturally very great frustration and disappointment at this, what shall I say, difficulty of moving onwards in regard to Goa. In Goa itself there was trouble, and though there had been numerous revolts against the Portuguese Government in the past, there was no such revolt now because conditions were different and people in India and in Goa naturally thought in terms of some kind of non-violent or peaceful approach, accustomed as they were to our own methods in achieving our independence. This was attempted unofficially by large numbers of people, and this was suppressed in a very cruel manner by the Portuguese, and many people were killed. Now, this went on, and all of us in India felt that our independence was not complete till Goa was free.

Now, during this period, that is, since the independence of India, the Portuguese decided to declare that Goa was one of the overseas provinces of Portugal, that Goa was Portugal in fact, which was an extraordinary proposition, and certainly we could not accept it, nor could anyone else, although, unfortunately, in the course of the last few years, some countries did give some approval to that position. Now, at any rate, that is absolutely clear because the United Nations last year declared that Goa was a colony, which it was.

Then came recent events, and among the recent events were not only those that happened in Goa, but also what was happening in other Portuguese colonies like Angola. Although Angola has nothing to do with India, a great deal of feeling was roused in India and it still exists about Angola; first of all, about colonialism in general and, secondly, more especially, about Angola and the way the Portuguese were suppressing that movement in an extraordinarily cruel manner.

I mention all this although it has nothing to do with Goa because it did affect people's minds in India very much all our minds.

Then, about 7 months back, I ventured to state in this House, I think, that we could not rule out any other measures, any sterner measures, even military measures in regard to Goa. I gave them notice; I gave them and other countries notice. And even so, as I stated then, we hoped to settle this matter peacefully.

There is another unfortunate aspect of this question which encouraged Portugal to hold on to Goa and to refuse to talk to us even. That was the active or passive approval by certain powers, allies of Portugal, to the then existing position in Goa. I feel—I cannot say I feel sure—it might have been easier to settle this peacefully if those ether powers had exerted their efforts to this end.

Ultimately, and rather suddenly, if I may say so, although our minds had been prepared for all this, our hands were forced by what took place in and just outside Goa. There was, the House will remember, some firing on Indian shipping carrying on in the normal way, not entering Goa, and some actual incursions

from outside, the Goanese territory, into India proper. That made it difficult for us not to take any steps to prevent this kind of thing happening. And, we, thereafter, took steps and sent some military forces there. The fact is that these military forces functioned—they hardly functioned in a military manner there—and within a few hours—it may be called 24 hours or 36 hours; it depends upon the measure of time—the whole thing was over. We could not have done so if there had been any real resistance; it could not have been done so if the people of Goa themselves were opposed to it. In fact, the people of Goa welcomed the Indian forces to come there.

Ever since we took possession of Goa, it was our advice—we consulted our legal advisers—that under article 1 of the Constitution Goa became part of the Indian Union and all that was necessary for us was to declare, in Schedule I, I think, that Goa is part of the Union. It was decided to do so by making Goa one of the Union Territories. I think that is the right thing because within that Union territory any amount of economy or self-government can be given. It does not come in the way of autonomy.

There has been, recently, a proposal that Goa should be a separate State, in the normal sense that States are. We have been unable to agree to that. But, quite apart from that fact, it would be quite impossible to constitute it as a State at the present moment because things are not wholly settled. We would require all kinds of State apparatus there. At present there is military governorship functioning with the civil laws to help it. And, the second Bill that I hope to place before this House a little later refers to our accepting the legal system there, not changing the laws except what we want to. We feel that this is the simplest way of changing the Constitution and giving a certain authority and permanence to what has happened.

The Bill, as placed before the House, is a very very simple Bill. It simply says that in Schedule I, Goa, Diu and Daman be added to the other places there. That is all.

That gives us plenty of opportunity to think and put before this House, ultimately, the exact measures to be taken within Goa to grant it an autonomous position. We have made it clear that we want Goa to maintain its separate identity, separate individuality, call it what you will, because in the course of more than 400 years Goa has had a separate identity and the course of history had imparted it some. We have no intention of changing that or suppressing that identity. In fact, some people have advised us to make another change in the Constitution and to recognise the Konkani language as one of the official languages of India.

There are many languages in India which we recognise for purposes of administration, education etc. which are not mentioned in the Schedule about languages attached to the Constitution. But, in any event, I want to make it clear that we want to give full place to the Konkani language in Goa and not to ignore it or to suppress it in any way. That is the main language of Goa. Maybe, there are very few persons who know the Portuguese language, a number of people know Marathi and a smaller number, probably, know Kannada. But Konkani is the principal language and we propose to give it full recognition in that matter.

So, the position is that this principle will apply to Goa and Daman and Diu—Daman and Diu are slightly different. But, broadly this principle will apply to them; they will be Union territories and they will have a good deal of autonomy; their individuality, their language and their customs etc. will be completely preserved.

Therefore, I place this Bill before this House. Although, as I said, it is a small Bill, a simple one, it does mean the end of an e-poch and the beginning of another for Goa and for India. Therefore, to some extent, this Bill has something of history attached to it and I feel that for this House, which has thought so much and thought so much passionately about Goa in these many years, it is a matter of great satisfaction that this question has been settled; this anachronism, can I call it of history, has been removed and the independence of India has become complete.

I feel proud to be able to place this matter before this House and I must say the House will appreciate that this simple Bill ends a part of history which is not pleasant for us to remember and starts a now historical e-poch in India.

Sir, I have little to answer. Some criticisms have been made not on this Bill, but rather on events preceding this Bill, of our embassies not having properly informed the people of the countries to which they are accredited on the Goan situation. I am not going to deal with that matter. To some extent perhaps the criticism may be justified. But, on the other hand, I do not think that hon. Members who have criticised our embassies knew all the facts and perhaps could not know all the facts.

Normally ambassadors do not deliver public speeches. There is an exception in the case of the United States where apparently they do; all of them do. But in other countries they do not publicly do what might be called some kind of publicity or propaganda. They make diplomatic approaches and of course circulate some publications which explain their countries' attitude.

In regard to United States especially, it was said that the Indian Embassy got cold feet. I should say that there have been few better statements on the Goan case than that put out by our Ambassador in Washington. It was at a speech he delivered after the Goan action, certainly a little after, but at some public gathering—I forgot what it was. It was a very clear, emphatic and convincing case. The difficulty has been that people often criticise our lack of propaganda. I do not know what kind of propaganda hon. Members expect us to do. All the propaganda in the world does not affect a closed mind, or a mind that is made up.

In Delhi there are a large number of foreign correspondents. What they say from Delhi has a greater effect than what our embassies might say, because our embassies are supposed to repeat official propaganda. Delhi is not a place cut off from the rest of the world. There are plenty of foreign correspondents who send their own opinions and views about conditions here.

Apart from this, Goa was viewed in the West from the point of view of the cold war, because Portugal was an ally of certain powers and they did not wish to say anything against Portugal. In fact they often said something which was in favour of Portugal. The result was that there was a closed mind to it. They would not accept the

things we said. It is quite possible that something more could have been done on our behalf, but to say that nothing was done is not correct. A great deal was done in the course of fourteen years—it was not done continuously.

Then again Mr. Nath Pai referred in his speech that I should have said something to Mr. Khrushchev, Mr. Macmillan and President Kennedy. He specially referred to President Kennedy. It is true that I did not discuss Goa with him, but I spoke to him about it, that is to say, I referred to Goa. I must confess that I am rather hesitant, or I have too much of conceit .to appeal to people. I put across an idea. It is up to them to accept it or not. I do not go on my knees to anybody, whoever he may be.

The day I arrived in New York, that very day, there was a big television interview. At the television interview I was asked a question if the masses of India felt excited about the Berlin situation. I said, "Certainly not". I said, "the masses of India do not know anything about it, or very little; of course, many of us, so-called politicians and people interested in public affairs know about it and do think it is highly important, it may lead to war; but to say that the masses of India feel excited is not correct".

Then I added; "but the masses of India do feel terribly excited about the Goan situation, about Goa". I said, "I know that the Berlin situation is far more important than the Goan situation from the point of view of the world, war and peace and all that; but, nevertheless, to the average Indian, Goa is a much more important issue than even Berlin, important as that is".

I thought that that way of putting it by me might help in the American public realising the importance that we attached to Goa. And when I spoke to President Kennedy I referred to this television interview of mine, to say how much importance we attached to Goa. I did not, I confess, go any further to discuss it with him. But I told him how much importance we attached to it. I thought it was up to him to consider this aspect of the case. At that time, I should like to add, we had not taken any decision about taking any action in Goa. I was in the United States in November, in the early part of November. This decision was taken in December, sometime after I came back. And it was rather speeded up by the events have happened round about Goa, the firing on our steamers and all that. These things by themselves were not of high importance; but coming at a critical moment, coming when we were highly worked up on this question of Goa they had that effect. Immediately we thought that if they fired at our ordinary oceangoing liners and we cannot protect our passengers and crew, it is a bad thing, we must protect them. We decided to protect them.

That led to other questions: if we protect them, what will be the next step? Are we going to remain just protecting them on the sea when somebody is firing from the coast? And, step by step, logically we came to the conclusion that we cannot protect them from the sea without taking action on land.

All this occurred in December. I had no notion—although vaguely I had said previously that we might have to take other measures—I had no notion that we would take this action when I was in America. I say this because some people in America said, "Why didn't you say so here?" Well, previously I had no notion of that.

Secondly, when we had decided to take this action We felt, and our military advisers felt strongly that this action should not be broadcast to the world before it took place. Because, it might lead to complications. One does not take such action. The whole essence of that action was swift and effective action. If it loses that swiftness and effectiveness by previous declarations we might get entangled. Of course, there is no doubt that we would have won, but we would have won in a different way. We might have got entangled in all manner of things, military and other. So we were not able to say much.

As a matter of fact, the mere fact of the special trains going and others led people to believe that something was going to happen. Rightly, they thought so. And, other countries, including the United States of America asked us about it. Our answer was that we were forced into taking action. We did not mention the date or what kind of action we intended to take but that we were forced to take action. And it was pretty clear that we were going to take action. They knew about it.

It was not only argued, but our case was put before them, that is before the foreign officers of the countries concerned, as well as some other friendly countries in Asia and elsewhere before.

And then, of course, when we took action, again, it was fully explained.

But I beg of the House to remember that publicity in any country of Europe almost, or America, is not governed by the number of leaflets or pamphlets that one issues. Of course they should be issued. It is not easy for a man even to get an opportunity to speak in public there. That is, there won't be many persons to listen to him. And when he speaks there will be no publicity in the newspapers; they will not publish what he says. I am not complaining about that. That does not apply to us alone, it applies to various other countries too. They will pick and choose what they publish, if they are not interested in a subject they do not publish it. It is often happening. Therefore, it is not so easy as in India to go to the Ramlila Maidan, make a speech and get a fairly good report in the press. You don't get a hall to address; and, If you do, there may be a dozen persons coming and sitting there. Probably the dozen persons are either converts or loafers who want to come and see what is happening!

The main point is, it is very difficult to put across to people in the west the strong feeling on this subject in India. It may be that unlike a neighbour country of ours we do not shout so much about what we feel. We feel it is rather undignified to function in that way. It may be perhaps that that is a very effective way of affecting the west. But, after all, our training and culture has been different. I think ultimately this pays; immediately it might not occasionally.

But the fact is that Goa was to us, If I may use a word which is perhaps not happy, almost a complex, spiritually, ethically linguistically, in every way; it hurt us to see this continuing aggression of Portugal in Goa.

There was another aspect of it, which was the mere fact of a foreign European foothold in India. All our history challenged that, all our nationalism challenged that.

We could not tolerate it. It is not a question of somebody possessing a bit of our territory; it was not just a territorial matter. Everything connected with our Independence objected to it strongly. We felt that our struggle for independence will not be over till Goa came to us.

Those people thought of it, apart from this context, this emotional context, spiritual context, they thought of it as just grabbing at a territory, which is quite wrong. It is not a question of grabbing at territory. There was the other aspect that because of this foothold and because of Portugal being a part of the NATO alliance, nobody quite knew what part Goa might play if there was trouble, as a part of the NATO alliance. As a matter of fact, this House will remember that the question was raised as to how far the NATO alliance would apply to help being given to Portugal in regard to Goa. And some statements made, which were clear, said that it did not apply, while some other statements made were not so clear.

Apart from the spiritual or the emotional aspect—of course the political aspect comes in here—the fact that we may have to face a bridgehead in India belonging to one of the warring powers was a dangerous situation for us, in a big war. I had no doubt that if any such thing had happened, if a war had occurred, then our very first action in a military sense would have been to drive out the Portuguese. About that we were quite clear—within twentyfour hours of the war, if a war had occurred, we would have had to. We could not possibly tolerate a bridgehead like this in India. Naturally, we wanted to deal with this long before a war occurred; we did not want a war to take place.

So, all these facts were very difficult to explain adequately; privately it may be done, but publicly to explain to these powers it was difficult; because they are full of their own view of international affairs. It is quite amazing how these great powers, think great as they are not only in power but in ability and other ways—and we admire them and respect them and we want their friendship—but they all think from their own particular viewpoint. They are unable to put themselves in the position of another party, what that party may think. That, indeed, is the sadness of the cold war attitude. The cold war attitude puts blinkers in our eyes. We can only see one way and not in any other way.

I would like to say just one or two words more. Hon. Members have congratulated our Army. It was, indeed, a very efficient piece of work. What is even more important, their behaviour subsequently and during this operation was very praiseworthy. Some complaints have come in afterwards about their behaviour. I think many of those complaints are exaggerated. Some of them are completely wrong. For instance, complaints came to us that a member of our Forces had misbehaved in regard to some woman. We enquired. On further enquiry we found that the man who had gone, who had apparently tried to molest some woman had gone with a false beard, pretending to be a Sikh. The beard came off actually. He pretended to be a Sikh and he put on a false beard. They reported that some Sikh regiment had come. But, the beard came off subsequently. Also it was reported that a man came and spoke in the Portuguese language to us. None of our Army, at least, of those that were sent, knew

a word of Portuguese. On examination we found that many of these complaints were not true. There were one or two cases of misdemeanour which were, I think, remarkably few considering the circumstances and those people were punished. On the whole, the behaviour of our Army has been extraordinarily good there.

One thing, I should add. Of course, presently, we shall have to make arrangements for representation of Goa, etc. in this Parliament. That will have to be done a little later.

As Shri H. N. Mukerjee said, those people who were the first to come to India are the last to go and I hope and trust that there will be no others, not only in the near future, but even in the distant future, who will come to India and will have to be ejected again.

BACK NOTE

XXXVIII. Constitution (Twelfth Amendment Bill),
14 March, 1962

NIL

REPLY ON MOTION OF THANKS TO PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

19 March, 1962

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have to apologise to the House, to begin with, for not having been present here most of the time when this discussion on the President's Address took place. I was engaged in the other House for a good part of the time. But, I have taken the opportunity to read the reports of many of the speeches delivered here. So, I am in some possession of what was said.

To begin with, may I associate myself completely with what has been said by some Members, notably the Lady Member who moved this Motion and other Members in their reference to our President? This as the President has said in his Address, is the last Address he is going to deliver to this Parliament. It is true that he will, no doubt, address the opening Session of the next Parliament also. It is rather an odd practice that is growing up here for the old Parliament and the new Parliament to overlap somewhat and the old Parliament to meet after the elections. It seems very odd to others as well as to ourselves. But, for some reason or other, we have got caught in this because of these dates. Perhaps, this might be avoided if the dates of election were somewhat different. However, we are likely to have, in the course of a month, another Address from the President addressed to the new Parliament. Although we shall have the pleasure of listening to him again it is a fact, as the House knows, that our President will end his term of high office in the near future. I have no doubt that every Member here and others outside will feel deeply grateful to the President and will rejoice at the fact that we have had during these initial ten years of our Republic, and a little before, his wise guidance and his personality which gave dignity to our Constitution.

As time goes on, the old captains and Generals pass away, and naturally, all of us feel, this gap and the country itself faces the situation in a somewhat different context, not only because our problems are different, but the fact that thus far, many of those who have guided the destinies of India were associated with the struggle for freedom gave them a peculiar competence, to deal with them—competence in the sense that they bridged the gap between the pre-Independence period and the period after Independence in the minds of the people. When that gap no longer remains there or when the story of our Independence is a matter for history, to be read about in books, the context will, naturally, be different. Now, no one else could have bridged that gap more than our President. And it was very fortunate for us, that we had the great advantage, the great honour of having him as the Head of our State during these many years. We would like to wish him, more especially as he has been through a serious illness, good health, and many years; although he has not preside over the destinies of our nation, we hope that his good advice will be available to us whenever it is necessary.

Now, this Address of the President, naturally, and especially because another Address will be coming in about three or four weeks' time, was rather a survey of the

past than a looking into the future, although he could not avoid, and he rightly dealt with, the future, here and there; yet, it was more a catalogue of some of our achievements and some of the problems that face us. Those are factual matters, and it may be, as some hon. Members say, that it is rather an optimistic account of what has happened, and that many difficult problems remain. I do not personally think that it is too optimistic, but that is a matter of expression really. The fact remains that much that we would have liked to do, we have not done, and many problems remain unsolved, and even as we solve some problems, others arise to the their place, and the situation can never be looked upon in a complacent spirit.

Our problems are problems that can be divided into two categories, problems external to India, and problems internal to India or domestic problems. External problems are important, because they affect us, as they affect the world, and, therefore, we have to pay attention to them. But, at the same time, the main time of this Parliament is naturally spent on thinking about internal problems because internal problems affect our very lives, the lives of hundreds of millions from day to day, and in effect, internal progress ultimately governs what we may do externally, because a weak nation, a nation which is beset with internal problems which it cannot solve, cannot play an important part in external affairs.

Before I proceed further, I should like to refer to a piece of news which came in this morning's papers, and which announced the long hoped for agreement between the leaders of the Algerian people and the French Government for a ceasefire. I doubt if we can easily find in the records of history even, such an intensive struggle as the Algerian people have lived through during the past seven years and more, such intense suffering, such large numbers of casualties, and killings, almost a substantial portion of the population of Algeria suffering because of this. Surely, no one can deny that if a price has to be paid for freedom, the Algerian people have paid much more than any price that could have been laid down. And apart from the principle involved of freedom and independence, they deserve it, because of this price that they have paid.

We should like to send our greetings and good wishes to them on this occasion. May I add that I should like to congratulate the other party, that is, the French Government under President De Gaulle also, because while we may disagree with much that has happened, done by the French Government there, we must recognise that all kinds of difficulties and extraordinary conditions came in his way, but he adhered to his resolve to grant, or to agree to, the independence of Algeria, and, therefore, he deserves credit for it? In coming to this agreement, there have undoubtedly been a number of compromises in which both parties have given up something to which they attached importance. But whatever has been given up does not come in the way of independence. That is the important thing.

Although this tremendous hurdle has been crossed, there still remain grave difficulties in Algeria and in France, because as hon. Members might know, a secret Army Organisation has grown up in the past, which has given a great deal of trouble,

and which is functioning—I do not know how to describe it—in a typically cruel, callous and Fascist manner. All I can hope is that this will cease now, and if it does not cease, that would be dealt with adequately.

I hope that the Algerian people, after having paid such a heavy price for their independence, and been conditioned by it,—because it is the price that they pay in suffering and sacrifice that conditions the people,—will grow, rapidly grow and progress and become a bulwark of peace and cooperation in the world.

I shall not refer to Goa, because we had recently some debate on the Goa Bills. All I would say is, and I repeat what I said then, that we can now say that we have completed the independence of India. That is an aspect of this question which many people outside India do not realise fully, namely that this is a part of our independence struggle, that our independence was not complete till this was done with. Naturally, our independence struggle was directed chiefly towards the British, because the British Dominion was a great part of India, but it included in its scope any colonies that any foreign Power might have in India; there were the French, and there were the Portuguese.

The House may remember that in the course of our independence struggle, Mahatma Gandhi did not particularly want us even to carry on agitations in what were called then the Indian States. Even then, nobody imagined that the Indian States would be outside India, outside Independent India. But he felt that we must concentrate on the major obstruction; that was the British Dominion in India; and in the Indian States, he felt that our struggle against the Rulers there, justified as it well might be, was a rather false struggle, because behind them was the British Government, and the British Government could take shelter, because we shall have to fight others and not the real troublemaker there. So, he advised us, and advised the Congress movement not to directly carry on agitations in the States. Of course, the people of the States could do so. It does not matter whether that was the right policy or the wrong policy. I am merely mentioning it to show how our attitude towards Goa and the French colonies was determined by the fact that we concentrated on the so-called British India as it was, feeling that the rest would inevitably follow. We never forgot either the French colonies or the Portuguese colonies; we never forgot them. But we did realise that they existed there because of the fact that the British Power had agreed to their coming back. So far as the French were concerned, they came back after the Napoleonic wars; during the Napoleonic wars, they had to give them up. The British agreed to that. So they came back. So far as the Portuguese were concerned, it is patent that they could not have held those colonies but for the protection of the British Power. That was obvious. And so we thought that when the British Power went from India, these would automatically revert to India. We tried to get this done peacefully.

We talked to the French Government. The French Government at first raised many legal and other points, but at any rate, they talked. We talked and they talked, both in a civilised manner about a question, and ultimately we came to a decision, an agreement. With the Portuguese, the facts of history were not admitted. The present context was not understood by them. They still lived in the 16th or 17th century.

It was difficult to talk. Indeed, they did not talk to us. They refused to talk to us about the future of Goa, except in terms of our admitting that they would exist there, which we could never do. We sent a Minister to Lisbon, opened a Legation there and presented Notes etc. which they would not accept. So we withdrew our Minister. The House knows what has happened since then.

So that what I want to lay stress on is this, that Goa was a part of our struggle for independence as much as any other part. Our concern was that foreign countries held parts of India. Whether they were the British or the Portuguese or the French or any other was a matter of details. The main thing was that India must be free of any foreign control. And we have had that.

Most people in the west seem to imagine that by some right or other, right of conquest, if you like, Goa was part of Portugal, and we did wrong in taking any steps, any forcible steps, to acquire it. I did not particularly like even those steps. No because I thought at any time that those steps were wrong; I think we were completely justified in law, under the United Nations Charter and everything, in taking those steps, taking into consideration the fact that Goa was part of India, that Goa was a colony. So I think we were right in that. Nevertheless, I hesitated to do that, because this kind of thing has effects and consequences in other places; this might be made a precedent for some other country to apply violence in the wrong place at the wrong time. But, as the House knows, we were compelled by circumstances to do so. However, that is over.

Unfortunately, we have still to look after a fairly large number of Portuguese soldiery—about 3,500 or so. Of course, they are being treated well. They live in their old barracks where they used to live before—and have everything. Indeed, immediately, after the Goa operation, we offered to the Portuguese Government to take them away. We made no bargain. We did not want anything in exchange. We said, take them away. Some people suggested that we could have bargained with them about the future of the Indian residents of Mozambique and Angola. We are much interested in the future of those residents, but we refused to bargain. We thought that would be dealt with separately.

So we have told them repeatedly, 'We shall hand them over to you; take them away.' But the matter has not yet been apparently decided. I said this on the last occasion here. A day or two later, a message appeared in the Press apparently emanating from the Portuguese Government saying that they had made a suggestion to us and they have received no answer. But we have received no suggestion at all, unless it be that it is on the way via the Brazilian Government, *via* the Egyptian Government and various Governments. That might take some time. Even then, it has been several days since this happened and no suggestion has come. We have even gone so far as to tell the Portuguese soldiery that they can go themselves; anybody can shift for himself and go and make his own arrangements, and we would facilitate his going from there.

This, unfortunately, creates a situation in Goa which comes in the way of normality returning, when 3,500 soldiers are there under detention. They are not treated as

prisoners of war in detention. Our Army is there to look after them. We have, as a matter of fact, removed a great part of our Army and Civil police that went there. We would have removed the rest except for a very small number, if these soldiers had not been there.

However, these matters will no doubt be settled soon. It is unfortunate that it takes a little time, for a simple thing like this. Other matters in too in Goa are gradually being resolved, and I hope that Goa will settle down and make progress.

Now the most important thing at present happening on the world scene is the disarmament Conference that is taking place in Geneva, to which we have sent a strong and able delegation. We feel strongly about disarmament. Our whole attitude has been, as it often is in foreign affairs, not to push ourselves forward too much but to help others. It is obvious that disarmament, although it concerns every country in the world, can only be brought about if the big nuclear powers agree. In the ultimate analysis, it is not merely a question of votes; it is a question of agreement by those powers. We have, therefore, tried to help in this agreement being achieved.

So far as we are concerned, in the course of the past few years, we have made repeated proposals in regard to disarmament in the United Nations. It is interesting to note that a number of our proposals when made were fiercely criticised; a year or two later, they were quietly adopted or some other country put forward those very proposals and they were adopted. The whole approach to this question is so full of suspicion, lest something might happen which might cause this country or that country some harm or injury, that every proposal is hardly considered on the merits but with that suspicious outlook. I do not blame anybody for it because it does involve grave problems. Disarmament does; although it has appeared today in the context of nuclear weapons, which makes it vital, disarmament is, after all, something which has never happened in the world. It is a new phase of the world's existence that we are gradually groping after. The weapons may have been bows and arrows, may have been breech-loading guns, may have been anything, but no body has ever talked of disarmament or at least effected it previously—some people have talked about it. After the First World War, the old League of Nations had a Disarmament Conference or some such thing. They appointed a Preparatory Commission for disarmament. I happened to be in Geneva then, and they went on talking the preparatory commission went on talking, for years. They produced reports, fat ones, a number of them, pointing out the difficulties of “disarmament—and that was a time when there were no nuclear arms. So, you can imagine how much more difficult it has become when nuclear weapons have come on the scene, with the choice offered to humanity of either disarmament or no survival at all. So, it is no good criticising anybody or condemning anybody because it involves grave issues of national safety, and every Government has to be careful about its own safety. The only difficulty is that each person considers his safety in the context of being much superior to the other to make sure, and you cannot have everybody being superior to everybody else, it is impossible for even two.

At the present moment not much progress has been made in this committee on disarmament at Geneva. Various proposals have been put forward, they are being discussed, and I believe they have agreed lastly, at our response, to meet informally and secretly and not in public all the time. They might have some public sessions, but most of the work will be done privately because it is impossible in these conferences to discuss anything very seriously in public. I do not think that we need be very much alarmed at the fact that during these few days not much progress has been made. That is natural because the countries are putting forward their own view points without yielding to anything else, but I hope the next development will be more accommodation to the others' view points.

The literature on the subject is tremendous now. Hon. Members may think that one is either for or against disarmament, but it is not so simple as that. It really is extraordinarily intricate, and some of us who have had to study it to a little extent have been amazed at the complexity of the problem, but there it is. The fact is that if we do not solve it on this occasion, conditions are likely to grow worse there will be more and more arms, always of a later pattern, more dangerous pattern, and it may go completely out of hand once the nuclear weapons and their progeny spread to a number of more countries.

One thing appears to me to be clear. Everybody has agreed in theory—by everybody I mean that the United Nations has said so and even the Great Powers like the Soviet Union, the United States Government and I think the United Kingdom Government have agreed—on complete and wholesale disarmament. What more can you have? But it is in translating that that all the difficulties occur. Still, it is well to remember that the agreement is on a very wide field. The disagreement is highly important because it comes in the way, but really the basic things have been agreed upon. Now, even if you start with this idea of agreement on this complete and wholesale disarmament, naturally it does not appear overnight: you have to do it by phases. Then the difficulty comes as to what should be the first phase, what should be the second. Thereafter it was agreed that in any phase or any step that was taken, nothing should be done that made one Great Power weaker than the other rival Power, that is, the relative proportion of strength should be maintained in partial disarmament etc. That is also agreed to, but however much it may be phased, it seems to me that the first phase must be a substantial one, must be a striking one, must be such as to strike the imagination of the world. There is no good saying: all right, let us reduce our arms by ten per cent or five per cent. That will not affect anybody, it will be a joking matter. So, while it has to be phased, that first phase has to be a striking one.

One thing else I should like to say in this connection. It was unfortunate, I venture to say, that last year the Soviet Government started a new series of atomic tests, nuclear tests. I do not know that reasons, I mean the military reasons, because military people always want these tests, and I know for a fact that military people in all these countries having nuclear arms are constantly pressing their Governments for more tests so as to improve their weapons. But one after it led to the United States Government

have some tests, they had underground tests at that time, and so the way was opened for this kind of thing unfortunately. Recently it was announced by the United States Government that they would start a series of new tests overground, atmospheric tests, within a month, I think, or some such period, unless a treaty banning all tests was evolved before then. If I may say so with all respect, it is very unfortunate that that was said just then, just on the eve of the disarmament conference because in a sense it came in the way of the success of that conference to some extent. It may have been thought that it would expedite matters in the conference, but it is hardly likely that the conference will produce firm treaties within a month or so; and it would be very unfortunate, I think, if the United States Government started these tests while the conference is meeting, because there is no doubt that the moment the United States Government started, the Soviet Government—it has said so—will start it also. Then this disarmament conference will progressively lose all significance while the real thing is happening outside, while the tests are taking place. Therefore, I would beg the Great Powers concerned to consider, not to have any tests while the conference is sitting, while they are making every effort to reach a settlement on these matters.

The subject of disarmament is complex as I said, very complex, and the more one tries to understand it, the more one realises the complexity of the problem, but behind all this physical complexity lies the fear and hatred of one country against another; and fear and hatred are bad companions and lead one to wrong results. Now, that is why I have been anxious that we should not be driven into fear and hatred to much in regard to our own problems. Our problem of the border, aggression by the Chinese, is a serious matter for us, serious for the present of course, but serious for the future. No country with any self respect can ignore such a problem. Nobody has suggested that it should be ignored, but I am merely saying that. And it is a serious problem because, to imagine that it can be solved easily by war is a misapprehension of the facts of the situation or of the effects of a war in dealing with such matters. If one is driven into a war, well, one is driven into it, and one does one's utmost to win it, but normally speaking, and looking at it even in the context of disarmament and all that is happening in the world, it would be an utter absence of prudence to rush in into some step, the end of which we cannot see.

Therefore, I have often stated that while we adhere to our position firmly—and the House only two days ago may have seen the recent correspondence on this subject with China—we should still make every effort to solve this question by settlement and peacefully. If, unfortunately, that is not possible, then, we may have to think of other means. But, there should be no jumping in into methods which close the door and bar any approach to peaceful settlement because we are dealing not only with the present evil but the future relations of the two greatest countries in Asia which geography has placed side by side for ages past and which neither of them can ignore; and neither of them can with the greatest power in the world, with the greatest effort in the world defeat the other and conquer it. The result is, it will be a continuing struggle, tussle, war etc. It is not an easy matter for any responsible person to see this kind of longterm hostility with a permanent neighbour. And, at the same time, one

cannot be Complacent about it. Therefore, we have to create conditions in which such a settlement is possible.

Among those conditions is general opinion in the world. In a sense, you might say that world opinion is with us. I do not say that world opinion makes a finality to anybody; but it does make some difference. And, in this matter, it may well be said that world opinion has been strongly in our favour and has not appreciated the Chinese attitude. And, the second part, of course, is that we should strengthen ourselves and prepare for all consequences.

Now, to say briefly something about our internal situation. Much has been said by hon. Members about it in many of the suggestions made by them and many of the criticisms made by them, which I partly accept. Some I accept; some I do not. But, generally, there is no doubt that much can be criticised and we should endeavour to meet these criticisms. I have no doubt that whatever hon. Members have said here will be carefully considered and kept in mind and efforts made to meet those criticisms.

Hon. Member, Shri Tyagi, referred to certain basic matters. That is about the fall in standards and values in the country, as exhibited in the elections and in various ways. I must confess that I am greatly worried about this; greatly troubled in mind about this. I do not think we have become, as a people, less virtuous than we were just as I do not think that we suddenly became terribly virtuous, fundamentally virtuous when we were serving under Gandhiji. We all have, all of us, got combined the devil in us. Some things bring out the divine element in us; and some things the devilish element in us. It all depends upon circumstances. The virtue of Gandhiji was that he drew out the best in us. It does not mean that the rest had disappeared. It was there; it came out even during his lifetime in communal troubles and this and that; it came out in murders and in a terrific way while he was alive after the partition. What could be worse than that? That really humiliated us before the world.

But the fact remains that there are certain developments in our public life which are deplorable and standards appear to have fallen. People are the same. But, it may be that the process of democratic elections—good as I think it is, both in theory and in practice—does help to bring out these evil traits in our character or in any character unless we hide it; because democracy requires more training and more capacity for permitting the person who does not agree with you to function than anything else. It is a higher form of civilisation; leave out all else. Democracy is meant for civilised people, not for uncivilised people. If people are basically uncivilised then democracy is no good for them; they can have dictatorship or whatever they like. We do not pretend to be civilised. We are not always too civilised—any of us—and the devil takes hold of us. And, the devil seems to be particularly obvious and present everywhere at the time of elections. And, so people do and say things which are totally indefensible in any civilised society; but they pass off in election time.

I do not wish to go into these elections. Some hon. Members here criticised the elections and accused, I believe, the Government and the Congress of wrong

things, of corruption and what not. Well; I have seen something of these elections myself. I have wandered about all over India. I do not pretend to say that all the Congress candidates were virtuous angels. But I do say—that is my impression—that I was shocked beyond measure at what the opponents of the Congress did in these elections. They were beyond excuse—of course it is a weak word. Some of the things done were so abhorrent and abominable that I was amazed at them. I do not wish to name any party or anybody. But they lacked the commonest decency. Maybe some individual Congressmen had done so. But there it is not an individual Congressman or an individual member of a party but groups functioning in that way, and large numbers of them.

This is a matter for very serious consideration for us, how we can meet the situation in the interests of everybody, not in the interests of anybody, any Government or any organisation.

I said the other day here something to which exception has been taken by some newspapers. I said that we had asked the Home Ministry to collect posters, leaflets and books etc. issued at the time of elections. We cannot easily collect what has been said; but we can collect the printed word or the printed picture, just to see in which direction things are going and to avoid them if they are bad, to take steps to avoid that kind of thing happening.

In fact, we have taken some steps in the recent amendment of the Representation of the People Act. But, may be, that will come up in election petitions and the like. I said that, first of all to know the trend of people's thinking and people's actions during the elections; and, secondly, to help us to prevent them.

Now, to my amazement some newspapers have said that it is very wrong, very unfair. I see nothing wrong, nothing unfair. We have not said that a particular party should be condemned or we have not said that all the leaflets of a particular party.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

It should make it easier to get them. Anyhow, we have asked the State Governments and the District Magistrates to collect them. And, I hope that when these have come we should have an exhibition of them for the benefit of Members of Parliament and others. Maybe, some are not available. We should have tried to do it before the elections; that would have been a better time but it did not strike us. But it is an important question that Shri Tyagi has raised, important but not easily capable of getting hold of. Of course education is an important element in shaping people's minds and making them better beings but something much more than that is necessary and above all it is necessary that those who are, or think they are leaders of people should function in a particular way and should set an example to the others. That perhaps is the most important of all.

Now, Sir, we had before the elections the National Integration Conference and I deeply regret that this has not been followed up by a meeting of the council. It

became very difficult to hold a meeting of the council when these election processes were going on. I hope that before long, a meeting of that council that was created then will take place because national integration is, I suppose, the most fundamental thing of all and all the tendencies which have been so obvious in this election, caste tendency, communal tendencies and the like which are harmful and which disintegrate the country have to be met as far as possible unitedly. Hon. Members know that a party has risen in the South.

Yes. It is still more unfortunate that the party is supported by people who should be wiser. It shows what I said earlier: how elections upset our thinking apparatus and put passions in control of us and of others. Here is a fundamentally wrong thing to which every Indian must object, stoutly object and not only object to a point but object to any point. As I said one day, there are some things which could not be accepted here. If it is war, it will be war but it will not be accepted. When I find that not only the people who talk about them but others encouraging such parties and asking people to vote for them, it shows that something has gone wrong in somebody's thinking completely. So, these questions have to be met; these are fundamental questions.

Now, for the rest they are domestic questions like the Five Year Plan and agriculture and industry and all that is contained in the Plan. I would not go into this question except to say that we have always attached the greatest importance to agriculture. I am glad that agriculture is looking up and I have no doubt that it will look up. The general outlook is favourable. There is this business of giving priority to agriculture over industry. You cannot give any priority because the two have to move together. Agriculture cannot go ahead without industry going ahead. In fact agriculture and industry cannot go ahead without a certain modern outlook coming into the mind of the agriculturist or the industrialist. I do not mean the big industrialists, but a person engaged in industry. That is happening. I found very definitely this time because I toured all over India in a rapid way, from the far south to the far north, east and west, and so I got a rather comprehensive picture of crowds no doubt—not of individuals, within a month. There are many pictures that I saw and which were very pleasing. I have no doubt that generally speaking, whether in the countryside or in the towns, there was much progress. Above all, I was looking at human beings. I am interested in human beings; I am not interested in any big buildings. The human beings were better; they were better fed, better clothed and generally more wide awake.

Having said this, I shall also say that—in parts of the country they were pretty bad—pretty bad, in the sense of poverty, etc. and usually these parts that were bad were the bid *talukdari* ridden tracts, old *zamindari* tracts and old *jagirdari* tracts. It is extraordinary. The *talukdari* system may have gone, the Indian princes may have ceased to function as princes; the landlord system may have gone. But the effect of long ages of suppression under that system continues till today. There is all the difference in the world between an ordinary peasant in the *ryotwari* system who is

progressing and the ordinary peasant in the old *talukdar* system in Oudh and elsewhere. He is better a little but his progress is slow because ultimately the progress comes out of him. It is not merely facilities that are given to him. He is afraid still; he could not get out of the fear complex; he could not take any step forward because others oppose him. I have never been so convinced as during this tour of the disastrous effects of these systems, whether land tenure or others, which suppress a human being, just like our friends *Harijans* have been suppressed for ages past. As I have always said, we must have merit and we cannot afford to give up merit for anything; in our administration we cannot put third rate men simply because they are *Harijans*; I refuse to accept that; it makes a nation third rate. What I am saying is that one can understand how ages of suppression have bitten into their minds and souls. They are only gradually coming through it; they will come up no doubt but it takes a little time. We who have been more fortunately circumstanced in the past in spite of factors which discouraged us had opportunities to grow. So, I felt rather dejected at these parts of India which are still backward. They are making good slowly. They are still afraid and full of fear of the ex-talukdar, ex-prince, ex-this and ex-that. They are influenced and influenced sometimes in the way they were in the old times. Some people have pointed out: the Congress has many rajas and others among its candidates. It is true that we had a number of rajas and others but there is all the difference in the world to have a raja conforming to your programme and policy and a raja conforming to his own and adding to it the prestige of another party. This thing is not in theory; it is obvious. One can go and examine it in these areas and find what the popular impression is. The popular impression was spread that the old princely system is coming back. In fact, people are coming to those people who had been elected and asking them all manner of things which they cannot do. They have been elected now—their bosses—and now they ask them to do things for them which they might not have done or could not have done when they were princes. This is extraordinary. I suppose these feudal elements are playing their last cards in India, whether they are zamindars or princes or others, not realising that their day was over and is over and nothing in the wide world can bring back, can change the course of history.

Only, perhaps what hurts me is in regard to the way we dealt with them, because I doubt if you will find a parallel in the whole of history for the generous way we have dealt with such an element in India. However, that is a passing phase although it is an annoying phase.

The real thing in these five year Plans, etc.,—we have got the Plan and I will not go into it—is, I think, the Plan is on right lines. We may make some minor changes here and there. The real thing is its implementation. That is most important. The real things are these. One aspect which has not been forgotten in the Plan but which came before me more vividly is that in some parts of the country greater amenities should come to the people—little things,—say, water supply in Rajasthan. The thought of it is irritating—that people cannot get good water yet. In some places they have to go

miles to fetch their water. Whatever Plan there should be—of course in the Plan it is certain that every village should be given pure water and maybe by the end of the Plan this will be done—greater importance should be attached to the common, basic necessities of human life which everybody in India should have.

Secondly, the administrative aspect is important, because all the Plans ultimately depend on the administration that functions: the administration not so much at the top, because I do believe that our administration at the top is a very good administration. It may be slowmoving occasionally; it may be, if you like, bureaucratic occasionally, but it is an able administration, and it has adapted itself very largely to the needs of the situation. But, when you go down the scale, the administration is not so good and is often lacking in integrity. This is a problem which has to be met and faced, because all the Plans in the world will not succeed if the administrative apparatus is not turned up to them.

In the final analysis, I would say that our progress consists in many things,— I am saying in physical terms —but most of all, in electric power and iron and steel. Electric power requires a great deal of investment. We are trying to progress, but the progress is rather slow. The moment every village in India has electric power, our problem is not ended but our problem speeds ahead at an express rate. It changes the mentality of the people and the working habits of the people. Iron and steel is most important because almost everything requires iron and steel. I am rather regretful, I am rather sorry, that the progress in iron and steel has not been as rapid as we wanted it to be. In the second Plan too progress had been slow. In the third Plan, we are nearly doubling the number of plants of the second Plan and in the third Plan, we have a very big plant in view, Bokaro, which, apart from the target at the initial stage—one million —was supposed to double it—two million—add which can come up to ten million tons per annum, by way of production. There is enormous potential about it. Something has been done; some preliminary reports have been made, but it has been unfortunately held up for a variety of reasons. It is unfortunate because holding it up means the effect will take place after three or four years, when there will be a gap and we would not be able to fill the gap. I mention the importance of iron and steel because there are some people still in India and some businesses concerned with iron and steel who do not particularly fancy further plants growing up. I cannot understand how they can do so, but of course the scarcity of iron and steel will push up the price and they may profit by it more. But I cannot understand any other reason.

Then there are, of course, exports. They are very vital and they are growing as the President has said in his Address. It is a good trend but it has to be worked up much more.

Dr. Sushila Nayar said something which I do not understand. She said that waterlogging was due Bhakra-Nangal. This is the first time I have heard of it—That Bhakra-Nangal should be responsible for waterlogging in the Punjab.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²

I do not know which canal she refers to. The waterlogging has taken place because of the old canals in the Punjab, not be Bhakra-Nangal canals. That is what I am pointing out. It is not the Bhakra-Nangal canals that have done it, but the older canals that have no lining. I cannot speak with absolute authority now, but this is my impression, and no Bhakra canal has been constructed without lining.

I do not think it is necessary for me to go into the details of the Five Year Plan. We have discussed that and we shall no doubt discuss them in the future, and the next Parliament will discuss them also. But I would like to request this House to consider this picture as a whole. There are innumerable points to which attention should be directed, where there are failings. But look at the picture as a whole and look at it in the context of things in India, because you cannot separate the picture from the context. Look at India in the context of Asia and look at India in the context of the world today. I think you will find that in various ways we have done rather well in the context of Asia or in the context of the world.

Acharya Kripalani shrugs his shoulders. I am afraid it will do Acharya Kripalani a lot of good: if he went about the world, just trying to understand what is happening in the world, surely he could have understood more even about what is happening in Asia than from sitting here in Delhi.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX³

I referred to him because he smiled rather contemptuously when I said that. I think that, as many people have said, one of our thriving industries in this country is to run down our country; to run down what has been done by this country, not by this Government—it is a thing of today or tomorrow— but by the people of this country. I think it is not right to run down our people. Our people are ordinary people like all the other people in the world. They have their weaknesses and they have their good points. But still it is my personal opinion that they are very fine people, taking it on the whole and it is because I have faith in these people and it is because I am proud of those people that I trust in the future of this country.

These elections have brought out many wrong things; nevertheless it was a fine thing to see this election take place in this vast country with hundreds of millions of people involved, and the administration itself involving millions of people. It is a thing without a parallel in any part of the world, which has impressed the world. But apart from that, if you look at what India has done in the last 10, 12 or 14 years and compare it to any country in Asia—because it is difficult to compare it with the USA or the Soviet Union; you cannot compare it with those which have been functioning for long years—we have been building almost from scratch upwards and if you compare it with countries in Asia or maybe with some countries in South America and elsewhere, you find we compare very favourably with them, in spite of our failings and the mistakes that we have undoubtedly made. We have been marching painfully step by step, but we have been marching—that is the main thing—and not going back.

But for the people who are against this, partly because their whole concept of human progress is different, who call themselves as conservatives and the *Swatantra*

Party, the others are not against this march ahead. I remarked the other day that the Jan Sangh was about 200 years behind the times. Objection was taken to this by a noted Jan Sangh leader in Delhi, who said, "What? We are 2,000 years behind the times, not 200 years". It is open to him to say that, but certainly he has nothing to do with the present day times. Therefore, either this country has to decide—as it has now decided—whether it is going forward or backward.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁴

I did not say you claimed that. First of all, I did not say that applies to every Jan Sangh member. But a gentleman in the Jan Sangh said something like that; I forget his exact words.

We are not discussing the Jan Sangh; there is nothing there to discuss. What are we to discuss? They have no policy, except the wrong things they say. Let us not get into that.

We have to be clear about our aim. I submit that the aim in our third Five Year Plan and previously is the correct thing. We have to be clear about the broad way to it in agriculture, industry, education, social service, etc. I do think that what has been put down there is correct. It may be slightly changed here and there. First of all, you have to be clear about planning. There are some hon. Members in this House who object to planning at all. What is planning? It is an intellectual exercise to see what best you can do in the circumstances. If they object to any intellectual exercise in dealing with the nation's problems, they are welcome to do without intellect. I do not know why the nation should do without intellect. It is extraordinary to me.

Take another thing—joint farming, which was made so much of in these elections and made so much of falsely and wrongly. They went about saying, "Your lands will be taken away from you", which is completely wrong. I do firmly believe that joint cultivation in conditions like those in India is desirable; it will produce more and it will be more for the benefit of the peasant, because they have such small holdings that they cannot progress and they cannot use modern implements. We have said that there will be no joint farming except by consent. Even so, they can walk out of the joint farming after two or three years if they do not like it. The ownership of the land belongs to them.

I can tell the House an interesting fact. It has become a political controversial matter, but in the year 1908, I think—I am not sure—Rabindranath Tagore, presiding over the Bengali Provincial Conference for the first time, and I think that was the last time also, pleaded for joint farming. Why? He was not concerned with political problems, socialism, communism or anything. He pleaded because he argued that conditions in Bengal were such that that was the only way to solve this problem and to make progress. What is more he started it in his own zamindari. People seem to think these are completely new notions emanating from: some horrid place to spoil the sacred soil of India.

So, we are going forward with certain definite ideas and I would venture to say that the President was completely right in saying that these elections indicate that

those broad ideas are not only acceptable to the public, but they agree with them fully and they want to encourage them. Indeed, the criticism was more for the delay in giving effect to them than for the ideas themselves. We do not have any rigid doctrinaire attitude. Having some ideas about the picture of our objective and the way we are going to achieve it, we proceed pragmatically. We learn from experience, I hope and with painful step, we go forward.

Nobody, no Government, in India or anywhere else in the world, can go forward without the great help it can get from the public. It is impossible for these large schemes to be implemented through governmental agency alone. We have received a great deal of help from the public and we have also had to face a great deal of the natural heritage of ages, *i.e.* the inertia of this country and all that it has brought with it. A little while ago, this House will remember the great excitement exhibited all over the country, aided by many people belonging to many parties, including, I think, the Congress Party, when a few planets came near each other— the *Ashtagrahi*—the great excitement about it and the vast sums of money, energy and time spent on it. That is the sort of thing which we are fighting. I do not want a single vote under any misapprehension. We are really fighting superstition wherever it occurs. I am not denying anything that may or may not happen, but I will not submit to superstition. Whether I get a vote or I do not get a vote, whether my party gets a vote or does not get a vote, there are certain things we must stand for. We must stand for a reasonable, logical, intelligent approach to the nation's problems and not the approach which usually is made by Acharya Kripalani which is none of these things.

We are all members in a certain milieu out of which we have all grown. We are all a bit superstitious. We try to get over it. We live in a certain context of society, but let us now in our saner moments acknowledge that it is wrong. We may ourselves do wrong things occasionally, but we may acknowledge that it is wrong and not praise it or encourage it. After all, we are dealing with vast problems. We, this Parliament, has shouldered responsibility for the governance of India for five years and many of those who are here will continue to share that honourable burden. We have tried our best to carry the torch and not allowed it to be snuffed out by anything. After this Parliament ceases to be as it will be in a fortnight or so, it will hand, that torch burning brightly to the next Parliament.

So, Parliament after Parliament, generation after generation, the torch, has to be kept alight and we should march forward. This can only be done if we can see the future, if we have some idea of the future and not remain statically where we are satisfied with our own superstitions and customs, satisfied with the way of life when the way of life in the wide world is changing, when we talk about the scientific inventions, of people going to the moon and so on. I am not interested in going to the moon. This world is enough for me. But I am interested in the science which produces, which gives the power to humanity to go to the moon. That is what interests me and I should like other people to be interested too and to develop that habit of searching for the truth in the physical world—certainly they can search for it in the spiritual world, I have no objection but the physical world for the moment is enough for me—

and to find out the truth of nature and try to use it for the profit of humanity and the country.

That is what is happening in the wide world today and, if it is not suddenly suppressed and put an end to by the disaster of war, it will surely achieve its object. And, we in India can help the world. But the best way we can help the world is to help ourselves in this business. I think we have created a new atmosphere in the country to some extent and, personally speaking, I am always thinking of that atmosphere more than even the other things, because that will affect a large number of people's thinking and this is a common matter for all of us, to whatever party we might belong, to help in doing, in creating, so that when our time is up this torch which we all individually and severally hold may be handed over to worthier hands.

BACK NOTE

XXXIX. Reply on Motion of Thanks to Presidents Address, 19 March, 1962

1. SHRI TYAGI: May I remind, Sir, that only lately we have amended the Representation of the People Act wherein we have said that any publicity with regard to election, a copy, has compulsorily to be submitted to the District Magistrate. So, every little thing is there in the possession of the Magistrate.
2. DR. SUSHILA NAYAR (Jhansi): The seepage from the canal has caused it.
SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is not so, because there is no seepage from the canal, since all the canals are lined with cement. How can there be any seepage when they are lined with cement?
DR. SUSHILA NAYAR: They are not all lined, Sir. That is the point.
3. SHRI BRAJ RAJ SINGH (Firozabad): As a roving ambassador?
ACHARYA KRIPLANI (Sitamarhi): I am just sitting silent, why are you getting angry at me? Are we precluded even from smiling?
4. SHRI VAJPAYEE (Balrampur): I do not want to interrupt the Prime Minister, but I would like to seek a clarification. We never claimed that we want to take India 2,000 years back.

STATEMENTS REGARDING:

- (i) PROPOSED RESUMPTION OF NUCLEAR TESTS BY U.S.A.; and
- (ii) AIRMEN CAPTURED BY NAGA HOSTILES

24 April, 1962

Sir, I have received notice from the Lok Sabha Secretariat - calling attention notice - to make a statement about the situation arising out of resumption of nuclear tests by the United States of America and India coming under the fall-out pattern of these nuclear tests. I was asked to make a statement on this tomorrow. As I may not be here tomorrow I seek your permission to say something briefly in regard to these matters.

First of all, if these unfortunate tests take place, there is likelihood always of the fall-out going in any direction. It depends on the prevailing winds; if there are large scale tests the likelihood is all the greater. But apart from that it is a matter of great concern to us that any such tests should take place. Unfortunately, last year, the prevailing-not a ban, but-agreement that tests should not take place was ended by the Soviet Union starting a series of tests and since then there have been some other tests by other countries. This almost mutual rivalry in having tests is, I submit, most unfortunate, more especially when in Geneva a conference is taking place to consider this whole question of disarmament, and particularly and separately the question of tests. While the conference is being carried on, when these matters are being discussed, if any tests are held, surely it will have a very bad effect on the conference and make any agreement exceedingly unlikely at least in the near future.

In fact, some of the unaligned countries represented in the Geneva Conference have put forward-some proposals for the consideration of the nuclear powers and the nuclear powers have agreed to consider them. There is some gain. At least they have not rejected them outright. I would have imagined that as they are considering these matters any test taken before this consideration is completed would surely come in the way of that consideration.

I am not referring to the far-reaching consequences of these tests. It is said that every test has some harm following it. Hon. Members put questions as to the amount of fall-out and the radio-activity increasing. But possibly the radio-activity does not increase as much as the X-ray photographs taken show. But the point is, it is increasing gradually by all these tests and the time may come when it reaches a rather dangerous level, but a much more important point is this: that these tests may lead to a progressive deterioration in atmosphere and a possibility of actual conflict, actual war. That is why the disarmament conference is meeting in the Geneva and these tests lessen chances

it is true that we have not sent a formal communication to the State Department on the subject because we thought our views were well-known and are being repeated. If I say something here in this House, that is official enough and I have no doubt it will reach President Kennedy and the State Department. I cannot say what they will decide, but they will pay heed to what our Parliament says.

As for the second part of the question, about my receiving some messages from Earl Russell, I have received a message from him suggesting that we should send one of our ships, presumably a war ship, towards Christmas Island, hoping that our sending it will prevent the atomic tests. I am a great admirer, as I have said often, of Lord Russell and, specially, his crusading zeal in regard to stoppage of atomic tests and in favour of disarmament. But I confess that I have not quite understood this proposal of our sending one of our war ships to Christmas Island and what the consequence of this will be.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁴

I hope the hon. Member would listen as much to what others say in the same way as he wants others to listen to him. He would not doubt understand that the position is not clear. It is said, presumably by some Naga hostiles, that these airmen are in Burmese territory, surrounded by Burmese forces. Some people say that they are released, but they are not confirmed; we do not know. In fact, we are doubtful as to the fact whether they have been released yet; may be, in future they may be released.

BACK NOTE

XL. Statements regarding:

- (i) Proposed resumption of nuclear tests by U.S.A.; and
- (ii) Airmen captured by Naga hostiles

24 April, 1962

1. MR. SPEAKER: In connection with the subject matter of the other statement, would the hon. Prime Minister like to refer to Shri Hem Barua's letter?
2. SHRI. HEM BARUA (Guahati): May I explain before the Prime Minister replies to it?
3. SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): Sir, may I ask a question on the statement? Earlier you were pleased to rule that you would allow one or two questions arising out of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Anyone of you may put one or two questions.

SHRI NATH PAI: My questions are on the statement about tests. Sir, one would readily agree with the statement made that he expressed concern for the whole House and not only the party of the Government which he heads today. May I ask whether that concern was conveyed to the United States Government, because their determination to resume tests was made clear by President Kennedy who said that: "unless an agreement is reached with the Soviet Union by the end of this month we would". May I also know whether he has received a communication from Earl Russell expressing perhaps the anxiety of the large part of mankind suggesting that some ship be sent: if so, what is his reaction?

4. SHRI HEM BARUA: He has made this appeal to several other nations also.

MR. SPEAKER: Does he want to say something about his letter?

SHRI HEM BARUA: Yes, Sir. The hon. Prime Minister has given a gist of my letter but that does not explain the whole matter. I have written specially in my letter that yesterday, on the question of this capture of IAF men by Naga hostiles, the Defence Minister said :.....

MR. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister has said that there was some difference

SHRI HEM BARUA: The Defence Minister told us yesterday: "we received a signal from the Military Attache in Rangoon which informed us that our Embassy had received an unconfirmed report that these Naga hostiles have released our IAF officers in Burmese territory....."

During the question hour in the Rajya Sabha the Minister of External Affairs, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, stated: "The airmen are, however, still in the custody of the Naga hostilities."

MR. SPEAKER: The first objection is that he cannot refer to anything that happened in the Rajya Sabha during the current session.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I have referred to it in order to pin-point the discrepancy here. The whole country is agitated over this question and wants to know where those people are, whether they have been released in the Burmese territory or they are still in the custody of the Naga hostiles.

ALLEGED MUSLIM CONCENTRATION ON EAST PAKISTAN BORDER

30 April, 1962

Events have happened in Malda, certain unfortunate events, and grossly exaggerated accounts about them have been published in the Pakistan newspapers and, indeed, in foreign papers too. I am afraid I cannot in a brief statement say what has happened in Malda. We are getting more facts, but the accounts given about the large-scale deaths and casualties and migration of large numbers of Muslims to Pakistan, I am quite sure, are very grossly exaggerated.

Then, in Dacca and Rajshahi also incidents have happened, resulting in killing and burning, arson etc. It is very difficult to get exact figures about these because, just as on the one side they are exaggerated, on the other side they are minimised in the Pakistan accounts. We do not wish to exaggerate or minimise all the facts. Both these incidents, in Dacca and Rajshahi and Malda, have been unfortunate; and it is no use exaggerating them or minimising them. We are trying to get all the facts. I do not think whether it would help if I gave some odd fact here and there. I cannot give the complete set of facts until further information reaches us.

BACK NOTE

**XLI. Alleged Muslim Concentration on East Pakistan Border,
30 April, 1962**

NIL

**REPLY ON MOTION OF THANKS TO
PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS
2 MAY, 1962**

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on many occasions we have considered such motions of thanks to the President for the Addresses which he has been pleased to deliver to the joint sessions of both Houses of Parliament. This present occasion has a special significance and a certain element of sadness about it, because this is the last Address that the President has delivered to this Parliament. Many hon. Members have drawn attention to it, and I should also like to add a sentence or two in tribute and homage to our President for his high dignity and simplicity and his keeping up of the traditions of his high office and of our Constitution during the 12 or 13 years that he has presided over this nation. It is no small matter for any one, however able he might be, to discharge the functions of the President of India. People may think that he is a constitutional President which, of course, he is. Nevertheless, it is a matter of great importance how even a constitutional head of a State discharges his functions. It adds to the dignity of the nation, or takes away from it. In India where we have been during the last 13 years or more than that passing through this big period of change, it is all the more important what kind of President we had, and it was our extreme good fortune that we could have a President who combined in himself the virtues not only of a good President, but of a good leader of the nation and a leader in the fight for independence. So, this Motion of Thanks that we send him is not a formal affair, but something more than that.

I regret, Sir, that I was not present here during the greater part of the debate on this Motion. I have, however, sought to find out what hon. Members said by the copious notes which my colleagues took, and by reading some of the speeches which have been reported. Many things have been said in the course of the debate by Members either on this side or the other side, many criticisms have been made, with which, I might as well say frankly, I am in certain sympathy. I am not here to defend everything that Government has done, or everything that has happened in India, although undoubtedly the responsibility for everything is the Government's, but while I recognise that—many of the criticisms, many of the errors that we might have committed or not coming up to the mark that we have laid down ourselves—I do submit that if one judges of what has happened in India and what is happening, it is not good enough to repeat old charges of corruption and this and that, to make a list of failures on the part of Government or the administration, but also to have a look at the success of the administration, of the Government. Only then can you have a balanced view.

It is well known, and every one realises here and elsewhere, that the tasks in India are stupendous, colossal in their extent, and the real difficulty is not so much in the extent of India, in the vastness of our population, which is there of course, but in the

fact that we are trying to jump over a few centuries in our country. As it is, as has been often said, we represent today almost every century in India from primitive times in some parts of India, primitive people—and I use the word “primitive” in no bad sense, but the fact is that they are using primitive methods of production etc.,—to the most modern methods. We are fairly advanced in atomic energy, which is the latest exhibition of the modern age. So, we represent all these centuries and we are trying to pull ourselves up and bring hundreds of millions of people to what might be called the modern age, at the same time not pulling them out of their own roots of thinking, because I think that is important. Because India has been in the past, and, I believe, in spite of her numerous failings, still continues to be, in some ways, rather unique, rather special, having something of her own, an individuality. I would not have that individuality go in search even of some material advantage, although I am all for the material advantages. And, I do not think we can go far without achieving a certain material standard of life. So, material advantages are important. But, at the same time, what I call the uniqueness and individuality of India, her way of thinking, if I may say so, her general philosophy of life, are also important; and it would be a great pity if we were uprooted from those in the search merely for material advantage. In fact, we want both to continue. And, the great problem of today is to find a synthesis between what India has been and what India hopes to be. I hope we shall achieve success in finding that synthesis. But, no man can say; and only subsequent history will tell you of our success.

Broadly speaking, therefore, today, we have, keeping in view these old roots of India, to modernise India, modernise her way of thinking, her way of production, her way of doing things, just as in agriculture. The first thing that strikes me and the first question I ask of an agriculturist when I meet him is, “What is the kind of plough you use?”, because that is the test: it suggests in what century he lives. So, this question of the modernisation of people, rooted in the ancient past, every century of the past, of people whose numbers go up to 440 millions, is a tremendous question. It is not a question of some statistical analysis. Of course, statistics help us. It is a question of the human being changing; and how do we change the human being?

There are complaints made here, and, I can make many such complaints myself, in regard to the elections of people still functioning in the narrowest grooves of caste, and sometimes on feudal lines, sometimes on caste lines, sometimes on other narrowing lines and grooves which make one sad because they represent a mentality, a mentality, I should like to say, not confined to the so-called unprivileged people but to the most privileged people in this country, a mentality which has no business to be flaunted in this age.

People talk about the privileged and unprivileged and unemployed. There are two kinds of unemployed always; the unemployed who cannot get work and the other who need not work because they are too privileged. But both kind of unemployed are bad for the country, because both are a burden to the country. They produce nothing; only they consume.

So, we have to change all this. We are still in a semifeudal age in parts, in bits; and we have to change the millions of our people in their thinking and their actions. In fact, normally speaking, political groups and parties are formed having some kind of ideal of change. Some do not want any change. But, even so, it is the methods that differ. Methods may differ, and may differ from time to time. Anyhow, the ideals must be there.

Now, so far as our ideals are concerned, broadly speaking, our Five Year Plans give them. We may not live up to them; we may not be able to solve all our problems because of the defect of the human material we have. Of course, we have our own failings; that may be. But we must be clear about those ideals: where we are going to. Most of the criticisms made here may be justified from some point of view but they must be measured up to the problem we have to face. What are the ways of doing it?

