

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): With your permission, Sir, I would like Members not to address each other in this way. I think it is most objectionable.

Shri C. D. Pande: But, as most of the Members were admonished for that and they still persisted, I am also a victim of that habit. Anyhow, I am telling you that, ours being a true democracy, we cannot go with Russia. That is a fundamental fact and we can never give it up whatever may happen.

Then, the second thing as to why we do not join the American bloc. We do not want to join the American bloc because they are not for the freedom of the colonial people, they are against and a hindrance to their freedom. They are treating their coloured people shamefully in their own country. Their domination and exploitation enjoins us not to be with them. Therefore, we are sailing a clear path of neutrality. I call it a positive policy of peace and freedom. A country like India having a glorious past and present status must follow an independent path. If we join Russia, then our people will have to suffer what the great statesmen of Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary have suffered. You know how many people there have committed suicide, how many people wanted to run away from the country. They were just liquidated. Were they not patriots? Did they not fight the battle of freedom in their own country? They had to leave their own country because the atrocities of the dictatorship were so great. Now, I will say a few words about . . .

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member will avoid personal references, and speak in the third person. If he will only look towards me and not to the other side, it will be all right.

Shri C. D. Pande: The Members on the opposite side have shown great impatience in not achieving the Five Year Plan in the time stipulated and they are not very hopeful that things will be achieved within the coming five years as well. I will tell them that in Russia they too had Five Year Plans. In fact, we have learnt these plans from Russia. But we must know the price the Russians have paid for making their plans successful. Are they ready to make those sacrifices. They grumble at small inconveniences here and there. When we find there is some difficulty, they invoke democracy, freedom of the individual and civil liberties. But in

Russia the civil liberties of millions of people have been crushed, and then they achieved a certain amount of success. Our friends here are not going to pay the price.

पंडित ए० आर० शास्त्री : अध्यक्ष महोदय में एक प्रार्थना प्रधान मंत्री जी से करना चाहता हूँ। मैं यह अनुरोध करता हूँ कि वह अपना भाषण राष्ट्र भाषा हिन्दी में दें।

[**Pandit A. R. Shastri** (Azamgarh Dist.—East cum Ballia Dist.—West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a request to the Prime Minister. I would appeal to him to deliver his speech in Hindi, our National Language.]

Mr. Chairman: It is open to the hon. Prime Minister and every Member of the House to speak in any language he likes. Both the languages can be spoken on the floor of the House.

पंडित ए० आर० शास्त्री : मैं अपनी प्रार्थना बाधे मिन्ट में कर लेता। मुझे सिर्फ यह कह लेने दीजिये।

[**Pandit A. R. Shastri:** I would take only half a minute to put forth my request, I may be allowed to say just that much.]

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have listened with care and, I hope, earnestness to this debate which has lasted nearly four days, sometimes with a measure of astonishment also at the things that have been said. I am perhaps at a certain disadvantage compared to hon. Members on the other side of the House; and more specially those on the opposing benches, because I have to try, at any rate, to speak with a certain restraint, because I cannot refer to great countries or small casually, either condemning them or praising them up to the skies. It may be that I do not agree with what another country says or does, but hon. Members will appreciate that the foreign policy of Governments is not carried on in the same way as public meetings are carried on, that the phraseology which may come very easily to some hon. Members on the other side of the House is not used when responsible people speak about other countries.

First of all, I should like to point out, as has been pointed out in fact before, the strange misconception about the President's address. Hon.

Members have given notice of hundreds of amendments and in their speeches have pointed out how many things are not included in the address. Now, the address is not meant to be a catalogue of all the things that have to be done. It is a brief, a concise statement, with some reference to foreign policy, of what the next session of Parliament is likely to do. That is all. This particular session specially is a budget session and, as is pointed out in the President's address, not much legislation can be undertaken. In any event it is, I think, not possible or desirable for the President's address to contain these long lists of all that we wish to do. Therefore, for us to be told that it does not contain references to so many subjects shows a certain misapprehension of the situation.

There are many things. For instance an hon. Member from Manipur. I think, talked about the tribal people, about the Nagas in particular. Well, so far as I am concerned I attach the very greatest importance to the tribal people of India, and I hope that this House also will consider this matter at the proper time more fully, not only because there are a large number of tribal folk in the country but because they occupy a very special position and have a very special culture which, I think, should be protected and helped to advance on the lines of its own genius. I do not want the tribal culture to be overwhelmed or exploited by others among our people, because they happen to be simple folk.

So in this way there are many other matters. Reference was made to the refugees, that nothing is said about them. On a previous occasion there were full particulars given in the President's address of the rehabilitation of refugees. Now, I do not see the point of repeated reference unless you merely wish the President to go on saying that we wish well by them and we would like this to be done.

So I should like the House now and, I hope, in the future to deal with the President's address in a concise way. I do not wish to limit the freedom of the House to discuss any matter. But the result is that somehow we get lost in a maze of detail and the main points that should come out in such a debate are somewhat hidden from view. No doubt we have had a fairly long debate and many points have arisen, and I shall in the course of what I say refer to some of the minor matters if I have time and to some of the major matters.

