

in Notification No. G.S.R. 68 dated the 14th January, 1961. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-2663|61].

—
PETITION RE. CONSTRUCTION OF
A RAIL-ROAD BRIDGE

Shri Sarju Pandey (Rasra): Sir, I beg to present a petition signed by 48 petitioners regarding construction of a rail-road bridge over the Ganges near Ghazipur.

—
12.12 hrs.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE
PRESIDENT—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with further consideration of the following Motion moved by Shri Bhakt Darshan and seconded by Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman on the 20th February, 1961 namely:

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

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

along with the amendments moved thereon.

Shri Khadilkar may continue the speech.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): May we know, Sir when the hon. Prime Minister is going to reply ?

Mr. Speaker: When will the hon. Prime Minister like to reply—at 3 o'clock?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Yes, Sir, if that suits you

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister will reply at 3 o'clock. Therefore more hon. Members will have an opportunity to speak.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday in my preliminary remarks I was pointing out some weaknesses in our economy which are likely to frustrate our efforts of development. I referred to an observation by an eminent American economist, James Duesenberry, to the effect that if there is an affluence at one end and squalor at the other end, it not only creates an imbalance in a highly advanced capitalist society but it equally effects the under-developed countries as well. Recently, when an eminent British economist, Thomas Balogh, who was here, took exception to the manufacture of the so-called people's car and licensing of manufacture of chocolate in this country, he was also thinking on the same lines, namely, that we will have to make every effort to control or restrain consumption on the one hand and to avoid on the other hand the present pattern of concentration of economic power, particularly in the corporate sector a tendency which has now become rampant. I do not want to give details as they were mentioned by my hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta. But I would like to plead with the hon. Finance Minister, who is supposed to be austere in his personal life if not a little puritan, that he should try to impose some social discipline at the present juncture so as to control consumption. I would like to suggest some sort of a remedy, for instance, the banning of exhibition in the country of Hollywood films. Because a certain life is depicted in the Hollywood films that are exhibited here, it leads to further temptation in certain section of society to lead a glamorous life. I wish some such steps are taken along with the step that has already been taken by appointing a committee to find out how concentration of wealth is taking place and how to avoid it. Because the Soviet Union and Japan isolated themselves in the early stages of their develop-

ment from the so-called developed world, all these temptations that are creeping in our society were avoided there and they could reach a higher stage of development at a quicker pace. So unless you take positive steps to control consumption in some such way and unless a certain measure of austerity and social discipline is imposed, I am afraid all the plans of development which are intended to build up a firm and secure industrial base in the country would be frustrated. This is my plea regarding the economic weakness that is obviously visible in our developing economy.

Then I turn to the report submitted by our team of officials, I mean the report regarding India-China border. As everybody has said, they have done a splendid job. If one were to go through the report, as they have observed in their conclusion, one would find that our border as defined by nature, confirmed by history and sanctified by the laws of nations has been pointed out giving all the facts. They have done a good job of it. There is no question about that. But let me be frank about the report. It has brought out in unmistakable terms the mistake that we committed in the past. Let us admit it frankly. History will never excuse us for that mistake if facts stated in this report are correct. That mistake is that not knowing fully well as to what was the status of Tibet and of Tibetan sovereignty, we wrote it off for gaining the friendship of China. That impression I got on reading the report.

12.17 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

This fact of bartering away of sovereignty of Tibet to win the friendship of China—of course, our neighbour has proved unworthy of our trust in a way—clearly emerges from this report. This would remain a blot on India whether we like it or not.

So far as the alignment of the boundary is concerned, it is a good thing that our team of officials has seen the boundary line right from Afghanistan at one end to Burma on

the other excepting Nepal. So the question of delimitation of boundary as regards the territory occupied by Pakistan, namely, the so-called Azad Kashmir, does not arise so far as we are concerned, because all the evidence is there to show what our boundary is there also.

Some people ask, "What next?" They mistake one thing when they ask that question. That is, what was the objective before these teams. Were they empowered to negotiate a settlement? Let us be very clear about it. When a suggestion was made for some sort of preliminary talks leading to these teams of representatives of China and India meeting together, some people with borrowed ideological feathers said, "Oh! this is a wrong way. We should not talk to them." But they will have to admit that because of these talks our position has been strengthened so far as fact-finding is concerned. Because China's team was not also empowered to negotiate or to admit the fact—that also was not there—it is left to China to take the initiative, if China is so inclined, and admit the boundary line as defined by nature—if I were to repeat the conclusion of the team—confirmed by history and sanctified by the laws of nations.

One point emerges from these talks which is also very significant. That is, unless the boundary is finally delimited and sanctified by a boundary agreement, no boundary is there. Ultimately, the Chinese argument leads to this. I would like to ask the Chinese friends whether such a boundary between the Soviet Union and China and for that matter, between Mongolia and China exists. Then, why insist on this formal delimitation so far as India is concerned supposed to be a very friendly country till this aggression took place, that unless that is delimited and sanctified or entered in some sort of a border agreement arrived at, there is no boundary line between the two nations? Is this the

[Shri Khadilkar]

position of China? If it is, it is the most ridiculous position that China is taking on the basis of the facts that have emerged out of this.

So far as the boundary question is concerned, sometimes, it is argued that on this question, we are one and we speak with one voice. Unfortunately, I must state to our communist friends though they are showing some sort of an ambivalent attitude here and showing sympathy and support by paying compliments to our team. I know it as a fact that when a conference of communist took place near Bombay in Thana, one of the leading communist worker questioned Shri S. A. Dange, Shri Ramadive and other leaders who were sitting there, as to how do they justify on the Marxian principle the forceful occupation of Indian territory, do they want to say that any country which is outside the orbit of the so-called socialist world and having a different social system has no moral justification for territorial integrity and we must say then that if some other nation of the socialist system encroaches upon, or forcibly occupies the other territory, as China has done in the case of India, there is nothing immoral in it. On the contrary, we should welcome it. It should mean, therefore, so far as our internationalism is concerned we must say that if some other social system is encroached upon, invaded, occupied forcibly and taken possession of by a socialist state, then, the question of nationalism or national integrity does not arise. The communist pundits and their leaders had no answer to this when he charged them that this is perversion of internationalism as it is understood in Marxian phraseology. Why I say this is today, if in India, any section of public opinion were to take this stand, it is not only incorrect, it is not only unpatriotic, but it is not consistent with even the latest Moscow document.

I want to refer to that in another context. In that statement, they have now characterised all the newly lib-

rated territories which have become free from the Imperialist world as national democracies. They do not look at the form whether it is Ghana, whether it is Egypt, Iraq, India Burma or Pakistan. We must try to understand this new characterisation and instead of adopting "a holder than thou" attitude, if we try to look at our neighbours, whether it is Nepal, whether it is Pakistan or whether it is Burma, we cannot judge their democratic content from the parliamentary or particular form that they have adopted. We have got to realise now as the Moscow document in the new charterisation has realised that all this liberated world will have different forms. You cannot judge the character of their government whether they are a formal democracy or a particular type of democracy which has been evolved, whether it is the British pattern or the American pattern. Why I say this, is if we do not understand this new characterisation properly and approach our neighbours and newly liberated countries in a more friendly way, there is likely to be created a new wall of prejudice between us and the neighbouring countries.

We ought to realise, as I said yesterday, not only regarding the Congo but generally, the international approach that India has taken has been vindicated in every walk of life. For instance our neighbour Pakistan used to stick to a particular line of military alignment. In view of the new economic penetration and new oil explorations, the whole policy of Pakistan has been completely undermined. That you can see for yourself. As Dulles said, neutrality or non-alignment is immoral. No. Even in America, it has now more or less got approval of morality and good international behaviour. That itself is a great vindication of our policy and we can take pride in it.

Before I say something about other matters, I would like to mention one or two points.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Within one minute, he may do anything.

Shri Khadilkar: When we look at the Indian situation, there are one or two disquieting factors. I remember when I met last our Home Minister Shri G. B. Pant he pointed out to me a book he was reading, *The Dangerous Decades*, by an American author. Since then I have read that book. I must mention that all of us are very much exercised by his illness and would pray for his early recovery, because all of us love him. But, I may mention this fact for one reason. After the emergence of the Language States a certain identification of allegiance in that context has taken place and regional patriotism is running riot, whether it is Bengal or Tamil Nad, I do not want to mention the States. But it is a fact. Unless positive efforts are made to contain this regional patriotism in a broad national framework, there is every danger that our national unity is likely to be disrupted. This is the warning that is contained in this book whatever the purpose of the book apart. Language plays a big part; as it is a force of social integration at a level. It integrates society. It also differentiates and disintegrates society and creates certain complications. That must be understood.

Regarding Jabalpur riots, I will say one word and I will finish, because that is very important. It is very symptomatic. I have heard many people saying, what is wrong there, instead of communism, we would welcome communalism. I have heard this.

Shri Yadav Narayan Jadhav (Malegaon): Nobody has said that.

Shri Khadilkar: He says I am right.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): In this House there was no such suggestion.

Shri Yadav Narayan Jadhav: Outside.

Shri Khadilkar: If this is the approach of some of those who want to

build up secular democratic society in this country, there is no hope. If out of fear of growing communist influence—in fact, it is reading because of their mistakes—if, because of some imaginary fear, we are going to take shelter under and strengthen communal forces in this country, I am afraid there is no hope for Indian democracy. Therefore if we are to draw a lesson from the Jabalpur riots—as most tragic thing—it is our duty and it the duty of this Parliament to further strengthen the secular approach and keep away the forces or parties who are lined whatever their camouflage or political propaganda might be, with some sort of communal forces in the country and communal organisations in the country.

With these words, I conclude.