We stand for a socialist order of society. There are many criticisms. What have we done in regard to socialism? How are we advancing towards it? We see disparities of income all over the place and they are growing. All these criticisms are justified, I say, to a large extent. And yet, even though they are justified what exactly is the way to deal with that situation? I do not know what idea of socialism people have. But socialism in my view is not a spreading out of poverty so that everybody should be poor; it is not a dispersal of poverty. There can be no socialism with widespread poverty, lack of production and primitive methods of production. Yet most people seem to think that socialism means somehow equalisation at the lowest level. That is not my idea of socialism. Socialism involves higher grades of production, more production, and more wealth being produced and equitable distribution. There can be no equitable distribution when there is nothing or next to nothing to distribute but only poverty to distribute. That fact has to be remembered. Therefore, production is of the essence of socialism as in any other ism because nobody, whatever be his ism wants to base it on poverty except perhaps some people in India. But normally nobody wants to base his ideals, his objectives and his policy on the fact that a country is poor and is going to remain poor. Therefore, you must base it on production, production of wealth plus equal distribution. That is why our Constitution itself says that there should be no monopolies and no concentration of wealth. That is all right. But when you produce wealth to some extent there is an inevitable tendency for wealth to be concentrated. The more competent man, that is to say, in our present stage of society may be in another stage it may not be necessary inevitably makes more money. A hardworker, a competent peasant will make more of his land than an incompetent or a less working peasant. An abler person is in a position to earn more and he grows. If you blame him for being competent, for being more hardworking, then you put a premium on lack of work, on being stupid. That is not right. Surely, you must encourage hard worker, an abler person, the man with the ideas and all that. But you must not allow him to profit so much by that as to become harmful to society. The whole thing depends on what kind of society you build up. Acquisitive society which is more or less the society we have is a bad ideal. It does not mean that a person

should not have incentives; of course, he should have incentives. It does not mean that you make everybody equal; people are not equal. But you can give opportunities to all, equal opportunities to all and make a society in which they have equal opportunities and the acquisitive element is less and less. However, I do not wish to take the time of the House in general disquisitions of this kind, I merely pointed this out that I would have liked this. But I am grateful to the hon. Members for the criticisms because criticisms are good for us, for any Government. Certainly there is always a tendency for us to see the good side of things, for our officers to report the good side of things and not the bad side. It is, necessary, therefore for criticism to be made, and a Government which cannot profit by criticism or is deaf to criticism has lost the mainsprings of action. I am not in the slightest complaining of criticism, but I would submit that criticism should first of all be related to the thing done and not to the thing not done only. Then you get a balanced picture and it should be related to the task in hand. Only then you can judge what has been done and what has not been done and what the deficiencies are; not the kind of criticism as, for instance, when frequently everybody gets up and says—it is so easy to make—“Oh, there is corruption; everything is done”. I do say that India is one of the least corrupt countries in the world in administration.

I say that with some knowledge of other countries as well as of India. I do not pretend to say that there is no corruption. There is plenty of corruption in India, though I do think that always in a poor country corruption in the lowest scales is always greater. In Europe it is an ordinary thing for the milkman to come and leave a bottle of milk in front of the door and walk away. Anybody might come and walk away with it, but nobody walks away with the milk because it is so cheap. Not that Europeans are more honest or incorrupt, but it is not worthwhile walking away with a bottle of milk. It is so cheap. Here in front of every house, if a bottle of milk is left, it is possible that some bottles may disappear, so that in a povertystricken country there is a greater tendency in the lower ranks for petty acts of that kind.

In the richer countries you will see that public theft is on a larger scale and a vaster scale and the rich people do it. May be in the poor countries too that may happen, but, by and large, I do think that while there is petty theft, larceny or petty corruption, which is undesirable and should be put an end to undoubtedly, broadly speaking, our administration is one of the least corrupt of the administrations of the world.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

Maybe the hon. Member who questions this may have greater knowledge of the world than I have. I have some knowledge of it and I have studied this particular problem and others who have studied it have also said so. But this comparison is not much good. For instance, the richest country in the world I do not wish to name the countries is the United States. Now, in public administration, I do not think the United States occupies a high position from that point of view. It may be very good in achieving things, but from the point of view of integrity of public administration, it

is not supposed to be exceedingly high. Of course, that does not mean that most people are like that, but there are cases occurring there; in spite of the high grade of life that they have, still even there they have this.

But I do submit it is no good comparing countries with India, considering the vastness of the work we do; because since Independence, I suppose public administration is—I do not know how much, but I should say— hundred times bigger than it was before Independence. It is vast, and all kinds of people have been thrown into it— good people, indifferent people, bad people—and undoubtedly many of them misbehave. All that is admitted, but let us have—again to use the word—a balanced picture, balanced in India and balanced with other countries. I say if you take a picture like that, all this talk, continuous talk of corruption is not justified. Indeed, it actually adds to that corruption, because it creates an atmosphere in which people think, “Everybody is doing it; why should not I do it?” It does not purify the atmosphere.

Other criticisms are made, which may be good themselves, but in the way only a certain number of criticisms are piled up, they give a very foolish picture a very wrong picture, of India as it is today, because India today is a working country. It is a flourishing country; it is a country which has stood all kinds of dangers. It is a country, almost the sole country. In Asia, which has stood out against the various failings, inner and outer, that have afflicted the countries of Asia. It is no small thing. I should like hon. Members to remember it; and, it is a thing that is recognised all over the world the fact that India is progressing, progressing not merely because of plants, factories, this and that, but progressing in some inner sense. It is crossing the centuries and crossing them fairly fast and the probability is, if one grave danger does not overwhelm us and the world that danger is world war we will succeed fairly rapidly. When we talk about countries, “fairly rapidly” does not mean in a year or so, but I do think the next ten years or even less will bring achievements to our country in a large measure; not full achievement, but it is a continuous process.

I just made one exception. I said, unless world war comes, because if unhappily world war descends upon us, we will not be partners, I hope and believe, in any war, but that does not matter much. If war comes, it will destroy the world. I am not quite sure if we, who are addicted to peace we talk about peace so much and believe we are very peaceful attach enough importance to this matter, because the fact of the matter is, we have not experienced war and its horrors. We have experienced something worse than war; that is true. After partition, our experience was infinitely worse than any warkilling of innocent people but we have not that experience of war. It may be that some people, some active, energetic, acquisitive people, may think of war as a time for profits and therefore, not so undesirable after all. But the new type of war that may come, the nuclear war, will not leave much room for profits or profiteers. I think although we are inclined peacefully, we do not think so much actively of it. There is some active thought given to it in European countries, because they realise what the effect of war would be. They will be destroyed, some of them completely and utterly. Therefore, there is active feeling about it.

At the present moment, there is a conference on disarmament functioning in Geneva, which, I think, is considering the most important thing in the world today, because disarmament is the only way to put an end to this fear of war. Everybody recognises it and I am quite sure that sometime or other disarmament will come, unless by mischance the whole thing breaks up and we drift to war. In Geneva, there is also a small committee, a part of this conference, dealing with this question of banning of nuclear tests. It surprises one that in regard to such a vital matter, on which the differences are not so great after all, yet the differences prevent agreement. Perhaps the House knows that the neutral countries represented in the disarmament conference I do not like the word "neutral", but I use it for the sake of simplicity and facility India is one of them and a number of other countries—I do not remember what the others are for the moment some European countries like Sweden, some African countries, some Asian countries have made a proposal to the conference about this test bans and, fortunately, both the main protagonists, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, have said that it is worthy of consideration. They have not agreed to it, but they have not rejected it. That, itself is a great gain.

Now, while this is happening and a search is being made for some way to put an end to this horror of nuclear tests and piling up of armaments, we have again the beginning of further nuclear tests. I should like to read out to you what this 'nuclear test' means. This is a letter from a very eminent professor and a Nobel Prize winner—Professor Pauling, who is Professor of Chemistry at the California Institute of Technology. He has sent this letter to the New York Times, which has published it. It says:

"Prof. Pauling mentioned 'two principal reasons for objecting' to the present atmospheric test series. One, this act would 'decrease the chance of success of the 17 nation disarmament conference and would hence increase war danger through increasing the probability of a devastating nuclear war. The other is that the tests themselves would do damage to human beings not yet born'".

We associate damage with some frightful thing happening before our eyes, a house falling and all that. The kind of damage that nuclear tests do, apart from in actual war where of course there will be cities destroyed, is this radioactivity which damages millions of human beings not yet born. Here it says:

"According to a 'rough estimate' by him, the total toll of the current atmospheric tests in terms of 'genetic damage' will be 'about 3 million' deaths. He added: 'I have estimated that the recent Soviet atmospheric tests will, if the human race survives, reap a toll approaching 20,000,000 grossly defective children and embryonic and neonatal deaths. President Kennedy's statement assures us that the number of children sacrificed to the proposed American tests would not be so great. But should we not be concerned about polluting the atmosphere with additional radioactivity materials in such a way as to cause even a few tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of defective children and of embryonic and neonatal deaths'."

I do not know enough to say whether this will happen or not. But here is a man who is a very eminent scientist, a Nobel Prize winner and a specialist in the subject. Even if there is a chance of this happening, it is a terrible chance. And, this is when tests are undertaken. If there is war, you can multiply that by any figure you like because the whole surface of the earth will be affected by it.

Therefore, it has become of the most vital importance that disarmament should take place, and the first part of disarmament is for these tests to stop because they are actually doing injury, and the biggest injury they do is to make disarmament itself more difficult of achievement. Of course, everyone knows that anything that comes in the way of disarmament is fear, is apprehension, that the other party may go ahead and if these tests continue, this fear and apprehension will grow.

Hon. Members may perhaps know it was mentioned in the press that I received a message from Mr. Bertrand Russel (now Lord Russel) some days ago, suggesting that we should do something here, not only to protest against these tests but, to some extent, to try to prevent them. He suggested that we should send a ship to Christmas Island where the tests are likely to take place as our very presence will deter the country concerned from continuing these tests. And, please remember, it has been quite clearly stated that if the United States Government carries on these tests, there is no doubt at all that the Soviet Union will also carry them. So, we will have a double dose of them in various parts of the world, and each will be an incentive to the other to do more. I cannot understand, I do not understand the military significance of them. It is said that they increase the military power of a country, new weapons are forged and new methods of using old weapons. Anyhow, Mr. Bertrand Russel suggested that I should send a ship to the Christmas Island. I am a great admirer of Mr. Bertrand Russel ever since my boyhood; I might say that when his books came out, they affected me very much and many people of my generation. I admire particularly his crusading zeal in this matter. But the more I thought of his suggestion, the less I understood how I could send a ship to Christmas Island. It is obvious I could not send officially one of our warships. Mr. Bertrand Russel himself realises that. He suggested as an alternative that we may send a tramp or some other ship with some people in it. I have not yet been able to understand how I can do it. Who will be the tramp crew? Will they be volunteers? Who will engage them or send them? So, I find myself unable to act up to this suggestion, even though I entirely agree with the urge that he has.

I have appealed previously here in this House, and I would appeal again to the great powers the United States of America and the Soviet Union to desist from nuclear tests, even if we are not certain of the saying of a man of high knowledge like Professor Pauling that it is a crime against humanity, it is a crime against the survival of human race. So, I do submit that even though we are dealing with our national problems this matter is more important than any national problem, because it will come in the way of every national problem, national growth, national advancement etc.

Coming to some other problems which are national and international I come to our difficulties in our borders which was referred to by some hon. Members. I believe there is an amendment too, saying that the President has said nothing about our border problems. Hon. Members will remember that only a month ago the President delivered another address to a joint session of Parliament when he spoke about these border problems. The fact that he did not refer to that again in this address a month later did not mean that he did not attach, or the Government did not attach, any importance to that; only, he did not wish to repeat what he had said recently.

Our border problems are in the main two; Pakistan and China, both of them. So far as Pakistan is concerned, we have almost learnt to live with it and the problem in the hope that some time or other it will solve itself because we have not seen at any time any effort to solve it on the part of Pakistan. To us it almost appears that they wish to keep it alive for such reasons as they might have. Even now when I speak here the matter is being considered—the question of Kashmir has been raised by Pakistan in the Security Council and is going to be discussed in the next few days again. I am not going to talk about Kashmir here because it is not fitting that we should discuss it here just when the Security Council is discussing it. But few international problems can be based on such lack of truth as Pakistan's case is in regard to Kashmir right from the beginning. It is true that, even as Hitler said, go on repeating an untruth or a lie repeatedly and it will produce some effect on people. It may produce some effect. I do not pretend that we are terribly virtuous, but we do avoid telling patent lie; and we do avoid shouting at the top of our voice all the time because we consider it rather indecent. It is a little difficult for us to catch up with Pakistan in this kind of behaviour because fundamentally we think that in the long run that behaviour does not do much good and it is so. India's patience and India's more courteous behaviour has produced an effect in other countries.

At the present moment apart from Kashmir we have had further communal troubles in East Pakistan and in West Bengal. I do not wish to say much about them. Many hon. Members have wanted to know what has happened in Dacca and Rajshahi. I could give a few facts as to how many people are supposed to have been killed—cannot be positive; we do not know how many houses have been burnt and all that. But unfortunately all this business only incites communal passions on this side or that. In Malda this happened. It was grossly exaggerated, as I said, by the Pakistan authorities. There is a reaction to that. Communal passions were excited in Rajshahi and Dacca and some people were killed or stabbed and many houses were burnt.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²

No. Our High Commissioner has gone to Dacca. He is in Dacca now. He has not gone to Rajshahi.

It is easy to blame each other for these things but not profitable and it does not produce the atmosphere which we would like to produce. We cannot deal with these

matters by shooting too much or by cursing each other. But it is unfortunate that the whole policy of Pakistan appears to be to keep this tension up, and in a sense we play into its hands if we help in keeping up this tension. It is a very frustrating experience, not today but for the last fourteen years. We had hoped when partition took place that two neighbouring countries with so much in common in fact not so much in common, we are of the same blood, same bone and blood and flesh would be friendly to each other, would help each other and cooperate with each other. Instead of that, we have had to face the enmity of Pakistan throughout. All over the world their chief activity, of their diplomats, appears to be to run down India. We cannot compete with that and go about running down Pakistan, because we do not think that that is right. And in their own country too, instead of talking as we do about our Five Year Plans, about economic progress and about other matters, the main topic that is raised there is fear and hatred of India. How a country can progress basing its policy on fear and hatred, I do not know.

Then there is China. Well, I must frankly say that there has been no improvement in the situation in our border. I think it would be correct to say that since October last there has been no material change in the border situation. A patrol may come a little this way or that way; that is no material change. This House sometimes learns about our protests to China about what they have done; they do not often get the large number of protests that we have received from China about what we do on the border. The fact is that we also take many steps to strengthen ourselves, to make fresh posts. If you start thinking as the Chinese do— they start on the assumption that the territory in Ladakh, specially in the Aksai Chin area, is theirs and has been theirs—well, everything that we do there is an offence to them. But if we start on the basis of thinking of that territory as ours, as it is, then everything that the Chinese do is an offence. It depends on with what presumption you have started.

So far as our case is concerned, it is fairly well, given in the Report of the Officials which hon. Members probably have seen. I am glad that at last this Report has been published in China after a year, and people read it.

We are, of course, chiefly concerned about our own internal condition, but China is at present also afflicted by many things, chiefly by repeated bad harvests. And it is a terrible thing, with such a huge population, for harvests to fail. And with a growing population, each year the growth of Chinese population requires an additional I believe 3 million tons of foodgrains, just for the additional part. Now you can imagine how this goes on piling up every year three million plus three million, that is six million, then nine million and so on. And unless foodgrains are grown adequately there is continuously a very grave difficulty, an explosive situation. Now, in spite of our strained relations with China nobody wants the Chinese people to starve and not to have enough to eat and thus create these explosive situations. Broadly speaking, we do not want, we dislike exceedingly, a war with China. But, that is not within our control. Therefore, we have to prepare for all contingencies. Many questions are asked here and I find it difficult to answer them, because, the answers I give are really

or may be helpful to the other party. It is not my desire to keep an information from the House. In fact, we have given practically everything. But, it has so happened that the information we give in the House has been used against us by the Chinese Government and the Chinese authorities. One has to balance these things. I do believe that relative to the position, we are stronger today than we were and we are growing stronger to face it. Whatever action we may take we have to have behind that a certain strength. That we have built up.

I come back, now, to our internal position which is really the question which concerns us most from every point of view, if we have to play an important part in external affairs. Because, we can only do so if we are internally strong. It is because we have been internally stable, internally progressive, internally advancing that our reputation in the world has gone up greatly. It is a good exercise sometimes to compare India during the last dozen years or more with other countries in Asia, any country, our neighbours distant or near, and find out how we have functioned and they have functioned. The mere fact of stability during these years the mere fact of our working along for our Five Year Plans we may fail here and there; we may not reach our targets but the mere fact of doing that is of great importance. It shows a certain running in a particular direction, in a direction of our choice. It may not go fast. Whirlpools and eddies may be left behind.

Take the question of unemployment on which, rightly, hon. Members have laid so much stress. How is employment created? How has it been created in other countries? How at least has unemployment ceased to be in many countries? You will find that unemployment has been met only by technological progress, industrial progress. There is no other way. That is, by the growth of wealth, by the growth of the ways of producing wealth. We come back to the same thing. By technological progress, by modern methods, we can meet it. We may temporarily help the unemployed by some dole. That is a different matter. We may help them by giving it is really a dole—some old methods of work, something which does not produce wealth, but which helps them. That is a different matter. That is not a permanent method. The only permanent method is by industrialisation, including big industry, middle and small and village industries. That is the only method, and that method exercised through the latest techniques.

How is that to be done? Some indication has been given in our Third Plan report. You cannot solve these problems which are scores of years old, hundreds of years by some magic wand. In India, today, unemployment figures are increased by another factor. Women have come into the field. It is a good thing. They are also unemployed. They did not use to be, because they did not work at all in this way. They worked in other ways. So, you get a higher percentage of unemployment because women are also in the field of employment

It is a very good thing. What I am venturing to point out is, when you see the figures of unemployment, apart from the growth in population, which is tremendous,

of course, you have a tremendous growth in people coming out of the Universities and High Schools and seeking employment. All these people were there unemployed previously, but somehow carrying on in their villages. Now, they are not. They seek employment. It is a change in the social structure that is taking place that is bringing out the question of unemployment more and more to the fore. That is right. It is not something new.

Look at the other aspect of how many additional people have been employed in the last few years, both in the mass and the so-called educated people. I think you will be amazed at it. Take the educated people which is more easy to grasp: how many opportunities of employment an educated man has by educated, I mean a person who has gone through the Universities, etc. compared to what he had before Independence. It is enormous. It runs into millions. But, at the same time, we produce educated people by the ten million. Therefore, there is a gap. It is very difficult to measure all these things. We want to have education free and compulsory for every one; which is essential, apart from everything else, for our industrial advance. I would beg you to consider, with free and compulsory education, we will produce apparent unemployment than ever before, because, every one who has gone through the University will call himself unemployed. So, the problem becomes not only a big one, but an increasing one. In a sense, it is becoming more and more apparent. The people were there before.

The only way we can solve it is by greater industrialisation and by modernisation. There is no other way. The only countries that have solved the problem of unemployment are the countries which are industrially advanced. No other country has solved it, especially with these huge populations. I think we have done rather well in this business of employment. That does not mean that there is no unemployment. There is very heavy unemployment. Within the Third Plan period, the labour force is expected to increase by 17 million. The programmes included in the Third Plan are estimated to provide 14 million additional jobs. Taking the aim of providing work for all the new entrants during the Plan period as the minimum, rural works programme calculated to provide work for 2½ million during the slack agricultural season is being taken up. That is, 16½ million are going to be provided out of a possible 17 million. Of course, all these calculations can never be accurate because of all kinds of subsidiary employment that unemployment gives rise to. It may be that the subsidiary employment actually covers all this unemployment figure. Take the small industries in the Punjab, in Madras and elsewhere. Growth of small industries,—which, mind you, do not come into the statistical figures, in the Punjab has been phenomenal. This is the word which, I think, the World Bank used. It is extraordinary. Once you get this machine moving, then, the results are fairly quick. In order to get it moving, you have to put in all your energy and it takes some time.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX³

As regards the rise in the cost of living or the rise in prices, I think the prices have risen, but on the whole, it is remarkable how they have not risen, not that they have risen.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁴

In fact, the policy of Government is broadly laid down in the Third Five Year Plan. That may, of course, be criticised, improved etc. Government may occasionally do something within that framework, but it is the Plan that should be looked at.

There are one or two small matters that I should like to mention. The first is about the committee on distribution of income and wealth. This was formed, because there has been, I believe, a disparity, and it has grown. That does not mean that the great majority of the people have not improved or advanced materially somewhat; there is no doubt about that in my mind. There are pockets where they have not improved perhaps, or not improved enough. But it is true that the disparities have grown among some wealthy classes and in the majority. It was because of that, that we appointed a committee with Professor Mahalanobis I think, as chairman. It was entirely a technical committee of economists.

Among the studies which the committee has undertaken are the following:— (i) Size and composition of the national income and their variation over time; (ii) examination of consumer expenditure data collected by the National Sample Survey; (iii) Data concerning levels of living, including growth of various social services; (iv) sample survey of income tax assesses over several years; (v) Study of earnings of wage earners or salaried employees in relation to consumer prices; (vi) certain selected studies relating to concentration of shareholdings and of management control and pattern of finance by controlling organisations; (vii) distribution of land holdings etc. So, it is a complicated subject; it is not so easy, Anyhow. we hope to have, within a fairly reasonable time, their report.

One hon. Member, I understand, Shri Manoharana, a leader of the DMK of Madras, took exception to some circular issued from here, making the learning of Hindi compulsory for Central Government employees in Madras. He seemed to think that this was opposed to some assurance that we had given. He is entirely mistaken. It is essential for Central Government employees who have to serve anywhere in India, or who may have to, to learn various languages. If they have to serve in Madras, we have to insist on their learning it depends on what they are doing Tamil. This is not a new thing. It is an old practice. Even in the British times, a person who had to serve in a special province had to learn the language of that province. I am talking about the Central Government employees.

The assurance that we had given was that the knowledge of Hindi will not come in the way of a person being employed, that is, in any examination or any test, the lack of knowledge of Hindi will not prevent him from getting in; but once he has got in, he should pass a test in Hindi. That is a different matter entirely, because he has to serve anywhere in India; and he may have to learn something else, apart from Hindi; he may

have to learn Gujarati or Marathi or Bengali; that is a different matter. But we do thing that a certain standard in Hindi is desirable. And this applies to Central Government employees.

Then, he also wanted that the Government of India should interfere in Ceylon in regard to people of Indian descent, who are chiefly Tamilians. I do not quite know how he wants us to interfere.

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**⁵

I am glad that the hon. Member did not say so. But my point is that hon. Members must know that the conditions in Ceylon have been rather difficult to face for any Government there, and it becomes very difficult for us to bring pressure to bear repeatedly, and it might have even the contrary result. As it is, broadly speaking, many Tamilians there, who run into several hundred thousands, are carrying on their avocations. It is really the merchant class which has had to leave Ceylon, because their visas etc. expired. The estate labourers who are the persons who require our help chiefly are unfortunately in the position of not being either Indian nationals or Ceylon nationals. Our case is that many of them have been born there or anyhow, they have lived there for a large number of years, and they should be considered as Ceylon nationals.

So, in spite of the fact that the Ceylon Government is very friendly to us, and we are friendly to them, I do not think it will be advisable for us to press them, to bring pressure to bear upon them in regard to these matters. Whenever an opportunity occurs, we talk to them about it.

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**⁶

Well, I do not know; I might.

There is one other thing I should like to mention-one hon. Member raises that question frequently. In East Pakistan, there is a mill, the Chittaranjan Cotton Mills. I must say that the way the East Pakistan Government have treated this mill has been most extraordinary. And looking at it from their point of view, they are running a great profit making organization, from which the Government, apart from others, profit, simply because many of the shareholders live in West Bengal, in Calcutta. First of all, they took charge of it on the ground that it was not being run properly. As a matter of fact, it was running very well and making a good deal of profit. Now, it was feared that they would take other steps to deprive all the shareholders in India of their interest in it. This is very unfortunate.

I do not think I need take up the time of the House any more in regard to the many criticisms which have been made. As I have said right at the beginning, many of those matters deserve criticism. For instance, coal and transport and power have given us a lot of trouble. May be it was bad planning. We are trying to remedy that as

fast as we can. We cannot easily produce a railway track or increase our power quickly. In fact, most of our troubles are due to the fact that we are progressing faster than our capacity. Power and steel are required more and more. It is a sign of our progress. Any how, I am grateful for the criticisms made and we shall profit by them. I cannot take it upon myself generally, but if any hon. Member sends any question like that, I shall certainly send a reply.

They may send it to me informally and I shall send a reply.

BACK NOTE

XLII. REPLY ON MOTION OF THANKS TO PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS, 2 MAY, 1962

1. AN HON. MEMBER: Question.
2. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY (Barrackpore): Has our High Commissioner gone to Rajshahi?
3. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: What about rising prices?
4. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: From when? Only from August. What about 1959, 1960 and 1961? If you compare the prices only from August to December, then you may say that the prices have remained stable. But compare the figures from 1960, 1959 and 1958, in respect of foodgrains and all those other commodities; then you will see that the rise is there.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad): Progressive rise.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): The price level is lower than last year, during the twelve months.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: In January? The hon. Deputy Minister is mistaken.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: It is lower than last year.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: Between January, 1962 and January, 1961, there is difference in the foodgrain prices.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Calcutta South-West): I think the Labour Minister said something the other day to some organisation of manufacturers.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am sorry; I am just trying to find out some figures which I had.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: has to juggle with them. That is the difficulty.

SHRI JAWAHAR LAL NEHRU: In March, 1961, the general index of wholesale prices was 30 per cent higher than in March, 1956. In March, 1962, it was 3 per cent lower than in March, 1961.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: What about foodgrains?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: There is no doubt that some prices have risen, but in the last year, the prices had actually gone down a little.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: Is that so in regard to foodgrains, or is it in regard to the general consumer index or price index?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That is the general price index.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: But kindly see the position in regard to foodgrains.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Thus, broadly, the rise in prices has been arrested, and the price level has been more or less stable for the last three months of 1962, the first year of the Third Plan.

You must remember that the tendency for prices to rise in a developing economy is always there. To check it is a difficult process. In spite of that, it has been checked during the last year, and that is a fairly comforting phenomenon.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: In three months, again you will find the prices going up.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: (Kampur): It will be better if we do not develop for sometime; then, the prices will go down.

5. SHRI MANOHARAN (Madras South): I did not say that the Government, of India should interfere into the affairs of Ceylon. I only said that the First Secretary at the High Commission there should be a person conversant with the Tamil language.

6. SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati): Will you be discussing this matter, when you visit Ceylon next?

STATEMENT REGARDING FIRING ON POLICEMAN FROM CHINESE TRADE AGENCY

11 May, 1962

I want to say something about a matter raised yesterday by Shri Hem Barua about firing on Kalimpong. Now it has been found out that first of all no fire-arms were used. The firing was not by a fire-arm, but by an air gun. It appears that members of the Chinese Trade Agency at Kalimpong have been in the habit, or sometimes they discharge air rifles from their premises in the direction of the police headquarters, maybe just to frighten them, or whatever it maybe. In the past these slugs from the air guns did not hit anybody, they went into the air and fell down, but on the 22nd March when this was done, a slug from one of the air rifles fired from the Chinese Trade Agency's office hit a policeman in the thigh and there was a policeman in the thigh and there was a minor injury. On the 30th March, the SDO at Kalimpong lodged a protest with the CTA about this incident. On the 2nd May the CTA in his reply denied that anybody in the Trade Agency had fired an air gun on that day, and he dismissed the charge as a baseless slander. We have asked the SDO at Kalimpong to let the CTA know that his reply was not satisfactory and if there is any further shooting from his premises, he would be personally held responsible. This is what we have got from the West Bengal Government.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

This is probably so. The hon. Member said that Chinese Agency was not interested in having policemen round about. That is probably so. They are interested, but they are interested in not having them.

BACK NOTE

XLIII. Statement Regarding Firing on Policeman from Chinese Trade Agency, 11 May, 1962

1. SHRI. HEM BARUA (Guahati): Undoubtedly this Chinese air-gunning is very interesting, but whatever it might be, they fired and injured a policeman, and these policemen are kept in Kalimpong to guard the Chinese Trade Agency. Are we to understand from this that the Chinese Trade Agency there in Kalimpong are not interested in having our policemen guarding them and all that? Or, what might be the reason?

STATEMENT REGARDING DISTURBANCES IN EAST PAKISTAN AND SUBSEQUENT MIGRATIONS

04 June, 1962

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the House will recall that on 12th May I had spoken, at some length, on the unfortunate, disturbances in Malda, In April, in which fourteen people lost their lives, nine on Holi day this was in March-and five more between 16th and 20th April. There was no trouble whatsoever in Murshidabad district. The grossly exaggerated reports in Pakistan newspapers and some very objectionable statements by high ranking officials in Pakistan, it will be recalled, then led to the very serious disturbances in Dacca, Rajshahi and in several other districts in East Pakistan. We had protested about all this to Pakistan and pressed the Government of Pakistan to take active and immediate steps, for the restoration of law and order, the restoration of confidence among the minorities and rehabilitation of those who had suffered in these riots in East Pakistan.

The Government of Pakistan has now replied to our note of protest of 12th May. The Pakistan reply suggests that communal riots never start in Pakistan and whenever there are communal incidents in that country, they take place only as a reaction to the communal troubles in India. The Pakistan reply however, admits that the trouble in East Pakistan was serious. They have said nothing about the particular incidents in Darsa and other places, to which we had drawn their attention; but they have given a detailed account of the steps taken to restore confidence in the disturbed areas. The House will permit me to read out a part of the Pakistan Government's reply:

"The latest reports from the district of Rajshahi, as indeed from some other areas, where tension was high owing to the atrocities committed on Muslims, across the border, show that the situation is now completely normal throughout East Pakistan and has been so for nearly four weeks. As a matter of fact, troops as well as strong contingents of the East Pakistan Rifles that were posted to the affected areas are being withdrawn gradually at present. As many as 1908 arrests, have been made in the areas where the disturbances took place. Police investigation is being vigorously pursued in order to deal effectively with those responsible for the unfortunate disturbances. Already a large number of persons have been charge-sheeted and further chargesheets are being filed every day. The local authorities and the Muslims of the affected areas are reconstructing the dwellings of the members of the minority community which were burnt or otherwise damaged. In Rajshahi district, 90 per cent of such dwellings have reconstructed and more than 50 per cent of the looted properties have also been restored to the respective owners. Instances have not

been lacking where Muslims in many places, at great personal risk, provided protection to the Hindu neighbors in distress.”

It is clear from all this that there was very serious trouble in East Pakistan. They had to use troops and also strong contingents of East Pakistan Rifles to control the time situation. We feared at one time, with ample legitimacy, that there would be substantial migration of the minority community from East Pakistan into India. In the first three weeks of May our Rajshahi office (Assistant High Commission) had interviewed over 4,000 intending migrants. Subsequent reports show that these people had been persuaded, not by us but by Pakistan authorities, to go back to their villages. Our latest reports from Dacca show that, so far, less than 2,000 requests for migration have been received by our Deputy High Commissioner. (Migration Certificates are issued only by our Deputy High Commission at Dacca). He has authority to render them such assistance as may be necessary. But I want the House to understand in all this that there has been no substantial migration from east to west. Our enquiries reveal that about 200 persons belonging to the minority community in Pakistan had come across immediately after the first disturbances in Rajshahi district. Thereafter in May, a little over 600 persons have arrived in West Bengal, about 400 of whom hold Migration Certificates issued to them before the disturbances. The statistics of travelling between East Pakistan and West Bengal actually show that there is reasonable normalcy in the traffic. In the month of April, for instance, 11,664 Hindus had come to West Bengal and 13,015 had left West Bengal for Pakistan. 14,776 Muslims had come into West Bengal in April and 14,264 (i.e. some 500 less) went from West Bengal to East Pakistan, despite the grossly exaggerated report in the Pakistan Press of the massacres in Malda and the migration of refugees. I do not have with me the full figures for the month of May, but in the first half of May the Hindu arrivals are not high, being 6,464 (which twice over, would be 12928), though the departure of Hindus is less—2,676 for half the month. The Muslim figures for the first half of May are even more significant. 6,487 Muslims have left West Bengal for East Pakistan in the first half of May; but no less than 5,435 Muslims have come to West Bengal from East Pakistan in the same fortnight. It is perfectly obvious that if Pakistan newspaper reports had any truth in them, over 5,000 Muslims would not be crossing over—as they always do—from East Pakistan into India in the fortnight immediately following the so called murders in Malda and Murshidabad.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

Our high Commission in Dacca have issued migration certificates only after due enquiry. They did not offer facilities, or deny them, to anybody. Anyhow, that is a matter to be considered by the authorities in India later. To begin with, it appears that a large number of people came and asked for migration certificates of which some are pending cases. Then, quite a large number went back to their villages, apparently induced by the Pakistan authorities to do so. Whatever the reason may be,

BACK NOTE

XLIV. Statement Regarding Disturbances in East Pakistan and Subsequent Migrations, 4 June, 1962

1. SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati): Sir, may I seek a clarification?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes

SHRI HEM BARUA: May I know whether it is a fact that our High Commission in East Pakistan deliberately slowed down the process of offering facilities to those members of the minority community in Pakistan who wanted to migrate to this country, on the plea that there were no officials working there to cope with this problem? On the other hand, Sir, my information is that Government did it deliberately with a view to check migration as Government feared that this might be an inducement to other members of the minority community in East Pakistan to migrate to this country. If so, why should people be allowed to suffer or face slow death on a big scale like this?

SHRI BADRUDDUJA (Murshidabad): May I know....

MR. SPEAKER: Let us first hear the answer.

2. SHRI BADRUDDUJA: May I know if on the 22nd of March 1962 six Muslims were burnt to death at Malda, three beaten to death and one girl of eight raped and, later on, on the 16th of April, several other persons were beaten to death. This had a demoralising effect upon the entire population of the district resulting in the exodus of Muslims from the town of Malda?

3. MR. SPEAKER: I cannot allow a regular discussion.

SHRIMATI RENUKA RAY (MALDA): In view of the last question just now put by an hon. Member, I would like to know whether the Government is aware that out of the persons who are killed in Malda there are not only Muslims but also Hindus and the number of the latter is roughly five. Is it not a fact that the figures given by the Prime Minister are only of the Muslims alone?

SHRI BADRUDDUJA: May I know ..

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, Shrimati Renuka Ray says that in the number of persons killed in Malda there were Hindus also and that they were not all Muslims.

**STATEMENT REGARDING FIRING BY PAKISTANI
ARMED POLICE ON EVACUEES FROM
RAJSHAHI DISTRICT**

18 June, 1962

I had made a statement on 4th June on the unfortunate communal incidents in West Bengal and East Pakistan in the months of March and April. I had, in this, referred to the Pakistan Government's reply to our protest Note of 12th May, which had as good as admitted that there had been very serious disturbances in East Pakistan.

There has inevitably been some excitement and a certain amount of tension on our side of the border, mainly in the second week of May, after the stories of the happenings in the East Pakistan districts had trickled through. There have been stray incidents in West Dinajpur, Jalpaiguri and Cooch Behar, but the State authorities had been warned to be vigilant and they have handled the situation with the necessary degree of firmness.

We had no reports of any serious trouble in East Pakistan after the last week of April and there was every reason to believe that in the month of May, generally, tension had decreased and the movement of the people between West Bengal and East Pakistan had become almost normal. Unfortunately, there has been a recrudescence of serious trouble again in Rajshahi district in East Pakistan. But before I come to this, I wish to place before the House certain facts and figures for the whole of the month of May which were not available when I made the statement on June 4.

Earlier in May, some 4,000 intending migrants had been interviewed by our Rajshahi office (Assistant High Commission). The latest figures that we have now received show that the demand for migration certificates in the month of May was not abnormally high. The number of applications received by our Deputy High Commission in Dacca in May totalled 606 covering 1793 persons. By way of comparison, 1312 persons had applied for migration in April and 1530 had applied in March. Our Dacca office has granted migration certificates to 1015 persons in May, as against 952 in April and 1080 in March. I am furnishing these figures to show that the statistics for May are not abnormally high.

Apart from the migration certificates, the figures of the normal traffic through the Immigration Check Posts in West Bengal are even more interesting. In April, 11,664 Hindus had come into West Bengal and 13,015 had left West Bengal for East Pakistan. In April 14,776 Muslims had come into West Bengal and 14,264 (only 500 less) had gone from West Bengal to East Pakistan. These are the figures for the month of April, when the Pakistan Press was shouting about massacres in Malda and

the migration of thousands of Muslims from West Bengal to East Pakistan. The May figures are still more significant-12,827 Hindus have come from East Pakistan, and 8,408 have gone across. The Muslim traffic figures show that 13,053 Muslims have left West Bengal for East Pakistan in the month of May, but as many as 12,720 have come across from East Pakistan to West Bengal. This should amply falsify Pakistan's propaganda that thousands of Muslims had fled across the Indian border because of tension in India. This being the position in May, it is all the more regrettable that there should have been trouble again in Rajshahi district of East Pakistan. The reports we have received from West Bengal Government say that on 15th June, at about 03:00 hours in the middle of the night while about 600 Hindus, Pakistan nationals, mostly santhals and Rajbanshis of villages Gopalpur, Joka, Sonamasha, Manchalpara and Ekrampur were about to cross the border at Barabila, police Station Gomostapur (East Pakistan), without travel documents, Pakistan Armed Forces suddenly opened fire on them. As a result of this firing, a one year old female child and another girl of fourteen were killed on the spot and two men and six women were injured. About, 300 persons are reported to have crossed over into India. The rest are reported to have been rounded up by the Pakistan forces. Of the eight injured persons, one adult male and a girl of eight years is reported to have died on the way to Malda hospital.

Strong action has been taken by the district authorities to ensure that there are no repercussions following these unfortunate events on our side of the border in Malda district.

On Saturday, June 16, the Commonwealth Secretary has brought all this to the notice of the Pakistan High Commissioner in New Delhi. He has protested against this reported conduct of the Pakistan authorities and has expressed concern on behalf of the Government of India that the East Pakistan authorities should take such strong measures to physically prevent members of the minority community from crossing over into India, when they were doing this in some obvious panic as a result of lack of confidence in the authorities.

The West Bengal Government have already lodged a protest with East Bengal authorities and our Deputy High Commissioner in Dacca is seeing the Governor of East Pakistan today.

I might add that this morning the Pakistan High Commissioner saw the Commonwealth Secretary here in Delhi and he gave the Pakistan Government's version of this incident which amounts to this. The East Pakistan Government's version is that on the 14th/15th night police outpost at Charal Panga got the information that a large mob was proceeding towards the frontier. Police station Gomostapur was alerted and a small police patrol was sent out to investigate. The mob of people would be an unlawful assembly in law as it stands in this region. At 2.30 A.M. the police party contacted the mob and challenged them and were immediately attacked with bows and arrows. The police fired 14 rounds, in self-defence and one person, an aboriginal,

BACK NOTE

XLV. Statement Regarding Firing by Pakistani Armed Police on Evacuees from Rajshahi District, 18 June, 1962

1. SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati): That is not so. The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, pointed out the other day....
2. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY (Barrackpore): Does the Prime Minister know that for the last three days, from Friday onwards, there have been about a thousand evacuee refugees coming into Malda town from the border area, and may I know whether the Central Government was alerted about this even prior to the firing itself, and if that was so, whether our Deputy or Assistant High Commissioner living in Rajshahi knew nothing as to why these large numbers of people are migrating to India?
3. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: It was admitted by the West Bengal Government itself.
4. SOME HON. MEMBERS: Rajshahi.
5. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: Are we to take it that there was actually no basic objective or reason for these people to come across? Or, was there really some recrudescence of trouble, because about 600 to 1,000 is the number that is admitted by the West Bengal Government itself.
6. SHRI TYAGI (Dehra Dun): Have they given any information today? It is quite a few days now since all this has happened. Have the Government consulted or contacted them, at least by wireless message, and got confirmation of what has happened?

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow some questions to be put, one by one.

SHRI TYAGI: Have they visited those places?

SHRI HEM BARUA: I would first refer to the Prime Minister's reference. I just remember that the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, was saying the other day that when she saw this news in the newspapers, she contacted that Government for the information. That shows-what a sad commentary-the way our governmental machinery functions.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Sir, I have not put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

7. SHRI HEM BARUA: I discovered this discrepancy in the two statements and I pointed it out.

8. SHRI HEM BARUA: The Prime Minister says he got the information immediately, but Shrimati Menon said she got the information first from the newspapers and then she contacted the West Bengal Government. That is the contradiction.

9. SHRI HEM BARUA *rose*

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Prakash Vir Shastri.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I have not put my question; I only pointed out the discrepancy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. I cannot allow him to go on like that.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I have a legitimate right to put my question.

MR. SPEAKER: That is why I gave him an opportunity.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I have only pointed out the discrepancy....

MR. SPEAKER: If he thought that preferable, what could I do?

SHRI HEM BARUA: If you do not give us protection....

MR. SPEAKER: I am always giving him protection.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I have only pointed out the discrepancy; that is besides the question I wanted to put.

MR. SPEAKER: He will kindly resume his seat.

SHRI PRAKASH VIR SHASTRI (BIJNOR): Hon'ble Speaker sir, lakhs of Hindus living in that particular part of Pakistan are upset with the ill treatment being meted out by Pakistanis and are looking towards India with hope. Taking this fact into consideration, I would like to ask the Prime Minister as there hasn't been any significant outcome of the Nehru-Liaquat Pact till date and still thousands of people are eager to migrate India due to ill treatment, what decision does the Government of India intend to take on this matter so that they can have some gratification?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I just told you that very few people have migrated here, although they were given an opportunity from our side to migrate here. There was no encumbrance from our side. It is possible that there might have been some impediments from Pakistan's side at some places, but even they can't do much. Now it has been said in Pakistan that Muslims have come to Pakistan in considerable numbers

from Hindustan. I have read out to you about the number of Muslims migrated from Pakistan to Hindustan during the period, i.e., in March, April, and May, and similarly the number of Hindus migrated from West Bengal to Pakistan during the same period. It is obvious that these numbers do not include the people who migrated clandestinely. It's difficult to estimate their number. Some people have come clandestinely, but it is not certain, the fact is that the number is very less.

SHRI PRAKASH VIR SHASTRI: My question was about the future course of action by the Government in this regard so that....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHRI H. P. CHATTERJEE (Nabadwip): things happened in Rajshahi some time back. I have pointed out that thousands have come over here. I had received information and in my personal visit....

MR. SPEAKER: He should come to his question.

SHRI H. P. CHATTERJEE: My question is, what arrangement was made by our Government to see that they could get their migration certificates in Rajshahi and not go to Dacca, because there is so much of hindrance in going to Dacca, realising money and all sorts of things? What arrangement was made by the Deputy High Commissioner at Rajshahi to give them migration certificates?

10. SHRI H. P. CHATTERJEE: How ignorant is he! How ignorant is our Prime Minister!

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: Sir, the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* points out that late on Friday night Shri K. P. Mukerjee, the Home Minister of West Bengal was contacted to find out exactly the number of people dead but he could not say anything and yet we are now told that nine dead bodies have been brought to Malda on Friday for *post mortem* examination. It is a statement of fact. May I know whether the Central Government is prepared to find out exactly what the situation is, find out how many have been killed and how many have been injured?

11. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: I am saying about his figure of one dead and the figure given here that nine dead bodies have been brought for *post mortem* examination.

12. SHRI RAM CHANDRA BADE (KHARGONE): Sir, whether the Honorable Prime Minister does not realise his duty to give protection and security to the Hindus who are still living in Pakistan, and ensure the safety of those Hindus who wish to come to India from Pakistan. When they approach the border, they may be given military protection, etc. to ensure their safe arrival here.

HON'BLE SPEAKER: Should they be given protection within Pakistan itself?

SHRI RAM CHANDRA BADE: Protection should be given to them at the border of Pakistan. I want to say why the Government is leaving these poor people on their own fate and not being provided protection? [ENGLISH] By some arrangement they should be escorted to our areas.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I don't understand the reason for those horrifying incidents that took place in the Princely States during that time and now similar incidents took place in Malda, although the outbreak was comparatively less. Barring incidents in Princely States, I don't remember, but there were communal clashes in many districts where Muslims were killed. Now it's a matter of shame whether such incidents take place in Pakistan or here. I agree that communal clashes spread there more, but this matter should not be equated just to assess the volume of outbreak of such clashes. We are now ready. We have not impeded people to migrate from there, but the honorable member wishes that we should help them or protect them. We cannot protect them in the territory of Pakistan. Now, if we talk about the incidents that have taken place, and you see I have just read the Pakistani statements that it is illegal for people to gather at the border at night. So, people came to the border at night and acted against the law. When the police outpost went there, they shot arrows at them, consequently the police fired shots at them and four men were killed. As per our information, two men died immediately, and two died later.

STATEMENT REGARDING SITUATION IN LADAKH

6 August, 1962

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the 28th November, 1961, I placed White Paper No. 5 on the Table of the House. This contained the further notes, memoranda and letters exchanged between the Government of India and the Government of China. I am now placing on the Table of the House another White Paper No.6, which contains some ninety notes sent by us to China and some seventy-five notes sent by China to us, since the 10th November, 1961. [*Placed in Library, See No, LT-256/62*] Many of these have already been published in the press. The Chinese Government sometimes publish their letters and notes to us even before they reach us. This led us to publish our replies to them earlier than was customary. Normally, according to diplomatic practice, publication takes place some time after receipt of the communication. We have drawn the Chinese Government's notice to this diplomatic practice and we hope, in future, this will be adhered to. Because of this we have not till now given publicity to our last note to the Government of China dated 26th July 1962. I am now, however, placing this note on the Table of the House. This is not included in the White Paper No.6.

During the last session of Parliament, I referred to the measures taken by Government to stop further Chinese advances into Indian territory. These steps continue to be taken by our Government and a number of military posts have been established. It may be said that it is very difficult for Chinese forces to advance now because of the establishment of Indian posts at various points without an actual conflict between the two. It is in this context that the strong and almost abusive Chinese notes must be interpreted. We have in all our notes repeatedly pointed out to the Chinese authorities the dangers inherent in Chinese aggressive activities and our determination to defend our borders even though we will avoid doing anything to precipitate a clash.

In recent weeks Chinese troops in superior strength have sometimes come up close to our posts with a view to harassing and intimidating them. This has happened in the Galwan Valley. Our men exercised the utmost self-restraint and exhibited exemplary courage and patience in the face of grave provocations from the Chinese forces. The Chinese forces thereupon retired to some extent, but Indian and Chinese forces in this area continue to be in close proximity, though no untoward incident has occurred so far in this area.

In the lower reaches of the Chip Chap Valley, an Indian patrol, while performing routine duties, was ambushed by Chinese forces and attacked by rifle, machine gun and mortar fire. Our men had to return fire in self-defence. Two members of the Indian patrol were wounded, one slightly, in this incident. Another incident occurred in the Pangong area. Despite the provocation, our forces did not return the Chinese fire there.

A feature of Chinese propaganda in these incidents has been to allege that Indian troops have encircled Chinese forces and fired at them, while the Chinese are reported to have waved and shouted to our troops not to attack. We have found that these allegations are baseless and are merely attempts to cover up Chinese aggressive activity against our posts or patrols. As the House will notice from the correspondence contained in the White Paper, the Chinese notes display a characteristic ambivalence. The first part of the note generally contains baseless allegations, often in exaggerated and even abusive language, while the latter part refers to the Chinese desire to settle our border differences by peaceful negotiations.

The recent increase of tension in the Ladakh region has been the direct result of intensified Chinese military activity which is inconsistent with the Chinese professions of their desire to settle this question by peaceful negotiations. We in India are by our background and temperament peaceful by nature. We earnestly believe in settlement of differences by peaceful discussions and negotiations. The unwarranted Chinese aggression on our territory came, therefore, as a shock and surprise to us. Despite the Chinese aggressive behaviour and the inconsistency between their professions and practice, we still desire to settle our differences with China by peaceful discussions and negotiations. At the same time, we will not hesitate to meet any threat to our territorial integrity with firmness and, where necessary, by force.

In a note we sent to the Government of China on the 14th May, 1962, we made concrete suggestions regarding mutual withdrawal to the boundaries claimed by the two sides in the Ladakh region with a view to creating the necessary atmosphere for settlement of the dispute by peaceful discussions and negotiations. The Chinese did not agree to it. Instead, the incidents during the last few months have created further tension. We have, in our recent note dated 26th July, 1962, again pointed out to the Chinese Government the necessity of avoiding incidents and reducing tension and of making an adequate response to the constructive suggestions made by us to create the necessary favourable climate for further talks and discussions of the boundary question. I quote the following paragraph from our note of July 26:

“Paragraph 8. The Government of India are prepared, as soon as the current tensions have eased and the appropriate climate is created, to enter into further discussions on the India-China boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials as contemplated during the meeting of Prime Minister Chou En-lai with the Prime Minister of India in 1960. The Government of India hope that the Government of China will give a positive response on the concrete suggestions made by the Government of India for relaxation of the current tensions and for creation of the right climate for negotiations.”

To this note of ours we received a reply in the late afternoon yesterday. This reply is rather disappointing as the Chinese Government continue to repeat the

charges made by them and to maintain their position as stated previously. They go on to say in their final paragraph as follows:-

“The Chinese Government approve of the suggestions put forth by the Indian Government in its note for further discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials of the two countries. There need not and should not be any preconditions for such discussions. As a matter of fact, if only the Indian side stop advancing into Chinese territory a relaxation of the border situation will be effected at once. Since neither the Chinese nor the Indian Government want war and since both Governments wish to settle the boundary question peacefully through negotiations further discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials of the two countries should not be put off any longer. The Chinese Government proposes that such discussions be held as soon as possible and that the level, date, place and other procedural matters for these discussions be immediately decided upon by consultation through diplomatic channels. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will give positive consideration to this proposal and kindly reply at an early date.”

We are examining this note of the Chinese Government and we hope to send a reply to it at an early date. We shall keep the Parliament informed of developments.

BACK NOTE

XLVI. Statement Regarding Situation in Ladakh,
6 August, 1962

NIL

should be taken now, we thought that the time had come for us to implement that agreement of two years ago fully.

In effect, therefore, this House had accepted the basic point that these Bills raise, that is, of Nagaland with certain powers etc., apart from details which are given in the Bills; this House has accepted it, and we have acted upon that for all this period.

Now, I am happy to be able to move this amendment because it is in continuation of the policy that we have followed in regard to Nagaland throughout. We have never relied on using military forces merely to deal with the situation there, although, unhappily, we had to use them because of the activities of certain hostile elements there. We have always made a political approach, the approach to make these people friends and citizens of India. It was in continuation of that that we had these Conventions there which produced ultimately, two and a half years ago or thereabouts, a sixteen point memorandum which the Nagas themselves brought before us and placed before us that is, the Naga leaders of that Convention. We accepted it then not fully but we accepted it almost entirely except for some minor changes which we could not give effect to; and the matter was one of agreement between the Government representatives and the members of the Naga People's Convention. I submit that this matter, the basic matter, has been accepted, not in the form of a law, but it was placed before the House and it agreed that in the circumstances that should be done. Now, I am coming forward with detailed provisions to give effect to that agreement arrived at and broadly accepted by this House.

I do not propose to go into the history of what happened in the Naga Hills, because this matter has been before us in various forms, and many questions are asked from time to time. After the transfer of power in 1947, the Naga Hills district and the Tuensang district were incorporated in the NorthEast Frontier Agency, and they were included in the Sixth Schedule of the Constitution.

Later, some people organised armed resistance, and not only armed resistance, but there was a succession of murders, forcible exactions, arson etc. With great reluctance, we had to take measures, that is, military measures or police measures to deal with the situation. May I say here that our military and police forces and the Assam Rifles have had an exceedingly difficult time there, not difficult in the military sense, but difficult in the sense that they had always to be held back by us so that innocent people might not suffer? It was very difficult. It was not organised armies that we were dealing with but snipers and others. Occasionally, some innocent people did suffer. We are sorry for that. We even took steps to punish those who were guilty, although they might have been innocently guilty, that is, our forces. And yet, in spite of all this, in spite of all the care that we have taken, the kind of propaganda that has been made by Mr. Phizo and some of his lieutenants has been quite extraordinary and quite outrageous in its character.

I cannot guarantee, naturally, that in several years of operations, things have not been done by any individual member of the police or the Army, which are undesirable. We are trying to stop that, and our policy has been that these should not happen, but under the extreme stress and strain of this place, something may have happened;

two years it has been functioning as a preliminary to the changeover; progressively, the Governor, although in law he had authority, has acted in accordance with the wishes of the Council of the Nagas.

The House may remember the tragedy when that great leader of the Nagas, Dr. Imkongliba Ao, was shot down by some of the hostiles. That itself indicates the kind of people the hostiles are—shooting down one of their own great leaders who himself had at one time supported them earlier but had subsequently found that this would lead to no results, and had worked for an agreement and for peace and harmony there.

In the agreement that was arrived at, there was a transitional period, as desired by the Naga leaders themselves, during which an Interim Body consisting of 45 members chosen from the tribes of Nagaland and a Council of not more than 5 members from the Interim Body were to be constituted, to assist and advise the Governor in the administration of Nagaland. These interim arrangements were brought into force and had been functioning satisfactorily. Elections to the village, range and tribal councils had been held and the administration of Nagaland has increasingly become the responsibility of the representatives of the Naga people themselves.

Apart from the desirability of this change on the merits, it is something to which we are completely committed. I would submit that even this Parliament is committed to it, apart from the minor points of it, and any hesitation in giving effect to it will not have good results; it will show that we give our word and cannot keep it, which is not a good thing for a government and certainly not for Parliament.

The State of Nagaland Bill we are considering has certain special provisions. One is that for the time being the Governor will have special powers in regard to law and order and finance, but as soon as the situation is normal, that will not be so. That can be declared by the President. I may add that all those special clauses have been made by the Naga leaders. As for finances, the actual income of Nagaland is very little at present, It could be more, but it is little. The Government of India has been spending a large sum of money in welfare schemes, and we thought that the Governor should have special powers to see that the finances were not misused.

These are the two temporary powers that he is given. As soon as the situation improves, the Ministry which will be in existence in Nagaland will be in charge completely.

But there is one part of this State of Nagaland, which is the Tuensang Division or District. That has been treated separately, not because we wanted to treat it separately but because the Tuensang representatives wanted it to be treated separately and the Naga representatives who had come to that Convention agreed with that. This area is somewhat more backward than the other two districts of Nagaland. Therefore, it has been decided that this and will have a Regional Council, and the Governor will play a little greater part in that area for the first ten years, the period being shortened if need arises.

I should like to stress that this proviso about the Tuensang district is not of our seeking. We agreed to it because the representatives of Tuensang and the

representatives of the Nagas put it forward, and we thought it was a proper provision to make for the future, because conditions are different, and they were a little afraid, that is the people of Tuenjang, that their interests might not be properly looked after otherwise.

It is proposed that the Governor of Nagaland will also be the Governor of Assam, or the other way about, the Governor of Assam will be the Governor of Nagaland; that is, he will be there not as Governor of Assam, but as Governor of Nagaland.

Also, it is too cumbersome a procedure to have another High Court. The High Court of Assam will continue to function for Nagaland.

I do not wish to go into further details of this. Naturally, in forming a State with all kinds of special provisions, the Bills are rather lengthy. For instance, we do not wish to interfere with their tribal customs, tribal ways of justice, and therefore, we have left these tribal laws in tact, and their tribal councils will deal with them; and an exception has been made about that, as well as about transfer of land.

Thus, by these Bills, we do an important part, that is add to the number of autonomous States of the Indian Union. The State is a small one," and the State, for the time being, will have certain restrictions on its autonomy in regard to law and order and finance, and certain special provisions in regard to the Tuensang District. Otherwise, it will be a full State of the Union, and in course of time, I hope as the situation returns to normality, it will have all the other powers of the States of the Indian Union.

I think that considering the background that we have had, and the trouble we have had in this area, it is a happy consummation that we solve it not purely by military means, but by this political and friendly approach, making them equal partners in this Union of India to all the other States and to ourselves. I beg to move.

BACK NOTE

XLVII. Constitution (Thirteenth Amendment) Bill and State of Nagaland Bill, 28 August, 1962

1. SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati): We have closed that chapter. Why does he make reference to that?

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad): It is irrelevant.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am glad that the hon. Member realises that he is irrelevant.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Along with you. We share the honours.

2. MR. SPEAKER: He may move both the motions formally and then make a common speech on both.

3. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: On a point of order. Leave has not been granted to move the second Bill, namely the State of Nagaland Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: What leave?

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: I believe that the motion was made only for the first Bill. Leave must be granted first for the motion on the second Bill.

THE MINISTER OF LAW (SHRI A. K. SEN): That is only at the stage of introduction.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: We cannot consider the Bill unless it is introduced and the next motion is made.

SHRI A. K. SEN: There is no necessity for leave for consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not quite follow. To what leave is the hon. Member referring?

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: The motion must be made first, and then only he can speak on the Bill.

SHRI U. M. TRIVEDI (Mandsaur): He says that the motion has not been moved.

MR. SPEAKER: That is what he has done just now.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: We did not hear.

MR. SPEAKER: He has just moved the two motions, one after the other, that the two Bills be taken into consideration.

4. SHRI HEM BARUA: On the 26th August.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It was in 1957.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTY (Barrackpore): 22nd August.

**RESOLUTIONS REGARDING PROCLAMATION OF
EMERGENCY AND AGGRESSION BY CHINA
8 November, 1962**

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"This House approves the Proclamation of Emergency issued by the President on the 26th of October, 1962, under clause (1) of article 352 of the Constitution."

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX¹**

I beg to move:

"This House notes with deep regret that in spite of the uniform gestures of goodwill and friendship by India towards the People's Government of China on the basis of recognition of each other's independence, non-aggression and non-interference, and peaceful coexistence, China has betrayed this goodwill and friendship and the principles of Panchsheel which had been agreed to between the two countries and has committed aggression and initiated a massive invasion of India by her armed forces."

This House places on record its high appreciation of the valiant struggle of men and officers of our armed forces while defending our frontiers.

And pays its respectful homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honours and integrity of our Motherland.

This House also records its profound appreciation of the wonderful and spontaneous response of the people of India to the emergency and the crisis that has resulted from China's invasion of India. It notes with deep gratitude this mighty upsurge amongst all sections of our people for harnessing all our resources towards the organisation of an all out effort to meet this grave national emergency. The flame of liberty and sacrifice has been kindled anew and a fresh dedication has taken place to the cause of India's freedom and integrity.

This House gratefully acknowledges the sympathy and the moral and material support received from a large number of friendly countries in this grim hour of our struggle against aggression and invasion.

With hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be."

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX²**

It is sad to think that we in India, who have pleaded for peace all over the world, and who have sought the friendship of China and treated them with courtesy and consideration and pleaded their cause in the councils of the world should now ourselves be victims of new imperialism and expansionism by a country which says that it is

against all imperialism. This strange twist of history has brought us face to face with something that we have not experienced in this way for over a hundred years or more. We had taken it, almost for granted that despite some lapses in recent years, as in the Suez affair, we had taken it for granted that this type of aggression was almost a thing of the past. Even the Chinese aggression on our borders during the last five years, bad as it was, and indicative of an expansionist tendency, though it troubled us greatly, hardly led us to the conclusion that China would indulge in a massive invasion of India. Now, we have seen and experienced this very invasion and it has shocked us, as it has shocked a large number of countries.

History has taken a new turn in Asia and perhaps the world, and we have to bear the brunt of it, to fight with all our might this menace to our freedom and integrity. Not only are we threatened by it, but all the standards of international behaviour have been upset and so all the world is affected by it, apart from the immediate consequences. No self-respecting country which loves its freedom, and its integrity can possibly submit to this challenge. Certainly, India, this dear land of ours, will never submit to it whatever the consequences. We accept the challenge in all its consequences, whatever they may be.

It may be that this challenge is also an opportunity for us. Indeed, the people of India in their millions have demonstrated that they accept this challenge and have shown a unity and an enthusiasm such as has been very seldom in evidence. A crisis has come and we have stood up to face it and meet that crisis.

I have moved a Resolution seeking the approval of this House to the state of emergency that has been declared by the President. That was inevitable when foreign legions invaded India and our Constitution wisely provided for such a course to be followed by us in any serious crisis. I have no doubt that this House will approve of this declaration by the President and subsequently I hope also of the Defence of India Ordinance and the other steps that are being taken to face this crisis.

I should like this House for a moment to look at this matter in some perspective. We stand, I do believe, at a turning point not only in the history of India but of Asia and possibly even of the world, because what happens in this conflict will affect it obviously. It will affect Asia, of which two of the biggest countries are China and India. But it will affect the world also and, therefore, this conflict has very wide-reaching consequences. We should try to look at it from this point of view. For the moment, we are shocked at this cruel and crude invasion of another country. The world has also witnessed the response of the people of the country invaded, that is, our country, and the world will yet witness the way the people of India act when their freedom is threatened and their dear liberty is imperilled.

So, we are shocked and in a state of high excitement. That is inevitable, and not surprising, but we have to remember that this turning point in history is not going to end soon. We may have to face this for a long period, for a number of years, I do not know how long, and we must train ourselves and the nation to be prepared to face it, however long the crisis may last. It is in the mood, in that mentality, that I seek this House to give a lead to the country.

Chinese aggression on our frontiers is five years old and during these years this House has discussed this matter repeatedly. On the last occasion this discussion took place on the 12th August, 1962. Many White Papers have been issued, giving the long-drawn-out correspondence between the Government of India and the Government of China. Only today I have placed another bunch of these papers contained in White Paper No. 7. On the 22nd August, 1962 we sent a note to China. A reply was sent to this on the 13th September last. But before the reply was sent or received by us, even on the 8th September, China's forces crossed the international boundary in the northwest corner of NEFA across the Thagla ridge and began to threaten the Indian post at Dhola. We had a number of posts near the northern frontier of NEFA adequate enough to meet any minor or normal incursion. We hoped that we would be able to meet this new aggression and immediately we took steps to strengthen our forces in that area.

Five days after this new aggression, on the 13th September, the Chinese Government sent us a threatening reply, asking for discussions on the boundary question. We have previously demonstrated by a mass of evidence that our boundary is what has been called the MacMahon Line, but the boundary was not laid down even by Mr. MacMahon, whoever is responsible for it. It was a recognition of the long-standing frontier on the high ridge of the Himalayas which divided the two countries at the watershed. To some extent, though indirectly, the Chinese accepted this. Certainly they accepted the continuation of this line in Burma. But, apart from the constitutional or legal aspects, it is undoubted and cannot be challenged that no Chinese has ever been in that part on this side of the line, excepting, as the House knows, in a little border village called Longju.

