

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

tended. I also wish that legal aid may be given to the poor. But I do feel that the system of rotation has not worked well anywhere.

I am sorry to say that even in our Rajya Sabha, even in our Legislative Councils, this system of rotation has not been all that we wanted it to be.

Therefore, it is good that we are going to have elections at one step. The tenure may be a little longer than the period stipulated. Four years is a very brief period. A Member of the Lok Sabha goes on for five years, a Member of a State Legislative Assembly goes on for five years; I do not see any reasons why a member of a State Bar Council or a member of some other Bar Council should not go a little longer than the period stipulated in this Bill. I would, therefore, request the Minister to look into this and see that this change is made.

Another point is this....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does he want more time?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can continue on the next day.

15.32 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS
NINETY-FIRST REPORT

Shri A. S. Alva (Mangalore): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Ninety-first Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 3rd August 1966."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Ninety-first Report of the

Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 3rd August 1966."

The motion was adopted.

15.33 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: INDO-U.S.
FOUNDATION—contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri H. N. Mukerjee on the 6th May 1966:—

"This House disapproves of the proposed project of an Indo-US Foundation and calls upon the Government of India not to proceed with it".

Two minutes have been taken by the Mover. He might continue.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): How long are we going to discuss this Resolution?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: One hour and 58 minutes.

Shri Sidheshwar Prasad (Nalanda): Time may be extended.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will see later.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, last time, as I had just begun to commend my Resolution to the House, I said how it appeared as if we were going to get another of these gilded millstones from the United States to wear around our neck.

This so-called Indo-US Foundation is a project which I wish to God Government does not proceed with, and there does appear some indications as if sense might dawn even at this stage on Government. It is a good thing that our academicians have strongly registered their protest

against this projected invasion of our academic independence. In this matter, the lead was taken by 54 distinguished scholars of Delhi University, about whom there was a report for some-time, which happily the Government later contradicted, that the police were after them. Fifty-four Delhi academicians, followed by thousands from different parts of India—I know of several thousands of professors and others in West Bengal—have protested against the Indo-US Foundation.

This Indo-US Foundation is not just President Johnson's dramatic gift to our Prime Minister when she was on her visit to dollarland. It was very long in the offing, and in the time of the late Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri, it had almost been finalised, but I understand that at that time the University Grants Commission expressed certain fears about it, and even though the Prime Minister's secretariat which continues merrily in its positions of vantage was enthusiastic about it, for the time the matter was held over. But now when the Americans find everything so lovely in the Indian garden, our Government has proceeded further and President Johnson announced that he had made this donation to India.

It appeared at one time to some rather ingenuous souls perhaps that we are getting a windfall of \$300 million, 1,50 crores—now it is very much more, Rs. 2,10 crores or even more than that—nearly an astronomical figure as far as India is concerned, that all that money would be available for the purpose of advancement of learning in this country. But the trouble is that just as in the notorious Cooley loans scheme where a large part of the PL 480 counterpart funds are buttressing Indian private capital, Indian private capital chosen by American agencies for their submissiveness to American capital, just as that Cooley loans project was to buttress Indian private capital, this is the counterpart of the Cooley loan project in the sphere of education by means of this Foundation. Education was chosen as a prime

US investment in the strategic sense, and those who imagined—my friend, Shri Chagla must have thought so—that it was innocent of political purpose are, I am afraid, only innocent of the kind of thing which goes in the garb of international politics these days; only such people would think of it in that manner.

This effort to use the cultural weapon which the Americans have been using in so many countries and continents, this effort to inject in whatever way they can the American way of life, however, unacceptable it might be to India, this effort still goes on. And in regard to their money of \$300 million, it is not really an American investment. The idea of American investment is fictitious because the rupees are out of PL 480 accumulations, and it is just as if the Government of India printed that many currency notes. At the rate of 6 per cent return, Rs. 9 crores a year would have been available according to the older exchange rate—now it would be much more. Compared to that, our own University Grants Commission last year spent altogether Rs. 14.8 crores at all levels of university education. At no point of time has the UGC had more than 6 crores of rupees in any one single year for the purpose of new educational programmes. But here we are getting used Rs. 9 crores according to the old exchange rate but which would be a great deal more, Rs. 14 crores or more that would be at the disposal of this so-called Foundation. And this Foundation, I fear—our academicians, the most eminent among them fear—would have a stranglehold on our higher educational system and would direct our education perhaps into unwholesome channels to the advantage of the USA, and our universities would come, as they are already increasingly coming, under the hegemony of certain people primarily belonging to the US.

This is a very long story, but I would make it very short. Back in 1962, there was a team of Harvard professors who reported in America that

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

America should catch 'em young, that is to say, America should get hold of young people between 18 and 25 years of age in the under-developed countries and bring them by way of granting scholarships and that kind of thing to US university campuses so that they would go back to their own countries saturated with the United States way of life and be dependable allies. This was the conclusion of a report in 1962 of a team of Harvard professors.

In this country the United States has long been scouting for allies. There is the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the rather disreputable Asia Foundation; perhaps the Fulbright scholarships are a silver lining in the cloud because it is a two-way traffic. But these are pockets of US influence in the academic world.

We have also the massive reprinting of American textbooks under P. L. 480 scheme. There are such very undesirable things like the fact that the planning unit of Delhi University looks to the chief of the Rockefeller Foundation in Delhi for guidance. Somebody might get up and say that is not true; but to all intents and purposes, practically speaking, it is a fact that the planning unit of Delhi University has got to look to the chief of the Rockefeller Foundation in Delhi for guidance.

I know for a fact, and it came up in this House—Mr. C. K. Bhattacharyya is still a Member of the Senate and Syndicate of the Calcutta University; he told some of us how the new Calcutta University Senate structure was dictated to by the United States; and there is in Calcutta University United States officials masquerading as academicians, who lord it over the place, who dominate the research programmes and all that kind of thing.

Today a state of things has come to pass where the United States Embassy

and its agencies become the real source and centre of academic patronage. If only under scholarship schemes and all that, a few chaps went to America and came back, it would be quite an innocent thing, a good thing too. Our people have to go abroad, and America is one of the countries which our people should know, but that kind of thing is not much of a problem. Now they would settle down here and they would practise the kind of subversion in which the Central Intelligence Agency of America, the notorious CIA, have specialised, and this CIA subversion through the academic cloak would become more effective because it is under legal cover.

If I am told that the CIA should not be brought into the picture, I would say that our friend the Minister and the Deputy Minister should both read, if they have not already read, a book on CIA by David Wise and Thomas B. Ross called *Invisible Government* published last year, in 1965. And of course, they have already read something about CIA disclosures which were brought out in the *New York Times* which were largely reproduced also in this country.

CIA's domestic activities clearly, unashamedly, include links with the universities. The main function of the CIA's domestic field offices is to serve as contact points with the universities. The relationship between the CIA and American universities is described as two-way. The CIA secretly underwrites research programmes at some universities. The universities in the United States as well as abroad provide, under the direction of the CIA, a pool of knowledge about foreign countries upon which the CIA could draw. This thing has gone on in such an egregious fashion that certain facts should be known to our country.

In the United States, some professors have resisted the temptation of selling themselves out to the CIA,

but the book by David Wise and Thomas Ross to which I referred shows very clearly that the CIA has succeeded in obtaining the services of almost all the academic institutions and individuals it has approached.

A university like Harvard turned down a few of the CIA suggestions, but it has been passed on to an institution called the Centre for International Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. This Centre for International Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, about which we hear so much was set up in 1950 by Rostow, the man who talked about the take-off economy, and it is through this kind of organisation that information is collected, intelligence is more or less systematised, and then it is, what is called in American parlance, sanitised, made sanitary, so that it is good enough for public consumption.

The activities of such places as Harvard University and the Centre for International Studies are of more than academic interest to our country because a group of ten economists from this Centre came to India in 1958-59, and, thanks largely to the solicitude of our present Ambassador in America, Mr. B. K. Nehru, they were permitted by the Planning Commission to have access even to classified papers, and had a say in the formulation of the Third Plan. When this scandal was about to burst, when this matter was about to be brought up in Parliament, the experts left India abruptly. Later, Mr. B. K. Nehru, our Ambassador still in the United States, tried to get our late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, into associating the MIT Centre with India's planning, but luckily he failed.

The CIA is interested in information about what the Americans call sensitive areas, in order to fight communism, and India is one of those countries which they consider is a sensitive area where steps have to be taken against the developing danger

of communism or whatever else they think is a danger to them. In India there is already at least one organisation which, knowingly or unknowingly, gathers voluminous data and passes them on to American universities, some of whom might pass them on to the CIA.

This kind of work which the CIA is doing has gone on for, too long, and there is no doubt about the danger which India faces when through the Indo-American Foundation and the peace corps and such other organisations the CIA, which is the invisible government of America, is going to have a stranglehold upon us even in this sphere of education.

The CIA has become such a danger that in 1963 ex-President Truman, who himself had been the founder of the CIA, wrote:

"I never had any thought when I set up the CIA that it would be injected into peace-time cloak and dagger operations."

These cloak and dagger operations are exactly what they continue today, and our universities are going to be riddled, if this Foundation gets under way, with CIA cover men. Our higher civil servants are sitting ducks for CIA blandishments, and some of the political parties may also be misguided stooges of CIA designs and even in this sphere of education for which the Minister is responsible, this kind of thing is very likely going to take place, if the Indo-U.S. Foundation goes ahead.

The CIA produces an enormous amount of bogus literature, so-called communist as well as anti-communist literature and so on and so forth, and it provides all kinds of ammunition for purposes which are subversive of different countries. It claims to have the capacity to make and unmake governments in different parts of the world.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

It has its links with the universities. An allegation was made in India, from Hyderabad, and information was sent out that the Michigan State University men were functioning there as a wing of the CIA; Michigan University tried to deny it, but it did not hold water because whoever knows how things take place in this kind of work is aware of this position.

I find also that on account of American control percolating, it has already percolated a great deal into the universities, sometimes what happens is that some of our institutions which get American assistance are not doing the kind of work they should, but they do other kinds of work. I will give one example.

In a national laboratory, a fairly big research scheme on the chemistry of tung oil has been sanctioned under P. L. 480 funds. Now, the United States has been affected by the stoppage of tung oil experts from China. India has no tung oil resources but substitutes in linseed and castor seed based dry oils. Why should we in this country, in our laboratories which have other jobs to do, work on tung oil? Basic research work of course is an honourable idea but its pragmatic result at present is, wherever American influence has percolated, the employment of Indian research talent for American profits.

There are what are called area studies. American area studies have got to be conducted as far as Indian also is concerned. In Delhi there are some other schemes financed by American money for instance, statistical analysis of the trends in the general elections with particular emphasis on the shifts in the floating votes in the country or the study of communist influence, its growth or decline in Kerala or Andhra or whatever it may be. These are very interesting topics for students of political science but the CIA studies it

much more carefully than those so-called scholars who submit their Ph. D. theses on this kind of subject. This is chosen by so many of our scholars because it enables them to get assistance from America. Now, therefore, I say that pockets of American influence in the academic world are growing and this has become a matter of serious concern. Already we have so many centres of purely American studies. American Institute of Indian studies in Poona, American Studies Research Centre in Osmania. Grants are given to Americans for coming to India for promotion of American studies in India.

Is this foundation to be a massive parallel overshadowing the UGC and damaging to our country in every sense of the term, which would give a new and wrong character to old institutions or build new ones? Our scholars, many of them are so much in need of money. I do not blame them; they want money to carry on their research work better and perhaps in good faith they think this manna coming from the American heaven; let us take advantage of it. They do not understand or they are unaware or careless to think about the implications of this matter. For instance, there is an American bias in favour of what they call behavioral studies. There are schemes now for setting up schools of behavioral studies on a very massive scale. This kind of thing, if it happens is bound to take place only on the basis of American assistance on terms which are very likely to cause great damage to our country. I am not going to say more about the kind of institutions of behavioral studies supposed to be started very soon in this country. It is a very serious matter. I am glad to find that even a man like Mr. J. R. D. Tata is opposed entirely to that idea and I do hope the Minister does not proceed with the idea of such a kind of academic institution or pseudo academic institution which would play into the hands of these Americans, pseudo-scholars

who in the name of behavioral studies try to penetrate into every country of the world. It is necessary from our point of view to have a different idea in regard to education. Our education, however much money you spend on it, produces qualitatively indifferent results because the spirit is not there, because if you think more of buildings and the luxury of apparatus that you have inside these buildings and that kind of thing, you do not have the spirit in which our old time scholars used to work. There is no doubt about it; the Minister knows it; he was told in the consultative committee the other day that there has been a fall in standards. On this matter I would like to end up by referring to some observations made by a newspaper against which nobody would bring the charge of its being particularly prejudiced against the Americans as such; it is the *National Herald*. It says very clearly:

"Government should have been wary in proposing to accept a large scale gift of foreign funds for education which is bound to bring in foreign interference."