Dr. Samantsinhar (Bhubaneswar): It has been said by some speakers that the President's Address is colourless, odourless and tasteless, but we all know the colourless, odourless and tasteless; it is good water which is hygienic and good for health. Further this colour, taste and odour are also matters of individual idiosyncracies. Hence we must not consider the President's Address to be a propoganda literature or a publication of the Publications Division of our Ministry. The simple facts as to what the Government achieved in the last year and what they are going to do in the coming year have been given there. So, I am grateful to the President, and I fully associate myself with the Motion of Thanks moved by my esteemed friend Shri Bhakt Darshan.

The President was perfectly right when he mentioned in his Address that the Government had to pass through stress and strain, both external and internal, last year to solve some of the problems of our country. We are also gratified to know that in solving these problems, our Government have adhered to the basic principles and policies of the country. Two instances of this are our attitude towards Pakistan, and our stand regarding the Congo. It is a good thing

[Dr. Samantsinha:]

and the whole world appreciates the Government's attitude of friendship towards Pakistan. We all hope that the bitterness created by partition would soon end and both our countries would fight together against poverty and march ahead in progress.

Some say that our international policy is not appreciated by others, and I may give an instance of that. While I was in Tokyo during the last week of this January, the Japanese Diet met for the first time after their recent general elections. Prime Minister Ikeda was making his first policy statement before the Diet, and while doing so, he criticised the policy of neutrality and said that minor nations could afford to adopt that policy. At this there was much resentment, particularly among the Opposition, and there was so much pressure from the House that he had to withdraw that expression the next day. This shows how our international policy is sound.

As regards our progress during the last ten years no doubt there are some shortcomings, but the progress on the whole is appreciated everywhere. Even other nations are now following our methods. They think that Indian ways and means are ideal, and they are now adopting our methods. While saying this, I appreciate the help given by foreign countries for our progress, and I am therefore, thankful to them.

Coming to the home front I would submit that the first article of our sacred Constitution declares that India is a Union of States. So, I request the Prime Minister that there should be a convention, at least when he is in office, that in the Cabinet there should be at least one member from each State, and while appointing Ministers in different Ministries, there must be a due share to each State.

In this connection I would also draw your kind attention, and through you that of the Government, to the fact

that the vexed problem of the amalgamation of Seraiklla and Kharsawan with Orissa has not yet been solved. It is not a boundry question or dispute between Orissa and Bihar. This will be clear from the following extract from the *White Paper on Indian States*, of July 1948, paragraph 74, which states:

"The 25 States which merged with Orissa under these arrangements included Saraikalla and Kharsawan. On further consideration however, it was realised that on account of the situation of these two States as island territories in Singbhum District, it was impossible for any Government other than that responsible for the administration of that district to administer these States effectively. The Government of India, accordingly, took over from the Government of Orissa the administration of these States and made it over to the Government of Bihar on the 18th May, 1948."

At that time these two States were island territories. At that time Mayurbhanj, which was a princely State, did not merge with Orissa. It has now been merged with Orissa. As I said it is not a border question or boundary dispute between Orissa and Bihar, it was then simply given to the State of Bihar for administrative convenience. Now, when these two States have ceased to be islands and can be conveniently administered by Orissa, why not these two States be returned to Orissa? The Government of India took over their administration and gave them to Bihar. It is now for the Government of India to return these two States to the Government of Orissa.

As regards planning, of course the Planning Commission has done much good work, but there are many defects still and the greatest defect is regional disparity. Regional disparities have been problems in other countries also,

and if we do not tackle this problem at least now, in this problematic country it will add a further grievous problem to be solved in future.

As regards our agrarian policy. I would submit that by our policy the farmer is neither to live nor to die. So, this policy must be changed. Briefly, I would say please consider one thing. In the industrial sector, the interest rate on loans is $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, but in the agricultural sector it is 8 to 9 per cent. These loans are given through co-operative societies. The farmers are also facing much hardship and difficulty in getting these loans in time. Besides, even to get a small amount of loan, they have to incur much expenditure.

As regards fair price to the producer I do not know on what basis the fair price is calculated. I do not know whether while fixing the fair price, they take into account the enhanced agricultural production charges. The present method must be changed and in the light of the enhanced agricultural production charges, the price of foodgrains should be fixed at an adequate, fair reasonable level, so that it will give impetus to the agriculturists to produce more.

We all know that the sacred ashes of our two great patriots and leaders are there in Japan. One of them is our Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, and the other late Mr. Rash Bihari Basu. We all know that both these leaders fought very bravely for our country in order to make this country free, but still, their ashes are in a foreign country. I would request Government to do the needful to bring their ashes with full honour to this country.

I would also like to point out that most of the freedom fighters who fought to make the country free are neglected. There must be some provision for their proper maintenance. They must also get proper financial help from Government to educate their children and to maintain their families.

It is a good thing that the President has in his Address referred to the panchayat raj. Actually this is a great social and political revolution, and it is a good thing that by establishing panchayat raj, we have reached the grass-root level of democracy.

But, in doing so, we must not be chary of giving more powers to the panchayats. The panchayats must get proper powers in order to function properly. These powers should not be there merely on paper but there must be adequate provision in the Act and also the rules in order to give real and proper powers to the panchayats.

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप (मयुरा) : श्रीमान जी, बहुत सारी बातें कहने की हैं। उन के बारे में मैं ज्यादा क्या कह सकूंगा, उनको सिर्फ गिना ही सकूंगा, आपकी सेवा में निवेदन ही कर सकूंगा।

यह तो हम सभी कहते हैं कि बहुत अच्छा हुआ, हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी पवारे, हम को याद किया और अपने विचार सुनाये। हम सब उनके अनुगृहीत हैं, इस में क्या सन्देह है। एक बात मैं ने पहले भी कही थी और आज भी कहता हूँ और वह यह है कि जैसे कि हमारे श्रीमान प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बड़ी कार छोड़ कर छोटी कार पर चढ़ना शुरू कर दिया है, इसी प्रकार अगर हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी भी एक इन सम्राटी तरीके को, शाही तरीके को, छोड़ कर शान शीकत से न आ कर एक जीप में बैठ कर चले आया करें, तो बहुत अच्छा होगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं मन्तव्य सदस्य से कहूंगा कि उन्हें मालूम है कि सप बातें गवर्नमेंट की अपनी मर्जी से और उनकी पालिसी के मुताबिक होती हैं, प्रेजीडेंट साहब कुछ अपनी मर्जी से नहीं करते। उनको नुकताचीनी में न लाया जाए।

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप : अर्ज यह है कि मैं तो यह कोशिश कर रहा हूँ कि हम ये बात करें या न करें। अगर हो सके तो हम २५५

[राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप]

सदस्य इकट्ठे हो जाएं और २५५ सदस्य इकट्ठे हो कर इस प्रकार की सरकार बनायें कि यह चुनाव का अंजट ही दूर हो जाय। पंद्रह माल तक हम यहां बैठें।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : एक शिकायत है कि जो राजने हैं वे आते नहीं।

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप : मैं तो नया परसों मर भी जाऊंगा मगर हमारे जो नौजवान हैं वे १५ साल बैठें। अर्ज यह है कि इस तरह की सरकार हमें बनानी है जिसमें हमारे राष्ट्रपति यही रहें, उपराष्ट्रपति यही रहें और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी भी यही रहें। मगर जैसे कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी देवता हैं, कुछ करते बरतें नहीं हैं; ऐसे ही हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी भी हो जायें और काम हम करें, तो अच्छा होगा। मेरा यह सुझाव है। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि अगर ऐसा हो सकेगा तो बहुत सारी दिक्कतें दूर हो जायेंगी।

मैं यह कहने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह बहुत बुरा किया या हमारे फर्मा मंत्री जी ने यह ठीक काम नहीं किया। यह मैं नहीं कहता। मैं तो यह कहता हूँ कि साहब आप हमारे हैं, आप अपना काम कर रहे हैं, हम लोग आपकी मदद करना चाहते हैं।

मिसाल के तौर पर चीन का ही सवाल है। हमारे बहुत सारे भाई उन के बारे में काफी कुछ यहां कहने रहे हैं और कुछ बहुत नाराज भी हुए हैं। मेरा यह कहना है कि मैं तो एक काम कर सकता हूँ। पांच साल तक चीन में रद्दा तिब्बत में भी गया था, मैं वहां जाने के लिये तैयार हूँ और मुलह कराने के लिए तैयार हूँ। इसमें सिर्फ बीस हजार रुपया खर्च आयेगा। मैं इस तरह की संधि कराने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान, चीन और जापान अपनी बढ़ती हुई जन-संख्या का उन टापुओं में भेज दें, जिन की

कि जन संख्या कम है। यह मैं कर सकता हूँ। यह सुझाव मैं ने पहले भी रखा था और अभी फिर खता हूँ।

कांगो का भी मसला है। कांगो में क्यों न हम दस हजार की सेना भेजें, बीस हजार की सेना भेजें, और यू० एन० ओ० की मदद करें। अब तो एक छोटे आदमी नहीं, बहुत बड़े आदमी, जिन्होंने कि एक तरह से हम को आजादी दी, लाई एटली साहब यहां पधारें हुए हैं। उन्होंने बिल्कुल वही बातें कहीं हैं जो मैं तीन चार वर्ष से आप से कहना चना आ रहा हूँ। मगर बात यह है कि मुझे तो लोग यह पसन्दे हैं यह पुराना आदमी हो गया है, क्या जाने, भूल गया, मठिया गया है। मगर अर्द्धा हुआ कि हमारे वकील साहब आ गए, लाई एटली और उन्होंने वही बातें कहीं जो मैं कहना रहा हूँ। यू० एन० ओ० की, हमारे साहब का कहना है, फौज बनाई जाए, उसको फौज दी जाए। यह सब बात है। अगर यू० एन० ओ० के पास फौज नहीं है तो वह बकती रहे, कोई मुनेगा नहीं, कमजोर की कोई बात मुनता नहीं है। अगर यू० एन० ओ० के पास फौज होगी तो वह अपने हुकम को मनवा सकेगा। मैंने प्रधान मंत्री जी को निवेदन किया था कि ज्यादा अर्द्धा यह हो कि हम तो अपनी पूरी सेना यू० एन० ओ० को दे दे और उमे कहें कि आप हिफाजत करिये, हम सब की। मगर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जवाब यह दिया और अपने दस्तखतों में दिया कि यह "प्रेक्टिकल" नहीं है। उन्होंने यह लपट इस्तेमाल किया है। मैं तो अर्ज करता चला जाता हूँ और बड़ी शुद्ध भावना से निवेदन करता चला जाता हूँ कि ये बातें ऐसे ऐसे हो सकती हैं।