Even the MacMahon Line which the Chinese have called illegal was laid down 48 years ago, in 1914, and that was a confirmation of what was believed in then. Legal or not, it has been a part of India for a long number of years and certainly let us say for 50 years or so, apart from its previous history which is also in our favour. Here then is a boundary which for nearly 50 years has been shown to be our northern frontier. I am limiting what I say to 50 years for the sake of argument; really it was even before that. Even if the Chinese did not accept it—and I would like to say that the objection they raised in 1913 to this treaty was not based on their objection to the MacMahon Line; it was based on their objection to another part of the treaty which divided Inner Tibet and Outer Tibet, the MacMahon Line did not come in that; however, it is a fact that they objected to the whole treaty because of that other objection—even if the Chinese did not accept it then, this has been in existence now in our maps, in our practice, in our Constitution, in our organisation, administration etc., for nearly 50 years. Even the non-acceptance of it, can it entitle them to undertake an armed invasion to upset it? Even the Chinese know and say that independent India has been in possession of this territory right up to the Himalayan watershed. It is rather difficult for me to say what they say. Because, if any person takes the trouble to read through this vast correspondence, he will notice that their alleged frontier is a very mobile one; it changes. It is wherever they have laid the frontier and in this matter too they have stated many contradictory things. They have laid stress sometimes

on the fact that we have occupied this area of NEFA or a large part of it since we became independent. That is a curious statement since, as I have said all along, it was fully recognised in 1913-14. Apart from that, when we became independent, we did one thing. We naturally wanted these tribal people in the frontier areas to share our independence. The British largely left them to their own resources and interfered only when there was some trouble. But there is no doubt that the British considered their frontier to be the MacMahon Line. They did not have a fullfledged administrative apparatus there. On gaining independence, we were naturally anxious to develop these areas as we were trying to develop other areas of India. We tried, therefore, not only to introduce our administration there but schools, hospitals, roads, etc. It is this which the Chinese say represents our occupying that. Any person who sees these papers and the history behind them would easily say that we have occupied it in every sense, legally, constitutionally, administratively, practically for a large number of years.

Now, the point is that whatever the legal and constitutional aspect of their claim might be we think there is no force whatever—does that justify a sudden invasion of this kind? The House will remember that we have discussed this matter many times previously; we discussed it largely in relation to their aggression in Ladakh because nothing had happened here except with the sole exception of the little frontier village Longju. Repeatedly, in the course of talks sometimes they are reflected in these papers too—we were given to understand something not absolutely, not clearly; as has now been discovered, always their phrases had a double meaning attached to them which could be interpreted any way, to assure us of something and later to deny that they had assured us. I remember the long talk I had with the Chinese Prime Minister, specially about the MacMahon Line. I forget the exact date; it was five years ago or six years ago; I do not remember exactly. That was when he came to India. We had a long talk and immediately after the talk I put down in a note I prepared the contents of our talk so that I might not forget it. That note is here in our office. Much later I sent an extract of my note of that talk to the Chinese Government and they denied the truth of it, I was very much surprised and hurt because I was quite certain. When we were talking it, not once I asked; I asked the same question two or three times and definitely the answer was given to me. He gave me to understand that although the Chinese Government considered the McMahan line an illegal line and a British imperialist line, nevertheless because of the large number of facts, because of their desire to be friendly with us, they would be prepared to do this. That was the clearest impression that I got. He denied it later on. So, it becomes a little difficult to say what they stood by at a particular time.

Anyhow, my point is that whether they acknowledge the McMahan line or not undoubtedly it has been, till a few weeks ago, completely in our possession; the area on this side was completely in our possession; for generations past it has been in our possession; if you like it I can put a later date, 1913-14 and I may say that it was a recording of what had been happening previously. How does it justify the Chinese Government to carry on an invasion of it, by any law, international standards of behaviour or for any other reason?

The House may have noticed a very peculiar approach that the Chinese Government has made to what has happened recently in NEFA. They go on saying that India attacked them and their frontier guards as they are called are—merely defending themselves. I must confess that this complete perversion of facts and the attempt to make falsehood appear to be the truth, and the truth to be the falsehood has amazed me because nothing can be more utterly baseless than what they have been saying. Here is a single fact. We have been up to the McMahon line all these years; we have not gone one inch beyond nor have we covered another's territory. They have come. Let us for the moment assume their case that there is some doubt about where the McMahon line is. But the point is that they have invaded in area which has not been in their possession ever, ever in the history of the last 10,000 years. After all the present Chinese Government came into existence 12 years ago or thereabouts. Any claim that they may directly make to this territory can only be made either in these 12 years or possibly previously through Tibet. So, it becomes a question of what they can claim through Tibet or through their domination over Tibet. It is true that for a long time past there were some frontier questions between Tibet and India, even in British times. But all these questions were about little pockets or little frontier areas, small areas. Nobody has ever put forward, no Tibetan Government has ever put forward previously these large claims to what tantamounts to two-thirds of NEFA, apart from the vast area in Ladakh.

So, we arrive at one firm conclusion which is not capable of argument or denial; that is, the Chinese have come to this territory with a massive force, territory which for a long time at least has been included in India, and administered in a vague way and a little fully administered by India. If they had and claim they could have discussed it and talked about it and adopted various means of peaceful settlement, appointed arbitrators or gone to the Hague Court or whatever it was.

Here, I may say, it has been unfortunate, in this as in so many of her cases, that the present Government of China is not represented in the United Nations. Hon. Members are surprised when we have supported the Chinese representation—the representation of the People's Government of China—in the United Nations. We have supported it in spite of this present invasion, because we have to look at it this way: it is not a question of likes or dislikes. It is a question, which, will facilitate Chinese aggression; it will facilitate its misbehaviour in the future. It will make disarmament impossible in the world. You might disarm the whole world and leave China, a great, powerful country, fully armed to the teeth. It is inconceivable. Therefore, in spite of our great resentment at what they have done, the great irritation and anger, still, I am glad to say that we kept some perspective about things and supported that even now. The difficulty is one cannot call them up before any tribunal or world court or anywhere. They are just wholly an irresponsible country believing, I believe, in war as the only way of settling anything, having no love of peace and stating almost that, and with great power at their disposal. That is the dangerous state of affairs not only for India but for the rest of the world. I am not going into the question, as some people do of

communism or anti-Communism. I do not believe that that is a major issue in this matter or any other. Communism may help; but the major issue is, an expansionist, imperialist minded country deliberately invading into a new country.

I do not know what the hon. Member has said. I am not entering into that argument. I am laying stress on this fact because as some countries do, they explain everything in terms of communism and anti-communism. I think the result is that they are unable to see many of the basic facts of the question. Communism may help or communism may hinder. Communism may give them a certain strength or weakness, whatever it may be. But today we are facing a naked aggression, just the type of aggression which we saw in the 18th and 19th centuries; there was then no communism anywhere.

So, we have to face this; new type of imperialism on our borders. Asia is facing this new type, and the whole world is concerned with that. For the moment, we are most concerned with it, and we have to face it and bear the burden ourselves, although some of our friendly countries are certainly helping us and we are grateful to them for that help.

To say that we are committing all this aggression on Chinese territory is a kind of double talk which is very difficult for a man of my simple mind to understand. "We commit aggression on ourselves; we commit aggression on the soil of our own country and they defend it by coming over the mountains into our territory". It is really extraordinary to what length people can go to justify their misdeeds.

It is true that when we heard on the 8th September of their coming over the Thagla pass into our territory in some forces, we had quite adequate forces in our posts. We had no doubt some forces there to meet any incursion, but if large forces come over, an ordinary military post can hardly resist them. We took immediate steps to send further forces to reinforce our posts. We sent them immediately as we had to, in the circumstances; yet there was one unfortunate factor which normally should be remembered. That was, if we send our forces, who are tough, young and strong, nevertheless, we send them from the plains of India suddenly to 14,000 ft. high. For any person; however strong he may be, it requires time to be acclimatised to these heights. But they went there. When they went there, then began a process; we sent some further forces and thought that they would be adequate to meet the Chinese menace in so far as it was feasible. The Chinese also started increasing their forces there. Now, for them, it was a relatively easy matter, because they have vast forces in Tibet. I do not know how much they have. They used to have 11 divisions, and I am told they now have 13 or 14 divisions in Tibet. Just imagine the very vast armies they are having in Tibet alone.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX³

I think, if the hon. Member feels keenly about it, we will send him to the frontier! Perhaps the speeches may convince the Chinese. So, first of all, the Chinese armies were fully acclimatised, living for long on the high plateau of Tibet. It was just not in the line with the ridge but only a little below the ridge.

which one normally talks about in Parliament openly. But I would be glad to explain what we have done, what we have not done and the difficulties that we had to face.

The hon. House will remember that till independence, our defence department was entirely under the war office, and the war office not only laid down the policy, but insisted that everything as far as possible should be acquired through Whitehall. During the last great war, because of the difficulties of acquiring war material from abroad, from the United Kingdom, some of our ordnance factories grew up, but still they were rather elementary. The first problem we had to solve, therefore, was to get out of this Whitehall atmosphere and the practice of our acquiring everything from there, determining our own policy and all that. I think we have done rather well to build up in these years this industry.

There is always a choice and there has been a choice in this and other matters for us to buy arms from abroad or to make them ourselves. Obviously it is infinitely better to make them ourselves, because that strengthens the country industrially and otherwise and secondly, you cannot altogether rely on, outside supplies; any moment they may fail you and economically it is bad to get them from outside. So, our practice has been to try to build up our arms, the industry and the like in the country and we have done fairly well. We might have done better; I do not know. All kinds of difficulties arise, because development of one industry depends on the whole industrial background of the country. We have laid stress on that. I would not go into that.

A great deal was said about arms, automatic rifles and the rest. For the last three or four years, we have been trying to make them and various difficulties arose about patents, this, that and the other and sometimes about our own difficulties in finding enough foreign exchange. This has been a continuing difficulty, as to how much we should spend in the shape of foreign exchange. Ultimately, we got over these difficulties and we started their manufacture, I forget the date, but sometime this year and we are now making them.

The only alternative was previously for us to get a large number of those weapons from abroad. We hesitated; we wanted to make them ourselves. Undoubtedly, we could have got them, but remember this. If we have tried to get all those weapons from abroad in what might be called relatively peace time, we will have to spend enormous sums of money. Our whole planning, etc. will have gone, because when you talk of weapons in terms of war, you talk in terms of thousands of crores. It is not a question of a few crores, but thousands of crores and it would have smashed our economy. It is a different matter when we have to face this tremendous crisis, which both our people feel so much and the world sees; we can get better terms to get the things and our people are prepared to spend much more.

I am, merely pointing out somethings; they may not be adequate explanation, but I want you to appreciate that every attempt has been made and continually being made to build up industry—an aircraft industry, an arms industry, etc., an up-to-date one. Obviously we cannot be up-to-date in the sense of competing, let us say with America or the Soviet Union or England. It is just not possible for us to advance our

firm resolve to resist it—a copy of it. I have placed on the Table of the House. We have received many replies, not from all yet but from many of them, extending their sympathy and support at the present crisis.

Just soon after, four or five days after this massive attack, the Chinese Prime Minister came out with, what is called, a “threepoint proposal” on which a ceasefire might be arrived. This was very vague. It was not quite clear what he meant. But what appeared to us and what appeared later on to us with further elucidation was that it meant our not only acknowledging or partly acknowledging their right to be where they were on our territory, but our force retiring still further, some 20 kilometres or so; that is to say, although the Chinese armies would retire a little on our territory we would retire further and they would have an opportunity to build up their strength on our territory to attack us further later. It is an impossible thing for us to agree to. There has been some confusion about this in the countries, not only, here but in other countries too, but as we have explained it most people have understood it—I am talking about other countries.

We, in reply or independently or rather, proposed that they should retire to the line prior to the 8th September, that is, behind the McMahon Line there and they should also retire the advances they had made since the 8th September in Ladakh. Some of our friends have said that this was a weak proposal, we should have asked them to go out completely. Well, it is for the House to judge our weakness and strength and the proposals must have some realities, because we have not only to abide by it but we have to convince all our friends elsewhere that we are making something, a proposal which is reasonable and which can be given effect to. The proposal was that they should retire to that line as it stood on 8th September both in NEFA and Ladakh. Then we were prepared to meet their representatives to consider what further steps should be taken to lessen tension etc. Once that was agreed to, then would come as a third step our meeting together to consider the merits of the question. We have made that proposal and we stand by it. I think it is a reasonable proposal and certainly not in any sense a dishonourable or a weak one.

Then, meanwhile, many of our friends abroad, well-intentioned countries, made various efforts to bring about ceasefire, stoppage of fighting and a consideration of the matter on the merits. Their efforts, or rather their desire, to help in stopping this fighting is very laudable, and we welcome their desire. But, not knowing all the detailed facts, sometimes they made some proposals which had no great relevance to the situation.

I shall refer only to one of them and that was the reference made by President Nasser of the UAR. I must pay my tribute to President Nasser in this matter because he did not make a vague proposal in the air. People advise us to be good and peaceful, as if we are inclined to war. In fact, if we are anything, as the House well knows, we do not possess the warlike mentality and that is why for the purpose of war there is weakness, we may have developed it, but that is a different matter, I am talking of the past. So, people talking to us to be good boys and make it up has no particular meaning, unless they come to grips with the particular issues involved. Now, President

Nasser took the trouble to understand the facts and, thereafter, issued a presidential decree or communique issued by the President-in-Council of the UAR in which he made certain proposals. These proposals were not exactly on the lines we had suggested but were largely in conformity with our proposals. They laid special stress on troops withdrawing to their lines which they stood prior to the 8th of September. That was a major thing. That fitted in with our proposal. China has rejected this proposal, made by President Nasser.

Now, this crisis is none of our making or seeking. It is China which has sought to enforce its so-called territorial claims by military might. Indeed, she has advanced beyond the line of her territorial claims. As I said, their frontier is a mobile one; anything they could grasp, becomes their frontier.

In his task in defending our frontiers and our motherland, we have sought help from all friendly countries. I wish to express my gratitude for the prompt response to our appeal for sympathy and support which have been given to us by various countries. This help that is given is unconditional and without any strings. It does not therefore, affect directly our policy of non-alignment which we value. Those countries which have helped us have themselves recognised this and made it clear that they do not expect us to leave that policy. Help has been given to us swiftly by the United States, by the United Kingdom and by some other friendly countries. We are in touch with many others. We have also made approaches to other friendly countries like the Soviet Union and France for supply of equipment.

We have often declared that we do not covet any territory of anyone else; we are quite satisfied with our own territory such as it is. But there is another aspect of that. We do not submit to anyone else coveting our territory and although the aggressor in this instance has gained some initial successes. I do not know what they have in mind, whether they want to use it as a bargaining counter or they have some other evil designs as I have said we cannot submit to it, whatever the consequences.

There is one other aspect which I should like to mention, which is not indirectly connected with this matter but directly connected, and that is our development plans and the Five Year Plan. Some people have said "let us give up these Plans so that we may concentrate on the war effort". What is the war effort? People think of the soldiers in the front, which is perfectly right. They are bearing the brunt of the heat and danger. But in this matter, in the kind of struggle that we are involved in, every peasant in the field is a soldier, every worker in a factory is a soldier. Our work, our war effort essentially, apart from, the actual fighting done, is in ever greater production in the field and factory. We must remember that. It is an effort which depends greatly on our development. Today we are much more in a position to make that kind of effort in field and factory than, let us say, ten or twelve years ago; there is no doubt about that. We are not still adequately developed. I hope this very crisis will make us always to be remembered that an army today, a modern army, fights with modern weapons which it has to manufacture itself in that country. It is based on the development of industry, and that industry must have an agricultural base if it is to

succeed. Therefore, we have to develop all round, apart from agriculture and industry, which are the basic things in our Five Year Plan. Then there is power, which is essential from the point of view of war effort, from the point of view of industry, from the point of view of even agriculture. So that, to talk of scrapping the Five Year Plan is not to understand the real springs of our strength. We have to carry the Five Year Plan and go beyond it in many respects. It may be, in some matters which are considered, nonessential, we may tone down or leave them but in the major things of the Five Year Plan we have to make the fullest effort. Among the major things agriculture is highly important. How can a country fight when it is lacking in food? But I do not think we will be. We have to grow more and more, which is a difficult thing. We have laid down the targets for our agricultural produce in our Five Year Plan, but in the last year or two, this year especially, we have fallen behind because of floods and all kinds of things.

Now, although we have fallen behind, I take it that we have to aim at higher targets than we have laid down even in the Third Plan, and I am sure we shall get that. I am not talking vaguely. I think we can get that. We cannot get it so easily if we laid down certain targets in the office here in the Food Ministry. We must go down to the peasant, to the agriculturist, and transform his present enthusiasm, his present energy into greater production. Nothing is more cheering; and heartening than the reaction amongst the people, amongst the peasants who have given their little mite. Let them transform them into greater production. I am sure they can, if we approach them rightly. So also with industry; so also with many other things like education etc. We must look upon all of them as part of the war effort that we have to make. In this process I hope we shall not only build up our nation more swiftly but will make it stronger, make it more social minded and lay the base of the socialist structure that we aim at.

This peril we have to face is a grave menace. This challenge may be converted into opportunity for us to grow and to change the dark cloud that envelops our frontiers into the bright sun not only of freedom but of welfare in this country.

In effect we have to look at this matter as an effort of the whole nation. We may say—some people say we want an armed people. That is true in a sense. But what we really want is the whole people mobilised for this effort doing their separate jobs whether it is in the field, the factory or the battlefield thus combining together and strengthening the nation and bringing success to us. We have to be armed, therefore, not only by weapons of warfare but by weapons of agriculture, industry and all those as well.

We do not minimise our task. Let no man minimise it or have any illusions about it. It is not a thing which we can deal with by momentary enthusiasm, enthusiasm of the moment or lasting a month or two. It is a long effort that we require a difficult effort and we shall have to go out to do our utmost. It is not merely enough to pay something to the Defence Fund or to do something else. That is good in its own way. It is very welcome how people are paying them by straining every nerve to the utmost. We have to keep up our strength and our determination to the end. And that

end may not be near. Therefore we have to prepare in every way to strengthen the nation not only for today and tomorrow but for the day after also to meet this menace. If we do that, I have no doubt that we shall be able to show the determination and fortitude that is required of our people. We have had a glimpse of it in their present enthusiasm which has been a most moving sight. To see our people come, not only the young but the old—old men and old women and the young little children and their enthusiasm has been a sight to gladden any heart.

Now before I end I should like to say a word about our soldiers and airmen who are working under extraordinarily difficult circumstances. I want to send on your behalf our greetings and assurance of our full assistance. To those who have fallen in defence of the country we pay our homage. They will not be forgotten by us or by those who follow us. I am confident that all sides of this House will stand united in this great venture and will demonstrate to the world that free India which has stood for peace and will always stand for peace and friendship with other countries can never tolerate aggression and invasion. If we have worked for peace as we have done and we shall continue to do so, we can also work for war effectively if we are attacked as we have been.

Sir, I commend these Resolutions to the House.

BACK NOTE

XLVIII. Resolutions Regarding Proclamation of Emergency and Aggression by China, 8 November, 1962

1. MR. SPEAKER: I shall place it before the House.

Resolution moved:

“This house approves the Proclamation of Emergency issued by the President on the 26th of October, 1962, under clause (1) of article 352 of the Constitution.”

The hon. Prime Minister may move the other resolution also.

2. MR. SPEAKER: I shall place this Resolution also before the House.

Resolution moved:

“This House notes with deep regret that, in spite of the uniform gestures of goodwill and friendship by India towards the People’s Government of China on the basis of recognition of each other’s independence, non-aggression and non-interference, and peaceful coexistence, China has betrayed this goodwill and friendship and the principles of Panchsheel which had been agreed to between the two countries and has committed aggression and initiated a massive invasion of India by her armed forces.

This House places on record its high appreciation of the valiant struggle of men and officers of our armed forces while defending our frontiers and pays its respectful homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honour and integrity of our Motherland.

This House also records its profound appreciation of the wonderful and spontaneous response of the people of India to the emergency and the crisis that has resulted from China’s invasion of India. It notes with deep gratitude this mighty upsurge amongst all sections of our people for harnessing all our resources towards the organisation of an all-out effort to meet this grave national emergency. The flame of liberty and sacrifice has been kindled anew and a fresh dedication has taken place to the cause of India’s freedom and integrity.

This House gratefully acknowledges the sympathy and the moral and material support received from a large number of friendly countries in this grim hour of our struggle against aggression and invasion.

With hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be.

SHRI JAWAHARIAL NEHRU: Mr. Speaker, Sir we meet in Parliament today earlier than was intended, because of a grave crisis that has arisen. This House, and everybody in India, and the greater part of the world know that the People’s Republic of China has invaded India with massive forces, and there have been some bloody battles resulting in considerable casualties on both sides.

For five years, we have been the victims of Chinese aggression across our frontiers in the north. That aggression was, to begin with, rather furtive. Occasionally there were some incidents and conflicts. These conflicts might well be termed frontier incidents. Today, we are facing a regular and massive invasion of our territory by very large forces.

China, which has claimed and still claims to be anti-imperialist, is pursuing a course today for which comparisons can only be sought in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In those past days, the European Powers in the full flood of imperialist aggression and with strength and weapons given to them by the Industrial Revolution took possession of large parts of Asia and Africa by force. That imperialism has abated now and many of the colonies of European countries have been freed and are independent countries. But, curiously, the very champions of anti-imperialism, that is, the People's Government of China, are now following the course of aggression and imperialist expansion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame!

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (HOSANGABAD): Down with China.

3. SHRI RAMESWARANAND: Now, you must have understand the Chinese attitude.

4. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: We do not want to interrupt; you may go on replying in your own way.

5. SWAMI RAMESHWARANAND: I would like to know what had you been doing till now (Interruptions).

HON. SPEAKER: Please listen to it patiently. These type of interruptions would not do.

SWAMI RAMESHWARANAND: He remained trapped in his misconceptions till today and now he does not even like to listen to us.

HON. SPEAKER: Listen patiently please.

SWAMI RAMESHWARANAND: I would like to know what he was doing? What was he doing when they were attacking?

SHRI MANI RAM BAGRI (HISAR): When Swamiji said something, our Hon. Prime Minister said to send him to the frontier. Our children will go to the frontier, they are brave. They will go to China and come back victorious.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Swamiji, I am afraid, has not acquired

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV (BARABANKI): Swamiji's problem is that he does not understand this language, please explain it to him.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: This is what I was saying that the difficulty is that Swamiji does not understand anything.

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV: Swamiji understand everything...[Interruptions].

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is not a matter of language.

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV: Hon'ble Speaker Sir, it is not right for an Hon'ble Member to say that he does not understand anything.

HON. SPEAKER: Please understand my situation also. If Swamiji does not understand this language and Hon. Prime Minister speaks in another language, then several other Hon'ble Members will not understand. So, please listen to it. After that we will see how to explain it to Swami ji.

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV: Once Hon. Prime Minister had spoken here in the language of this country. Now he is speaking in English. It would have been better if he had spoken on this question in Hindi.

SWAMI RAMESHWARANAND: When I said six months ago, you had said that all those speeches were printed in Hindi.

HON. SPEAKER: It is not astonishing that Swamiji has an intuitive understanding, but, let us listen to it this time.

SWAMI RAMESHWARANAND: This is what I say that this has happened to me.

HON. SPEAKER: Swamiji, will sit comfortably now.

6. SHRI MOHAN SWARUP (PILIBHIT): What about arms?

7. MR. SPEAKER: Let us hear the hon. Prime Minister. All sections shall have their opportunity to express themselves. We are now listening to the Prime Minister.

8. SWAMI RAMESHWARANAND: What happened to those who were killed? Were they not treated there?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I will make a request to Swamiji. We are not joking right now. We are discussing very important things on which the future of India depends. He thinks that we are joking.

SWAMI RAMESHWARANAND: We are with you...

We are with you. We are ready to die for the country. Listen to us at least.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. I would first ask the hon. Members on these benches, on the Congress side, not to interfere or take into their own hands the right to silence any other hon. Member. I think I am competent enough. I will deal with I

any hon. Member who interrupts or who says things like that. Wherever I need the help of all those hon. Members I will request them. But I think would not need that. I hope hon. Members on this side would not compel me to go to that extent. They will have ample opportunity to have their say. I will allow them as much as they want. Now they should listen patiently. When their turn comes and when they speak, if they are interrupted in this manner they would not like that. Therefore, we would listen to the Prime Minister in order to be able to criticise what he has said. If they do not listen to him, how shall the hon. Members on this side criticise those facts that he is giving. Let him have his say. When their opportunity comes they can criticise him.

SWAMI RAMESHWARANAND: If you are explaining to us then say at least two words in Hindi.

HON. SPEAKER: I simply said that you should remain silent for now, your turn will also come and you can speak as much as you want at that time.

RESOLUTION REGARDING PROCLAMATION OF EMERGENCY AND AGGRESSION BY CHINA

14 November, 1962

Mr. Speaker, Sir, since I had the honour of moving this resolution we have had a long debate in this House, almost perhaps a record debate in this House and perhaps in other parliaments also. I do not quite know how many Members have spoken.

165 Members have spoken. While it may have been said that perhaps a very large number of speeches rather take away from the pointedness of the question before the House and our minds wander into details, yet I am glad that so many Members have spoken because the point that stands out is this, not that they have not made various suggestions, various criticisms, but that fundamentally and basically every person who has spoken in this House has spoken in the same refrain more or less, and that our Members have reflected the mood of the country.

I have put forward a longish resolution before this House, and it is clear from the speeches made that the resolution as it is welcome to this House and will be accepted as it is. But I have almost felt that it would have been, shall I say, suitable to add a small paragraph to the resolution thanking the Chinese Government for taking some action against us which of course, we have resented which has suddenly lifted a veil from the face of India. During the last three weeks or a little more we have had a glimpse of the strength of the serene face of India, strong and yet calm and determined, that face, an ancient face which is ever young and vibrant. We have not had seen her face, but rather this House saw a million faces representing that face of India or Bharat Mata.

That has been an experience worth having for all of us and it has been our high privilege to share in that emotion and experience. Whatever the future may bring, I do not think we shall ever forget this powerful emotional upheaval that India has had in which we have all shared I repeat, all of us whatever party or group we may belong to. Any person who gives thought to these matters will realise and I hope, other countries also realise—I hope that even the Chinese Government realises that what this signifies, because it seems to me obvious that no country which evokes that feeling in a moment of crisis can ever be suppressed or defeated. In fact many countries of the West and, I hope, many countries of the East also realise that today. They are surprised that, such an amazing upheaval should have taken place among our feelings that all our petty controversies which seemed so big to us suddenly become of no moment and are swept aside before the one thing before us, that is how to meet this crisis and emergency, how to face this invasion and to repel it. That is the major issue.

We may I am going into that a little more later have failed here and there. We might not have been quite prepared to meet this invasion. Our mentality may be built towards peace Although we prepared for any such emergency, nevertheless it is true that the mind of the people and of the Government while preparing sought peace all

the time. I am not sorry for that. I think, it was a right urge and it is that right urge that has led to this enormous upheaval in the Indian mind.

Much has been said about Our unpreparedness. In some degrees many non Members have referred to it. I shall deal with that matter presently. I do not seek to justify any error that we might have committed, but I do think that many hon. Members have done an injustice, not to any Minister of others, but to our Armed Forces as a whole in making various charges. I hope to disabuse their minds by stating some facts. The one real fact as I said, is that our whole mentality has been governed by an approach to peace. That does not mean that we did not think of war or of defending our country. That, of course, we had always in mind. But there is such a thing as being conditioned in a certain way and, I am afraid, even now we are conditioned somewhat in that way.

Shri Anthony said I am not quiet sure of his words, but he said something to the effect that now we must...

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

I had an idea that he used the word 'bloodthirsty'—I am not sure. Anyway, he said that our nation must be brutalised: that Jawaharlal Nehru must be brutalised. I hope that our nation, much less my humble self, will never be brutalised because that is a strange idea that one can only be strong by being brutal. I reject that idea completely. Our strength lies in other factors. Brutality is a thing which we have associated with certain movements which we have objected to or rejected. By becoming brutal and thinking in those brutal ways we lose our souls and that is a tremendous loss. I hope that India which is essentially a gentle and peace-loving country will retain that mind even though it may have to carry on war with all its consequences to the utmost.

There is a definite distinction between being strong and being brutalised. I need not mention an instance which has lent prestige to our history— the instance of the long period when Gandhiji was controlling the destinies of our movement for freedom. No man can say that Gandhiji was brutal. He was the essence of humility and of peace. No man can say that Gandhiji was weak. He was the strongest man that India or any country has produced. It was that peculiar mixture of strength with sacrifice to the uttermost, yet a certain humility in utterance and a certain friendly approach even to our opponents and enemies, that made him what he was. Those of us who were privileged to serve with him and under him do not claim of course, to be much better than we are. We are humble folk who cannot be compared with the truly great, but something of the lesson that he taught came down upon us and we learnt it in a small measure. In the measure we learnt it we also became strong though, I hope, not brutal. So, I would like to stress that I do not want to become brutal. I do not want that aspect of the cold war and the hot war which leads to hatred and dislike of a whole people and looking upon them is something below normal.

Some of us who are old remember the First World War and the tremendous propaganda in it against the Germans. I do not hold any brief for the Germans—

I think, they were wrong in the First World War and, I think, they were wrong in the Second World War—but the type of propaganda against the Huns and all that, against the whole people, not against an individual, was shocking. I have no doubt that the same type of propaganda was being carried on in Germany against the Western allies.

Wars are terrible and millions of people die; much destruction is caused. Yet, after all, death comes to all of us and if it comes a little earlier than otherwise in the great cause, it is not to be sorrowed for. We have to face it as men. Death in a good cause is not a thing to regret, even though we may regret the parting with of our colleagues and comrades. But brutality is something which degrades a person. Death does not degrade a person. Brutality and hatred and the offspring of these things do degrade a nation and the people. So, I should like to say right at the beginning that, I hope, no such emotion will rise in our country and, if it does rise, it will be discouraged. We have nothing against the Chinese people. We regret many things that their Government has done. We think that their Government has acted infamously towards us. We regret many things that their Government has done in their country. We cannot help them. Any how, we must always distinguish between the people of any country much more so of a great country, great in size, great in history—and its government and not transfer somehow our anger and bitterness at what has been done by the Government, to the people.

Perhaps, if I understand many Members, sometimes, listen to broadcasts from Peking. I have not done so at any time. They have told me of the constant appeals that Peking broadcast makes to the Indian people. It distinguishes the Indian people from the Indian Government or the Indian Parliament. It carries on propaganda that the present Government are just some reactionary people who are sitting and crushing the Indian people and making them do things against their will. I am sorry if they are so utterly mistaken, because even the blind can see that all the Indian people are one today. It does not require much perspicacity. But, I want the House to note the reason for their propaganda, that is trying always to distinguish between the Indian people and the various governmental agencies and parties. There is something in that. We must not lump together the Chinese people and the Chinese Government and everything that is in China together.

I cannot say how the Chinese people feel now. because they have no chance to express their feelings. Even if they had a chance, their minds are so conditioned by constant propaganda, by onesided news that they are likely to feel one way even though otherwise they might not have done so. We should always distinguish between governmental action and the people as a whole. Therefore, I have not liked some poor Chinese shopkeepers, some restaurantkeepers being attacked in Delhi or elsewhere as if they were the symbols of the attack on us. Perhaps some people thought so. But, it was wrong for them to think so. It brutalises us and gives us a bad name. I should particularly like to lay stress on this aspect because it does not add to our strength in the least; but, it weakens the nervous energy that we possess by using it in wrong directions.

War in these days is something infinitely more than it was in the old days. When I say old days, I am talking about India. I am not talking about the Great wars and other things. War involves not only courage. It tends to become total war in which every human being, man, woman, and perhaps child, somehow helps or hinders, may hinder; and the total energy, nervous and otherwise of the nation, is involved in it, organised and mobilised.

We have seen in these great wars that have happened in the past, in the First World War and the Second, very powerful nations, very brave nations, armed to the teeth with the latest weapons, contending against each other, killing millions on either side, yet carrying on, but ultimately the whole nervous energy of the nation collapsing. Perhaps if the one which collapsed could have carried on a little while longer, the other would have collapsed, as Mr. Winston Churchill said at the end of the First World War. It was the sheerest fluke that we won, the sheerest chance, sheerest fluke. Because both sides were determined to carry on. They were trained people in war and they had strength and determination. Ultimately, it becomes a thing of the whole basic energy of a nation collapsing, however it might be. It so happened that the Germans collapsed a little sooner. This is what Mr. Churchill said. Perhaps, if they could have carried on. the decision might have been otherwise. So also in the Second World War. Throughout the War, it almost appeared, except towards the end that Germany might win. Yet, ultimately, the other people won. So, we must realise that it is a question not only of a few weapons here and there, but of this entire energy of the nation, the mind of the nation being concentrated to achieve a certain objective and holding to it whatever happens and not wasting our energy or frittering it on any minor things, minor expressions and minor disputes.

I hope, of course, that we will mobilize the nation. We will profit by many of the suggestions made in this House and other suggestions that are continually coming before us. But, even if we make mistakes, as any person is bound to do, the real thing that counts is not an odd mistake leading to an odd reverse, but ultimately keeping up this united front and united nervous energy of the nation to face this crisis.

The fact of the matter is that before these 3½ weeks, before the 20th of October, it was not realised by the people at large what dangers possibly might confront us. They thought of frontier incidents. Hon. Members in this House criticised us for not taking steps in Ladakh to drive them out, not realising that it is not such an easy matter. Perhaps they realise in a little more now that these things are not so easy matters, that they require not only the strength of a nation, but properly utilised, properly directed, enormous field of preparation and consideration of military factors. Where these factors are against us, naturally we suffer a reverse, it does not matter what your strength is. Our jawans were very strong.

I might mention just for the information of the House that it was not today, but some years back—by some years, I mean a couple of years back—that is, after the Chinese started nibbling at our territory in Ladakh, that we had before us the question

of N.E.F.A. We considered it, what we should do if they attacked. We hoped that they would not attack there. Certainly we hoped, we expected that they would not attack in such large numbers as to bring about a regular invasion with several divisions, which they did. Nevertheless, we had to consider if they did, what should be done. The advice that we received then was that it will be disadvantageous for us to try to hold to the exact frontier line, the McMahon line, but that we should delay them, we should harass them, we should fight them a little but the real defence line should be lower down wherever a strong defence line could be made. Partly because to the last moment we did not expect this invasion in overwhelming numbers, partly from the fact that we disliked it—I frankly tell you that we disliked the idea of our walking back in our own territory, whatever it was—we faced the Chinese there under very disadvantageous circumstances from a military point of view. In addition to that, enormous numbers came over. It is no criticism at all of our officers or men that they were somewhat overwhelmed by this deluge and they had to retire to more defensive positions.

Shri Frank Anthony, I think, I said that we have been enabled to put up some kind of line of defence, because we have received arms from abroad. Now, we are very grateful for the arms and material and equipment that has come from abroad, but that was not correct then; no arms which were brought had reached our troops by then; they are gradually dribbling in and going there, but by that time when we achieved the present position, these arms which were brought had not been given and had not reached them. It was with the existing equipment that they brought the Chinese advance to a standstill.

So the real reason, the basic reason for our reverses in the early days of this campaign was the very large forces the Chinese threw in; in a restricted sphere or field, they outnumbered our forces, by many many times. Even the question of better arms did not arise. They had slightly better arms, but that question did not arise so much. They had better mortars to hit at some distance. They still have them, but they had stopped. That was the main reason, and there was nothing that we could do about it, because the geography of the place, the military appraisal of the place was against us in that particular area. The only fault we made, it may be, if it is a fault, was even to stick out where the military situation was not very favourable. It was not that we told them to stick out; it is folly for any politician to say so. But our soldiers themselves have a reluctance to go back, and they stuck on at considerable cost to them.

I referred to the great unity in the country, which is a wonderful factor. It is not unity of parties so much as the unity of hearts and minds. We can see that in the thousands of faces. When I talked about the face of India, I really should have talked about the million faces of India, because they all bear the same impress today, whatever community or party he or she may belong to.

And I should like to say something even about the Communists. Now, the Communist Party's manifesto as a manifesto was, I think, as good as it has been drafted by any non-communist People may think or say that it does not represent their real views, but because of pressure from outside they did it. Let us suppose that

it did not represent some of their views, some, no doubt. Some there are in the Communist Party who even objected to this manifesto, and were overruled. Even so, the fact that conditions in the country were such that they decided to issue that manifesto is a factor of some importance. It shows how these conditions mould people's minds in India, all of us, to whatever party we may belong to, even to a party which for reasons known to Members was inclined in the past to favour somewhat the Chinese, because they are also Communists. Even then, they stood out, and stood up four square against this attack as any hundred per cent nationalist would do. That is a good thing. Why should we not take full advantage of it instead of deriding it and seeking causes why they did it? After all, there are some leaders among the Communists, and they sometimes quarrel amongst each other about ideologies, these and what not, but the large number of ordinary workers or others who may belong to the Communist Party are simple folk. They are attracted by something in it and those simple folk are affected just as they are affected by the situation which affects every Indian; they have also been affected by this manifesto of the Communist Party, that is, the ordinary communist members. And that is a great gain. They should be affected in this way. Why should we lessen the effect of that by telling them that it is a wrong manifesto? So, I welcome that manifesto, and we should take full advantage of it in forging the unity against aggression that we have in fact forged.

Then, I do not wish to go into the hundred and more minor criticisms and suggestions made in this House. All suggestions made by hon. Members will be carefully examined. Some, as I said, were made because of not knowing that the thing had been done; some perhaps we cannot adopt; others we may adopt.

I should like rather to lay stress now on the general question of our preparedness, because hon. Members seem to think, some Members, that we sent our soldiers barefoot and without proper clothing, to fight in the NEFA mountains. It is really extraordinary to say that they were almost unarmed, and barefooted.

Some soldiers there were stationed there. Others were sent rather in a hurry in September. Our time for issuing winter clothes is September, about the middle of September. When they were sent, they went there, of course at that time in full uniform, full warm uniform, woollen uniform, and every man had two boots, good boots. As they were going, they were given three blankets apiece. Later on, it was made into four blankets; now, they have been issuing four thick army blankets. But these blankets took up so much room, and as they were going by air, the people decided, that is, the officer in charge, and the men themselves said 'They take so much room, and, therefore, send them later on to us. It was not so very cold then. So, they took, each one of them, one blanket and left the others to be sent later on. That was a little unfortunate, because sending them later, as we did, meant air-dropping them. And airdropping was a hazardous business in those days. Apart from the fact that the Chinese then could fire at them, airdropping in those very precipitous areas in the mountains could not be accurately carried out. Often, they went into the khad, into the deep ravine below, and it was difficult to recover them. So, we lost a good deal of our supplies, many of these blankets and other things.

Then, we even went further. We provide for high mountain altitudes snowboots; they had good boots, they had two boots apiece; they had snow boots; these boots had been provided to these soldiers of ours who were permanently located there. The others that were sent were all in Assam; they were not here; but they were in Gauhati and other places. But, again, the difficulty arose of sending them by air.

Broadly speaking, I would say that all our Army in NEFA was wellclad, and well-booted, but towards the end, that is, towards the end of September, realising that the Chinese forces were increasing very rapidly, we decided to send more troops quickly. These troops were sent in a hurry. And sometimes, it so happened that troops that were being sent somewhere else were diverted to NEFA, and these troops certainly had not the full complement of winter clothing then. Of course, it was decided to send them later. Except for these troops that went later and which did not have the full complement and subsequently it was supplied to them all others had the full Army complement, and many of them had snowboots also. In any event, everyone had good stout Army boots.

Some people have heard stories of frostbite. All the cases of frostbite occur naturally due to the cold and due also to the high altitude. I do not quite remember the number, but I have an idea that out of a large number of people,—I do not quite know, about two or three thousand, the total number of frostbite cases was only a handful. Even the cases of bronchitis, pneumonia etc., were only about forty, which is a very small percentage considering the conditions there. Of these too, we may say that more than half was due just to the altitude and not to lack of footcovering. This occurred not to our regular army serving on the front, but most of this occurred to people when on the 20th October when this fierce onslaught of the Chinese came, our forces in that particular place— one or two places there—were dispersed. They could not return to the base of their army. They dispersed and for some days, they wandered about the mountains and ultimately returned. That was also the reason perhaps for people saying that the casualties were very heavy. Of course, large numbers of our forces had not returned in order; they were wandering about the mountains, returning a few days later. I think these persons who returned a few days later were over 1,600. During these few days, these persons, naturally, were not well-protected. When they were wandering, they did not have the facilities of the army, blankets and other things they would at the base camp. They were not carrying them. They were wandering in high altitudes and they suffered a great deal. That was where the frostbite cases chiefly occurred, along with lack of other comforts. When they came back, they were put in hospital, and they are doing fairly well.

So I would submit to the House that it is not correct to say that our people were not sufficiently clad or sufficiently booted. It was an unfortunate thing that this was the time for changeover from summer clothing to winter clothing. Suddenly a small number of our army which was in summer clothing at that time was diverted to the east without coming back to their base, and the winter clothes took a little time to reach them. As regards boots, they had very good boots. Even snow boots were supplied. Some people do not have them. We do not supply snow boots to large numbers, to everybody. We do supply them to people in these high altitudes.

Apart from clothes and boots which were I do think excellent normally your army is not clad for the winter. They were clad, for instance, in the special clothes, but normally our army is not clad for the severe winter. They have got all kinds of winter things, but not for these very high altitudes and the cold winter there.

It might interest hon. Members to know that in Ladakh, round about the Chushul area, the temperature at present is 30 degrees below zero. Such is the ferocity of that climate. Ordinarily, it does not matter how many clothes you may have in a temperature 30 degrees below zero at an altitude of over 14,000 ft., unless you are used to it. Now, learning from experience, we have provided, in addition to all the other winter materials that our soldiers have, thick cotton padded coats and trousers. They are very warm. They may not look so smart as with the other clothes, but they are there. We started providing them these within a few days of the 20th, as soon as we felt that they ought to have these and it became colder there. We have been sending these cotton padded coats and trousers at the rate first of 500 a day and later at the rate of nearly 1000 a day.

The other charge made is about weapons, that they did not have proper weapons. Now the soldiers, jawans, who went there were supplied with all the normal equipment, that is, 303 rifles and the normal complement of automatic weapons such as light machine guns and medium machine guns. They did not have semi-automatic rifles because our army does not possess them. I might point out that many up-to-date armies in the west do not possess them yet. Even in England, the changeover to semi-automatic rifles has just fully taken place. It has just been completed; it took about four or five years; it has just been completed, this year, a few months ago. It is a lengthy process. And the British Army is relatively smaller than ours.

For about four years now, we have been considering and discussing this matter. Various difficulties arose. Points of views were different. The easiest way is always to order something—readymade article. But the easy way is not always a good way. Apart from the continuing difficulty we have to face, that is, lack of foreign exchange etc., it is not the way to build up the strength of a nation. If we get something today, we have to get ammunition for that all the time and we are completely in the hands of some other country. And specially if we have to deal with private suppliers in other countries, the House knows that the arms racket is the worst racket of all; because you need something, they make you pay through the nose.

So we were very much against getting it from private suppliers outside and we thought that we should build up our own arms industry to manufacture semi-automatic rifles. These arguments, specially in peace time, take a long period to determine. Of course, if we had this crisis before this, we would have functioned better. But it took about two to three years to determine what type to have. Ultimately, we started the first processes of manufacture and we have just arrived at a stage when within about three weeks or four weeks in fact, some prototypes have been prepared—they will begin to come in larger numbers and will increase in numbers in another month, two months and three months to a substantial quantity.

It is not a question merely of semi-automatic rifles. As I have said, we had automatic machine guns, LMGs and MMGs—Light Machine Guns and Medium Machine Guns. Every regiment had its complement of these. Certainly, they did not have semi-automatic rifles for the reasons I have given, namely, we wanted to manufacture them ourselves and this changeover to automatic rifles has been relatively a modern development. As I said, even in England, it is a recent thing. But this outlook of ours, about manufacturing things ourselves rather than buying them, covered our whole approach to this question. We are manufacturing a great many things in arms today which we did not previously. I shall give you some figures. The first pressure upon us is always that of finance, that is, foreign exchange. We could not really afford it. Do not compare that situation two or three years ago with the situation today when we have to meet a crisis. When we meet a crisis like this, it just does not matter what happens. We have to face it. We have to buy it here and there; we have to get it from wherever we can. That is a different matter. But normally, the whole approach was to make them ourselves.

How did we make them? The usual thing was that we bought some with the proviso attached that the persons we bought it from would give us the licence and the blue-prints to manufacture it here. So we bought some to begin with, and then started with the blueprints and the licence we had got to manufacture it and supply it with everything, whether it is tanks or other things.

Also, it is all very well to build a factory here and there, but really you want to have a strong industrial background. You cannot, out of a relatively agricultural background, suddenly put up a highly sophisticated factory. All this time the work we have done, not in the Defence Ministry, but all over the country, in our First Five Year Plan, the Second and the Third, has been meant to strengthen the nation by making it more modernised, more industrialised and build up this base out of which you can produce the things you require. Perhaps some hon. Members will no doubt realise this, some may not. You have to have a strong base, industrial base. You have to have indeed not only a strong base, you have to have a literate people. People may think for the time being that education can be stopped. Education is essential for a real war effort. It is essential because you want every soldier today to be a better mechanic; he has to be educated as much as possible. So, it all goes together. The whole basis of our Five Year Plan was to better our people, to raise their level and all that, but it was essential to make India stronger to face any trouble that arose, whether it was invasion or anything. And we are in a much better position today to face this trouble than we were ten or twelve years ago, there is no doubt because of the growth of our industrial base in the public sector and the private sector, both. If we had to face this business ten or twelve years ago, our army was the same as today, a very brave army, but it had no industrial background, and it would have been very difficult for it. We had to develop that industrial background as fast as we could. Now we have at least a base to develop, and I hope, therefore, that no conflict will arise in any person's mind whether we should go ahead with the Third Five Year Plan or devote ourselves to the war effort. That is part of the war effort—I do not say everything in

the Third Plan; some things may be avoided, slowed down, even dropped if you like. But take agriculture. It is the base of all industry. It is only on a strong agricultural base you can build up industry. The industrial base is the foundation of any war effort. So, the two are connected, intimately connected.

Education again. We want today, we shall want, not only a widely educated mass of people, but vast numbers of technically trained people. That comes in. Power is essential for industry, and so on. So, really, all the major things that we want were in the Five Year Plans, and are required today.

But the point I wish to lay stress on is this, that all our thinking in the past even from the point of view of the army has been concentrated on industrialisation, on making things ourselves.

Today we are getting large numbers of arms and equipment from other countries, and we are very grateful to the United States, to the United Kingdom especially, and other countries. But please remember that this kind of thing, and this kind of response, could not have occurred in peace time. Obviously, it is when danger threatens us, just as we feel in a particular way, others feel too, and they think, as they rightly think, that this is not a mere matter of India being invaded by China, but it raises issues of vast importance to the world to Asia, and realising that they do it, they help us; that is, they feel this involves many issue? In which they themselves are intensely interested. This could not have happened in peace time.

Some one asked us: we could have bought some of the things at a very heavy price. Today I hope we get them on very special terms whatever the terms are, they are being worked out, but it is understood special terms, not to put any heavy burden on us today. That kind of thing could not have taken place then. We would have bought these things, or even one-tenth of what we are buying, at a heavy cost, which would have made our Finance Minister shiver. But apart from that, in any long-term view, it was a wrong thing. The thing is to make them ourselves.

What has China done? The main difference—there are many differences between China and India, but one difference is that first of all they started about 20 years before the success of the revolution there, they were fighting all the time. They had a heavily trained army fighting in the mountains. They are especially good at mountain warfare: lightly clad with a bag of rice and a bag of tea in their pockets, they march on, with no questions of supplies or anything for days, with cotton-padded coats and trousers. They were highly trained in that warfare. But what I am saying is this, that they concentrated right from the beginning, apart from other developments in the country, on the development of armaments manufacture. They got a good deal of help from the Soviet Union; vast numbers, thousands of people set up their armament industries. We, although we did go on with our armament industries, did not concentrate on that, certainly not. We thought: better build up the whole industrial complex of India, and out of that other things would also be built up. Nevertheless, we did build up, I think fairly adequately, our armament industry, not as much as we would have liked. It was being progressed.

I shall just read out to you some figures of our ordnance factories production. In 1956-57, the issues to the army from the ordnance factories amounted to—I cannot tell you the details, it is not right for me to tell you. I am only telling you how much they cost.

It has grown about 500 per cent. I do not mind telling you, I am not going to give you what they are making, but the issues to the army in 1956-57 were Rs. 8.64 crores: civil orders Rs. 3.52 crores: Air Force and Navy Rs. 1.93 crores. In 1957-58. issues to the army Rs. 12.78 crores; civil orders Rs. 3.27 crores; Air Force and Navy Rs. 2 crores. Then the figure for the army goes up to Rs. 12, Rs. 14, Rs. 19, Rs. 24 and in 1961-62 to Rs. 33¼ crores, and at the present moment it is estimated at Rs. 60 crores.

Much has been said about civil orders, that we make thermos flasks and the like in ordnance factories. It is very unkind, that kind of criticism, without knowing anything. Most of the civil orders are for railways and the Government, A few things are made, some things like thermos flasks, simply because in the process of manufacturing other things, some things are manufactured which can easily be converted into thermos flasks etc., and there was surplus labour about. You will see that civil orders have not progressed much. They have become, from Rs. 3½ to Rs. 6 crores in these eight years, while the issues to the army rose from Rs. 8 to Rs. 60 crores. It has advanced much more, again with the difficulty of trying not to import machinery as much as possible. We did import some. Again, foreign exchange, that awful thing stares us in the face. And the result was that much of the machinery used was revamped, reconditioned machinery, which we got from old stocks; and our engineers are good men, they made it suit their purposes. Of courses, it is far better to get new machinery. We are trying to get new machinery. But it is remarkable what they did with the material they had before them and I should like to pay a tribute to the man in charge of our ordnance factories, not only because they are thoroughly competent but, what is more, they are filled with a certain enthusiasm. They are patriotic and they want to show results. They work night and day and at the present moment they are working 24 hours a day in the factories.

I should like to mention how pressure of circumstances makes one a hard realist. The food we supply to our army, though good, is complicated and not easy to throw about or be supplied from above. In the last two or three weeks both our Armed Forces food department and Defence Science Organisation as also the Food and Agriculture Ministry have been experimenting with foods which could be concentrated foods and which could be carried about easily in your pocket also and which should be enough for several days. Only this morning I was looking at an exhibition, demonstration rather, in the Defence Ministry of these foods, quite a large number, very attractive and very palatable. They looked palatable. I did not eat them. There are all kinds of preparations of gur and nuts. They are excellent preparations, I may also tell the House that gur is a good thing for high altitudes. We are making very good progress. We have in fact sent these things to the front to find out the reaction of the soldiers to that.

Some hon. Member asked a question about the newspaper item about our soldiers getting notices from courts or some such thing. I do not know that. Anyhow, we have immediately taken action to stop any such thing happening and every such thing will have to be postponed for the duration of this emergency.

Some people criticised our diplomatic missions abroad for not doing as good a job of work as they ought to in putting our case and countering the Chinese propaganda. My information is that our diplomatic missions abroad, by and large, are doing very good work. But another country's outlook is not determined solely by what we tell them. There may be many factors—may be, sometimes fear, sometimes 'other things. I think our missions abroad are doing well and, what is more, their work is being rewarded. The first reaction of many countries, many of these Asian and African countries, was regret and surprise at what had happened here and they hoped that it would be quickly ended by some ceasefire and compromise and all that, because they found themselves in a difficult position. Gradually this surprise is giving way; it has given way in the case of the UAR and even Ghana which took up an attitude to our regret originally and later supported the U.A.R. making some suggestions to the Chinese Government. It was very near to the suggestions we made about the ceasefire business. So, I do not think it will be right to criticise our diplomatic missions abroad. You must remember that these countries have their own diplomats too here who report to them, and most of them have got their newspaper correspondents. There are many ways of getting news about what is happening.

This question comes up in various ways—about Pakistan and Nepal. It is difficult for me to say anything definite. But about Nepal I should like to say that latterly the attitude of Nepal has been relatively much more friendly. Naturally, we have always made it clear—it is unfortunate that they thought that we were creating troubles—we have made it clear right from the beginning that we do not want trouble in Nepal. Apart from the Chinese invasion and the trouble there, they are largely internal. Anyhow, now, I think they believe our word and are very friendly and I hope that our relations will continue to be friendly and cordial.

As for Pakistan, there also, I will not quite be definite, but their newspapers have been peculiarly virulent about this matter against us. But I do not think their newspapers reflect very much the opinion of the people of Pakistan or even of those in authority in Pakistan. Gradually they are realising it; at first, apparently they thought this was a small frontier matter and nothing much. Now, they are realising how far-reaching are the consequences of this and they are making a reappraisal.

I should like to say a few words about the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has been, as the House knows, consistently friendly to us all along. It has been put in a very difficult position in this matter, because they have been, and are, allies of China, and hence the embarrassment to them as between a country with which they are friendly and a country which is their ally. We have realised that and we do not expect them to do anything which would definitely mean a breach over there. It is not for us to suggest to any country. But we have had their goodwill and good wishes all along, even very recently, and that is a consolation to us and we certainly hope to have that in future.

The Chinese Government has been making a lot of propaganda about our Defence of India Act as if that was specially passed to deal with some Chinese here. It has obviously been passed because of the situation we have to deal with. Everybody who is a mischief-maker, if it be a Chinese who makes a mischief, he comes under its purview; otherwise not. The difficulty with the Chinese is that they have a singularly perverted opinion and perverted view of what happens in the rest of the world. It is an old characteristic of the Chinese. Being a great nation with a vast territory, it begins to think all outside the limits of its frontiers are sub-human types and not so advanced as they are.

One thing more. There has been some criticism about our offer for a cease-fire. We have said that before we discuss anything, the Chinese forces must go back and restore the position as it existed before the 8th September, that is, a little over two months ago, when they first came over the Thagla pass. They have suggested something different, and something that is apt to delude the people. They say, let us go back to the position of November, 1959. Now, the people who do not know this might well wonder, they are going back three years, not now. But November, 1959 was roughly the date or period when the first claim was made by the Chinese Government, by Mr. Chou En-lai, to these territories according to their maps. Previously, they were included in their maps, but nobody had made any official claim. In fact, officially they have said that their maps are old and not up-to-date, and they will revise them. But in 1959, for the first time, they claimed them, meanwhile, of course, they having gone into a good bit of Ladakh.

In 1959, our counter-measures started taking effect. In 1959-60 and 1961, we went into Ladakh much more and more and established many posts there. Now, we realised, as I think I told this House then, that the object of these posts is to prevent their further advance unless they fight it out. It was difficult for us to have a major armed conflict with them there, because they had great advantages. Their roads came right up there. They could bring all kinds of weapons, tanks, etc., there from Tibet which is near, which is relatively a flat country, while for us, although we made some progress and the road is recently made—at that time even that was not made—it is very difficult; it meant months of effort to get there. Nevertheless, we put up those posts to check their advance and they did check their advance. In fact, we pushed them back a little. In the NEFA area, we had previously put up our posts at the border or just under it, because one cannot have a high-ridge post. Even in Thagla pass, our post was two or three miles on this side, but not on the pass itself.

Now, if we accept their proposals, which seems so innocuous; they would retire, they said, up to the McMahon line, but then they add that their idea of McMahon line was different from ours: and it is on this side of the ridge, and we should have to retire from where we are today—another 20 kilometres, that is, leaving about 40 kilometres of territory which was not occupied either by their armies or ours. That is to say, they would have a fixed base on this side of the Thagla pass, an open territory which they can walk across any moment they like. It was impossible for us to agree to. And in Ladakh, it meant our withdrawing still further from where we are, and their not

They have always been saying that their chief grouse against us is that we have been encouraging a revolt and rebellion in Tibet. That is the thing which ultimately turned them against us. If we say that, it will justify their argument, which had no foundation, and give them in international circles and everywhere considerable strength. It will mean our saying something which we cannot possibly, feasibly do. It is impossible. We have got a big enough task, a tremendous task, which we should realise, to push them back to their own territory from our own country. We are going to do it. It is going to be mighty difficult; it might take us a long time. So, I hope that while we should be strong and determined, as we must be, we must not just for the sake of appearing braver than others say things which are, I regret to use the word, manifestly nonsense.

Now, the resolution I have placed before the House is a fairly comprehensive one. It is a resolution of resolve, of determination and of dedication. I hope, therefore, that in accepting the resolution, as I hope this House will, the House thinks in terms of dedication, not in bombast, not in tall talk, but realising that we have a very difficult task before us we are determined to fulfil it however long it may take and whatever the consequences might be. And, in doing so, we will be heartened by the biggest thing that a country can do and which India has done thus far, and that is, produce this enormous emotional upheaval that we see all over India among man, among women and, perhaps more than all, among children. So, I put forward this resolution before the House in the hope, faith and with the strong determination that all those who are present here and the country will abide by it and will act up to it.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX³

I regret, Sir that such questions are put to me. I will give no assurance of any kind. How can I give assurances. I can give no assurance except that we are taking all measures that we can if such a thing occurs there. How can I give assurances about the future in matters which are determined not by my assurances but by other factors? But I do not think that the Chinese, if they venture to invade and come from Chumbi Valley, will be allowed to come or will find it an easy job.

One thing I have to mention—it is unconnected with this question. I have received today a letter signed by 35 Members of Parliament offering their services to serve anywhere. I am very grateful to those 35 Members and I welcome their offer. I do not quite know how we can immediately profit by it. But I am sure as our organisation progresses work would be found for more and more people in all grades and departments of life.

BACK NOTE

XLIX. Resolution Regarding Proclamation of Emergency and Aggression by China, 14 November, 1962

1. AN HON. MEMBER: Brutalise.
2. SHRI PRIYA GUPTA (Katihar): Are we going to allow them to march to Delhi?
3. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Mr. Speaker, may I by your leave ask just one question? The Maharaja-Kumar of Sikkim is reported to have said in Darjeeling two days ago that there has been a tremendous Chinese military build-up on Sikkim's border during the last few days or weeks. Is the Prime Minister in a position to assure the House and the nation, in view of the agreement which India has with Sikkim for the responsibility of its defence, that our army is better prepared to resist the Chinese aggressor in Sikkim than it was, unfortunately, in NEFA a few weeks ago?

STATEMENT ON SITUATION IN NEFA AND LADAKH

19 November, 1962

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have to give grievous news to this House. Both Walong and the Sela ridge in NEFA have fallen to the enemy. In the Chushul area fighting is proceeding.

In Walong, the enemy attacked on the 15th/16th night. This was a two pronged attack. The battle continued till the morning of the 17th. The enemy succeeded in shelling this air field, which was the only source of supply to our forces. In the 17th afternoon, our troops started withdrawing to defensive positions in the rear.

In the Jung area, the enemy attacked our positions on the 17th November. Their attack was repulsed four times. Ultimately there was an attack in greater strength, and this Jung position had to be given up. Our troops fell back to the main position at Sela. In the meantime, the enemy bypassed our main post by a wide flanking movement between Sela and Bomdila. They attacked in the early hours of the 18th November, and cut the road between Sela and Bomdila. The infiltrators were forced to withdraw. They formed up again and renewed the attack. The situation is somewhat confused, and fighting is going on, but our Commander had to withdraw from Sela.

In the Chushul sector in Ladakh, heavy artillery attacks were made on the Chushul air field and the outposts. Our post at Rezang La was attacked on the 18th morning. After fierce fighting, this post was overwhelmed. A part of another post six miles east of Chushul was also attacked.

Other attacks in the Chushul area were repulsed. Fighting is still going on.

This is bad news. I cannot go into further details at this stage. I should like to add that in spite of the reverses suffered by us, we are determined not to give in, in any way and we shall fight the enemy, however long it may take to repel him and drive him out of our country.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹

I would not like to say anything beyond what I have said. I have referred to both Jung and Chushul.

..... XXX XXX XXX²

As the House knows, every effort is being made to get arms and other equipment from foreign countries, and we have received some, and they have been immediately sent on to our forward posts.

BACK NOTE

L. Statement on Situation in NEFA and Ladakh, 19 November, 1962

1. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: On a point of clarification.

MR. SPEAKER: I have received, and probably the Prime Minister may have received, a call attention notice from several hon. Members. That was specific about the fall of Jung to the enemy, and the reportedly precarious position of Chushul. Would the Prime Minister like to say anything more?

2. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: (Hoshangabad): I am sure the House is distressed and shocked beyond measure to hear of this most calamitous reverse since October 20. Our gallant jawans are being killed and taken prisoner in their thousands.

The former Defence Minister, on the eve of his resignation, stated in Bombay or elsewhere, that the position was that we are not only outnumbered, but out-weaponed. May I ask the Prime Minister whether steps, and vigorous steps, are being taken now to obtain arms and equipment from all friendly nations on a massive scale and thus allay the widespread public apprehensions that our armed forces are not yet fully equipped to meet the enemy?

3. SHRI PRIYA GUPTA (Katihar): May I know the extent to which foreign military aid is taken, and whether Government have a blueprint for further military aid to meet this crisis arising out of the fact that there is a reported mutual understanding between China and the Pakistan Government to the effect that China would help Pakistan to get Kashmir and West Bengal and Assam according to Group C proposal of the British Cabinet Mission?

MR. SPEAKER: All this question is not relevant here.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: Our jawans are being killed.

MR. SPEAKER: I have said this question need not be answered; it cannot be answered.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: In what way shall I express my feeling Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot enter into an argument . . .

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: May I submit that the jawans are dying there.....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. He should now resume his seat..... Dr. Singhvi has not given his name. I cannot change the procedure....Order, Order. We proceed with the motion made by Shri Datar.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati) *rose*.

MR. SPEAKER: He was not in his seat.

SHRI HEM BARUA: We were told that the statement would be made at 12.30.

MR. SPEAKER: There was an interval after the motion had been made and therefore, I thought that I may take it up.

SHRI BAGRI (HISAR): My name is also there in it.

MR. SPEAKER: Your name is there and you can ask the question.

SHRI BAGRI: The statement given by the hon. Prime Minister revealed that we have moved our forces back. I would like to know as to what happened to the population of Walong. Have they also been removed or have they been left at the mercy of the Chinese. Please, throw some light on the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no question of leaving them at the mercy of the Chinese, but it is legitimate question whether the population has been removed or not.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I cannot answer this at the moment because I do not have all the information... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. He has put a question and the Prime Minister has said that he has not this information with him; and that whenever it is got it would be supplied to the House.....

