

[Shri Naldurgkar]

firmly hold that the frontiers between India and China have been for long well established by treaties custom and usage."

14-58 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

The hon. President has suggested:

"China will persuade herself to come to a satisfactory agreement."

If China does not do that and insists upon the illogical occupation and incursion, then China would be responsible for future results. The whole responsibility would be of China if there is war resulting in global warfare. It is a clear warning to China. I differ from the opinion of those hon. Members who have criticised this Address as lacking in creating enthusiasm or inspiration or lacking in stating a definite policy.

Next, there is also one suggestion, that our Government—

"cannot accept the results of unilateral action or decisions taken by China."

This is a clear warning; and this is sufficient as far as the situation is concerned.

The President has given very valuable suggestions on page 8, in para 37. He says:

"I have drawn your attention to the great tasks and burdens that are in front of us all."

The attention of both Houses has been drawn to the dynamic and explosive world situation; and in the end the President says:

"I am confident that wisdom and tolerance and the spirit of co-operative endeavour will be your guide."

This is sufficient justification that there is a definite policy in the Address as far as foreign policy is

concerned, as far as the frontiers are concerned. I want to point out that the reference by the hon. President to our Panchayat Raj must be welcome. It is nothing but the orientation of our previous panchayat raj; in the previous days, the decisions of the panchayat were implemented or executed like the decree of the court and there was domination of panchayats. Now we are creating panchayat raj in a different form. Our experience is that different persons are elected from different shades of political opinion and there is a clash in the panchayats as far as administration is concerned. I therefore hope that they will be wise enough in future in this matter as they have to play a great role in the development of our nation.

15 hrs.

Now, I want to make this last point—the constitution of a separate State of Nagaland. An interim body and the executive council have been newly inaugurated there. There are several tribes and they have different cultural patterns and social and religious dogmas. I hope that the leaders of Nagaland will try to unify all these tribes though their task is a hard one. I appeal to all the brothers living in the Nagaland that they abandon the cult of violence and separatism and that they work and co-operate with the present set up of administration as Indians. I assure on behalf of the House that we will co-operate with them for their future welfare, prosperity and progress.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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. Maybe, 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—

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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 well-being, 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 well-meaning 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 inter-relation 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. (*Interruptions*).

An Hon. Member: He is not 'Acharya'.

Shri Tyagi (Dehradun): Shri Rajagopalachari!

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (West Dinajpur): Acharya Kripalani will be offended.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): Is it proper for the hon. Prime Minister to refer to Members in the way in which he has referred?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I did not refer to Members of Parliament; I referred to some council.

Mr. Speaker: He did not refer to Members of Parliament. There can be engineers and doctors here also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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 co-operative, 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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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 skelton, 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 co-operative sector which shows how co-operatives are creeping up and advancing.

Then, I think Shri Dange talked about the Nagpur Resolution....

An Hon. Member: Co-operative farming.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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 co-operation is growing in India fairly fast. There are two things—service co-operatives and joint farming co-operatives. It is true that the service co-operatives 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 co-operation 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 co-operatives 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 co-operative 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.

An Hon. Member: No.

Shri Muhammed Elias (Howrah): He said that it produces 6½ million tons.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have got the official record here.

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.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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.

An Hon. Member: It is "uncorrected".

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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...."

An Hon. Member: 6½ million tons.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: My 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....."

Shri Tyagi: How much per capita?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I was really taken quite aback because the total production of the world is not up to that.

An Hon. Member: It is the uncorrected record of his speech.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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 extra-ordinary 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 Plan 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 hustled 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.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): Does it not mean that the planning was defective?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is so, exactly. As almost always, the Acharya is right.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Every Acharya?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We are all human beings.

For instance, take one thing, The whole production system received a blow from the general strike. It cost 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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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.

Some Hon. Members: United States.

Some Hon. Members: United Kingdom.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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.

Some Hon. Members: He is here.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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.

16 hrs.

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!

Acharya Kripalani: You are building roads much faster than the PWD which is very notorious for its speed and integrity.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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, high-power 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 north-east 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 checkpoints, only five checkpoints 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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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 furthest 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.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: It took two years.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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 Chang-lung 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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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 tri-junction 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 En-lai 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.

Mr. Speaker: There are as many as 123 amendments to the Motion. May I know whether any hon. Member wants any amendment to be put to vote separately?

Some Hon. Members: All of them may be put together.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put all the amendments to the Motion to vote of the House.

All the amendments were put and negatived.*

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

“That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms:—

That the Members of the Lok Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 14th February, 1961”.

The motion was adopted.

*For texts of the amendments, see Debates dated 20.2.61.