It says:

"Americans have a bias in favour of behavioral sciences where others are concerned. American universities have a joint project with Indian universities in scientific research which makes no material difference to this country's scientific and technological processes but can influence the behaviour of the people of an under-developed country like India."

It goes on to say:

"The fear is not about American politics but about possible American projection of a bias in vital educational matters. Even by American admission their research abroad is strategic in their aim and their anthropologists and

sociologists and bacteriologists have often interchanged with Central Intelligence Agency men."

It says further:

"It is suggested that the foundation which would be an autonomous non-profit trust should have a bound of 18 members with equal representation of Indians and Americans, that the Chairman should be an Indian and that the executive officer should be an American. This is a mere arithmetical approach. If the Americans want the funds to be used in Indian interest for Indian purpose, they should be prepared to allocate them to the University Grants Commission."

And further,

"Any considerable gift that any foreign government or foundation is prepared to give in the sphere of higher learning should be suspect . . . and our educationists eager to spend on pet schemes and with their mouths watering at the sight of funds would eagerly welcome any help from any quarter, whatever the conditions. This would be a sordid bargain in things that concern the mind. Education cannot be treated like fertiliser and whatever may be the underlying altruism of American charity, it is our duty to save ourselves from influences which are contrary to the direction in which we want to go. The Americans are keen on saving any people from themselves and that is enough to tell us what we should accept and that we should not."

This is the voice of the *National Herald* which, I take it is on this issue the voice of the whole nation. Let us not be lured by blandishments which are very much more than doubtful. Let us not walk into this

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

kind of a strategic trap. Let us not be lured by blandishments which are very much more than doubtful. Let us not walk into this kind of a strategic trap as far as our educational integrity and independence is concerned.

15.55 hrs.

[SHRI SONAVANE in the Chair]

Let us think of other and more vital ways of developing the creative talent of our people in the region of the advancement of learning. Let us learn to stand on our own legs. Let us have assistance if assistance is needed. But in the name of assistance, let us not be lured into this kind of thing; Indo-United States foundation is, I say again, is a gilded grindstone which you are going to wear round your neck. It is not a good thing to do in the conditions that prevail today. And now that we know so much about the ways and means of American penetration into under-developed countries in the area of political instability which is there from Suez to Seoul, we know the way American policies function in this part of the world, let us be more careful. I beseech of the Education Minister to exercise his independent authority to see to it that this potential invasion of our educational integrity does not take place. Sir, I move my Resolution.

Mr. Chairman: Resolution moved:

"That this House disapproves of the proposed project of an Indo-U.S. Foundation and calls upon the Government of India not to proceed with it."

There are some amendments. Is Shri Yashpal Singh moving his amendment?

Shri Yashpal Singh (Kairana): Yes, Sir, I move my amendment.

Mr. Chairman: What about the others? Are they also to be moved?

Shri Sidheshwar Prasad: Yes, Sir, I am moving my amendment.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I move my amendment.

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay Central—South): I move my amendment.

Shri Yashpal Singh: I beg to move:

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

"This House is of opinion that when the details of the proposed Indo-U.S. Foundation are finalised, they should be placed before Parliament for approval and pending its approval no agreement should be signed." (1)

Shri Sidheshwar Prasad: I beg to move:

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

"This House urges upon the Government to utilise the funds, allocated for Indo-U.S. Foundation, on irrigation, power, tubewells and other works relating to food production and to bring about necessary changes in the proposed Foundation accordingly." (2)

Shri Shree Narayan Dass (Darbhanga): I beg to move:

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

"This House calls upon the Government to appoint a Committee consisting of members of Parliament, prominent educationists and scientists to consider the constitution, composition and functions of the proposed project of an Indo-U.S. Foundation and to recommend to the Government the form and functions in which the said project should be agreed upon." (3)

Shri V. B. Gandhi: I beg to move:

That for the original resolution, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House recommends that the Government of India should consider the usefulness of the proposed project of the Indo-U.S. Foundation and proceed to give effect to the project on being satisfied that the scheme of the project subserves the interests of India in respect of Indian and U.S. Representation on the joint board of directors and in respect of other cognate matters." (4)

श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद : समानति जो, भारत-अमरीकी प्रतिष्ठान को ले कर हमारे देश में काफ़ी चर्चा चली है और न केवल डा संसद् के अतिरिक्त दोनों के भारतीय सदस्यों ने इन विषय में विज्ञान प्रकट की है, बल्कि इन देश के विषयविद्वानों के विद्वानों ने, और विषयविद्वानों से बाहर भी शिक्षा से सम्बन्ध रखने वाले व्यक्तियों में भी काफ़ी चिन्ता व्यक्त की है। लोगों को आश्चर्य होता है कि भारत-अमरीकी-प्रतिष्ठान को ले कर इस देश में इतनी चिन्ता क्यों व्यक्त की गई है और जब कि अमरीका से अनाज आ रहा है, दूसरी चीजें आ रही हैं, कई प्रकार की सहायता मिल रही है, तो अगर शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में एक प्रतिष्ठान के माध्यम से अमरीकी सरकार हमारी सहायता करना चाहती है, तो हम उस सहायता का क्यों विरोध कर रहे हैं। श्री मुकुर्जी ने इस सम्बन्ध में अपना प्रस्ताव पेश करते हुए आज भी और पहले भी जो बातें कहीं, उन से यह बिल्कुल स्पष्ट हो जाता है। कि शिक्षा का क्षेत्र बड़ा ही महत्वपूर्ण है और हम नहीं चाहते कि हम अपने सोचने विचारने और अपने सांस्कृतिक जीवन के आधार को प्रभावित करने वाले इस महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्र पर किसी भी प्रकार का ऐसा प्रभाव आने दें जिसमें हम आगे चलकर पसंद नहीं कर सकते या जिस की वजह से भारत इतने वर्षों में जिस तरह से विकास

करता रहा है उस के मूल लक्ष्य में किसी प्रकार की बाधा पड़ती हो, इसी भावना से इस प्रतिष्ठान का विरोध किया जाता रहा है। दूसरे भी कारण हो सकते हैं जिसमें एक महत्वपूर्ण कारण यह है कि हम नहीं चाहते कि हमारे देश में कोई ऐसी प्रतिष्ठान हो कि जिस का नियंत्रण, जिसका संचालन किसी भी अर्थ में विदेशी व्यक्तियों द्वारा हो। यह दो बड़े महत्वपूर्ण कारण हैं;। लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में इसी लिए मैंने एक संशोधन पेश किया है जो इस प्रकार है :

"यह सदन भारत सरकार से अनुरोध करता है कि भारत-अमरीकी प्रतिष्ठान के लिए नियत राशि निम्नलिखित, विज्ञानी, नलकुल और खाद्य उत्पादन के अन्य कार्यों पर खर्च की जाय और प्रस्तावित प्रतिष्ठान में इसी के अनुरूप परिवर्तन किये जाय।"

मैंने यह संशोधन इतलिये सदन के सामने उपस्थित किया है, सरकार के सामने इसलिए यह संशोधन विचार के लिए उपस्थित किया है कि हम इस बात से इनकार नहीं कर सकते कि जब सार्वजनिक-ऋण-480 के अन्तर्गत इस देश में करोड़ 7-8 अरब रुपये जमा हो गए हैं और सक्का करोड़ 13 प्रतिशत खर्च करने का अधिकार अमरीकी दूतावास को है तो उस के लिए कोई न कोई रास्ता हम जरूर सोच कर निकालें। कोई न कोई रास्ता निकालने के लिए...

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj (Wardha): Sir, on a point of order. These P.L. 480 funds are governed by the American people and they are not governed by us. It is their desire where it is to be spent or how it is to be spent. The amendment brought in by my hon. friend says that it should be spent for purposes otherwise than those desired by the American Government. Could the decision or opinion expressed by the Indian Lok Sabha be binding on them? I think therefore that the amendment is out of order.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): It need not be binding on them. It can be the basis on which the Indian Government allows it to be spent.

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj: It is a different thing. But as the amendment stands, I think it is out of order. I seek your guidance.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: I repeat. How can it be binding? It may be that those people do not want to give aid in this form. That is a different matter. My hon. friend Shri Sidheshwar Prasad has brought in an amendment to say that this money should be spent on irrigation. This may be the opinion of this House. The Americans may not like to give aid for irrigation. That is another point. But this House has perfect right to express its opinion, and Government action must take this into consideration.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): What I want to say is this: the American Government may have taken a decision with regard to certain funds which must be spent in India. But as far as we are concerned, whether we agree with that point or not is quite a separate question. It is open to this House to express its opinion. This House may certainly seek certain amendments and the Government may consider it. But it does not mean, as my hon. friend contends, that if America says something we say *ipso facto* 'yes' or we exclusively say that it is wrong. Let us have the opportunity of discussing the resolution that has been brought before the House by my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee and also the amendments which have been moved. Let us discuss and express an opinion. What should be done later will be according to the decision taken by the Government of India.

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): This amendment would perfectly be in order if the House was urging the Government to spend

Indian revenues on a particular project. As it is worded, I am afraid it does not seem to be in order. If my hon. friend Shri Sidheshwar Prasad puts it this way, namely, that the House urges upon the Government not to accept American funds unless they are utilised for this purpose, that would be in order. But to say that the House urges the Government to utilise the funds for irrigation etc., may not be in order. How can we utilise somebody else's funds that are not our funds? It is perfectly open to Parliament to say "Do not take this fund for a particular purpose." But the recommendation is to utilise it for this purpose. This is the distinction I am drawing. There is a clear distinction. It is open to Parliament to say that our funds shall be used for a particular purpose, but how can Parliament ask us to utilise somebody else's funds? This is a foreign fund. It is open to Parliament to say, "Do not accept this gift," or "accept it only if it is utilised for this purpose." But that is not how it is worded. It is perhaps too technical, but there it is.

Shri Krishna Menon (Bombay City North): Do they remain foreign funds after they are given to us?

Shri M. C. Chagla: They have not been given to us. They are counterpart money.

Shri Krishna Menon: Counterpart money is utilised for our use.

Shri M. C. Chagla: They are not; under PL 480 they are not. I will explain it. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I have heard the arguments on both sides. I think after hearing the hon. Members and the Government side, we will decide at the time of putting the amendment to the vote.

श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद : सभापती जी, ग्रामी मेरे संशोधन पर मेरे मित्र श्री कमलनयन बाजाज ने जो आपत्ती उठाई उसे सत कर मुझे

आश्चर्य्यं हुआ। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि पी० एल० 480 के अन्तर्गत जो करार है उस की जो शर्तें हैं उससे वह पूरी तरह वाकिफ नहीं हैं। अगर वाकिफ होते तो इस प्रकार की आपत्ति नहीं उठते और मुझे ऐसा भी लगा कि माननीय शिक्षा मन्त्री ने जो आपत्ति उठायी वह भी इस प्रकार की आपत्ति न उठाते अगर वह इस संशोधन के शब्दों को जो मूलतः हिन्दी में मैंने दिये थे, उन को ठीक से समझने की कोशिश करते। मैंने ऐसा नहीं कहा है कि भारत सरकार जो प्रस्तावित प्रतिष्ठान है उस में इस प्रकार का परिवर्तन करे। मैंने ऐसा कहा है कि भारत सरकार संयुक्त राज्य अमरीका से इसके लिए इस प्रकार का प्रस्ताव रखे उस के सामने। अमरीका सरकार का पैसा हमारे यहां है, जमा है और पी० एल० 480 के अन्तर्गत जो करार है उस में यह बात लिखी हुई है। उसमें यह बात कही गई है कि यह पैसा हिन्दुस्तान में अगर खर्च किया जायगा तो क्या भारत सरकार या भारत की जनता के मत और उस की भावना के विपरीत यह पैसा खर्च नहीं किया जायेगा? ऐसी स्थिति में अगर अमरीकी सरकार इस पैसे का उपयोग इसलिए करना चाहती है कि वह भारत की जनता में अपने प्रति सद्भावना उत्पन्न करे तो निश्चय ही मैं समझता हूं कि अमरीका की सरकार इतनी दूरदर्शिता से जरूर काम करेगी कि वह "पैसा इस ढंग से न खर्च किया जाय कि जिससे भारत की जनता को ठेस लगे, उस की भावना को ठेस लगे और पैसा भी खर्च हो और उस के साथ साथ अमरीका के प्रति यहां भारत में दुर्भावना उत्पन्न हो, रोष की भावना उत्पन्न हो, विरोध का भाव उत्पन्न हो।