SHRI RAM SEVAK YADAV: It is a question of the country's security and freedom.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: It should be answered.

MR. SPEAKER: I am allowing this question. But if four or more than four Members ask the question at the same time, how can it be answered?

SHRI HEM BARUA: [Guwahati]: In view of the fact that a very grave situation has emerged with the fall of Walong and Jang and Sela pass has also fallen according to my latest information ... and the Chinese are making a headlong thrust into the heart of Assam, in this context may I know whether the Government proposes to go in for a total war with military aid in men and materials from our friendly countries or the Government proposes to go in for immediate negotiations for peace on the basis of cease-fire at whatever cost? These are the things that I want to know from the Prime Minister; the situation has become very serious.

4. SHRI HEM BARUA: May I submit that there is no defence in Assam? What is the defence preparation ...

MR. SPEAKER: I will request hon. Members to resume their seats.....

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: I didn't find anything specific in the speech.

SHRI BAGRI: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: When I am standing, they should sit down.

If you people continue to speak like this and don't stop, then how can the matter be solved.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA *rose*

MR. SPEAKER: Would he resume his seat.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: I will, with all humility. But I would ask the Prime Minister one thing. The Prime Minister is laughing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: what kind of Non- alignment Policy is this...

MR. SPEAKER: When I am standing, he should not stand.

SHRI HEM BARUA: We are having the same fate. First they said it was difficult terrain. I know that. But that argument does not apply now. .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. I have allowed him to put questions.

SHRI HEM BARUA: My question was whether we are going to call an immediate cease fire and start negotiations and all that, or whether we are going to have a total war, with military aid from our friendly countries, with men and materials, to set out to fight.

MR. SPEAKER: He has put the question.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Assam is exposed now; it is vulnerable.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: Aid from all our friends.

MR. SPEAKER: We cannot continue the proceedings in this manner. I would request all hon. Members to resume their seats. Now, the hon. Member wants to know about the policy of the Government. He wants to know whether it is possible for the Government just to say at this moment whether the Government is going to ask for an all-out aid from the capitalist countries to meet this situation.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Aid from all friendly countries.

SHRI HEM BARUA: From friendly countries.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry I made a mistake.

SHRI HEM BARUA: You put a twist to what I have said.

MR. SPEAKER: If I had made a mistake, I corrected it.

SHRI HEM BARUA: If you have corrected it, I do not have any objection.

MR. SPEAKER: Then, he should listen to it. I have corrected it. Even his colleagues know that I have corrected it.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I beg of you to understand our feelings, the feelings of this country, on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I do. But you should also understand the difficulties.

SHRI RANGA: May I make a suggestion? Nothing could be heard now, and so, could you allow some time so that we can settle down? It looks as if there is a fracas between the Chair and some hon. Members of the House. It is not possible to have a talk. Therefore, kindly give us time to settle down.

MR. SPEAKER: They should not talk simultaneously, of course. When I stand up, I only say that others should resume their seats. Then, I will sit down and any hon. Member might stand and speak. That is the only procedure we can adopt.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad): May I earnestly plead with you that on this particular occasion, you will kindly understand and appreciate how baffled how distressed and how shocked we all are, and therefore, I would earnestly request you not to misunderstand when some of us get up and ask questions. I would only give the gist of what my hon. colleague asked. His question was that Assam which is his State and our State-India is one, we are all integrated into one nation-is now vulnerable and thoroughly exposed to the enemy, and so, what measures-virile, vigorous and strong measures-were taken, have been taken and are being taken, by arms, equipment and all that, to step up our preparations and stop the Chinese thrust southward and right into the heart of India. What measures have been taken?

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Kamath and others who put the question should know that all of us are distressed. They must include me in that "us" as well as the Prime Minister. Everyone of us, wherever he might be sitting, and everyone in the whole country will certainly be distressed. But are we just going to face the issue just in this manner? He has put the question and I was putting it to the Prime Minister and then there was interruption. I was not allowed to repeat that question. That was my difficulty. How can I proceed in this manner if this method is adopted? I will ask the hon. Prime Minister.

SHRI HEM BARUA: May I put another question?

MR SPEAKER: Does he want the answer to the other question or not?

5. SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: My question is regarding the reported agreement between China and Pakistan to hand over Kashmir, West Bengal and Assam to Pakistan. Does he know anything about it?

MR. SPEAKER: How can the Government say anything about that?

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: *rose*

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. He insists on his attitude and he goes on without having a pause or listening to anybody else.

SHRI RANGA [Chittoor]: I do not wish to come in the way of your enforcing the rule in the usual manner, but these are very important and critical days and, therefore, I would like you to show some latitude to us, and in the procedure also which you would be enforcing. The other day, my hon. friend Shri Kamath had suggested that Parliament should be given the opportunity of meeting at least once in every month, for a week, and now, we do not know anything at all as to what the Government wishes to do. Even on this occasion, my hon. friend, the Prime Minister, did not take the trouble, did not think it necessary, to go a little beyond than the ordinary answer that he has given to the Calling Attention Notice; we would like him to tell us a little more than what he has told us just now as to the steps that he proposes to take, first, to keep the House in constant consultation and also the steps that he proposes to take to strengthen our defences. Otherwise, it would be very difficult for us merely to satisfy you and the House according to the rules and, at the same time, to play the role that we have to play here.

MR. SPEAKER: I would request hon. Members that they should also appreciate the difficulties that the Government might be experiencing. I quite know and understand the feelings that we have got just at present. We cannot just express ourselves at this moment. Everybody is feeling like that.

So far as the session is concerned, I had advised Shri Kamath to take it up at the end when we are just going to adjourn. Then we will certainly discuss whether we should so decide. I will know what the attitude of the Government is by that time and then we can decide whether the Parliament has to meet more often and very soon. We will decide it certainly. I had told him that, and I had suggested that it might be taken up at the end. So, is there any necessity for the Prime Minister just to say anything about it now, or for anybody else also to say about it? We will take it up when we are going to adjourn-when we are going to meet again-and the Government's attitude also will be known by that time. If the Government has to make those arrangements, certainly, we shall have to leave to them also certain things.

They cannot declare anything in detail here, on the floor of Parliament. If certain hon. Members want something more, they can go and meet the Prime Minister, sit with him, and know the position. The Government would not be able to disclose everything here, what action is being taken, what procedure is being adopted, what we are doing, etc. Certainly, there is anxiety. I would request hon. Members—two or three of them might go and sit with the Prime Minister. Probably he will be more communicative then, but here, it is not possible to go into all the details. If the Members get impatient simply on that, namely, that the details are not given, we appreciate the difficulty, and we must appreciate the difficulty of those who have to administer or who have to go ahead with the matter. The information might be harmful to our country also. Therefore I thought we should proceed to other business now. I would advise those who feel so strongly about it—of course, everyone feels so strongly about it—that if they are so inclined, they might, go and see the Prime Minister.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Sir before you pass on to other business, may I crave your indulgence a little more? The other day I made a request and I reiterate it today that as long as the House is in session the Prime Minister should daily make a statement on the war situation. Every day we open the papers and find that fierce fighting is going on. But the House is not told. I request the Prime Minister to make a statement every day on the war situation. I do not know what is the difficulty. When some calamity has occurred, he comes and makes a statement.

SHRI RANGA: three days after it has happened, he comes and tells us. The papers have stated on the authority of the External Affairs Ministry spokesmen or military spokesmen that Walong had fallen three days ago. But the information was given to the press yesterday and we come to know of it in the House only today. Would it not be possible for the Government to take the House into confidence and tell us? Certainly we are courageous enough to maintain our courage here inspite of some of these grievous losses.

6. SHRI HEM BARUA: We got the news of the fall of Walong day before yesterday all right.

MR. SPEAKER: We shall now proceed with the motion moved by Shri Datar.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: I made a request. That has not been replied to.

MR. BAGRI: Sir, I would like to request that..

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member has asked his question. There is no more information at this time.

MR. BAGRI: I would like to request that there is nothing more urgent and important thing before the country than this. It is on this account that an emergency session of Lok Sabha has been summoned. Today, the entire country is concerned about it. When we retreat after saying that we are moving forward, then the psyche of the country is hurt. Its solution is that if not today then tomorrow, if not tomorrow then day after tomorrow, Lok Sabha will have to make up its mind and tread on its own path with clarity. And keeping this in mind, kindly assign another day for debate. The policy which the Government had envisaged earlier has failed. What we said has been proven wrong. We have lost the trust, the country has reposed in us. Therefore, it is necessary that this should be debated again and suggestions should be placed before the country afresh, so that the country rises and is not debilitated.

MR. SPEAKER: Alright.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: I understand the Prime Minister telling the House that the House did not sit on Saturday and Sunday. But on Friday morning, the papers carried the news that fierce fighting was going on in Walong and Jang, but no statement was made in the House.

STATEMENT REGARDING REPORTED CHINESE OFFER OF CEASE-FIRE

21 November, 1962

Sir, I should like to make a brief statement in regard to certain developments that have taken place.

The Government of the People Republic of China, it appears from Radio broadcasts, has announced that they will have a cease fire from midnight of 21/22 November and will start withdrawing their forces from the positions they occupy from the 1st December. This is a unilateral announcement. We have thus far received no official confirmation of it. As soon as we receive any official message from the Chinese Government, we shall give it full consideration. Till then I would not like to express any opinion in regard to the Chinese proposals. Our position in regard to any negotiations continues to be what we have previously stated, that is, that the position as it existed prior to September 8, 1962 shall be restored. We shall continue our efforts to obtain aid from friendly countries and strengthen our country's defences and its economic potential.

We should like to express again our gratitude to the many friendly countries who have offered us aid and sympathy and support during the time of our distress.

We have made it clear previously and we repeat that we have no desire for any territorial expansion in any for any direction and our aim is to live in peace and amity with our neighbours.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

In the little statement that I made a little while ago, I have stated that we shall consider any communication from the Chinese Government carefully and then express an opinion about it. I have not gone into it and there is much that can be said in regard to it. Other hon. Members have given their first reactions and I have listened to them. But in a matter of this kind or any serious kind Government has to think carefully all aspects of it and then form an opinion and give effect to it. I do not wish to say more. There is only one matter the hon. Member Shri Kamath talked about my broadcast the other day as if there has been any change in my submission to this House here or broadcast anywhere. We said some time ago, after careful thought that the position prior to the 8th September should be restored; to that we have stuck all along; to that we stick even now.

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**²

I am merely stating what our position has been in regard to this matter and we do not shift it about every 24 hours. I think it is a good position and strong position and, as I have said before, we do not propose to consider negotiations till that position is resorted. Negotiations themselves will be in various stages and when it come the first thing will be how to create the conditions which will enable negotiations.....

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**³

A suggestion has been made by one or two hon. Members that before we communicate any reply to the Chinese Government we should have it discussed here. I am afraid this is a very novel procedure. General principles are discussed here and we are guided by whatever the House may decide. But to discuss these communications between one Government and another would be a very extraordinary thing; and it is a very undesirable and harmful thing. We cannot carry on communications with Governments in that way.

Fourthly, an hon. Members has suggested that Parliament may be prolonged. This is entirely for you and the House to decide. It is not for me to say. But I would suggest this,-we have not only to consider carefully any communication that comes to us from the Chinese Government, but also to find out and watch how they are giving effect to it before we can form an opinion. Even according to them, they say- apart from the cease fire which will be from tonight onwards-that they will start withdrawing on the 1st December, and therefore, in order to watch what they do, it will involve some little time. It is not a question of extension by a few days, of Parliament. That is all I wish to submit.

BACK NOTE

LI. Statement Regarding Reported Chinese offer of Cease-Fire, 21 November, 1962

1. SHRI PRAKASH VIR SHASTRI (BIJNOR): China has declared ceasefire and the reaction of India has been stated by the Prime Minister just now. In view of the above facts whether it is possible that you would also formulate any such plan in near future to step up efforts that were being made by some of the mediating countries for reaching an agreement or the same level of preparedness that was there in the past would be maintained?

Mr. SPEAKER: It's reply has been given already.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshingabad): Mr. Speaker on a point of clarification or rather information, the Chinese Government seems to be an adept at their game of fraud and deception and when the situation continued to be so fluid. I would request you and the Leader of the House will agree. I am sure, that in this parliamentary democratic set up, the Parliament of the nation must continue to be in session and have the privilege of advising and guiding the Government in this emergency.

That is the first point.

Secondly, may I suggest that notwithstanding the fact that the Prime Minister had earlier offered, or made the offer of withdrawal to the September 8th line as conditional to talks or negotiations, latterly, the day before yesterday, in his broadcast, very heartening broadcast, and inspiring broadcast to the nation on Monday night, he declared categorically that there would be no talks and no negotiations unless and until every inch of our territory, of our sacred land, our sacred Motherland-that was the word used by him-is cleared of the Chinese invaders? And Parliament has had the privilege of endorsing wholeheartedly that declaration, and I hope that he will today give a categorical assurance to Parliament and to the nation that he will stand firm by that policy which has been clearly enunciated by Government and endorsed by the Parliament of the nation, and there will be no departure from that policy. Now, there ought not to be any departure....

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member wanted to make only one point. But, now he has made two. Now he should conclude.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: It is all part of one. The Prime Minister has said that the flow of arms will be kept up. May I also request him to see that these friendly countries who have rushed to our aid will be kept in close touch with the developments from day to day and will be taken into confidence before any concrete move is taken in the matter?

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): I want to ask whether the Government of India have received any communication containing the full text of their suggestions and whether its implication has been analysed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER: Members should only put such questions as those in respect of which information has not been given. Why should they repeat the same thing again?

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE: It appears in the newspaper that our Charge d'affairs also met Premier Chou En Lai.

SHRI RAGHUNATH SINGH (Varanasi): That is old news.

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE: Let not my hon. Friends be hasty about it. I want to know this because the details were not known. Our officer had a talk with the Chinese Premier. I want to know whether any letter was sent by us, and if so, what the details of that letter were.

MR. SPEAKER: That answer had been given yesterday.

SHRI SHIVAJI RAO S. DESHMUKH (Parbhani): Yesterday, the Prime Minister answered that question and said that a note from us was delivered to them.

MR. SPEAKER: I have also said that. Where was the necessity for the hon. Member to get up and give this reply?

SHRI TYAGI (Dehra Dun): I am glad that the hon. Prime Minister has not made any commitment at this stage. India is, I think, by now....

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask hon. Members to give only their reactions or any suggestions and not to press the Prime Minister to make any statement at this time. That is what I would advise hon. Members that they should also restrain themselves.

SHRI TYAGI: That is true. We thank you for this. We all agree to that idea. This is not the state for that. But let us give our reactions and say how we react to this. India is too well experienced by now to be hoodwinked by any such gestures.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated-Anglo-Indians): Not gesture, but trick.

SHRI TYAGI: I have also heard that radio news, and it was not in good taste, I am sure; all that they said immediately before this and all that they said afterwards were quite adverse to the gesture that they have made. India knows very well....

MR. SPEAKER: I would request the hon. Member to be very brief.

SHRI TYAGI: I am not going to make a speech. I would only make one suggestion.

I also agree with my hon. Friend Shri Kamath that Parliament might just continue in session for some time more, because we all would like to know, and everyone of us is interested in knowing, what will come off of these things. Of course, we are quite sure that the Prime Minister is quite further acquainted with the reactions of the Army as well as of the people in this regard, and the strategic position today which they occupy. What is the meaning of their keeping time till 1st December to retire? Why do they want all this time? Do they want to build roads?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. Member said that he would not make any speech, but at the same time, he is making it.

SHRI TYAGI: I have only one request to make. I hope that that too must be in the mind of the hon. Prime Minister. Now, since quite big countries and friendly countries have come out openly to help us, and they have also, after all, bracketed themselves with us, as far as the relationship with China is concerned, I hope that they will also be taken into confidence before any final decision is arrived at.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one Member from each Group to give his reaction.

SHRI HEM BARUA: My name is there.

MR. SPEAKER: I will call him, if his name is there. I will call one Member from each Group. More than that it is not possible to do.

SHRI BAGRI (HISAR): Two Members from one party are also being called.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no.

DR. L.M. SINGHVI (Jodhpur): Apart from the broadcast, do we definitely know through our own sources of information whether the Chinese have actually and in fact ceased fire?

MR. SPEAKER: That has been answered. I find that Members are putting questions that are answered. I only want that each one of them might, in a minute, give his reaction only to the news, nothing further.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I wanted to submit that the Chinese are not in a position to wage a long-drawn war because of their economic situation and all that. But then she has announced a unilateral cease fire and all that. At the same time, she has humiliated us sufficiently in the whole of South-East Asia, and all over the world. By this, her influence in South East Asia, which she wants to build up meticulously, would be growing. Then, judging from the broadcast she wants to make a difference between the line of actual control and some other line and all that. It is because of all this that I want to request the Prime Minister that while coming to a conclusion or decision, all different aspects should be taken into consideration and the House should be taken into confidence.

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV (BARABANKI): Mr. Speaker, the news of ceasefire broadcast by the Chinese radio has left such an impression on me and on several other people that it could be a trick to deceive us. It seems that they are buying time to beef up their position and put us in more trouble. Secondly, it could also be true, but in both the cases whether it is a trick, or a deceit or an honest move, we should not relax our efforts. We should be fully prepared.

MR. SPEAKER: He has said that already .

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV: Secondly, after the Prime Minister's speech on the radio, the statement given in this House yesterday and the current status of today, the statement given on 8th September raises apprehensions among the people like me.

The third thing is that I agree with the suggestion given by Shri Kamat that it is extremely necessary in the present scenario that proceedings of House should continue.

SHRI FRANCK ANTHONY (Nominated-Anglo-Indian): I did not intend to say anything, but since you have asked for our reactions, may I put my reaction briefly? I feel that it is a typical piece of calculated Chinese trickery. According to the newspaper report, they are purported to have once again repeated their proposal of October 24 which they know we have rejected. What I feel is this. We now know enough of Chinese Strategy—the Prime Minister knows better than we do; take a base, prepare it, seeks a breathing space; take another base, prepare it. They are wanting to prepare another base.

I am glad that the Prime Minister has left no illusions in our minds that whatever they may do, we are committed now to building up our armed strength and to retaking every inch of our own soil.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: (Calcutta-Central): I had no intention of intervening, but after my hon. friend, Shri Frank Anthony, I wish only to say one thing. Only the other day, we passed by acclamation a unanimous Resolution which has been seconded unequivocally by the country outside, and that Resolution presupposed that the Government, led by our Prime Minister, would have, as far as is possible in the parliamentary set-up, a free hand in the conduct of the proceedings which are now going on. I feel therefore, when the Prime Minister comes forward himself to say that he has not yet studied the material sufficiently to be able to make any commitment, it is necessary and important....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHRI H.N. MUKERJEE: We are not going to win or to lose on account of the Three Musketeers of a particular party or the Four Horsemen of another.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: For the stooges of a particular party

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member should not provoke others. I would request the hon. Member, as well as other hon. Members, to have in mind the unanimity that was shown recently

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: He is upsetting that.

MR. SPEAKER: I should rather now advise the hon. Member to desist from such temptations of criticizing others.

SHRI TYAGI: Let them betray their inner feelings.

SHRI HEM BARUA: He should withdraw his remarks on the three musketeers of a particular party the four horsemen and all that.

MR. SPEAKER: Would he kindly resume his seat?

SHRI HEM BARUA: I would ask him to withdraw those words.

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly it would be advisable now for him to withdraw those words.

SHRI H.N. MUKERJEE: We have put an embargo on speaking, so to speak. We know that it is not necessary in this House to speak over much. That is why I make a submission to you.

MR. SPEAKER: I have said this was not advisable at this moment to refer in such a manner. Therefore I would advise him to withdraw those phrases.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: He must withdraw.

SHRI H.N. MUKERJEE: If you ask me to withdraw, I do not mind, but I do beseech you, and through you the House, that it is very necessary in the interests of national solidarity, if not for anything else, that we behave in this House in a manner which will show that behind the Government there is unity in the country.

SHRI RANGA (Chittoor): I want to be as brief as possible. Reference has been made to the resolution that has been passed by this House. If any one were to look into the reports of the debates....

MR. SPEAKER: Why should he go into that?

SHRI RANGA: It is under great stress, we have to express ourselves because you have stipulated certain provisions subject to which alone we have to make our observations. If any one were to go through the debate, he would be able to see how wrong my hon. Friend is in his statement that everything is left to the Prime Minister.

It is left to the national leadership; of which this sovereign Parliament is the spearhead. And then we made it very clear that we should not accept the Chinese

proposal that we should go back again, that we should accept their dates. Only yesterday the hon. Prime Minister was good enough to state in this House as well as in the other House that we are not going to enter into any negotiations with the Chinese Government until our country is vacated of their aggression.

Our friends have already made those points. I am in agreement with all the points made, including the points made by Shri Tyagi. It is all the more reason why there should be a secret session of this Parliament, and the sooner the better.

Secondly, I do not want Parliament to be adjourned. We are extremely anxious to see that the Prime Minister will take care to take not only the friends from outside, (all those friends outside, our country into his consultations.) but also this Parliament into his constant consultation, and to stand by the declaration that he has made yesterday, and would see to it that this country's honour is sustained in spite of all these tricks, Ravana's tricks, that are being played now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHRI RANGA: It is about the Chinese I am saying, I am not referring to these friends here to my right. There was a hero, son of Ravana, known as Indrajit; he used to go into the clouds and play mischief. In the same manner, this new offer has come. There is no precedent in history for a thing like this. Even Hitler could not think of it, but here are these people making a peace offensive, when?—soon after their victory. Hitler did it, but never before was there a direct offer like this of ceasefire. Cease-fire since when?—from the 1st December.

MR. SPEAKER: He has said enough.

SHRI RANGA: Therefore, it is most essential that Parliament should be kept in session, and you should cooperate with us, and the hon. Prime Minister should cooperate with us, in seeing that no proposal is made to the Chinese until Parliament is taken into confidence by them in the open session, and if necessary in the secret session also.

SHRI BADE (Khargone): Our impression is that the reported Chinese offer of cease-fire and withdrawal of its troops could well be a deceptive move to confuse world opinion and again lull India into inaction. And the proposal in the cease-fire is in no way different from the earlier one rejected by India. If China really wants to return to civilized and peaceful ways, it should straightaway clear out of Indian territory. The preparations that we are making, we shall continue to make and that is our suggestion. I want to ask the Prime Minister whether it is not a fact that the proposals of ceasefire made in Peking radio have been rejected by our Prime Minister.

SHRI MAURYA (ALIGARH): Mr. Speaker, had the information of ceasefire received from Peking been true, it would have pleased me. But in reality, it is a conspiracy to ascertain our strategy. It is my humble opinion. This news had cast an

effect on this House. I wonder if the news of ceasefire is like lull in the ocean. Whenever there is lull in the ocean, it is indication of a storm. We should intensify our preparation. We should not lull ourselves into inaction from this news.

Moreover, I also request that our reaction to this news should not have been as such. I wonder how we can withdraw 20 kilometers back from our border within our motherland. This is not acceptable. We should put our best efforts and deploy all our forces on the border. It seems that this is happening under some pressure on which I do not wish to comment. We should not let our guard down and prepare ourselves fully to put up tough resistance.

SHRI BISHANCHANDER SETH (ETAH): I wish to make a small suggestion. As our honorable Prime Minister has said that he has not received any official information in this regard from Peking yet. I understand that till any official information is received, any reaction from the side of Government should not come. But as suggested by other Members, I wish to tell the Hon. Prime Minister that it is necessary for us to be alert. It would be unfortunate to believe the news coming from China because our experience till now has been adverse.

DR. GOVIND DAS (JABALPUR): I want to say one more thing.

MR. SPEAKER: If I allow you, then other Members would also like to speak. Hon. Prime Minister will speak on your behalf.

2. SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: 8th September? People of India do not want that. In the main Resolution the hold Prime Minister never said so.....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

3. SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: It has cost us. There can be no negotiations at the cost of our country's prestige and honours.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Does he belong to any party or not?

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Then I cannot accommodate each member of the party. He should not stand up in this manner. I warn him about it.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: I prayed for time all through and I submitted call attention notice to the Prime Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Everyone cannot be given time. If the hon. Member belongs to no party, I said I would not give time to individuals.

MOTION REGARDING BORDER SITUATION RESULTING FROM THE INVASION OF INDIA BY CHINA

10 December 1962

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

“That the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China be taken into consideration.”

About a month ago, on the 8th November, I placed a Resolution before this House on the Proclamation of Emergency resulting from the aggression and invasion by China. This was followed by another Resolution dealing with this aggression and invasion and how China had betrayed the friendship and goodwill of India as well as the principles of Panchsheel which had been agreed between the two countries. After recording the high appreciation of the House of the valiant struggle of the men and officers of our armed forces and paying its respectful homage to the martyrs who had laid down their lives in defending the integrity of the motherland, this House recorded its profound appreciation of the wonderful and spontaneous response of the people of India to the emergency and the crisis that had arisen. The House affirmed the firm resolve of the Indian people to rid the sacred soil of India of the aggressor, however long and hard the struggle may be. There was a long discussion on this Resolution and a very large and record number of hon. Members spoke on it. On the 14th of November, this Resolution was passed not only unanimously, but in an unusual manner, by all Members standing and pledging themselves to what it contained. By that pledge we stand.

Two or three days later, the Chinese forces mounted a massive attack on our position at the Sela Pass as also at Walong. This resulted, on the 18th November in our forces having to withdraw from Sela and Walong, and somewhat later from Bomdi La.

On the 21st November, the Chinese Government issued a statement making a unilateral announcement of ceasefire as from the midnight of November 21st-22nd, and a withdrawal of their forces from December 1st. On the 23rd we asked for some clarifications, and received a reply on the 26th November. On the 30th we sought further clarifications.

On the 22nd November, the Government of Ceylon announced that they had called a conference of six non-aligned countries in Colombo. The date for this was subsequently changed, and it is due to begin, or rather has begun, in Colombo today.

On the 28th November, a letter was received from Premier Chou En-Lai, urging the Prime Minister of India to give a positive response, that is to accept the Chinese offer of ceasefire and withdrawal, with all the other provisos contained in it. I replied to this on the 1st December. These letters have been given in full, together with some maps in the pamphlet issued by the External Affairs Ministry entitled “Chinese Aggression in War and Peace”.

The ceasefire took effect as stated, though there were a number of breaches of it on the Chinese side in the first few days. It is not yet quite clear how far the withdrawals of the Chinese forces have been effected. To some extent this has been done, but considerable Chinese forces are apparently still in some forward positions.

On the 5th of December, the Chinese Red Cross handed over 64 wounded and sick prisoners of war to the Indian Red Cross Society at Bomdi La. They have stated that they will hand over more such wounded prisoners within the next few days.

Soon after the Chinese attack on the 20th October, a three-point proposal was made by the Chinese, suggesting a ceasefire and withdrawal of their forces, provided India agreed to these proposals; otherwise, the fighting may restart. On the 22nd October, stated that we were unable to accept this proposal and that our proposal about the restoration of the *status quo* prior to the 8th September was a simple and straightforward one. This was the only way of undoing at least part of the great damage done by the latest Chinese aggression. The Chinese proposal made on the 21st November for ceasefire and withdrawal was a repetition of their proposal of the 24th October with the addition of a unilateral declaration of a ceasefire and withdrawal.

I wrote to Premier Chou En-lai on December 1, indicating that the three-point proposal made by the Chinese violated the principles that the Chinese had themselves been advocating in their documents and correspondence. We could not compromise with this further aggression nor can we permit the aggressor to retain the position he had acquired by force by the further aggression since 8th September, 1962, as this would mean not only letting him have what he wanted but exposing our country to further inroads and demands in the future.

To this letter, no direct answer has been received from Premier Chou Enlai. But the Peking Radio has broadcast yesterday a long statement rejecting our proposal about the restoration of the *status quo* prior to the 8th September. There was a further broadcast later yesterday which stated that our Charged affairs in Peking had been given a note asking the Government of India three questions. These questions are: (1) Does the Indian Government agree or does it not agree to a ceasefire? (2) Does the Indian Government agree or does it not agree that the armed forces of the two sides should disengage and withdraw 20 kilometres each from the 7th November, 1959 line of actual control, and (3) Does the Indian Government agree or does it not agree that the officials of the two sides should meet and discuss matters relating to the withdrawal of the armed forces of each party to form a demilitarised zone, establishment of check-posts as well as the return of captured personnel?

Before I answer these questions, I should like to remind the House of the past history of these incursions and aggressions. I shall not go back five years or more when these aggressions started in Ladakh. That has been repeatedly stated in this House, but I should like to remind the House that before the 8th September, 1962, there was no active aggressions on the NEFA frontier by the Chinese except in regard to the small frontier village, Longju. Not only was no further aggression there but in the past repeated assurances were given that the so-called MacMahon line

would not be crossed by the Chinese and that although they considered this line an illegal one and imposed by the then British Government, they would acknowledge it as indeed they acknowledged the continuation of this line in Burma. Thus, the aggression across this line near the Thagla pass on the 8th September, 1962 was not only at variance with these assurances but constituted a major crossing over of their frontier for the first time in history.

This was a clear case of imperialist aggression and expansion. The Chinese forces continued to cross the frontier in large numbers and on the 20th October they delivered a massive attacks on the Indian positions and overpowered them by superior numbers. In the five-year long story of Chinese aggression, this was the first instance when massive attacks were made by large forces and a regular invasion of the Indian territory took place.

No longer were these mere frontier incidents as previously in Ladakh. A well-organised and well-prepared invasion on a big scale had been mounted by China.

On the same day, a similar invasion took place in the western sector in Ladakh. Thus, it was obvious that this was a fully coordinated attack along various parts of our frontier. Soon after, that is, on the 24th October, the Chinese made their three-point proposal which, if agreed to, would have given them the benefit of their recent invasion and placed them in an advantageous and dominating position for further aggression in the future. We could not possibly accept this and consequently we rejected it.

I would like to repeat that these invasions, which took massive shape on the 20th October can only be described as imperialist aggression. It has to be noted that the Chinese Government, which often states that it is against imperialism has itself committed one of the grossest acts of imperialist aggression. The fact that the Chinese had never entered into NEFA territory previously is very relevant. But, for the moment, we may set aside the question of the merits of their claim. Even according to them, the McMahon line was indicated about 50 years ago. This was not a line drawn by McMahon, but a recognition of a previous fact, that is, the watershed was the frontier. Ever since then and in fact long before that, it is clear that the Chinese were not there.

Since our independence, we have tried to develop this area of NEFA and build schools, roads, hospitals, etc. Suddenly the Chinese break through our frontier and deliver massive attacks. Is this the way of peaceful negotiation and settlement by peaceful methods? I repeat that whatever the claims may be, this well-prepared invasion was at variance with the Chinese professions and can only be described as blatantly imperialist expansionism and aggression.

In answer to this, was stated that we could not proceed to any talks with them until at least this latest aggression was vacated and the the *status quo* prior to the 8th September, 1962 restored both in NEFA and in Ladakh. This was the least we could do and that is the position we have consistently held during the last few months. Anxious for peace as we are, we suggested this minimum condition which might lead to a peaceful approach. They have rejected our proposal. The result is that at present, there is no meeting ground between us. We have repeatedly laid stress on our

considering this matter by peaceful methods. But it is not possible to do so when aggression continues and we are asked to accept it as a fact.

As for the three questions that had been asked on behalf of the Chinese Government, the first one is whether we agree or do not agree to a ceasefire. The declaration by the Government of China was a unilateral one. But in so far as the ceasefire is concerned, we accepted it and nothing has been done on our behalf to impede the implementation of the ceasefire declaration.

The second question is, do we agree or not that the armed forces of the two sides should disengage and withdraw 20 kilometres each from the November 7, 1959 line of actual control. We are in favour of the disengagement of the forces on the two sides on the basis of a commonly agreed arrangement. But such an arrangement can only be on the basis of undoing the further aggression committed by the Government of China on Indian territory on the 8th September, 1962. If the Government of China disputes that this was Indian territory, this is a matter for a juridical or like decision. The fact, however, is that it has long been under Indian occupation and this cannot be disputed. The Government of India have given their understanding of the so-called line of actual control on November 7, 1959. They do not agree with the Chinese interpretation, which is not in accordance with actual facts. It should be easy to determine the facts even from the correspondence between the two Governments during the last five years. The Government of China cannot expect us to agree to a so-called line of actual control of November 7, 1959, which is manifestly not in accordance with the facts. What we had suggested is a simple and straight forward proposal, that of restoration of the *status quo* prior to the 8th September, 1962 when further aggression began. This is clearly factual and is based on the definite principle that the aggression must be undone before an agreement for a peaceful consideration can be arrived at. We have dealt with this matter fully in the correspondence which has taken place with Premier Chou En-lai and which, I take it, Members of the House have read.

The third question is "Does the Indian Government agree or does it not agree that the officials of the two States should meet and discuss matters relating to the withdrawal of armed forces of each party to form a demilitarized zone, etc?" It is obvious if the officials are to meet they must have clear and precise instructions as to the ceasefire and withdrawal arrangements which they are supposed to implement. Unless they receive these instructions, which must be as the result of an agreement between the Governments of India and China, they will be unable to function. Therefore, it has to be determined previously which line is to be implemented. Between the line of actual control immediately prior to 8th September 1962, and that of 7th November, 1959 as defined by China, there is a great difference of about 2,500 square miles of Indian territory which China occupied as a result of invasion and massive attacks during the last three months. The Chinese Government by defining this line in its own way wants to retain the advantages secured by the latest invasion.

Any person who studies the painful history of the last few years more particularly of the recent months, will come to the conclusion that Chinese interpretation of various lines changes with circumstances and they accept the line which is more

advantageous to them. Sometimes they accept part of a line and not the rest of it which is disadvantageous to them. It is perhaps not easy in the course of a discussion in this House to go into the many and changing factors which have governed the situation during the last five years. Nevertheless, the major facts are quite clear and, apart from any claims that the Chinese may have, it is on these facts that any temporary arrangement can be made and not on changing lines which the Chinese put forward as the lines of actual control.

There has been, the House must have, no doubt, noticed, an amazing cynicism and duplicity on the Chinese side on these developments and these discussions. They accuse us of being aggressors. We are supposed to aggress on our own territory and they come as defenders on our territory. They come to a place where they have never been, so far as I know of history, at any time of history. And, they preach against imperialism and act themselves in the old imperialist and expansionist way. Altogether, their policy seems to be one of unabashed chauvinism. They have referred, as hon. Members may have noticed, to their frontier guards being attacked by Indian forces and acting in self-defence. It is curious that acting in self defence they, have occupied another 20000 square miles of Indian territory. The whole thing is so manifestly and so outrageously, what shall I say, improper and wrong, and utter misuse of words that it is a little difficult to deal with persons who use words with different meanings, what we may call, double talk. I regret to say that I have been forced to the conclusion that the word of the Chinese Government cannot be relied upon.

The Chinese threat against India is a long-term one and the last five years, and even more to the last three months, have brought out the basic expansionist and imperialist attitude of China. This is a continuing threat to the independence and territorial integrity of India. We cannot submit to this challenge and must face it with all the consequences that it may bring.

As the world knows, we are a peaceful people and have always tried to adhere to peaceful methods. It is not any choice of ours that we have been driven to warlike activities. But the defence of our mother land is the first essential duty for every Indian, and imperialist and expansionist challenge to that is not only a challenge to us but to the world, as it is a flagrant violation of international law and practice. If this aggression is tolerated and acquiesced in today, it will continue to be a threat not only to India but also to other countries in Asia and will be a bad precedent for the world. We will, therefore, endeavour to the utmost of our ability to face this challenge and to protect our motherland. But, at the same time, we shall always seek peaceful methods to resolve and dispute but conditions for a peaceful approach have to be created if this is to yield any fruit.

What China has done is an insult to the conscience of the world. That is clear from the great response that we have received from a large number of countries. We still hope that our peaceful and reasonable approaches will be agreed to. Otherwise, this conflict may spread and bring disaster on a widespread scale, not only to India and China but to the world. Once these preliminary conditions that we have suggested

are met, we can consider further the peaceful methods that should be used for resolving the basic disputes.

Hon. Members may have read the pleas which we have repeated several times in our communications to the Chinese Government or the Chinese Premier that we should explore avenues of peaceful approach; apart from meeting each other, explore other avenues of settling these questions peacefully. I am prepared when the time comes, provided there is approval of Parliament, even to refer the basic dispute of the claims on the frontier to an international body like the International Court of Justice at The Hague. I submit that there is no fairer and more reasonable approach than what I have indicated. But that also can only come when the aggression is vacated and the position as it was before the 8th September is restored.

The Colombo Conference which is meeting today is considering what recommendations honourable to both sides it might make to resolve the differences between India and China. We recognise their friendly feelings and their well meant attempts to solve, or at any rate to lessen, this crisis. I trust, however, that they will appreciate that there can be no compromise with aggression and an expanding imperialism and that the gains of aggression must be given up before both the parties try to resolve their disputes.

We have long followed a policy of non-alignment, and, I believe firmly that this was a right policy. It means our not joining any military bloc or military purpose. I think that policy should continue. But we must take all necessary measures to defend our motherland and take the help of our friendly countries who are willing to assist us in this sacred task.

We are very grateful to the countries which have come to our aid at this moment of crisis and have extended their full sympathy and support to us. I believe that even they appreciate that it would be wrong for us to abandon the policy of non-alignment. It is odd—it is well to remember—that the one country that does not approve of non-alignment for us or for anybody is China; they take some satisfaction in that. They go on repeating that by circumstances they will compel us to abandon it and so we have abandoned it. So, it is clear and hon. Members can themselves realise how the Chinese outlook in this matter is utterly different not only from ours but from that of most countries in the world.

All of us in this House and in the country, naturally, and, if I may say so, rightly feel strongly on this subject. Nevertheless, I have endeavoured to speak in a moderate language because I have felt that the issues are grave and cannot be dealt with lightly or merely by abuse. The future of our country is at stake. We have to rise to the occasion to consider the mighty problems that face us. They have many aspects—military, economic, the future relations of two of the greatest countries in Asia and the future of world peace. Though we may feel passionately about these problems, we may not allow our passions to run away with us and lead us to wrong courses. But it is clear that the future for us is a hard one and our people must therefore prepare themselves in every way to meet it. We shall have to strengthen ourselves in every way and mobilise our country for it. We are trying to do that.

Even though there is no actual fighting at present, the emergency and the danger continue and will continue so long as China's present policy and military postures continue to be a threat to our independence and integrity. Let us, therefore, give all our strength to meeting this threat and, at the same time, not forget that we have to win the peace and further the cause of peace.

Soon after the Chinese invasion of the 20th October, the House may remember, I indicated that this struggle or war, whatever shape it might take, will be a long one. It may even last five years or more. I think, the country and all of us should bear this in mind. It is a long and big effort that we have to make. I feel, and I speak in all honesty.

I feel confident that we shall win in the struggle. But it will require our hardest effort and many sacrifices and a refusal, whatever happens, to bow down to these imperialist tactics of China. We have to remember above all that we fight not for fighting's sake but to save our country. It is a matter of survival of freedom and a free society in India, and to further the cause of peace in the world, because it would be a poor thing if in attempting to save our country we somehow helped in the process of converting this into a terrible world war. We have to keep all this in mind. But, for the moment, the major thing before us is to protect our country and our freedom which we achieved after so long, after so many difficulties and sacrifices. This House has already expressed itself in the Resolution which it passed on the 14th of November and clearly stated what it is determined to do and taken the pledge. By that pledge we shall stand and I hope we shall honour it in full.

BACK NOTE

**LII. Motion Regarding Border Situation Resulting from the
Invasion of India by China, 10 December, 1962**

NIL

MOTION REGARDING COLOMBO CONFERENCE PROPOSALS

23 January, 1963

Sir, I beg to move:

“That the proposals of the Conference of six nonaligned Nations held at Colombo between the 10th and 12th of December, 1962, with the clarifications given by the Delegations of Ceylon, U.A.R. and Ghana in the meetings with the Prime Minister of India and his colleagues on the 12th and 13th of January, 1963 laid on the Table of the House on the 21st January, 1963 be taken into consideration.”

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I should like to refer to some recent events which no doubt are in the minds—

Sir, on the last occasion Parliament discussed this question of Chinese aggression on the 10th of December 1962 and expressed approval of the measures and policy adopted by Government to meet the situation resulting from the invasion of India by China. Since then a number of events have taken place which I should like to mention to the House.

On the 15th December, the Consulates-General of India and China in the respective countries were closed. The withdrawal of Chinese forces from the NEFA area continued during this period. There were however, reports of violation of the unilateral ceasefire by the Chinese army. 716 sick and wounded Indian soldiers and 13 dead bodies of prisoners were returned by the Chinese forces. On the 17th December Mr. G.S. Peiris, envoy of Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, Prime Minister of Ceylon, brought the Colombo Conference proposals to New Delhi and handed them over to the Prime Minister.

A joint communique was issued by Pakistan and China on complete agreement in principle in regard to the alignment of their border on 26th December, 1962.

China and Mongolia signed a border treaty in Peking on the 26th December 1962.

Premier Chou En-lai sent a reply dated 30th December 1962 to Prime Minister's letter of December 1, 1962.

Prime Minister's reply to Premier Chou En-lai's letter of 30th December, 1962 was sent on January 1, 1963.

Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike visited Peking from 31st December to 8th January.

Ghana Delegation led by Mr. Kofi Asante Ofori-Atta, Minister of Justice, arrived on 9th January in Delhi.

Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike arrived in New Delhi on 10th January.

The U.A.R. Delegation led by Mr. Ali Sabry arrived in Delhi on 12th January.

Then, as I said, firstly, on the 24th October the Chinese made a proposal called the “three-point proposal”. To that proposal we did not agree and we said then that we cannot consider this even as a temporary matter, that is, even for purposes of discussing it, not for the purpose of putting aside the November resolution but for the purpose of discussing it, till the position of the 8th September is restored. That was the position. That came up repeatedly before this House, and it is perfectly true, if the hon. Member wants to lay stress on it, that point was not formally adopted by resolution by this House. But there are many things which happen in this House, which are stated in this House and stated repeatedly with regard to Government policy and which are then admitted as the Government’s policy. My point is that the November resolution was not in any sense affected by subsequent happenings; it remains still and it will remain. The position taken in this House repeatedly, and also on the last occasion when this was discussed, was that we cannot consider this matter and discuss it with the Chinese Government until the position on the 8th September is restored. That has been the position. Therefore, subsequent happenings have to be considered by us on that basis.

Now, Sir, when we met last time on the 10th December and discussed this, the Colombo Conference was at the point of meeting or was meeting that very day. It was to have met on 1st December, but then it was postponed and it met on the 10th December—10th, 11th, 12th or thereabouts and this House happened to meet and discuss this question. Then we did not know what the Colombo proposals were going to be. But we know that they were meeting and a reference was made to it in the course of the debate. A reference was also made by us, on behalf of the Government, to the effect that we can only consider this matter after the position on 8th September is restored.

Well, the Colombo Conference met and put forward some proposals. They went to Peking some of their representatives and then later came to Delhi. Their proposals as originally framed were not clear in regard to one or two matters and were liable to one or two different interpretations. So the first thing we did when they came to us was to ask them to clarify their proposals and to make us understand exactly what they were so that they might avoid any misinterpretation or different interpretations, and it was only when they had done that would we be in a position to express our opinion in regard to them.

In considering that matter the issue before us then was how far these were in conformity with what we had said repeatedly, that the position prior to 8th September be restored. Also, it must be remembered that it was stated all along that any response that we may give or the Government of the People’s Republic of China may give to it or any steps we may take in regard to their proposals would not prejudice in the slightest position of either of the two Governments as regards their conception of the final alignment of the frontier.

The whole purpose of this exercise was to create a situation when something could be considered by the two parties. Before creating that situation, I repeat, we

had said that something should be done, that is, the Chinese should vacate the aggression they had indulged in after 7th September. There is no question, therefore, of our going behind or varying in the slightest the resolution passed by this House in November.

The merits of the dispute were not considered by the Colombo countries or any other. It was only to pave the way for discussion between the representatives of both the parties and, as I said, we can only discuss them if certain conditions were created and certain aggression committed by the Chinese was vacated.

Now, these proposals as explained and amplified by them in answer to our questions related to these three sectors; the western, middle and eastern sectors of our border. In regard to the eastern sector the position prior to the 8th September was that the Chinese forces were to the north of the international boundary and the Indian forces were to the south of this boundary that is, what is normally called the McMahon Line for facility; it is not named McMahon Line officially nor did Mr. McMahon, or whatever his title was, lay down that. He recognised it as the existing boundary. Therefore, I refer to it as McMahon Line for facility. The boundary is said to be the high ridge of the Himalayas there and it continues into Burma. In fact, the Chinese Government has recognised this boundary of the high ridge in Burma. So, before the 8th September no Chinese forces elements had come across that boundary there except there is one exception in Long ju, as the House well knows, Long Ju being a village just on the frontier. In regard to this the position that was taken some time ago was that for the present nobody, neither party, should occupy it. The Chinese had forcibly occupied it previously and later it was suggested that neither party should occupy it. The Colombo Conference proposals, as clarified by the visiting delegations, confirm this position except as regards the Thag La ridge area, which the Chinese call Chadong area, where we have a border post known as the Dhola post. The Colombo proposals and the clarifications refer to these areas Thag La Ridge and Long Ju, as "remaining areas arrangements in regard to which are to be settled between the Governments of India and the People's Republic of China by direct discussion". That is to say, in regard to the Eastern sector, the 8th September position was, according to the Colombo Conference proposals, entirely restored, except in regard to Thag La Ridge area and the Dhola post. These are within three miles of the McMahon line. About this the Colombo proposals stated that this matter may be left undecided. They left it to the parties to decide by direct discussion. That is the position, so far as the eastern sector is concerned.

With regard to the middle sector, the Colombo Conference proposals required the *status quo* to be maintained and neither side should do anything to disturb the *status quo*. This conforms to the Government of India's position that the *status quo* prior to the 8th September, 1962 should be restored as there has been no conflict in this area and the existing situation has not been disturbed.

Coming to the western sector, *i.e.* Ladakh sector, the restoration of the *status quo* as it obtained prior to 8th September would result in re-establishment of all the

Indian posts shown in blue in the maps circulated to member. We have circulated a large number of maps to hon. Members as well as the Colombo conference. Therefore, I am not reading them out because they have already obtained enough publicity. If we went back to the 8th September position in the western sector, this would have resulted in the re-establishment of all the Indian posts shown in blue in the maps circulated to Members. This will also mean that the Chinese will maintain the old Chinese posts at the locations shown in red in the same map. The Colombo Conference proposes that a 20 kilometre area will be cleared by the withdrawal of Chinese forces, and this area is to be administered by civilian posts of both sides, Indian and Chinese. The House will observe that this area which is to be administered by civilian posts on both sides covers the entire area in which Indian posts existed prior to the 8th September except for two or three posts to the west of Sumdo. On the other hand, the 20 kilometre withdrawal by the Chinese forces entails the Chinese forces going several kilometres beyond the international boundary in the region of Spanggur and further south. The Colombo Conference proposals and the clarifications thus satisfy the demand made for the restoration of the *status quo* prior to the 8th September. The slight variation is about two or three Indian posts west of Sumdo. This is, however, compensated by Chinese withdrawals in the region of Spanggur and further south; also, by the fact that many Chinese military posts have to be removed from the withdrawal area. If hon. Members consider this matter with the help of maps, they will observe that this position, as indicated by the Colombo Conference proposals, has certain advantages over the one which we had previously indicated, that is the restoration of the 8th September position. In the 8th September position the Chinese were there in strength, in very large strength, in that area and we had also some posts. In that particular area it was obviously much to the advantage of the Chinese, because of their large strength etc. Now, if this Colombo Conference proposal is accepted in regard to the western sector, it removes the Chinese strength from that sector and makes that sector a demilitarised area, with our posts as well as Chinese posts, by agreements being civil posts, in equal number with equal number of people and similarity of arms. It would be civil arm, police arm or small arm. This I think, is definitely better than the restoration of Chinese posts in that area in a big way with large arms.

On full consideration of these matters as contained in the Colombo Conference resolutions and their clarifications we came to the conclusion that these proposals fulfilled the essence of the demand made for a restoration of the *status quo* prior to the 8th September. I, thereupon, sent a letter to the Ceylon Prime Minister, stating that the Government of India accept in principle the Colombo Conference proposals in the light of the clarification given and will take further action to place them before the Indian Parliament for consideration before the Government of India can finally accept them.

I had told the Ceylon Prime Minister and her colleagues that we would like to know the attitude of the Government of the People's Republic of China to the Colombo Conference proposals and clarifications as this would facilitate the consideration of

the proposals and the clarifications by our own Parliament. I have just this morning received a message from the Ceylon Prime Minister, conveying the Chinese attitude to the Colombo Conference proposals. The telegram from Mrs. Bandaranaike reads as follows:

“In response to my telegram of January 14th, I have received today a reply from Prime Minister Chou En-lai. Prime Minister Chou En-lai has reiterated his earlier acceptance in principle of proposals of Colombo Conference as a preliminary basis. To the meeting of Indian and Chinese officials to discuss the stabilisation of ceasefire and disengagement and to promote Sino-Indian boundary negotiations.

The Chinese Government however maintains two points of interpretation in their memorandum that I handed over to you but they hope that difference in interpretation between the Chinese and Indian sides will not prevent the speedy holding of talks between the Indian and Chinese officials. They hope these differences will be resolved in their talk.”

Perhaps hon. Members may have seen yesterday the report of what was stated by the Chinese Foreign Minister, Marshal Chen Yi more or less to this effect; that is to say, while they repeat that they have accepted the Colombo Conference proposals in principle, they raise some vital matters in which they differ from them. It is obvious that the Chinese Government do not accept the Colombo Conference proposals as “a definite basis providing conditions for the acceptance of both parties”, nor do they accept the Colombo proposals and the clarifications given by the three Colombo Conference delegations who visited Delhi. The Chinese Government maintain certain points of their own interpretation of the Colombo proposals. This obviously means that they have not accepted the Colombo proposals as a whole. We on our part are, however, clear that there can be no talks and discussions between officials as stated in the Colombo Conference proposals to settle the points left for decision by direct discussions between the Governments of India and the People’s Republic of China by the Colombo Conference, unless the Government of the People’s Republic of China accept in to the Colombo Conference proposals and their clarifications.

I should like to call the attention of the House to this fact that the Colombo Conference was, of course, held not at our instance. In fact, the Conference was organised and people were invited without any reference to us except when this fact was decided upon. Then the Ceylon Government was good enough to inform us that this was being done by the Prime Minister of Ceylon. Thereafter, in regard to these things, we have communicated with the Ceylon Government and not with the Chinese Government. Throughout this period we have not conferred with the Chinese Government in regard to the Colombo proposals. It is for the Chinese Government to communicate with Colombo and for Colombo to tell us, or for us to communicate to the Ceylon Government and for them to tell the Chinese. So, now it is fairly clear from what Marshal Chen Yi has said and from the message received by us through the Prime Minister of Ceylon, it appears that the Chinese Government have not accepted the Colombo proposals in regard to certain important matters. Therefore

or in these preliminary matters, do we consider the merits of the case. They are not changed.

When we asked for the restoration of the 8th September line, that had nothing to do with our accepting that line as a settlement; of course, not.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX**⁶

I regret, Sir, that this matter that we are discussing which, as the whole House realises, is one of high importance not only in the present but for the future also, should be reduced occasionally to a very much lower level by these interruptions.

I submit that the present question, although this is a complicated matter and we have to consider it in all its aspects and it may have far reaching results, first of all, is that in keeping fully with the Resolution that we passed in November that is a Resolution passed in all seriousness and in all determination; and we are determined to carry it out however long it may take and however it may end and realising that, anything that happens in between will be governed by that Resolution. Certainly, we have often said, and I hope that we shall continue saying it and acting accordingly, that our basic policy is of adopting and pursuing peaceful methods, and at the same time to maintain our determination to preserve our freedom and integrity. These are basic policies. I do not think that there is any conflict between them; there should be none. But some people.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX**⁷

Therefore, the present question before us is to be viewed in this context, first of all, our firm determination to carry out what we have said in our November resolution, our firm determination; at the same time, we cannot, I feel, reject any peaceful method; in fact, we should definitely pursue peaceful methods where they do not come in the way of our firm determination, in the way of our integrity and freedom, in the way of anything that is honourable to India.

Some hon. Members perhaps do not agree with our general outlook, to preserve and to carry on with peaceful methods. It is open to them to disagree. But I think that has been our policy for a long time and I do not think that that policy should be interfered with. Otherwise our policy is a useless one, and that policy becomes one of.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX**⁸

What I was venturing to say was this. I was not saying anything against any Member or any party. I was venturing to say that there are two basic policies, or rather two aspects of the same policy that we pursue and we have always pursued. One is to pursue peaceful methods for the solution of anything; and we think that such peaceful methods should be applied everywhere; we have said so repeatedly, and when we tell others to do so, we cannot obviously reject them because then we are hypocrites. But the second part that we must preserve, and we must be determined to preserve, our freedom and integrity is an equally important part. In fact, I was saying in regard to the first part, that is, peaceful methods, that if it is demonstrated

BACK NOTE

LIII. Motion Regarding Colombo Conference Proposals, 23 January, 1963

1. SHRI KISHAN PATTNAYAK: On a point of order. Sir. The Parliament has never agreed to this proposal.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the point of order in this?

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: He is making a wrong statement.

MR. SPEAKER: He can correct it when he speaks. He will have that opportunity. There is no point of order.

2. SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: It is imposed upon us.

MR. SPEAKER: It cannot be imposed if he [has the freedom to say something and he goes on saying in spite of Order, order.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: I am sorry, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: What the Members object to is that there was no mention about the line or the situation on the 8th of September in the resolution which the Parliament adopted.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, not at all.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It was not mentioned because the question had not arisen. The resolution of November stands and must stand; there is no question of one's going behind it.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: Then do not get irritated.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. If he cannot himself, then I will have to help him.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Should I? Does he want that I should assist him in that?

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: No. He gets irritated, that is what I submitted to you.

MR. SPEAKER: I will only ask the leader of the Party...

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): I am sorry, Sir, for what has happened.

MR. SPEAKER: That expression of being sorry has been expressed so many times by the hon. Members.

SHRI SURENDRNATH DWIVEDY: I hope he will bear in mind, certainly, all that happened today and in the future he will act as any disciplined Member of our party in the House will do.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. I expect this from the leaders at least.

3. SWAMI RAMESHWARANAND: If the conversation had to be held on the request of Mrs. Bandaranaike, it would have been done earlier. Why were twenty thousands men got killed? You went abroad saying push the Chinese out of the border.

HON. SPEAKER: I am surprised that Swamiji could understand everything.

4. SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame!

5. HON. SPEAKER: This is being said by those who often say that they cannot understand English.

SH. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It was said by mistake...

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV: In your opinion, English is more important than the problem of China and India?

6. SHRI RAMESHWARANAND: Our Prime Minister gets very angry at the members but not at China.

SHRI BADE (Khargone): How can the chair request the hon. Members to leave the Party? That is objectionable.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a suggestion for action.

7. SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: After changing the definition of freedom and integrity.

SHRI SHAM LAL SARAF (Jammu and Kashmir): We seek your guidance, Sir. It is very difficult for us to follow what is happening here, if every time there are interruptions like this.

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV: Interruptions are also part of the proceedings.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA (Kanara): May I submit that the foreign affairs debates have been conducted by us with great dignity in the past? It is not quite fair to interrupt the hon. Prime Minister in this fashion.

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV: We don't like this policy through which we lose our land.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: Interruptions are relevant. I do not think that all interruptions are taboo.

8. SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV: It has been useless, and it has been proved.

MR. SPEAKER: Every word that is being uttered should be listened to and appreciated, so that all the implication? may be studied by the hon. Members when they have to make speeches; instead of that, if they make interruptions, they miss certain words and then perhaps shout or interrupt, without fully realising what the implications would be. I would rather request them to listen patiently, to see what it means and then to reply in the debate. That would be much better.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Thank you.

9. SHRI NATH RAI PAI (Rajapur): We are not sure that the Chinese are tired of these methods. We are not sure that the Chinese are tired of these methods.

10. SHRI TYAGI (Dehra Dun) : I wish to seek to a clarification.

MR. SPEAKER: Let me place the motion before the House first.

DR. M. S. ANEY (Nagpur): Before you place the motion before the House, I would like to ask one question by way of clarification. What is the next step to be taken after we finish our discussion? Is that step to be taken by the Colombo Conference or by the Chinese Government?

SHRI TYAGI: May I also put my question?

MR. SPEAKER; These are things that will be made clear in speeches. The Prime Minister will reply at the end. If all the clarifications are sought now. what else is left for discussion?

SHRI TYAGI: It is not an argument. I only want a clarification so that whoever is said may be after knowing that.

In the papers we have read today, there is a news item about this. The Hindustan Times today carries an AP news item emanating from Colombo saying that 'China objects to a suggestion by the six Colombo Powers that a demilitarised zone in the Ladakh sector of the disputed SinoIndian border be jointly policed by Indians and Chinese.' This is attributed to a reliable source. It is further mentioned:

"The Chinese objection was incorporated in a memorandum from the Chinese which Ceylon Premier Sirimavo Bandaranaike delivered to New Delhi, the source said".

If this is so, I wanted to know whether it has been received or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Was this the one that the hon. Prime Minister referred to?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: No. no.

MOTION REGARDING COLOMBO CONFERENCE PROPOSALS

25 January, 1963

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I crave your indulgence and the indulgence of this House to speak on the subject that we have been discussing for the last two days and try to do so objectively and dispassionately, I am afraid the beginning of today's debate has rather vitiated the atmosphere of objective consideration of any subject. However, I shall endeavour to try to be as calm and objective as possible and I trust that hon. Members will hear me and then, of course, it is open to them to decide as they wish.

In the course of the debate—I think day before yesterday—Shri Dhebar asked a question: What exactly are we considering? It was a very relevant question, because the issues that were before us were confused, over-laid and covered up by all manner of other considerations and therefore were likely to be forgotten by hon. Members. I recognise, of course, that the immediate issues before us have a considerable background of history and we cannot separate that background from the present issue, I do not object to all the other matter coming up or being pointed out to us. Indeed, I myself would like it to be considered in that context.

So far as this background is concerned, I take it that in spite of many differences of opinion on many other subjects, there is no Member of this House who differs in his judgment of that background and our reaction to the Chinese aggression and invasion. So, if I do not refer to it at any length, it means that we take it for granted. This is common ground and we expressed that common ground in the solemn resolution that we passed in mid November, and took a pledge. Now, we have not only to consider this background, but also the future as it might take shape. That future is of great concern to us in India. But it has relevance also to Asia and the world, as any conflict between India and China must necessarily have. We live in a rapidly changing world. We cannot, therefore, think in static terms. We have followed a policy of non-alignment and I believe in it fully. Now, I hope we shall continue to follow it. But even the old concept of non-alignment is slowly undergoing a change. On the one side, the Soviet Union and China are beginning to fall out. On the other side, there is some attempt at a closer approach between the United States and the Soviet Union. We cannot, at this stage, say much about it, but it does hold out some hope.

Our policy of non-alignment has won such favour in the outside world, not only among the so-called non-aligned countries, the newly independent countries of Africa and Asia, but even the major aligned countries like the United States and the Soviet Union have come to see some virtue in it and want it to be continued. It has surprised me, therefore, that just at this moment of our success in this policy, some people in India should doubt its worth. In any event, what I wish to lay stress

on is the dynamic character of the world today. Any position that we take must keep this in view.

We have had to deal with, at first, the slow encroachments of China on Indian territory, which have lasted five or six years and then from September, 1982 aggression on a massive scale. We believe, and many other countries agree with us in this matter, that China, as constituted today, is an aggressive expansionist country, possibly with vast designs for the future. It believes in the inevitability of major wars. Thus, essentially it does not believe in peaceful co-existence between countries and it does not believe in the five principles of *Panchsheel*, which China and India laid down some seven or eight years ago and which had been accepted by a large number of countries.

The curious fact emerges that just when most other countries have come to this conclusion that peaceful co-existence is essential and war is no longer a desirable or a possible way of settling disputes between nations, China stands apart and follows a policy which is peculiar to her. China is a great nation with a great past. A great nation pursuing such aggressive policies necessarily becomes a danger and a menace to the other countries and to the world. It has been our misfortune that we have been victims of this aggression, but that very aggression, has made not only us, but other countries also realise the nature of the problem that faces the world. I believe that even the Government of China has realised the danger of the course that it follows. Possibly also it has realised the wrong it has done to India and to itself by following this course. I am not referring to moral rights and wrongs, but to the practical consequences of the action. It must be obvious to China that they cannot compel us by military or other forceful means to surrender to them in any important matter. In spite of the aggressive actions that they have taken on India and the very intemperate language that they have used, it appears that they are beginning to realise that it is not good for them, as it is not for us and for Asia and the world, if our two countries be entangled in a war which may well last a long time and do tremendous injury. One thing is certain, and they must recognise it, that India as it is constituted today will not submit to any dishonour, whatever the consequences.

India has been devoted to peace, and in her long history, whatever we may have done within our own country, we have not invaded other countries. Our fault has been to submit to others' invasions in the past, but that time is past now, and a new India has arisen which cannot and will not submit to any aggression. We want to live peacefully and in freedom, and we do not wish to interfere with the freedom of others. "We believe, whether others believe in them or not in the *Panchsheel* or the five principles, because that is the only civilised or even practical way of existence in the modern age". There is no other way except war and wholesale destruction, extermination. Therefore, we have to try to bring, in so far as we can, apparently two contradictory urges and principles— to promote peace and live in peace and freedom on the one hand, and on the other hand to resist any encroachment of our freedom and integrity with all our might. That is a difficult thing to do, but there is no reason why we should not endeavour to do it to the best of our ability. But it is clear that we

cannot unilaterally pursue the path of peace if aggression takes place against us, and our freedom, integrity and honour are threatened. Because we were so threatened, our nation responded in the only way that any self-respecting and freedom-loving nation can respond, and we were witnesses to a sight which was worth having even at the cost of the trouble we had on our frontier. Our people proved to themselves and to the world that freedom had brought a new spirit in them and that everything else was secondary to the preservation of their freedom and integrity.