गोआ के बारे में बहुत सारे भाई बहुत नाराज हैं। मैं ने आप से कहा और मैं फिर दोहराता हूँ कि पौर्बुगल के साथ ऐनी

संधि की जा सकती है कि हम अपनी बड़ती हुई जन संख्या को मोझाम्बिक और अंगोला में भेजें और ऐसी भी संधि की जा सकती है कि पौर्चुगल के साथ हम लोग शादी व्याह भी करें। इस से तमाम भयले हल हो जायेंगे जैसा कि पौर्चुगल के साथ मौजूद हैं।

मेरी एक और अर्ज यह है कि अगर हम यू० एन० ओ० को, जितना रुपया वह मांगें उतना दें, और वे ही सब जगह अपने डिप्लोमैटिक मिशन रखें, राजदूत रखें तो काम ज्यादा अच्छी तरह से हो सकता है। मेरा कहना है कि अगर सभी देश ऐसा करें, तो हमारा बहुत सा पैसा बच जायेगा। यू० एन० ओ० की तरफ से जो राजदूत होंगे वे सभी देशों के साथ बहुत हमदर्दी के साथ न्याय करेंगे। सभी संसार की एक मेना होनी चाहिये, संसार की एक कचेहरी होनी चाहिये, और जो भी हमारी शिकायतें हों वे उसी कचेहरी में तय होनी चाहियें और संसार की जो फौज हो वह जो फैसला हो उसे मनवाये।

जैसा मैंने कई दफा अर्ज किया है, इस बात की बड़ी जरूरत है कि विचारों को परखा जाय। विचार कभी कभी ऐसे होते हैं जैसे बीमारी के कीड़े। जैसे हेजे के कीड़े होते हैं, तपेदिक के कीड़े होते हैं, मलेरिया के कीड़े होते हैं, उसी तरह से कुछ विचार होते हैं जो हम को लड़ाते हैं। उन विचारों की खोज की जाय और उन को ढूँढ ढूँढ कर खत्म किया जाय, चाहे वे दीन में हों चाहे धर्म में हों, चाहे पार्टी में हों, चाहे कम्यूनिज्म में हों। हमारे कम्यूनिस्ट भाई हैं बड़ी अच्छी बातें करते हैं। कहते हैं हम मजदूरों का भला करेंगे, किसानों का भला करेंगे। मैं भी कहता हूँ कि मजदूरों का भला कीजिये, किसानों का भला कीजिये। मगर मैं कहता हूँ कि हमें लड़ाओ मत। हमारी प्राचीन सभ्यता यह कहती है कि समाज का संगठन इस तरह से होना चाहिये जैसे मनुष्य के शरीर का मनुष्य के शरीर में कोई भाग दूसरे भाग से लड़ता नहीं। मैं ने नहीं सुना कि

पैरों ने कोई जलसा किया हो और यह प्रस्ताव पास किया हो कि सिर बड़ा बेईमान है, हमेशा ऊपर रहता है। अगर कहीं ऐसा प्रस्ताव पास कर दिया होता तो मनुष्य की बहुत बुरी गत बनती, सिर नीचे और पैर ऊपर। इसलिए मैं कहना हूँ कि लड़ने वाली बातें बहुत बुरी होती हैं। हम को यह सिद्धान्त बना लेना चाहिये कि सब को सब के लाभ में लगा कर सब को सुखी बनाना है।

फिर मैं अर्ज कहंगा कि शायद बस्तर के महाराज के साथ बेइन्माफी हुई है, और उस की बददुआ किसी बजीर पर पड़ी हो। मुझे बड़ा अफसोस है कि निव्वत में चीन ने कुछ ज्यादाती की और उस की चीनियों को बड़ी सजा मिली। आप ने सुना होगा कि आज चीनियों को बहुत ज्यादा तकलीफें हैं। जबलपुर में जो कुछ हुआ, उस के लिये तो क्या कहें? रोना आता है। मुझे अफसोस है, मगर अगर हम बीमारी को देख कर रोयें तो बीमारी तो इस से जाती नहीं, अगर हम बीमारी को गाली दें तो उस से भी बीमारी नहीं जाती, उस का तो हम को इलाज करना होगा। इस लिये जैसा मैं ने पहले भी अर्ज किया आप को मेहरबानी कर के एक सदाचार गुट बनानी चाहिये। सदाचार गुट इस प्रकार की बनायी जाय कि वह मोहल्लों-मोहल्लों में हो और देखे कि लोगों में क्या विचार है, कोई गलत तरीके पर तो नहीं चल रहा है, कोई बुराई तो नहीं कर रहा है। यही एक दवा है जिस को हमारे धार्मिक नेताओं ने भी बताया है। जब आदमी दुराचारी होगा तो उस के मस्तिष्क से बुरे विचार ही निकलेंगे, जैसे कहीं गन्दगी होगी तो उस में बीमारी के कीड़े पड़ेंगे ही। इसलिये यह कोशिश होनी चाहिये कि हमारा समाज सदाचारी समाज बने। इस के लिये मैं ने एक कार्यक्रम रखा है सदाचार गुट का। "धर्म पाठ" एक छोटी सी पुस्तिका है, मैं ने उस में इस विषय पर बहुत कुछ लिखा है। इस "धर्म पाठ" को मैं ने राष्ट्रपति जी को राष्ट्रपति भवन में २० मिनट तक सुनाया। जब उन्होंने वे बातें सुनीं तो मुझ से कहने लग

[राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप]

कि राजा साहब, अगर यह विचार फँस जायें तो फिर तो कोई लड़ाई होगी ही नहीं। मैंने कहा : साहब, फँसाइये इन विचारों को। उन्होंने पूछा कि इन को कैसे फँसाया जाय ? मैंने कहा : आप सब स्कूलों में हमारे प्रेम धर्म का भजन कराइये। तब वे चुप रहे। फिर मैं ने यह कहा कि अगर यह सम्भव नहीं तो शहर में ही बड़ी बड़ी सभाओं का प्रेम धर्म का भजन कराइये। फिर भी वे चुप रहे मैं ने कहा अगर यह भी मुमकिन नहीं तो फिर राष्ट्रपति भवन में ही यह भजन कराइये। तब उन्होंने कहा हाँ, यह ठीक है। मगर वे यह भी नहीं करा सके। जब यह हाजत है तो क्या किया जाय। बहरहाल मैं तो अर्ज करता चलूंगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जो दो बाहरी आदिमियों की आपस की बात है, वह पार्लियामेंट में इस तरह पर नहीं कहनी चाहिये।

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप : मगर साहब, वह बड़ी अहमियत रखती है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अहमियत आप के लिये थी और उन के लिये, यहाँ उस के बतलाने की जरूरत नहीं है।

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप : पंचायत राज के विषय में ठीक वही बात हुई जो मैं कहता रहा हूँ और इस के लिये मैंने प्रधान मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद भी दिया। मगर मैं वही बताना चाहूँगा जो कि मेरे भाई डा० सामन्तसिंहार ने यहाँ कही कि सभी गांवों में शक्ति दी जाय पंचायतों को। वह इस तरह से कि पटवारी पंचायत का हो, चौकीदार पंचायत का हो, जो फँसले हों वे पंचायत में हों, इन कच्चेहरियों में कोई न जाय जिन में दस-दस, बारह-बारह साल तक मामला चलता रहता है और बाप मर जाय, बेटा मर जाय, नाती के

जमाने में उसका फँसला हो। यह चीजें नहीं होनी चाहियें। मैं कहता हूँ :

“गांव गांव में हो स्वराज,
गांव वालों का अपना राज,
नगर नगर में हो स्वराज,
नगर वालों का अपना राज।”

आज हम पर जो तरह तरह के कर लगाये जाने हैं, वह भी नहीं होना चाहिये। मिर्फ जमीन व मकान पर और दौलत पर कर लिया जाय, और उन का फायदा सब को पहुंचाया जाय। आप चाहे जितना भी रुपया बना लीजिये, उस में कोई हर्ज नहीं, लेकिन हम देखेंगे कि वह रुपया खर्च आप कैसे करते हैं। अगर आप बुराई में रुपया खर्च करते हैं तो हम आप को रोकेंगे, पकड़ेंगे, और अगर आप अच्छे कामों में उस को खर्च करते हैं तब बड़ी अच्छे बात है, खर्च कीजिये।

अब खत्म करना चाहना हूँ इमलिये गिना ही सकता हूँ अपनी बातों को। इतनी बातें हैं, क्या क्या कहूँ ? बुरे मिनेमा न हों, घुड़दौड़ और जुए के खेल न हों, मट्टा न हो। आखीर में मैं यही बातें आप से कह सकता हूँ।

हिन्दुस्तान कामनवेल्थ में से निकले, पाकिस्तान न रहे, आर्यान बने। ईरान से असम तक, हिमालय से सीलोन तक आर्यान हो, एशिया के सूबे का एक जितना और एशिया संसार मंघ राज्य का एक सूबा। गांव-गांव में हो स्वराज, गांव वालों का अपना राज, नगर नगर में हो स्वराज, नगर वालों का अपना राज। मजदूर कारखानों के भागीदार बनाये जायें, खानों में भागीदार बनाये जायें और रेल का जो बोर्ड है उस में प्रतिनिधि बैठें मजदूरों के।

आखिर में मेरी अर्ज यह है कि तमाम मदरसों में कारखाने हों, खेत हों, बाग हों, गोशाला हों और हमारे लड़के आवश्यक

वस्तुओं उत्पन्न करें। यही चीज द्वावतियों में हो। हमारे जो सिपाही हैं उन को भी खुश करना होगा। हम तमाम जमादारों को कैम्पेज बना देंगे और तमाम सूबेदारों को कर्ना बना दें। इन तरह से अगर हम उन को मिना कर चर्ने . . .