First of all, I should like to say a few words about something that fell

from Dr. Mookerjee and perhaps one or two other Members opposite. They asked for some measure of co-operation from Government with the opposition, in regard to various policies that we adopt or are likely to pursue. I want to say that so far as we on the Government side are concerned, we would welcome every kind of co-operation from every Member of this House, whether he sits on this side of the House or the other. It may be that in certain vital matters, there may be differences of opinion, basic differences, but I feel quite sure that there is a large field over which there can be co-operation, and even in matters where there might be difference of opinion, it is always a good thing to see and hear the other opinion and then form your own. Naturally the Government cannot give up its responsibility for coming to its own decisions, but in doing so, it certainly wishes to consult and to have the views of other Members of the House, whoever they might be.

Having said that, I would like to point out that it is not a particularly easy matter to pursue that course always. Stress has been laid by some hon. Members on the fact that the majority party in this House according to some arithmetical and mathematical calculation represents 47 decimal something percentage of the electorate. I take that figure to be correct. I have no personal means of judging it, but then, of course the question arises as to what mathematical percentage hon. Members on the other side represent (*Hear, hear*). It will interest the House to know that the Members of the Communist Party plus the Peoples Democratic Front of Hyderabad etc. represent 4.45 per cent. The Socialist Party represents the most and from this point of view, it represents 10.5 per cent. The K.M.P. Party represents 5.8 per cent., the Jan Sangh 3 per cent. The Scheduled Castes Federation 2.3 per cent., the Independents 15 per cent. and so on till we get into infinitesimal fractions. Now we have in these Members who sit in the opposition every variety of opinion—I say so with all respect and if it is represented in colours from scarlet, various hues of red, pink and yellow to deep blue. If you represented in the normal language of the West, you have every variety in the Opposition from the extreme left to the extreme right. They hold together, I suppose because of the stress of circumstances and sometimes there are marriages of convenience, sometimes followed by rapid divorces, and on the whole we find these strange bed-fellows consorting together because

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

of a certain spirit of opposition to the majority group. I do not criticise that. I am merely pointing out the fact that where you have this motley array, it is not exceedingly easy to deal with it in the matter of consultation, etc. But I do wish to make it clear that we are desirous of having that consultation and co-operation wherever it is possible.

We welcome the coming to this House of the Members of the Opposition. Whoever they may be, and however much we might differ from them in many matters, we welcome them, because, undoubtedly, they represent a certain section of Indian opinion, and because it is good in a House of this kind to have a vigorous opposition so that whether it is Government or the majority party, they do not become complacent. If I may strike a personal note, regardless of the present differences, when I see many faces of old comrades who belong to the opposition now, some memories of the past come to me. I do not wish to forget them, and I cannot imagine that ways may not be found for a measure of co-operation with those with whom we have co-operated in the past. It is in this spirit that I approach this problem.

It would be easy for me, or perhaps not so difficult, to address my friends in a spirit of argument, of bandying words and making debating points as other hon. Members have rightly done. But, I do feel the importance of this occasion because the matters that we are considering are of grave import.

An hon. Member told me that I had lost my place in history because of the attraction of some tinsel, something or other. Well, it is a matter of little consequence, what happens to me in history. It is a matter of little consequence ultimately what happens to any individual present here in history. But, it is a matter of very large consequence what happens to India and her millions of people. Therefore, forgetting the personal aspect, I should like to direct your attention to certain basic facts of the situation.

Perhaps, when we consider certain important issues like the economic issues confronting our country, there might be differences; there might be a very large measure of agreement as to ideals and objectives; the differences may be about the methods to achieve them: maybe the speed, maybe the cost, and many other things. But, there is a certain vital method of approach to these problems, which has obsessed my mind, if I may say so.

12 NOON.

Just think of the state of affairs in India four and a half years ago when Independence came, because, you have to judge of every situation in a particular context. You may have principles; you may have ideals; but, you cannot divorce ideals or principles from the particular context in which you are working. The Communist Party in India has changed its policy many times in the last few years. It is open to it to do so. It is not for me to lay down their policy. But, I am merely pointing out how they have changed their policy repeatedly, because they found themselves off the track, because they found themselves losing what they thought was so important, that is, the confidence of the Indian people which they aimed at getting. So, compelled by circumstances they had to give up something about which they were shouting so loudly a few months before. Ultimately, you have to adapt yourself. You have to have certain ideals and certain objectives. You have to give certain priorities to them. But, you cannot carry on an ideal regardless of the context, regardless of the consequences, because, if you do so, the ideals may go and may take with them many other things that you thought were quite safe.

Many of the hon. Members present here know recent history in Europe and elsewhere, and know how at the end of certain conflict between progressive forces in great countries, there came out not the victory of those forces, but a victory of the most naked fascism. That thing occurs. People talk about revolution, believe in it, maybe, and work it out, maybe. But, because they do not judge the circumstances properly, because they act wrongly, they actually open the door to counter revolution. It is not good enough that you try for great objectives; it is equally important, if not more so, that you try to achieve them through right methods. That is, of course, I should be told, a platitude, as we have been told that the President's address contains platitudes. All the great truths of the world are platitudes. But it is no answer to meet an ancient platitude which is true by well-worn cliches which sometimes hon. Members of the opposition indulge in.