इस के बाद अब मैं मूल प्रस्ताव की ओर आता हूं और सरकार का ध्यान इस बात की ओर आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूं कि अभी जब अमरीका के खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री यहां आये थे तो उन्होंने अनेक स्थानों पर वाचस्प किया

सार्वजनिक रूप से और सरकार के जो ऊंचे अधिकारी हैं उनसे वह मिले तो उन्होंने इस बात पर जोर दिया और वहां की सिनेट में भी यह बात कही गई थी कि भारत सरकार को अनाज का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए हर प्रकार का प्रयत्न करना चाहिए। पी० एल० 480 का जो पैसा है वह अनाज का पैसा है और अगर अमरीकी सरकार थोड़ा भी समझदारी से काम लेगी, दूरदर्शिता से काम लेगी तो मैं समझता हूं कि भारत सरकार की ओर से इस प्रकार का प्रस्ताव अगर उसके सामने जाता है कि इस रुपये को खेती की पैदावार बढ़ाने पर खर्च किया जाय, उसके लिए साधनों को उपलब्ध करने में खर्च किया जाय, तो मैं समझता हूं कि अमरीकी सरकार को इसमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं हो सकती और उससे देश की जनता में भी कोई विरोध की भावना नहीं उत्पन्न होगी। इसी उद्देश्य से मैंने यह संशोधन सदन के सामने उपस्थित किया था। हम जानते हैं कि अनेक कारणों से, अनेक ऐसी बाधाएँ हैं, अनेक ऐसी कठिनाइयाँ हैं जिन की वजह से खेती की पैदावार जितनी बढ़नी चाहिए थी वह नहीं बढ़ सकी। और ऐसी स्थिति बार बार इस देश में उत्पन्न होती रहती है कि अनाज के लिये हमें पिछले करीब 20 वर्षों से अमरीका के सामने हाथ फैलाना पड़ता है। अभी तक अमरीका से जो अनाज आ रहा था, उस का भुगतान रुपयों में करना पड़ता था लेकिन अभी अमरीकी कानून में संशोधन हुआ है, अब उसका भुगतान हमें डालर में करना पड़ेगा। ऐसी स्थिति भी आ सकती है कि अमरीका आगे हमें अनाज देने लायक भी न रहे। इसलिये भारत सरकार अमरीकी सरकार के सामने, यदि इस प्रकार का सुझाव रखती है, इस प्रकार का प्रस्ताव रखती है कि वह पैसा इस देश में खर्च हो, लेकिन वह पैसा सिचाई के लिये खर्च हो, बिजली के लिये खर्च हो, खेती के लिये दूसरे साधनों की जुटाने में खर्च हो, तो ऐसा सम्भव है कि अमरीकी सरकार को इस पर आपत्ति नहीं होगी।

[श्री सिद्धेन्दर प्रसाद]

दूसरी बात जो मैं माननीय मंत्री के विचारार्थ रखना चाहता हूँ, वह यह है कि आज तक सरकार ने इस देश के सामने कभी यह नहीं रखा कि इण्डो यू० एस० फ.उण्डेशन की शर्तें क्या हैं, उसकी रूप-रेखा क्या है, उस में चार्ज क्या हैं—अभी तक सदन को यह नहीं बताया गया। भारत सरकार ने इतने महत्व का निर्णय लिया, लेकिन क्या वजह है कि भारत सरकार ने इस बात को इस सदन के सामने कभी नहीं रखा कि इण्डो-यू० एस० फ.उण्डेशन की मूल बातें क्या हैं, उसकी शर्तें क्या हैं। एक साल हो गया, डेढ़ साल हो गया, दो साल हो गया, इतनी चर्चा इस के बारे में इस सदन में चलती है, सदन में चिन्ता व्यक्त की जाती है, तब भी यह नहीं रखा गया है। इसलिये ऐसा लगता है कि मूल रूप में इस बात के लिये शायद करार हो गया है कि इण्डो-यू० एस० फ.उण्डेशन बने, लेकिन उसमें ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है कि निश्चित रूप से पैसा शिक्षा पर खर्च हो सकता है। दूसरे कामों के लिये भी उसे खर्च कर सकते हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में सरकार दृढ़ता के साथ इस सुझाव को अमरीका सरकार के सामने रखती है तो निश्चय ही इस उद्देश्य की प्राप्ति सम्भव है और दोनों देशों के बीच सद्भाव का वातावरण बन सकता है और यह पैसा जिस काम के लिये खर्च होगा, उस से देश को आत्म-निर्भर बनने में मदद मिलेगी।

इसलिये मैं इन संकल्प को मूल प्रस्ताव के स्थान पर रखना चाहता हूँ और मुझे विश्वास है कि सदन न केवल इस का समर्थन करेगा, बल्कि सरकार भी इस का समर्थन करेगी और इस सुझाव को, लोक सभा की इस भावना को, भारत की जनता की इस भावना को, अमरीका सरकार के सामने रखेगी और उम्मीद है कि प्रतिक्रिया होगी वह पुनः इस सदन के सामने विचारार्थ लायेगी।

Mr. Chairman: Shri Dwivedy.

Shri Yashpal Singh: My amendment should come first.

Mr. Chairman: I will give you a chance.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Sir, I welcome a discussion on this question. Not that I am in accord with the resolution that has been moved, but it will afford an opportunity to this House to express its opinion on this very vital question.

"I do not know why the Government are playing a hide-and-peek game about the whole affair. Even the other day, on 27th July, when this question was raised and repeated supplementaries were put, the Minister was not quite clear, as to what the aim of this Foundation is and what it is really going to achieve in this country. All that he has been able to tell us is that in principle this has been accepted, but the terms are yet in a fluid condition. Let the Government make it clear whether this matter has not been discussed by this Government for the last several years. As far as I know, in 1961, the U.S. Congress passed the Mutual Educational and Cultural Act, which empowered the U.S. Government to establish such Foundations in different countries to utilise the PL 480 funds. The U.S. Agency for Economic Development held discussions with the Planning Commission, the Ministry of Education, etc., and it went on. Ultimately it was conveyed to the U.S. Government that we are in agreement with this. In 1965, the then Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, approved it after a Cabinet decision. This matter, whatever decisions they arrived at and whatever conditions they agreed to, was placed before the United States Congress—only we in this country are kept completely in dark about it. I would like to know, when this decision was conveyed, whether it was just in principle that was accepted or any conditions, the purposes or the objective was made clear to this Government, that these funds, when they

will be available, will be utilised under the auspices of United States Government, their representatives, and the Government of India will have only limited power to function within the ambit of this organisation? What worries this country is not that this is something new. We have been utilising so many funds. My hon. friend Mr. Mukerjee raised the question of CIA. Really, one should express concern on the activities of such an organisation. But such intelligence organisations are there not only of America but of Russia, China and every other country. But one advantage in regard to C.I.A. is, it is known how such an organisation in a democratic country is functioning, and it was the *New York Times* in which the entire pattern of its functioning in different countries of the world has been exposed. This is all condemnable, reprehensible from every standpoint, but I do not think we should create a fear psychosis by drawing into this discussion the CIA because I think in this country there are sufficient number of Americans who function in different spheres. We bring Americans even to decide whether we should have a particular examination system or not. They are there in all experts committees in this committee and in that committee, any number of them, and they can function through them as well. That is not the danger. What really matters is, we have been neglecting our education all through, through successive Plans. Whatever funds are made available are very inadequate. Allocation is made on a percentage basis. If you look to the allocation made for 1965-66 you will find that it has been reduced. If one considers the demands of this country for education, one will find that the funds available are quite inadequate. Even this large sum available for a particular purpose is much more than what the University Grants Commission is spending in a year. Naturally, when such large funds are coming for educational purposes it creates a certain amount of apprehension in the minds of the people whether this is not going to influence the entire edu-

cational system of our country, whether through these funds they are not going to really inject the American way of life into our country. That is the real apprehension and that ought to be guarded against.

Shri Chagla pointed out that it is not for us to say how this fund should be utilised, they know, it is their money and they want to spend it. If they want to spend it in this country, is it a gift, I would like to know? If it is a gift, then it should be a gift and the entire control, management and direction of the funds should be in our hands and they have nothing to say in the matter. If it is not so, if for the development of education in our country we want this money and for getting that we have to agree to certain conditions imposed by them, then it is not a gift. That is to say, it is American money which they utilize in this country, and on conditions which are acceptable to them. But what are those conditions? Why are they not made clear? Again, it is not the amount of money that is going to be spent that matters. What matters is how it will be spent, for what purpose and by what means.

It is said that the Foundation will have 18 educationists on the Board of which the Chairman will be an Indian and the Executive Officer or some other official will be an American. Why is it so? Why should they not be in the Board merely as advisers, so that the entire Board will be controlled by Indians? In that case, there will be no objection to that arrangement. That will be understandable.

Again, why did they not agree to give these funds to the University Grants Commission to distribute in the way they think best, because they are in charge of disbursing money to educational institutions dealing with higher education in this country? There should have been no objection to this kind of arrangement. If the Government are still in correspondence, I want to know whether they have put forward this proposal.

There is another aspect which has to be considered. The term "educa-

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

tional purpose" is all right. But, on what aspect of education will this money be spent? It has been stated by Shri Sidheshwar Prasad that in this country the whole of the Plan is going to be upset because of lack of agricultural production and development of the rural sector. We can impart education so that there will be improvement in that aspect. Are they prepared to do that? After all, it is PL 480 funds and it will be in conformity with their objects if the money is spent on aspects of educational activity. Or, it can be spent on these technical education. Again, as suggested in certain quarters, we want to build universities. There is clamour everywhere for that; we do not have funds for buildings. If they really want to help, let this money be set apart for buildings or for other educational purposes so that we can utilize our money for more fruitful things.

Let there be clarity in thinking and let this Government make their position very clear. If what he says is really correct, if they have not yet accepted any conditions whatsoever, if the terms of the agreement are yet to be finalised, what prevents them from putting forward these conditions? Have they ever discussed with the United States' authorities this matter when they agreed in principle to this Foundation?

I would refer to another matter in this connection. This raises the question of our attitude to those foundations that are functioning in our country. Let them be very clear in their minds. I do not want to join the chorus of anti-American or anti-Russian lobby, which is quite prominent inside the Congress Party. Some months back Shri Chagla himself laid the foundation of some institute with Soviet assistance in New Delhi. There may be some other countries which may come forward to help us in the development of our education if they have funds at their disposal. They are all welcome to do so, because we are at that stage today that if at all

we have to survive, we can survive only with the help of foreign countries. We have no other go, no other alternative today; for every little thing we have to depend on foreign assistance, foreign aid, foreign money.

That is our position. That is a very deplorable situation. But then we must be very categorical and clear in our mind. As has been rightly stated, investment in education is the real investment for the future of this country. We may build houses, bridges, industries but by spending money on education we will be building men, the future of this country. If that is so, we should be on guard to see that at least this sphere remains purely and truly Indian with no interference or influence, direct or indirect, of any country whatsoever. Therefore we have reached a situation when this Government should clearly make up its mind and attitude towards funds available from any foreign country for the purposes of education. I think, the Minister would clarify this position and if this is clarified, I do not think there will be serious objection even to this Foundation. We want to utilise this money if it is so readily available but on our own conditions. That is the point.

In reply to my own supplementary the Minister has given this assurance. I hope, he will carry out this. He has said:—

"I can give an assurance to this House that when the Foundation is ultimately established, Indian opinion will have a preponderating voice."

I do not want only a preponderating voice.

"The Foundation will never be permitted to formulate or implement any policy which will run counter to our national policy; nor will we permit American influence to be injected into our culture and our way of life."

Merely saying this will not do. It should be clearly provided in the Foundation itself. I want him to do this. Once this matter has been raised here.

Now I read in the newspapers—I do not know how far it is correct—that by some arrangement between this Government and the United State Government they are going to postpone this issue only because the elections are approaching and if they accept it now it will adversely affect them in the coming general elections. Therefore the American Government, which is very anxious that in this country only the Congress Government should come into power . . .

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warrangal): PSP they want more.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: That information may be available to Shri Mirza.