उपाध्यक्ष मनोदधः : पहले इतनी बातों पर ध्यान हो जाने दजिये, बाकी दूसरे मौके पर कहियेगा।

राजा महेंद्र प्रताप : मेरा दावा है कि अगर इन तरह से हम अपनी दुर्भूत का चनायेगे तो पंद्रह साल यहां बैठेंगे और हमारी कोई मुत्रातिकत नहीं होगी और हम और आप भिन्न कर इन तमाम कार्यक्रम का चर्ने रहेगे।

13 hrs.

Shri Parulekar (Thana): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, out of the two main functions to be discharged by a Presidential Address, the task of stating and describing the economic conditions in the country fully, objectively, and in all its essential aspects, and of dealing with the burning problems of the people and pointing out the measures which Government propose to adopt for solving them is a very important one.

Does this President's Address try to discharge this task? I will confine myself to seek an answer to this question. Sir, it will be my endeavour to point out that the President's Address is a dismal failure in this respect. Firstly, Sir, it tries to describe the economic advance of this country, but fails to point out the unhealthy tendencies which are developing fast and the dangers to which our economy is exposed. Secondly, it tries to describe the economic conditions of this country minus the conditions of the people who constitute the country. This has not been a feature of this Address alone, but this has been a common and a distinguishing feature of all the

Addresses so far delivered in this House during the last four years.

Sir, I will proceed now to state some facts to substantiate the charges which I have made. Sir, the Address tries to draw the attention of the country, of the people and of this House, and rightly so, to the economic advance which has been made during the last four years. It points out that the index of industrial production in this year is 167 and it was 149 for the corresponding period of the previous year. It also points out that the production of kharif cereals is estimated to be more than two million tons higher than that in 1959-60. It also draws the attention of the House to the fact that the national income is estimated to be Rs. 12,210 crores, as compared to Rs. 10,920 crores in 1955-56. This is so far as the economic advance of the country is concerned.

But it ignores the dangerous tendencies which are developing in this country and which are a danger to our developing economy. That danger is the flow of foreign capital into this country from those countries which have got surplus capital to export; and which export their surplus capital in order to seek profit. The exploitation of the country is thus fast increasing.

In this connection I would like to draw the attention of the House to the figures which have been given in the Reserve Bank of India Bulletin of April 1960. It shows that in June 1948 the foreign capital invested in this country was Rs. 255.8 crores. In 1953 it was Rs. 392.1 crores. In 1955 it was Rs. 456 crores; in 1956 it was Rs. 492.8 crores; in 1957 it was Rs. 541.7 crores; and in 1958 it was Rs. 570.8 crores. These figures are eloquent enough to show that the foreign capital is flowing into this country at a rapid rate. I have no time to give other figures also which clearly show that the rate at which it is flowing into this country is fast growing.

[Shri Parulekar]

Sir, there are some who advocate that investment of foreign capital in our industry is not only inescapable, but not economically harmful. The chief exponents of this theory are the hon. the Finance Minister and Shri Manubhai Shah. I would not enter into a theoretical discourse to point out that investment of foreign capital is most dangerous to our economic development. Sir, development of economy with the aid of investment of foreign capital cannot be an independent economy; it will be an economy which will be exposed to dangers. It is an elementary principle of economics and yet it is surprising that the hon. the Finance Minister and the other Ministers do not know this fundamental principle of economics, the harmful effects of the flow of foreign capital and investment of foreign capital in our industry, and the danger to which our economy is exposed thereby. Sir, leaving aside this theoretical aspect of the question, I would ask one question: have we not that bitter experience through which this country has gone when it was under the rule of British imperialism for more than three hundred years and of the harmful effects of investment of foreign capital on our industry? Have we forgotten to draw lessons from our past bitter experience. Sir, this has not been brought out in the President's Address.

I would like to draw attention to another omission in the President's Address. Sir, it ignores to draw the attention of the House to the disturbing fact that foreign debt is fast mounting and to its serious implications on our economy. These figures which are given in the same issue of the Reserve Bank Bulletin will indicate how dangerous is the situation which has developed. Sir, these are the figures of foreign debt: in 1955 it was Rs. 714 crores; in 1957 it was Rs. 1,053 crores; in 1958 it was Rs. 1,291 crores; in 1959 it was Rs. 1,578 crores. Thus during the last five years it has doubled. And now there is a proposal of the Planning Commission to have

additional debt in the Third Five Year Plan of Rs. 2,700 crores. This is a colossal figure. These figures include the foreign debt which we have received from socialist countries, but it is not of great magnitude.

Sir, the World Bank Mission in 1958 when it visited India came to the conclusion that so far as India was concerned, she had mortgaged her future foreign exchange reserves; her debt is so heavy.

There is difference between debt incurred from socialist countries and the debt incurred from other capitalist, imperialist countries. The debt incurred from socialist countries helps to develop an independent economy, a self-reliant and expanding economy, whereas the debt incurred from capitalist countries only perpetuates our dependence on those countries and does not help the country to develop an independent economy. Sir, I would in this connection read a very small paragraph from a book which is entitled *Soviet Economic Aid* by Mr. Joseph Berliner, published for the Council of Foreign Relations, New York. It is not a publication of any Communist Party anywhere in the world. This is what it says:

"Soviet loans are used primarily for the construction of industrial installations, some of which may eventually increase the foreign exchange earning capacity of the nation, either by the increased production of exportable commodities or by increased domestic production of commodities that substitute for imports.

In the case of India, about 80 per cent of the United States grants was used for the purchase of industrial commodities and about 55 per cent of the total consisted of machinery products. But of the latter, the largest proportion consisted of railroad equipment and motor vehicles and engines, much less of industrial machinery to be installed in factories."

This is on page 63 to 64. Further he says at another place:

"United States aid agencies and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development insist on a detailed analysis of the economic usefulness of the projects they are asked to finance.

United States aid programme requires its administration to pass on the economic soundness of the project proposals and to refuse these requests it considers unjustified."

"The Soviet Union, on the other hand, represents itself as willing to finance any project that the recipient considers desirable."

He points out a third distinguishing feature. It is this.

"U.S.S.R. is willing to accept repayment in the commodities the borrowers traditionally export."

"The approach seems to be, 'Tell us what you want and we will take anything you wish to sell us in exchange'."

Then, he concludes that—

"The availability of Soviet aid increases the independence of neutral countries."

These are the chief characteristics which distinguish the two kinds of debts. Unfortunately, the fact is that the other kind of debt which will perpetuate our dependence has increased at such a rate that we have already mortgaged our foreign exchange resources of the future. This debt is still increasing.

In this connection I am very happy to point out that Shri Asoka Mehta, whose antipathy and opposition to communism we all know, has also written an articles, the gist of which has appeared in the *Times of India* dated the 14th February and in which

he substantiates what this author has said

Now, I will pass on to other categories of omissions in the President's Address. The Address hides the ugly fact that despite the fact that employment is increasing, unemployment is increasing faster. The figures are heart-rending and they are given in the March issue of the *Reserve Bank Bulletin*. I will read these figures briefly. About the number of applicants on the live register seeking employment—there are various categories—it states:

	1951	1959
Industrial Supervisory Services	3,448	13,747
Skilled and semi-skilled services	38,021	105,263
Clerical services	85,057	356,170
Educational services	4,825	68,981
Domestic services	11,704	53,100
Unskilled services	162,445	754,079
Others	23,219	69,561

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must try to conclude now.

Shri Parulekar: I have a lot to say, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Thirteen minutes have already elapsed. I am very sorry that if I give more time to the hon. Member I will have to knock out another speaker. He knew that he had 15 minutes. Priorities ought to have been fixed by him. He knew that every member from the Opposition is not to get half an hour. Every member of a group can get 15 minutes while the first speaker alone gets 30 minutes.

Shri Parulekar: If you can give me 5 minutes I will be able to do justice to the other points.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: My difficulty is that one other hon. Member will have to forego his chance. All right. The hon. Member may go on.

Shri Parulekar: The total number is:

1951	328,719
1959	1,420,901

Another fact which the Address does not bring out is that despite the fact that production has increased, the cost of living is increasing faster. In 1956, the index number was 374 on the basis of 1939 as 100; and in 1960, it was 438.

With regard to conditions of workers also, there is enough evidence to show that the cost of living is increasing and the real wages have been falling during the last 4 years. As regards agricultural labour, Shri Gopalan has already pointed out the features which the report has brought out and the fact that the conditions of agricultural labourers are deteriorating.

I will only take a minute or two before I conclude. The only question that arises is, 'Are these ugly consequences inevitable?' Are they inescapable? Since I have no time to deal with the subject, I will only mention that they can be avoided; they are not inevitable and they are not inescapable provided we follow the non-capitalist path of development. If we follow the capitalist path of development, these are its inherent consequences which cannot be avoided. That is what I want to point out.

What is the conclusion which emerges from the facts which I have stated so far? The one conclusion that emerges is that the Address hides ugly facts of the reality. It gives only a partial picture of the reality. It is, therefore, unfaithful and deceptive.

Now the question can be asked and will be asked, 'Why does the Government hide these facts? Does it do so consciously or unconsciously?' I do not know why. But, if Government is hiding them consciously, then the only conclusion that emerges is that it

is a conscious and calculated attempt to deceive themselves and the people. If it is done unconsciously, then, the other conclusion is that the Government is absolutely indifferent and callous to the woes, miseries and burning problems of the people.