So we have seen that in spite of progressive movements trying to attain certain ideals they have lost ground and something completely reactionary has come into the field as in some countries of Europe. Now with this background look at India four and a

half years ago, four years nine months, whatever the period is—August, 1947. How many Members remember that period vividly? It is a matter of history now, and public memory is short. That was a period when independence suddenly came to us and came peacefully so far as the British were concerned, and that was an advantage because it is easier to build after a peaceful transfer than otherwise. But it was followed by enormous upheavals, migrations, violence, massacres, etc. in Pakistan, on our side of the border and on their side. We had suddenly to face apart from these upheavals a new country where everything was split up—army, police, services, telephones, telegraphs, wireless, railway system, transport, everything was split up suddenly overnight and on top of that came these upheavals and mass violence on a prodigious scale. And then these migrations of unhappy people, losing everything, coming in their millions. I do not know of a single instance in history where a country had to face exactly this kind of a thing. Well, we had to face it and we had to face something much more. All kinds of reactionary forces not liking the changeover from the British power to the new nationalist Government wanted to upset that Government. It had nothing to do with the fact—if I may say so, forget it for the moment—that it was dominated by the Congress Party. It is immaterial, it was a national, a more or less progressive Government. All kinds of reactionary forces did not like that—feudal forces, communal forces, other forces—because they thought, rightly or wrongly that this new Government is going to work for social and economic change—they did not want that. So behind the power of that communal upheaval in India there arose all kinds of counter-revolutionary violent movements all over northern India. Our friends who come from the South may have no conception of this because they were far away from the scene of action but here in northern India we lived in the middle of this upheaval where all the reactionary forces were fighting for mastery. They could not have succeeded, of course, in the sense of really gaining mastery as a whole because they did not have that strength. But they did have strength in that particular context to break up things, a destructive strength, and it was touch and go whether that would succeed because if that had succeeded it would undoubtedly have spread all over India. Of course we would have got over it because I think India and the people of India are fundamentally sound, but

we would have had a considerable period of anarchic violence, not even violence for any supposed noble cause but just anarchic violence where every man with a band of hundred men behind him is the master of a particular patch of land. We would have gone on to that period of history which brought in the British power to India, when India was disrupted, states fighting each other, not thinking of the whole country.

And so we had to face this situation. We had to face it not for a day or week but for a lengthy period. Gradually, we overcame it at tremendous cost not only in the shape of human suffering, in the shape of migrations etc. but at tremendous cost in other ways and that took many, many months. But in a sense it took years—I mean in the sense of controlling this grave situation, arranging for the rehabilitation of the refugees and the rest. What was the basic duty of any Government that India might have possessed then? The phrase "Law and order" is often used. May I say with all respect to my colleague the Home Minister that I dislike that phrase. I do not dislike the meaning behind it, but I dislike that phrase. I dislike it because others have used it on other occasions and at other times wrongly. Do not call it law and order. If you like, say that it is an essential thing that at a time like this the unity and stability of the country should be maintained. Therefore if I may speak in terms of history, the first priority was for the unity and stability of India to be maintained. It just did not matter what economic or social ideals you might have had, because they could not flourish and you could make no advance along those lines unless there was this cohesion of India, unless India held together, and there was a measure of peace and a measure of stability about her. Therefore, from this consideration of priorities, it became quite essential to lay the greatest stress on that.

Now, what did many of our friends do at that time? I have not mentioned the other difficulties that we had. I did not mention that Kashmir came into the picture and later Hyderabad. I am also not referring for the moment to the Telengana movement. But we had the old, feudal Hyderabad and behind this picture always there were conflicts with Pakistan and I should be quite frank with you and say that no man knew at what moment there might not be war with Pakistan in those years. So, we lived on the verge of this conflict. We did not know

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

whether the Kashmir struggle might extend to a large war; whether Pakistan or Hyderabad might lead to it, or something else. We were not going to war with Pakistan, but we did not know what the people of Pakistan, or the Government of Pakistan might or might not do. We had to be prepared for all contingencies—naturally. So, here is the background. Now, what cooperation did we get in this moment of great national peril,—not Congress peril, not a party matter, but a national peril,—what help did we get from many of the groups and parties represented on the other side? There were the communal parties; each aided and abetted these disruptive tendencies. There were our friends of the Communist Party who tried to take advantage of that national difficulty, by giving trouble in small ways and big, all over the country, and ultimately in a few months' time while this peril lasted and was at its highest, by the development of this Telengana business. Think of the background. I cannot conceive how hon. Members opposite who are so intelligent and so eloquent could have been ignorant of this background. They did something which might have shattered India and made it go to pieces. It just does not matter how noble their sympathies were for any cause and how that cause was influenced, because that cause itself was bound to suffer and fail if they did not take this larger view of things in India. Therefore, it is not a question of my arguing with hon. Members about certain noble ideals that they might have had.

Hon. Members talk about the current of history and historic forces. I agree. Let us judge things by the current of history and historic forces. Let us see where the current is leading us, and what is the first thing and what is the first priority; because if that current itself somehow falls over a precipice and is dashed into a thousand little streamlets, then it ceases to be a current and I say that at that moment the first and the most essential objective that an India should have had was to hold together India, was to keep the unity of India and then, at the same time, if you like go ahead as far as you can maintain the other most important thing, the social and economic progress of India.