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): They do not want you.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If the PSP was favoured by the Americans or the Russians then it would not remain P.S.P. Even the Indian capitalists are against it and, therefore, it is in a weak condition politically, but let that alone. What I want to point out is that it has been published in the papers that they want to postpone this issue till the general elections are over. I say, this is a political trick. This House is seized of the matter. Why does the Government fight shy? Why are they afraid? If they feel that there is tremendous opinion against this Foundation and they should not go in for it, let them decide that way. By postponing the issue they will be postponing the evil day and will create more confusion and suspicion in this country. Therefore I would like Shri Chagla to give a very clear answer to the points that I have raised.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): Mr. Chairman, I welcome this debate because, 1158(ai)L.S.—11.

in fact, outside this House and on certain questions put to the Government this matter had come up on several occasions before the House. As Mr. Dwivedy pointed out just now, it is not really the gift. If it were a gift, all these conditions would not have been there. The conditions are such whether, in the national interest, in the interest of cultural integrity of this country, we should look at this as a gift is the problem before the country. I do not know when this proposal was put forth before the late Prime Minister, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri. I do not know whether, before accepting it, the Education Ministry in this country was consulted. I would like to get some clarification from the Education Ministry.

Another important question is: What is the intention of this gift at this hour? We are in need, no doubt, but a certain dependence on aid, material and otherwise, a type of psychological dependence, in this country is growing. It should be resisted at every stage. It is the duty of the Government to be very cautious, if not suspicious, when gifts of this nature are made with a certain purpose. I say, "with a purpose" because education is a most sensitive, in a way, strategic field. In this country, even during the British regime—I need not remind our Education Minister—when the foreign rulers started education institutions, certain missionary institutions were also in the field. What were their activities? Their activities were not only relating to conversion to Christianity but certainly they were also generating an atmosphere of loyalty in order to frustrate the growing sense of nationalism. That was their approach. Now, at this juncture, when America or some foreign countries who are in a better position consider us to be very weak, almost dependent in a way where they could try to put conditions and we would accept them, it is because of our attitude to these things.

Sir, I cannot understand, after such a long controversy, why the Govern-

[Shri Khadilkar]

ment has not made a categorical statement. Their replies have been all evasive. It is derogatory to our national honour. This is my view. Education is a vital matter. Let the Education Minister make a categorical statement, "Whatever might come, gift or no gift, with any condition, we are not going to accept it and allow those pockets of certain foreign influence to be created in the most strategic and sensitive field in our country."

I want to deal with this problem more on academic and objective level. Many academicians of high standing, honoured in the academic field, have expressed their doubts. Prof. Mukerjee the mover of the Resolution, pointed out certain things as to how many of them have opposed it and all that. I would like to point out what seven or eight academicians of Delhi University—some of them are well-known; for instance, Dr. K. N. Raj, Shri Das Gupta and others—have said about it. They have put, to my mind, the position of Indian academicians very objectively and searchingly. They have stated, and I also feel, that whatever gifts of this nature are offered, particularly from America because this is the experience of all the developing countries, particularly, African and Asian countries and the people, they have an ideological bias. Do you want to impart a certain ideological bias, known to be there, at an early tender age, to the youth or the students of this country to be moulded or affected with a particular type of outlook? As it was rightly pointed out by one of the hon. members, it is not a question of this generation. The coming generation must have an independent outlook and that outlook must certainly reflect a certain cultural heritage, the national heritage that we are supposed to pass on to the next generation. Or are you considering now, "after us, deluge". History has a continuity. You cannot obliterate the past and you will create tensions in the academic field by taking this money and handing over the

management of the Foundation into the hands of those who are suspect. I am not saying this as if it is my personal reaction. In all the Afro-Asian countries, this is the main question. So, here, the question is that there is a strong ideological bias. We are an open society. Do you want to shut our doors when some wind comes from the East or from the West? The founding father of the Constitution had built a certain tradition during the national struggle. Our minds are not shut. There is no prohibition; no attempt is made to ban or try to keep away a certain influence, whether it is Marxist influence or whether it is an influence coming from the Western liberal thought. The liberal thought has made a certain contribution to our thought. In fact, the first impact of the liberal thought in this country started a type of renaissance; it gave an impetus to the recovery of the past where we stood together; that new consciousness was roused in the minds of those who led the early national movement in this country. Therefore, this is one point which you should bear in mind.

There is another point. In America I find rather a larger latitude of academic freedom which is now being cramped here. I read about the teach-in programmes regarding vital policies on which the present Administration has pledged almost everything. Persons from all sections, holding different viewpoints, including communists like Deutscher were invited and they were allowed to talk to him. This shows a certain vigour and vitality that exists in American democratic life. I do not want just to bypass it. Even now there are persons there who are not afraid of saying anything. We, here, are afraid to say anything. The former Ambassador in this country could publicly declare that America would find their diplomatic grave in Vietnam or something like that. We are afraid of saying anything. I do not know why. You say that your Father of the Nation is Gandhiji. He created a certain at-

mosphere of fearlessness. But I find now fear all around and we are all the time groping under a sense of fear. There is no self, a sort of our own mind, a certain determination, "we are following this, come what may; we shall face all the difficulties". I am not against Americans. I would like to say that a certain academic freedom that I find there is absent in our country at the present juncture.

I want to point out on this occasion that there is a certain weakness at present. I thought I could see a certain ferment at the educational level, but I find that it is totally absent today. In my days, when I was a student, till 1930—and most of us were students in those days—there was a great ferment. That is absent today. What would happen if you accept this money? And you are accepting only the Indian counterpart. We need side by side development in agriculture and other aspects. If at all we need anything, we need a certain higher learning in certain fields; there is certainly hunger for education and hunger for knowledge and particularly in regard to the technical aspects of life. In the technological sphere, we are at a much lower level. If they want to give us education, let them give us that education through donation. Again, it is not only the Indian counterpart that would do. What about the foreign counterpart? We need a lot of instruments and a lot of laboratory equipment. Are they going to provide for these things also? Because there is this money, quite a lot of it has affected the whole internal economy in a way which is adverse to the common man; partly, the rise in prices today is because of this money flowing like mercury freely in this country and without restraint and with easy availability. That is a threat to our economy. Are they going to provide for all the equipment and other things that we need.

I would like to make a specific suggestion. Do not accept it. See this gift-horse properly and then decide about it. Make up your mind clearly.

But this is also equally important. If it is to be used for educational purposes, then the entire management must be in the hands of our people. The more important thing is that that foundation and the management must be answerable to this Parliament. The grants to any foundation, whether it is with American money or with British money—I do not want to stand in the way of foundations of this nature; there might be some good intentions behind them—must be handed over to a Central academic body like the University Grants Commission and ultimately that body must be made answerable to Parliament. These are the main things that come in the way. Do not consider this as anti-Americanism or anything of that kind. There is nothing of that kind at all. Unfortunately, I feel that we are dependent on it; I want to shed that dependence and I feel that we must make our own supreme efforts. I have even gone to the length of saying that we must not import food, and I have said so on several occasions.

Particularly on this point, I am very firm; looking to the nature of the gift, we shall have to be very firm. Either the donor will have to accept our conditions consistent with honour or we shall have to request them to take it back, and we should return it with thanks. For, I feel that in this country, unfortunately, after freedom there is not that vigour which we had experienced in the early days of British rule.

You know the amount of scholarship which has been there in the western part of the country and in Bengal. For instance, there were Dr. Bhandarkar and others. There were no foundations. There was no Ford Foundation grant. But they had produced monumental works regarding our ancient culture, and even today whatever Dr. Bhandarkar and others have written are certainly so valued that no scholarship can proceed further without reference to their books. I have mentioned only one name; but there have been other scholars too like Ranade, for instance.

[Shri Khadiikar]

We are dependent today for many things on foreigners. But let us try to preserve this core. I say that this is the spiritual strength of our country. If we allow foreign foundations of this nature to weaken the spiritual fibre of the nation and taint the cultural heritage of our country and influence its course of development, then I am afraid that the healthy growth of the nation will stop and mental dependence would start growing. If these things are not to happen, then I would suggest that Government should come forward with specific schemes. It is no use explaining things away. I do not know whether the Foundation idea is still alive or they have withdrawn this idea, because there are some rumours to that effect.

What Shri H. N. Mukerjee has said is correct. I find that one of the leading papers, namely *The Patriot* has given a PTI summary of CIA activities in a university. I would read out only one sentence from that report because the Americans are considered to be the best democrats . . .

An hon. Member: But they are not.

Shri Khadiikar: . . . and we are trying to emulate them. In Cambodia, these research project people from Michigan University went to the length of replacing ballot boxes in order to defeat a particular party! Is this the education that we are going to get in our universities if we accept this Foundation grant? If we want to preserve democracy and free elections, will this be healthy and useful for us? These are the questions I would ask.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Yashpal Singh. I have 13-14 names here. I have accommodated only three Members so far. So it will be better if Members restrict their remarks to 10 minutes each.

Shri Bade (Kharagone): Let me know if my name is there in the list so that if it is not there, I need not wait.

Shri Khadiikar: Time must be extended.

Mr. Chairman: Let us not waste further time.

श्री यशपाल सिंह : सभापति महोदय, मैं माननीय सदस्य, श्री एच० एन० मुकेशी को ऐसा सुन्दर प्रस्ताव लाने के लिए कान-ग्रेटुलेट करता हूँ। उन्होंने सारे देश की जरूरत को महसूस किया है। सरकार इस पालियामेंट से ऊपर उठ कर डीवैल्युएशन कर लेती है और इस पालियामेंट से अलग अलग ऊपर ही यू० एस० फाउंडेशन कायम कर लेती है। इस लिए मैंने यह एमेंडमेंट पेश की है कि जब इस फाउंडेशन के बारे में सब डीटैल्ज तय हो जायें, तो उन को इस पालियामेंट की एक्जल के लिए पेश किया जाये और इस की एक्जल से पहले कोई एग््रीमेंट साइन न किया जाये। सरकार कभी नहीं सोचती है कि इस पालियामेंट का भी कोई अधिकार है। मैंने बारूबार सरकार को यह समझाया है कि वह अपना यह तरीका बदले।

पिछले अठारह सालों में सरकार की जो नीति रही है, उस का परिणाम पराजय हुआ है—उस पालिसी का नतीजा डिफ़ीट हुआ है। हर जगह इस सरकार ने भीख मांगी है और छोटे-छोटे मुल्कों के सामने हाथ पसारें हैं। आज सरकार का काम यह है कि वह हिन्दुस्तान को अपनी फाउंडेशन पर खड़ा करे। यह यू० एस० फाउंडेशन किस लिए है? महात्मा गांधी ने कहा था कि जो बच्चे दूसरों की एजूकेशन पर पढ़ेंगे, वे कभी देशभक्त नहीं हो सकते। आज आचार्य विनोबा भावे यह बात कहता है कि आज देश के जो नीनिहाल, देश के जो जवान पी० एल०—480 का अनाज खा रहे हैं, वे अमरीका के गुलाम हो जायेंगे, वे कभी भी देशभक्त नहीं हो सकते।

हमारा इतना बड़ा मुल्क है, पचास करोड़ का मुल्क है। मुझे यह कहते हुए शर्म

आती है कि अगर पचास करोड़ वृक्ष या दरख्त होते, तो उन में भी फूल और पत्ते निकलते, लेकिन ये पचास करोड़ इन्सान तो लाशों की तरह रह रहे हैं। इस सरकार ने या तो उन्हें भिखमंगा बनाया है और या उन को नपुंसक बनाया है—या तो दुश्मन के सामने हाथ जोड़ने के लिए तैयार किया और या दूसरों के सामने हाथ पसारने के लिए तैयार किया है। आज इस पालिसी को बदलना पड़ेगा। जो छोटे बच्चे यू० एस० फाउंडेशन के अन्तर्गत शिक्षा प्राप्त करेंगे क्या वे देशभक्त हो सकेंगे? “इन्डो” का तो नाम ही नाम है। वास्तव में तो यह यू० एस० फाउंडेशन है। जो बच्चा यू० एस० फाउंडेशन में तालीम पायेगा, वह कैसे देशभक्त रह सकेगा।

नाम का बड़ा असर पड़ता है। हमारे स्पीकर साहब का नाम है “हुकम सिंह”, उन का हुकम दुनिया भर में चलता है। हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब का नाम है, “मुहम्मद करीम चागला” वह हजरत रसूल सली-अल्लाह आलिया व सलम के फ़ालोअर हैं। उन का नाम चलता है। वह यू० एन० ओ० में जा कर हिन्दुस्तान की इज्जत का डंका बजा कर आए हैं। हमारे श्री भक्त दर्शन देश के सच्चे भक्त हैं। मैं “यशपाल सिंह”—मैं मर जाऊंगा, लेकिन देश के यश को खराब नहीं होने दूंगा।