Shri Jhunjunwala (Bhagalpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks to the President. In saying so, I just have to submit as follows.

The President, in his Address, has said:

"Though many and stubborn problems still await solution, or are in the process of being solved, the situation both at home and abroad shows signs of improvement and justifies hope and cautious optimism."

Supporting the view he has taken he has not stated the basis of optimism. He has not told us as to how these problems will be solved. We should have been enlightened on this point.

So far as the problem at home is concerned, there is great disintegration in the country as we see at present. In order to do away with disintegration we have to find out the causes which have led to this disintegration. The first cause which appears to me is our mental outlook of the position and functions of the legislators and of the Ministers. We have made this thing a forum of satisfying our low ambition for our self-aggrandisement. This profession is a very noble and pious thing and we should regard it as a profession of dedication to the service of the country rather than gratifying our personal ambition.

There are certain things which are taken advantage of by the so-called politicians and as such disintegration

arises. The Government has not got a firm policy in regard to language and we find there is so much of dispute and difference of opinion with the result that so much trouble arises. We should have a very firm policy regarding the question of language; we should have a decisive policy and tell everyone that this is the policy which we shall follow. I would suggest that, if necessary, we should have an all-party conference and there we should decide regarding the question of language in all the States. The States should also follow that policy so that the political parties would not exploit and create commotions on this question.

The other thing is about the partition of States in two or three parts: Nagaland, Punjabi Suba or this or that suba. In this regard also, we should have a very firm policy and this also may be done at the all-party conference so that the other party which always exploits these problems for their own political ends may not do so. These things have to be taken into consideration and at the all-party conference level should decide these two questions once for all and then most of the problems of disintegration will be solved. As I have said in the beginning, we should regard this profession and work in Parliament and legislatures as one of dedication; the ministerial classes should regard themselves as dedicated workers for the country.

14.33 hrs.

[SHRI MULCHAND DUBE in the Chair]

The moment we regard it as a duty to our country and we dedicate ourselves to that, there will not be so much trouble.

In our external relations, we have placed too much reliance on the so-called friendly agreements with other countries and we have not seen whether the other country which has entered into an agreement with us is serious about it or it is only a pious hope that they have given to us. We

should be very vigilant and we should not forget that we have to protect the interests of our country. I must say that in the past we have not been vigilant and that is why China has been able to encroach so much upon our territory. It has become rather difficult to get back those territories from her. We should not simply hope that China will persuade herself to see the mistake and restore the territory to us. We should tell China once for all that unless the occupied territories are given back to us there could not be any question of negotiation. We should strengthen ourselves from all sides in order to get back all our territories. We feel that if we enter into agreements with other countries, they will behave in the same way as we do but that is not the case. I would refer here to the Berubari question—a human problem and not a political problem. We appealed to our Prime Minister and he referred it to Ayub Khan that he should consider it as a human problem. But he did not do so. Pakistan would not have lost anything; in exchange they could have got some other territory. But he stuck to his demand. My point in bringing in this question is that while entering into these so-called friendly treaties or agreements, whatever we may call them, we have to be careful and vigilant and see whether the other countries also abide by them.

Take again the question of China's suzerainty over Tibet. They had gone back on the agreement with us. Tibet was a buffer State and gave us great protection. Now that has gone. If this has happened in our countries the Government would have been brought down by the people. But here such mistakes are made even by the Government. It is not that they are done deliberately. We are very straightforward and we do what we agree to. We think that the other countries which sign the agreements will follow the same policy. Now, we know that we should not depend upon the other people entirely and we should be very vigilant.

[Shri Jhunjhunwala]

I shall now come to the question of our economy. We have now the Five Year Plan; it is welcome. The way in which it has been framed is good. It is not difficult to make a Plan when we have money and other resources and other things. We know our requirements and we can make a plan. The most important thing is to see how it is implemented and executed. But, as our Prime Minister has said, the whole difficulty lies in the execution and implementation of the Plan. Instead of having this kind of Planning Commission, we should have a Planning Commission for finding out as to where we are deficient in executing and implementing the Plan. When we look to the three steel plants, we find what colossal loss is occurring daily. There is no co-ordination between one Ministry and another. When we want to start a particular thing, we have to make all arrangements for it: from where we shall get the coal, the iron ore and all these things. All these are not taken into consideration. There is want of co-ordination between one Ministry and another. Therefore, I would suggest that the Government should have a Commission to see how the Plan can be executed and implemented properly.

The President has also made a remark that much time is taken between the time when the policy is framed and the period when it is put into practice.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: I shall finish in five minutes. The President says that this aspect is being taken into consideration. It is a most urgent point. If you want to build up our economy in the right direction this is very very necessary. They say sometimes that while we are doing such and such a thing, a short delay does not matter. But then it puts us into a colossal loss. In paragraph 22 of the Address, the President has mentioned

that the national income for 1959-60 is such and such and in the next paragraph he says that so far as the price level is concerned, it has increased by about six per cent. When we compare the per capita income, we shall find that the prices are rising high.

In this connection, I should also like to point out that when we calculate the per capita income we should bear in mind that most of the income goes to the people of the higher level. The smaller people get very little. So, if we take that aspect also into consideration, we will find that the national income at the lower level if at all it has increased it is very insignificant and it cannot cope up with the rise in the prices which is going on.

The President, in one of his earlier addresses—for the year 1959-60—said that our economy should be such as will be self-generating and self-reliant. In this respect, in the course of the reply in the Rajya Sabha, it has been said that a base has been created. Yes; a base has been created and so many industrial estates have been established in many States. But it all requires a very extensive propaganda and we should go and tell the people that this is the thing which we should do and that they should take to them. Otherwise, all this will remain where it is.

I may next point out one more thing. *Panchayati Raj* has been established. This is a very good sign and this is a thing which India requires. It is of course an old thing.

Mr. Chairman: May I point out that the hon. Member's time is over?

Shri Jhunjhunwala: I am on my last point though I have got many more things to say. I shall finish in one minute. As I have said, disintegration has taken place at a high level. If it percolates into panchayats and all these things, we do not know where we shall be. I should request hon.

Members to see in what difficult position we shall be when the disintegration which has been going on at the higher level percolates to the lower level. It is now left to the higher level people to build up good, high and noble traditions so that the people at the village level can also follow the same. The tradition of the people below has been to follow the people in the higher level. But then we are setting up a very bad example. We preach one thing against casteism, against provincialism and all these things, but while applying it to ourselves, we do it in quite a different way. This produces a very dangerous effect on the minds of the people in the villages. We should be very careful in this respect. The people at the higher level should build up noble traditions and they should regard it as a profession of dedication and not of personal ambition and personal aggrandisement.

श्री नरदेव स्वामी (अलीगढ़—रक्षित—
अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : महाशय, राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर आज वाद-विवाद का चौथा दिन है। पिछले तीन दिनों से इसपर बहस चल रही है। कांगो की, लाप्रोस की, अल्जीरिया की और जर्मनी आदि देशों की समस्याओं के बारे में जो कुछ हो रहा है, उनको जिग तरह से मुतझाने की कोशिश की जा रही है, वह दुनिया जानती है। उन देशों की समस्याओं की अपेक्षा हमारे अपने देश की भी बहुत बड़ी समस्याएँ हैं। चीन जोकि हमारा पड़ोसी देश है, बड़ा होने के नाते हम उसको अपना बड़ा भाई मानते हैं। परम्पराओं और आदर्शों को यदि हम देखें तो हमारा देश उससे कहीं ज्यादा आगे है। परन्तु आज के युग में आवादी का बड़ा महत्व है, इसलिए हम उसको अपना बड़ा भाई मानते थे। परन्तु बड़े भाई ने छोटे भाई पर पीछे से पीठ पर वार किया है और हमारे १२,००० वर्ग मील भूमि पर, सीमा क्षेत्र पर कब्जा कर लिया है और दुनिया को सह-अस्तित्व और पंचशील का उद्देश देता जा रहा है। हिन्दुस्तान को बदनाम करने

में उसने कोई काम उठा नहीं रखा। उसने वर्मा से सीमा सम्बन्धी संधि की, नेपाल से संधि करने वह जा रहा है और हमारे पड़ोसी सहोदर भाई पाकिस्तान को बहका रहा है। साथ ही साथ हमारे दो छोटे भाइयों, भूटान और भिक्रिम को वह फुसला रहा है। वे छोटे देश हैं। इन्होंने चीन को प्रंगुष्ट दिवा दिया है और उन्होंने अपने बड़े भाई हिन्दुस्तान में गठबन्धन किया है और कहा है कि उनकी सीमाओं के बारे में जो निर्णय होना है, वह भारत करेगा। इस तरह से हम देखते हैं कि हमारे पड़ोसी राष्ट्रों को चीन बहका रहा है और हमारे देश की भूमि पर अपना कब्जा जतला रहा है और कुछ भाग पर तो कब्जा उसने कर भी लिया है।

हमारी वैदेशिक नीति स्पष्ट है। संसार के दूसरे देशों ने हमारी वैदेशिक नीति को सराहना की है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री और भारत सरकार प्रस्तुत कर रहे हैं कि लड़ाई न हो। आप जानते हैं कि खेत को मेड़ के प्रश्न को लेकर दो भाइयों में भी झगड़ में लड़ाई हो जाती है, लड़ भी चल जाते हैं। परन्तु इतने बड़े भूभाग पर चीन द्वारा कब्जा कर लिये जाने के बाद भी भारत सरकार और हमारे देश के नेता यही चाहते हैं कि शान्तिपूर्वक मानना मुमकन जाये। परन्तु दुर्भाग्यवश चीन इसको मानना नहीं है। यह समय ही बतलायेगा कि मापना कैसे मुमकन है और हमारी सरकार इसके बारे में क्या करती है। यह बहुत बड़ी समस्या है, जिन पर आज हमारे देश को गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करना है। अणुजिशन में जो लोग बैठे हुए हैं वे चाहते हैं कि लड़ाई की घोषणा कर दी जाये। वे लड़ाई की भाषा में सोचते हैं। हम उनसे ज्यादा लड़ाई की बात करना चाहते हैं पर इसका आज समय नहीं है।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने राज्य सभा में कहा है कि हम अपनी सीमा के मामले में कोई सौदेबाजी नहीं करेंगे और यदि जबरदस्ती हमारे पर लड़ाई थोपी गई तो उम्कना हम मुकाम न।