Hon. Members often draw parallels with other countries. Here again I am at a disadvantage, because I do not wish to make invidious comparisons and I do not wish to say ill of

any country. I am not afraid of any parallel that you might draw with any country. I do not mean to say that we as a Government have not made mistakes; that we could not have done many things which we could have done or that we should have avoided doing something which we ought not to have done. I admit that failing. But I do submit to this House that this Government—and if I may say so, this party, the Congress—has performed a certain historic function which was essential and that historic function was to hold India together, to lay down certain basic foundations on which you can build the future social and economic fabric of India, because without those foundations all your attempts would have failed. We did that. And if I may again carry on that metaphor, even to this day the Congress represents a certain historic need in this country in that respect; it has gained and continues to gain a large measure of sympathy from our public. The moment it ceases to perform that historic task and does not change itself to perform the new historic task, that moment the Congress or any party will cease to function effectively. Let us admit that. It is not a matter of individuals, however bright or clever they may be, or of election organisation and the like, but of putting yourself parallel, and in tune, with the current of human events and history. If you do that, well you are doing something important. If, on the other hand, you get divorced from it, then you stagnate and cease to be—whether it is the Congress or the Communist Party or any other. That matter is not going to be judged by the slogans and clichés that people may use.

With respect to the Communist Party, I would repeat something that I have said at other times. I recognise the worth of many individuals in the Communist Party. They are brave people. But with all respect to them, they sometimes appear to be completely out of date. A strange thing to say of a party which considers itself the vanguard of human progress! They have something about them which is the vanguard—I admit it—in communist theory something towards which the world will go inevitably. I think, unless it breaks up before that. But they have something else with them which makes them rigid like the old bigots of religions. Well, so far as I am concerned, I have refused to bow down to the bigotry of any religion and I refuse to bow down to the bigotry of this new religion.

But let us understand these historic currents, especially in the present phase of human history, when we stand on a verge which may lead to grave disaster or which may lead to a new world. And in this how are we to help? How are we to decide which way the world should go or to put our weight on that side? I do not know exactly; but I know generally the direction in which we should try to do that—we or any country. Of one thing I am quite positive in my mind—that the way of war is not the way which we or any country should pursue. Now when I say that I mean something a little more than actual warfare—of course, I mean actual warfare between countries—what is called nowadays 'cold' war, which I think, not only leads to a shooting war, but essentially from another point of view it is almost as bad, because it coarsens people, it degrades people, as it is coarsening and degrading humanity because we tend gradually to lead a life surrounded by hatred, anger and violence.

Now I cannot offer any logical proof of this, but of this I am absolutely convinced that any way which depends on hatred and violence or anger is bound to lead to wrong results and consequences. And indeed history shows us—recent history, if not past, and in the present one can see and one can judge mathematically, if you like,—when a shooting war or a cold war continues, you may balance and say this party is more to blame than the other. It may be so. We may have our private or public opinions, but the fact remains that the result is the same. The fact is that if you have a war, it will bring the most disastrous results for humanity and it passes my comprehension how after a terrific war you can build up any social or economic order that you may aim at, because it will take generations just, perhaps, to get rid of the ravages of war and to come back to some low stage of human existence. It passes my comprehension how some people who dislike communism and make it an enemy, how they think they are going to put an end to communism by war. What will happen after that war I do not know, except that there will be large scale, vast, destruction, a large measure of anarchy over a large part of the world, lower standards and so on and so forth.

So, I do not think that it is right for us as individuals or as a nation to follow a path which coarsens and degrades us and which leads to this international vulgarity that we see all

around us. If hon. Members opposite will forgive me, the methods they adopt in the national sphere, however noble their motives might be, coarsen and degrade them. I do not say that the methods, as individuals or as a group, my colleagues on this side of the House adopt, are always good or pure or do not coarsen. They do often enough. We have to meet this challenge. But there is a difference in deliberately adopting a method as a group, or as a party which coarsens and degrades and in others slipping in through the weakness of human nature. Therefore, I am prepared to have the largest measure of cooperation, but with violence and coarseness and vulgarity. I hope there will be no co-operation.

And I would appeal to hon. Members opposite also to feel that way and to act that way. Let them hold on to their principles, whatever they are, completely, because apart from the obvious fact, if I may say so, that violence and vulgarity and coarseness affect and degrade people—once you let them enter into you, it is not easy to get rid of them—and apart from that fact, India as she is constituted is a large and varied country, and there are many forces in it which have held it together, held it intellectually together even if it was physically separated, held it culturally together when it was divided into many bits. There are many disruptive tendencies and forces in India also. In the past it perhaps did not matter so much, but in the present it is a matter of the utmost consequence that the disruptive forces in India do not gain strength. Even though each particular force may have some justification, nevertheless if it is a disruptive force in the larger context of things, it tends to break up India at a critical moment when India must hold together. There again, if violence is indulged in even for a supposed good cause, I have not the shadow of a doubt that it means disruption. It means civil war, and if you have civil war, it is worse than international war in so far as vulgarity, coarseness and the spirit of violence are concerned. It is because of this that it becomes a part of the normal business as others may say of promoting law and order, which words as I said I do not fancy very much, but from this larger point of view it is the bounden duty of any Government, any group, any individual who thinks rightly along these lines to prevent violence, to prevent the degradation of our public life, the splitting up of our public life, the civil conflicts that it may bring about. Quite apart, of course, from this fact, all idea of economic progress itself is undermined.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

You cannot have both. At the most you can say: we will have civil conflict first; after we have won that, we will have economic progress, after we have paid a terrific price for it.