On 14th November last we took a solemn pledge and by that we stand. Members have reminded me of this pledge, and they imagine that something is suggested that will go counter to that pledge. I would like to tell them that tomorrow, on our auspicious Republic Day, scores of millions of people all over India are going to repeat that pledge or a slightly modified form of it.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX¹**

Slightly modified form of it. Naturally, the circumstances, the date has changed. Our whole community development movement, numerous blocks and community centres and panchayat ghars, all of them are going to meet tomorrow, I believe at 9 o'clock in the morning, in their respective places and take that pledge, modifying the words slightly to suit them; otherwise, the substance is the same.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX²**

The modification has nothing to do with the substance. Naturally, Parliament says one thing in one way, and the community centres say it in a different way.

That will be a noble demonstration of our people's will and determination. Would we have organised that if we wanted to bypass the pledge? Let this be remembered and this argument of our proving false to our pledges not be raised again.

We have been told that Government is paralysed by fear and the military might of China, that we want to accept the Colombo proposals because we are frightened, and that it will be dishonourable for us to accept these proposals, and a breach of the pledges we have made. There have been heroics and hysterics and, what has been described by a foreign newspaper, a competition in patriotism, as if patriotism is to be measured by words and phrases and the strong statements that one makes. Patriotism is made of stronger stuff. It is to be judged by something more than the words we use, rather by the life we have led.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX³**

By that life let us judge each one of us.

We have committed many mistakes, and no doubt will commit more—

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁴

But I have yet to know that we have succumbed to fear and have fashioned our policies on that basis. Long years ago, when we had the privilege of serving under the leadership of Gandhiji, we learnt one lesson: that was to shed fear. There is little likelihood that we would forget that basic principle that he taught us. But fearlessness has to be married to wisdom. Otherwise it is reckless folly. It is to be governed by certain principles as well as a measure of intelligence and understanding of what the world is today. What have we been debating here during the last two or three days? It is the Colombo proposals. How do these come into being?

On the 20th of October last, the first massive invasion of India took place. Before that about six weeks ago, on the 6th September the Chinese forces had started coming from across the Thag La ridge in NEFA. On the 20th of October was this massive invasion. On the 24th of October the Chinese Government made their three point proposals— that is, three or four days after this. Within two or three days we rejected these proposals as they were considered dishonourable for India and we could not possibly accept them. We had, therefore, to take a positive line and to make some positive proposals suited to the moment. Some people called it the 'peace offensive'. We had to meet that offensive, apart from any other positive line that we should take. It was then that we suggested that we would be prepared to talk to the Chinese if the situation as it existed before the latest invasion was restored—that is, what is called the 8th September line was restored. That was an ideal proposal for India as well as, I think for China. Neither of these countries could succeed in humiliating the other; each of them is too big and too conscious of its honour to submit to any humiliation.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁵

May I proceed, Sir? I am not aware of having referred even indirectly or remotely to any hon. Member opposite, anywhere. I do not know why this extraordinary excitement should take place. I am talking slowly, calmly and dispassionately trying to analyse the position.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁶

I am grateful to the hon. Member for permission to proceed. This 8th September proposal was repeated by me many times in Parliament and outside, at meetings, on the radio and in the Press. It was definitely mentioned by me repeatedly in the course of my speech then. A substitute motion was proposed by Shri Ram Sevak Yadav for the particular purpose of the rejection of this proposal of the 8th September line.

This substitute motion was rejected by a very large majority in the Lok Sabha. Subsequently a substantive motion was passed approving all the measures and policies adopted by Government. I shall read out these motions. The motion under discussion was:

“That the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China be taken into consideration”.

In the course of my speech, I said:

"In answer to this it was stated that we could not proceed to any talks with them until at least this latest aggression was vacated and the *status quo* prior to the 8th September 1962 restored both in NEFA and Ladakh". This was the least we could do and that is the position we have consistently held during the last few months. Anxious for peace as we are, we suggested this minimum condition which might lead to a peaceful approach."

I referred to this again on two or three occasions in the course of the same speech. I would read further from that:

"What we had suggested is a simple and straightforward proposal, that of restoration of the *status quo* prior to the 8th September, 1962, when further aggression began."

Shri Ram Sevak Yadav proposed a substitute motion to this which ran as follows:

"This House having considered the border situation resulting from invasion of India by China, is of opinion that the policy of the Government of India to start negotiations on the condition of withdrawal by the Chinese aggressors to the line of control as on the 8th September, 1962 should be rejected, and no negotiations should be undertaken till the Chinese aggressors withdraw to the Indian boundary as it existed on the 15th August, 1947."

This substitute motion was voted upon in the House. The result of the division was 13 in favour of the substitute motion and 288 against.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁷

I had simply read out the wording of the substitute motion. It is for the hon. Members to say what it means, I shall read out the substitute motion again:

"This House..., is of opinion that the policy of the Government of India to start negotiations on the condition of withdrawal by the Chinese aggressors to the line of control as on the 8th September, 1962, should be rejected and no negotiations should be undertaken till the Chinese aggressors withdraw to the Indian boundary as it existed on the 15th August, 1947."

Subsequently, an amendment was proposed by Shri Vidya Charan Shukla that for the original motion the following be substituted namely:

"This House having considered the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China, approves of the measure; and policy adopted by the Government to meet it."

This was passed without voting apparently, but almost unanimously, though some did not agree.

..... XXX XXX XXX⁸

I definitely say that Acharya Ranga did not agree with it. Probably he will never agree on anything good. I am prepared to make an exception to Acharya Ranga in every proposition that I may make.

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**?

It is not a question of argument about words or things. It is beyond argument—what has been done by the House; that is the parliamentary practice and procedure. It is not normal—or can be followed by Government—to come every time to the House and take its opinion about a certain step that it might take. It places the general policy before the House and the House approves of it or disapproves of it or criticises it, and Government has to function accordingly. If the House disapproves of it naturally the Government have to change their policy. In this particular matter it was not necessary from the point of view of any Constitution or law for the Government to come to this hon. House and take—I am talking about the 10th December—their views about the 8th September line which was the proposal made by Government as a reaction to the proposal made by the Chinese previously. But we did come and we came after this matter had been repeated for two months, repeatedly by me and by the organs of public opinion. The House was particularly fully seized of this fact; this has been done; this has been said. I came here and stated, “this is our policy,” and subsequently, after the substitute motion that Shri Ram Sewak Yadav proposed—it referred to something being rejected—a resolution was passed by the House that the House approves of the measures and policy adopted by Government. That is my understanding. How can there be any doubt in the least? One in a million. I say there can be no doubt about that. What is the effect of this? The effect of it is that the House, at that moment, approved of the proposal that we had made about the 8th September line. That is my submission. Others may disagree with it. Both negatively and positively it was cleared out.

I am almost prepared to say that with the exception of Acharya Ranga the House approved of it. It is always open to the House, may I say, to disapprove of something it has approved previously, to change its mind. That is a different matter. I am not challenging the right of the House I am merely saying as a matter of recorded fact in our proceedings that this fact was before the House; it was deliberately brought before the House in my speech, repeatedly, and in other public statements. Subsequently, the policy of the Government was reaffirmed by this House. There is no doubt about that. In that policy, at that time, this was the major thing, the other things having been previously agreed to. Therefore, I do submit that that particular matter, rightly or wrongly, was not only accepted by Government but this House also approved of it fully.

Even at the time when we were discussing this matter in the House, the conference convened by the Prime Minister of Ceylon was meeting. The Prime Minister of Ceylon had taken the initiative in regard to that in November—I forget the exact date, I think it was towards the last few days of November—in the third week probably—

that she had taken the initiative, and she had suggested at first the 1st of December for that meeting. She did not ask us about it; we knew nothing about it till we were informed that she had convened it. Naturally she had asked the other countries; we could not come in the way. We, in a sense, welcomed her initiative, and then the date was changed to the 10th of December, so that actually on the day we were meeting here in the Lok Sabha, this conference was meeting in Colombo. Subsequently, they passed some resolutions, copies of which they gave us. But they made it clear that they wanted us to keep them confidential till a later stage, when they come to us. Some days later, again, the Prime Minister of Ceylon with some of her colleagues went to Peking to discuss these resolutions and later she came here. She was accompanied by two representatives of other countries: the Prime Minister of the United Arab Republic and the Minister of Justice of Ghana. First of all, we asked them to explain to us. What exactly those resolutions meant and whether there was any doubt about the interpretation or not. It was obvious that some parts at the resolutions could be interpreted in more than one way. So we said that those should be cleared out. We asked them some questions and they gave us their explanations and amplifications in writing to be precise. Then we considered the original Colombo resolutions with their amplifications, and considering them we came to the conclusion that they fulfilled the essence of what we had asked for when we had put forward the proposal of 8th September line. Thereafter we told them as a Government that we accept them in principle but we would like to put them up before Parliament and take their reaction to them, and then we will let them have our final reply.

Now, I should like to add that the September proposal had nothing to do with any of the merits of the case or anything. The Colombo powers stated that they wanted to help in creating a situation which would enable the parties to discuss matters between themselves, to prepare the ground and to lessen tension. That was the position then, and that is what we are considering today.

When the representatives of the Colombo powers came here they told us—we had heard previously—that the Government of China had given, what is called, a positive response to these proposals, whatever that might be. Subsequently, it appeared that that so-called positive response was limited and restricted in various important ways. I may mention one or two of those a little later to the House. Anyhow, it appeared that it was not in complete acceptance of the proposals as they were and as they were amplified by the representatives of the Colombo powers to us. So we told them that our acceptance in principle of these proposals meant our acceptance in principle, naturally, of those proposals as interpreted and amplified by them. We did not ask them to change the proposals or to alter them even though we might have wanted to do that; we wanted to keep them as a whole. Otherwise, we would have asked them to change their proposals, they would have gone back to Peking and would have possibly been asked to change the proposals in some other way. Anyhow, we did not discuss any change of the proposals, but we took the proposals as amplified by them which we found, then and subsequently, was not the interpretation of the Chinese to these proposals.

What I said was that in NEFA, according to the Colombo proposals, we are supposed to go all over except in two points which have been reserved for further discussion. No decision has been made according to these proposals about them. They are a little territory near the Dhola Ridge and Longju. No decision has been made about these two matters.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹³

So far as Longju is concerned, according to these proposals and according to our September statement, no decision is necessary because when we have said that they go back to the 8th September line, well, Longju will remain with the 8th September line now and later. The question does not arise. I do not want to go into its history as to how Longju is there and then say that they should withdraw or we should withdraw, whether that is right or wrong and so on. That is another matter. But, according to the 8th September line, it is not affected. Dhola is affected, undoubtedly.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹⁴

Anyhow, Longju and Dhola are matters open to discussion and further consideration. So far as we are concerned, we have made it perfectly clear that Dhola and Longju.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹⁵

We are not commenting. We have made the position clear and the Colombo Powers have made the position clear on this point. About Longju, as I have stated, there is no question. We have stated it repeatedly. I would beg of the House to remember that we have to consider, we are considering it from the point of view of the 8th September line, not on merits. According to the 8th September line, Longju is a frontier village, half with us and half with them. Dhola post is also an important area. Our position was, and is, that Dhola and all the area on this side of the post should be completely vacated, and that remains so. So that, if you accept the position which I have stated, no question arises in NEFA.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹⁶

The present position is, as I have said yesterday, the Chinese have withdrawn throughout NEFA, except in a small area near the Thag La Ridge which has not been decided yet and which is supposed to be discussed by us further, and by the Colombo Powers we have been assured that we can occupy all those territories.

Coming to Ladakh, which is perhaps the area which has been exercising the hon. Members' minds most, may I say that I was a little surprised to learn from the hon. Member, the leader of the Praja Socialist Party, that he doubted the fact that they had advanced only twenty kilometres. I do not know how he measures and from what place he measures.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹⁷

that this was included in the general lines of policy approval which have been given by this House to me. Further, I thought that if I place the whole position.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX**²⁴

I am prepared. I did not bring it for two reasons. One was, as I have said, that I did not think it necessary and I did not wish to create precedents for the future that every matter is voted upon by Parliament. It is not a good precedent. It is not followed by other Parliaments.

Please let me go on. Please let me finish a sentence or two.

Secondly, because the Chinese had not given their final reply, I thought it on the whole desirable for this matter to be left by the House to the Government to pursue within the lines of the general policy. But, if there is any doubt in any people's mind that this is not a correct course, I would suggest to you and to the House to permit me to move an amendment here and now and to have it this way or that way.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX**²⁵

I am sorry, the hon. Member thought that because it could not have been that. Any intelligent approach would show that it could not be that. How could I put this up? Leave out Parliament for a moment. Government is committed to a certain line of action and Government, naturally, pursues it unless it is told not to do so by Parliament. It has to; Government cannot remain in the air in matters of this kind. We have said that. First of all, I showed that so far as Parliament is concerned they have also given their approval to the 8th September line as a matter of policy. Then comes the question of interpretation as to how far the 8th September line has been carried out by the Colombo proposals. That is the sole question that we have to consider as Government and we have told them that we accept these in principle. We thought, we should accept them. Of course, our acceptance does not bring this about wholly because this is a matter concerning China also. China has thus far not accepted it. I do not know what it will do. But we cannot remain in the air. We have to inform the Prime Minister of Ceylon what our position is. As I told you I shall inform her. Therefore what the hon. Member opposite said, namely, that I have not brought forward a substantive resolution because of the November thing, I do not at all understand. How can that help us at all at the present moment? Of course, we hold to the 8th November thing and, of course, I am going to repeat it tomorrow from a hundred thousand platforms in India. That is a different thing. But in this matter we have to say something. We have to say "Yes" at "No" and therefore it is for the House to tell us to say "Yes" or "No".

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX**²⁶

In view of the fact that there is this difference of opinion, I submit that the difference of opinion should be set aside and the vote be taken now, if you like, on a substantive motion. If the House permits me, I shall move it....

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²⁷

I know that it is unusual for me to suggest it at this late stage. But if the House agrees and you agree. I am perfectly willing. That is all that I wish to say. I do not wish to press it. But one thing is perfectly clear.

The hon. Member Shri Nath Pai has certainly, according to me. misunderstood what I may have said or the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs may have said. He said that we shall not bring it up because in the normal course it was not necessary to bring it up. Government follow a certain policy, and if that policy is explained. if the House broadly accepts it that is enough...

Therefore, the position necessarily is that I have to send some precise answer to the Colombo Powers and to the Prime Minister of Ceylon today or tomorrow as to where we stand. I cannot tell them that we have not made up our mind. It is absurd. As a matter of fact, we have already told them that we accept them in principle. And it is the proposition of Government that we should tell them definitely and precisely that we are prepared to accept these Colombo proposals subject to the amplifications and elucidations. Whether they will come into effect or not depends on the other party accepting them. For the moment, they have not accepted them. Well, if they do not accept them they do not come into effect: that is a different matter. But I have to choose; there is no help for it: I have to choose this way or that way. If there is any doubt in any hon. Members' minds, I propose to resolve that doubt by suggesting to you and to the House to permit me even at this stage to put forward a specific motion....

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²⁸

The hon. Member opposite says that he does not challenge my right to give the Government's reaction to it to the Colombo Powers. Then, will the hon. Member at a later stage, some other day.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²⁹

I leave myself in your hands and the hands of the House, because I have to take some action, and not merely deliver a speech here, and I have expressed to the House what the intention of Government is very clearly, and we think we are right; it may be that some hon. Members think that we are not right Now, there are two ways of dealing with this matter. One of them is the very clear way of putting it to the vote. As a matter of fact, it is going to be put to the vote in a slightly indirect way by Shri Ram Sewak Yadav's amendment, which is a negative one, and which seeks a disapproval of this. If that is rejected, certain consequences; flow, but I am prepared to accept those consequences. But, if not, and if the House wants a clear direction, I am prepared to have a direct vote on it. It is immaterial. But the fact is that I want the House to realise it, I do not want to be said that I did something behind the back of the House, or which the House not accept. That must be made perfectly clear.

It is Government's intention to convey a final answer to this matter to the Prime Minister of Ceylon, approving *in toto* the Colombo proposals as amplified and explained by them. I would naturally add that the fact of giving effect to them will only come when the other party has fully approved of them. I think that is the position on which I propose to act, and I cannot act if the House does not approve of it; naturally. I cannot act, and I would not act, if the House does not approve of it, but nobody should be left in any doubt about it.

May I add that in spite of all this argument that we have had these two or three days, this business of the 8th September line and the Colombo proposals is a temporary thing for a temporary objective?

As I said earlier, the whole question of our conflict with China is a very much deeper one, and it may carry us on for years, whatever may happen in between. I do not say that the actual war will go on for years, but the conflict will go on and the menace will be there. Therefore, we have to prepare and strengthen ourselves to the best of our ability; whatever happens, we have to strengthen ourselves.

Some people imagine that because of these Colombo proposals being accepted or acted upon we shall slow down or slacken. That would be utterly wrong. That is certainly not the view of Government, or, I take it, of anybody in this House. We must strengthen ourselves, because it is inevitable that we should build up our strength, not only get such help as we are getting—and we are grateful to the countries who are giving us that help—but the real thing is to build up our strength in India, build up our industry, build up everything that goes to strengthen our nation in war and in peace. That is urgent and important.

The hon. Member Shri Frank Anthony in his eloquent, and if I may say so, rather flamboyant language referred to something; he said that in two hundred years, something was going to happen, not in my lifetime, not in his lifetime, and all kinds of things would flow from it. I am glad that he thinks of the future also sometimes and what the consequences of our action might be. For, as I said at the beginning, the world is not a static world, it is a changing world; it may well be that the present face of the world may change completely; it may well be that what is talked about now about oneworld State may arise; it may well be that frontiers may cease to exist except for some administrative purposes; all kinds of things may happen. We are too much wedded to a static view of the past even to consider the present. In this changing dynamic present, the main point is that we must never submit to coercion or military pressure.

Now, I do not know what the Chinese objections are, all of them, but I shall mention one or two to you, their objections to the Colombo proposals. One is that they do not want us in that Ladakh area, that corridor as it is called, to put up any kind of military or civil posts. That is an important matter. And China wants to put up her own posts there, civilian posts, not military posts. That is one important matter. The second, I believe, relates to . . .

publicity etc., that all our publicity is ruined by some such remarks made in this House. If for instance, contemptuous remarks are made about these countries, any of the Colombo Powers, these go there and they say this was said in our Parliament. That has a worse effect than all the propaganda that can be made by China against us. I want the House to remember that one has to speak rather carefully about other countries, specially other countries which are friendly to us. May be they do not agree with us.

Now, much is said about their not separately condemning the Chinese as aggressors. First of all, it is difficult for them to do so. Whatever views they may have held, once they start acting in a mediatory role, it is difficult for them to move about condemning one party with which they are dealing. They can retire and then condemn certainly.

I would remind the House about one country, the United Arab Republic, which has done more than any other country to support us. Their Cabinet has passed a resolution supporting us. I do not remember the words they have used, but in dealing with the situation they have been very strongly in our favour. When Mr. Ali Sabry, their Prime Minister, comes here, he is attacked by our press, asked to say that China is an aggressor—attacked in the sense that he is crossexamined. Here is a man coming as a mediator. He has to behave with some decency towards the parties concerned. It is very unfortunate that he was treated that way.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX**³³

Take another, Burma, for instance, I might mention, was deeply grieved at the charges made against her in this House. Some questions are asked about Burmese troops cooperating with China. They are very annoyed at that, and they protested.

Then there is some not very reputable paper, a weekly, which also gave some extraordinary stories about Burma.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX**³⁴

We had actually a protest from the Burmese Government about it, asking why we did not go about formally denying this kind of thing, repudiating it. We pointed out that it is difficult to go on repudiating every deviation from fact that occurs in Indian newspapers, for that would be to long a process and would be giving “further publicity to something that has been said by a not very widely circulated paper.

Then yesterday or the day before—I forget—an hon. Member quoted something from the Anand Bazar Patrika. I was deeply grieved about it. I had heard about it before, because that was a very contemptuous personal reference to Mrs. Bandaranaike, the Prime Minister of Ceylon. I was also included in it but leave me out, it does not matter what is said about me. But it was very improper for any person to have said that about not only the Prime Minister of a country but of a country very friendly to us,

a country with whom we have close dealings, a country which is trying, according to its lights, to serve the cause of peace.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX³⁵

It is not a question of merits. I am merely saying, if we want friendship in the world, we have to restrain ourselves. We cannot go out and condemn other countries and then expect them to stand up for us.

I would just repeat just one thing more which I have said previously. We have been attacked and we are, and may be, at war with China. That I hope will not affect our fundamental approach in the world and in India to solving problems by peaceful means, because the world is too dangerous. Hon. Member must have seen what happened in the Cuba affair where it was touch and go—within 24 hours 200 millions might die from nuclear bombs. It is a terrible thing to think that such a thing might happen by a slide mistake. Fortunately, wisdom came in the way and stopped it. We have neither nuclear bombs, nor do we intend possessing them. Nevertheless, I have always to think of these possible consequences of what may happen. So that we have to join, as I said, our Arm determination and preparation to resist to the best of our ability, always with an attempt, where possible and where it is honourable to us, to adopt peaceful methods to settle any problem.

In this connection, I had said previously about the suggestion I had made about the International Court of Justice or arbitration or some such thing. It is no good my placing this matter before the House at this stage, because the question has not arisen. But I do mention it to the House because it may bear it in mind. If it arises, I shall come to the House to take its advice in the matter.

I may say concisely what I have said. The question that arises today is a very limited question, which is not a question which will last 200 years, as Shri Anthony said that it might or its effects might.

But it is a question as to how to bring about the Chinese withdrawal to a certain extent in order to be able to deal with this matter in a manner which may lead to results or not—possibly not— but, the fact that a course of action does not lead to results should not deter us from going into it, provided it does not do any harm or injury. I think both from the political and the diplomatic point of view—I am not referring to military matters; hon. Members opposite seem to be experts in it—this is desirable, Our rejecting this would be harmful to us, harmful diplomatically and from every point of view. Not only those countries which have made these proposals, but other countries, big and small, will think that we are acting wrongly and will not support us, as they have done and as they might do in the future. We are grateful for their support, of course, and we want their support. But it will not be quite right for us to ask for support if we do not do two things.

One is, we should shoulder our own burden. We shall have to shoulder it; we are shouldering it and we are going to shoulder it, because then will be no respect for us if we are not prepared to meet up to the challenge ourselves. We want all the help we can get; we are grateful to those who give it. Secondly, we must not take all the time a belligerent attitude. It must be all right in the context of India today A belligerent attitude is usually taken by weak nations, not by strong nations. Strange people, when necessary, take strong actions and prepare for it. But merely taking up a belligerent attitudes without the necessary strength does not impress anybody.

Therefore, I submit that the attitude that the Government has taken, and intends to take in this matter is correct and I am sure that the House will give its support to it.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX**³⁶

Yes, Sir. The Chinese Government have said that they are going to send one or two ships to take back the Chinese civilians who have been interned here. We have said that all those who hold the Chinese People's Republic passports can go back to China and we will not come in their way—we are talking about civilians at the present moment—unless there is any civil or criminal case pending against them. That is to say, we are not going to force any person to go back. We are leaving it to the choice of the person concerned, whether he wants to go to China or not.

..... **XXX** **XXX** **XXX**³⁷

These are not prisoners of war; these are civilians.

BACK NOTE

LIV. Motion Regarding Colombo Conference Proposals, 25 January, 1963

1. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Modified?
2. SHRI MAURYA (Aligarh): Pledge is always pledge, there should be no modification.

MR. SPEAKER: Without understanding what the modification is!

3. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Exactly.
4. SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): That is the only thing we are sure of. We are quite sure of that.
5. HON. SPEAKER: Is bravery only in these interventions? Now listen to what he thinks. You have expressed your views in your speeches. Now listen to them.

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV: Hon. Speaker Sir, ...

HON. SPEAKER: Please sit down. I am requesting everyone to sit down.

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV: I would like to speak one thing about bravery. I am not very brave. But I am not a coward as they are levelling me.

SHRI MANI RAM BAGRI: Why did you pointed your fingers towards me?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Every one in his speech had made comments and the Prime Minsiter also can do that . Now, the hon. Members would kindly keep silent and listen to him ...(Interruptions)

SHRI MANI RAM BAGRI: Be brave..

HON. SPEAKER: Please sit down. I would ask all the Members to sit down.

6. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Please proceed.
7. SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: We refrained from voting on that motion.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: By your leave, Sir, I want to raise a point of order. I would like tgo drtaw your attention and also the attention of the House to what the Prime Minister has consistently held and declared and stated in his speeches in Parliament and outside and in broadcasts, portions of which I will read out.

MR. SPEAKER: Other speeches are not to be there. Only the debate that was held here was being referred to.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: My point of order is this. You have to give a ruling on that. He made it clear on every occasion that only the government stands committed to this proposal. It is recorded there. I will read out one sentence.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the point of order? He cannot read from the debate now.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Certainly if he can, so can I.

MR. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister is on his legs.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: The point of order relates to the statement that he has made.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: The point of order in brief is this. He has said that the Parliament has endorsed the policy with regard to the September 8 line. I do not contest that proposition. But, Sir, it would be wholly wrong to say that it was adopted unanimously, just as the Parliament adopted the 14th November resolution unanimously, with acclamation, happily, at your instance all standing. Parliament never endorsed it like that. That is all.

MR. SPEAKER: He has raised no point of order, although he stood up on that pretext, I would request hon. Members to desist from this temptation when there is no point of order. At least senior Members should not stand up and interrupt when there is no point of order. (Interruption)

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: The House never endorsed it unanimously.

SHRI KISHEN PATTANAYAK: My point of order is this that the amendment proposed by Shri Ram Sewak Yadav Ji is being misinterpreted. The amendment he made

HON. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

SHRI KISHEN PATTANAYAK: Let me complete my submission. I want to make. Shri Ram Sevak Yadav's amendment was that the line of 15 August 1947 should be accepted. How does rejecting it mean that the line of 08 September has been accepted? Please clarify its meaning.

HON. SPEAKER: Is this your point of order? Please tell me what is the point of order in this? I think it is completely inappropriate to stand up like this and interrupt the proceedings. Hon. Prime Minister is giving an interpretation and is reading the

proceedings for it. Another person's opinion may differ from this, but how does this institute a point of order?

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: On a point of order. Only one hon. Member should be on his legs.

SHRI KISHEN PATTANAYAK: Please give your opinion.

HON. SPEAKER: There is no need for my opinion nor is there any point of order in this. I would ask Hon'ble Members not to raise such points of order.

Now the hon. Prime Minister may be allowed to proceed.

8. MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. He said, "almost unanimously".

9. SHRI RANGA: When I was agreeing with you I was a good man!

10. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Let us have more details of those small matters and other matters.

11. SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati): That is not the correct position. Sir, this is a very important thing. Nowhere have the Colombo proposals stipulated the withdrawal of the Chinese forces from Dhola and Longju, and the pity of it is that they were nowhere there in any of these areas prior to 8th September.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must have patience. The hon. Prime Minister was coming to those things.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I would beg of the hon. Members to learn the habit of listening quietly.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I have listened. I only say that the word "completely" should not be there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. He will come to that.

12. SHRI HEM BARUA: I did not do that.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am not saying that.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: Conventions are changed with the prospects changed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. Member must resume his seat now.

SHRI HEM BARUA: The Prime Minister should not be allowed to throw omnibus abuse against us.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: We can reciprocate, but we do not want to do it.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The Prime Minister should not, I entirely agree with the hon. Member, be allowed to throw abuse omnibus or any other bus.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: You set an example yourself.

13. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: What about Thagla Ridge?

14. SHRI HEM BARUA: Longju is also affected.

15. SHRI TYAGI (Dehra Dun): Since Dhola and Longju are matters for discussion in the future, we should not comment about them one way or the other.

16. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Thag La Ridge.

MR. SPEAKER: Thag La Ridge is the name of that place and Dhola was the post.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: We know that.

17. SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: I asked whether by their withdrawal of 20 kilometres back from the line of actual control they will reach the 8th September line. That is to say, have they advanced only 20 kilometre from that date?

18. SHRI HEM BARUA: Question. We have grave doubts.

19. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: How can they withdraw and still be there?

20. SHRI U. M. TRIVEDI: We are vacating and giving them peaceful possession.

21. SHRI HEM BARUA: No, no.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): No, no.

SHRI KISHAN PATTNAYAK: It is unpatriotic to say like that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Hon. Members can have their own opinion. But is the hon. Prime Minister debarred from giving his own opinion?

SHRI HEM BARUA: What about the 2,000 sq. miles which we have lost in that area...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order. He can have his own opinion and approach to this problem. Here we have to listen to the speech. Why should the hon. Member get impatient?

SHRI BAGRI: Sir, on a point of order.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: How can there be a point of order when I am speaking?

SHRI MANI RAM BAGRI: Hon. Speaker Sir, on a point of order, my point is that although the Hon'ble Prime Minister and the House should be respected, but does the rule and law allow this? Even when the Hon'ble Speaker is standing, Hon. Prime Minister keeps standing like a rock, but in comparison to that if any other Member stands up, he is told that it is against the rules and regulations of the House. I want a ruling on this point.

HON. SPEAKER: I have already said that no Member can stand when the Speaker is standing. So, and everybody knows that 'Members' includes even Ministers.

22. SHRI HEM BARUA: That is not the 8th September proposal. It was " for unconditional withdrawal... He is misleading.

MR. SPEAKER: Now he should listen.

SHRI HEM BARUA: We want to be enlightened.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am trying to enlighten you.

SHRI HEM BARUA: That is not the 8th September proposal. It was that they must withdraw completely unconditionally.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The 8th September proposal was to restore the position as it was on the 8th September.

SHRI KISHAN PATTNAYAK: Did the corridor exist on the 8th September?

23. SHRI BAGDI: Have the names of the forward posts have been mentioned?

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: Even if that is granted, this certainly is not the restoration of the 8th September position.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: 7th September position, that is, pre-8th September.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have said so. It is not a restoration there; it is better than a restoration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: How?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Please allow him to explain that.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That is why the Chinese do not accept that...
(Interruption).

AN HON. MEMBER: They want more.

DR. B. N. SINGH (Hazaribagh): Because they do not accept it, it is better?

SHRI BAGDI: Hon'ble Speaker Sir,

HON'BLE SPEAKER: Order, order. Can the House function like this?

SHRI BAGDI: You should ask this to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister himself is creating such conditions.

HON'BLE SPEAKER: When the Prime Minister speaks in the House, he puts forward his opinions, thoughts and the attitude of the Government. If you people do not want to listen to him, should I stop him from speaking? You have to listen to him, even if his thoughts are not favourable to you. The House will decide on such matters in due course of time.

24. SHRI NATH PAI: That is not quite true. You made sure even of your supporters.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I do not know what the hon. Member feels. If the House agrees, I am prepared to put it forward here and now...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.

SHRI RANGA: You have got majority, anyhow. We do not question that.

25. SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV: You should have had courage enough to bring forward a positive motion instead of saying now that you want to move an amendment.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Parliament can pass anything by majority. We do not contest that position at all. By a majority you can pass anything.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: What I want to point out is that when it was said that there will be no approval of a Resolution, we took it for granted that the policy accepted in this House on the 14th November is accepted. Now, the hon. Prime Minister says that there is no question of an approval motion because of the adoption of that amendment on the 10th December which, he now interprets, also accepts this. That was not our understanding.

26. SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: What is all this? How Should this be recorded, may I know?

SHRI RANGA: He has got that reply also.

MR. SPEAKER: He is arguing his case and when there are shouts of 'No', there are shouts of 'Yes' also. But I am asking all the hon. Members and not one side only...

SHRI RANGA: You should not be upset.

MR. SPEAKER: Why should I not be? If the proceedings are not peaceful, I have got to regulate them.

SHRI RANGA: When they said 'Yes', we said 'No'.

SHRI NATH PAI: I do not want to interrupt, but he was not aware of the developments. I claim the attention of the hon. Prime Minister. After he summoned us to meet him, it was clearly understood, on the assurance given by no less a person than the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs who should bear this out to avoid all misunderstanding in the House, that the Government will not seek a positive vote and it is expected that we will not move an amendment to reject it. That was the position given to us to understand and that remains. No wrong inferences should be drawn. That is our expectation.

I hope that I am correctly quoting him.

27. SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: You should have brought it forward earlier.

28. SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: Nobody questions your right as a Government.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Your majority is there.

SHRI RAMESHWARANAND: Please pay heed to my request. I sat down earlier acceding to your instructions. Now listen to me please.

HON'BLE SPEAKER: Please sit down. I will listen to you.

SHRI RAMESHWARANAND: I will take my seat as you ask. But I would like to request that I may also be listened to.

29. SHRI RAMESHWARANAND: Hon'ble Speaker sir, hundreds of people have been killed ...

HON'BLE SPEAKER: I have already told you that I will listen to you but please take your seat as of now.

SHRI RAMESHWARANAND: I have sat down thrice on your instructions. Please do listen to my request now. You have not listened to me till now.

HON'BLE SPEAKER: I have said that I will listen to you.

SHRI RAMESHWARANAND: Please see to my discipline. I have already acceded to thrice as asked by you.

HON'BLE SPEAKER: Please say what you want to say.

SHRI RAMESHWARANAND: I would like to know why the Government keeps changing the policies on a daily basis. Yesterday, they were claiming that they would not hold any talks with China until it vacates our areas. What are they saying today? What are they doing today? The Government is telling the Chinese to be honest and good. Whether their intentions have turned noble and they have turned friendly to us as before or more than that?

HON'BLE SPEAKER: I have listened to you. You wanted to speak and you have spoken.

30. SHRI HARI VISNNU KAMATH: What was the pre September 8 position with regard to that point? I think we had more.

31. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Let them also go back. Let them also not come in there.

32. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: May we know what was said by Shri Kamath? He has not spoken at all.

33. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Is it right to say they 'attacked' him. He was asked questions.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member is right By 'attacked'. I mean he was cross-examined.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: That is not improper in a democratic country. The Press only asked questions.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am not challenging their right. What I am saying is that you have to bear the consequences which flow in many countries which are very friendly to us.

34. SHRI HEM BARUA: Is it *Blitz*?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: No, it is the *Current*, if he wants to know.

SHRI HEM BARUA: They are the same, two faces of the something.

35. SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: That is a personal opinion.
36. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: About the reported Chinese Government's demand for the release and repatriation of the Chinese detenus and internees in India and the Government's reaction to it, you said that you had referred it to the Prime Minister and he would answer it in the course of his speech. You told me so at the outset.
37. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Is it not the Government's policy to demand the release of our prisoners of war in Chinese custody before we agree to release the Chinese detenus?

REPLY ON MOTION OF THANKS TO PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

27 February, 1963

Mr. Speaker, Sir, during this fairly long debate on the President's Address many matters have been mentioned and a great deal of ground has been covered. Just prior to my getting up, the hon. Member who was speaking said something about community development schemes, something very derogatory to their working—that is, money being wasted upon them. May I take that up, to begin with, and say a few words about it?

I was surprised to hear him say that and to quote from somebody whom I do not know. Anyhow, the community development scheme has developed into something different and much bigger—that is, Panchayati Raj—and I would venture to say that one of the most hopeful things in India today is Panchayati Raj and, connected with it, the community development. I do not mean to imply that all its working all over India is perfect or even good. We will have to remember the extent of it, the vastness of the domain covered by it, and there could be little doubt that in many places it has not come up to expectations. It may be that it was the hon. Member's misfortune to visit some of these places where it has not done well. But this Panchayati Raj or community development scheme touches the very basic problem in India; that is, I should say, to rouse up the hundreds of millions of our people who live in rural areas, to make their minds work differently. It is a terribly difficult thing to change people's minds. Even here, if I may with great respect say so. I find it very difficult, even in obvious matters, to change the minds of some hon. Members of the Opposition. People have a way of sticking in old ruts. A thing may be past and gone, and yet they do not realise the changes that have taken place. Now, we having lived for—I do not know—thousands of years as people and attached to various habits—the farmer in the way he ploughs and the way he lives and all that, and others too—it is a very difficult task. And yet, that is the basic task in India. Not all the factories we put in India can solve the problem; they will help to the extent the factories will help the farmer to change his mind.

That is the basic task set before community development and Panchayati Raj, to develop in the people the spirit of selfreliance and a new thinking of the new ways and understanding of the new world. After considering the whole problem as hundred per cent in India, if we succeed 25 or 30 per cent in India, it is an amazing success, because it covers hundreds of millions of people, and it has the seeds in it of greater success to come. Therefore, let us by all means try to find out how to improve these things, but to run them down means running down something that hold? the greatest promise in India.

Now, Sir, in this debate many things have been touched upon and referred to, but the major things inevitably have been Chinese aggression and economic

development—the two are connected; I think everyone begins to realise more and more.

The hon. Members opposite have harped back to the Colombo proposals. They have not got over their distaste of them—I put it mildly, they have used stronger language. We had a long debate a little over a month ago in this House, and after that debate we took some action. But hon. Members still cannot get out of the rut of thought in which they have got themselves into, and still discuss it as if we were discussing it a month ago. Much has happened in the month. After this debate we accepted them formally and informed the Colombo powers accordingly. Yet, hon. Members go on saying that it was something dishonourable that we did, by which I presume they imply a great majority of this House belonging not only to one party but several parties acted dishonourably or were foolish enough not to distinguish between honour and dishonour or were afraid. I do think, this way of thinking and talking shows the extremely limited outlook of the hon. Members who spoke these. And, that is my difficulty. We stick to something not seeing the consequences that flow from it, not seeing that things have happened and we remain stuck to certain opinions that we formed probably wrongly to begin with and so we confirm ourselves in wrongness. It is unfortunate, because we live at a time when great speed of thought is necessary, great speed of action is necessary, great appreciation of changes made in the world reactions. I do not pretend to say—how can I—that my Government or I do not make mistakes. We make any number of mistakes, but I do venture to say that, partly, not because of any special virtue in us but because we are responsible, we are in positions of responsibility we have to react to events, we have to watch them carefully and try to do the best that lies in our power.

I have often repeated and I repeat again to this House, that we have to realise that we live in an extraordinary age, an extraordinary age in the sense of changes. Well, the world has always been changing and no particular generation has been able to stop the process of change. But, at times the changes are much swifter, much faster, a process started not today but some two hundred years ago, which is called the industrial revolution.

That too was a successor of other changes in the mind, but that brought about great changes, and that has continued at an ever faster pace. And we, after our independence came to the conclusion that it was quite essential for us to catch up with these changes—not every change, some changes may be bad in the world, but the basic change I am saying—and industrialise our country. There was no other way to meet the problems that confronted us—economic problems social problems and, if you like, military problems. Well, there is no strength in the nation unless. It is industrialised, unless it takes advantage of modern science and technology.

That was the basic thing. We have to get out of our ruts. And, of all people—I do not say of all people, I do not know of all people, but, broadly speaking, almost of all people we in India who have many virtues have also one drawback or failing, and that is we stick to certain ruts of ideas.

I am sorry the hon. Member, whom I respect greatly, although I completely and absolutely disagree with his mental thinking, is somewhat unfortunately lost in the backwoods and he cannot even see the clear light of the sun.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX³

We have had this tremendous experience, an experience which shakes up a nation and which did shake us up. It has shaken us up and let us at least profit by it by remaining wide awake. I do not mean to deny that we, as a Government, or if I may say so with all respect, this Parliament or the people as a whole have been rather out of touch some times with reality in the past. I ventured to say so three days after the Chinese massive invasion in a broadcast that I delivered. But, nevertheless, we have to think what the problem is, in what context it is specially when we talk about military matters. It is obvious that no victories on the battlefield are won by speeches there or here. Other things have to be prepared for victories in the normal course.

Obviously, the two major things before us are this Chinese invasion and, in a sense connected with it and with our thinking, the economic development of the country. Economic development is intimately connected with it because nothing else can strengthen us. Hon. Members may think that help from other countries will strengthen us. That is correct but only in a measure. It is correct that it does strengthen us, but even to use that help we have to have economic development; and, anyhow, one cannot live in the hopes of continuous streams of help coming to us year after year and decade after decade. At some time or other we have to build our own strength, with the help of others as we are doing, but nevertheless it must be our strength. That strength consists in advancement in science and technology which should be applied to all our processes, agricultural, industrial etc. That is a basic thing. The two are connected—all else are either parts of this or are of secondary importance—that is, firstly, the immediate issue of the Chinese aggression and how to meet it or repel it and, secondly, development in the country.

We have had this question of development before us ever since we became independent. Everybody has it. Every country has it. Yet, there is a difference. There are many countries round about us here in Asia or Africa who talk about development and seek help from other developed countries but who have no consciously regulated view of development. Consciously regulated view means roughly a planned approach to it. The planning may be slightly wrong or right, but a planned approach means a logical, reasonable approach, an approach to which, unfortunately, the leaded Acharya opposite me does not agree. That is just it. I am glad that we had agreement about this matter at least. But that is the whole basic of my argument, that is, that the one thing that is absolutely essential in and developing country now—it is admitted by almost every intelligent person in this country or maybe in other countries—is that planned approach is essential. The nature of the planning may slightly differ here and there, but the major facts of planning are the same.

When we plan we may consult others. We consult experts from America, from England, from Russia and from countries that are capitalist, socialist or communist we consult them. Apart from certain basic differences, nevertheless, when we come to later things to be done, it is quite extraordinary how they agree, because once they get out of their ideological differences and conflicts, they have to consider it from the scientific point of view of a planned approach. It will surprise hon. Members, we have had all manner of persons coming from dozens of countries in the world, eminent technicians, eminent statisticians and the like, some of them professors in communist countries, in Poland, etc., some of them professors in American Universities and others. And yet, when they have sat down together with us, they have, broadly, generally speaking, made the same observations and pointed out the same mistakes that we have committed. Because, today, we are slightly, not wholly, getting out of that old habit from which the world has suffered and from which some hon. Members opposite suffer greatly, of thinking that the world is confined to communists and anti-communists and nothing else. The fact is that the world today is a scientific world. There is no such thing—I hope even Prof. Ranga will agree—as communist or capitalist chemistry or a communist or capitalist gun or mortar. There is no such thing. It is a product of science and technology.

Today, almost all the things that we use in the world from day to day are products of science and technology which is the same whether the approach is communist or capitalist. There is difference, of course, in other matters between communism and capitalism. Basically, the thing is, the world we live in is a scientific world, resulting in technology and all that. Because it is a scientific world, any approach that you make must be based on science. Otherwise, you lose yourself in the quagmire of illogic and lack of reason. Every country that is considered a strong country today is, normally speaking, a prosperous country, a developed country. That is, a developed country is both a prosperous country and a strong country, relatively strong country from the point of view of military affairs. You can not be strong unless you are technologically, industrially, scientifically developed. Some may be more strong than others. That is a different matter. That is the basis of it. That development has to take place. It cannot be imposed upon one. You cannot give a gun to me and make me developed. I may use the gun and do some damage with it. But, until I go through the process of manufacturing the gun, and lots of people do that, a gun is not so useful as it might otherwise be. That we have to develop. That is the whole essence even from the military point of view of our Five Year Plans and the like.

Behind military strength lies a developing nation, lies developing science and technology. That is why the very month or 2 or 3 months after we became independent, we laid stress on the development of science and started a fine magnificent series of national laboratories, national institutes which cover the country today and which have put India in a fairly advanced position in the ranks of scientific and progressive countries. That is the basis. Technology comes from that. You have got technological institutes. It is not putting up a mill here or a mill there. That is not industrialism. That may result in the man who owns it making a lot of money. That is a different matter.

If you analyse social justice, it means justice for all, equal opportunity for all, thereby releasing the pent up energies of a whole people so that they may take their place as equals with others. Social justice has no place at all in it for feudalism and relics of feudalism. It has no place for many other things that we have to put up with today, the great discrepancies in people's conditions and opportunities. But anyhow, I am for the moment not talking about what we have failed in achieving, but rather about our policies. Our policy of social justice inevitably leads to some structure which should be called socialism.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁶

I am not, again, speaking of socialism as some fixed, dogmatic, doctrinaire system, but, broadly speaking, of what flows from that concept. Therefore, our objective has been socialism or a socialist structure of society leading to equal opportunities for all, and a measure of affluence for all, a measure of prosperity for all. Any sensitive man will feel it is scandalous—we may not act up to it—that some of us should be rich and prosperous and others should starve or should lead miserable lives. Any social system which permits that or which encourages that is definitely bad. There is no good looking back to the medieval times or to more ancient times to justify it by some saying or evidence.

Therefore, in the domestic field, our policy has been, first, of course, bettering the lot of our people—a welfare state—but aiming at social justice and socialism so as to give equal opportunities to all. Apart from the justice of it, the rightness of it, there is no other way, because once you give people political democracy, their minds begin to wake up. They do not submit to much that they submitted to previously. They make demands. So social problems arise. They make demands which we cannot fulfil, unless we change the social structure to some extent.

These have been our planned approaches towards socialism. It is true that we have attached great importance to democracy. But that very concept of democracy which we have adhered to or which we will adhere to tell us that democracy is not complete by merely remaining a political democracy. It has to become an economic democracy; only then democracy is complete. Therefore, again we come back to the ideal of a socialist structure of society. And this can only be achieved in the modern world or in any world with the help of science and technology. I do not call it socialism for everybody to be poor and starving, everybody to have the same lack of opportunity. That is not socialism or advance. Therefore, the only way to achieve this is through science and technology and to direct the products of science and technology into right channel so as to benefit the large mass of the people. Therefore, I submit that the policy that we have pursued of a planned approach to this end, to this desired end, is right in the domestic field.

The foreign field, however much we may discuss it from time to time, is after all secondary to the domestic field. It becomes primary suddenly when there is an attack

or aggression on us, or when something happens to work us up—that is a different matter—but generally, the domestic field governs the foreign field. If we are prosperous in this country, if we are strong, our voice is heard everywhere. If we are failures in our own country, nobody listens to us. Therefore, ultimately it is the domestic field that counts. But domestic policy and foreign policy are more or less tied up. It is absurd to have a domestic policy which differs completely from the ends of the foreign policy.

In foreign policy we have ventured to lay stress, considerable stress, on peace, peace in the world. I would submit that that was right, and that is right. That does not become wrong because the Chinese Government believes in war. The Chinese Government believes in many things which are utterly wrong. They have strayed away from every canon of international behaviour, from their own high civilisation which they have pushed away. Therefore, we stood for peace and for co-operation with all nations. That simply means that we cannot cooperate with somebody who will not co-operate with us, but we are prepared to cooperate, to be friends with other countries. If I may respectfully say so, some people, quite a number of people, have said something to the effect that we are isolated in the world. What that means I do not know. I know something of the world, too, and I think the position is quite the reverse. There is hardly a country which is so much honoured as India anywhere. I do not mean to say that we are not criticised—we are criticised, and there is much to criticise in this country as in any other country—but we are honoured, and we are honoured principally and chiefly, apart from our ancient heritage, because of the memory of Gandhiji, and secondly because, to a small extent, I do not say more that a small extent, we have endeavoured, according to our dim lights, to follow that—not completely, of course; I admit that; we cannot, in the circumstances. But they have seen that we have put noble ideal before ourselves and we work up to them.

We have adhered to the democratic method and yet tried to do things which no democracy, working through democratic methods, has tried to do yet. It is a new, novel example in the world's history that India has been trying to do—i.e., build herself up by planned economy, planned approaches, and yet retain the democratic method.

So, we are by no means friendless in the world. We have plenty of friends, but though we may have many friends, each country decides its foreign policy not on high principle, but on material interests. That is what we see round about India, in the countries surrounding us, how their policies have changed, often unfortunately very wrongly changed, not because of any principle. In fact, the thing that is obvious is that the changes that have taken place are wholly without principle. But one cannot measure one's own policies by the failures of others to adhere to any principle. As a result of the policy pursued in regard to other countries, it was inevitable, both because of our background and practical considerations of today, that we should have a policy of non-alignment which is largely accepted by this House, I believe and even

by many hon. Members on the opposite side. I would explain again non-alignment. Simply, put in a different language, it is freedom of action. Non-alignment is not anything else but a measure of independence and freedom of action and complete friendship with other countries. It does seem to me essentially right. It is odd that when we started talking about this policy of non-alignment many years ago, we were among the very few countries mentioning it. Gradually in the course of these ten or a dozen years a large number of countries have adopted it—chiefly the newly independent countries. Because it seemed to them the right attitude for a newly independent country to adopt and it came naturally to them. But what is more important is this. The people and the countries that looked rather askance at this policy of ours to begin with gradually began to appreciate it and we had arrived at a stage when almost everybody, every country that counts appreciates that policy. I do not mean to say that they appreciate it so far as they are concerned; they may be members of power blocs. But situated as we are, they appreciated it. The only extraordinary thing is that some people, some hon. Members, like in other matters, still disagree with us. They disagree with the whole world and they will continue in the rut of thought into which they have got by some peculiar process reasoning or lack of reasoning.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁷

These are the two major domestic policies that we have pursued and I venture to say that they were right and they are right and they will continue to be right in the changing world. Take non-alignment. The mere fact that it gives us freedom of action does not tie us and we can adopt to a changing world. Now, here is a country, our neighbour country, Pakistan which, inspite of being very much aligned is wandering about all over the place without any principle or any adherence to anything worthwhile. It was extraordinary.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁸

So, I do venture to say that the policies we have pursued in both these important fields are right. Events have shown them to be right. They are right in principle, theoretically but practically they have been shown to be right and therefore, we must adhere to them, both in the domestic and in the foreign field.

Opinions may differ as to the progress made by us in those policies, I venture to say that in both these, progress has been considerable. In the domestic field no doubt many of us would have liked to have gone faster. But we have to work. It is not merely a question of Government's functioning or this Parliament functioning and fine speeches being made and resolutions passed. It is after all dependent on the mass of the people working, mass of the people understanding the position and working in that direction. Of course, we this Parliament and the Government have to give a lead and help the process. But essentially we have to set the whole nation working, whether it is for war or peace or for both. I think that it is easy to say that we have not succeeded in many things, that we have not progressed as we ought to have progressed.

But nevertheless, the progress that we have made in these last dozen years has been quite remarkable. It would have been remarkable even if we had made no such progress, compared to.

I shall explain myself. The mere fact of our continuing as a democratic entity, functioning as a democratic entity, in spite of all the storms and stresses that we have gone through, is itself remarkable. If, in addition to that, we measure the progress of any country round-about us, in Asia or Africa, one might see the difference. We have had democratic structures being replaced by *coup d'etats* or revolutionary violence into autocracies, into authoritarianism, into something that we consider very undesirable. This is happening, has happened all over. So, this comparison itself brings to light what we have achieved.

If we agree to these basic principles and policies, what we have to do today is to examine not the principles, because they are proved to be right, but the implementation of those principles; it is in the implementation that we have often failed, and the implementation requires a great deal of capacity to work for millions of people as well as the capacity to lead hundreds of thousands. It is a difficult business. We have to create, if we want to develop industrially, a strong industrial base; that is, not merely odd factories here and there, but a strong, logically organised industrial base out of which other things come. We have built a good part of the base, not compete by any means, but we are on the way to its completion; probably in another six, seven or eight years we would have made enough progress to stand to a large extent on our own feet. That is the theory behind it, and inevitably that would have made us even from the point of view of military necessities more or less independent; not entirely but more or less. I mention this merely to say that there is no question of being prepared for war except by going through this process. The other process is getting a large number of weapons of war from other countries, buying them or getting them without payment or on easy payment system. When a crisis occurs one does that and we are doing it today. But it is not strength. We must realise that even ammunition required for these weapons is a crushing burden, continually to get ammunition, unless you manufacture them here. So we have essentially to build up our industrial machine which becomes, when the need arises, a war machine. And meanwhile we have to rely for whatever things we need on what we can get from outside. That is what we are trying to do.

There is one thing I would like to say about the response of our people to the Chinese invasion. We have all described it as a wonderful and spontaneous response. But what lies behind it? Why did they respond in that way? You may say, it is because of the love of the country. That is true; but, even that means that they have got the concept of the country. Why should people near Cape Comorin respond with great fervour to this invasion in the far north-east of India? It is because they have got that concept of India in their minds. It is a very fine thing; you must realise it. Further, it is because the challenge is made to the India of today; that is to say, however much

they may criticise the India of today and the Government of today, they appreciate what has happened to India in the last 10 or 12 years, which they are not prepared to lose. It means that. Otherwise, there are only a few intellectuals who get warmed up by some theory. But the common people visualise these things as not merely theoretical, but practical things and they responded in this magnificent way, because, if I may say so, they appreciated what had been done in India since independence and they did not want to lose it.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁹

We have to face a military problem. But if we consider it as a purely military problem, we shall make a grave mistake. It is a political problem also in the larger context and therefore, from both these points of view, military and political, we have to prepare our people and make them a nation armed militarily and with clear ideas politically. Lack of political appreciation of the world we live in and of our country will weaken the military effort. Our people must feel that we and they are labouring for a better future for them, where every Indian can have a chance and we have rid ourselves of our terrible poverty. A socialistic ideal is essential to create that feeling among our people, apart from its desirability otherwise. We have made progress, but even now there are reactionary elements in the country, which confuse the issue and make it more difficult to progress.

Hon. Members have asked, what are we doing now about all this? I cannot easily go into the lists of what we are doing in the military field, what we are trying to build ourselves, what factories we are putting up, what we are trying to get from others, etc., partly because it would not be a right thing for me to do so and partly because I do not know what ultimately we will get. We are getting many things. There are many other things we want, and we are trying our best to get them. The main things that we want are machines to build things ourselves—aircraft, training for special aircraft, etc. All those things we want.

I need not say much about the question of air umbrella. The other day I made a statement. So, I think it should have made the position quite clear. As it was thought—this business of air umbrella—it seemed to me quite a wrong thing, because it really meant, if you analyse it in that way, that we do not build anything important ourselves, anything worthwhile ourselves and we rely on others to do that job for us. That is a bad thing both psychologically and actually, because at the end of the period, whatever they might have done, we remain as weak as we were. Secondly, this impression in our people that other people are going to do our job is a bad impression. It weakens them and creates a mentality which might be called the Maginotline mentality—something like a protecting cover, they are standing like chowkidars with lathis ahead, we are free of thieves or scoundrels coming in and we can live happily. It is not a right mentality to create, in any country, in the people. Psychologically it is bad. But, as I have said enough, we are trying our utmost to get the assistance of other friendly countries to give us what we require, whether it is in the air or in the field.

Longju. Apart from that in the whole of NEFA we can go anywhere, we can send our armed forces anywhere, subject only to the decision of our military people as to when to send, what to send and how to send. In the same way, in Ladakh too, we are free to send our forces where we like within the limits of our agreement, according to the Colombo proposals.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹⁵

I am sorry, there is no “agreement” in that sense. What I have said in regard to the Colombo proposals is that it is no doubt a limit which we have not reached yet, which our army has not reached yet. That is what I said. This is a matter which is a continuously changing matter. It will depend upon what the position is. It is an obvious thing for me to say that here it is not a question of advancing, waving a flag. It is a question of advancing with strength enough to face any odds and the Army has to think of that. We cannot tell them to go here or to go there. They have to decide whether they can go there. They can go within a certain range.

I would repeat one thing. Whenever we think of war a large number of amateur strategists arise who are constantly advising us as to what to do and how to carry on a war or our preparation for a war. All of us have some views about it but if it really comes to any warlike operations, one has necessarily to depend upon the experts who are there to advise us and who have to carry it out.

Broadly, I would remind this House, although we are taking every step to prepare ourselves, even so, we do not rule out any possible settlement by negotiation. It may be unlikely—probably, it is—but to rule it out would be wrong. That has not been our practice at any time. I have previously referred to a reference of this matter to the International Court of Justice at the Hague or even to a proper arbitration by a number of countries. It may be unlikely that China accepts it. That is a different matter, but I think it is a right course for us—right in itself and right from the point of view that the world is appreciating it.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹⁶

Obviously, I cannot commit the country to such a step without coming to this House, but I have already stated it in my letters to the Chinese Prime Minister about two months ago or a month ago—I forget when—and made this suggestion. Suppose—it is an unlikely supposition, but suppose—he accepts them; then it becomes rather awkward for me to back out of that.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹⁷

Then, may I refer to some other matters? Some people have suggested that we should put an end to the state of emergency. At the same time they have also criticized

the Government and the administration for not keeping up the mind of emergency, if I may say so among the people. Is it not obvious, apart from other reasons, that if we put an end to the state of emergency everybody will lose all thought of an emergency?

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹⁸

I must confess that what is obvious to me finds difficulty in appreciating by Professor Ranga. But one thing is certain—I do not say that that is the sole test of that—that once we did that the whole country will feel that the danger is past or that something has happened and they need not be taut and ready for any crisis. That is one reason. The fact is—I want this House to appreciate it—what the danger is not past. I do not know what may happen in the next two, three or four weeks in the month of March or April; I have no notion at all. I know that we have been preparing for everything and we have to go on strengthening ourselves. This process of strengthening will go on not only for a few weeks or few months but, maybe, for a year or two. That is so. Because, we want to be prepared for every contingency. To imagine that there is no possibility of any new crisis suddenly arising, will be completely wrong for us.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹⁹

So far as Defence of India Rules are concerned, there have been some arrests and some objection has been taken to preventive detention, etc. Nearly all these arrests have taken place at the instance of the State Governments, certainly with the general approval of the Government of India, not individual approval of individual?. But, the fact that they took some such action.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²⁰

I just ventured to say with the general approval of the Government of India, not in regard to any individuals. Where they considered any persons dangerous from the point of view of war effort, etc., they might take action: that is our general direction to them. But, the choice lay with them how to do it. Since then, we have repeatedly asked them to reexamine these cases and where they did not consider it necessary, to release them. In fact, about 200 or so persons, who were originally arrested, have been released. This process of reexamination is continuously going on.

About Kashmir, I would like to say a word, though not much. Because, I feel, having decided to talk with the Pakistan Government, it will not be proper for me to discuss this matter in the House or in public although I must say, the recent new development, which has induced the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to go to Peking to sign a treaty with them about their border. . . .

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²¹

Yes . . . has come as a shock. It has come as a shock not only because of the basic facts of the situation. But. the extraordinary thing is the timing of these events. The House will remember that when first my colleague Shri Swaran Singh went to Rawalpindi for the first series of talks, the day before the talks were going to begin, an announcement was made that an agreement in principle had been arrived at between China and Pakistan about the border. It was an extraordinary timing: just the day before. Now again, when he is going in a short time, they go. The least that it shows is. . . .

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²²

Nevertheless, the timing is significant I think one is justified in thinking that this timing cannot be fortuitous or accidental. It is deliberate. Therefore, it does not indicate any strong desire on the Pakistan Government's part to arrive at any agreement. That is a matter. We gave some consideration to this as to whether we should continue these talks in spite of this visit of Pakistan Foreign Minister to Peking at this moment. We came to the conclusion that we should adhere to our previous resolve and not back out of these talks because of this, although, naturally, the talks will be affected by it. So, probably, I say probably, I do not know what might happen in the next week or 10 or 12 days, probably, subject to that, I shall request Shri Swaran Singh again to journey to Calcutta to continue these talks.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²³

Because, one has to balance various considerations. We thought that it would to be desirable for us to break on this issue. Hon. Members here know all the background. But, for the world at large, the fact that will stand out is that we have broken these talks, not that they have gone to Peking. That will be very much before them.

Then, there are one or two other matters that I should like to refer to. One is that many Members have referred to corruption and mal-administration. It is a favourite subject and a right subject to refer to, though perhaps, very often, the reference gives an exaggerated picture. Anyhow, it is a vitally important thing on which there cannot be any two opinions. And I can assure the House that we have been doing our utmost, and I do not know if Members see these things or these papers get enough publicity, but every month, I think, I receive a long list of persons in the Government service, who, after due inquiry, have been either proceeded with in the law courts or departmentally and punished.

Recently, there was the Vivian Bose Enquiry Report, which I hope, every Member has got now, for, it is a document worth reading, not only because of the particular things mentioned in it, but even more so because of the background in which such

persons, all Members, will agree to the implementation of it. There may be difference of opinion and some suggestions made. That is a matter which should continuously be under the consideration of the Finance Minister. But I am not going into that matter because I understand there is going to be a full debate on it very soon....

On the 5th the matter might be discussed then.

There is just one other thing—I have taken so much time of the House—a proposal made by some hon. Members about NEFA, Nagaland, Tripura and Manipur, all being made into a homogeneous province with Assam. I think that on paper it would sound very nice but it would create great difficulties and will not be liked by the people concerned. That is a very important consideration. We cannot take a step today which goes against the will of the people concerned there.

Another criticism has been made about NEFA being treated as a kind of reserved area where people are not allowed to go easily. To some extent, that is true. That has been so. But the House will remember that NEFA has been the special responsibility of the Government of India in the External Affairs Ministry, with the result that it has had more attention paid to it than most other areas. It is not a question of keeping it apart from India, but certain changes should take place in a manner that they may fit in instead of creating difficulties and irritation among the people who live there. We have to go on with the process of integration, but without gaining the goodwill of the people, the integration would be superficial. Therefore, for the moment—specially at this stage from the point of view of border troubles—it will not be desirable to make any major change in the constitutional arrangements there.

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**²⁷

One must judge of wholesale prices, and wholesale prices have, on the whole, been stable. In fact, there was a slight declining tendency up to December. Since then, there has been some rise, but of a marginal character only. As for retail prices, it is very difficult to have even very correct information about the whole of India, but we are trying to get as much information as possible. But on the whole even retail prices have not changed very much. Nor has there been any market fluctuation in the price of manufactured articles. In regard to cloth, the supply position is good, and prices have been at a relatively satisfactory level. The fact remains that the question of prices is a very important one and I believe is very much in the mind of the Planning Commission and other Ministries that deal with it.

Thank you.

BACK NOTE

LV. Reply on Motion of Thanks to President's address, 27 February 1963

1. SHRI RANGA: Are they dead? Let us be clear about it. What is the good of saying it over and over again?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: They are not dead.

SHRI RANGA: There you are.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: And they cannot die.

SHRI RANGA: As long as we live.

2. SHRI RANGA: November 14th is still alive. The resolution that we passed on that day was a unanimous resolution. It is not to be upset.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The discussion lasted five days. Members of all parties have said what they wanted. They have criticised the Government and said that they do not approve of the policies of the Government. Now the reply is coming. Let us hear it.

SHRI RANGA: We will always refer to their mistakes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. He will have patience.

3. SHRI RANGA: The only thing is that I am not an ostrich, I know where the ostrich is.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati): The hon. Prime Minister has invited that.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I will therefore venture to say that I hope and wish to deal with a few points raised by hon. Members, but I want to carry this argument a little further because we must have clear thinking, above all at this moment of crisis.