[श्री नरदेव स्नातक]

करेंगे। आप जानते हैं यह क्यों हो रहा है ? यह इसलिए हो रहा है कि जिस तरह में गिना नकेल या पगहा के बड़ा मांड उपद्रव करता है, ठीक उसी तरह से चीन कर रहा है। राष्ट्र संघ का वह सदस्य नहीं है। हमारी सरकार और हमारे नेता बहुत दिनों से प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं कि यू० एन० ओ० का चीन सदस्य बन जाये। अब भी हम यही चाहते हैं और भविष्य में भी यही चाहेंगे कि वह यू० एन० ओ० का सदस्य बन जाये। परन्तु कुछ बड़े राष्ट्रों के रवैये के कारण चीन को उसका सदस्य बनने नहीं दिया जा रहा है। यदि वह यू० एन० ओ० का सदस्य बन जाता तो यह निश्चित बात है कि जो उमने हमारे भूभाग पर कब्जा कर लिया है, वह न कर पाता। अब समय बनाने का कि हमारी सरकार इस दिशा में क्या प्रयत्न करती है और किस तरह से इस क्षेत्र को वापिस लेती है।

अब मैं हिन्दी के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना चाहूँगा। हिन्दी भाषा को हमारे संविधान ने राज भाषा के रूप में स्वीकार किया है। सन् १९६५ में हमारी राष्ट्र भाषा हिन्दी राज भाषा घोषित कर दी जायेगी। यद्यपि यह कार्य बहुत उपयोगी है, परन्तु अंग्रेजी के लिये सन् १९६५ तक छूट दी हुई है। हम यह देखते हैं कि केन्द्रीय सरकार के जो मंत्रालय हैं उन में काम करने वाले जो अधिकारी वर्ग हैं वे हिन्दी से विरोध रखते हैं। मंत्री या बड़े अधिकारी उन से कहते हैं कि जल्दी से काम करो और हिन्दी में उत्तर देने की जो बात है वह हिन्दी में दो। परन्तु यदि वे उत्तर देते भी हैं तो बहुत देर में देते हैं। इस का यह परिणाम हो जाता है कि जिस प्रयोजन के लिये वह वार्तालाप या पत्र व्यवहार होता है उस में देरी हो जाती है और काम में विघ्न पड़ता है। आप जानते हैं कि हिन्दी जानने वालों की संख्या संसार में तीसरे नम्बर की है। पहला नम्बर तो चीनी भाषा जानने वालों का है, जो कि चीन देश में रहते हैं, लगभग ३० या ३५

करोड़। दूसरा स्थान अंग्रेजी को दिया जाता है। कहते हैं कि २५ करोड़ के करीब अंग्रेजी भाषा भाषी हैं, और तीसरे नम्बर पर हिन्दी को बताया जाता है, जिस को लगभग २० करोड़ लोग जानने वाले हैं। यदि हम लंका, नेपाल, सिंगापुर और बर्मा तथा पाकिस्तान में हिन्दी जानने वालों की संख्या को और जोड़ लें तो यह संख्या करीब ३० या ३३ करोड़ के हो जाती है। इस तरह से संसार में हिन्दी जानने वालों की संख्या दूसरे नम्बर पर हो जाती है, जब कि हिन्दुस्तान में अंग्रेजी जानने वाले १ फी सदी से ज्यादा नहीं हैं। फिर भी सारा शासन कार्य अंग्रेजी में चल रहा है, चाहे वह केन्द्रीय सरकार हो या प्रदेश सरकार हो, उन सब जगहों में अंग्रेजी का ही बोलबाला है। यद्यपि गृह मंत्रालय ने केन्द्रीय सरकार के मंत्रालयों के लिये हिन्दी की कक्षा की व्यवस्था कर रखी है, उन में जो भी कर्मचारी या अधिकारी वर्ग हैं, उन की संख्या पांच या नान वर्ष पहले जितनी थी, उतनी ही आज भी है, जब कि पढ़ने वालों की संख्या पहले से काफी ज्यादा है। अब उन की संख्या बढ़नी चाहिये। इस तरह से हमारे काम में भी सहूलियत हाँगी और हम को असन्तोष भी नहीं होगा। इस समय हमारे गृह मंत्रालय ने अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय अथवा रोमन अक्षरों के लिये एक आदेश दे रखा है। और वह यह कि जितने प्रतिवेदन हिन्दी में छूटें, उन में जो अक्षर लिखे जायें वे रोमन अक्षरों में हों। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इस तरह का आदेश क्यों दिया गया है। वह तो ऐसी ही बात हो गई जैसे लहर के कुर्से पर विधायनी कपड़े का पैबन्द लगा दिया गया हो। इसी तरह से देवनागरी लिपि में लिखी जाने वाली हिन्दी प्रतिवेदन में अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय अक्षरों का लिखा जाता है। मुझे कोई चिन्ता नहीं है यदि रोमन में अथवा अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्वरूप में अक्षरों को लिखा जाय। लेकिन यदि यह होता है तो मेरा यह सुझाव है कि अंग्रेजी के प्रतिवेदन में हिन्दी के अक्षर लिखे जाय करें। इस तरह से हम देखते हैं कि जो हमारा अधिकारी वर्ग

है वह अपनी मूहलियत के लिये जनता को मूहलियत नहीं देता है। इस देश के प्राये से ज्यादा लोग हिन्दी समझते हैं, पढ़ते हैं, और बोलते हैं, परन्तु उन को उन की भाषा में न समझा कर सारे प्रतिवेदन या वक्तव्य जो द्रोने हैं वे अंग्रेजी में दिये जाते हैं। जिस को १ फी सदी लोग भी नहीं जानते हैं। यह एक विचारणीय विषय है।

मैं देखता हूँ कि शिक्षा मंत्रालय ने इन दिशा में काफी प्रयत्न किया, और अब भी कर रहा है, परन्तु जितना उम्र को करना चाहिये था उतना नहीं किया है। आज भी कहते हैं कि हमारा शिक्षा मंत्रालय विश्व कोश बना रहा है तथा एक ऐतिहासिक व्याकरण तैयार कर रहा है। वह कब तक बनेगा, किन्तु उम्र में पैसा लगेगा, इस का पता नहीं। आज जो साधारण व्याकरण है यदि उम्र के अनुसार भी कार्य शुरू कर दिया जाय तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह जल्दी हो सकेगा और आम जनता को समझने में भी आसानी होगी। इस तरह से हम देखते हैं कि हर ओर से हिन्दी के साथ सौतेला जैसा व्यवहार किया जा रहा है। मैं ने अपने कई एक भाषणों में हिन्दी के बारे में निवेदन किया है, परन्तु सरकार इस दिशा में संदगति से प्रयत्न कर रही है, वह तेजो के साथ इन काम को आगे नहीं बढ़ा रही है।

आज हमारी जो शिक्षा व्यवस्था है, एजुकेशन का सिस्टम या पद्धति है, वह बड़ी विचित्र है। जो हमारे देश के नेता हैं, बड़े बड़े विद्वान हैं वे विश्वविद्यालयों के दीर्घकाल भाषणों में इस वर्तमान शिक्षा प्रणाली की बड़ी आलोचना करते हैं, वे कहते हैं कि वर्तमान शिक्षा प्रणाली दूषित है, इस को बदलना चाहिये, परन्तु जब उन से इस दूषित प्रणाली को बदलने के लिये कहा जाता है, तब वे चुप हो जाते हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि अब तक जो शिक्षा प्रणाली है वह अंग्रेजी राज के जमाने से चली आ रही है और उस में अब परिवर्तन होना चाहिये। कोई युग था, जब कि यहाँ अंग्रेजी राज्य था, तब वह उपयुक्त थी, परन्तु

अब उस को परिवर्तित करना जरूरी है। एक जमाना था जब कि गुरुकुलों और ऋषिकुलों का कुलपति राजा होता था। वह दम दम हजार ब्रह्मचारियों को गुरुकुल में पढ़ाता था, उन ब्रह्मचारियों को पढ़ाई की सुविधायें थीं, खाने पीने की सुविधायें थीं, वस्त्र की सुविधायें थीं, रहने की सुविधायें थीं और इस का प्रबन्ध राज्य की तरफ से होता था, क्योंकि वही कुलपति होता था। किन्तु आज हमारे राज्यपाल कुलपति हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि उन्होंने विद्यार्थियों के खाने पीने की, कपड़े की और रहने की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की। मेरा निवेदन है कि आप परीक्षण के तौर पर उन संस्थाओं को, जो हि अंग्रेजी राज्य के जमाने में अपना आदर्श कायम कर के अभी तक चलती रही हैं, पतपायें। आज हमारे बहुत से गुरुकुल हैं, उन की ओर ध्यान दें। और यदि ऐसा नहीं हो सकता तो मेरा निवेदन है कि हर एक जिले के अन्दर एक ऐसी संस्था खोली जाय जिस में २००, ४०० या ५०० विद्यार्थी न सही, कम से कम ५०, १०० विद्यार्थियों को आप प्रशिक्षण दें। आप उन के कपड़े की, खाने की, पुस्तकों आदि की व्यवस्था करें, जैसे कि प्राचीन गुरुकुलों का सिस्टम था, तो मैं कह सकता हूँ कि हम उस में अवश्य सफल होंगे और जो हमारी शिक्षा प्रणाली में दोष है उन को दूर कर सकेंगे। इन तरह से जहाँ हमारी दूषित शिक्षा प्रणाली में परिवर्तन होगा वहाँ हमारे बच्चों में भी कुछ अ.च.र धर्म आयेगा और उनके अन्दर सदाचार पनपेगा। आज हम देखते हैं कि जो हमारे बच्चे स्कूल और कालेजों में जाते हैं वे ज्यादा से ज्यादा समय बाह्यात चीजों में, सिनेमः देखने में और दूसरे राग रंगों में व्यतीत करते हैं। अपने मां बाप का बेशकीमती कर्नाई का पैना, दूनरी चीजों में व्यय करते हैं और जो उन का कीमती समय अध्ययन में जाना चाहिये, उस से वे अछूते रहते हैं। यह हमारे सिस्टम की कमी है, उस में गलतियाँ हैं, इन लिये उस को बदलना होगा, तभी हमारे देश का उन्नति हो सकेगी। इस शिक्षा व्यवस्था के लिये