Other countries are mentioned, and I admire the achievements of other great countries like Russia, China etc. I do not admire everything that has happened there. First of all, it is well to remember the terrific price that was paid in the Russian Revolution. How far we are prepared—by we I mean the people of India—to pay that price I do not know. Certainly, I rather doubt—I say so with all respect for the leaders of the Russian people—if they had another chance to pay that price, they would try other ways of achieving their ideals. I rather doubt that they would. However, that is a matter of opinion. But it was a terrific price they paid. Let us not forget that. Also let us not forget that it is 35 years or so since their revolution. It is not fair to compare results of this long period of intense working—they were working on a clean slate and with full power to do whatever they wanted to, still it has taken a considerable time.

An hon. Member spoke about education. Education is highly important, of course, and I deeply regret that we are not doing in the field of education what we should do. Yet, may I mention a simple fact? The Russian people and the Russian leaders after the Revolution attached the greatest importance to education, rightly of course—the greatest importance to compulsory education of every single individual there. And yet, if I remember rightly, it took them 13 years to introduce it to every place of that great country with all their desire, with all their intense wish to do so. It takes time—and they were working at high pressure all the time. I know that in the early days of the Russian revolution there were years of civil war and difficulty and all that and outside forces were attacking, but then that is just the difficulty. If you take to the sword and if I take to the sword, others take to the sword also. In India, if we take to the sword, others take to the sword. It may be that nobody knows whose sword will be the longest in the end. But anyhow, whatever the result may be, you lose enormously. Apart from time, you pay in human misery, in human resources, and you delay that time that would make for progress. Take China, a country for which I have the greatest admiration. Now, there have

been big changes there. My hon. friend opposite, Mr. Hiren Mukerjee, asked us to copy China. I do not mind copying China in so far as I can copy it: I will be glad to do so. May I remind him that a little while ago, maybe, a year ago, China was held up as a place where corruption and black marketing and everything bad had been completely and absolutely put an end to? A wonderful example it was. Six months ago, the Government of China said that they were shocked and amazed at the amount of corruption in China, and they started a great movement, in which the biggest people were involved; they took effective steps. My point is that the picture that we saw a year ago was not quite the same, as the Government themselves said. It may be that they are a more effective Government and they take more effective steps. Possibly, I agree. Let us be more effective. But the distant pictures that we see may not exactly be as they appear today.

So, I come back to this period of history through which we have been passing, where we have had constantly to face difficulties, turmoil, and trouble. There were the post-war difficulties, of course. There were the difficulties of the partition. There were the difficulties of the constant tension with Pakistan. There was the Kashmir issue, and the Hyderabad issue, and many other issues apart from our internal natural disasters that we have had in the shape of earthquakes, floods, droughts and the like. There were so many of them. We should, of course, expect some natural disaster every year and provide for it. But I must say we have been peculiarly unfortunate in the succession of these. Now, with this background, how did many of our groups or parties represented here in the Opposition—how have they functioned during these past few years? We are asked to extend our co-operation. I extend my hand of co-operation. How far have they co-operated during these four or five years, not in high policy where they might disagree, but in the day to day happenings? Take food procurement—an essential thing. We talk of food subsidies and this and that, and we go in for food procurement, and many people, respected people, go about preventing that from happening. Many of them even advocate a scorched earth policy. Just imagine that! It is an amazing thing. Scorched earth policy, so that the Government cannot have food! The House will see that the whole outlook, far from co-operation, was to injure the Government. And injure the Government—how?

By injuring the people of India, and thereby injuring the Government. Now it is open to any Opposition to go against the Government. But it is a dangerous thing, and I say a bad thing if in order to shake or weaken a Government you go and hit the very people of India whom you seek to serve.

And so, we have had to contend during these last four or five years with a continuous barrage of propaganda against us, of vituperation, of condemnation and the like. I honestly put it to hon. Members opposite: Is that propaganda justified in truth? I am perfectly prepared to stand comparison with any country about our achievements, about what has been done in the last four or five years in this country. I remember, some years back—was it 20, or 24, years ago—when in the first five year plan of the Soviet Plan they started that very great scheme of the Dneprostroi Dam, the whole of the Soviet Union rang with this great work, because they knew at that time that it was going to be the foundation of many other schemes. And quite rightly. But we do something here, something bigger, and we are condemned and criticised. We have got at least three of our major schemes today which are much bigger than that, to serve a much bigger area. I am not comparing invidiously; I am merely stating a fact. But what we get is criticism of it, although that very thing, I am quite sure, if it had happened in China or Russia, would have evoked praise from hon. Members opposite.