4. SHRI RANGA: Nobody has said that. It is only your socialist plan that we object to. You do not want to give up your dogmas even in this crisis.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have often felt inclined that there are many institutions in Delhi or some institutions for the Members of the Opposition to go to and learn what the modern world is.

SHRI HEM BARUA: On a point of order.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad): He is the Leader of the House, and if he will lead the way, we shall follow him. He is the leader of the biggest party. Let him show the way and we shall follow him.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have always considered myself a student, and I still consider myself a student.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: We are with you in that.

SHRI RANGA: He does not realise his mistake. He goes on repeating it. He seems to think that he alone is the sanest person.

SHRI HEM BARUA: If he thinks himself a student then we would like to go with him, to these institutions. Why should he isolate us?

MR. SPEAKER: There are lessons to be learnt here, and let us all try to learn them.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Does he mean institutions like the Udyog Bhavan and the Vigyan Bahavan?

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Without his company it would be uninteresting.

SHRI RANGA: I suppose that even there he would be the leader.

SHRI NATH PAI: Today's performance is more than that of a professor to a student.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: Better a lecturer than a student.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Does he mean the Udyog Bhabhan and the Vigyan Bhavan?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Again that is being repeated.

5. SHRI PRIYA GUPTA (Katihar): And cumulatively falling national income?

MR. SPEAKER: Can he not contain himself?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is extraordinary how the truth of my words is evidenced so frequently by what hon. Members opposite say.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: He is the Leader of the House. He looks happy.

6. SHRI RANGA: No, Sir.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): It is a lone voice in the country.

7. SHRI RANGA: We remain in isolation and we do not recognise it today.

8. SHRI RANGA: Has India freedom of choice?

SHRI TYAGI: My hon. friend wants to be aligned bothways.

SHRI RANGA: Yes. She is playing with two; there is no bigamy there.

9. SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati): It is all selfpraise.

SHRI RANGA: In spite of yon, they have united

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): You are demeaning that magnificent response by claiming partisan credit for it.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: It is not a party affair at all.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I did not venture to say it is a party affair.

SHRI NATH PAI: You are giving it that colour.

SHRI RANGA: Before we became free, when we were getting united, there was no Jawaharlal Nehru as Prime Minister. He was only one of the fighters for freedom. We all rallied round you as well as Mahatma Gandhi. But now you are only a Prime Minister and we know the result.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: He is still a fighter, I hope.

10. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: May I submit that the word "umbrella" itself with some of its former political associations is an unhappy word?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I agree with the hon. Member completely in this matter.

SHRI RANGA: The word "umbrella" has gone and "armada" has come.

11. SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: Are we preparing for a war or for a conflict?

SHRI RANGA: We are living in an emergency.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Whether it is war or conflict the preparation is the same.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: I see.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The preparation is identical and, if I may add, if it is negotiation, even then the preparation is the same, because no negotiation can take place, it has no value, unless it has the strength behind it.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: In respect of war it is the same?

12. SHRI RANGA: That means they are not dead.

SHRI HEM BARUA: But there was a gap between the Chinese cease-fire and the Colombo proposals. What did you do during that gap?

13. SHRI NATH PAI: That is not very convincing. Basically, it is a political decision. You are avoiding your responsibilities. Basically, the decision is political. If you do not like to face it, that is different. We cannot accept the position that it is a military decision. We fail to understand how to move to the border is a military decision.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: The Defence Minister has not a free hand, I believe.

14. SHRI NATH PAI: That is implementation.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Its implementation is up to the army.

SHRI RANGA: May we seek a clarification? He said that it is up to the Army. Army is also a department of this Government and there is a Cabinet Minister in charge of that. Are we to understand that the army and the Cabinet Minister are free to take any decision and then go ahead? What did the Prime Minister say when he went to Ceylon?—"I have asked our troops to march". Was it a military decision, or political decision, or the Prime Minister's decision?

SHRI TYAGI: Should we inform the enemy what we are going to do?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Hon. Members will appreciate the little fact that something has happened since the middle of September.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Very much.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU. What I said then was not my decision alone; it was the viewpoint of the military people too. They wanted to do it. Otherwise, I would not have dared to say anything like that. It is obvious.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: The then Defence Minister also.

15. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: What agreement? There is no agreement.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Within the limits of our acceptance of the Colombo proposals; I am talking of the present—a different situation may arise

tomorrow—I am talking of the position as it is now.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH. Sir, on a point of clarification. The Prime Minister himself says that the Chinese have not accepted the Colombo proposals. So, we are not bound by them when they have not agreed to them.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU. They have not accepted them. As a matter of fact, that need not come in our way at all, because we have not implemented that part too. Because, practically speaking, there are difficulties.

SHRI HEM BARUA: It depends upon the acceptance by the Chinese also, for its implementation.

SHRI RANGA: Drop the word “agreement” then.

16. DR. M. S. ANEY: I hope, you will do that after consulting this House.

17. SHRI NATH PAI: Accept what?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The reference to the Hague Court or something like that.

SHRI NATH PAI: He dare not.

SHRI HEM BARUA: He has made that clear.

SHRI NATH PAI: He dare not face an international tribunal; rest assured.

18. SHRI RANGA: No, Sir; they have a greater sense of patriotism.

19. SHRI RANGA: Should you keep it on taking away civil liberties, and giving all the freedom to the Congress party to carry on as they please all over the country, treating the rest of us who differ from them as traitors?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; it is not a speech.

20. SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR: Are we to understand that the Central Government did not send any directive to the State Governments?

21. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Our border.

SHRI NATH PAI: Which is their border? We claim Kashmir as part of India.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: They have usurped our border.

22. SHRI U. M. TRIVEDI: We knew all the while that they were being invited. Peking was inviting. Mohammed Ali was invited. This gentleman was invited.

23. SHRI HEM BARUA: This is going to be the last.

SHRI U. M. TRIVEDI: We should reorientate our policy.

24. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Will Parliament have an opportunity of discussing that report?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Undoubtedly, but we have not put it up. . . .

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: An opportunity of discussing it early?

25. SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: In regard to the anti corruption drive, let there be a forum for the Ministers also to be tried in case of complaint. That is my submission. The Home Minister has said that Ministers are not Government servants as such, and so, there must be some forum to look into complaints of corruption against the Ministers.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I cannot talk about forums.

MR. SPEAKER: Not the public forum.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: About the National Defence Fund, some charge is made that coercion and compulsion is being exercised in these collections.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: What about my submission?

26. SHRI NATH PAL: No, no. It is Comrade Dange who has opposed that—your progressive friend.

27. SHRI HEM BARUA: How do you propose to bring about a comprehensive Indian mind so far as these people are concerned?

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: It is coming slowly.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: They won't get a comprehensive Indian mind if they get the idea that the average Indian goes there to exploit them.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I know that. That must be stopped, from whatever source it comes. But the policy of segregation, with the rest of the Indians not being allowed to go into that place, must not be persisted in.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: The Chinese are exploiting them all right.

SHRI HEM BARUA: On the other side of the line, the Chinese are coming in and going out, and fraternising with the people there.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: What I ventured to say was that the process should go on, as the hon. Member suggests. It has to be gradual to fit in. If you upset them, it is difficult to soothe them down again.

I am sorry I have taken so much time. May I now say a few words about prices? Much has been said about prices. Oddly enough, some Members have complained of rising prices and some have complained of declining prices.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: There has been a debate already.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I know. The fact that Members have complained of two entirely opposite tendencies indicates that prices have, on the whole, been stable.

SHRI HEM BARUA: That is the easier solution!

CONCENTRATION OF CHINESE TROOPS IN TIBET

23 March 1963

On the 1st March the Ministry of National Defence of the People's Government of China issued a statement that their troops had withdrawn along the entire India-China border on China's own initiative and that this withdrawal had been completed by the end of February, 1963. The withdrawal was to points 20 kms beyond what the Chinese claimed as the 'Line of Actual Control'. The statement added that the Chinese forces were "now far behind their positions on September 8, 1962."

On 3rd March, I received a message from Prime Minister Chou Enlai referring to this unilateral action by the Chinese Government and stating, "In order to promote direct Sino-Indian negotiations, the Chinese Government has done all that is possible for it to do. ...Therefore, I do not think that there should be any more reason to delay the holding of talks between Chinese and Indian officials". I sent a reply to Prime Minister Chou En-lai on 5th March in which I pointed out that "the obvious thing if the Government of China are sincere in their professions regarding peaceful settlement, is to accept the Colombo Conference proposals without reservations just as the Government of India had done. We can go to the second stage of talks and discussions only thereafter".

Since these exchanges took place, certain other developments have occurred. One was the signing of the Sino-Pakistan Border Agreement in Peking on 2nd March. During the last fortnight we received several notes from the Government of China. Despite their peaceful professions, the Government of China chose to use sharp and provocative language in these notes, one or two of them being actually scurrilous in tone. We have replied to these notes and contradicted the false allegations made.

We have also received reliable information of additional induction of troops into Tibet, of projects of further road construction along our borders and of the requisition of Tibetan villagers, pack animals etc., by Chinese Armed Forces in Tibetan areas to the north of our border. Though the Chinese forces have withdrawn 20 Kms from what they call the line of actual control, their concentration beyond this narrow strip continues unchanged.

There are other factors of recent developments which make it difficult to believe in repeated Chinese professions of their desire for peaceful settlement. The Chinese Government have, so far, declined to accept the Colombo proposals. The statement made by the Ministry of National Defence of China on 1st March referred to earlier, ends up with a warning that "Although the Chinese Frontier Guards have withdrawn from the Line of Actual Control as of November 7, 1959, we have not given up our right to self-defence." This reference to "Self-defence" in the context of what happened in October and November, 1962, coupled with Marshal Chen Yis statement in a

BACK NOTE

LVI. Concentration of Chinese Troops in Tibet, 23 March 1963

1. SHRI YASHPAL SINGH: It is our moral responsibility and political duty to defend Tibet and it is important for our defence also. So, I would like to know whether the Government is giving some sort of assurance in this matter to the Dalai Lama Government of Tibet.

HON'BLE SPEAKER: This is a separate question which is not related to this matter.

SHRI KISHEN PATTANAYAK (SAMBALPUR): May I know whether our Military Intelligence has somewhat improved which was very poor earlier. And another matter is whether we are going to use our air power in future in case of a Chinese attack.

HON'BLE SPEAKER: It cannot be foretold whether we are going to use air power or not. The first part of the question, regarding whether our Military Intelligence has provided inputs of developments there, can be replied.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The information regarding Military Intelligence is generally not shared publically. But, it is obvious that whatever I shared has been shared through that means only. Apart from that, we do not have any information.

SHRI KISHEN PATTANAYAK: Has there been any update in Military Intelligence?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I can only say that we are continuously being updated.

SHRI P. C. BOROOAH (Sibsagar): It is gathered that the Chinese troops before withdrawing from NEFA in certain places created some good atmosphere by harvesting the crops of the people and collecting them for the people in their absence, and before going they stated that they were not against the people of India in the border areas, particularly, but against the present sarkar of India.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the question now for clarification?

SHRI P. C. BOROOAH: I am coming to that. May I know whether this concentration in Tibet has any relevance to that statement of the Chinese troops?

MR. SPEAKER: He wants to know whether this concentration in Tibet has any relevance to NEFA? I could not follow the question.

SHRI P. C. BOROOAH: The Chinese troops before withdrawing from NEFA in certain areas have created some good impression about themselves, that means they harvested the crops and collected them and said that they were not against the people of India particularly...

MR. SPEAKER: This is not clarification of any statement that has been made about the concentration in Tibet.

SHRI P. C. BOROOAH: I want to know whether that concentration has any relevance to the statement that they are coming again; they said that they would be coming again.

2. SHRI ONKARLAL BERWA (KOTA): I would also like to know the status of our administrative machinery in the areas of NEFA vacated by the Chinese military and the steps taken by the Government to ensure security of the officials of the administration.

HON'BLE SPEAKER: This is a different question.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): In view of these recent developments, namely the concentration of troops in the Tibet area etc., may I know whether any special attention is being paid to the areas in Indian territories adjoining these places to put a check to the activities of espionage and sabotage, especially to curb the activities of elements who have extraterritorial loyalty?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Naturally, we try to pay every attention to any possibility of espionage and take action where we discover it. I do not know what the hon. Member meant by the last sentence, especially 'extraterritorial'. I do not know whom he means.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: There are parties and persons who have extraterritorial loyalties. I want to know whether their activities are put in check, especially in these areas, in view of the fact that they are nearer to the border.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am still unable to understand whom he calls 'extra-territorial'.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: I mean the Communist Party and persons who hold loyalty to Russia.

3. SHRI HEM BARUA: In view of the fact that one of the reasons for this massive Chinese troop concentration on our borders might be to force the Colombo Powers to force us to accept the Colombo proposals as adumbrated by China, may I know whether our Prime Minister is prepared to give us an assurance here and now that our stand on the Colombo proposals will not be diluted, whatever the consequences?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I do not know. The hon. Member wants me to give all kinds of assurances.

SHRI HEM BARUA: A very simple assurance.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I will give no assurance of any kind except that our stand is there and we intend standing by it. What other assurance does he want me to give? Does he want me to take an oath on some sacred book?

SHRI HEM BARUA: No, no. I did not have that in mind. I believe in the integrity of the country as much as the Prime Minister believes. Therefore, I wanted him to reiterate our stand of firmness, in regard to the Colombo proposals, against this heavy Chinese troop concentration.

MR. SPEAKER: All that is contained in the statement itself.

SHRI YASHPAL SINGH: It is necessary to know about the offensive potential of the Chinese Air Force on our borders keeping in view the defence of our country. I would like to know whether the Government has gathered information regarding the strength of Chinese Air Force accumulated on our borders.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Some information is definitely being gathered but I am not ready to share the said collected information with you here in the House.

INDUSTRIAL LICENSING POLICY

23 April, 1963

Sir, no change has been made in the basic Industrial Licensing Policy of the Government. The press reports that have appeared give certain distorted versions of some correspondence that has taken place between some of my colleagues and me. The letters addressed to me by them were confidential, and I regret greatly that confidential communications should be published in this way, removed from their contexts to give a wholly incorrect idea. The correspondence dealt with the need for maintaining and accelerating the rate of industrial growth in the country and a certain dissatisfaction was expressed at the slow rate of growth. It is not correct, however, that any disagreement exists among them in regard to the present procedure of issuing industrial licences.

The resolution governing the Industrial Policy of Government was laid by me on the table of this House on the 30th April, 1956. Licensing of industries is being done under the Industrial (Development and Regulation) Act of 1951 in accordance with this policy. In addition, the priorities as laid down in the successive Five Year Plans are being followed in industrial licensing. As the House is aware, industrial licences are issued on the recommendations made by a licensing committee constituted in accordance with the rules framed under this Act. The committee is composed of representatives of the various Central Government Ministries concerned and the Planning Commission. In the meetings of the committee, representatives of State Governments also take part.

Before the applications for industrial licences are considered by the committee, they are examined in consultation with the Department of Technical Development (formerly the Development Wing), the various Ministries concerned, such as the Ministry of Mines and Fuel, Steel and Heavy Industries, Railways, Finance (Department of Economic Affairs), Department of Company Law Administration and also Planning Commission and the State Governments. In making its recommendations, the committee bears in mind the targets fixed by the Planning Commission and gives full weight to such factors as regional distribution, possibilities of exports, avoidance of monopoly or concentration of capacity, etc., apart from the possibility or otherwise of the scheme leading to savings in foreign exchange. Where an industry is not reserved for the public sector and where the more difficult capital intensive industries are concerned, which call for the acquisition of foreign collaboration facilities, foreign exchange from private or semi-public lending agencies abroad and the provision of experienced managerial talent, naturally the applications from the larger industrial groups in the country have to be considered, if the Plan targets have to be expeditiously achieved. Otherwise, the policy is to prefer new entrepreneurs wherever possible.

There is also a sub-committee of the Central Advisory Council of Industries which function under Rule 18 of the Licensing of Industrial Undertakings Rules. This

sub-committee *suo moto* or on representations received from applicants, reviews all licences issued, refused, varied, amended or revoked from time to time and it is open to it to advise Government on the general principles to be followed on the issue of licences for new undertakings. On this subcommittee, there have been some general Members of Parliament also. There is thus also a non-official agency to scrutinise the implementation of Government's licensing policy.

On the 11th April, 1963, a statement was laid on the table of the House giving an analysis of the licences issued to certain leading industrial houses during the calendar years 1960 and 1961. I have had figures collected for 1962 also. During these three years, out of the total number of 4,211 industrial licences issued, the number of licences that have gone to ten leading industrial houses were 182. These figures include not only new industrial undertakings, but also projects for substantial expansion of existing undertakings in order to ensure economies of size.

In considering Industrial Policy, we should not confine ourselves to the sector that is governed by the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. There is outside this, a large and growing sector of small scale industries which collectively are of considerable economic significance. The number of such small scale units which have been registered up to date run to over 52,000. There are, in addition, a very large number of such units which function without being registered. It is Government's policy to give to this sector all the help that is possible to make it expand, though I must admit that difficulties of foreign exchange tend to affect this sector as badly as the large scale industries.

Government's industrial policy is clear and the machinery for its implementation by way of licensing appears to be adequate. As the House is aware, we have appointed a committee with Prof. Mahalanobis as Chairman, to study, amongst other things, the extent to which the operation of the economic system has resulted in concentration of wealth and means of production. When the report of that committee is available, there will no doubt be further opportunity to consider whether any changes are called for in the policies or procedures relating to Industrial licensing.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

BACK NOTE

LVII. Industrial Licensing Policy, 23 April 1963

1. SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: According to the hon. Prime Minister, the report is somewhat distorted. I want to know whether there is any truth in the report that both the Ministers have accused each other for showing favours to big business houses, for creating unhealthy trend in the licensing policy. I wish to know whether in view of this difference among the Ministers working in the same Ministry, the Prime Minister would like to have a thorough probe into the licences issued since 1957, that is, after the Resolution on Industrial policy was adopted, and if not, the reasons for not having a thorough probe into the working of this Ministry as far as licensing is concerned.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member is suggesting that I should have a probe into some.....,

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: From 1957. If something is correct in both the letters.

MR. SPEAKER: According to the press reports, there have been differences between the two Ministers and there have been allegations made, one against the other that there have been favouritism or something shown.....

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Unhealthy trends in licensing...

MR. SPEAKER: In giving licences. Therefore he suggests that a probe might be had into the issue of licences that have been issued during the last 4 or 5 years.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I do not know what the hon. Member is basing his information on.

MR. SPEAKER: Press reports.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Press reports, as I have said, give a distorted view. In fact, there are two press reports that I have seen which differ from each other. I do not think one can go by that. I regret, it is highly objectionable for these confidential letters between Ministers to be published.

SHRI TYAGI: How did they leak out?

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: Somebody must have given out.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am sorry, I cannot say how they leaked out. Certainly they could only leak out presumably from that Ministry or my office. I am sure they did not leak out from my office.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: There should be a probe into the matter.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: This is the second time that Shri Manubhai Shah has got into this kind of controversy.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is unfortunate that there should sometimes be difference of opinion between two Ministers in the same Ministry. On the other hand, there is one healthy aspect of it that any mistakes committed are found out.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: That is why we want a probe to find out the mistake.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Too many leaks are bad.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGE BILL

24 April, 1963

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I confess to a feeling of a little confusion after the speech of the hon. Member who has just spoken. I hoped and I intend, as far as I could, to deal with the question before this House—

..... XXX XXX XXX¹

But the last speech-I am not criticising it, and I am merely saying that I do not quite know what it was about, and I must say with respect that many of the speeches delivered either for the motion for a criticism of it, were—

..... XXX XXX XXX²

When we started the course of the bill, when it was introduced, we saw a most extraordinary and disgusting and disgraceful spectacle in this House. It was a bad beginning. You were pleased to take some action in regard to that matter. I do not know-I hope at least - that it has some effect on those who misbehaved on that occasion, because if they really thought about the matter at all, they have done more injury to the cause of Hindi than any man in the whole of India. Now, if this is the logic how some hon. Members act, it is a little difficult to meet their arguments which are equally wide of the mark.

Yesterday, on hon. Member who had not come here but in the precincts of this House behaved in a rather extraordinary manner, I do not know if that gentleman, that hon. Member, has the least conception of what Parliament is, what democracy is how one is supposed to behave or ought to behave. It is extraordinary where we are going to.

..... XXX XXX XXX³

That, I submit, raises even more deeper questions than even the question of language. Therefore, I am referring to it, because language, after all, does represent some of the deepest urges of the human beings and is the vehicle of all our business. I am perfectly free to say that I will prefer any language, whether Finnish, Swedish or anything, but I am not prepared to have this behaviour in the name of language and spoil democracy and everything.

As I said, many of the speeches— delivered yesterday—some I had the privilege to listen to and some I read subsequently—it seemed to me, having regard to the importance of the occasion and consideration of problems which raise considerable heat and passion, were on the whole, if I may say so with respect, in spite of the delicacy of the subject and in spite of the strong sentiments expressed, in line with parliamentary practice and procedure and were good for all to listen to, even though we may not have agreed with them. I refer to the speeches like those delivered by Prof. Mukerjee or Dr. Govind Das. Much that Dr. Govind Das said, and indeed part of his speech consisted of quotations from various persons, including quotations from me, one can agree with that and yet, as it happens, thoroughly agree with the conclusion that he has arrived at. Whatever he said, he said because he felt it and I welcome his saying it.

I am sorry I cannot say exactly the same thing about the hon. Member, Mr. Anthony's speech, which I read in full afterwards. It was unhappy. I am not referring to his views. But it was an unhappy speech and as he himself said in the course of his speech, he represented a rather extreme, and I think he used the word 'bigoted' point of view. That is not the way to consider this question. I shall venture to deal with one or two points that have been raised. There are not many points raised; in spite of the heat engendered in the debate, there are not really many points raised, because it is not a contest between English and Hindi. It will be wrong to look at it in that way.

This is a Bill in continuation of what has happened in the past, to remove a restriction which had been placed by the Constitution on the use of English after a certain date, *i.e.* 1965. It is just to remove that restriction that this was placed. It was to carry out an assurance given in this House; it does not do really much more than that. There are a few other little things, but the main thing is to remove that restriction. It was our purpose to bring this Bill during the last session, but the last session was tied up with many things, you will remember, with regard to the emergency. It was a short session and we could not do it for lack of time. We were accused then of deliberately not bringing it forward and postponing it. We were accused of doing that by the very persons who want us to postpone it today. I do not understand it. In spite of the heavy work before this House, we insisted in bringing it forward to please the people who thought that we were playing about with this matter and postponing it for various reasons, because we dare not bring it before the House, etc. Now we are asked to postpone it. I am sorry I do not understand the logic behind this demand. This bill is essentially a Bill to extend this period, more or less indefinitely, beyond the period put down in the Constitution—1965. That is the main purpose—there may be differences of language etc.—and I think it should be looked at in that way.

Now, the hon. Member, Shri Anthony has said very hard things about various persons and about the assurance I gave. I am sorry, I am not, I hope, lacking completely in some kind of mental capacity—I am entirely unable to understand what he has said about going back on any assurance I gave at any time. He talked about all kinds of pressures being exercised on me. I do not know who is exercising it. I am not aware of it, and I have not succumbed to any pressure either exercised or implied. I had given on the last occasion an assurance about no major change being made in regard to the use of English without the consent, without the approval of the non-Hindi-speaking people. That was made by me and that represents not only my view point but the view point of our Government. And, when it was made, it was clear to me that it was made, largely with the approval of this House. We stand by that completely. There is not an iota of difference from what we had said then. And, apart from that, what I may have said or not said, there are circumstances in the country which inevitably point to that direction. May be, some of these gentlemen who perform havans, and what not, on this question may think otherwise. That is a different matter. May be, Shri Anthony in his excitement may also think otherwise. I would strongly

is a very important language and, I think, in some form or other—it is not a question of ten years or not—English is likely to remain in India for a long long time. I repeat it. I do not know the exact form it will take, whether for international use or otherwise, but the mere fact of its being there will serve as a vitaliser to our language, though it is a curious argument that I am using.

Our languages are fine languages and old languages. I do not know who, I forget the name, somebody, probably Shri Anthony, said they are 50 years old. I was amazed to hear that.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁶

Our languages, most of them, certainly the big languages, Bengali, Gujerati, Marathi etc. and the Southern languages of Tamil, Telugu, Kannada and Malayalam are great languages from any point of view. They have produced great books, which are rooted down in the minds of the people. There is no doubt about that.

So far as Tamil is concerned, if I may say so, it is as old as Sanskrit, and all our languages. Northern languages, apart from the four Southern languages, are all daughters of Sanskrit and have grown out of Sanskrit. The other languages also, to some extent, have grown from that root and have been closely associated and affected, by Sanskrit. In fact, one may say with confidence that Sanskrit has represented broadly all the thought, culture and traditions of India; I do not say exclusively, but broadly it may be said so. I am an admirer of Sanskrit; not that I know very much, but I admire it very greatly.

I thought that it would be a great pity if Sanskrit became a completely dead language in India at any time. That would be a great damage done to all that we stand for in India. Unfortunately, we cannot make Sanskrit the working language in India today. That is obvious. I should like to encourage the learning of Sanskrit as widely as possible, but it cannot become the language of the common people. It ceased to be a language of the common people 2,000 years ago when Prakrits came in. It remained a language of the learned and gradually Prakrits developed. But it gives a certain basis and foundation for our present day languages, strengthens them, gives them depth and so on which we should cherish.

If we had only two or three languages, I would have suggested— suppose, there were three languages—that all the three languages should be national languages in the sense that all three should be used as they use three languages in Switzerland or as they use some languages in Finland or in Canada. In Finland about 10 per cent of the population is Swedish but Swedish is also a national language in addition to Finnish because the 10 per cent are there.

In these matters of language one has to be very careful. One has to be as liberal as possible. One should not try to suppress a language. One should not try to coerce anybody into a language as far as possible. Wherever an attempt has been made to suppress a language, a popular language, or coerce the people into some other language there has been trouble. There have been innumerable examples of this. Therefore

since it is impossible for us to have 13 or 14 languages mentioned in our Constitution as languages which everyone should know and use daily, nevertheless the makers of our Constitution were wise in laying down that all the 13 or 14 languages were our languages as much as any other. There is no question of any one language being more a national language than any other. I want to make that perfectly clear. Bengali or Tamil is as much an Indian national language as Hindi. Therefore it becomes our duty to encourage the 13 or 14 languages.

But having admitted that may I differ completely from the remark that many hon. Members have made here—and the hon. Member who spoke last repeated it many times—about Hindi being not allowed to grow and not encouraged etc.? I entirely disagree with that. I think, Hindi has grown more in the last 15 years. Not only Hindi but all our Indian languages have grown more in the last 15 years than any language anywhere in the world in this course of time. It is a big thing, I say. But I say that with some knowledge and confidence because I happen to be the President of the Sahitya Akademi which deals with all these languages. I see what is being done in all these languages. Reports come to me. Hundreds and thousands of books have been produced in all these languages, including Hindi of course, by the Sahitya Akademi. Hundreds of translations from one into the other have been done. All our languages are alive and are dynamic today. People seem to imagine that the growth of a language is whether it is used by some wretched clerk in some wretched office or not as if that represents the life of a language. It is a part of the use of the language; certainly, it should be used, but no clerks and no departments and Government offices have ever made a language grow.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁷

Languages grow because of other reasons. What has happened to our languages? In spite of our fine old literature, in spite of some magnificent books, the fact remains that our languages have ceased to grow. They have become static because they did not wholly represent life as it is lived today and the modern trends of thought. They represent our traditions. In the 19th Century our languages had to face English, not directly. English came in—not with our goodwill, but it came in—and because English came in, English became a vehicle of new ideas about the new world, not only of science and technology—that of course, but many other things too. It is the impact of English on our languages that has made them grow from the 19th century onwards. Even the literary forms of our languages changed greatly. They are very very few—prose works, very fine poetical words, epics in our languages, prose works of 19th century creation in our languages, fine prose works as they came. So, because of the impact of English on our languages, our languages grow and I do submit that even now, although they have grown and they will grow, the further impact of English on our languages will be good for our languages. From the limited point of view, for the growth of our languages alone, it is good for them to be in contact with foreign languages. I say, foreign languages. They can be in contact with Russian, with French, with German, with Italian, with Spanish, etc. But the fact is that the easiest contact for us is through the English language. Therefore

fourteen national languages have a place. There is no doubt about that. You cannot speak of English in that connect. You can speak of English in many connections. You can say as I do say that English should be a compulsory language in the schools, second language, foreign language; that is a different matter; that English should be used for foreign contacts, that English should be used for scientific and technological work of a higher grade and all that. That is all right. But, English cannot be we must admit it, a language which rouses the understanding or emotion of the common people in India. They must be the languages of India, whether it is Tamil, Hindi, Bengali or Marathi.

I would add that all these languages of India have made remarkable progress in the last 15 years. Some, of course, have made it before too. But, they have now made remarkable progress. I entirely deny, repudiate the suggestion that these languages have not progressed. You may criticise some Government activities. They might have helped more. I do submit, you are thinking entirely in terms of offices and clerks. Language is something bigger than offices and clerks. I will tell you an instance. Take Urdu. I think it may broadly be said that no great encouragement has been given to Urdu and yet, such is the vitality of Urdu that today, Urdu is growing faster than many of the other national languages of India. If you judge of it from the number of books that are published,—that is a good text books, dramas, stories and other literary books, it is extraordinary how fast Urdu has grown. Because, it is a dynamic language. I think that if Hindi is really to grow very fast, it should ally itself with Urdu, ally itself in the sense of vocabulary, etc. It will get vitality from Urdu retaining its own genius and nature. Urdu is vital. I shall tell you why. For many reasons, because, Urdu has a strange capacity of adaptability and of drawing from other languages. Urdu has drawn more from English than Hindi, strictly speaking. Urdu has drawn from Persian, Urdu has drawn from Arabic, Urdu has drawn from the Turki language in Central Asia. It can do that. I do not mean to say that you should adapt from Arabic or Turki in Hindi. That is not my point. It is this adaptability that makes a language strong. The other thing weakens it. The tendency which, unfortunately, has been evidenced in India for some time of living in a narrow linguistic circle and coining words from ancient Sanskrit or Pali, I do not know, does not help. Because those words which you coined have no reality behind them, have no emotion, have no history. Every word, if you look up in the dictionary, has got a history behind it. It is an impossibility for you to really translate from one language to another. Because, you cannot translate all the historic connections of that word, where it has been used, how it has been used. That is so in regard to the best of all languages. You may translate, of course, a chair or table. Something like that you can translate. But, as soon as you get a slightly more complicated idea, you cannot translate it. You may represent that idea. Of course, once you get into the question of translating into or from Chinese, it is almost an utter impossibility to do it. Because, the whole background of the Chinese language is quite different. It is not even an alphabetical language. It is a picture language, or whatever it is. That apart, we do not have to face that difficulty in translating from Hindi to English or any other European languages because the basic stock is the

same, historical development, etc. Yet, it is extremely difficult to translate from one language to another. As one who has tried it, I am amazed at the rapidity with which our journalists translate, seldom correctly. But, they do. They pass off some journalese starting off which I rather doubt if it would benefit the growth of our national languages. This is a new development.

We have to develop our regional languages. There is no doubt about that. I am putting for the moment Hindi as a regional language only. We have to do everything. I have no doubt that they will do more and more of the work, education, administration, etc., in the regional languages.

The real difficulty arises in the next stage. What is the link connecting these regional languages? That is the point we are dealing with. Thus far, the link has been English. In fact, not only the link, but work has been done not in the regional languages, but in English even in the regions. What are we to do? That is not a question of your choice or mine. It is partly, of course.

We all know that English standards are going down; not because of conflict between Hindi and English, but because of conflict between the rising regional languages and English. English standards are going down. They will go down. I think English would be more widely known in India in the future than even now. But, it will not be better known in quality. Individuals apart, you won't have people as we have had in the past, who took pride in their English quite so much. As Shri H. N. Mukerjee said, we have had a fixation about English and we still have it to a large extent. There is no doubt there is a certain vested interest created in the knowledge of English. It is a bad thing to have a fixation. It is a bad thing to have a vested interest. Because, that automatically separates us from those who do not know English. It is a very bad thing. We know before independence what the position was. In this country of castes, the most hardened caste was the caste of English knowing people, English clothed, English living, English knowing people. A terrible caste. All our administrators and others, many of us too belonged to that caste. It is a bad thing because it put tremendous barriers between us and the masses of India. We gave it up; many of us gave it up. I do not attach much importance to clothing. But, it is important that it removes the barriers. We gave it up and we took to wearing clothes which were more in keeping with the Indian people. That brought us nearer to them. It is quite clear if I go in European clothes to a village, I am further removed from them than otherwise. As it is, I am far enough from them in many ways. But, I am further removed from them if I go like that. If I go and speak to them in English, I can satisfy myself; I won't satisfy anybody else. That is patent. We have to remove these barriers that have come between us and our people. The great success of Gandhiji's movement was that we removed many of these barriers. That process has not stopped.

All that is admitted. It follows logically that we can only progress in our national languages. National languages mean all the languages mentioned in the Schedule to the Constitution. We cannot, I would add, suppress any of them; we cannot impose any of them on others—both these things. Because, imposition in the sense of imposition is resisted and it is harmful to the thing being imposed. Other languages

come up and they fight with each other. The growth of India in the language sense can only take place by the cooperation of languages and not by conflict of languages. They are near enough. I was talking about translation. It is relatively easy to translate from one Indian language to another, because, the ideas behind them are much the same and the language is not so terribly difficult. We can do that. So, we have to take all the languages together. The only question that remains is—there are many questions, and one of them is—the link language between them. And Hindi has been suggested by our Constitution as the link language for Central and official purposes. Remember the words “Central and official purposes”.

It is clear that if we do not think of English as such a link language for any length of time, then inevitably we have to deal with Hindi, not because Hindi is superior to Bengali or Marathi or Tamil—of course, not; nobody says that; in some matters it may be better; in some matters, it may not be—but for the simple reason that Hindi is the most feasible for this purpose, apart from its being widespread; and it is spreading. If I may say so, all the steps that my hon. friend the Education Minister may take in regard to the spread of Hindi do not go as far as the effect of the cinema on the spread of Hindi. These are patent things. This is what is happening. This is life as it is. These are recognised things. And any order that in this office Hindi must be used tomorrow—I have no objection to that, but that—does not spread Hindi to the root of it. The cinema does more than all these orders, so that we can envisage or have a link language which is Hindi and no other, that is, if it is not English. I submit that we cannot have English in any sense for a long time.

I said some time ago that I want English to continue here for many purposes, and I hope it will continue and to some extent, it may even be a link language between thinkers and authors, individual thinkers, literary people and even governmental people—

I have no objection but the normal link language cannot be English.

Therefore, the normal link language has to be an Indian language, and of all the Indian languages, only Hindi is feasible. That is the only claim that I make for it. Because of this, it was decided in our Constituent Assembly, and wisely decided, that Hindi should be the official language for Central purposes.

Now, it is said that it might have become, but I think that most people agree that at the present moment, it will not serve the purpose fully to take up all this work of the administration. But they say that this is because the Government has not helped it or not encouraged it enough. There may be some justification. I do not think that there is much in regard to Government not helping it, but the reasons are far deeper than Government help or lack of help. People seem to think that a language is a thing which grows or spreads by some magic like the mango tree covered up and which grows up. It is a much deeper thing than that. Especially when there is a question of one language people rubbing up the people of another language, it becomes still more difficult. You have to proceed very cautiously. It is not a question of producing

only dictionaries, although dictionaries have to be produced and have been produced and will be produced, all glossaries of terms and other things. It is something much bigger than that.

A language must develop the thinking habits of the subject with which it is concerned. You can write books, and translations are being made of technical books, and that is right, simple books, but the moment you go a little beyond that your translations are stilted; they have no history behind them; the words used have no history behind them. Here, you have a tremendous history which is contemporaneous for the growth of science and technology, out of which each word has come. Now, if you translate it quickly into some word which has had no previous history, and no previous life in it, it becomes a stilted word. So, all these things come in the way.

That is why it has been suggested, and, I think, accepted, that all scientific and technical terms should as far as possible be in line with international usage, not only in Hindi but in all the languages of India. And if you do that, if all the languages of India adopt scientific and technical words in conformity with international usage, you succeed in two things; first of all, you bring the languages of India closer to each other. Secondly, you keep contacts with the thought of the world in regard to technical and scientific matters. They are both important. And it becomes easy for you to learn another language for scientific work etc. All this is happening daily. And to say that Hindi has not progressed is merely to show an utter and absolute ignorance of the subject. Hindi has progressed; Bengali has progressed, and Tamil has progressed and so on. I am surprised at the abundance—I am not concerned very much with textbooks, although they are important, but really—of the matter coming out in all our languages, which represents new thought and a new approach to our problems. That is the growth of a language, and that is happening.

So, I submit that there is no escape for us; you may argue; you may have your preferences as you like; but there is no escape for us from these three or four languages.

India is a multilingual country. Although it is multilingual, the languages are closely allied, and, therefore, they are not foreign to each other. That is, you can skip from one to another with relative ease, and we should try to do so. We have suggested the three-language formula. A larger number of people should know, some other languages apart from English, some other Indian languages, that is, other than their own. And as this grows, you will find them coming closer together, a large number of people knowing the other languages and the gaps which exist today between Indian languages will, lessen. But, inevitably, those languages must grow in their own regions. That should be encouraged.

The question of the link language remains, and there can be no other link language than Hindi basically. But merely saying it or putting it down in the Constitution does not make it the link language. It has to grow into it. It is not sufficiently adapted today for various reasons. It is getting rapidly adapted. Let it be adapted, and let us

encourage that process. And while that process is being encouraged, it becomes necessary and almost inevitable for English to continue to be a link language. The process is not a sudden thing that you fix a date and from that date you say that English ceases and Hindi comes in. It is a gradual process of both being link languages, and Hindi gradually getting better and better known and better and better used, and in regard to English, as is happening today, and as I said, the standards are going down, and the use will go down to some extent, although it will be more widespread. That is the process I see.

And in this gradual transformation, dates have very little significance except to see what happens, except to examine the position from time to time to see what is happening, to see whether we are going along the right lines or not. It is important that we should see and give a certain direction to our movements.

Now, from that point of view, it becomes, and it is quite inevitable, according to me, apart from the assurances I gave or I may have given, that English has to continue as an associate language or an additional language or call it what you like.

These words have no particular meaning. The door remains open, and it will be used. As a matter of fact, it is the circumstances prevailing in the country that will compel you to use it. They do compel you to use it, and not what you call it. And if you try to suppress its use, undoubtedly, you create not only a hiatus and a gap but you do stop or progress in many directions, because that progress cannot be achieved at the present moment entirely through Hindi.

Therefore, the whole object of this Bill is to remove that barrier which was put by the Constitution, that barrier of date, and to allow things as they are to continue. For how long they will continue, I think, is a matter which I cannot precisely and definitely say. But our progress should be in these various directions, in developing our regional languages, in developing Hindi also, not only as a regional language, but as a link language, as far as possible, and maintaining English to serve that purpose so that there may be no hiatus or gap. And gradually this process will automatically take shape. Regardless of governmental decisions, these are the forces at work. This is bound to happen. It is happening. You may expedite it or you may slow it down a little. That is a possibility. But I do think we should get rid, not of English, which, I think, is very good, very useful, but of the fixation of the English language in our minds. I think that is bad, because that separates us from the rest of our people.

There is one thing else. I think the Home Minister said or may say later that whenever that Committee, which is envisaged in this, after ten years is constituted and reports, that report should—we entirely agree—be sent to all the State Governments for their views, so that there is no question of rushing a thing like this. There is no question of trying to impose anything on others in this way, because the attempt will fail. The more you impose, the more obstructions you have, the more difficulties you have. A question like this can only be dealt with by a large measure, of consent and consultation.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁹

I should like the House to consider this matter not only in the limited sense in which we have been arguing it, but in the broader sense, in the wider context. We are passing through difficult and delicate periods of transition in many ways, and it requires wisdom from us and a capacity and flexibility in order to meet the demands of the times. Rigidity stops growth. The main question is of India's growth in every way, materially, scientifically, industrially, intellectually and spiritually. We must view every step that we take from the point of that major question. What will it profit us if we honour Hindi and put it in a closed space, which prevents not only its growth, but the nation's growth? The growth of our languages is essentially tied up with the growth of the nation. Both help each other. We must, therefore, look upon this question in this wide context and see to it that we advance all along the line to reach the great goal that we have in view.

BACK NOTE

LVIII. Official Language Bill, 24 April, 1963

1. SHRI YASHPAL SINGH: It would be better if the Hon'ble Prime Minister speaks in Hindi amidst the pious atmosphere today.

SHRI BAGDI (HISAR): It would be nice if our Prime Minister speaks in Hindi today.

HON'BLE SPEAKER: Please be seated. Every Member has the right to speak either in Hindi or English. It is solely his discretion. I cannot ask any Member in this regard. Please be seated.

HON'BLE SPEAKER: Please be seated now.

SHRI BAGDI: He should at least speak the language of Gandhi ji.

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV (BARABANKI): He is successor of Gandhi ji only.

2. SHRI BAGRI: Hon'ble Speaker, I am walking out because even on the issue of language, the Prime Minister does not speak in Hindi. In protest, I walk out of the House.

(Shri Bagri then left the House)

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am very grateful that the honorable member left from here.

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV: Hon'ble member's walk out left at least one impact, you spoke a few words in Hindi.

HON'BLE SPEAKER: Order, order if you wish so

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I will be even more grateful.

HON'BLE SPEAKER: Would you not allow anyone to speak?

3. SHRI BADE (Khargone): On a point of order, Sir. When the hon. Member is not here and when action has already been taken against him, can he say...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Yes.

4. SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated— Anglo Indians): Sir, I rise on a point of explanation. May I know—I am not questioning the motives of the Prime Minister—how the Bill reflects his assurance? How are the non-Hindi-speaking people going to be consulted? How is "may" going to be prevented from being interpreted as "may not"?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I shall deal with those points. I do not see how this Bill was going to say anything about the consultation of non-Hindi-speaking people.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Why not?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I say, according to my thinking, it is quite absurd and un-constitutional.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Why is it unconstitutional? Give us some reasons. I am a lawyer and the Prime Minister also is. Why is it unconstitutional?

5. SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Why absurd? That is the natural meaning.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: May be, but I disagree with the hon. Member.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: If you disagree with the natural meaning, what can I do?

6. SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: I did not say that. I quoted Shri Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, who said that what is now being passed off as Hindi came here as a dialect only in 1860. I never presumed to say that. That is what Shri Suniti Kumar Chatterjee says.

7. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: (Hoshangabad): Why wretched clerks?

AN HON. MEMBER: Wretched Ministers.

8. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY (Barrackpur): The Vice-Chancellors do not agree. That is the trouble.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (Dr. K. L. Shrimali): They have agreed.

9. SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: May I very respectfully ask one thing? On this clause 5 I raised this very question. When the report of the Parliamentary Committee was discussed here, I sought to move an amendment. The Speaker said that Parliament had no authority to change that Report by one syllable. What is the good of bringing it here and sending it on to the States? You shortcircuit Parliament. We cannot change it by one syllable. That is what we are asking for.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I do not know what happened then. But I do not see how you can change a Report. A Report is a Report.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Why should not the recommendations be of Parliament? It is a Parliamentary Committee. Why should not Parliament make the recommendations?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Parliament may make independent recommendations. It can always do that. But it cannot change the Report of other people.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: We always consider reports. It can consider the Report and make recommendations.

SHRI TRIDIB KUMAR CHAUDHURI (Berhampur): May I ask another question? The Prime Minister has just said that the Report of the Committee which would be appointed after ten years would be sent to all the States for their opinions and general concurrence.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: We can have a provision to that effect in the Bill.

SHRI TRIDIB KUMAR CHAUDHURI: What prevents Government from bringing in an amendment or accepting an amendment tabled by some Members here to that effect and incorporating it in the Bill?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Parliament can do what it likes. But it cannot change the thing of somebody else. That is obvious.

SHRI TRIDIB KUMAR CHAUDHURI: Shri Frank Anthony wants that report to be changed. But my question was different. I want some provision to be made here in the Bill about sending it to the States.

SHRI TYAGI (Dehra Dun): That question will be discussed in detail.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I do not think there will be any difficulty about that. My colleague, the Home Minister, will deal with that matter that he has raised in his reply. I have no doubt he will. But the whole approach to this question must be one of the fullest consultation and agreement.

10. SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: With great respect, what exactly did you do last time? You shortcircuited Parliament. You shortcircuited the unanimous Resolutions of the West Bengal and Madras Legislatures.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No no.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: That was exactly what happened.

SHRI TYAGI: Even then, English is there.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Unfortunately, Frank Anthony is not frank.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not fair.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: One cannot refer everything.

11. SHRI H. P. CHATTERJEE (Nabadwip): May I ask one question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No no.

SHRI H. P. CHATTERJEE: I have tabled an amendment also and I want to be clear about it.

SHRI H. P. CHATTERJEE: The Prime Minister wants all the State languages to flourish in India. I ask: being a Bengali, why am I not allowed to speak here in Bengali? In the USSR—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHRI H. P. CHATTERJEE: Let me finish my question. I want a clarification.

MR. SPEAKER: I am giving that clarification. Let him resume his seat. Whenever he expresses a desire to speak in Bengali, he should get the answer from me, not from the Prime Minister.

SHRI H. P. CHATTERJEE: You cannot be of any help because I have to submit a translation in English if I have to speak in Bengali. Why should I have to do that?

In the USSR, every language has that privilege. They can speak in any language they like. In the Supreme Soviet, 100 peoples are gathered there. They are allowed to speak in their own languages. I have been there. Why should I not be allowed that here?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member probably has much greater information about the USSR than I possess. But what I should like to know is, at any meeting—all- Russia meeting—how many languages are used?

SHRI H. P. CHATTERJEE: In the Supreme Soviet, there are 100 peoples gathered. Of them, 40 did not have any letters at all. So they created their letters, and languages and they are allowed to speak in those languages.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: There can be no objection to anybody speaking in the various national languages—of course not. The only practical difficulty that comes in is that a large number of people will not understand them. Maybe we can evolve some system of translation, automatic, simultaneous translations and all that.

SHRI H. P. CHATTERJEE: Yes, that should be done.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: There is no objection to that.

STATEMENT ON DISCUSSION WITH FOREIGN DIGNITARIES

7 May, 1963

Mr. Speaker, Sir, several distinguished representatives of friendly countries have visited Delhi during the last ten days. We have taken advantage of these visits to exchange views with them on matters of mutual interest. Mr. Ali Sabry, President of the Executive Council of the UAR, arrived in Delhi on his way back to Cairo from Peking on the night of the 26th April and left on the night of 27/28th April. Admiral of the Fleet, the Earl Mountbatten of Burma, Chief of the U.K. Defence Staff, arrived in Delhi on 30th April and left on 3rd May. Mr. Duncan Sandys, the U.K. Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, was here from 1st May to 4th May. Mr. Dean Rusk, the United States Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, was in Delhi with Mr. Phillips Talbot and Mr. William Bundy from 2nd to 4th May. Apart from the visits of these distinguished representatives of friendly countries, it was during the last ten days of April that the fifth round of Indo-Pakistan Ministerial level talks on Kashmir and other related matters took place. It was also during this period that our Minister for Economic and Defence Coordination, Shri T. T. Krishnanvachari, paid a goodwill visit to New Zealand and Australia. It is natural, therefore, that the Members of the House should want to know something about the talks and discussions that we had with various distinguished foreign representatives during this period. A large number of Calling Attention Notices have been received in this connection, and I am taking this opportunity of acquainting the House broadly with the nature of the talks we had. I cannot give details as these informal and friendly talks with representatives of foreign governments have, in accordance with normal conventions, to be treated as confidential.

INDO-PAKISTAN TALKS

As the House is aware, the Government of India have always been anxious to reach a settlement on our various differences with Pakistan including those over Kashmir and to do everything possible to realise our main objective of having friendly and cooperative relations with Pakistan so that India and Pakistan can live side by side in peace and friendship. My colleague, Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of Railways, who has been leading the Indian delegation, has pursued this objective with admirable patience in the Indo-Pakistan Minister level talks that have been going on during the last few months. Despite difficulties caused by provocative statements on the Pakistan side, he has always conducted the talks with perfect calm and coolness and has not allowed occasional difficulties and setbacks to interfere with our objective to do everything possible to promote friendly and cooperative relations with Pakistan. That the five rounds of talks should not have yielded any useful results and that our differences with Pakistan still remain is a matter of serious regret to us. We are however,

determined, despite setbacks and difficulties, to continue our efforts to resolve our differences and to promote friendly and cooperative relations with Pakistan. I would, in this connection, like to draw the attention of the House to our repeated offers of a "No War" declaration to Pakistan, in pursuance of our sincere desire to have peaceful and friendly relations with them. These have so far met with no response. In my letter to President Ayub Khan last October, I had pointed out that we have to build up adequate defence potential to meet the Chinese threat but this new defence potential cannot and will not be used for any purpose other than effective resistance against Chinese aggression. I had also assured him in this letter that the idea of any conflict with Pakistan is one which is repugnant to us, and we on our part will never initiate it and expressed my conviction that the future of India and Pakistan lies in their friendship and cooperation for the benefit of both. I am sure that the House fully supports me in my reiteration of these sentiments.

INDIA-CHINA CONFLICT

Mr. Ali Sabry, President of the Executive Council of the UAR gave us, during his visit, his assessment of Chinese thinking based on his discussions with the Chinese leaders in Peking. We understood from our talks with Mr. Ali Sabry that while the Government of China were not prepared to drop their reservations on the Colombo proposals, and therefore not willing to implement the Colombo proposals, they were prepared to enter into discussions on the major issue of the differences regarding the boundary on the basis of their acceptance of the Colombo proposals in principle. In effect, this means that the Government of China are determined to maintain the unilateral situation on the border that they had created by their aggression and massive attacks and subsequent ceasefire and partial withdrawals from Indian territory and are not prepared to agree to the restoration of the presence of both sides in the demilitarised zone in the western sector as recommended by the Colombo proposals. All that the Government of China seem to be interested in a negotiated settlement on our border differences on the basis of the altered situation on the border created by them as a result of their aggression.

It is obvious that we cannot enter into any talks and discussions with the Government of China on the major issue of our differences regarding the border till they accept the Colombo proposals without reservations and the recommendations made in the proposals are implemented on the grounds. We had made constructive suggestions in this regard in a note we sent to the Government of China on 3rd April. I am placing a copy of the note on the Table of the House. There has been no specific reply to this note so far.

The assessment of Chinese thinking given by Mr. Ali Sabry is confirmed by a letter dated 20th April that Prime Minister Chou En-lai sent to me. I have replied to this letter on the 1st May. I am placing copies of these letters on the Table of the House.

In view of the experience we had last October and November, the continued intransigence of China on the Colombo proposals and the constant venom of anti-Indian propaganda that is being poured out every day—I am placing copies of a Chinese note dated 27th April and our reply to illustrate this—we have to be prepared for any eventuality. The strengthening of our defence potential against a renewed threat by China is therefore, a matter of vital importance. And this has to be followed up with determination and single mindedness of purpose.

In this connection, I would like to mention Shri T. T. Krishnamachari's recent visit to New Zealand and Australia. During these visits Shri Krishnamachari had talks with the Prime Ministers of these two countries and also some of their colleagues. These informal and friendly talks have, I am sure, brought India and New Zealand and Australia closer together in their approach to problems of common interests. During the visit to Australia, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari was accompanied by our Cabinet Secretary and opportunity was taken to discuss questions of production of defence equipment and allied matters. It is intended to follow up the results of this visit by a further visit of an Indian technical team connected with production of defence equipment to Australia and, perhaps at a later stage, by the visit of an Australian technical team to India to get Australian technical cooperation in connection with programmes of production of defence equipment.

Visit of Mr. Duncan Sandys and Lord Mountbatten

Lord Mountbatten had planned to visit us in October 1962. This visit was postponed because of the crisis in the Caribbean. We were glad to see an old friend and exchanged views with him on our mutual problems. As Chief of the UK Defence Staff, Lord Mountbatten has been in close touch with the problems of our defence requirements both in the way of equipment and machinery for defence production to build up our defence potential to meet the Chinese threat. He discussed these matters generally with me, with the Defence Minister and with various Service Chiefs. The Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, Mr. Duncan Sandys, discussed with us the general question of our defence requirements, the progress of the Indo-Pakistan Minister-level talks on Kashmir and other related matters and Indo-Pakistan relations generally. During the talks he made it clear that settlement on Kashmir is not a condition to the military aid from the United Kingdom to meet the Chinese threat to India. He added, however, that a settlement of the differences between India and Pakistan will greatly ease the UK's task and hoped that progress will be made in the talks between India and Pakistan to settle their differences.

I would like to take this opportunity of saying a few words on reports about the grounding of I.A.F. planes for lack of supply of British spare parts, that have appeared in the press as a result of a question asked in the British Parliament on this subject. While some aircraft with flying units have temporarily become unserviceable, it is expected that this temporary difficulty will be soon overcome in view of the great

interest taken in this matter by all concerned. Our requirements of spare parts for I.A.F. planes of British manufacture are being dealt with on the basis of priority. The main difficulty has been the availability of supply, with the Royal Air Force and with the British manufacturers, as some of the types of British aircraft in service with the I.A.F. have gone out of production.

Dean Rusk's visit

In our talks with Secretary of State Dean Rusk, which was in the nature of a tour d'horizon of the problems in which both India and the United States are interested, Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, assured us of United States sympathy and support to India against the Chinese threat. He made it clear that there can be no question of compromising with the Chinese threat and that the question of U.S. aid to India was not lined with the settlement of Indo-Pakistan differences including those over Kashmir. He added that, so far as the U.S.A. were concerned, their view was that Chinese aggression and expansionist policies posed a threat to the entire sub-continent and, in that context, they were interested in promotion of friendly relations between India and Pakistan. I told Secretary of State, Dean Rusk that geography, our common bonds of history and cultural and other ties made it inevitable that India and Pakistan should have co-operative and friendly relations. In resolving our current differences including those on Kashmir, however, care has to be taken to see that both the methods and the lines of settlement of differences that may be followed should secure the main objective not only of resolving the differences but of promoting friendly and cooperative relations between India and Pakistan. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that no inadvertant step should be taken which may, instead of making for improvement, worsen the climate between the two countries. It is in this context and in the context of the long term nature of the Chinese threat that we welcome the interest of U.S.A. and other friendly countries who are helping us in meeting the problems we are facing.

Technical Team's visit to U.S.A., Canada and U.K.

An official team of technical experts has been visiting the U.S.A., Canada and the U.K. during the last three weeks in connection with our defence requirements. The team returned to Delhi on the morning of the 5th. Secretary of State Dean Rusk told us during his talks that the U.S. authorities would welcome the visit of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari for having further talks and discussion, in continuation of these exchanges between official experts. I had a recent message from Prime Minister Macmillan in which he mentioned, amongst other matters, that an early visit by Shri T. T. Krishnamachari to the U.K. will be useful. Shri T. T. Krishnamachari will be leaving for his visits to the U.S.A. Canada and the U.K. in a few days.

I have attempted in this statement to give a broad indication of the developments during the last few weeks and of the discussions we had with distinguished representatives of friendly countries who visited Delhi recently. While we must take

and we are taking with such assistance as we can get from friendly countries, necessary measures to safeguard our security and territorial integrity against the Chinese aggressive threat, our dedication to peace and peaceful ways and our desire to have friendly and cooperative relations with all countries, more particularly with our immediate neighbours, continue to be the guiding principles of India's foreign policy. We want to develop in freedom and independence according to our own genius. We will continue to take independent decisions, on the merits of each case, on all international issues that arise without prejudices or predilections of any kind. We do not want to interfere in the affairs of any other country nor do we covet an inch of any country's territory. At the same time, we will not permit any interference in our affairs or any aggression on our territory.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

BACK NOTE

LIX. Statement on Discussion with Foreign Dignitaries, 7 May 1963

1. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: On a point of clarification.

MR. SPEAKER: I am inclined to think that there ought not to be any questions put at this stage. I would appeal to hon. Members.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: This is the last day of the session. He has made a long statement. We would not put many questions.

MR. SPEAKER: That is so, and I do realise that this is the last day of this session, but the subject covers many items; this statement contains so many subjects that if we open out discussions on each point, certainly, it would take a long time.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: We shall put only a few questions to seek information.

MR. SPEAKER: How would it be possible for me to allow opportunity only to one hon. Member and not to others?

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: We have given notices of short notice questions and calling attention notices on these matters.

MR. SPEAKER: I would again appeal to him to kindly resist the temptation.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: It is no temptation, but it is only the discharge of our duties. I am sorry, Sir, that you used the word 'temptation'. You cannot call it temptation.

SHRI NATH PAI: It is not a temptation. We are here to discharge our duty.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: I am very sorry that you put it in that light.

SHRI NATH PAI: You may disallow the question, but to call it temptation would not be proper.

MR. SPEAKER: In the discharge of duties also there is a temptation that one should discharge them.

SHRI NATH PAI: It is not temptation, but it is loyalty to one's duty.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. I shall allow one question to each party and not to each Member.

SHRI NATH PAI: There is no question of party, here, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall allow one question to each party. Anyone from each party can put it.

SHRI NATH PAI: There is no question of party here, Sir. We want information on certain points. Otherwise, how shall we answer the people when we go back to our constituencies?

MR. SPEAKER: I shall allow one question to each party, whoever from the party might put it.

SHRI HEM BARUA: The question of party does not come in here.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: On a point of clarification. With regard to the Indo-Pakistan talks, will the Prime Minister be so good as to tell the House when and where the next round of talks between the representatives of India and Pakistan will take place, and whether during the talks since December last between Shri Swaran Singh and Mr. Bhutto, any proposal was mooted for a meeting between the Prime Minister and the Pakistani President in the near future, and if so, with what tangible effect?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: As at present arranged, the next round of the Indo-Pakistan talks is supposed to take place in Delhi, I believe, from the 15th of this month onward. Am I right?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH (The Minister of Railways): Yes.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: As for President Ayub and myself meeting, that has been in the air for a long time. But, no specific proposal was mooted recently or during these talks. It has been there. I have always expressed my readiness to meet him.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY (Barackpore): In view of the resolution adopted by the National Conference, of Kashmir, may I know whether in the course of the talks, the Prime Minister has made it clear that that is the stand of India also regarding the partitioning of the Kashmir Valley?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The resolution of the Kashmir National Conference was not before me. As a matter of fact, I think I read it for the first time last night. However, the position was very much before me, and we have made it quite clear that any idea of partitioning Kashmir Valley would be exceedingly harmful and would not be acceptable to us.

SHRI NARASIMHA REDDY (Rajampet): We are glad to know from the Prime Minister that the Western diplomats made it clear that the settlement of the Kashmir question was not a condition precedent for the supply of arms. But, may I know from the Prime Minister whether in his talks with the Western diplomats he got any indication from them that the present supply of arms would be considerably speeded up and enhanced if we come to a settlement with Pakistan?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have said as much as I can say in the course of my statement about that. Both eminent representatives of the USA and the UK told us specifically that the question of helping us or giving us assistance in regard to military and like equipment was not connected with Indo-Pakistan issues; at the same time, they did say that they would welcome any settlement, and it would ease their path. That is the position.

Dr. L. M. SINGHVI (Jodhpur): May I know whether the Prime Minister is in a position to tell us that there is no abatement of interest in the USA and the UK in respect of their continued assistance for strengthening our defences, and if so, whether the prospect or particularly the insistence on building up our Air Force is any the brighter now than before?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The same question comes round in different language. I do not know how to explain it. I have stated all that in my statement.

SHRI U. M. TRIVEDI (Mandsaur): I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether during our talks with Pakistan through Shri Swaran Singh, it has been brought to the notice of Pakistan that it will be in the interests of both countries if Pakistan gave up its attitude about partitioning Kashmir.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I should like to answer that question. Not only did he not bring it to their notice, but we are entirely opposed to the suggestion which the hon. Member has made.

STATEMENT ON INDO-PAKISTAN TALKS

13 August, 1963

The statement which I propose to make is rather a long one. If you wish, shall read it out.....

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX'....

I beg to lay on the Table a Statement on Indo-Pakistan talks.

Statement

On the 7th of May last I made a statement in this House in which I referred to the joint talks on Kashmir and other related matters between India and Pakistan which had then still not concluded.

These talks originated from a joint statement which the President of Pakistan and I issued on November 29, 1962, announcing our agreement to make a renewed effort to resolve the outstanding difference between India Pakistan on a Kashmir and other related matters, so as to enable the two countries to live side by side in peace and friendship. On the 30th November I made a statement in the House in regard to this joint statement and referred to the discussions which I had with Mr. Duncan Sandys, Minister for Commonwealth Relations of the U.K. and Mr. Averell Harriman, Assistant Secretary of State of the United States.

In pursuance of the joint statement our delegation led by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of Railways, participated in six rounds of talks. In all these six talks, spread over nearly five months, Pakistan showed no readiness to discuss anything apart from Kashmir.

As I have stated on many occasions previously, it has always been and continues to be, India's policy to seek friendly and cooperative relations with Pakistan. The lack of such friendly and cooperative relations between the two countries would not only be unfortunate but would do violence to the long standing ties of geography, history and culture between the two countries. We are convinced that the only proper course for the two countries to adopt is to develop cooperative and friendly relations and live as good neighbours. In the larger interest of the two countries, we have been anxious to bring about a settlement of all Indo-Pakistan differences, including Kashmir, on a rational and realistic basis. It was in this spirit that we agreed to have joint talks but, as the House is aware, in spite of every effort made by Sardar Swaran Singh to arrive at an equitable and honourable settlement, these talks ended in failure.

From the very beginning, the Pakistan Government took various steps which came in the way of a settlement. On the eve of the first round of talks in Rawalpindi, Pakistan announced its so-called "agreement in principle" with China on Kashmir's border with Sinkiang. The timing of this statement was apparently intended to provoke India to refuse to start the talks the next morning. We felt that this was a bad augury

for the future of the talks. Nevertheless, because of our earnest desire to arrive at some settlement we decided to continue with the talks.

During the first plenary meeting, the Pakistan representative expressed his disinclination to discuss any of the Indo-Pakistan difference other than the Kashmir question which, he insisted, must be settled first. Sardar Swaran Singh in his opening speech listed various subjects which required to be discussed. But Mr. Bhutto insisted on confining himself to Kashmir only. Even on Kashmir, because of Pakistan's insistence, considerable time was spent in friendly but futile discussions on the old idea of plebiscite which, chiefly because of Pakistan's own acts of obstruction and non-implementation of the U.N. Commission's resolutions, had already proved to be impracticable, particularly in the light of irreversibly changed conditions in the last fifteen years.