जो बच्चे यू० एस० फाउंडेशन में पढ़ेंगे, उन की रग-रग में अमरीका की गुलामी भर जायेगी, उन की रग-रग दूसरों की दास हो जायेगी। गुलाम की पहचान यह है : परभाषा, परभाव, परशिक्षा, परपरिधान, पराधीन जन की यह पूरी पहचान। गुलाम की पहचान यह है कि उस की भाषा, उस की ड्रेस, उस की थिंकिंग और उस की शिक्षा विदेशी होती है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि पचास करोड़ इन्सानों को क्यों भिखमंगा बनाया जा रहा है, क्यों उन को दूसरों के रहम पर ज़िन्दा रहने के लिए मजबूर किया जा रहा है। अगर इन इन्सानों के स्थान पर पचास करोड़ लाशें होती, तो उन की बदबू से ही दुश्मन खत्म

हो गए होते। ये पचास-करोड़ इन्सान नपुंसकों की तरह खड़े कर दिये गए हैं। मैं चागला साहब से कहूंगा कि अगर वह अमरीका या रूस से यह आशा करते हैं कि वे इस देश का निर्माण करेंगे, इस देश की बिल्डिंग करेंगे, इस देश की तामीर करेंगे, तो यह उन की गलतफहमी है—वे हरगिज़ ऐसा नहीं करेंगे। हां अपना उल्लू सीधा करते रहेंगे, ज़रूर करते रहेंगे। जिस काम को आप करना चाहते हैं, देश का निर्माण करना चाहते हैं, तो क्या देश का निर्माण उस वक्त होगा, देश उस वक्त अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होगा, जब बच्चे यू० एस० फाउंडेशन में शिक्षा प्राप्त करेंगे। अभी हमारे भाई सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद ने कहा जब हम उन से मदद ले रहे हैं, रोटी की मदद ले रहे हैं, कपड़े की मदद ले रहे हैं, तो शिक्षा की मदद भी क्यों न लें। आज कपड़े और रोटी की मदद हम लेते हैं, उस से हम परागन्दा होते हैं, लेकिन आज जब हम शिक्षा की मदद लेंगे तो उससे हमारी सन्तानें परागन्दा होंगी।

इसलिये मैं आज सरकार से अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ कि वह इन ख्यालातों को पनपने न दें, अगर ये ख्यालात पनपे तो इससे और ज्यादा डिफ़ीट होगी। 50 लाख से कम आबादी वाला देश बेलजियम है, वह हम को 50 फ़ेक भेजता है ; दिल्ली शहर से कम आबादी वाला देश डेनमार्क है, वहां के बच्चे भूख हड़ताल कर के, इसलिये कि हिन्दुस्तान के बच्चे भूखे हैं, यहां पर सहायता भेजते हैं। कितने शर्म की बात है। छोटे छोटे मुल्कों के सामने आप परेशान होते हैं, भीखमंगे होते हैं। मुझे याद है भगवान श्री कृष्ण एक दफ़ा दुर्योधन के यहां चले गये। दुर्योधन ने कहा, महाराज, भोजन कीजिये। नयनानन्द गोविन्द माधव मुकुन्द आनन्दकन्द केशव श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र भगवान ने कहा—

प्रीतिर्भोज्यानि अन्नानि तथा आपदग्रतानिच किसी के यहां खाना खाने के दो ही कारण हो सकते हैं, या ठो भोजन न मिलता हो, या

[श्री यशपाल सिंह]

मेरा और तेरा प्रेम होता, तब मैं तेरे यहां भोजन करता। दोनों ही बातें नहीं हैं, इसलिये मैं तेरा भोजन ग्रहण नहीं कर सकता। लेकिन आज हम दूसरों की मदद पर जिन्दा हैं। इस देश का 50 करोड़ इन्सान अपने आत्मसम्मान को रक्षा नहीं कर सकता। कभी इन पचास करोड़ इन्सानों को पंचशोल की अफ़ीम दी जाती है, तो कभी ताशकन्द की कन्न में ठोका जाता है, कभी अहिंसा का राग अलापा जाता है, कभी तकली और चर्खों की बात की जाती है, यह सबसे बड़ा फ़ाड है, 50 करोड़ भगवान के बेटों के साथ यह वृहत बड़ा मजाक है। इस तरह से दूसरों को भीख पर आप इस देश को निर्भर करते जा रहे हैं। मभापति महोदय, जिस वक्त किसी देश की जनता में दूसरों पर निर्भर रहने को आदत पड़ जाती है, उस वक्त देश में गुलामी पैदा होने लगती है, उपेक्षावृत्ति पैदा हो जाती है। आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि हिन्दु-स्नान अपने पैरों पर खड़ा हो, भारत अपने आत्म सम्मान की रक्षा करे। यदि इस देश पर फिर मुमीबत आती है तो याद रखिये न हमें रूस बचा सकता है और न हमें अमरोका बचा सकता है, न कोई और फौरन कन्ट्री बचा सकता है, हमें यदि कोई बचायेगा तो हिन्दुस्तान का पचास करोड़ जन-समुद्र बचायेगा, जनता-जनार्दन बचायेगी, जिसको एक-एक ग्लास पानी के लिये आपने तरसा दिया है, दूसरों पर निर्भर कर दिया है। इस देश में किसी वक्त दूध की नदियां बहा करती थी, लेकिन आज हमारे बच्चे अमरोका का भोजन हुआ डिब्बे का दूध पीते हैं—

तिपल में बू आए क्या,

मां बाप के अतवार की ।।

दूध तो डिब्बे का है,

तालीम यू० ए० ए० सरकार की ।

ऐसी हालत में इस देश में देश-भक्त पैदा नहीं हो सकते। सब से पहले जरूरत इस बात की

है कि इन ख्यालात को खत्म किया जाय, भूखा मर जाना अच्छा है लेकिन भीख मांग कर खाना अच्छा नहीं है। आज आप कहते हैं कि अगर हम न लें, तो कैसे जिन्दा रहेंगे, अपमान के भोजन से भूखा रहना अच्छा है। ऐ तायरे लाहती, उस रिजक से मीत अच्छी, जिस रिजक से आती हो, परवाज में कोताही। आप कहते हैं कि जिन्दा कैसे रहेंगे, जिन्दा रहने का सवाल ही नहीं है, भूख से मर जाना कहीं अच्छा है।

इस देश को गुलाम बनाने को जो कोशिश की गई है, जो इस को पंचशोल को अफ़ीम दी गई है, आज तक ताशकन्द के मरे हुए पत्थर के नीचे इस को रखा गया है, आज तक इसको अहिंसा का गलत पाठ पढ़ाया गया है, जरूरत इस बात की है—जैसा भगवान श्री कृष्ण ने गीता में उपदेश दिया था—

“सुखिनः क्षत्रियाः पार्थ लभन्ते युद्धमीदृशं”
आगे दुश्मन का मुकाबला करने के लिये हमारा देश अपने पैरों पर खड़ा हो, हमारे देश का आत्म सम्मान कायम रहे। अगर देश का आत्म सम्मान कायम न रहा तो हरगिज हम देश की स्वतन्त्रता की रक्षा नहीं कर सकते।

हमारे एक वाइस चान्सलर जापान गये थे, उनका नाम था—रास मसूद। वह अलीगढ़ यूनीवर्सिटी के वाइस चान्सलर थे। उन्होंने वहां देखा कि एक लड़का एक किताब के लिये पांच मील पैदल चल कर आता था और फिर पांच मील पैदल चल कर वापस कर के आता था। वह फावड़ा चला कर उस आजीविका से अपनी एजुकेशन को चलाता था। ऐसे प्रतिभाशाली, परिश्रमी लड़के को देख कर उन्होंने खड़े हो कर कहा कि मैं दो सौ रुपये माहवार इस को हमेशा देता रहूंगा जिससे कि वह अपनी शिक्षा को पूरा कर सके। लेकिन उस लड़के ने क्या कहा, उस ने कहा कि यदि मैं हिन्दुस्तान के किसी शख्स से 200 रु०

कुबूल कर लेता हूँ, तो मैं जापान का देशभक्त हरगिज नहीं रह सकता। उस ने यह सहायता स्वीकार नहीं की। यह है देश-भक्ति और चरित्र का उदाहरण।

उन लोगों में स्पष्ट है, लेकिन हम लोग आज हर जगह भीख मांगते हैं। कोई गेहूँ की भीख दो, कोई राइफल की भीख दो, कोई भास्त्रों की भीख दो, कोई एजुकेशन की भीख दो, कोई फाउण्डेशन की भीख दो, कोई मीनारों की भीख दो, यह चीज क्या है? 50 करोड़ इन्सान, सभापति महोदय, ये ऋषि, मुनियों की औलाद हैं, पीर-पैगम्बरों की औलाद हैं, ये गुरुओं की औलाद हैं, जिन्होंने संसार को प्रकाश दिया था—

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

असतो मा सद्गमय

मृत्युर्मा अमृतं गमय।

जिन्होंने संसार को विश्वास दिलाया था कि ये इनने लोग संसार का हमेशा पथ-प्रदर्शन करते रहेंगे। मुट्ठी भर लोगों ने सारे संसार का पथ-प्रदर्शन किया था, तो आज क्या हम 50 करोड़ इन्सान ऐसा नहीं कर सकते। मैं हरगिज इस बात को नहीं मानता हूँ कि भगवान अमरीका में ही इन्जीनियर पैदा करता है, खूबसूरती पैदा करता है, अमरीका में ही भगवान विद्वान लोग पैदा करता है, क्या हिन्दुस्तान की धरती ने 50 करोड़ गधे पैदा किये हैं—मैं हरगिज इस बात को नहीं मानता। यह इनका कसूर है, यह सरकार का अपराध है, इस सरकार ने हिन्दुस्तान को भिखमंगा बनाया, नपसक बनाया। अभी भी समय है —इट इज नेवर लेट टु मन्ड —अगर अपना सुधार करना चाहते हो, तो कर सकते हो।

इस लिये माननीय मुखर्जी साहब से मेरा अनुरोध है कि वह हरगिज इस प्रस्ताव को वापस न लें, चाहे ये कितनी ही कोशिश करें, चाहे इसकी स्पष्ट को खत्म किया जाय, इस के लेटर को खत्म किया जाय।

Mr. Chairman: Before I call upon any other Member to speak I should like to know whether the discussion on this motion should be concluded as scheduled because two hours are allotted and they will be over at 5.30.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: Time may be extended.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: The debate may conclude at 6 P.M.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: At that time, if you are forced to take a vote on this? I have a very important resolution which is next to the resolution of Mr. Mukerjee. It did not come up in the ballot for three times and only last time, it came up. Lakhs of people will be benefited by it. I wish you give time to move it.

Mr. Chairman: We started at 3.30 p.m. today. In the ordinary course, 2½ hours means, 6 O'clock. Now, we have extended the time by one hour and so, we will close this debate just five minutes before 6 O'clock so that Mr. Saraf can move his resolution. How long would the hon. Minister take?

Shri M. C. Chaglia: About 15 to 20 minutes.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I would need about 5-7 minutes for reply.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): We have half an hour discussion after this.

Mr. Chairman: That will be taken up afterwards, as usual. Members will close their speech at 5.30 and I will call the hon. Minister at 5.30 and the Mover will be called afterwards. If hon. Members take about 5-7 minutes, I will be able to accommodate more Members. Shrimati Renuka Ray.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Mr. Chairman, a good deal has been said about

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

the matter both here and elsewhere. I will be very brief. I want to say that Rs. 700 crores have accrued from PL 480 wheat and naturally that is a problem for India. Because Rs. 30 crores have already been spent, and if it is to be spent at all, it must be on some specific ground, and that is the reason why specific grounds have been sought. The former Finance Minister was very anxious that it should be spent on some kind of specific project or on some specific ground of which we in India approve fully. That is the background against which we later on heard about this Indo-US Education Foundation for which 300 crores of this money in Rupees was to be set apart.

17 hrs.

I am one of those who are most anxious about our educational advance in this country, anxious not only for expansion but for quality in education. But I had felt that this Indo-US Education Foundation, in the manner in which it is supposed to be composed, even with a few deviations, will be most detrimental to the country's purpose. It will not help us. I have no anti-American bias. U.S.A., or USSR or any other country, I have no bias against any country. Therefore, I say this in all seriousness that a foundation of this nature, with which a foreign country has so much to do, cannot possibly serve the best interests of Indian education and the advancement of Indian culture. That is the background against which we have to view this, and if we view it against that background, we cannot in India approve of a Indo-US foundation as it is.