If that thing had happened,—I am not quite sure that it has happened in China or Russia—hon. Members opposite will have praised it, "See how China is progressing, how Russia is progressing?" Now, does that not indicate, if I may say so with all respect, a perverted outlook and a jaundiced view of things and a closed mind. True, I agree entirely that we should not think much with our limited resources of grandiose schemes. We must think of small schemes which will bring quick results. I agree; certainly let us do it. But at the same time we have to think of some grandiose schemes too; because remember, if we think in terms of industrialisation, industrialisation means and is measured by the amount of electric power that you produce. Hon. Members opposite will certainly remember what Lenin was supposed to have said about Communism being Soviet Russia plus electricity or electric power. It is an essential thing for us to have this electric power if

our industry is to grow. For that electric power we have to have these hydro-electric works quite apart from agricultural or other purposes which are so important. My point is that what has been done in India is not a small thing. If I may venture to say that, people who have come from abroad—and among them are not small people—not only from America, England, Germany and Turkey and other countries, but people who have come even from the great land of Russia and the great land of China have expressed often enough their surprise at the measure of achievement that we have had. I do not say they liked our policy or anything, but they were surprised. They did not know that. Why did they not know it? Because, unfortunately, their means of getting knowledge of India is somewhat limited and those who supply the knowledge about India supply not facts but their own idea of what those facts are or might be and that too always full of condemnation of everything. Surely in these four or five years has everything that the Government has done been bad? It is a well-known fact that if you condemn wholesale your condemnation is not worth much. It is only if you look at the full picture and give credit where credit is due and discredit where it is due, that there is something true in it. I should like hon. Members to go and see some of these great river valley schemes. We shall welcome them. I should like them to visit here in Delhi if they like, some of our great laboratories. Everybody who has seen them from any country has been amazed—not at the fact of the buildings—there is nothing at all in it—but at the fact that we are laying the foundations in this scientific age, we are laying the foundations of scientific progress—because without it you cannot progress. We are not going to depend greatly on the help of America, Russia or China all the time. We hope to build our own resources and our own scientific men and knowledge; I wish it could be more. I wish our Universities could be helped more—that is a different matter. However, of what we have done, I do speak without much knowledge of what is happening in other parts of the world, but nevertheless with some confidence that there is hardly any country perhaps including Russia which has made that solid progress in building scientific laboratories as we have done in this short period of time. Of course, they are infinitely more in advance of us. I

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

am talking about the initial stages. Once you go ahead, you progress. For instance, take this enormous undertaking in Sindri, our telephone factory in Bangalore, our Chittaranjan locomotive workshop—all these things are really worthwhile things; it is man's job that we have done there; it is not good to cavil at those things. Cavil at other things, if you like.

Many of our countrymen have gone abroad—I am not referring to hon. Members opposite only, there are others also whose chief function has been to run down our country abroad. It is not the usual practice of other countries to do so: they keep their quarrels at home; when they go abroad, they speak favourably about their own country, and not run it down before foreigners. There are others who have struck against certain basic facts of ours: whether it is our national flag, whether it is our national emblem, the Asoka Chakra, or whether it is our national Anthem, they are not party symbols; they are national symbols. If any group or party does not accept them, that group or party offends against the national idea (*Hear, hear*). It is one thing to admire other countries, and seek to learn from them. Let us do so by all means. It is totally a different thing to think of that country as more one's own than one's own country.

Right at the beginning of this debate, hon. Members opposite started by saying something which had been referred to later as well, which seemed to me to be perfectly remarkable; an hon. Member referred to the President's address as being a declaration of war on the people of India. He has every right to use that phrase. It is parliamentary, I suppose. If he feels that way, then there is war between him and us. (*Hear, hear*). I say so plainly, because anything more fantastic, more nonsensical, and more perverted, I cannot imagine; I challenge him to sit down with me here or elsewhere, to take the President's address and point out to me phrase by phrase, word by word, what he means by that statement. There was another hon. Member who talked about it as being callous, I believe. He has got every right to say that the President's address is full of platitudes. You may have it as your judgement. But what exactly does it mean? Who are the people referred to in 'the declaration of war'? War against what people? Are they

the people of India? In spite of the 47 or 49 per cent. or whatever percentage it may be, we also happen to represent the people of India here. (*Hear, hear*). Our President also has been elected by the people of India. Are we being told that hon. Members opposite are the sole repositories of the confidence of the people of India here and they alone could speak on their behalf? It is an amazing proposition like the story of 'The three tailors of the Tooley street'. You can advance an economic theory and say that the government is wrong. I can understand that. But to talk like this is simply nonsensical and absurd.....

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: On a point of order Sir, is the expression 'nonsensical' parliamentary?

Mr. Speaker: It is absolutely parliamentary.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am surprised that the hon. Member should object to the word 'nonsensical'. I can use any other word, if he prefers. The English language is rich in words. I can choose any other word. But I do wish to convey my sense without any offence, that it is wrong on their part to have used such phrases in regard to the President's address. The idea was the result, if I may say so, of loose thinking or not thinking at all, or of a completely perverted outlook. That is the difficulty we find in regard to many other matters. I say so in all earnestness. I do not mind what the past has been. I am prepared to erase the past. But look at the picture we had in the last few weeks. It does not apply only to the party which the hon. Members, some of them, represent but others too. We have seen repeatedly what are called walk-outs in various Assemblies when the Governor or the Rajpramukh came in. It is an extraordinary thing. Here is a Governor, whom you may like or dislike—it is not a personal matter—representing the headship of that particular State. He comes in, and normally one pays respect to the head of the State—one may dislike him intensely. But here is a deliberate affront offered to the heads of States like this till one almost thinks that it is a profession of some parties to walk in and out—a walkers-out party! I do not just understand it. Is this the way people seek co-operation? I do not mind much, because I hope that these days will be given up, they are relics of the past.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): Sir, on a point of order. There has been no walk-out here.