This was followed by the signing of the Sino-Pakistan agreement under which Pakistan gave away as much as about two thousand square miles of our territory to China. The fact that this was done in the course of our talks indicated how little importance Pakistan attached to our talks. It was extraordinary that while these talks were taking place. Pakistan was busy handing over a large part of our territory to China which had invaded our country. The object apparently was to present us with a *fait accompli* in one part of our territory of Jammu and Kashmir, while keeping her hands free to negotiate for the remaining part of the State. We might have been justified in not proceeding with the talks at this stage. Nevertheless, we proceeded with them after recording our strong protest.

The Rawalpindi talks, despite Pakistan's preliminary agreement with China, had ended with the leaders of the two delegations issuing an appeal for moderation in mutual criticism the joint appeal had hardly been made by the leaders of the two delegations in December when Pakistan launched an unprecedented campaign of vilification against India not only in Pakistan, but also in the capitals of Europe through their responsible officers. Thus, it appeared clearly from the beginning that Pakistan was interested not so much in a settlement of outstanding differences or even of the Kashmir problem, but only in making political capital out of the situation created by Chinese aggression against India.

When the Pakistan delegation shifted from a futile discussion of plebiscite to the consideration of a possible political settlement, they began to put forward astonishing proposals. Pakistan claimed the catchment areas and the water-sheds of the three Western rivers, the Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus, in Jammu & Kashmir, on the ground that these rivers had been allotted to Pakistan under the Indus Waters Treaty. Our delegation pointed out that the Indus Waters Treaty protected Pakistan's interests fully and gave her no ground to claim any territory in Jammu and Kashmir on the basis of the use and development of waters. If every lower riparian claimed the territory of the upper riparian on the pretext of its water requirements, the maps of many countries in the world would have to be drastically revised. By the argument, the lower riparian might even claim Tibet because the Indus and the Brahmaputra start in Tibet. No less absurd was another of Pakistan's claims to Jammu and Kashmir,

namely, that they must have the State to protect their Grand Trunk Road and their railway line, the security of which, our delegation was told was essential to ensure, what Pakistan called, its "defence in depth". Finally, Pakistan claimed Kashmir on the basis of its Muslim majority. This was a vicious communal approach repugnant to the entire spirit animating our national struggle for independence, and contrary to our Constitution and to our whole attitude to the problem of relationship between the State and the individual.

Pakistan's objective was obviously not a rational and realistic solution of the problem. They were just out to claim the entire State of Jammu and Kashmir, leaving to India, as it happened, in a forgotten moment of generosity, an insignificant area in the extreme south, roughly coinciding with the district of Kathua. Even more astonishing was the offer, obviously induced by their awareness of India's need for the defence of Ladakh against China, that Pakistan would be willing to agree to an interim arrangement in the Valley for a period of six months or a year to enable India to deal with the Chinese. All that this could mean was that India might continue to commit its men and resources for the defence of Ladakh against the Chinese threat, but that once its effort and sacrifices had liberated Ladakh. India should abandon the State in favour of Pakistan. Another proposal was the so-called internationalization of the Valley, again for a period of six months, followed by some method of ascertaining the wishes of the people. This was the old and discarded idea of a plebiscite, without Pakistan having to implement the conditions laid down in the UNCIP Resolutions.

Faced with this deadlock, when a breakdown of the talks seemed inevitable on the last day, our delegation again offered a No-War agreement, together with a practical and immediate disengagement of troops, thus hoping to reassure our neighbor that our efforts to strengthen our defence against the Chinese aggression constituted no threat to Pakistan. A No-War agreement, we said, could include a specific undertaking that the two countries should continue to seek peaceful solutions of the problem, because we did not want the problem frozen. Such an agreement could be registered with the United Nations to give it an international backing. Pakistan rejected this offer. Their delegation also refused to agree to remit the matter to the two Governments for a review and for considering other appropriate steps towards a peaceful settlement. Thus, Pakistan achieved what it had aimed at from the very beginning, that is, a non-settlement and a deadlock on every-thing that should have been covered by the phrase "Kashmir and other related matters". This is where the Ministerial level talks with Pakistan ended.

In the early part of May, Mr. Dean Rusk, U.S. Secretary of State, and Mr. Duncan Sandys paid a visit to Delhi. In the course of discussions, the question of Kashmir came up again. We assured them of our earnest desire to have a settlement provided this was fair and equitable. As an earnest of this desire of ours, we said that we would be prepared to have the good offices of a mutually accepted personality, even though previously we had declined a similar proposal. Pakistan, however, continued to make quite impossible demands. In the first week of June, the President of Pakistan said at Sargodha that no useful purpose would be served by the adoption

of such procedure. Other Pakistan spokesmen have been suggesting impossible terms of reference. They wanted a time-limit, suspension of arms supply to India during this period, etc.

We used to be told by many friends, even by leaders in Pakistan, that a settlement of the Kashmir issue was essential in the interest of joint defence of the two countries. At one time, Pakistan made a grievance of the fact that while she was offering joint defence to us, we were not willing to accept it. That the proposal of joint defence was no more than a propaganda stunt, has now been made perfectly clear by the statements of Pakistan leaders. They have publicly declared that even if the Kashmir issue was settled amicably, Pakistan will not go either to the defence of India against China or change her friendly relations with Peking. On July 17th last, Mr. Bhutto is reported to have said in the Pakistan National Assembly than an “attack from India on Pakistan today is no longer confined to the security and territorial integrity of Pakistan”, but “involves the territorial integrity and security of the largest State in Asia”. He also said that if India were to turn her guns against Pakistan, the latter would not be alone in that conflict. He was obviously referring to China. The fact that India has no intention whatever of threatening the security of Pakistan or of turning any guns towards her, was ignored and the repeated offers of a No-War pact were forgotten. Pakistan today has only one object, and that is to malign India and to damage us in every way. They do not want to see us strong enough to stand up to China. They would like us to remain weak and helpless against the Chinese threat. They do not like to be told that the arms aid to India has nothing to do with Kashmir.

We have made it clear that while we are, and shall continue to be, anxious as ever on a settlement of our problems with Pakistan, based on rational and realistic considerations, there is no question of our considering any proposals for internationalizing or division of the Valley, or joint control of Kashmir, and the like. If and when a settlement is arrived at, it must obviously be a peaceful one, not affecting the stability and progress already achieved, and must strengthen the friendship between the peoples of India and Pakistan. Without this, no settlement has any meaning.

During the talks, India not only exercised great patience and restraint, but also offered generous concessions, though in vain, in the hope of winning Pakistan's friendship and opening a new chapter of fruitful cooperation between the two countries. While we continue to cherish this hope there is little possibility of a settlement so long as Pakistan persists in its irrational animus against India. The concessions which we offered to Pakistan are no longer open, and they must be treated as withdrawn. We do not wish our generosity and sincere desire for friendly relations with our neighbor to be treated by its Government as a jumping off ground for further claims. While the break in the talks is a matter of deep regret, we have to accept the facts, and we must wait for a more opportune moment for a settlement of all our differences with Pakistan.

BACK NOTE

LX. Statement on Indo-Pakistan Talks, 13 August, 1963

1. MR. SPEAKER: If it is a long one, it might be laid on the Table of the House, and I shall try to see that copies are distributed to Members.

STATEMENT ON AGREEMENT WITH VOICE OF AMERICA

14 August, 1963

The need to strengthen All India Radio's external broadcasts had been repeatedly brought to Government's notice and this need became more urgent after the Chinese aggression towards the end of 1962, more particularly in the context of the vicious and venomous propaganda against the Government of India by Chinese broadcasting services directed in various languages to bordering areas of India and to various Indian regions, as well as the countries in South East Asia and Africa. A decision was taken in November, 1962 to explore the possibility of obtaining high powered transmitters on reasonable terms from countries where such transmitters were available.

The preliminary enquiries made in pursuance of the decision to explore the possibility of acquiring a high powered transmitter showed that the only transmitter of this kind readily available was with the Voice of America, who mentioned in March, 1963 the possibility of their offering the transmitter on certain terms to the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. As we felt strongly the need for a high powered transmitter to counteract the Chinese propaganda, the Government of India decided to ascertain the terms and conditions on which such a transmitter could be acquired from the Voice of America.

Discussions between the officials of the Government of India and the U.S. officials concerned continued, with some intervals, from March to June, 1963. While it was known that the possibility of Voice of America broadcasts being made through the transmitter under Indian control presented a difficulty, it was agreed to go ahead with the discussions and see what the terms and conditions relating to the offer were.

I was consulted on two or three occasions but did not go into the whole matter at any particular stage. The matter was, however, briefly mentioned to me before the agreement was signed and, in that context, I must assume responsibility.

Immediately thereafter, it became clear that this arrangement was not in consonance with our general policy and will, if further pursued, not only make Indo-U.S. relations a subject of controversy inside India but will prejudice our main objective of counteracting anti-Indian propaganda broadcast from Chinese radio. We have taken up these matters with the U.S. authorities and are discussing with them how the difficulties mentioned above can be met. These discussions are going on. Any decision will have to be in consonance with our basic policies.

BACK NOTE

LXI. Statement on Agreement with Voice of America,
14 August, 1963

NIL

CHINESE TROOP CONCENTRATIONS ALONG THE INDIA-CHINA BORDER

16 August 1963

Since I placed White Paper No. VIII, containing notes, memoranda and letters exchanged between the Governments of India and the People's Republic of China, on 23rd January, 1963, further exchange of a large number of communications has taken place. I am placing on the Table of the House White Paper No. IX containing notes, memoranda and letters exchanged between the Governments of India and China between January and July, 1963. [Placed in Library. See No. LT1415/63.]

When I last spoke on the subject of the India-China conflict on 7th May, I placed copies of the Government of India's note of 3rd April, in which we had suggested a series of constructive steps to be taken for the settlement of the Sino-Indian border differences, and of my letter to Prime Minister Chou En-lai dated 1st May which reviewed the events of the last few months since the Chinese massive attack and reiterated our desire for a peaceful settlement of our differences with China and referred to the constructive suggestions we had made. There has been no response to these communications from the Government of the People's Republic of China so far.

Apart from the fact that there has been no response from China to the constructive suggestions that we had made for peaceful settlement of the differences, some alarming developments have since taken place along the India-China border areas which have been causing us concern. The House will remember the hostile and negative attitude adopted by the Chinese Government to the Colombo Conference proposals. The Chinese, in total disregard of the Colombo proposals, proceeded to implement their so-called declaration of unilateral ceasefire and withdrawal and proceeded to set up 26 civilian posts in the demilitarised zone in the three sectors ostensibly "for normal movement of border inhabitants, prevention of the activities of saboteurs and maintenance of public order along the border". Seven of these so-called civilian posts were set up unilaterally in the demilitarised zone in the Western sector in violation of the Colombo proposals which laid down that there should be civil posts of both sides in this demilitarised zone. In the demilitarised zone in the Eastern sector, in which there were to be 16 civilian posts according to the Chinese unilateral declaration, there are today as many as 52 combined military and civil posts and even the pretence of the posts being civilian in character has been given up. There is, apart from these posts, considerable patrolling and probing activity along the borders, particularly in the Eastern Sector.

For our part, the Government of India have not only scrupulously observed the Colombo proposals but also refrained from impeding in any way the declaration

of unilateral ceasefire and withdrawals made by China. We had hoped that the friendly advice of the Colombo countries would exercise a moderating influence and the Chinese will accept the Colombo proposals. We expected that they will, in any case, adhere to their unilateral declaration. This hope has been belied as the Chinese have acted, not only in violation of the Colombo Proposals but in violation even of their unilateral declaration by establishing a large number of military posts in the demilitarised zone and resorted to offensive patrolling and probing in the border areas.

This is not all. They have inducted fresh troops into Tibet and augmented the strength of their forces along the border. The strength of the Chinese forces along our borders today is larger than what it was at the time of the unprovoked massive attacks in October 1962. Apart from this augmentation of Chinese forces, a further development has been the forward movement of these troops to camps and strong points nearer the Indian border than they were last October. There has been, during the last few months, considerable activity by way of construction of barracks, gun emplacements, storage dumps and airfields 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 sub-terranean trenches along these border areas. Chinese land and air intrusions into Indian areas and Indian air space have also increased considerably, particularly during the last few months.

All these activities make it clear that the augmented Chinese forces are consolidating their position immediately to the north of the Indian border with a view to maintaining a state of permanent tension in those areas. They might even be contemplating using these forward bases that they have consolidated for another thrust into India.

It is difficult to gauge Chinese intentions. That they are not exactly friendly is, however, clear. We understand that on 17th July the Chinese Government presented a memorandum to the Heads of Missions of the Colombo Conference countries in Peking citing the so-called military provocations by India. It may be that, consistently with their past practice, this might be a move to justify their renewed aggression against India "on the specious ground of "counter attacking in selfdefence". We have brought these developments of Chinese aggressive activity along our border to the notice of the Governments of the Colombo Conference countries.

The militant and aggressive attitude of China has been much in evidence in recent months not only *vis-a-vis* India-China relations but in the wider field of international relations including their attitude to the recent partial Test Ban Treaty which has been acclaimed by almost all countries and people of the world as a significant first step towards a relaxation of international tensions and a promising move towards purposeful measures of world peace and disarmament.

We hope wiser counsels will prevail and China will revert to the paths of peace. We want a peaceful settlement of our border differences with China and we have

repeatedly made constructive suggestions regarding the series of practical steps to be taken to this end. The Chinese authorities, however, have not only not responded to these constructive suggestions but intensified their aggressive preparations along our borders. In the context of unprovoked massive Chinese attacks to which we were subjected last October-November, we have to take note of these aggressive developments, face the facts of the situation and calmly and resolutely intensify our defensive preparations to resist any further threat to our territorial integrity.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX¹....

I am not in a position to talk about where military forces should be kept. That is for the defence advisers and army people to decide as to what is most desirable and what is likely to bear the greatest results. Obviously, we are going to defend Assam and NEFA.

One thing more may I say? I have said that I am placing White Paper No. IX. In addition to that, I am placing on the Table copies of Premier Chou Enlai's letter of 2nd August, 1963 and my reply thereto dated 14th August.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX²....

I propose, Sir, to make a statement about the matter referred to by the hon. Member, that is, the report of Justice Das. But, as I have stated previously, I am not able to place the report on the Table of the House. I have consulted again the Chief Justice of India and Justice Das and they are unable to agree to my placing it; or else, they said I could place bits of it, taking off the most important part of it. That, I think, is most undesirable —to leave out all the vital parts. Therefore, I am not going to place it, and I have said that in the last session too. But I am going to make a statement on this question tomorrow.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX³

BACK NOTE

LXII. Chinese Troop Concentrations along the India-China Border, 16 August 1963

1. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad): On a point of clarification. Is the Prime Minister in a position to categorically assure the House that his Government and armed forces are today better prepared than they were last autumn to meet the mounting Chinese threat which may any time deteriorate into a massive invasion?

AN HON. MEMBER: Of course, they are.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): May I ask this as a supplementary to it? He said we should be prepared to meet any further thrust. Does it mean that the Government of India is not contemplating any steps, apart from the Colombo proposals, to procure the vacation of the territory occupied by the enemy?

SHRI HEM BARUA: From the statement just made by the Prime Minister, it is evident that the Chinese intentions are very militant and aggressive, and they have created about 52 combined military and civil posts in the eastern sector. I am perturbed about one thing only, and I want a clarification from the Prime Minister. Last time we had our military posts in NEFA and yet unfortunately we suffered reverses. This time, as far as my information goes, we do not have any military posts in NEFA; except that we have extended our civil control over NEFA NEFA is almost a no man's land.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please put the question.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Because we do not have any military posts in NEFA, I want to know from the Prime Minister how he proposes to defend NEFA and Assam, the whole eastern sector.

2. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: He has not answered the question whether his Government and armed forces are better prepared than last year.

SHRI NATH PAI: He referred only to the further thrust. What about the existing occupation? What does he propose to do about it?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have not quite understood.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: The question is whether the Prime Minister is in a position to categorically assure the House that his Government as well as the armed forces are today better prepared than they were last year to meet the mounting Chinese threat which may any time erupt into a massive invasion as he himself said.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I think so, definitely.

SHRI HEM BARUA: My question has not been answered. It was a pertinent question. Is the Prime Minister prepared to give the reply? He has not given any categorical assurance in that respect. It was the Prime Minister who revealed on the floor of this House that not to send troops to NEFA was a military decision and a political decision also. I wanted to know whether we are prepared to defend NEFA and what measures have we taken in that respect.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: I have to make another submission, about a different matter altogether. I have written to the Speaker and to the Prime Minister also to see that the report of the enquiry made by Justice Das is placed on the Table of the House. We are discussing the noconfidence motion on the 19th. Only 17th remains as a working day before that. I hope the Prime Minister will place the report here tomorrow. The Speaker had sent me word that the Prime Minister, after making some other statements, will place that report.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is for the Government to decide.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: It is for the Government to decide, but we must know whether they are doing it tomorrow or any other day. We would like to have it before the no-confidence motion is discussed in this House. Let us know whether he is placing it on the Table tomorrow.

SHRI RANGA: It is for you to advise or direct the Government.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I cannot force the Government.

SHRI RANGA: Either advice or direction can be given by the Speaker. It is a very important matter, and prior notice has already been given by my hon. friend. Surely we would expect, the Government to be prepared to place the report on the Table of the House in order to enable the House to have a discussion on that motion.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: I wanted to make a reference to it on the first day, but the Speaker promised me that he had sent word to the Prime Minister about it. So, what is the reply of the Prime Minister? I want to know whether he is going to place it tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is for them to decide.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: The Speaker had considered it and it was the Speaker's assurance that he would write to the Prime Minister about it.

SHRI HEM BARUA: The report must be placed on the Table of the House.

3. SHRI NATH PAI: It is a very important question.

SHRI H.N. MUKERJEE: It raises a very important question of principle.

On the last occasion, when the Prime Minister said that he was not going to place the report of the judge concerned on the Table of the House, it was our feeling—and we gave expression to it at that time—that if a matter is mentioned in Parliament and an enquiry is made in pursuance of the announcement by the Prime Minister in Parliament, it is part of the privilege of Parliament, the right of Parliament, the prerogative of Parliament, to have complete copy of the report presented. This is a matter of concern to Parliament. It is purely a technical matter. I feel also that it is unfair to Parliament and unfair to the Minister concerned that the report is being withheld. I have a definite feeling that the Minister was pursued by certain elements, particularly the oil companies, who do all kinds of things—bribery, murder, subversion of Governments in different countries. It is their way, and that is why he was hounded, and perhaps for a technical default he has been pushed out, while other Ministers are going on in this Ministry who have done very much worse things. It is only fair to the Minister concerned and it is fair to Parliament that whatever enquiry is made by the judge is placed on the Table. As the Prime Minister said, the judges only permit something to be placed here. The judges do not have the final say in the matter. Parliament is supreme. The Prime Minister is answerable to Parliament. Therefore, the Prime Minister is under an obligation, moral as well as constitutional, to place this matter entirely, in fairness to the Minister and in fairness to Parliament, before the House.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I beg to disagree with the arguments of Shri H.N. Mukerjee.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I want to refer to.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: About the same matter?

SHRI HEM BARUA: Yes; it is of vital concern, and we are vitally concerned. There is a large group of people who are corrupt in this country, and also a Minister has indulged in corrupt practices. Therefore, we should have the entire report before us in order that we may get a correct picture about that man.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is for the Government to place or not to place the report on the Table. The hon. Members may make comments as they like when the discussion comes up.

SHRI HEM BARUA: It is doing injustice.

SHRI RANGA: The House was told that an enquiry was instituted into the NEFA affair, the manner in which things were conducted or misconducted there. The Defence Minister informed us that the report had been submitted by Gen. Henderson Brooks, and the Government have been considering it for sometime. We were hoping that we might be able to raise it also in the House as soon as possible. I hope the Prime Minister would be able to accede to our request. We

were hoping that this report would be placed on the Table of the House before Monday, or at least on Monday, so that the discussion can be conducted and the noconfidence motion in regard to these matters be conducted with full knowledge of that report.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: About this report, I think before the Prime Minister says something, already there is...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do not make another speech.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: I am not making another speech. I am only reminding you of what has been said in this House about the report of Justice Das. The Prime Minister had promised to give the conclusions of the report, but now there is a demand that the entire report should be placed. I think it is fair that the entire report is placed on the Table. Mere conclusions will not satisfy the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member may make comments, but it is for the Government to take a decision.

SHRI RANGA: We ask for guidance from you but you call us to order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot force the Government. You have made your arguments. The Prime Minister said that he will be making a statement.

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV: Hon'ble Deputy Speaker Sir, I would like to know that as per the statement of the Hon'ble Prime Minister an attack is anticipated and the country should be ready to face it. It is quite right that the Government is making preparations to face the attack but in case the attack does not happen, what are the preparations of the Government regarding the Indian land which is right now under the occupation of foreigners and illegally occupied by the enemy. Are we making preparations to get that land back?

DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order,order. That matter is over now.

SHRI RANGA: We ask for guidance from you but you call us to order.

DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I cannot force the Government. You have made your arguments. The Prime Minister said that he will be making a statement.

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV: I would like to know how the Hon'ble Prime Minister could assure the Das Commission on its appointment that their report would not be tabled in the House. Why did he say so? The purpose of constituting an inquiry commission is to hold an inquiry and to table its report in the House.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I think the Hon'ble member recollects that the Chief Justice agreed to look into the matter through a Supreme Court Judge on condition that his report would not be presented in Parliament and also not be published. This is what he had said. I had made the statement about this in the Parliament. Again I consulted him about this and also asked for his opinion. He held his opinion which he had expressed in the past. He said that publishing that report and presenting in the Parliament would not be appropriate and if done so that would set a wrong precedent because this was not a statutory inquiry. This is of different nature. In this matter neither the judge is protected nor the public. Such reports are always private. Chief Justice repeated his opinion expressed in the past that it would not be appropriate to present it in Parliament or publish.

Now I shall respond to Prof. Ranga's points.

SHRI RAMESHWARANAND: Of what use is this report when it will not be tabled in the House nor will be presented before anyone else?

SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV: I would like to know one information related to what the Hon'ble Prime Minister just stated. When the Prime Minister himself is of the view that the report should be made public and it is not correct not to present and publish it; why did he agree to appoint the inquiry committee under these conditions?

SHRI BAGDI: Is it due to the fear that involvement of some more ministers may also be exposed?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Professor Ranga has referred to the enquiry that has been taking place in regard to the military operations last October and November. The enquiry has taken place and, I believe, the report has been presented to the Chief of Staff of the Army who has given his own summary of it to the Defence Minister.

SHRI NATH PAI: Only a summary even to the Defence Minister?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: He has given a summary. The other papers, no doubt, are open to the Defence Minister also. It is for the Defence Minister to answer this. But as far as I know his mind, and I entirely agree with it, he will make a statement about this report. It is quite improper he thinks, and I agree with him, to place a report of that kind before Parliament, to publish it in any way or place it here. It is not proposed to do so—he will make a statement about it—because in these matters it is not only not desirable to publish them but it will be harmful actually to our military preparations etc., to publish that report on these operations last year.

SHRI NATH PAI: The report refers to a past act and not future preparations. We want to know what went wrong and who is responsible for it. National security is not involved in it, the security of some individuals may be involved.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: If the hon. Member will permit me to say that, perhaps our army people in the Headquarters and in the Defence Ministry are sitting in a better position to judge of these matters than he is.

SHRI RANGA: Sir, it was in the wake of the defeat that we had sustained there that this enquiry came to be instituted and General Brooks was invited to conduct this.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would request the hon. Member to wait till the Defence Minister makes the statement.

SHRI RANGA: May I request that the Government make their statement.

MR. DEPUTYSPEAKER: The Prime Minister has told the House that the Defence Minister would make the statement.

SHRI RANGA: I would request them to make the statement if possible tomorrow; if not, at least by Monday.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I do not think he will be ready for a number of days to make that statement, so far as I know, because it is a difficult matter for him to go into the matter, consider it and prepare the statement from all those papers which are under his consideration. I have not seen all the papers yet myself; I have seen a very brief summary of it.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: I submit, Sir, if I may say so, with all respect to the Prime Minister, that he has unfortunately missed one aspect of the matter, that is, the No Confidence Motion which will come up before the House on Monday. In the course of the debate on that NoConfidence Motion this particular matter, the national humiliation last year, the debacle last year, will figure most prominently, I am sure. Therefore, the House will be handicapped, I submit, if it has not before it the report on why things went wrong, why everything went wrong in NEFA last year. Therefore I submit to the Prime Minister and to his colleague the Defence Minister, that even if they do not place the full report—I hope they do agree to place the full report on the Table of the House at least as detailed a statement as possible giving the conclusions, the findings and also other relevant and cognate matters may be laid on the Table of the House by tomorrow 12.00 noon because on Monday we are starting the debate.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I would convey the hon. Member's desire to the Defence Minister. But I am almost sure that he cannot do so by tomorrow or by Monday. He told me previously. He refers to the NoConfidence Motion that is going to be taken up on Monday. This matter was decided a few days ago. But the other matter about the report and the preparation of a statement is a big matter and it has been under his consideration. It will take some time. The House will surely agree that nothing should be done which might affect adversely our defence at the present moment.

SHRI NATH PAI: We are interested in strengthening the defence.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: How can the hon. Member opposite judge of that, I cannot understand.

SHRI PRIYA GUPTA (Katihar): How can the Prime Minister judge of it .

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I cannot judge of it. This is the view of our army staff, our Defence Ministry, such of it as I know, and I entirely agree with them. I have not seen all the papers even. In fact, I might say those papers.

SHRI NATH PAI: You are ignoring the supremacy of Parliament in all these matters.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have never heard that supremacy of Parliament consists in disclosing secret documents to the disadvantage of the country.

SHRI NATH PAI: They are not secret matters. The world knows them. Sir I want to submit how it raises a matter of fundamental privilege of the House and the country.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is a matter of opinion.

SHRI NATH PAI: It is not a question of opinion. It is the basic thing. There are certain privileges of the House. We are entitled to know what went wrong and how it went wrong. Sir, I want to say one sentence and let him ponder over it. Certainly, the Prime Minister wishes that we do not fall into the same pitfalls again, that lessons and inferences must be drawn and we must be on the guard. How can we believe that these things are being done that steps are being taken unless we are told what went wrong, who was responsible for what went wrong? It is not in a spirit of vengeance that we are seeking this information. We want to avoid.

AN HON. MEMBER: And we want to know who did a good job.

SHRI NATH PAI: Exactly, also who did a good job. May I, Sir, remind him of his promise that he made for the first time in the Rajya Sabha. He has given an assurance then. I do not recall the exact word and therefore I do not want to pin him down to any word but, broadly, the implication of his pronouncement in the Rajya Sabha was that the Government is bound to hold a fullscale enquiry, find out what went wrong and tell Parliament. That was the assurance. Whether there was an assurance or not, it is our inherent privilege to know in such a vital matter. Let us not raise the false bogey of future defence preparedness. It refers to a past occurrence. Military chanceries of every country are doing this. May I conclude, Sir, by saying this, that after the debacle at Dunkirk, soon after Parliament was told what went wrong and how they failed. Certainly, we want to know it, and I do not see any convincing reason for which he can deny telling the country what are the findings of this report unless it be that too many people whom he wants to shield are involved.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: That is the real reason.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated Anglo-Indians): Sir, may I make a request to the Prime Minister? I agree with him that the publication of certain parts of that report may be entirely undesirable so far as it deals with military preparations, so far as it may impinge on our preparations in the future. But I think he owes it to himself and to his Government to allay a lot of statements and rumours that are going about that this debacle was largely due to direct political interference from Delhi like orders to the troops not to fire on the Chinese, deliberate limiting troops to 50 or 51 rounds..

SHRI TYAGI: How do you know that?

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: I want this thing to be cleared. That is what I am saying. The rumour is that even during the actual operations the Minister hamstrung his generals, he would not allow them to implement the decisions that they had taken. We want answers to these. Surely, in fairness to the Government these things should be told to the House.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The answer is that they are completely baseless, without the least truth.

SHRI U. M. TRIVEDI: Sir, it is quite true that the Prime Minister may tell us that the allegations made from this side may be very baseless. But we would like to get a confirmation in our mind and those of us who are not making any allegations may be told definitely, on very good foundation and with good confidence that the allegations that have been made are baseless. How are we to know that the allegations that are made are baseless. It is in the interest of the Government that the facts that have been recorded or brought out by this enquiry are placed before the House so that baseless allegations may not be made and rumours may not go on spreading. We are all very much surprised to know how it was that a whole army of 16,000 men could not lift their finger or do anything to the Chinese community. That is why we want to know how this debacle came across.

**STATEMENT REGARDING ENQUIRY MADE BY JUSTICE
S.K. DAS INTO CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS OF
M/S SERAJUDDIN & CO.**

17 August, 1963

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, as I informed the House on the 7th of May I had requested the Chief Justice of India to suggest the name of a Judge of the Supreme Court who might be trusted with an enquiry about some entries in the papers of Serajuddin & Co. purporting to relate to Shri K. D. Malaviya. This enquiry was entrusted to Shri Justice S. K. Das of the Supreme Court. At The Chief Justice's request I confirmed to him that the enquiry was only meant to help me in coming to a decision about this matter; that in the nature of things the enquiry would be secret and confidential; that Shri Justice S. K. Das would be complete master of the procedure and of the proceedings and also that all relevant papers in the possession of Government would be placed at the disposal of the Honourable Judge.

Shri Justice Das, acting in his discretion, decided not to allow any lawyers to be present. He had to arrive at his conclusions only *prima facie*. On many points his report was favourable to Shri K.D. Malaviya but on some points it was unfavourable to him. Shri Justice Das sent me his report on the 10th of June. As I said on the last occasion Shri Malaviya has offered to me to resign even when the matter first came up before me. He reiterated his wish to resign before he knew the result of the enquiry by Shri Justice Das. As you know his resignation has been accepted. Even though I am not personally convinced that Shri Malaviya has done anything which casts a reflection on his impartiality and integrity, yet I accepted his resignation and in doing so, I have followed and must follow those high principles of parliamentary government by which the office of a Minister is governed and I have discharged my duty accordingly. It was with deep regret that I had to take this action. I must acknowledge and on this I hope the House will agree with me—that Shri Malaviya has rendered meritorious services to the nation during the time that he filled the office of a Cabinet Minister and other offices since 1950.

I am not placing the report of Shri Justice S.K. Das before this House for several reasons. Formerly I had stated in the Parliament that the condition on which the Judge had agreed to hold the enquiry was that the report was not to be published and discussed in Parliament or elsewhere. It is of a private and confidential character and was intended to guide me in the discharge of my functions as Prime Minister and was solely meant for my use. It is obvious that it is not in consonance with the dignity of the office which Shri Justice Das is holding that his report should be made the subject of comment or discussion either in Parliament or in the public. Moreover certain cases are pending investigation and are likely to be placed in court shortly. The disclosure of the contents of the report made by a Judge of the highest court in the

land may prejudice the trial of those cases. It will be opposed to all notions of fairness and property, to make the report public. For these and other considerations, it is not in the public interest to place the report before the House.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX¹....

If the hon. Members listened to what I said, they would see this: I said that Mr. Justice Das, with such material he had and such evidence as he took, came to a *prima facie* conclusion. He did not go through all the matter and all the possible evidence. In fact, most of the important witnesses were not called on the ground that they are themselves entangled in court cases or are likely to be, and he thought it would be unfair to them to call them because they will have to stand their own chance. And, therefore, his opinion could only be based-*prima facie* opinion and not final opinion after full trial-on such evidence as he took. He came to certain recommendations on that opinion. As I have said, out of six, four were in favour of Shri Malaviya and two were not in his favour.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX²....

So, on looking through, or reading his decisions or recommendations and such other evidence as I could, I said I am not convinced. My words were:

“..... I am not convinced that Shri Malaviya has done anything which casts a reflection on his impartiality and integrity.”

But then the mere fact that *prima facie* such things were thought of, I thought, should result in his resigning and my accepting his resignation from the Ministry.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX³....

It is not correct to say that it is a forced resignation because Shri Malaviya had resigned before all this took place, right when a charge was made, and then it was not accepted, and later on, before he knew what Justice Das's report was, he again resigned, and I accepted it later.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX⁴....

My acceptance of that resignation was certainly partly conditioned by Justice Das's report obviously. Although that report was in the nature of a decision-his decision was a *prima facie*-decision and not a final decision-I thought that was enough. It might have been perhaps more desirable if a full judicial enquiry took place. That is a method. I might have made a mistake; and Justice Das was himself rather conditioned by limiting factors; it is not his fault. Maybe, it is my fault that I pursued this course. That may be so.

....XXX....

....XXX....

....XXX⁵....

I have no such intention because—

...XXX....

...XXX....

...XXX⁶....

There are in fact three or four cases in the courts; they are likely to come up; they are not actually in the courts. In three or four days they will come up. They have been under enquiry, which partly concerned all these matters and many of these matters will come up in court-the entries in Serajuddin's books and other matters. I do not know what the result of those cases will be, but we shall watch those results and if it is necessary, we shall take further action. I do not think any further action is required in the present case so far as Shri Malaviya is concerned, because on the facts, a certain *prima facie* opinion was given about him in regard to one or two matters, and so far as this House was concerned, that led him to resign and me to accept his resignation. There the matter ends so far as this House is concerned more or less. If any other occasion arises-

...XXX....

...XXX....

...XXX⁷....

I do not know what articles of the Constitution are necessary for an opinion to be requested.

...XXX....

...XXX....

...XXX⁸....

I did make a request to the Chief Justice of India and he, after consulting his colleagues, agreed to that request, but I do not know, if Shri Nath Pai makes a request what his response will be.

...XXX....

...XXX....

...XXX⁹....

May be it might have been a wrong step on my part to proceed on these lines, because the other course would have been to have a statutory enquiry governed by certain rules laid down. That would be under the Constitution, and the laws, etc. It was then decided, as is often done-it is not the first case that a private advice on the papers that we have, on the evidence we have, would be better. That question is not so much of Shri Malaviya but of the Supreme Court judge himself. It puts him in a very false position if the opinion he has given in a private enquiry is made public because he himself is not protected then; it is not a statutory thing; the judge is not protected.

...XXX....

...XXX....

...XXX¹⁰....

Shri Malaviya may charge or may not charge me, but that is the reason why right at the beginning the Chief Justice and Das stated that his report should not be published.

...XXX....

...XXX....

...XXX¹¹....

I do not know how he has got that. He said that parts of the report, a substantial part of the report, containing his main recommendations should not be published and the rest describing how it took place, the preliminary part which has not great importance can be published. First of all they said both the Chief Justice and Das, that this report as a whole should not be published; but they added, because I had myself pleaded with them to get their permission to place it before the House, that they do not want to publish it but if we think it absolutely necessary even then we should not publish these parts, which would make the report truncated and pointless because important parts which the hon. Members are interested in are not to be published and the other descriptive parts might be published.

BACK NOTE

LXIII. Statement Regarding Enquiry made by Justice S.K. Das into Certain Transactions of M/S Serajuddin & Co., 17 August, 1963

1. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad): On a point of clarification.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Only one or two questions I will permit.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): I wanted to ask about several things. I would like to know....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Only two or three questions.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: I want clarification only on two or three questions, not more.

SHRI BALKRISHNA WASNIK (Gondia): On a point of order. Rule 199 of the rules of procedure says in sub-clause (4):

“There shall be no debate on such statement, but after it has been made, a Minister may make a statement pertinent thereto.”

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): We know it.

SHRI BALKRISHNA WASNIK: A Minister may make a statement pertinent thereto. The Prime Minister has made a statement. I do not think any kind of discussion or debate should be permitted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is no debate; I am permitting only two or three questions.

SHRI RAMESHWARANAND (KARNAL): Why is the resignation of someone is being sought who is innocent and not guilty?

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: The House is at a great disadvantage on this question because the Prime Minister himself said that he is convinced about Shri Malaviya's impartiality etc. He has also disclosed a part of the report saying that it is favourable and also unfavourable to Shri Malaviya; and Shri Malaviya still maintains that he is innocent.

Under these conditions, it is proper that the Prime Minister should lay the report of Mr. Justice S. K. Das on the Table of the House. Or if even the Prime Minister feels and if he indirectly agrees with the insinuations made by Shri Malaviya, that the charges were false and mischievous, let him appoint a commission of enquiry which will go into the entire question of Surajuddin affair.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is a speech, not a question.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: Secondly, I want to know from the Prime Minister-he may correct me if I am wrong-whether it is not a fact that neither the Chief Justice nor Justice Das wanted that only bits of the report may be given as he told us yesterday. The report it seems contains 70 or more paragraphs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: How do you know?

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: Let him contradict. Justice Das contends that there may be four or five paragraphs which contain personal remarks which should not be released, but the rest of the report is such which gives us an idea about the entire transaction that took place and which will reveal to a great extent how business houses and Ministries together are carrying on in this country.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You rose saying you were asking a question, but you are making a speech.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: I want this clarification whether Justice Das or the Chief Justice wanted, if the Prime Minister so desired, not to make public only four or five paragraphs which contain some personal remarks against certain persons. Regarding the entire report excepting these they have no objection. If that is so, I would like the report to come and a commission of enquiry to go into the matter.

SHRI BHIBHUTI MISHRA (MOTIHARI): Deputy Speaker Sir, the hon. Member said that these matters have been written in the report. I would like to know that where he saw the report.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Amroha), *rose-*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No more questions, please.

SHRI J.B. KRIPALANI: May I say a word?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No speeches are allowed. I have to bring to your kind notice that no speeches are allowed. If you want any information, you can ask a question.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: Shri Malaviya has said that neither evidence was called, nor lawyers were allowed to come, and he says that he is innocent. It is not necessary to see that his name is not besmirched? For that, it would be necessary that a committee of enquiry may be held in his own interests, because without lawyers and without evidence being called, it would be a very poor judgment upon him.

SHRI HEM BARUA: (Gauhati): On a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your party Member has asked a question. Now you are raising a point of order.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: It is not a party matter.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I rise on a point of order.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): Which is above party matters.

SHRI HEM BARUA: It is above party matters. It was I who brought these charges against Shri Malaviya. He could not reply to any of the charges.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

SHRI HEM BARUA: I will come to that. Now he has come out with a challenge and he describes my charges as false and malicious and I have a right to reply.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There cannot be any speeches.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I do not make a speech.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please state the point of order.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Rule 199 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the Lok Sabha reads:

“A member who has resigned the office of Minister may, with the consent of the Speaker, make a personal statement in explanation of his resignation.”

He can make a personal statement. When he was making a sermon on socialism, we did not object to that just now. When he was describing himself as pure as an angel, we did not object to that.

SHRI D.C. SHARMA (Gurdaspur): On a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Barua is commenting on his statement. If he wants to raise the matter he may table questions later. On that statement there cannot be a speech.

SHRI HEM BARUA: It is linked up with the statement made by the Prime Minister.

SHRI D.C. SHARMA: I think all the aspersions that have been cast by this gentleman must be expunged from the proceedings.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Taking the two statements of Shri Malaviya and the Prime Minister, how do you reconcile them, how do they go together? It is specifically stated in rule 199(4):

“There shall be no debate on such statement, but after it has been made, a Minister may make a statement pertinent thereto”.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Will he please sit down now?

SHRI HEM BARUA: I seek your protection. It is not to be taken lightly. I seek your protection.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

SHRI HEM BARUA: He said false and malicious. What about that? When the Prime Minister himself says that certain points in Mr. Justice Das's report are unfavourable to Shri Malaviya, I have got the right to say he has not been able to prove, and that is why I say that the Prime Minister should place the report on the Table of the House. Or else, we will not allow....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order. When I stand up, the hon. Member should please sit down. I expect every hon. Member to observe the rules of the House. Otherwise, we cannot carry on any proceedings in this House.

Shri Hem Barua has raised a point of order. There is no point of order in it. After Shri Malaviya's statement, we went to another business, and the Prime Minister has made a statement. After the Prime Minister's statement, a point of order cannot be raised on Shri Malaviya statement. All that Shri Dwivedy wanted was to have some clarification. No point of order can be raised now.

SHRI D.C. SHARMA: What about the statement he has made?

SHRI SHIVAJI RAO S. DESHMUKH: (Parbhani): On a point of order. My point of order arises out of Shri Hem Barua's statement. I may be permitted to make a statement.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please sit down. Shri Ranga.

SHRI RANGA (Chittoor): In view of the fact that Shri Malaviya has said that he is innocent....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We are now on the Prime Minister's statement.

SHRI RANGA: What do you want me to do? Then I had better sit down. The House is impatient, and you are also impatient.

In view of the fact that Shri Malaviya has said that he is innocent and the Prime Minister also agrees with me, and a large number of those friends seem to agree with him because they clapped, we would like to know what is it that was contained in the report of Mr. Justice Das that persuaded or obliged the Prime Minister to take the decision that he should accept Shri Malaviya's resignation.

The next point comes in from it. There must have been in the mind of the Prime Minister, because he wanted to leave all these things to his own conscience, certain standards which should be conformed to by the Ministers, and he must have come to the conclusion that in this case, in the light of the recommendations made by Mr. Justice Das, Shri Malaviya has been able to live up to those standards, and therefore he accepted the resignation.

SHRI BHIBHUTI MISHRA: Deputy Speaker Sir, is it a lecture or a clarification?

SHRI RANGA: We would like the Prime Minister to elucidate these two points: what are those particular standards that he placed before himself, which were more or less the same set of standards which were recommended or referred to by Mr. Justice Das, to which he thought the Minister concerned was not able to conform and hence wanted him to resign.

Dr. RAM MANOHAR LOHIA (FARRUKHABAD): Deputy Speaker Sir, I have a question. Prime Minister is saying this.....

AN HON. MEMBER: Let the Prime Minister reply.

Dr. RAM MANOHAR LOHIA: When all the questions are completed, the Prime Minister should reply them.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: He will forget.

Dr. RAM MANOHAR LOHIA: Ok.

2. AN HON. MEMBER: What are the two cases?
3. SHRI RANGA: What are such things?
SHRI PRIYA GUPTA (Katihar): Is it a forced resignation?
MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member must contain himself.
4. SHRI RAMESHWARANAND: If it was not a crime then why did he resign?
SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: Is your acceptance of the resignation on the findings of Justice Das?
MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order.
5. SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: Even now this judicial enquiry can be done.
SHRI HEM BARUA: Do you propose to hold an open judicial enquiry now?
6. SHRI PRIYA GUPTA: He is the Chief Judge of all things!
7. SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: What are those two matters on which ~~there was~~ a *prima facie* decision and on which the resignation was accepted?
SHRI J.B. KRIPALANI: May I enquire from the Prime Minister if Shri Malaviya's resignation would be considered by the public as a blot on his conduct and in order to see that justice is done to him, should not a greater probe into the matter be taken in hand, and if necessary a judicial enquiry be made? Because the impression on the public mind will remain that there was something shady on account of which the Prime Minister was constrained to accept the resignation of one of his senior colleagues.
SHRI JOACHIM ALVA (Kanara): May I be permitted to just refer to what happened in the House of Commons only a few weeks ago? Mr. Richman-
MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order. The Prime Minister is replying now.
SHRI JOACHIM ALVA: I would ask your permission, in view of the questions that have been put-
MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Not at this stage.
- Dr. RAM MANOHAR LOHIA: Deputy Speaker Sir, the Prime Minister said that Das ji accepted two cases and dropped four cases against Malviya ji, it has increased our curiosity and the curiosity of Lok Sabha and the country. It will do more harm to Malviya ji, it will be talked more and people will understand that the two cases were dangerous. The question is not about two matters or one matter. If five cases are dropped and one is taken for granted then that one also can be a very serious and dangerous matter. I request that the judge only investigates and presents the report. He cannot say whether it should be printed or not, nor can he give any final decision.....(Interruptions).
MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is only repeating the argument made earlier....
- SHRI NATH PAI: Under what provisions of the Constitution can a private opinion of the judge of a high court and the Supreme Court be obtained? What are

the provisions of the Constitution under which opinion of the high court or the Supreme Court can be obtained?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order.

8. SHRI NATH PAI: Can I ask for an opinion from a judge of the Supreme Court?

9. SHRI J.B. KRIPALANI: Was Shri Malaviya a private employee or a public employee?

SOME HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No more questions.

10. SHRI NATH PAI: He cannot undertake a private enquiry then. It becomes an inquisition. Shri Malaviya can rightly charge you that it was an inquisition and not an enquiry because he was precluded from giving evidence.

11. SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: How can some portions be published and some portions cannot be published. My hon. Friend here even knows that it is a 70 page report.

MOTION OF NO CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

22 August, 1963

Mr. Speaker, Sir, for four days we have had this debate, and I believe 40 Members have spoken; I am the 41st. I have tried my best, respectfully and with patience, to follow the speeches— to listen to them myself and follow them. Sometimes it has been a little hard but, on the whole, I believe I have succeeded.

It has been a strange experience to see this varied assembly of the Opposition speak in different terms. Only just now we heard a representative of the Muslim League, a little before, of the Hindu Maha sabha, and a little earlier—yesterday, I think—of the D.M.K. of Madras, all in serried ranks behind Acharya Kripalani and his fellow generals. In fact, they are all generals; there are no privates in the army.

A no-confidence motion, of course, aims at or should aim at removing the Government and taking its place. Now it is clear that in the present instance there was no such expectation or hope. And so the debate, although it was interesting in many ways, and profitable, I think, was a little unreal. Personally, I have welcomed this motion and this debate, and I have almost felt that it would be a good thing if we have periodical examinations of this kind.

I have listened, as I said, with respect to the speeches of the Opposition Members, and tried to understand what troubled them. Some things I knew. But still, what has brought together in this curious array these various Members? It is obvious that what has brought them together is a negation, not a positive fact, not only a dislike of Government, of our Government, but perhaps, if I may say so, it is more— I am sorry to say so—a personal matter against me, both as leader of the Government and otherwise. I do not mean that everybody feels that way. Certainly, it is a negative matter that has brought them together. That takes away a great deal from the strength of the Opposition, and it reduces it. What are they after? There might be something in it; just to remove this Government; and that too is not within their expectation. So, it really comes to this. They were too full of feelings, huff and anger and dislike, and they wanted to express themselves in forcible language. It comes to that ultimately.

I must confess, and I say so with all respect, that the Members, leaders of the Opposition including, of course, the hon. Member who proposed this motion, have not done justice to this motion or to themselves. I have been rather disappointed at the charges they made. I do not mean to say that all the charges they made had no substance. Of course, you might divide their attack into four heads, namely domestic policy, foreign policy, defence and general corruption, etc. I am not prepared to say, and nobody can, that corruption is not a most serious matter to be inquired into, to be eradicated and to be crushed out. There is no difference of opinion about that.

There may be a difference of opinion as to the extent of it, and possibly, sometimes, it is exaggerated, and thereby, perhaps, an atmosphere is created which instead of putting an end to corruption gives it a certain licence. However, these are the four main subjects dealt with.

Now, we have been debating a matter of high State policy. Whether the Government comes or goes, the matters we have debated are important matters for the country, for the State. I should have thought that most of the debate would deal with high matters of State policy. Sometimes, they have been referred to, undoubtedly. But, generally, the debate has proceeded on rather personal grounds, personal likes and dislikes, personal criticisms and attacks, which have taken away much of the force of it. The person concerned felt irritated. That is a different matter. But this was an important moment in the history of Parliament. And as a parliamentarian, apart from being a Prime Minister, I had hoped that we would rise equal to that occasion on both sides of the House and deal with the great matters that confront our country and also incidentally deal with the unfortunate Government that is in charge of many of these matters; but, to concentrate rather on the failings of individuals seems to bring the debate down to a lower level.

The three hon. Members, the three newcomers, whose speeches I listened to with great interest and care, Acharya Kripalani, Shri M. R. Masani and Dr. Lohia, perhaps, were a little excited still with their victories in the by-elections and seemed to think that they could make a frontal attack on this Government and all who are parts of it.

Dr. Lohia did me the honour of referring to me repeatedly. I do not wish to argue about myself; it is unbecoming for me; to do so, anyhow, would be wrong. But that did bring the debate down to a singularly low level of the market place.

I have met Dr. Lohia here in Parliament, I believe, after seventeen years. I do not remember the exact date, but probably, it is about seventeen years since I met him last. And my recollection of him was such that when I heard him I was singularly disappointed. He did not do justice to himself. I expected better of him than merely clever phrases and personal attacks.

We were dealing with the future of India, not of Jawaharlal Nehru or Morarji Desai or somebody else who happens to be for the time being in posts in the Government. We shall go, of course, even if we do not go because of this vote of no confidence, otherwise too; in course of time, we shall go; others will take our place. It may be—I do not know about the future—that other parties will come in. And I felt that in a moment like this, to talk in this petty and small minded way was not becoming. However, that is for each Member to choose how he should speak, and how he should present his case, but it does affect the major case. When we are talking about what really means the future of the country, the freedom of the country, the prosperity of the country and all that, to bring it down to this low level of personal criticism and abuse is not good.

Now, sometimes, in the course of this debate, Members have been rather excited, on the whole, not very much, I should say, in the four days, but still, sometimes.

It will be my endeavour to avoid saying anything which might have the result of exciting people. Of course, naturally, I may say something which is not liked. That is inevitable. But I have no desire to carry on this debate, towards the end of it specially, on a note of resentment and anger.

So one of my disappointments in this debate which otherwise has been helpful in many ways has been the absence of a larger vision, to which we were looking forward to, and to which we as a Government have failed to come up. That would have been something which would have raised the debate and raised people's thinking, our failure being attached to the larger vision that we should possess or we are supposed to possess. There was hardly any reference to any large vision. When many years ago most of us here, not only on our side but on the other side of the House too, were participating in the struggle for freedom, under the leadership of Gandhiji, we had that larger vision, not only of freedom or of attaining independence, but something more all the time most of us had. There was a social objective, there was a vision of the future which we were going to build, and that gave us a certain vitality, a certain measure of a crusading spirit. Now, perhaps it is true that most of us are lost, are rather tied up in humdrum politics and petty matters of the day. Whether we are in the Government or in the Opposition, we are both tied up that way, and the larger vision escapes us, or sometimes only we have glimpses of it. And yet, if India is to go ahead, as we all want to, India will have to have a vision of the future, always to think of it, and always to judge our present conduct by seeing how far it comes up anywhere near that vision, because a country which has no vision gradually goes down. A country which has a wrong vision inevitably goes down, but a country which has no vision gradually loses its vital energy and perishes ultimately. I do not think India is going to perish. It has not perished for five thousand years or more, it is not going to perish, but there is something in between, that is existing. I do not want India to exist, I want it to live a full life. I want it to advance, I want the people of India to flourish in every way, not only in the physical, material sense, but in other senses, cultural, intellectual, moral and other senses. It has much to learn from the world and also to give something to the world, because I have been convinced, I am convinced, that India does possess something which it can give to the rest of the world, although it has to learn much from the rest of the world also.

So, I have found in this debate, I am sorry to say, a singular lack of reference to this larger vision that we are supposed to have. Looking at things in perspective, I would say even looking at things in the economic aspect, the social aspect, the planning aspect, the perspective planning aspect, to look at things in some perspective—that is the very essence of planning, where we are going and how do we go?

Shri Masani gave expression to his views about economic affairs, and I am astounded that any intelligent people should talk in the way he did. There is no sense

in it, no understanding of the modern world of economics as it is understood today. He said: why have a steel plant? A more astonishing remark it has not been my bad fortune to listen to. What does he expect? We should not have that, we should have small industries? I am all for small industries. We should have what is called no capital intensive works, that take up too much capital and therefore we should advance like this? Where do machines come from for the small industries? We can get them from Germany, Japan, Russia, wherever you like, and pay heavily for them, go on paying for them. Is this anyone's conception of industrialisation of this country? No country has been industrialised in that way. It is essential if you want industrialisation, as we want it, to have a base, an industrial base. Apart from pure industrialisation, it is essential for our strength, for our military strength, defence strength, to have an industrial base. That is the trouble we have today. We do not lack men, we do not lack stout men, brave men, in this country, but all the stout men in this country are precious little good ultimately when it comes, to the use of modern weapons, modern industry and all that. Therefore, I say you cannot even remain free in India without an industrial base. You cannot advance, industrialise this country, without an industrial base, and an industrial base means basic industries and mother industries, heavy industries and the like. As soon as that is established, smaller industries flow from them, and the rate of progress is fast. If you do not establish that, well, you remain tried up not only not advancing fast, but you are tied up to other countries who are economically dominant over you, who can prevent your growth, who can lower down the rate of progress. You are not economically free completely. That is not a prospect which I look forward to and I imagine that is not the prospect which this House will welcome.

We want real freedom. Real freedom is not merely political freedom; it is economic freedom in two senses. One in the sense that you do not have to rely on other countries. You are friends with them, you cooperate with them, you take their help, but you are not dependent upon them to carry on either for defence or anything else. And the second economic freedom I mean is economic freedom for the vast masses of our country, that is their having higher standards of living, leading a good life, not only physically, materially, but culturally and otherwise, and putting an end, as far as possible, in stages if you like, to these gross differences that exist in India, which are not good for any country from any point of view.

It is difficult to remove them suddenly. Remember that we in India have had a background which is not a good background in spite of all our great thoughts and all that. The social background we have had to deal with in India has been a bad background, with caste and tremendous differences, and that has soaked down to millions and millions of our people, and that is why one of the big things that we have to do is to uproot that background, change the way of thinking, change the way of living. It is no good our thinking that the magnificent books we have, the Mahabharata, the Ramayana and all that are a substitute, can cover up the evils of a bad background of thinking and action. We are backward, backward in our thinking, backward in our

lives, in the way we live, backward in the way we treat others. All this caste system, and Harijans and this and that, it is a bad thing. That comes in the way even of bringing in material things. All that is changing, I know, and will change. But we have to have some idea of the demons that we have to contend against, and the problems here are much more intricate and deeper than possibly countries elsewhere might have, just fighting one demon of poverty.

So, in our domestic field, not today, but at least 30 years ago, more than 30 years ago, this Congress organisation—and many of the Members sitting opposite were Members of the Congress organisation—took a step which national organisations seldom do, took a step towards the formulation of some ideal of social justice, took a step about land reform. It did not take it, it could not do it, but it formulated a policy of land reform and social justice, and some steps towards the formulation of a public sector. This was the Karachi Congress, more than 30 years ago. Of course, the whole concept of Gandhiji, although he did not talk perhaps in modern language, was not only one of social justice, but of social reform, land reform. All that was his. It was inevitable that Congress should begin to think that way because we became a party of the masses; even though we were not exactly proletarians or peasants and all that we were influenced by the mass of the people who became members of the Congress and so we were forced to think of agrarian reforms especially and other things too. Gradually this idea developed and ultimately we came to Independence and we passed a Constitution. It talks of social justice. It does not talk of socialism but practically it gives the background of what socialism is in the Constitution. Later this Parliament definitely adopted the ideal of socialism, and the Planing Commission too. If any hon. Member in the opposite side criticised us for not having gone fast enough on the road to realise socialism, I would accept that criticism; we have not gone fast enough. We have been slow for a variety of reasons, some within our control and some not in our control. But I am convinced that there is no choice for India, party or no party; no party whatever it may feel can stop this march to socialism in this country, to democratic socialism. We are perhaps the only country—I would not say only; I do not know—or the outstanding country where an attempt has been made to put this idea of social democracy and try to achieve it by planning. Planning has taken place in other places; they are not democratic places. Other countries which are democratic have not accepted planning. But the combination of the two is rather unique. Of course planning is a thing which everybody talks about now. But planning in the sense of an organised, well-thought out method of going step by step, putting a goal before you and marking out the steps you have to take—that is a scientific process but rather a complicated and difficult process. Most people think that planning is to put together a number of things and schemes and proposals. They call that planning. That has nothing to do with planning; it is remote from planning. Planning is something which leads from one step to another and ultimately to the goal. It may not be quite accurate because conditions vary and

there are many factors, the biggest being the human factor which you cannot wholly control. It is impossible for any one of us here to do that. Parliament cannot by any law say how 440 millions of our countrymen will work; they may create conditions for their work; they may help them and they may advise them. But you cannot force them to do something; human nature being what it is, at any rate in a democratic system you cannot do that.

So India took up this big tremendous adventure and thereby attracted attention all over the world because it was a great thing to do, especially having regard to our background of caste and other differences which we are faced with. We have been at it now for a dozen years or more; we have progressively learnt more. I think that we know more about it than we had when we started at the end of the First Plan. Not only have we collected more material in the shape of statistical material but all kinds of other ideas, discussions with all kinds of people. We have had the good fortune to discuss this matter with people from almost every major country in the world, certainly the countries of Europe, America, Russia, Japan including at one time, I believe, some Chinese people,—two or three specialists came—Scandinavia, Yugoslavia we have discussed with them not individually but together with them sometimes. That was interesting to discuss it. There was a Soviet man apparently thinking in terms of Soviet planning; there was an American professor or somebody thinking in terms of or in the background of America, an Irishman, a Frenchman, a German—was sat together and often discussed it with them. It was extraordinary that although they differed in their ideological outlook—I use a word which is so often used—when they came down to hard facts of the Indian situation, it was extraordinary to see how much they agreed between themselves. They differed somewhere here and there because they realised that it is no good discussing ideological thoughts between themselves here; they discussed here what we had to do to meet a certain situation. They drew up thousands of papers and our Planning Commission is full of the papers they wrote jointly and separately. It was extraordinary to see how much they agreed even among themselves as to what we should do, although one thought on communist lines, another thought on some kind of socialist lines and a third on capitalist lines. But being economists usually they took a problem and had to solve it; they had to come round to that process of perspective planning, of laying great stress on heavy industry and of course other light industries must come. Power perhaps is the most important thing of all. If I could do it I would concentrate on power all over India realising that with the coming of power other things will come, power meaning electric power. So, we built it up. We made mistakes. The first thing that we realised was that it was no good thinking in terms of copying America or copying Russia or any other country. The problems of India are its own problems. We can learn from America, Russia and certainly we should. But the economic problems of India are different. In our colleges, I do not know now, but some years ago the economic books of America and England were taught and there was absolutely no use for that because those countries were thinking more or less of an affluent society in which they lived and they discussed the problems of the affluent society whereas we were a poverty stricken people and

then we had to learn economics from books dealing with an affluent society. It was not much good. Of course it taught something. So, gradually the idea arose and it has arisen now, I believe, that economics is taught from the point of view of India and not from the point of view of America or Russia, learning from them of course as they have great experience. So, we have gone step by step. We always realise that the fundamental factor was the growth of agricultural production. That is basic, because however much we attach importance to industry— industry is a good thing—unless we had surplus from agriculture, if industry had no surplus, then we have nothing. We cannot live on doles from other countries. So, we attach the greatest importance to agriculture. At the same time we realise that by agriculture alone India will not go forward; however much agriculture may progress, industry has to come— industries of various kinds; heavy industries are the base and we need industries even for agricultural implements; we need small industry which could be allied to agriculture. In India that is very important that you should have some auxiliary industries which should fit in with the agricultural process. I am not at the moment thinking of what Gandhiji had said about handspinning and the like, but that does fit in. It is no good saying that handspinning is no good in the modern age, that it is not economic. It is useful under certain conditions in certain parts of India as things are. I do not say what would happen 15 or 20 years later. But what I was referring to is not merely handspinning but some village industries, preferably with electric power and modern techniques, because whether you do small industry or big industry or the biggest industry, one thing you must be sure of; that you use the latest modern techniques. It is no good using a bad technique, an ancient technique which is out of date.

Thinking like this we tried to proceed. There was the first five year Plan. Then the second Plan came. We got some more statistics and some more knowledge, some more experience and some more heartbreaks. And then came the third Plan in which we are now. We started with difficulties and are still carrying on a little better than we expected. The second Plan was in a bigger scale and achieved much more than the first. The third Plan, in spite of the various difficulties we have had, will no doubt, I think, improve the conditions of the country more than the second Plan made. And so we go on.

So, if you look at this broad picture, it is a picture not of something that produces defeatism; it is an optimistic picture, in spite of the vast difficulties in India, in spite of the population problem on which Shri Frank Anthony laid great stress; it is a good picture, and I am quite sure we shall succeed.

But the basic thing, the main thing in India is the peasant: how to change his mental outlook; how to modernise, how, by making him use the modern tools and modern ideas in a certain measure, to get him out of the rut in which he is living from ages past. With that end in view, we started community development. We succeeded to some extent and then they fell into a rut. There is an enormous capacity in India for people, whatever goodwill they have, to fall into a rut. I may confess that even

poverty, misery and all that, and yet you will see something which is heartening and that is this. All stagnation has gone, or is going, and a certain dynamism has come into life in India. I do not at all wish to miss the fact of the poverty and horrors of the Indian scene even now. But it is changing; that is the main thing. It has got out of the old rut and I think it will change pretty soon. The rate of the change will become faster and faster than in the past.

And all this has been done with the democratic structure of Government. In fact, if I may say so with all respect, the very fact of the no confidence motion that we are debating today is a proof of that structure. It will be a good exercise for us to look round a little to the other countries of Asia and elsewhere, specially the newly independent countries and compare what we have done with what they have done or are doing. A few of them have maintained democracy. But, even apart from that, let us see how far they have progressed on the economic and social plane. I am not going to compare India with, China now, partly because I do not know enough about China, about the progress made by China because the reports are often conflicting. But I do know that the cost that they have paid for this economic progress has to some extent, been a very heavy one in individual and personal liberties. I do not want to take that kind of cost into account while comparing us with other countries. When we compare us with other countries excluding China, the rate of our progress has been heartening. It is no good comparing our rate of progress with, let us say, Germany, Russia or Japan. Shri Masani talked of the miracle of Germany. It is all very good to speak about the miracle of Germany, but Germany was a highly industrialised State before the war with everybody almost an engineer, a trained person, so that when they sat down after the war to build up there was material on which to build up. So, they built on it. Japan did the same. Russia, which is a socialist or communist State, did almost the same, because it had the background, the industrial complex behind it and the trained people behind it. We have to suffer because we have not got that complex. We are trying to build it. We have built it up partly. So, I would submit that in spite of the poverty in India, there is no doubt, it does not require much in the way of statistics to see it, there is greater welfare in India, except in some pockets, than ever before. We can see that in the food they eat. In fact, they eat more and they eat better food. They wear more clothing; they had precious little previously. They have better housing. Schools are growing everywhere and health facilities are growing. Some people have even the temerity to talk about the miracle of India. They talk of the foreigners, what they have seen of the changes in India during the last dozen years which laid the base for future growth.