I am sure that the Government will not bring it in as it was first conceived, but in whatever form it is brought in, it would be better if it did not deal with education, unless the money is made over to the Ministry of Education or to the University Grants Commission and they are

asked to spend it on any specific work such as science or technical education. That would be better. I want to point out here that there is an India International Centre which gets money from the Rockefeller Foundation in the United States. It is a non-official body, and when the committee to organise this centre was set up, it was on the basis that no American would be in it as President or Vice-President or as any other officer-bearer. It was set up on the basis that it will be specifically by Indians in whatever they think would be the best way. This can be done by a non-official organisation taking grants from an American non-official foundation. We know that under the PL-480 funds the Indian Government seem to find their hands and feet tied. I do not understand how this position could possibly have come. I do not want to go into any more details about it. As I have stated, I have no particular bias against America, but I most positively and clearly state that it cannot be to the interests of the majority of Indians, if the Indo-US foundation remains in its present form or conception and the money spent on education in this manner. Either you do not have a foundation of this nature at all—which is probably preferable—and the money is made over to the Government either for education or any other purpose, or the Government may accept the amendment by Shri Sidheshwar Prasad or the other one brought in by Shri Shree Narayan Das; the latter suggests that we discuss the whole issue, and that Government should appoint a Committee of Members of Parliament, and then the matter could be decided. Whatever it is, I hope that the Government will give us a definite assurance that they will not proceed with the matter as it is. Either it should be changed, or, if a foundation is to be set up, the funds should be utilised for agricultural advance like irrigation etc., or, in any case, the matter should be kept pending until the

Members of Parliament, a Parliamentary Committee, goes into the matter in detail and decides what would be the best way in which the fund could be utilised, and this fund must be kept frozen until such time, so that it does not add to the inflationary pressure in the country.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: Sir, Prof. Mukherjee has criticised the Foundation and that was to be expected. He has attacked the project with excessive vigour and dramatised the event. I do not propose to do any such thing. I look upon the proposed project as a simple fact of a gift made by a friendly country to another country to be used for the purpose of promoting education and advanced research in that other country. I, therefore, support the idea of the establishment of this Foundation. But I do so in terms of the substitute motion that I have moved I say that,

“the Government should consider the usefulness of the proposed project.”

Before they proceed to implement it, the Government should be satisfied that “the Scheme of the project subserves the interests of India in respect of Indian and US Representation on the joint board of directors and in respect of other cognate matters”.

We cannot talk in this House about this project without first saying something about the 54 professors of Delhi University who have rushed to the Press expressing their disapproval. Ordinarily, 54 professors of a university would be entitled to our respect for their opinion, provided that opinion has been expressed after a due consideration of the facts involved. In this particular case, we know that the professors were rather in haste in going to the press, because when they did it, they did not have in their possession the details of the project. In fact, the details are not yet known to us. They have to be negotiated

between the two Governments. I am sure we shall be very glad to welcome any opinions that the professors may have to give us after they have received the full details of the project.

Something has been said about the intimate involvement of a foreign Government in matters affecting Indian educational policy that would be involved in accepting this project. After all, education is such a matter in which there should be always an intimate involvement and intimate exchange between one country and another. Our tradition in India has been that there has been such an intimate involvement and exchange between India and America, India and Great Britain, India and Germany and so on. Today thousands of our young people are going in a big stream that is flowing towards American universities. They are receiving highly technical advanced scientific knowledge and education in those universities. We are glad they are doing so, so long as we in India are not able to provide in an adequate measure all these facilities to our young people.

What really happens or can happen if one comes under the influence of another educational institution of another country? Do not we remember that here, in this country, most of our great men of today and yesterday have had their education in British universities, in American universities, in German universities and so on? Men like Shri Subhas Chandra Bose, like Mahatma Gandhi, like Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, our present Minister of Education and, for that matter, Professor Hiren Mukerjee himself, are distinguished products of foreign universities, and they are today no less patriotic because of their having been educated in other universities.

Something was said about the fund and it was asked why it is not proposed that the fund be turned over to the University Grants Commission. I think it is only natural, it is only

[Shri V. B. Gandhi]

human to expect that a donor country which makes such a gift of an unparralled proportion—it is really a big gift by all standards—to another country for purposes of education, it would be interested or it would want to see that the gift is used in accordance with some of the ideas, the original ideas that that country has in making such a gift. What is actually going to happen is that the fund is going to be established in India the fund money is going to be invested in Indian Government securities and all items that come up for consideration will be submitted to a decision by a Board of Directors, a Joint Board of Directors, which would be composed of distinguished citizens of both countries.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am surprised at the turn the debate has taken today and I am most surprised at the fears and apprehensions, doubts and misgivings that have been expressed today.

Mr. Chairman: I was told the other day on the floor of this House that each citizen of India, man or woman, old man or child, has to pay a debt of Rs. 85—perhaps on account of devaluation the quantum of debt has gone up. We have been getting money from all the countries of the world. We have our steel complex in this country, a steel plant run by the Soviet Union, a steel plant run by the U.K. Government, a steel plant run by German Government and so on. We are getting help from the Rumanians for our oil exploration. We are getting help from other countries. We are getting help in terms of thousands of crores of rupees. I think we have done that because ours is a developing country. No one has ever said that we should not take help from the Soviet Union for having our new steel plant. Nobody has ever said that we should not go to Rumania for assistance in our oil exploration. Nobody has objected to that. It shows utter lack of sense of

proportion to say that this Foundation, by spending about Rs. 9 crores or 13 crores, whatever the quantum be, is going to change the Indian culture, is going to un-Indianise us, is going to make us absolutely the image of an American.

The British people were here for 150 years and they gave us their own system of education and the products of that very system of education toppled the British Government. They were the freedom-fighters. They became our emancipators. Do you mean to say that the soul of India can be purchased for Rs. 9 crores? Do you mean to say that the culture of India will be blemished, will be tarnished because the Indo-US Foundation is going to give us Rs. 9 crores or 13 crores?

I think anyone who says that has a very low opinion about India, has a very poor opinion of the Indian people and has a very distorted vision of Indian culture. People talk of the sensitiveness of education. People say that CIA will come here. People say that the Asia Foundation, Fulbright Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation will influence our thinking. I know something about them. Everyone knows something about them. I think they are trying to do good to any country where they go. I do not think they interfere with the politics of any country. If you think that the Indo-US Foundation is going to interfere with the politics of our country, I think the sooner our politics is doomed the better it is. If with the help of Rs. 9 crores we are going to be purchased by America, or some other country, I think there is no future for our country. Therefore, I think that the fears expressed are utterly wrong and there is no ground for those fears.

It has been stated that some academic people issued a statement criticising this project. That is a symbol of the freedom which the academic

people enjoy and I think academic freedom is much more practised in this country than in any other country. I believe that academic freedom is the most valuable gift and, I can assure you, that this Indo-US Foundation is not going to undermine the roots of that kind of freedom. On the other hand, that freedom will acquire greater vigour.

When Mr. Chou-En-lai went to Paris a journalist went up to him and asked him: do you know that every student from China who goes to Russia comes back as an anti-Communist while every Chinese student who goes to Paris comes back as a Communist? So, in the matter of education, things do not work in the way in which mathematical propositions work or algebraical formulations work. We have our heritage of psyche and Indian psychology, we have our heritage of Indian culture; we have traditional academic freedom and the legacy of the freedom-fighters in this country. Young men of this country, I know, even now think of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.....

An hon. Member: Indira Gandhi.

Shri D. C. Sharma: ...and all those great freedom fighters. But one thing is there and it is that this Indo-US Foundation is just something which has been conceived. The baby is yet to be born and we have started talking about the baby before it is born. Therefore I say that when the baby is born we should have a look at it and should see to it whether the baby is deformed or good to look at or cooked. We should also see to it that the baby received the right kind of nurture and environment.

Shri Kishen Pattnayak (Sambalpur): We want it to be stillborn.

Shri D. C. Sharma: It cannot be stillborn.

When the baby comes here and if we find that this baby does not con-

form to Indian specifications either in body or in mind, either in spirit or in soul, if it does not conform to our standards of culture and our ideals of education, if it does not conform to the ideology that India cherishes most, we will see that this baby is handed back and does not grow on this soil. But, I think, there will be no danger of that because, after all, this baby is going to be looked after by distinguished academic persons. Therefore, I think, all the fears that have been expressed about this Foundation—I am not particular of the USA, I am more fond of the Soviet Union—are utterly baseless, unfounded and without roots and the sooner we give them up the better it is.

श्री रामसेबक यादव (बाराबंकी) :

सभापति जी, इस प्रस्ताव के पक्ष और विपक्ष में बोलते हुए माननीय सदस्यों ने शिक्षा-विशारदों, विशेषज्ञों और एकेडेमीशन्स की राय को पेश किया है। मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि यह जो प्रश्न प्रस्तुत है, यह जो प्रस्ताव है, इस का उन से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। यह शुद्ध और साफ़ एक राजनीतिक प्रश्न है और इसको इसी तरह हल करना चाहिए। सरकार को इस सम्बन्ध में एक निश्चित निर्णय लेना है और इस बात को घपले में नहीं रखना है।

माननीय सदस्य, श्री मुकर्जी, ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है, मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ, लेकिन जो कारण उन्होंने इस के समर्थन में दिये हैं, मैं उन से सहमत नहीं हूँ। क्योंकि जब कम्युनिस्ट सदस्य, या श्री मुकर्जी, बोलते हैं, तो वे हर एक प्रश्न को सीधा शीत युद्ध का प्रश्न बना लेते हैं।

आम तौर से यह कहा जाता है कि शिक्षा एक-दम मासूम चीज होती है, वह सांवेभ्यौमिक और सर्वदेशीय होती है, इस लिए जब भी शिक्षा का मामला आए, तो उस

[श्री रामसेवक यादव]

का विरोध नहीं होना चाहिए, उस का समर्थन होना चाहिए। यही कारण है कि जो बड़ी बड़ी शिक्षा संस्थायें हैं, उन का नाम विश्वविद्यालय रखा जाता है, चाहे वह हिन्दुस्तान में हों, अमरीका में हों या किसी भी देश में हों। परन्तु मैं विनम्र निवेदन करूंगा कि ऐसा नहीं है; शिक्षा पर भी देश और काल का प्रभाव पड़ता है और निश्चित रूप से हर जगह पड़ा करता है।

मैं और मेरा दल हमेशा यह कहा करते हैं कि जब तक इस देश में जन-भाषा और मातृभाषायें नहीं पनपेंगी, तब तक इस देश के गरीबों के हाथ में न राजसत्ता आयेगी, न अधिकार आयेंगे और सोशलिज्म या समाजवाद का कोई अर्थ नहीं होगा। हम पहले से ही अंग्रेजियत से दबे हुए हैं, लेकिन अगर यह प्रतिष्ठान बनेगा, तो निश्चित रूप से अमरीका की पद्धति और तरीके का उस प्रतिष्ठान पर, और इस देश पर भी, प्रभाव पड़ेगा। हमारे लिए वह घातक होगा और अंग्रेजियत हम को दबोचेगी और हमारे ऊपर छा जायेगी।

कुछ लोग कहेंगे कि मेरी यह बात केवल समाज शास्त्र और कला पर ही सही उतरेगी, विज्ञान पर इस का प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा। मैं विनम्र निवेदन करूंगा कि अगर हम इस विषय को गहरी और पैनी दृष्टि से देखें तो मालूम होगा कि समाज शास्त्र के अतिरिक्त विज्ञान पर भी इस का प्रभाव पड़ता है। मिसाल के तौर पर आज भी अमरीका में खेती के सम्बन्ध में उर्वरक पर ज्यादा जोर दिया जाता है और खेती की तरक्की के लिए उर्वरक की जरूरत है। लेकिन ठीक इसके विपरीत हिन्दुस्तान की स्थिति यह है कि उर्वरक की तो बाद में जरूरत है और सब से पहले पानी की आवश्यकता है। लेकिन चूंकि हम उस पद्धति से प्रभावित हैं इसलिए यहां भी

उर्वरक की रट लगाई जाती है और पानी की जो मुख्य समस्या है, उसकी ओर से हमारा ध्यान हट जाता है। उर्वरक नम्बर एक ले लेता है और पानी नम्बर दो पर आ जाता है।

17.26 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

इस लिए विज्ञान पर भी इसका असर पड़ता है मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि इस शिक्षा प्रतिष्ठान को भी इसी दृष्टिकोण से देखना चाहिए।

