

[Shri P. S. Naskar]

Rules, 1955, under sub-section (3) of section 40 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954:—

- (i) G.S.R. No. 1454, dated the 9th December, 1961.
- (ii) G.S.R. No. 1480, dated the 16th December, 1961.
- (iii) G.S.R. No. 1538, dated the 30th December, 1961.
- (iv) G.S.R. No. 96, dated the 20th January, 1962.

Wages Act, 1948. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-64/62].

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES—SUMMARY OF WORK

Secretary: Sir, I lay on the Table a copy of the *Parliamentary Committees—Summary of Work* pertaining to the period 1st June 1961 to 31st March 1962.

12.13 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FIRST REPORT

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I beg to move:

“That this House agrees with the First Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 1st May 1962”.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

“That this House agrees with the First Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 1st May 1962”.

The motion was adopted.

12.14 hrs.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE
PRESIDENT—*contd.*

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Harish Chandra Mathur and seconded by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad on the 26th April 1962, namely:—

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

“That the Members of 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 18th April 1962”.

and amendments moved thereon.

The debate was concluded yesterday. I will now request the hon. Prime Minister to reply.

The Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): 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 produc-

tion 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 a people, rooted in the ancient past, every century of the past, of a people whose numbers go up to 440 millions, is a tremendous question. It is not a question of some

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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 semi-feudal 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 wide-spread 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—maybe 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 main-springs 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.

President

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 worth-while 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 poverty-stricken 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.

An Hon. Member: Question.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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 war-killing 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 radio-activity 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 neo-natal 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 radio-activity 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 neo-natal 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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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 lies 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.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): Has our High Commissioner gone to Rajshahi?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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 co-operate 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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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.

13 hrs.

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.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): That is the worst.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Among the educated, there are large numbers of women who seek employment.

Shri Tyagi: And contest the elections also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What about rising prices?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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.

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 food-grain 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: One has to juggle with them. That is the difficulty.

Shri Jawaharlal 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 (Kanpur): It will be better if we do not develop

for some time; then, the prices will go down.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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 to 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 landholdings etc. So, it is a complicated subject; it is not so easy. Anyhow, we hope to have, within a fairly reasonable time, their report.

President

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 think 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.

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

(Shri Manoharan)

Secretary at the High Commission there should be a person conversant with the Tamil language.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Will you be discussing this matter, when you visit Ceylon next?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 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 organisation, 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. Anyhow, I am grateful for the criticisms made and we shall profit by them.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I would make a suggestion in regard to procedure because the Prime Minister, almost necessarily, gave a rather general reply and only towards the latter part of his speech he referred to certain specific matters. But I am afraid he was not very carefully briefed. The fact of the matter is that many Members have made both specific allegations as well as certain formulations which require to be corrected or at least decided in the light of the facts in the possession of Government. Could I suggest that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs who has now got a more elevated status processes these questions which are implicit in the speeches made

and answers are supplied by Government and laid on the Table of the House? Otherwise, so much material which the country has a right to know something different about is not really finalised. Certain things are said. For instance, one hon. Member said that the Prime Minister went to Bhopal and he was hoodwinked because inaugurated something supposed to be indigenously produced but it was produced in England or Japan or somewhere else. It may be true or it may not be true. I want that you give a direction to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to see that these things are answered properly and the information laid on the Table of the House.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): These might be taken up during the discussion of Demands for Grants.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot take it upon myself generally, but if any hon. Member sends any question like that, I shall certainly send a reply.

Mr. Speaker: Any particular matters can be pursued further. There are so many forms in which they can be pursued. It can be done very easily by Members if they have specific issues to be raised. Then again, generally the same things would be taken up by Members when we have the general discussion on the General Budget; most of the points would be taken up there also and they would be replied to then. But if answer is required to a specific issue, that might perhaps be addressed in the form of a question or other way and that would be answered.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They may send it to me informally and I shall send a reply.

Shri Mohammad Elias (Howrah): May I ask a question?

Mr. Speaker: No questions now.

Shri Mohammad Elias: I want a

clarification. It will take only one minute.

It is in regard to Bertrand Russel's suggestion to send a ship to Christmas Island to offer satyagraha or something like that. The Prime Minister has not yet decided whether it is possible for us to send a ship like that. I have got a suggestion to make.

Mr. Speaker: He can pass it on to him.

Shri Mohammad Elias: It will not take more than one minute.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Mohammad Elias: If it is not possible to send any ship officially, it can be sent non-officially. He has said that there will be difficulty in finding the way to take the ship to Christmas Island. So I make this suggestion. You know I have got 18 years of my service in the shipping line... (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Mohammad Elias: I offer my services to take the ship there. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He can communicate his proposal to the hon. Prime Minister.

Have I to put any specific amendment separately to the vote of the House?

Shri Mohammad Elias: The hon. Prime Minister wants to say something about my suggestion.

Mr. Speaker: No, no.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We would like amendments No. 38 and No. 65 to be put separately.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी)
अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण जानकारी—

Mr. Speaker: Let him wait.