Mr. Speaker: He was referring to the situation in the country.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In India we have very grave problems to face, chiefly economic, and others also. Unless this Government or any other Government can solve them, that Government ceases to perform any useful function. Solving them does not mean solving them by magic, by some magic wand. Let me put myself differently, that so long as this Government or this party which forms the government represents a liberating force in this country it is good and it will function. Once it becomes what hon. Members think it has become, that is, it ceases to be a liberating force and becomes a restrictive and repressive force, then it will fade out. It will fade out by the process of history. But the mere fact that we have come back here after one of the biggest elections in history shows that the people of India, or a very large number of them, still think of us as a liberating force.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): No, no.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have no doubt they do not think of the hon. Member who said 'No', in that connection. We are thinking about others, not you. So, it will not require votes in this House. Other forces will work which will put an end to any party or group which has ceased to perform that function.

There were a number of matters to which I should like to refer very briefly. Dr. Mookerjee referred to this business of passports between East Bengal and West Bengal and Assam etc. about which we have had a conference, and in that conference thus far we have arrived at no agreement. I cannot say much about it. But the House knows that we, that is the Government of India, have not liked this proposal to introduce a passport system in the East, because that will restrict traffic between Eastern Pakistan and Bengal and Assam. And that was the very object of the agreement of the Prime Ministers two and a half years ago. We opposed it, but if Pakistan introduces some kind of passport system on the other side, we shall have to take the necessary measures on this side. That is obvious, and there is no doubt at all about the fact that the minorities

in Eastern Bengal have had a very raw deal and continue to have a raw deal and all the sympathy of this House and a large number of people of this country are with them. We have tried to evolve some machinery to help them and as far as we can, we shall continue to do that. There are certain limitations. When two independent countries deal with each other, they can bring diplomatic pressure; they can bring other kinds of pressure and only the other type of pressure is a thing which we do not wish to bring because it can only bring misery.

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta North-West): It is not only the minorities of Eastern Bengal who have expressed disagreement with this passport system but a large number of Muslim representatives from West Bengal also who have expressed their apprehension that this will lead to the worsening of the conditions. I refer to a deputation led by Nawab Mussaraf Hosein and others.

Mr. Speaker: He is only referring to that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I agree with the hon. Member that it is not a question of Hindu or Muslim but all these people wanted free intercourse between the two countries and I think this passport system is a very undesirable thing.

Then there is the question of linguistic provinces a question about which we have made our position clear repeatedly. I shall be quite frank with this House that the linguistic provinces from some points of view are good, but it is immaterial whether I consider them good or bad, and if people want them, they will have them. We are not going to come in their way. Personally I think, especially in these last few years, when our first effort was to consolidate India, anything that might help the process of disruption was bad. So, even though linguistic provinces might be good here and there, the timing of it was bad when we were struggling for this consolidation and when the right time comes, have it by all means. Also the rule that we laid down was that there should be a large measure of agreement between those concerned, between the provinces concerned, because each such formation or division inevitably involves interests of groups and provinces, all round. We have been asked sometimes to impose our will upon others, do

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

net and that I think is completely wrong. If we have this large measure of agreement, we shall do it, although we would like this to be done in a way so as not to upset all kinds of things. Financial considerations and everything else will arise and that will delay the economic progress of that part as well as, may be, other parts of the country.

Then, I refer to the question of the tribal people. I personally attach the greatest importance to this. They have suffered very greatly in Assam and elsewhere by the Partition. So many consequences of the Partition pursue us still. Many of them are almost cut off from their normal ways of gaining their livelihood since the Partition. To build roads on mountainous tracks is very expensive. We have built a number of roads; we are building them. But, it is a matter of terrific expenses. In about a fortnight's time, there is a conference being held to consider this tribal question.

The hon. Member from Manipur talked about some compensation for war damage. As a matter of fact, I do not know its early history. Normally speaking, it was the business of the British Government to give compensation for war damage. However, we undertook that liability to some extent there and we have, I believe, paid compensation to the tune of 25 or 30 lakhs. An attempt has been made to pay it fairly. I cannot obviously say that this has wholly succeeded; I cannot guarantee it from here. Some Claims Officers have been appointed, and in consultation with the local councils of the local people, it is being paid. In fact, the process is going on and claims are still being considered.