जैसा कि मैंने शुरू में कहा है, रूस या कम्युनिस्ट लोग इस प्रतिष्ठान का विरोध शीत युद्ध के कारण करेंगे। मैं मानता हूं और साफ तौर से कहूंगा कि जहां तक व्यक्तिगत आजादी का सवाल है, रूस व्यक्तियों की आपसी दोस्ती में ज्यादा दखलअन्दाजी करता है। मैं आपके सामने एक मिसाल रखूंगा। हिन्दुस्तान से युवाजन सभा के कुछ सदस्य कुछ समय पहले रूस गये थे। वहां पर उनकी कई लोगों से व्यक्तिगत दोस्ती हुई थी। यहां आ कर उन लोगों ने लगभग दो सौ पत्र लिखे, लेकिन केवल कुछ दो चार पांच अधिकारियों के जबाब आए और वहां के साधारण नागरिकों ने उन पत्रों का जबाब नहीं दिया, क्योंकि वहां पर व्यक्तिगत जीवन में ज्यादा हस्तक्षेप है। अमरीका में भी इस प्रकार का हस्तक्षेप है और खास कर अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों में वे लोग हस्तक्षेप करते हैं, लेकिन जहां व्यक्तियों के मामले आते हैं, वहां पर अपेक्षाकृत शायद कुछ कम दखल होता है।

जो भी हो, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों में शायद कुछ निर्देश या दखल अच्छे भी होते होंगे, लेकिन उन से बुरे दखल छिप जाया करते हैं और बुराईयों सामने नहीं आ पाती हैं। इस कारण से मैं इस का विरोधी हूं और मैं

चाहूंगा कि इस तरह के प्रतिष्ठान इस देश में कायम न किये जायें, क्योंकि उन से देश की पद्धति और तरीके पर असर पड़ता है, जो कि हमारे लिए उपयोगी साबित नहीं होगा ।

मैं आपको एक और मिसाल दूंगा । हिन्दुस्तान के विद्यार्थी पढ़ने के लिये अमरीका और दूसरे देशों में जाते हैं और वहाँ से ज्ञान सीख कर आते हैं । वे यहाँ आकर खपत के मामले में ज्यादा आधुनिक हो जाते हैं और उपज के मामले में दक्षियानूसी रहते हैं । यह उसी का कारण होता है कि वे उस पद्धति से प्रभावित हो जाते हैं ।

इस कारण मैं समझता हूँ कि यह प्रतिष्ठान हमारे देश के लिए हानिकर होगा और इसलिए मैं इस का विरोध करता हूँ ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, even when I do not agree with my friend, Mr. Mukerjee, I always admire his scholarship, his diction and the grace of his speech. But, I find, in this particular case, there are many matters on which we are in agreement through we draw different inferences.

There is an English saying that we must not look at gift horse in the mouth. That does not apply to political and international relations. I am one of those who believe that one must look at every gift horse in the mouth and look at it in all its aspects as to what the horse carries. It may look all right but when one opens its mouth, one may find what was found in the Trojan horse story and, therefore, one has to be very careful.

श्री रामसेवक यादव : दान की बछिया के दांत नहीं देखे जाते हैं, यह भी एक कहावत है ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: But the trouble with Mr. Mukerjee is that he only

wants to look into the mouth of the gift horse when the gift horse is an American gift horse. If the gift horse had been a socialist gift horse, he would not look at it at all, he would not examine it at all.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuzha): Fundamental difference.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Why is it a fundamental difference? If we believe in our culture, as I do, and as you do, if we believe in the integrity of our intellectual and academic life, as I believe and as you believe, if, as you and I believe, we must not permit any foreign country to inject its culture into our way of life, then it is essential that whoever sends a gift horse, we must carefully examine it.

There is another principle which I would like to place before this House. I am sure the House will agree that we must keep all our windows open; we must permit the winds to blow from all quarters. Is our patriotism so superficial, is our culture so slight or slender that we are afraid that any foreign influence will affect our patriotism and culture? Our culture goes back to thousands of years compared to America whose culture is only a few hundred years' old. I have enough confidence in our country, in our countrymen, in our culture, as not to be afraid of any injection by the United States into our culture.

Mr. Mukerjee talked about gilded millstones round our necks. I do not like any millstone, whether it is gilded or silver or brass or copper. A millstone is a millstone and we should not have it.

What is the basic idea underlying this Foundation That has not been mentioned by Mr. Mukerjee at all. That is what I want to emphasize before this House.

Let us first look at the history of this Foundation. In April, 1964, a Sub committee of the Committee on

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, while discussing the utilisation of the local currency proposed the use of excess American money in Indian currency to endow a bi-national Foundation for the development of education and science in India. After that, Dr. Harman B. Wells, President of the Indiana University, came here. There were discussions and ultimately the principle of the Foundation was accepted by the Cabinet in 1965 under the Prime Minister-ship of late Shri Shastri. Therefore, it was not we who asked Americans to give us a gift; we never asked them that we wanted money for our education; it was they who suggested that they had some money which they wanted to put in a trust. This is not a gift that is being made by the United States; it is a trust and it is a trust of moneys which are entirely at the disposal of the United States.

Let me give this House the scheme of P.L. 480. The scheme of P.L. 480 counterpart funds is this 80 per cent are lent to the Government of India to finance development projects and programmes. These projects and programmes will only be financed provided the United States Government and the Government of India agree. I remember, when I was Ambassador in the United States, I used to get many letters saying, "we want this money to finance this project" and my invariable answer was that this was a matter which must be taken up between the two Governments and that they must agree; the United States cannot say that so much of the counterpart rupees should be put into this developmental scheme; it is a matter on which both the Governments should agree.

Then 7 per cent is earmarked for loans to industries in India having American capital participation. Then we come to the last one, which is a crucial thing; the remaining 13 per cent will be at the disposal of the

United States Government to be spent at its discretion. This particular 13 per cent has amounted to over Rs. 200 crores. We have no control over it. We cannot discipline this amount. The American Government can use it as it likes. Therefore, if we get this Rs. 200 crores invested in Government securities, to that extent we are immobilising this large amount of money.

My hon. friend has drawn a harrowing picture of CIA activities. I am at one with him in condemning the CIA. I do not like their activities; I do not like the subterfuges; I do not like the clandestine ways; I do not like the method of overthrowing Government. And I join wholeheartedly with my hon. friend in condemning the CIA. But is it suggested that by using the interest on this Rs. 200 crores—because only the interest is to be used, and not the capital—there will be more CIA activities in this country than when we leave Rs. 200 crores at the discretion of the American Embassy here? That is the simple question which this House has to answer.

If you want to resist CIA activities, if you want to resist underhand American influence, do you want then to use Rs. 200 crores as they like, creating lobbies, winning over our intellectuals and academicians doing all sorts of things, or would you rather that they had no control over this Rs. 200 crores and they would only use Rs. 5 or 6 crores by way of interest on this?

Shri Himatsingka (Godda): In consultation with Indians.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am coming to that.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Are these the only alternatives?

Shri M. C. Chagla: What I am saying is this. Let us look at it from the economic point of view. The money is there. The PL-480 scheme is there. Whether we like it or not,

that is the position today. The United States has at its discretion this money; Rs. 200 crores was the figure some time ago; I do not have the exact figure now; the Finance Minister will be knowing it; but I think it has gone up to about Rs. 300 crores today, because interest is also being added to it. This money is entirely at the discretion of the American Government. They can do what they like with it. I think it was Shri T. T. Krishnamachari who said that he did not know how a large amount of this money had been used by the American Government. Therefore, we are now immobilising this large amount of money. What is the scheme?

This money will be invested in Government securities, in our own securities. Only the interest on it will be used for certain purposes to which I shall presently come. That is the scheme. Somebody asked me about foreign exchange. Nothing final has been decided about it. There was talk as to how much of this should be used in foreign exchange, but no finality has been arrived at. But this is the main picture with regard to how this fund will be financed. Therefore, the position is this. The United States tells us—we do not ask them—'Look, we have got Rs. 200 crores it belongs to us; we have control over it; we want to make a trust of it in your favour', and we say 'Yes'. We accept the principle. Therefore, when my hon. friend Shri Sidheshwar Prasad says, 'Use it for this purpose or that purpose', I would say that it is not our money at all. They have suggested a trust, and broadly they have suggested certain purposes. I shall read out presently what the purposes broadly are. But it is not a gift, as my hon. friend Shri Surendranath Dwivedy has said. We cannot do what we like with it in that sense. After all, it is a trust. It is their money. They say that they want to make a trust. The question is whether the trust is in our interest or prejudicial to our interest. I agree on that with both my hon.

friends. If we are satisfied that this trust is against our interest, then certainly we should reject it. I do not think that anybody can accuse me of being pro-American. I am not pro-American; I am not pro-Russian; I am pro-Indian, and that is good enough for me. I do not look at it from the point of view of America or from the point of view of Russia. I am not prejudiced against one country or the other. I ask myself the questions 'Is this in national interest? Is this in Indian interest? Is this in the interest of education and science and research?' If it is not, it must go.

My hon. friend, Shri Dwivedy, asked, 'What are the terms of reference? Why don't you come out with them? Why are you playing hide and seek with this House?' I am one of those who believes in being fair and frank with the House, coming and telling the House whatever I know. I gave an assurance on the 27th July, to which my friend referred. The terms have not been finalised. They are still in a flexible stage. That is why I have welcomed this discussion.

So what did I do? I immediately called a meeting of the Delhi professors who had sent a manifesto against the Foundation. I talked to them. Then I called a larger meeting of educationists at which the Prime Minister was present. We discussed it. We have been reading objections to it coming from various quarters. We are noting down every criticism made against it.

Let me say this: it is not correct to say that the whole academic world is against it. Only the other day I got a letter from my very old friend who was my colleague on the Bench as a Judge, who had also argued before me—I refer to ex-Chief Justice Gajendragadker sending me a letter signed by distinguished academicians in Maharashtra saying that they entirely support the Founda-

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

tion. So it is not correct to say that national opinion is against it.

Let me also say this that at the meeting of the educationists whom I called, at which meeting the Prime Minister was also present, the consensus was that with proper safeguards, with proper rules and regulations, there was really no objection on principle. I again give the assurance to this House which I gave last time and which Shri Dwivedy repeated. I will read it again:

"I can give the assurance to this House that when the Foundation is ultimately established, Indian opinion will have a preponderating voice. The Foundation will never be permitted to formulate or implement any policy, which will run counter to our national policy; nor will we permit any American influence to be injected into our culture and our way of life".

Can there be a clearer and more definite assurance than this? If we carry out this assurance, what objection is there? It is only Rs. 5 crores. You can say, 'Can't you get Rs. 5 crores from the tax-payer? It is a drop in the ocean. We are paying Rs. 8 crores to our UGC'. I am not thinking of Rs. 5 crores; I am thinking of the Rs. 200 crores which can be used against our national interest which I am immobilising and putting under discipline, which disappears from the American control. That is my national interest and that is how this House should look at it. If you ask, 'Why are you anxious to have these Rs. 5 crores?' I say I do not want Rs. 5 crores; I think we can raise Rs. 5 crores. But what about the Rs. 200 crores which can be used as the American Embassy likes?

Let us turn to the question as to in which spheres of education.....

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: What about the composition of the Board itself?

Shri M. C. Chagla: All right. I will deal with that first. We have had discussions on this.

Shri K. D. Malaviya (Basti): The picture of the entire organisational structure may be given if it is possible.

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is under discussion. As you know, in all international matters, one cannot disclose details of negotiations while they are going on. But when we ultimately arrive at an agreement it will be to satisfy the assurance I have given to this House.

As regards the composition of the board, let me say that it will be an autonomous organisation, it will be an Indian organisation, it will be governed by Indian laws and, as I said, India will have a preponderating voice in the determination of the policy laid down by this Foundation.

A foundation like this can do a great deal of good. I will give an instance. Take the Rockefeller Foundation of the United States. What does it do? Some of the most brilliant people today in the world have been the products of the Rockefeller Foundation which gave a helping hand to these people. And their idea is this. You may have a project which neither Government nor any established agency will take up because it is doubtful. After all, if I start a thing in the CSIR, I am answerable for it; you will ask me if it fails: why did you waste this money, why did you start this? But an autonomous foundation is not answerable to anybody. Therefore, what the Rockefeller Foundation does is this. It allows people to start innovations, to try experiments which are not orthodox, which are not conservative, which are not conformist, and the result has been in many cases they are successful.