[श्री नरदेव स्नातक]

अन्दर से आप जो कुछ कर रहे हैं वह ठीक है, लेकिन उस में कुछ प्रगति होनी चाहिये।

अभी हमारे माननीय सदस्यों ने जबलपुर कांड के बारे में भी अपने विचार रखे। वैसे जबलपुर में जो कांड हुआ उस से हमारा और हमारे देश के लोगों का माया झुक जाता है, परन्तु इन सब के पीछे वही कारण है कि हमारे यहां के बच्चों में अनुशासनहीनता बढ़नी चली जाती है। जो बच्चे स्कूल और कालेजों में पढ़ते हैं उन के अन्दर आने ऊार नियंत्रण रखने की आदत न होने ने ऐसा होता है, वहाँ दो स्कूली बच्चों के कारण इस तरह के कांड न होते। यदि ये अनुशासनहीन हो तो इस तरह की दुर्घटना न होती। अब तो जबलपुर कांड के जांच की रिपोर्ट ही हमें बतायेगी कि वहाँ क्या क्या हुआ है, परन्तु फिर भी हमारा मिर इस दुर्घटना से शर्म से झुक जाता है। हमारी सरकार को इन सब चीजों की ओर ध्यान देना होगा और उचित दण्ड व्यवस्था करनी होगी।

मेरा अपना विचार है कि हमारा पड़ोसी मित्र चीन, जिस ने पांच माल पहले "हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई" का नारा लगाया था, उस के अन्दर कुछ अक्ल आयेगी और हमारा जो भू-भाग उस के पास है वह छोड़ देगा नहीं तो संपार का जनमत उस के विनाफ हो जायेगा और उन के अपने देश के अन्दर जो चीजें हैं वे ही उस बाध्य करेंगी कि जो हिन्दुस्तान की जमीन है, उस से वह हट जाय।

अन्त में मैं श्री भक्त दर्शन जी ने जो प्रस्ताव राष्ट्रपति को धन्यवाद देने का प्रस्तुत किया है उस का हृदय से समर्थन करना हूँ। राष्ट्रपति जी ने जो कुछ अपने अभिभाषण में कहा है वह ठीक है और समय के अनुकूल है और मैं चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दी के लिये जिस विभाग की स्थापना की गई है उस में ज्यादा से ज्यादा प्रगति हो।

Shri Nausair Bharucha (East Khansh): Mr. Chairman, we have been listening to this debate on the Motion of Thanks for the last three days and perhaps it is natural that our attention largely is riveted to the question of security of this country, to which so many speakers have made reference. The security of any country requires to be judged in the light of the international situation not only so far as the political part of that situation is concerned but also so far as the technique of aggression and defence is concerned. Today the whole world progresses so rapidly that one wonders whether the expenditure which we incur on defence running to nearly Rs. 250 crores annually is worth while incurring. Today we find, after having had complete control over our organisation of defence for over 13 years, this country remains as helpless in matters of defence as ever before. What is most surprising about the thing is that those who are in power and who should know better, seem to be completely self-complacent about this matter. Let it be frankly stated, if we have not been able to make any headway against aggression by China, it is largely due to the fact that we can do very little about it militarily. Apart from any other consideration involved in military use of force against China, the fact is that even if we wanted to, we would not be able to apply force, because war with China involves a totally different type of weapons of warfare from those that our army possesses. Warfare with China necessarily must mean a warfare in a jungle area, a warfare in a mountainous area, and a primitive type of guerilla war. Frankly, our army is not equipped with the necessary type of weapons to carry out this warfare. What is most surprising is that it is not appreciated that any warfare with China, if at all it comes to pass, would occur in mountainous terrain where most of our modern equipments, our supersonic jets, our anti-aircraft guns, our tanks, our armoured cars, everything very modern, would be practically useless. It

is a region where neither aircraft can operate very successfully, where aircraft has very limited operations, where small munitions carried on the back of men or mule can effectively carry on combat activities. While India is in a position to manufacture these small arms and munitions the most surprising part of it is that our ordnance factories are actually re-trenching employees as surplus staff or diverting their production potential to producing the civil requirements such as pressure cookers and hair-clippers. It is a pity that when the country is facing such danger, when our army should have been equipped with the right type of munitions which we can manufacture, I repeat our ordnance factories are manufacturing pressure-cookers and hair-clippers. Until our people at the very top, our Ministers, appreciate the fact that the requirements of defence in a terrain like this are totally different, till then we cannot even start preparing for a war with China. Therefore, the aggression of China must be taken as a *fait accompli*, and it will present us with a permanent problem and a problem which this Government will not be able to solve.

In the Address delivered by the President perhaps stress has been very rightly laid on the question of world peace and disarmament. No doubt our country has contributed in a limited way to the solving of this question or at least preparing the way for the solution of this question. But as one reads papers day after day and as one contemplates over the vast scientific progress that has been made in the matter of armaments, particularly rockets, one begins to wonder whether this world ever will be able to solve the disarmament problem. The other day we read of Russia sending up a rocket which is heading towards the planet Venus. A correspondent of the Russian paper, *Izvestia*, in an interview with me asked what my reactions were and I told him that while the feat was certainly wonderful and thrilling and as the satisfaction of the

human curiosity in such matters was so great that it has to be solved at any cost, this progress in rocketry raises very far-reaching issues in the matter of disarmament and the cause of world peace. Today the fact is not appreciated by many of us that just as America carries on a round-the-clock patrol by air bombers which carry nuclear weapons, similarly it is possible in the very near future, in a matter of months, to put into orbit nuclear weapons which will do the same function, namely, remain suspended in space not only for hours or days but for years together. It is quite possible that unless the question of outer space is tackled right from now the time may come when a good many of the nations may be able to occupy outer space, thus making disarmament in outer space much more difficult. But what is surprising is that we do not find any reference in the Address to this all-important problem.

Coming nearer home, another outstanding problem which affects us is in the matter of self-sufficiency in foodgrains. Sir, last year India entered into a contract with America for the supply of 17 million tons of foodgrains. It is most surprising that after two Five Year Plans the question of self-sufficiency in foodgrains is not yet in sight and the position at the end of the Third Plan will be that this country will continue to rely upon foreign imports. The paradox of the problem is to be found in this, namely, that while we wail over the agriculturists' incapacity to produce the requisite quantity of foodgrains, we continue to deny the agriculturists the necessary minimum price and other facilities. To my mind, a revolutionary policy in the matter of foodgrains is necessary and production of foodgrains must be put on a war footing. And this can be achieved, strangely enough, by commonsense methods rather than by importing very large quantities of foodgrains from abroad at terrific cost both in terms of money and in foreign exchange.

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

If we give more attention to small irrigation projects, if we give more attention to the fact that what is required by the agriculturists is reduction in the canal water rates, if we supply agriculturists with electricity for agricultural purposes at cheap prices, if we could supply them adequate quantity of fertilizers and supply them in good time, if we could supply them improved quality of seeds and cheaper credit, I for one am sure there would be no need for importing foodgrains in any quantity at all. It is wrong to dub our agriculturists as reactionary, not being capable of making use of more modern implements of agriculture. The agriculturists, I am sure, know and understand much better than what we do what their job is and, given the facilities, I have no doubt they will rise to the occasion and produce the requisite quantity of foodgrains.

Another question to which attention has been drawn is the question of inflation and spiralling of prices. The prices continue to rise. Government have tinkered with this problem, they have taken measures such as credit curbs, price fixation, taxation, savings, ceilings etc., all of which have limited utility in the matter of arresting the inflationary spiral, and one wonders what will be our position with an investment of Rs. 12,000 crores in the Third Plan. There you have made no provision for inflation during the third five year period. I am of the opinion that unless the Government pays greater attention to this problem of inflation a time must come when we will so get involved with the after-effects of inflation that not only our Third Plan will fail but there might be a veritable collapse of our entire economy.

14 hrs.

The last problem to which I shall refer is the question of liberation of Goa. Like everything else, we are to'd, the liberation of Goa has got to be peaceful. I have yet to come across

peaceful liberation of colonies occupied by powers which are notoriously colonial and yet I do not understand why Dadra and Nagar Haveli are not left free to organise liberation of Goa. We say on the one hand that Goa is part and parcel of India, as it certainly is, and on the other hand we take every effective measure to prevent its liberation being undertaken by the citizens of this country. What type of paradoxical talk is this that on the one hand we say that Goa is a part of India and on the other we prevent Indians from participating in its liberation?

There are many other things to which attention in the Address has been invited by the President. I am not satisfied that the Address gives us an invigorating lead for the next year to come. It is a humdrum list of what has been achieved—and achieved in a very small and limited measure—and the usual talk of the Bills which this House will have to pass. This is not the way in which an Address has to be delivered. There is nothing original about this Address. So long as we continue to remain in the rut that we have been in year after year, it is very difficult to see how India will prosper in the context of a world situation that daily grows more dangerous and more difficult to live in.