An hon. Member from Travancore said, something about monazite. Well, monazite used to be sold in large quantities almost for a song, till recent years. Then, it became a highly strategic and valuable mineral. For a variety of reasons, lately we stopped its export, although some of it is still going under licence. It is not quite as expensive as the hon. Member mentioned. He said it was £250 per ton. In America, at present, its price is half of that. We have as a matter of fact built a factory at Alwaye to separate monazite from ilmenite and other rare earths and this factory is going to be a great advantage to the State of Travancore and to India. We are keep-

ing this under consideration all the time as what quantities we can export. It was our policy laid down a little while ago that anything that is used for the manufacture of atomic bombs should not be exported from India, because, we did not wish to get entangled in this business of other countries manufacturing atomic bombs with material taken from us. But, where this question does not arise, we can consider what quantity of monazite we can send abroad and gain foreign exchange for it.

Reference was made to Kashmir. Much has been said about it. I should like to remind the House that much of the arguments has not been about facts, but rather about certain speeches that Sheikh Abdullah delivered, which were corrected subsequently. Let us not go into that. If people know the past history of Kashmir during the last 4 or 5 years, one can understand many of the forces at play there, the background of it, and how certain communal elements have been carrying on a very wrong and harmful propaganda. There is no personal issue about Sheikh Abdullah, but something which has helped Pakistan greatly. It is in that context that one has to see some of the speeches delivered.

Dr. Mookerjee asked question about the constitutional position of Kashmir, whether Kashmiris are Indians or what they were. Of course, they are Indians constitutionally and legally. If they want a passport to go abroad, they have to take an Indian passport. The House will remember that four or five years ago, when this question of the merger of the States was first tackled, almost all the old Indian States acceded in three subjects only, that is, foreign affairs, defence and communications. Every State did that. A little later, when the raid took place in Kashmir, Kashmir also acceded on these three subjects. Later, developments took place in regard to other States and they acceded in regard to more subjects and the new picture has arisen. But, during this period, so far as Kashmir is concerned, there has been this conflict with Pakistan, the raid, the war, etc., and the reference to the United Nations. Now it is quite impossible, not at all feasible, for any other changes to take place in regard to the relation of Kashmir and India during this period of turmoil and war and reference to the United Nations. Those are the basic subjects—Kashmir has acceded and is a part of India—but in regard to

other subjects obviously the people of Kashmir, that is their Constituent Assembly has every right to pass any laws it chooses. That is the constitutional position and there is no difficulty about it, that is the natural position at present. There are matters at issue which we are discussing such as financial integration and the like and they will gradually be solved. Naturally this question has always had to be viewed with its background of international conflict and that has created great difficulties.

About the rehabilitation of refugees, if I may remind the House while we are deeply conscious of a fairly large number of refugees, especially coming from East Bengal, who require rehabilitation, help etc., taking the picture as a whole, and more especially the picture of those who have come from Western Pakistan, I think I am not exaggerating when I say that the work of rehabilitation that has been done has been remarkable. There has been this question of rehabilitation and refugees in large parts of the world and the United Nations has spent large sums of money over it, and other countries have done it and all that, and experts in this work have come here from various countries and they have seen our work and they have expressed their amazement at our achievements in that regard. And we have achieved that. I should like the House to remember, without the slightest financial or other help from abroad, from the United Nations or anybody. We have borne the whole burden. I will say this that no Government could have succeeded in that way if large numbers of those displaced persons themselves had not played up and done their work. You cannot do it in a one-sided way. They showed enterprise and courage and therefore they built themselves up and ultimately this very great tragedy of the migrations has really been a sign of hope for us. It has shown how our people can face tragedy and overcome it.

I have taken a great deal of the time of the House. I apologise for it and I am grateful for the indulgence shown to me. I shall repeat again that so far as our Government is concerned we welcome help and co-operation. I had not, I regret, the time to deal with many important matters like foreign policy and the food policy and the rest. They have been dealt with elsewhere and I hope occasion will arise when we can deal with them here in a more leisurely way.

Mr. Speaker: There is now before the House the following motion:

"That the Members of the House of the People 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 16th May, 1952."

To this there are twenty-seven amendments which have been moved. I am not going to read each amendment separately but I shall mention the No. of those amendments and in all future proceedings now we shall refer to the No. alone:

Nos. 1, 15, 25, 37, 50, 66, 67, 71, 93, 96, 101, 105, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 176, 177, 184, 190, 191, 192 and 193.

I want to know whether any amendment has been left out.

I.P.M.

An Hon. Member: Sir, amendment No. 77 has been left out.

Mr. Speaker: It was not moved at all. So now the procedure I want to follow will be this. I propose to put in all these amendments as one group of 27 amendments to be voted upon together except if any particular Member wants his amendment to be specially singled out. Otherwise taking the vote on each amendment will mean nothing but waste of time. So, is there any proposal to have any particular amendment voted upon?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): We on this side have taken counsel on the amendments. There is the largest measure of agreement on the point that only amendments Nos. 158 and 50 be taken up for being voted upon. The rest may be considered as withdrawn.

(Amendments Nos. 1, 15, 25, 37, 66, 67, 71, 93, 96, 101, 105, 157, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 176, 177, 184, 190, 191, 192 and 193 by leave withdrawn).

Mr. Speaker: Now about the remaining two amendments Nos. 50 and 158, does he want them to be voted upon separately or as a group?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Separately, Sir. Further I submit there is the largest measure of agreement among parties and groups on this side that amendment No. 158 should be put to the House first.