Suppose this foundation—as I say, we have not finalised—was confined to

science and technology, what is it going to do with culture? Science is not Indian, it is not American, it is not Russian, it is international; technology is not Indian, it is not American, it is not Russian, it is international.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): Will science include political science, behaviourism and all those things?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Science in the strict sense of the term.

I quite agree that there are various sensitive parts of our education, where we should not allow any foreign influence. Take sociology, take political science, take history, take even literature, take the humanities as a body. So if the House tells me to confine the project to science and technology, I can understand, because, as I said, there is no such thing as American influence in science and technology. What is American influence in science and technology? Electronics is not American; biology is not American, physics is not American, chemistry is not American. Therefore, when we sit down and draft the terms, again I assure you we will see to it that American money—it is not American money, it will be the Foundation's money—will not be used in any sector of education which is sensitive and vulnerable.

But I am surprised when I am told that we cannot trust this Foundation. If we have a preponderating Indian voice, if we have a majority of Indians on the Board, can we not trust our fellow Indians to look after our interests? Supposing the Board is of 16 or 20, and we have 12 or 14 Indians can we not find 12 people in our country patriotic enough to know what is good for our country?

I think my hon. friend Shri Khadilkar said that we cannot trust this Foundation with regard to the management. We are not trusting

the Americans, we are not trusting the American Government, we are trusting an autonomous organisation in which in all probability the majority will be Indians, and Indians will have a voice if laying down the policy.

I am really amused when I am told about the injection of American money into our economy. Today, this very moment, look at the foundations that are helping our educational institutions. We have got the U.S. Educational Foundation in India, the Fulbright programme.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Are you quite sure that it is doing the work that we would like it to do?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I have had no complaints.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I have very grave doubts, and I can give you many examples.

Shri M. C. Chagla: If you will kindly come and see me, I will look into it.

U. S. A. I. D. Agency, Food Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, Asia Foundation. And may I say this? Those dons of Delhi University, if I may use an Oxford term, or the professors of the Delhi University who issued that manifesto, for whom I have the greatest regard, most of them are brilliant, a large majority of them have been educated in the United States. Did they come back poisoned or contaminated by the American way of life? Today we have got 5,000 Indian students studying in the United States. They remain in that country for three to four years, they get exposed fully to the American way of life.

Is it suggested that they lose their patriotism when they come back to India?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Quite a lot of them.

Shri M. C. Chagla: No, Madam. I do not believe it. There may be some blacksheep, as there is in any community; there may be. But by and

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

large I have faith in our young people. Our laboratories are full of people who had been to the United States. Our universities are full of people. These very people who have attacked it have been educated in America. Yet they had the courage—I admire them—to point out and say that this is not good for India. Therefore, let us not talk of being exposed to American influence. It shows our inferiority complex. We are not sure of ourselves; we are not sure of our culture; we are not sure of our history and we are not sure of our men. I do not suffer from any of these apprehensions. Therefore, let us take a realistic view of the matter. Rs. 200 crores is immobilised; it is invested and the income of Rs. 5 crores is spent. What are the subjects? May I read what President Johnson said when he announced this? Not that we are bound by this. As I said the terms have not been finalised. He says: I would suggest that this foundation be organised as an independent institution with distinguished citizens of both of our countries on the board of directors. I would propose that the new foundation be given broad charter to promote progress in all fields of learning, to advance science, to enter into research, to develop new teaching techniques on the farms and the factories, to stimulate, if you please, new ways to meet old problems. But are we being exposed only to American influence? I have myself been responsible, as my hon. friend said, for inaugurating the Institute of Russian studies. It is doing wonderful work. What is it teaching?—not merely Russian language, but Russian culture, Russian philosophy and Russian history. I did it because I am not afraid of communism. My friend may not like me to put it in that way. But I am not afraid that because people go and study Russian culture and Russian philosophy, necessarily they will forget their own culture and their own philosophy. What is happening in IIT in Bombay, one of the finest institutes of technology we have in India, entirely run with the collaboration of Russia. We

have Russian professors there. We invited a Russian team to advise us on science teaching in secondary schools and they produced a first-class report. We had a distinguished Russian professor on the Education Commission, so also American, French. For heaven's sake, let us not take this parochial view; let us not talk of American influence and Russian influence and German influence and French influence. If we have confidence in ourselves, in our own culture, I do not think any country in the world, with whatever amount it may have, can bring about a situation where we will forget our own past and our own way of life.

I think he has to reply. I have some other things to say but I have taken more than my time.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is a pity that the Minister of Education and I are so generally to agree to differ and I am afraid I have to be reconciled to it. I wish to say at the outset that all this talk about some of us on this side being anti-American is so much rot. There is no question of being anti-American as such. There is no definition of democracy better than that of Abraham Lincoln that it is government of the people, by the people and for the people. There is no formulation of human objectives better than the American formulation during the Revolution: our objective is to fight for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

But when America behaves in the way it does today in the world that we see before us, a world in which we share this peril in regard to American policies of penetration into our kind of country, I have always to join issue with the Education Minister.

The Education Minister told us that they offered; we did not beg for it; we accepted it. Is it also simple as all that? They offered it. They prepared the trap for us, if we have at all any idea about what American motives are in these days in the Afro-Asian and Latin American world. If we do not know

anything about Afro-Asia and Latin America today, it is a different matter. But they laid a trap for us and we walked into it. That is why I object to this American influence in this country. And why do I say it is a trap? The Minister of Education should know better than to compare the Indo-US foundation with an institution like the Russian Studies School here in Delhi or the Indian Institute of Technology in Bombay. We have got Americans, Britishers, Russians, Germans, running technological institutions; and nobody, never me, or anybody on our side, had raised a voice against it. But here is a foundation, a whole foundation, and I tried to explain how it is likely to act. But he did not answer.

On the contrary, what the Minister of Education said in his speech is so disconcerting. I hope he tells the Finance Minister, his colleague, about it. Only the other day, he gave certain figures which we contest, that round about Rs. 70 odd crores are at the disposal of the United States embassy. Now, he has told us, and he is a Member of the Cabinet, that at least Rs. 200 crores are entirely at the discretion of the United States embassy out of PL 480 appropriations. I know he is very much nearer the truth. Shri Chagla is at least an honest man; even in his gusto there is sincerity which I respect, and he sometimes, with a kind of openness of mind tells things which many of his colleagues would hide. He has said this: that all this money is at the discretion and disposal of the Americans; why not we try to control it and after all we can share in the control. That is what it comes down to.

What I have tried to point out is that out of these PL 480 appropriations which are a danger to our country, a large lot through the Cooley plan goes to that sector of Indian industry which the Americans can control, because they choose and they approve of Indian collaborators. And now it is the Cooley plan in education, Mr. Chagla. Please remember that here the Government of India is letting itself in for the Cooley plan

in education in the Indo-US foundation. That is why I object to it.

Here is an organisation ostensibly for the advancement of learning in our country, which is going to have more money at its disposal than the University Grants Commission. If Shri Chagla and his friends could persuade the Americans to be so good as to enter into an understanding with us, which President Johnson has declared in such glowing terms, could he not get them to agree to put this entire money at the disposal of the University Grants Commission or any comparable agency? Do we not have other schemes that we have to worry about—secondary education primary education? Could we not utilise this money for the sake of development of primary education facilities?

Shri M. C. Chagla: That may be much worse. I would not agree to this money being used for primary or secondary education.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: You will use it; not they.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: If this money can be used for purposes which India decides on her own, if the money is received by us as a kind of gift without conditions, if this money is not going to be administered by a body in which participation to the extent of 50 per cent as at present proposed is to be by foreigners, by Americans in particular, who have behaved as in the case of the Michigan University people as CIA agents of the dirtiest quality, if these are the facts, how is it that the Government of India took this kind of risk? Why did the Government of India plunge into these waters without knowing how dirty they are? They know—some of them know—all about it, but they do not mind it. Did we ever mind anybody going to America or to Britain or Russia or to Germany for education? I said myself in my speech that we do not mind our students going to America for education because they give

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

us facilities which are not available in our country. But it is a different thing; a set of our young people going to foreign countries, coming back better educated than they could be in this country, and it is a very different thing when there is a motivated programme on the part of the Americans to catch people young in these countries. I told Shri Chagla when I spoke about a report prepared by professors of Harvard in 1962; this was the scheme which the Americans were going to put up altogether: the CIA story and all that kind of thing which they have been doing; the peace corps chaps behaving in the way that they do. They make up a composite picture which Shri Chagla has chosen completely to ignore.

Merely talking about somebody being pro-American and somebody being anti-American, which is so much abracadabra, merely reiterating an old slogan about Indian having to be a pro-Indian—I have never heard that sort of non-sense; an Indian is an Indian; I do not have to call myself “pro-me—it is no good talking in that way merely in order to malign other people as pro-Russian or pro-American. It is no good talking about ourselves as pro-Indian. Nobody ever calls himself “pro-me”.

18 hrs.

But that is the subterfuge to which they have to take recourse because they do not understand the implications of this business. Mr. Chagla, I take it, does not understand really its implications; or, he would not have walked into this trap. He has amongst his colleagues some who do not mind walking into whatever trap is laid, which is why we are swallowing so many insults and humiliations and so many projects of this description from America.

I am pressing my motion, but I am willing to go so far as to accept Shri Shree Narayan Das's amendment, who

suggests that at least let there be an examination of the whole position by a Committee of Members of Parliament. If Mr. Chagla is ready at this stage to accept that amendment, then perhaps we can agree on this matter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put Mr. Yashpal Singh's amendment to the House.

Amendment No. 1 was put and negatived.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Regarding Mr. Sidheshwar Prasad's amendment a point was raised that it is out of order. You have to give a ruling on it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I ruled it is in order. I will now put that amendment of Sidheshwar Prasad to the House.

Amendment No. 2 was put and negatived.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Mr. Mukerjee appealed to me to accept Mr. S. N. Das's amendment. I accept the spirit of that amendment in the sense that everything that has been said in this House, whether by Mr. Mukerjee or others in the opposition benches as well as by friends on this side will be taken into consideration. Everything that the educationists have been saying will be also taken consideration. We will inform ourselves of public opinion. But as you know, you cannot have a Committee of Parliament to go into an international agreement. But any Member of Parliament is free to give us advice and we will give due consideration to it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Do you press your amendment?

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I withdraw my amendment.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We object to it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has he the leave of the House to withdraw it?

3105 Handloom Fabrics SRAVANA 14, 1888 (SAKA) Manufacture of small car (H.A.H. Dis.)
(Res.)

Hon. Members: Yes.

Amendment No. 3 was, by leave, withdrawn.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: I withdraw my amendment.

Amendment No. 4 was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put the main motion.

The question is:

"This House disapproves of the proposed project of an Indo-US Foundation and calls upon the Government of India not to proceed with it."

The motion was negatived.

18.04 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: RECOGNITION AND SUPPORT TO HANDLOOM FABRICS BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS, ETC.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have received a letter from Mr. Hem Raj authorising Mr. Saraf to move the resolution standing in his name. Mr. Saraf may move it.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that Government may take necessary steps to get recognition and support to the handloom fabrics sold under the trade names "Bleeding Madras", "India Madras" and "Madras" as a distinctive and exclusive product of India by all Foreign Governments and their agencies as well as the trade in those countries, and that appropriate action, where necessary, may be taken to prevent the use of the said trade-names for any other products in any manner which may prejudicially affect the interests of the producers of the aforesaid fabrics in India."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can continue on the next day.

18.05 hrs.

MANUFACTURE OF SMALL CAR*

Shri H. C. Linga Reddy (Chikballapur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the object of my raising this half-an-hour discussion on the subject of the small car project is that it is very necessary that the small car project be taken up immediately. The demand for the manufacture of a small car in our country under the public sector or under the State sector or under the private sector is as old as independence. The demand is there for more than a decade. We have built ships, we have manufactured railway engines, but it is unfortunate that though India has advanced industrially very much we are still limping with regard to the taking up of the manufacture of a very small car.

Sir, demands were made so often and even a committee was set up as long ago as 8-4-1959 under the Chairmanship of no less a person than Shri L. K. Jha, I.C.S., then Additional Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry. They gave a report recommending that this small car project should be taken up immediately. They thought if they waited till the final report was ready it would take a long time, and therefore they even gave an interim report nearly about 4 or 5 years ago. In spite of that the Government have been saying again and again, whenever pressed in the Lok Sabha or Rajya Sabha and also in the public, that this should be taken up, that this has not been done at all. Even in the month of April, 1966 the hon. Minister for Industry said that a decision would be taken within a month—end of April—but even that has not been done.

It is not as though definite proposals are not made to the Government. Several proposals are before them.

*Half-an-Hour Discussion.