We have to choose always, whether we are going to give some present people on our benefit today, or keep it for tomorrow or the day after. Looking at from the country's point of view, by spending the money we have we can get some petty benefits today. But that will not yield any permanent benefit. That is obvious. And one has to find a healthy balance between today's benefit and tomorrow's. All this business of heavy industries we have put in is for tomorrow's benefit, though it brings in some benefit today too. But it takes some years before it yields fruits.

So, the strategy of economic development is first and essentially agriculture, modernisation of agriculture, the training of our rural masses to use new tools and new methods and, at the same time, to lay the foundations of an industrial structure by building the basic heavy industries and above all, to produce electric power. Middle and small industries inevitably come in their train.

If you got to the parts of the Punjab today, you will see the industrial revolution coming on as you watch it. The revolutionary change that is coming over the Punjab is amazing. The Punjab at the present moment is the most prosperous province so far as per capita income is concerned. It is not have no great experience—but Americans coming as tourists who say that it is remarkable how this rapid growth of industrial revolution creeping up resembles what they have themselves experienced in some parts of America. So all these things are happening.

One thing that we have to lay great stress on apart from this, is that we cannot only think of tomorrow and the day after. People who have not even got the minimum standard of living have to be thought of today. That we all agree. It is always a question of our resources and how we spread them out. It is a complicated question. Some of our advisers have told us, “Forget today, think only of tomorrow”. That can not be done. On the other hand, if we think only of today, we do not make any progress.

The broad picture is that the rate of progress has increased progressively after every Plan. I have no doubt that the progress of the Third Plan period will be substantially higher than that achieved in the Second Plan. In terms of the key growth potential, that is, the infrastructure, the progress has been creditable. National income over ten year period has risen by 42 per cent as against the growth of population by 21 per cent. Per capita income has increased by 16 per cent. That is not enough, I admit, but it is not so bad as some body would think.

I think, Shri Anthony talked about production and thought that it will all be overwhelmed by the growth of population. He said that. But the principle thing is that foundations have been laid now by this infrastructure for a rapid rate of growth in the future. I hope that by the end of the Third Plan or in the Fourth Plan we shall progressively, approach that stage when we grow ourselves, if I may say so, without too much pushing from outside.

The hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture has said that foodgrains have gone up from 52 million tonnes to 80 million tonnes and I expect it to go up in the next three years to 95 million tonnes or even to 100 million tonnes. Industrial production has shown remarkable progress. There is no doubt about that. So, has transport and so has power.

In technical education, the degree level intake which was 4,100 in 1950-51 is nearly 14,000 now and is likely to be over 21,000 in 1965-66. For the diploma level the intake has risen from 5,900 to 25,000 and will be 46,000 and so on.

One thing about population, shri Anthony thought that we should follow Japan's example and encourage abortion. I might mention that even in Japan this has not been looked upon with favour as it is found that this method adversely affects the health of the mother. The Lady Rama Rao Committee definitely gave its opinion against abortion as a method of population control after examining all the evidence. As a matter of fact, the other methods are growing in use in India. There are at present over 3,000 family planning clinics in the villages and in the towns. The progress of voluntary sterilisation has been much more than expected. Up till February 1963, 334, 477 persons are reported to have been sterilised. This may not appear to be a big number considering the population but it is a steadily growing number. We think these methods are safer than abortion or anything like it.

I do not think I need say much about non-alignment. It has been adequately discussed and Shri Krishana Menon spoke a great deal about it with ability.

But I would ask Acharya Kripalani to consider whether he was right in saying—I believe he said it—that Panch Sheel was Panch nonsense. Now, I should like him to tell me which part of Panch Sheel is nonsense. I will repeat to him: the first is independence; the second is non-aggression, non-interference; then, about the third what it is. . .

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX³

I was surprised to hear him using the word 'nonsense'. I submit that Panch Sheel is the only basis for international relations. Anything else is not civilised relationship and leads to trouble, conflict and war. The fact that China after subscribing to Panch Sheel breaks it and attacks us does not make Panch Sheel wrong. Obviously, the fault is of China, if you like to say so. But the Panch Sheel is not wrong, the principles underlying international relationships.

I am submitting that Panchsheel is a right principle to lay down. The implementation may be wrong from one side or the other. That can be examined. But it is a principle that is not only right but a civilised principle which must exist between countries unless they are mutually at war and so to some extent the present major conflict between Soviet Union and China is based on that. China does not believe in peaceful co-existence. It says so and Russia says, it does. Of course, behind that lie national conflicts between the two.

Now, there is one thing more. It was said by Acharya Kripalani as well as by others that I hid from Parliament the fact of Chinese aggression for a long time. I have dealt with this in the Lok Sabha previously and I do not want to go into any detail because it can easily be seen—my previous speeches and answers. And I do submit that this is entirely a wrong idea. What happened was that in 1958—it was end of 1958, late autumn—we first heard of the Aksai Chin road being made. We did not know where it was exactly. We sent two sets of people separately to find out where it was, whether it was in our territory or not because Aksai Chin road spreads out behind that. It took months for them to come back because all these are real mountaineering

expeditions. One of them came back after some months and the other was captured by the Chinese. All this took months. We wrote to the Chinese to say that we had sent some people on our territory and whether they knew anything about them, and that they had not yet come back. Thereupon, they replied, "Oh, yes. They transgressed our territory and we arrested them. But now as we are friends with you, we are releasing them". That was the first regular information we had that Aksai Chin road had been built in our territory. That was in 1958. In October 1958 I think we sent a protest about this matter to the Chinese Government. About this time—end of 1958, beginning of 1959—the Tibetan rebellion took place against the Chinese rule and our attention had been rather diverted. The Tibetan rebellion took place; people came from Tibet; later the Dalai Lama came; many refugees came. And in our subsequent communications to China those things took rather the first place. But reference was continued to be made about this Aksai Chin road.

We first informed Parliament about this in 1959—I forget the exact date at the present moment, but it was in 1959. It might be said that we might have informed them three or four months earlier. We must have been waiting for the reply from them; and as soon as the reply came the Tibetan rebellion and other developments took place, and we informed Parliament. There was no long delay in it, and there was obviously no desire to hide anything from Parliament.

Now, Acharya Kripaiani has said that we should break off diplomatic relations with China. He asked: why don't we declare war? All I can say is that it would be very unwise for us to do so. It may be a brave gesture. But in our opinion it would be unwise; it will not help us in any way, and it may hinder us in many ways. Nothing comes in the way of our strengthening our defences, as we are trying to do to the best of our ability, and at the same time always to keep the door open, whether it is Pakistan or whether it is China, for peaceful settlement, provided it is honourable and in keeping with our thinking.

Now, Acharya Kripalani said something about our defence, and I asked our Defence Minister to give me a note on this question and I shall read that note, I wanted to be sure that what I said was correct.

"Shri Kripalani has alleged that the decision taken to drive away the Chinese Army as announced by the Prime Minister on his way to Ceylon was taken without any consultation whatsoever with the officers incharge of the Army in NEFA, that it is a political decision arrived at in Delhi and that it was astounding that military decisions of the battlefield should be taken without consulting the Army Headquarters at the spot by civilians. He has challenged the Government to publish the NEFA Enquiry Report as people have reason to believe that there has been treachery".

The Enquiry Report cannot be published in view of the secret nature of its contents and the security risk involved. But the Defence Minister intends to make a statement relating to the contents to the extent, they can be disclosed on the floor of the House during the session.

The allegations made by Shri Kripalani are absolutely without foundation. Decisions on important matters—and decision with regard to the attitude to be adopted in case of attack by China was an important matter—could only be taken at Delhi. There could not be one decision; a number of decisions had to be taken as the situation developed from time to time. Those decisions were taken by Government in full consultation with the Chiefs of Staff and other senior Army officers concerned and in the light of their expert advice. This applies particularly to the decision that the Army should not withdraw in October November 1962 from its forward positions in NEFA. While decisions of a certain nature can only be taken ultimately by Government, it is incorrect to say that decisions were taken without consulting the appropriate army authorities. The charge of treachery is of course baseless.

This note the Defence Minister has given me. I may mention this, because it was on my way to Ceylon that I was asked by the press correspondents about the frontier situation, I told them that we intend pushing them out. I do not see anything wrong about it, and that, as a matter of fact, was our decision, our military decision; the date was not fixed; and that was the only thing that I could say at that time, and I refused to say anything else.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁴

But my point is that that was not a sudden inspiration which I had. That was the result of talks with the Army generals and others, and on their advice—not their advice that I should say it to the press.

Shri Krishna Menon had said something about the kind of Army that we have inherited. It is a good Army from the point of view of the soldier, but it was not a modern Army. It is all very well for it to go and function as a part of the British Army in the Great War; and they did well, All our efforts have been concentrated on gradually modernising it. The modernising process is so expensive; if we take the whole Army, it would involve about Rs. 1000 crores, taking the Army even as it was. And with the continuous pressure on us, on not spending too much, I know, and my colleague the Finance Minister knows very well how repeatedly demands were made from the Defence Ministry or the Army Headquarters for more expenditure, but we discouraged them; sometimes, we might have cut them down too; they were in such fantastic figures, in geometrical proportion, or in astronomical figures that if suddenly somebody asks for Rs. 500 crores it will be difficult to give it, and it is always difficult except when you are faced with a war situation, when the country and Parliament and everybody thinks differently. That is what has happened now. As regards the amount we are spending now, the taxes that the Finance Minister has put would probably have met with much stronger opposition if there had not been this war or semiwar situation facing us. Even so, the process of modernisation was given some start.

There is one thing that I must say, and that is that I am surprised at Acharya Kripalani talking about the Army and saying it has no clothes and no shoes, as if we

send them naked to the field: I do not understand this. I think my hon. friend said in his speech that they did not have shoes or boots.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁵

I have not said anything about Pakistan. In fact, very little has been said about Pakistan by hon. Members who have spoken, except that some reference has been made to Shri Rajagopalachari's kind offer of Kashmir to Pakistan. Our policy consistently will be, will continue to be, to seek some settlement with Pakistan. It is not a question of settlement about Kashmir or some other matter, but a settlement which removes our bitterness against each other and brings a feeling, which creates co-operation between the two countries. There can be no other objective to aim at.

One of the Members of the Opposition Parties talks, I am sorry to say, very irresponsibly about things like Akhand Bharat and the like. They do talk about that. That is in the programme which they issued. They may not have said so here. That is very harmful. It is not merely folly, but it does harm, because it frightens the people in Pakistan, that people here want to upset Pakistan. Nobody here wants to do that and can do that, and it would be extreme folly if India ever tried to do that; it would ruin India, ruin Kashmir and ruin Pakistan.

I feel we may have been wrong in minor things. But I think that throughout these many years since Pakistan came into existence and the Kashmir trouble arose, we have always looked forward to a settlement of it. But a settlement does not mean our doing something which is completely wrong from our point of view, Kashmir's point of view and the people of Kashmir's point of view. That is a different matter. We shall continue to do that.

Indeed, I may say even about China that we shall always leave the door open for an honourable settlement with China, whenever it may come. It may not come soon; it may come later.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁶

We are living in a strange world, and if I may submit, our foreign policy—that is a test of it—has succeeded in putting us *vis-à-vis* other countries in a far more advantageous position than China is. It is no small matter that we have not only the goodwill but the active help of great powers like the United States and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has been helping us in various ways and, as the House knows, in regard to Kashmir, it has been our staunch supporter.

Shri Prakash Vir Shastri delivered a 15 minute address to the House in which he managed to put in as much condemnation and vituperation as it was possible within 15 minutes. I was surprised and pained to hear it, because many of the things

he said had no basis. But he was evidently angry and he expressed himself. It is now too late to talk about the subject of corruption. It is obvious nobody here can have any two opinions about corruption. It must be rooted out and it is a tremendous headache to all of us, how to deal with it.

If they say question, I do not know what they think. It is, if I may say so, a result of the democratic process, and I am a little afraid that as this process grows, for instance it is going down to the villages, it may bring with it its painful accompaniment. We have been trying to deal with it, and we have dealt with it. Hon. Members are probably thinking more and hearing a lot about Ministers and the like. Many of these complaints that are made come to me, or are sent to me, and we, first of all, have them thoroughly examined. We get some kind of explanation, that is the procedure adopted, from the person concerned, from the Minister concerned, and if there is anything even *prima facie* worthy of an enquiry, we first have private enquiries. Thereafter, we decide whether any other enquiry should be made or not. As a matter of fact, most of these complaints that have come, and which are talked about in the newspapers, have provided no ground at all after examination. They are exaggerated.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁷

Impartial, of course. The man who examined was impartial, he had nothing to do with that.

Some are still under examination, some I am examining myself, having got reports from both concerned, the one who accuses and the accused himself.

Then there is the Serajuddin matter. There has been, of course, Mr. Das's enquiry, but apart from that, there are four or five cases that are going to the courts, and I think, I am not quite sure whether they have actually gone there or are going in a day or two. It will deal with all the Serajuddin affairs. Then there is some connection of Orissa people with Serajuddin. As a rule, these matters should be dealt with by the State, but we, nevertheless, sent for papers etc., and my colleague, the Finance Minister and I examined many of them. Some of them have been, I think, as some one said, referred to the Public Accounts Committee. First they were referred to the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and the Leader of the Opposition. After accepting that work he rejected, he would "not do it. Then it was sent to the Public Accounts Committee as a whole, and I think that the Public Accounts Committee is a very suitable body. It contains Members of several parties, and the Accountant-General is there to help them, and it is right they should go into this matter. It affects governmental moneys also.

For instance, the present Deputy Chief Minister of Orissa, right from the beginning, almost *suo moto*, sent me and the Home Minister a long list of moneys he had received from Serajuddin, he was not a Minister then, and he said: these I have received, these were received by me for the Congress; every month he sent me

Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000 or something like that, and I have spent it for two purposes, for Congress and for giving scholarships to poor students. And there it is. It has been examined, and it fitted in with some entries in Serajuddin's books too. There was nothing to examine because he admitted the thing, and he was not a Minister at that time at all. The only question was whether it was properly spent or not.

So, all these things are being looked into as far as we can but the main thing is what process we can devise to deal with this major problem. It is not an easy matter and I hope we shall devise some process. There is of course, for officials, the special police establishment and every month I receive a report from them giving me a list of cases examined, cases started in a court of law or cases in which departmental action has been taken. It is a good and substantial report. Quite a number of people are punished that way.

But as I pointed out that something if possible has to be done. Of course mere measures like this may not succeed in routing out such an evil. In this matter we naturally want the cooperation of the public and of Members, Opposition and others.

Before I finish, I should like to say one thing. We have got a very hard task which is not only internal—that of course it is—but I am now talking about the menace on the border, a very difficult one. We must stand up to it, face it and strengthen ourselves. But everybody knows how strength in such matters depends not only on arms, armies and armaments but on the morale of the people, on the unity and morale of the people. We saw some evidence of this unity and morale in November, December and January last. I would beg of the hon. Members to consider how far this morale is strengthened, the sense of unity is strengthened by this motion of no-confidence or by the strikes that had taken place in Bombay. As a matter of fact if hon. Members had occasion to read the Chinese Press which I see every day; how they gloat over these things. How they gloat over this motion of no-confidence.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁸

Of course. It encourages them. I believe one of the reasons, perhaps a major reason, they attacked us last October was the feeling in their minds that India was faced with many disruptive tendencies and if they gave us a blow, we will split up into fragments. They were mistaken of course. The opposite has happened. The fact is there that apart from what they may think, what effect we may have on our Army and our own people if they feel that we quarrel too much among ourselves; it must demoralise them. Anyhow, personally I am grateful for having had this motion of no confidence and I think it has done us some good to hear speeches and to make them.

Thank you.

BACK NOTE

LXIV. Motion of No Confidence in the Council of Ministers, 22 August, 1963

1. SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: Landless labourers do not get 15 annas a day.
2. Dr. RAM MANOHAR LOHIA: Hon'ble Speaker Sir, has the Prime Minister calculated that I am stating five times more?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Yes sir. Dr. Lohia has made the mistake of considering the per capita income as per family income. He got nervous, taken the family as being of five members and divided the income by five.

Dr. RAM MANOHAR LOHIA: OK, please calculate and tell the income of 27 crore people at the rate of 3 Anna per person and then at the rate of Re. 1 per person. The Prime Minister is making a huge blunder in this.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have calculated. I have got a note of a respected economist sahib which is as follows:

“Dr. Lohia has confused per capita income of Rs. 25 per month with family income and has based all his deductions on this simple fallacy drawing naturally absurd conclusions.”

Dr. RAM MANOHAR LOHIA: Whose note is this?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is that of a sahib.

Dr. RAM MANOHAR LOHIA: Then, please speak to that sahib in the evening. I feel you will have to repent a lot.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Repent?

Dr. RAM MANOHAR LOHIA: You have very poor knowledge about agriculture and industries.

3. SHRI NATH PAI: Mutual respect—

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Territorial integrity.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That is No. 4 or No. 5.

SHRI NATH PAL: We know it better than you.

4. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: The press report then was that Government had ordered the Army in NEFA to push them out, not that it was intended to push them out, but they had ordered the Army to push out the Chinese.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That may be so; it might have been that. We had told the Army to push them out.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: You had issued instructions to the Army.

5. SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: I said that it did not have shoes for those high altitudes; I was referring to mountain boots with which they can work in snow. I have made my point very clear. I did not say that they had no shoes.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Everyone had stout boots.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: But stout boots do not work there.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: They do work; but it is true that for going in the snow, you do want snow boots.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: That was my complaint. That was all my complaint. They did not have snow boots.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Everyone had blankets, shoes, clothing etc. What happened was this; they did not take more blankets because they had to carry them. So, they said 'Send them by air afterwards'.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: But there is a Government communique asking from the people all those things, such as blankets, pullovers, and everything else.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Of course.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: That was after the debacle.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That is perfectly true.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: You had nothing.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: We were giving these not only to those people at the front but also to others, even to newcomers, because new people were also joining the Army. But everyone of them had two blankets, plus two more which they had to take but which they had left over, because they did not want to carry them and they had said 'Send them by air'.

SHRI RANGA: That was not enough.

6. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: It must not be too wide open.

SHRI HEM BARUA: They may walk in if it is too wide open.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Only a little open. Keep it a jar.

7. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Was it an impartial examination.

8. AN HON. MEMBER: Pakistan too.

OBITUARY REFERENCES

25 November 1963

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we meet here today under the shadow of shock and sorrow, To many of us it is a personal shock and grief. But the crime that has been committed was something more than a personal one. It was a crime against humanity. A man has been struck down in the prime of youth and achievement; a man of ideals, vision and courage, who sought to serve his own people as well as the larger causes of the world.

President Kennedy revived among his people the ideals enshrined in the American Constitution and in a changing world, sought to apply them to the problems of today. He endeavoured, not without success, to work for the removal of the tensions that burden and distract the world and to ensure an abiding peace. He devoted himself to the removal of injustice and inequalities among them. In his own great country, he laboured for civil liberty and worked so that Negroes might enjoy full freedom and opportunity without discrimination based on race or colour. In the wider world outside, a great part of which still suffers from poverty and lack of opportunities for growth, he threw his great energy and weight in favour of the development of underdeveloped countries, so that people everywhere should have the blessings of freedom and the advantages that modern science and technology give.

Wealth and prosperity came to his own country. To these President Kennedy added a deeper human and moral outlook which embraced in its scope the peoples of the world.

To these great causes he dedicated himself, and the picture of a great President emerged which brought a measure of hope to the peoples of the world. To his high office he gave lustre and grace and people in distant parts of the world looked upon him with hope and affection. The memory of his great predecessor Abraham Lincoln, the Emancipator, was revived, and in the confusions and conflicts of the present day world came a vision of the "self-evident truths" that all men are created equal and have certain inalienable rights, and till these are fully achieved the vision of the founders of the American Republic will not be realised in its completeness.

The gracious lady, his wife, to whom our thought must turn today in deepest sympathy, came to India, we had the privilege to give her an affectionate welcome. It was our hope that President Kennedy would also pay us a visit and he had himself expressed a wish to do so. That will not take place now, and an assassin's hand has

put an end to a life which had already flowered so well and which gave promise of greater achievement in the future.

A great President and a great man is dead, struck down by one of his own countrymen. We sorrow for this as indeed we must, but perhaps he has served the causes he cherished by his death even as he laboured for them in his life. Let us all draw inspiration from his fragrant memory and pay our homage to it.

These words which I have said, I am sure, represent not only my sentiments but the sentiment of all the Members here and all the Parties that are represented in this Parliament.

BACK NOTE

LXV. Obituary References, 25 November 1963

NIL

STATEMENT REGARDING INDIA'S REPRESENTATION AT FUNERAL OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

29 November, 1963

We were very anxious to send someone from here for the funeral of President Kennedy. But as it turned out, it became almost impossible for us to reach there in time. On the 23rd morning we heard about the assassination of President Kennedy. We took the normal steps of our flags being flown half-mast, etc. and we instructed anyhow that in addition to our Ambassador there, Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit might also attend the funeral. We did not know the date of the funeral. Immediately the next morning information came about the date of the funeral, which was the next day, 25th. We tried our best to find out how it could be possible for someone to go from here. Two names were suggested—the Vice-President's and mine, the Prime Minister's. The Vice-President was not even in Delhi. He was in Jabalpur. Apart from the names, we calculated how a person could go and get there in time for the funeral. We found it was not possible by any normal means. At the most, we could have reached London on the 25th morning and going from London to Washington would have taken many hours more. We would then have arrived in Washington after the funeral. So, reluctantly we came to the conclusion that it was not possible for any one from here to go there in time. The House knows the other steps that we took. The President, the Vice-President I, you, Sir, and many Members of this House went to the Memorial Service held at the American Embassy. This House adjourned for that day, and Government offices were also closed for that day.

BACK NOTE

- LXVI. Statement Regarding India's Representation at Funeral of President Kennedy, 29 November, 1963**

NIL

MOTION REGARDING REPORT ON MID-TERM APPRAISAL OF THIRD FIVE YEAR PLAN

11 December 1963

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have welcomed this debate, even though I have been somewhat surprised and, if I may say so, disappointed, at the approach of some of the Members to it.

There is the approach of some hon. Members who attacked the very basis of the idea of planning. It is perfectly open to them to hold any views, however much I may think them to be without the slightest foundation, base or sense.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹

Apart from that, it has been a real education for me to read—I am sorry I was not present here—Shri Masani's speech. It is so amazing in its lack of sense, lack of approach and of understanding of the whole concept of planning, the whole concept of progress, that I am surprised a person of his intelligence should have made it. Many other Members, even from this side, have concentrated on odd bits here and there. What they have said may be relevant, may be worth while, but the whole object of this exercise was to see it as a whole, to see the picture as a whole; in fact, not only to see this picture as a whole, but to see the picture of the last 12 years of planning as a whole, and then come and concentrate a little more on the last 21 years and then decide what we should do about it.

There is no doubt that there has been failure to achieve the targets in some matters and more especially, there is no doubt that one matter which concerns all of us most is agriculture in this respect, and we must look into it and try to improve it and get rid of the difficulties that have come in our way. That is so, but one must keep a balanced view about what has been happening.

Planning has been going on for last 12 years—the First and the Second Plans and now half the Third. I think it would be useful to see generally what has happened in the whole course of the planning period.

The first thing is that during this period we have succeeded largely in putting an end to the economic stagnation that India suffered from during the previous 50 years or more. That is no small achievement. Our national income increased by 42 per cent, agricultural production by 41 per cent, food production by 46 per cent, industrial production went up by 94 per cent. There has been considerable expansion of irrigation, power and transport. Through our steel plants,—to which more particularly Shri Masani objects; he thinks it is a vicious thing for the State to have steel plants—machine building plants etc., the foundations of industrial growth have been laid. There has been rapid advance in education, especially technical education, and in several other fields. There has been a spectacular advance in many branches of science and technology. In

spite of an increase of 21 per cent in our population, consumption levels rose; food consumption from 1800 calories per capita went up to 2100; cloth consumption from a little over 9 yards per capita per year at the beginning of the Plan to 14½ yards. Our health schemes have made remarkable progress. Malaria has been practically eliminated, and typhoid is greatly reduced. As a result of this, the death rate has gone down considerably, and the expectation of life has risen from 32 at the beginning of the forties to about 50 now.

These developments are significant as far as they go, very significant, and it will not be easy to find a parallel to all this change and development in any other country, developing country, situated as India is. But real importance of all this lies in all this being a base for future progress. We have laid the foundations on which progress in future might be faster.

Therefore, in looking at this two-and-a half year period—I would remind the House that nearly half that period was a period of emergency, about a year, which has cast special burdens on us, on our finances, on everything that we do—we must keep the whole picture, because it must be remembered that although planning is a continuous process, the normal progress in a five year plan cannot be measured as if one-fifth of the plan progress takes place in the first year, another one-fifth in the second year and so on. Usually, at the beginning of the Plan, at the beginning of any scheme, foundations are laid, but the actual results do not come out till the end of the period. It is possible—I cannot say what will happen—that in the remaining two years of the Plan, much of the ground may be covered, or, may not be covered. Therefore, I would beg the House to consider all this planning business in proper perspective, and in a balanced way.

If I may say so, looking carefully at what has been done, I am naturally disappointed at many things, more especially in agriculture. The reasons for that are a different matter. Agriculture is the toughest problem before any country, developed or undeveloped. The most developed countries are suffering very much from difficulties in agriculture today, as the House probably knows. Even highly advanced countries are suffering from it. You may apportion blame between Planning Commission, the Government of India, myself and the State Government, and it is not because of blame that I am saying this, but ultimately the thing depends upon the farmer, the actual cultivator, and ultimately, the question is of pulling him out of a certain rut, helping him to do so, giving him incentives and help and all that and to bring about a mental change in him.

The whole object of the community development movement, which has often been criticised, was to do that, and I do submit that in spite of many failings, it has done that to a good extent and it is doing that, and it ultimately led to Panchayati Raj, which cannot bear fruit immediately, but which is a revolutionary movement, which will undoubtedly bear good fruit.

So, I do not propose to enter into the many criticisms made, but I am sure that all that has been said will be carefully considered by those who have to deal with it,

either in the Planning Commission or in the Government. More particularly, as I said, I am very much concerned about the steps to be taken in regard to agriculture, but I would rather deal with the general approach to this question.

Apart from this perspective view which I beg the House to consider, I would say something about planning for the special benefit of hon. Member Shri Masani. Planning has been talked about for a long time, but it first came in the all India picture by the appointment of a National Planning Committee in 1938, I think, and that worked for two or three years.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX²

By Shri Subhash Chandra Bose and he was pleased to appoint me as the chairman of that committee. Unfortunately, that committee, although it worked hard, could not work easily or smoothly, because from time to time, many of us members were in prison. The British Government came in the way. Nevertheless it did a good deal of useful work.

Very soon after there came a plan which is often known as the Bombay Plan, produced by some of the leading, top-ranking, industrialists of this country. I am sure hon. Member Shri Masani must remember that. It is interesting to see what that plan, produced by industrialists wholly, with whom he is associated so closely, said. He objects to our laying stress on two things, I think—heavy industries, and also the public sector. I would like to quote a little about the approach of this Bombay Plan, the industrialists' plan. This Plan argued for a bold approach, to economic development with special stress on the growth of heavy and basic industries—exactly what the hon. Member Shri Masani objects to—such as power, fuel, steel, machine-building plants etc., in addition to agriculture. They are regarded as being crucial for sustaining the satisfactory growth of the economy. In fact, the need of planning was accepted in it. Of course, they may object to the people who plan. The need for planning was accepted and special stress was laid on heavy industries. The strategy of our plan has been based on this. I need not say much about agriculture because we accept agriculture is the basic thing and it must be helped to advance. Although the results in agriculture have not been so obvious, it has advanced very much and will advance rapidly in view of the change in mentality of our peasantry. Foundations have been laid and if we act upon them the advance should be rapid. We have built up some kind of infrastructure in the field of power, transport and technical skills which should help.

Chiefly criticism has been made of that high priority has been given for basic industries and there was criticism of the rule of the public sector also. Even the Bombay plan of the big industrialists laid great stress on basic industries, as indeed those who study this question must. It is only a political approach which ignores the facts of the situation and which leads astray hon. Members who presumably ought to know better. The role of the public sector—that again is not for me to defend. It has been so often placed before this House and accepted by it that to go through it all

again seems rather discourteous to the House. Now, how is the Plan produced? The Planning Commission considers it in great detail. Today, it is working on the Fourth Plan which is to commence years hence. It consults all the States; the officers and Ministers discuss with them and ultimately a draft is produced and is fully considered and then placed before the National Development Council in which all the States are represented. Then it comes before Parliament finally, probably twice, first the interim draft and then the final Plan. Then it is accepted. It goes through repeated phases of consideration at all levels. Quite apart from the fact that we want the draft interim plan to be considered even by Panchayati Raj organisations and numerous planning boards or planning committees, people from the universities and others are invited to consider it and send suggestions. Thus in formulating the plan a very large measure of consultation takes place with public men, experts, university people, students, senior students and rural areas and panchayats. Even so, some better method could be evolved to associate the public even more. Undoubtedly the more we bring them into the picture, the better. But the House will realise that the Plan as evolved right from the first Plan onwards is essential, inspite of some people in this House not liking it being called the national Plan.

I am glad that hon. Acharya displayed that he does not like the Plan; it is well-known; it is notorious. In this matter the hon. Acharya and his few straggling colleagues stand rather isolated. Mr. Masani threatened us that the whole people will rise against us and push us out of seats of authority etc., because of the Plan. What the people will do we shall see. But may I suggest in all humility that now or later or ever they will not come in large numbers to cheer Mr. Masani's gospel whatever happens.

The hon. Member has expressed his opinion as I have expressed mine and I too have some knowledge of the Indian people. My point is that planning has not only been accepted by the country and by Parliament once but repeatedly, after full discussion and it is rather odd for this basic thing to be attacked at this stage. Secondly, the strategy of the Plan is a good strategy. There may be many mistakes here and there but you cannot do without the Planning Commission. I would have often criticised it about its bureaucratic tendencies, this and that. I should like here and now to say that I am full of admiration for the work the Planning Commission has done. Some things are beyond the understanding of some hon. Members.

..... **xxx**

..... **xxx**

..... **xxx³**

I have criticised the growth of bureaucracy, the large numbers, etc. But in the last 12 years the Planning Commission, apart from such mistakes as it has committed—everybody makes mistakes—has performed an essential task; without it we could not have progressed. As my colleague the Finance Minister pointed out, we are a federal structure and it has served to bring the various States together and have an integrated planning. If it had not been there, the Central Government could not have done their job because immediately difficulties would have arisen that the Central Government

was encroaching on the rights of the States. It is an advisory body; I repeat it and the States and the Centre can approach them and discuss things with them. Almost everything that they have said about the States is after consideration and after reaching an agreement with the States.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁴

There had been two approaches to the Planning Commission, apart from Mr. Masani's approach which we may ignore as of no importance. One group says that the Planning Commission must consist of Ministers only, and no outsiders. Shri Hanumanthaiya, I think, said that. The other approach is that it should consist of experts only and no Minister should be there. These are contradictory approaches. I think that a Planning Commission consisting of Ministers only would not serve the purpose at all. It cannot function properly, and apart from the fact that the Ministers are heavily worked, they could not approach the States as the Planning Commission does. They cannot sit down and give their whole time to it as the Planning Commission is supposed to do. If you have only experts, that might be possible, but the connection between the Government of the day and the experts would not be a very close one. Therefore, it was advised that the Planning Commission should consist of whole-timers plus two or three members of the Government, members of the Cabinet so that this liaison should be kept up and they should be able to say what the Government's reactions are to various proposals. But essentially it is the permanent members of the Planning Commission, full-time members, who are working hard. I have been Chairman of it. Frankly, I am invited to it once in two months to attend some policy meeting. I go there. I cannot, and it is beyond my capacity to, deal with day-to-day problems. The Planning Commission has got a body of advisers, experts, panels and others. It may be that they can reduce their advisers or it may be that better people can be appointed. But we are considering principles and not individuals.

I think that, first of all, a Planning Commission is absolutely essential. I say we cannot move without it, and if any Government tries to move without it, it will come to trouble. Secondly, broadly, the composition of the Planning Commission as it is, is helpful: that is, a number of whole-time people working and some Ministers associated with it closely, and sometimes other Ministers also are invited when their questions come up. It is helpful. The whole question of the Planning Commission can always be reviewed as to how we can improve it. We propose to review it from time to time; we are doing it.

Here, I would like to pay my tribute to the work done in the Planning Commission by the previous Deputy Chairman, our present Home Minister. He has devoted himself to this work with extreme enthusiasm and devotion and practically built up the Planning Commission.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁵

Apart from the whole timers there, only Cabinet Ministers are members there. Their function is exactly the same as that of others, except that they could not afford time. They give certain ideas, and they listen to ideas, and on important matters they give their views or they initiate; they can function like any other member. Normally their function is generally limited to basic matters, that is, they would not normally sit down with the State Ministers and discuss with them and the Planning Commission, which absorbs a great deal of the Planning Commission's time. They join in a discussion of the whole Planning Commission just like any other member. Their views carry weight no doubt but they do not dictate to the Planning Commission. Obviously, in a matter involving finances, the Finance Minister's views carry great weight, but it is not much good that the Planning Commission decides something which cannot be accepted or acted upon by our Finance Minister.

So, it should be remembered that the Planning Commission is an advisory body. But it is true, being an expert body such as it is, its advice carries great weight; its advice given to the States, purely advisory, does carry weight.

I would like to point out one thing even in this. If you plan you must, broadly speaking, know what you are planning for, and whom you are planning for. You must have some picture of the future. Some people who object to planning, presumably have a picture as it is today—there have been gradual improvements here and there, but more or less as it is today; the topdogs remain as topdogs and the bottomdogs remain at the bottom, —with a little more facilities here and there. That is the essential point: what kind of picture you have for the future. Of course, we can generally say we want good life for all our people. That is a vague statement to which almost anybody would agree. But if you think that out, it ultimately leads you,—it leads me anyhow and I think the great majority in this House and the country—to some kind of socialistic structure of our fabric. Socialism has become, like many other words, rather a vague word. I admit it, because even now some capitalist countries talk about it in their own terms. Even Shri Masani talks about some kind of socialism in which the present order will continue. Now, therefore, we have to put it broadly: we want to plan for a socialist State. We want to plan for as great a measure of equality as possible. We want to plan for equality of opportunity for everybody in India, and we want to do all this in the democratic structure of the State. I think that we shall succeed. I cannot say how long it will take us.

Meanwhile, naturally, the major problems for us are to increase production; only then can we supply the goods that people want, and keep an eye on distribution so that it should not result in heavy accumulations on the one side and lack of them on the other. These are the broad approaches. We are not tied up to any doctrinaire system of socialism. But these are the broad approaches which I think are fundamental to socialism. These are broad approaches which are accepted now in the greater part of the world and even in the capitalist world, much more so; there is no developing country that I know of which does not accept them. It is inevitable. There is no other

way. If we adopted the normal capitalist approach, it would lead us nowhere; I submit to this House with great confidence.

Therefore, we have adopted a mixed structure. We have a private sector and a public sector, the public sector being the most important and dominating the economic policy. Otherwise there is no point in having a public sector helping the private sector because we want all kinds of production; we want it to be helped. As a matter of fact, in our economy, what is the private sector? The whole of our land is private sector. It is an enormous business. All our small industries are very very largely in the private sector. The whole conflict comes—not conflict but a certain pull—in two ways, about certain basic industries which some of the private sector have; some of them want more, because not only they might prove to be very profitable but we give them economic power. I think it is highly objectionable and it ought to be prevented, namely, economic power to be in the hands of a small group of persons, however able or good they might be. That is our broad approach. If you put this approach to the Planning Commission, immediately they have to deal with questions of production both in the private sector and public sector, question of preventing accumulations, etc. They have not done that very effectively, I will confess. I hope they will do so in future more effectively and our Government will do so more effectively too, in spite of the difficulties that may arise from hon. Members opposite.

Even in this report, Members have laid great stress on the failures of it. Mr. Masani's view of India today is a very dismal view.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁶

Quite right. The planning that we have done in the last few years—not 2½ years only —has created an infrastructure on which we can base progress later or in regard to power, transport and technical skills—it is very important —and has created a climate, if I may remind the House, of unprecedented buoyancy even in our private enterprise. It is well known that private enterprise has prospered as it has never done previously ever since we have planned, for the simple reason that they have certain assured things to aim at and they are profitable.

But as I said even in these years, we have laid stress on some failures, but rather ignored the success that we have attained even in these 2½ years in many respects. Agriculture is the major thing where we have not succeeded in the last two years for various reasons, some in our control and some not in our control. Agriculture still depends on natural factors, which are not wholly within our control. They can be lessened somewhat. I think we should give very special attention to agriculture, but that is basic. I have mentioned some of these things.

I mentioned the previous Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission and expressed my admiration for the work he has done for planning. I should like to welcome the new Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission.

The philosophy guiding the Swatantra Party is, I think, that of free enterprise and free market forces. The influence of free market forces is quite inadequate to

20 years ago. About half a dozen or ten, the biggest industrialists in India then and now were interested in it.

“It is an important part of our proposals regarding industrial development that in the initial stages, the attention should be directed primarily to the creation of industries for the production of power and capital goods. Nothing has more seriously hindered the development of India’s industrial resources than the absence of these basic industries and we consider it essential that this lapse should be remedied in as short a time as possible. Apart from its importance of quickening the pace of industrial development in India, it will have the effect of ultimately reducing our dependence on foreign countries for plant and machinery required by us and consequently of reducing our requirements of external finance.”

I hope that hon. Members opposite the Swatantra Party will ponder over what some of the people they admire greatly have said about it.

Planning, as has been said, is a continuous process. What is done today bears fruit much later. Thus, the habit of viewing the success of the Plan in relation to the target of a particular year betrays a lack of understanding of the dynamic processes of development, as in the very next year sometimes the target may be exceeded. The lessons have to be drawn are, the need for strengthening technical organisations for detailed planning and execution of projects and the necessity for advanced planning to take full account of the inevitable time lags. This is, if I may say so, one of the failures of our planning in the past that projects have not been technically examined at an early enough stage and also perspective planning has not been thought of as much as it should be. Now, to some extent we are doing it because, as I said, the Fourth Plan is being considered now and the consideration means most careful working out of the Plan. It is not a question of putting down big schemes—do this and do that—but each scheme, each project, is being worked out in smallest detail as to how many engineers will be employed there, what class of engineers, how many scientists should be there and all that. That has to be done and ought to be done for every project. These are the major lessons apart from the many other improvements that we should try to make. But we must strengthen technical organisation for detailed planning and execution of projects. I have not referred to the fact that—we plan here—the States’ planning structure are rather not very advanced and it is the States who have to deal with these things that are planned and we have to try to improve the planning in the States. I will draw the special attention of the House to perspective planning—planning is, in effect, perspective planning; only it should be more perspective than as hitherto is being done.

Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain referred very specially, I think, to family planning and that only two pages are devoted to it in this report. I do not quite understand him. I am all in favour of family planning. But how this report should have dealt with, in ten or twenty or hundred pages, I do not understand. As a matter of fact,

at the present moment there is a conference being held in Vigyan Bhavan which I had the honour to inaugurate yesterday. It is the first Asian Population Conference; it is the first conference of this kind ever held anywhere dealing with population problems. It appears that except one country which has gone ahead in Asia —possibly elsewhere too— that is Japan, the next in Asia which has done most in the matter is India. That is one reason why they have held the conference here and many people want to know what we are doing, what success we have attained, etc. I think, we have made considerable progress, basic progress, although naturally the success you can measure only after a number of years and India is such a huge country that every work that you may do is lost in the multitude of the human beings here.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹⁰

Any apparatus, any method, as I was discussing the other day, costs about Rs. 4 or Rs. 5 a month. Can you ask the masses of India to spend Rs. 5 a month? There the difficulty arises. It has to be cheap and some measure of education is necessary not only to understand it but even to use any method.

I would like to tell Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain that a good deal of research work has been done in India—good research work.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹¹

I do not remember what the report says. But a good deal of research work has been done; may be, it should be more. But we are one of the countries where research work has been done apart from the Rockefeller Foundation in America and one or two other countries.

There is one thing that I should say where I am disappointed, if I am disappointed at anything; we should, of course, try our hardest. But I am specially disappointed in regard to agriculture, although I do believe that seeds have been sown which will show results and rapid results in the future. But, on the whole, looking at the picture I am not at all dismal about it; I am not at all disappointed about it. Only, many difficulties appear which we had not seen previously. We have to face them.

..... XXX XXX XXX¹²

What I was going to say was this. One thing that distresses me very greatly is that although I am convinced that the great majority of our population has bettered itself, may be, a little, and is better and is eating much more food than before and has more calories and more clothes, yet, there is a goodly number of people in India who have not profited by planning, and whose poverty is abysmal and most painful, and I do think that some method should be found to remedy the situation. The normal

planner proceeds like this; he makes a theoretical approach. It is very good in theory, but it sometimes ignores certain human factors. He says that on this thing we want production, and the best way to have production is to do something, say, to put up a factory or something in a place where it will yield most results. The result is that they go on gathering these factories and things like that in the special places. And as they gather things, it becomes easier to start another factory there. That may be logical, and they may produce more, but it is not very human, considering the size of India.

Also, I begin to think more and more of Mahatma Gandhi's approach. It is odd that I am mentioning his name in this connection; that is to say, I am entirely an admirer of the modern machine, and I want the best machinery and the best technique, but taking things as they are in India, however rapidly we advance in the machine age—and we will do so—the fact remains that large numbers of our people are not touched and will not be touched by it for a considerable time. Some other method has to be evolved so that they become partners in production even though the production apparatus of theirs may not be efficient as compared to modern technique, but we must use that, otherwise it is wasted. That idea has to be borne in mind. We should think more of these very poor countrymen of ours and do something to improve their lot as quickly as we can. That is troubling me a great deal.

Ultimately, it is a question mostly of the agricultural masses, and I think that agriculture, unless it is allied to some other industry, will often not bring rapid results. I think that animal husbandry is one thing which has to progress and which can be allied to agriculture. Also, there can be small industries there. There are many things that can be done, and we hope we shall try to do that. But I hope that the House would remember the magnitude of the task before us. It is stupendous, and we must approach it in the proper spirit. We should not approach it with frustrated minds. That is not the way to approach any task, especially the biggest task. But we have to approach it with confidence, with strength and with a belief in our people and we should try to put this faith across to them, and if we have it in an ample measure, they will also be affected and they will also get it. Of course, we should try to learn all the lessons from this report and from other sources as to how to improve this method of planning, because without planning I do not think that we shall make any real progress, certainly not the kind of progress that we desire.

BACK NOTE

LXVII. Motion Regarding Report on Mid-term Appraisal of Third Five Year Plan, 11 December, 1963

1. SHRI RANGA (Chittoor): Nobody has opposed the idea of planning from our side. We are opposed to your planning.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That was not what the hon. Member's colleague, Shri M. R. Masani, said in his speech.

SHRI M. R. MASANI (Rajkot): Please quote it.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: He objected. He said that our having a Planning Commission is opposed to the concept of all democracy.

SHRI M. R. MASANI: That is true.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That is you do not object to planning, but you do not want to have any agency for planning.

SHRI M. R. MASANI: Only an advisory body, an expert body.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The Planning Commission is an advisory agency, nothing more.

SHRI M. R. MASANI: No, no.

2. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: By Netaji Bose.

3. SHRI KASHL RAM GUPTA (Alwar): How do bureaucracy and admiration go side by side?

4. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: How can it be advisory when the Prime Minister himself is the Chairman of the Commission? There should be a nonofficial Chairman, then.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: But surely the Prime Minister is also capable of advising.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: No, no. You are more the executor of the Plan.

5. Dr. M. S. ANEY (Nagpur): May I put a question? What is the precise function of our Ministers who are invited to the Planning Commission? What is the exact function of the Ministers: whether they would suggest improvements or supply information or whether they try to supply them with ideas?

6. SHRI TYAGI (Dehra Dun): May I remind him that Mr. Masani was once the closest friend of the Prime Minister and his own disciple?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That is not quite correct. But that is the tragedy of it that people can go astray even with the best of tuition. But you can always live in hope. Mr. Masani knows how to change rapidly.

SHRI M. R. MASANI: You have to change with the times; you cannot live in the past.

7. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Have a clean and efficient administration also.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I entirely agree with the hon. Member, but I would say—I say so with some confidence—that all this talk of corruption in India is exaggerated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Ghosts of Jaipur!

8. SHRI RAMSEWAK YADAV: Corruption there does not authorize you to justify the corruption here.

9. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Eliminate corrupt minds first.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am not accusing hon. Members with corrupt mind.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: You referred to frustration on this side. Eliminate corrupt mind on that side first; otherwise your Plan will fail, I warn you.

SHRI TYAGI: Let us cooperate.

SHRI BAGDI (HISAR): Your expenditure is high.

10. SHRI KARNI SINGHJI (Bikaner): Is the Prime Minister satisfied that the family planning message has actually reached the masses? I think, very few people know about it.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have just said that in India the population is so big and in such matters so ignorant that most messages only reach a relatively small number compared to the population. But, I think, the progress made here is not unsatisfactory and, if I may say so, the family planning is not the business of putting up a factory to produce certain contraceptive devices. Here, any question of birth control is intimately connected with education.

SHRI KARNI SINGHJI: The message of family planning has to reach the masses. They have to believe that it is wrong in our present high increase. Context to have too many children.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I entirely agree with the hon. Member. It is also to reach the people who are supposed to be not the masses but the classes. Even they have not got it yet.

SHRI KARNI SINGHJI: Everybody.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: What I am saying is that the essential condition of birth control, etc., on a big scale is education and a certain economic status and a certain growth in our economy.

SHRI KARNI SINGHJI: Our news reels carry no such message. There must be something in the news reels also.

11. SHRI A.P. JAIN (Tumkur): That is not what the mid-term appraisal says.

12. SHRI MAURYA (Aligarh): You may be disappointed or not, Government may be disappointed or not, but the farmers and the landless labourers are disappointed just like anything.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: No doubt, the hon. Member has helped in that disappointment.

SHRI TYAGI: Is there any intention to make a village-wise survey of the possibilities?

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

13 APRIL, 1964

Mr. Speaker, I am glad of this debate on External Affairs and I have specially welcomed the criticisms made by the Opposition.

Apart from the criticisms of administration, there has, however, hardly been much said constructively about the present policies pursued. My hon. colleague, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, has dealt with many of these criticisms. I propose to refer only to some major policy matters.

We have to face today difficult questions. Many new problems have arisen in the international sphere. The more difficult the problems we face, the more it is necessary that we should view them calmly and dispassionately and arrive at specific conclusions. It does not help much merely to get excited about them, and to deal with them in an agitated way.

Acharya Kripalani's speech showed that he is still tied up with the old happenings about Chinese attack on Tibet and our attitude to it. These matters have been repeatedly discussed here, and I do not wish to go back to them at this stage. The position in the world has changed considerably in recent months, and we have to face the situation as it is.

Acharya Kripalani's chief proposal appears to have been aimed at our giving up non-alignment. Non-alignment is not a basic policy of ours or of any country. It is our reaction to events, and more particularly, our desire to maintain our independence of thought and action. It arose chiefly because of the two Power blocs headed by the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and our desire not to get entangled with them. To some extent that continues, but many changes have taken place in these alignments.

The USA and the Soviet Union are not so bitterly opposed to each other as they were, and they are growing closer to each other. Among the two Power blocs, internal differences have arisen, and in some cases they amount almost to a split. Thus, the Soviet Union and China, the two Communist Powers, have practically separated from each other, and are bitterly opposed to each other. In the Western bloc, some differences have also arisen. Meanwhile a large number of newly independent countries have come into existence, and most of them adhere to the policy of non-alignment.

From any point of view, it would appear that non-alignment has not only succeeded in the past, but is even more desirable today. It surprises me, therefore, that Acharya Kripalani should at this stage oppose it.

Non-alignment is not merely not joining a military bloc, but it affects economic and other policies. It is especially psychological. We are on friendly terms with the leaders of these blocs, and are receiving substantial aid from them. To align ourselves would be to tie ourselves with many of their policies, with which we may not agree. It would mean also some kind of a break with our relations with the other group. That would be utterly wrong.

In addition, we have to remember that a large number of new countries as well as old ones are tied to this policy of non-alignment. It would mean our cutting ourselves adrift from the main trends of world opinion.

As the House knows, it has been decided to hold a conference of non-aligned countries later this year. This is a desirable development, and we are wholly associated with it.

Recently, the rift between the Soviet Union and China has grown greatly, and the Soviets have criticised the Chinese invasion of India and China's policies.

Shri Nath Pai has spoken vehemently against our foreign policy, but his vehemence has been directed more to our administration and other matters. He has spoken like a *prima donna*. I might add that he has criticised the Annual Report of our Ministry. I must confess that this Report leaves much to be desired. Shri Nath Pai has laid great stress on the Report referring to the visit of our hockey team to Kabul. I may inform him that the visit of the hockey team at the Jashan time in Afghanistan was greatly appreciated by the Afghans, and has therefore considerable importance.

We are always concerned with the progress or otherwise of the conference on disarmament, as this is of vital consequence to the world. For the present, however, our chief concern is about our two neighbours China and Pakistan. Some Members of the Opposition have accused us frequently of surrender and appeasement both to China and Pakistan. I am most surprised to hear these charges. Strength does not lie in strong language and shouting, but in other matters. It is perfectly true that we want peaceful settlements of our troubles with China and Pakistan, and we shall endeavour to realise them, however difficult they may seem today. Taking a long distance view it is essential that we should exist peacefully with these two neighbours of ours, more particularly with Pakistan. We can not live in conflict for a long time to come. I hope a time may come when India and Pakistan might draw closer to each other; there is no other way. To talk of exchange of population is, I think, utterly wrong. Not only would it be an extraordinarily difficult undertaking but it will not solve our problems. The two countries would face each other as bitter enemies, threatening each other's existence. I do not know what the leaders of Pakistan have in view apart from their present aims. I have a feeling that both Pakistan and China have larger objectives in view in regard to India. I do not think that either of them will be able to achieve these objectives and we shall have to be prepared for all attempts on their part and to gain them. It is clear that peaceful settlements of these conflicts would be desirable but

such settlements must be in keeping with the honour and integrity of India. That is an essential aspects to be borne in mind always. Keeping that in mind we should always strive for peaceful settlements.

In regard to China we have made it clear—and Parliament has approved of it—that if the Colombo proposals are accepted by China, we shall be prepared to discuss with them our conflict and disputes. In this matter I should like to make clear one development which took place some time ago. This was referred to by Mrs. Bandaranaike in one of her recent letters to us we are asked that if the Chinese vacated all their posts in the demilitarised area in Ladakh would we consider this a fulfilment of the Colombo proposals. This was first mentioned to me by two representatives of Lord Russell who came to me last summer. To them, I answered that we might be prepared consider this proposal if China made it. Since then no such proposal has been made by China. In the Colombo proposals it was stated that in this demilitarised area of Ladakh both parties should have by agreement an equal number of posts. It was possible to consider that this was satisfied if both parties by agreement decided to have no posts at all in this area. I had clearly stated to Lord Russell's representatives and later to Mrs. Bandaranaike that this could be considered by us if a proper approach was made to us by China. No such approach has been made and, therefore, the position remains the same as before.

In regard to Jakarta Conference which is now being held, Acharya Ranga has taken strong objection to our participation in this Conference because China would also be there. I am wholly unable to accept this argument. It would mean cutting ourselves away from important international conferences because China may happen to be there. It would mean some kind of discourtesy to the many other nations that went there and took part in it. Shri Nath Pai, has, I think, said that we had decided not to go to it and at the last moment sent one of our Ministers to it. That is quite untrue. I do not think that at any time I had said that we would not attend the conference. What I had probably said was that I personally would not go there. It was our intention to send our team under the leadership of Deputy Minister of External Affairs. A few days before the Conference, we decided to send the Minister of Food and Agriculture, Sardar Swaran Singh, as the leader of our team, and I am glad that he agreed to go. There was thus no question of our not going there, but only as to who should go. The Jakarta Conference is being attended by a large number of representatives of countries, and Sardar Swarn Singh is taking a leading part in it.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX¹

It is one thing not to favour it; but it is an other thing to boycott it.

There was no question, thus, of our not going there. We should go there and Sardar Swaran Singh is taking a leading part in it. Not to go there for us would have been to miss an important opportunity to put forth our view and to some extent influence the conference.

I have often thought these days of Gandhiji, how he would have dealt with our existing problems, specially those with Pakistan. It is difficult to say what he would have advised, possibly, in the course of the last 15 or 16 years he might have devised some method or other to deal with them. But I am sure of one thing, namely, that having regard to our ultimate aim of peace and friendship with Pakistan, he would not have advised any action on our part which should come in the way of this.

We must keep this ultimate aim in view and not be led away by momentary passions. It is true that at the present moment the fate of the minorities in East Pakistan bears down upon us terribly and we must do all we can to help them; but if we do something which adds to their troubles and misfortune, that will be neither good for the present nor for the future.

I would beg the House to distinguish between two things. One is that we have to take certain steps, however undesirable they may be and however they may burden us. That we have to do. But in taking them we must not do anything to create an atmosphere which comes in the way of any future arrangement between India and Pakistan. I would have hoped that India and Pakistan would be able to come together much closer, even constitutionally closer. I do not say so because this annoys Pakistan that we are trying to upset them. I do not wish to upset them; I wish them well, but there is no other way for India and Pakistan to live except to live at peace. It may take years to achieve that; that is a different matter. But I believe a new generation is rising up in Pakistan which looks differently at this problem than the older generation. I believe, in East Pakistan specially, there are all kinds of movements which do not like these old methods. It is, therefore, particularly unfortunate that East Pakistan is a particularly weak spot in the Pakistan chain and possibly this is one of the reasons why the Pakistan authorities have made East Pakistan the special place where these atrocities have occurred so as to get East Pakistan tied up with these atrocities and to move their thinking away from the other trends of thought in East Pakistan.

I hope that this Home Ministers Conference which has occurred papers of which have been placed before this House by our Home Minister will resume its meeting soon and will ultimately arrive at some conclusion which will remove or lessen this great tension that exists. I am sure that our Home Minister will agree with me that the Home Minister of Pakistan who came here struck me as being very earnest about it and trying his utmost to put an end to these troubles. Of course, he was tied up by various factors and he had to go back by a certain date. But I do hope, at the next meeting they will get over these difficulties and come to some arrangement and agreement.

I hope, the House will realise that however angry we may get—and we have enough reason to get angry—anger does not solve the problem of Pakistan and India. It will never solve it, whether it is today or a year hence or 10 or 20 years hence. It has to be solved on a basis of friends who have fallen out coming together, of not agreeing with each other, of disapproving of each other occasionally but

nevertheless remaining friends and cooperating. That is the only way to solve this problem.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁵

I know the people of Pakistan fairly well. I have known them in the past, not now. I have great respect for them. They are very decent folk. Of course, when you excite them with religious slogans, nobody remains decent; they become brutal. Everybody becomes brutal, whether it is the Hindu or the Muslim. We have seen what has happened in Rourkela and Jamshedpur. It is scandalous in the extreme that anybody should do what our people have done there. This kind of a thing does more disservice to India than anything that might happen across our borders and elsewhere because that is put in the balance as if this is happening on both sides and they are both pretty bad. I hope that the worst of this has passed and that we shall gradually—it will take a little time—get back to more normal behaviour.

As for China, that is a very difficult thing we have to face. We have to face it by strengthening ourselves, which we are doing and which we have done to a large extent, and by relying on ourselves more and more— certainly getting help from other people but relying ultimately on ourselves. The moment we give up that reliance we are lost. I do not know how Acharya Kripalani imagines that somebody else, however great the power may be, may defend us on our borders. Nobody can defend us; not the greatest power in the world can defend our borders except ourselves. It is well to remember this always and to keep our people to remember this so that they may not become weak and think of, what is called, the Maginot line or some such thing and that others will help them.

If I may say so with all respect and humility, we must not become too self-righteous. We think that every evil is being done by Pakistan and China and that we are completely free from any wrong doing. We are not free from wrong doing. In the Question Hour many questions were asked about intrusions of air space. There was some excitement when my colleague, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri said that there have been more something or other.

As a matter of fact, the statement that there have been more on Pakistan side is completely correct, from the point of view of the United Nations. The United Nations have received complaints of our intrusions from Pakistan and from us about intrusions by Pakistan. They have got both and they are receiving them constantly about these intrusions. The big difference is that our intrusions into Pakistan do not give rise to questions in Parliament; the others do. The United Nations' observers give their judgment, although as far as I remember certainly the majority are in our favour, a minority is against us too. Namely, that we intruded in their territory. Those questions do not come here. Nobody is interested in them.

..... XXX

..... XXX

..... XXX⁶

I am afraid, we are growing very self-righteous and we imagine that we are completely in the right and others are in the wrong. That is not a good thing. We

should always think of our wrong actions that we do. That is more important than the wrong actions that are committed against us. Wrong actions that we do betray our mentality, how we think, how we act, etc. They delude us. They do not delude the world. The world gets to know all these facts.

Our publicity is often criticised, and rightly so—I do not say it is good publicity—but our publicity abroad suffers very much from our self-righteous attitude. The result is that even many of the truthful things that we say are sometimes not believed. They say, “These fellows are self-righteous”.

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**

..... **XXX**⁷

BACK NOTE

LXVIII. Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs, 13 April 1964

1. SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): You told Parliament many times and last time also you said that you did not think that it would be, useful for us to go or that any purpose would be served by our attending that Conference.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have not got the words I used. I may have said at that time that it was not decided to hold it. It was decided long after that. When it was decided recently to hold that conference and we knew a large number of countries will go, we had no choice. We felt we ought to go and put forward our point of view.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad): The Prime Minister has often said that he prefers a Belgrade type of conference to a Bandung type of conference. He has never favoured a Bandung type of conference.

2. SHRI NATH PAI: Your offer must have gone so late that by that time he had accepted Pakistan's offer.

3. SHRI HEM BARUA (Gauhati) : Sir, on a previous occasion he gave us the impression that whenever the Seventh Fleet of the United States wants to enter the Indian Ocean our Government shall be informed. In this particular case, we are not informed but they are coming with nuclear weapons.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is so that we are not informed. But, according to the report in the press, they are not coming anywhere near India.

SHRI H.N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta Central): Are we sending any protest against it?

SHRI RANGA (Chittoor): Why should we?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The question of sending a protest will arise...

SHRI H.N. MUKERJEE: If they are here, according to the press reports, and they are carrying nuclear weapons, what are you going to do about it? They might be in the Indian Ocean somewhere.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Indian Ocean is a very big thing.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: Even so, are we reconciled to the nuclear weapons floating all over the place, somewhere near India, within the reach of India?

SHRI RANGA: They are coming here as friends. Is it not?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: They are not coming here at all.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: It is only three miles of territorial water and it does not matter in this instance.

4. SHRI NATH PAI: It is because the Government functions slowly and haltingly. If only the Government had promptly issued a contradiction after it was repeated and reproduced in two or three papers, this rumour could have been stopped once and for all. Yet, Government failed to act promptly in this very delicate and explosive matter.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Even though it was in the newspapers, it took government sixteen days to enquire into the matter. That is how you function.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member will realise that just because a news item has appeared in the press.

SHRI BAGDI (HISAR): It shows that the Government itself tried to publicise it, else they could have refuted this news article.

SHRI U.M. TRIVEDI (Mandsaur): Why should the Arab countries feel disheartened by this news item? Even if such things take place, these activities are carried on by nefarious people and not at governmental level.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The thing is so absurd, absurd in every way that it is difficult to deny even.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated Anglo-Indian): Your own Ministers circulate such stories. Your Minister of Information and Broadcasting, to my horror, circulated an utterly gruesome story to us. I tackled him "why do you regale us with this sort of thing?" and he was justifying it by saying "competition in barbarism". He is your chief storyteller.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: The Minister of Rehabilitation said "no woman or child is safe in Pakistan"— these were his exact words.

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA (The Minister of Works, Housing and Rehabilitation): What I said in this House was—and I will repeat it outside—that when I went to the Garo Hills and Mana, stories of this nature were reported to me. I have never made a statement of that nature.

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH : We will bring it up later.

SHRI NATH PAI: I hope the Government will show more altherness in future.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: We have every right to feel angered about what is happening in East Pakistan and do what we can to help the unfortunate refugees who are coming from there. But we must not forget that something very horrible has

happened in India too, of which we should be thoroughly ashamed—in Orissa and Bihar and partly in Calcutta. By these things we are playing into the hands of Pakistan which wants such troubles to happen.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Because you failed to take precautionary measures earlier.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Let us hear the reply.

SHRI HEM BARUA: He has been repeating this over and over again—what has happened in India. I say it is because of Government's failure to take steps in advance this is happening.

5. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: If they will not reciprocate, what shall be? That is the difficulty.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member is completely right. We have been trying to do that; they do not reciprocate. In spite of their not reciprocating we have to do it and force them to this.

SHRI HEM BARUA: How do you force them?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Force them psychologically, by having goodwill, by showing how we function in our country, by putting an example before them and their people of good behaviour there.

SHRI HEM BARUA: They have refused to learn any lesson from us of good behaviour.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am very sorry, the hon. Member has very poor opinion of human beings and human nature.

SHRI HEM BARUA: But our unilateral goodness is interpreted as cowardice by Pakistan.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Let us now set a good example.

6. SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Will the Prime Minister lay on the Table a statement giving those cases where it was against us? I can not believe it.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: You do not believe what?

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: That there are instances when the United Nations' military observers' verdict went against us.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: You may not believe it, but I am telling you the fact that of all the charges made on most of them the judgment was in favour and against Pakistan. But there were a good number where the judgment was against us, in favour of Pakistan. I am talking about the United Nations' observers. Whether they were true or not is for me to say. But these things . . .

SHRI HEM BARUA: We should have a statement about that. This is the first time that we are told about that.

7. SHRI HEM BARUA: Why don't you put it right?

SHRI RANGA: Publicity is asleep.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: If I may say so, it is Mr. Hem Barua's attitude that is the worst publicity for us, for India.

Sir, that is all. I am grateful to the House for the way in which they have dealt with this matter. It is a really difficult matter.