Shri P. R. Patel (Meh ana): Mr. Chairman, Sir, most of the hon. Members have given their views on China, Congo, Pakistan, Burma and other foreign countries. I generally speak on agriculture and I shall confine my remarks to domestic questions.

The President has referred in paragraph 23 of his Address to textile prices. In paragraph 24 he referred to Panchayati Raj and in paragraph 25 he referred to agricultural production. I shall confine my remarks to these three subjects.

I would like to know from the Government their clear policy towards agriculture *vis-a-vis* the textile industry. You will be pleased to see that

Government issued a notification on the 5th December, 1960, stating that textile prices were increasing and were causing undue hardship to the consumers for the last over a year. We see from this that the textile industry was allowed to earn as much as possible for the whole year. Then the Government says that a suggestion was made to the Indian Cotton Mills Federation, and a warning was issued to them and they heeded to the warning. How? The Federation issued instruction on the 3rd September, 1960, to all cotton mills in the country, that is, their members, asking them to charge 25 per cent more on coarse, 22 per cent more on lower medium, 18 per cent more on higher medium, 11½ per cent more on fine and 9 per cent more on superfine cloth over the prices prevalent a year before. These were the instructions that they issued. On the one side the Government were giving a warning to the mills, on the other side the warning was utilised by the Federation of the cotton mills to increase the price and legalise the rise.

Thereafter there was a meeting of the mill-owners with the hon. Commerce Minister and a contemptuous decrease in prices of about 2 per cent or so was accepted. So, they had a rise of 25 per cent on coarse cloth and a contemptuous decrease of 2 or 3 per cent was accepted by them. Thus we see that the textile industry is allowed to gather as much as possible at the cost of not only consumers but also at the cost of cotton producers. My grievance is that the textile industry is allowed to grow fatter and fatter at the cost of the producers.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): In spite of this complaint of his, he has gone there.

Shri P. R. Patel: I am here to serve the agriculturists in a better way than merely to waste my time away in speaking from that side.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: After four years!

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Five years in Bombay also.

Shri P. R. Patel: What has happened is that the ceiling on cotton price was fixed in 1951. We know that during the period 1951 to 1960 prices of all commodities have increased. That must be accepted. There is no exception. There is no commodity the price of which has not increased. I will give some figures to show that even the price of cotton manufactures increased from base 100 in 1952-53 to 130 at the end of July 1960. So there is an increase of 30 per cent. In timber there is an increase of 40 per cent.

Shri Naldurgkar (Osmanabad): But food prices are going down.

Shri P. R. Patel: I am saying so. Price of oil cakes increased by 39 per cent, of tea by 114 per cent, of *gur* by 50 per cent and of tobacco by 10 per cent. But the ceiling price of cotton that was fixed in 1951 has been maintained throughout. It has not only been maintained, but very recently when Government declared their policy about cotton for the year 1960-61 in that policy the ceiling price of Kalyan cotton that was fixed in 1951-52 at Rs. 870 a *kandy* was reduced to Rs. 840 a *kandy*. So there is a decrease of Rs. 30. We see on the one side increase in the prices of textiles. The mill owners—poor mill-owners—are allowed to gather more and for the agriculturists, the ceiling price has been reduced, not only for Kalyan cotton, but the other types, Western, Vijai, and Surti. Artificial zones were created and prices were brought down. When representations were made from all sides, and there were protests from all sides, the result was, a negligible increase was given in the case of Kalyan cotton, Rs. 10 or so. That shows our policy towards the agriculturists. I tell you, unless we revise our policy, we shall not be doing justice to 80 per cent of the population in the country. I would request the Government to look into the matter. I would ask the Government, how is it that textile prices went on increasing and

[Shri P. R. Patel]

how is it that the Government was pleased to decrease the cotton prices. Was it not proper time to raise the ceiling? The ceilings were fixed in 1951. There has been a rise in all prices. Naturally, the price of cotton also deserves to be put up at a higher level. But, we did not. What are we doing? This time, we had been short of cotton. Just to meet our needs in cotton, just to see that our mill owners do not suffer, we imported cotton from outside. We are indebting ourselves and under P.L. 480, we are getting cotton. We shall pay later on. My submission is that this policy requires a change.

Not only that. If we look at food-grains, what do we find? A reply was given by the hon. Minister of Agriculture two days back that surplus of wheat is there in Madhya Pradesh and Punjab. Wheat is accumulating. Well, it is not the fault of the Central Government; it is the fault of the State Government. It may be the fault of State Government; it may not be fault of the Central Government. But, what was the fault of the agriculturists who produced the wheat? It is accumulating. Prices have gone down and the sufferers are the agriculturists. We allow the agriculturists to suffer. My submission is that our policy towards agriculturists requires to be revised.

I may refer to Panchayati Raj. I do not want to say much. But, I can say that this is a revolutionary step that we have taken. It is a good thing. My experience is, because I have worked from Municipality to Local Board, and from the State legislature to this House, . . .

Shri Braj Raj Singh: The highest now.

Shri P. R. Patel: Yes. Those persons who come straight have no sufficient experience. My experience is that when the people's co-operation is there, everything succeeds and our Plan succeeds. We have implemented

two Plans. But, the enthusiasm that should have been created amongst the people is wanting. By the establishment of the Panchayati Raj, we shall be creating enthusiasm in the people to look after their own development works, and they will be participating in our Third Five Year Plan. It is a good thing. It is a new experiment here in Rajasthan. But, we had Panchayats in the days of Baroda; we had local boards in the days of Baroda. After Baroda was merged, we have so many panchayats in Gujarat. Our experience is that the Panchayats are doing very well. I think Panchayati Raj will be a success in the country. But, one thing is required. The man at the top in the ministry should run the Panchayati Raj in a most democratic way. He will have to forget the old methods and certain other things. I am sure the success will be there. Without Panchayati Raj, our democracy is not safe. We may have legislatures; we may have a Parliament. But, these are the *sikhars*. The roots are in the villages. Panchayats are the roots of democracy, and if the roots grow strong, we shall succeed.

In the end, if I may be permitted, I would refer to China. The President had the hope that China will persuade herself to come to a satisfactory agreement with our country in regard to our borders. It is good if it bears fruit. But, as I know China and Chinese history, I have little hope. China entered into a treaty with us in 1954 and agreed to respect our integrity and our borders. We see, after this Panch Sheel treaty, they have behaved rather contrary to the terms of the treaty. They have captured our country. All these documents are there. The official team has done well and they have put all the evidence. The evidence is on our side but the territories are on the other side. We are the least concerned with evidence. We are concerned with our territory. I believe that China would become wise

not by negotiation, not by persuasion, but only by force. The country should become united and make our Government strong in this matter. This is what I submit.

Shri P. C. Borooah (Sibsagar): Mr. Chairman; I associate myself with the Motion of Thanks to the President for the Address he was pleased to deliver to Members of Parliament. Coming as I do from the State which is vitally affected by the Chinese aggression and is also concerned with the famous McMahon Line, I could not but mention a bit about China, although China has been discussed by almost all the Members taking part in this discussion. We held high hopes that with the visit of the Chinese Prime Minister to our country followed by the meets of the high officials of India and China would settle our disputes; but all our hopes have been belied. Although there is good news that Long Ju has been evacuated by the Chinese whatever be the cause, reports have been coming that there are concentrations of troops and also preparations on the other side of the border. Added to this, we hear that the border talks have failed and that there are new demands by the Chinese for big chunks of our territory. The dark clouds that gathered in the northern horizon are becoming thicker and thicker. This House has not been given an opportunity to know the actual steps being taken by the Government to put up a strong defence, but, in the circumstances, I have only to submit that we must be able to rise to the occasion, we must see that we fortify our borders, build roads, improve communications, extend our railway line right up to the foot hills; above all, we must see that our national unity is not affected. We must prepare our people in such manner that they may rise as one man when occasion demands. They should be made aware of our imminent danger. Fissiparous tendencies should be crushed. Reactionaries, bad characters, and disruptionists should be combed out.

Coming to the formation of Naga Land, I do not find favour with the name Naga Land. It sounds as if it is a place somewhere in Europe like Poland, Finland, Scotland or Ireland. I wish the nomenclature is changed to Naga Bhoomi, Naga Pradesh or Naga Desh.

It is only five days ago that the inauguration of the interim body in respect of the proposed Naga Land has taken place, of course, under extreme precaution and extreme security measures. While I extend my good wishes to the President and members of the interim body and sincerely hope that the Naga brethren will be able to live happily and be prosperous in their new State, I cannot but express concern at the increasing hostile activities.

In reply to a question of mine the other day, the hon. Prime Minister was saying that the Naga hostiles, losing their ground, had become desperate, and were resorting to violence, but I am sorry that I cannot wholly subscribe to this viewpoint.

The Naga population is about 3½ lakhs, and for the last ten years they have been agitating for an independent Naga land. It is about six years since most of the agitator leaders have gone underground because of the pressure of our armed forces, and they have been directing the agitation from their jungle hide-outs. As a result, a lot of depredations, murders and attacks on officials, military personnel and loyalists have taken place. There is no denying the fact that it is only because of our superior and numerically greater armed forces that the Naga Hills are still within India.

The number of lives lost there, I think, would exceed the number of lives we lost during the 25 years of our struggle for independence of the country. We have not been able to get back the four air force personnel, about whom there was some mention

[Shri P. C. Borooah]

earlier in the House today. Yesterday our Defence Minister was saying that it would not be in the interests of the public to disclose details. But may I, with your permission, read out a news item from the *Assam Tribune* dated 21st February 1961, which from an official source? It says:

"The four Indian Air Force personnel, captured by Naga hostiles in September last after shooting down an I.A.F. Dakota engaged in supply dropping, have been taken to an area inside Burma border controlled by hostiles, it was learnt here from official sources today."

The only railway line that passes through the heart of the State of Assam, which is the life line of the State, is being frequently attacked by the Naga hostiles, and as a result there is very often dislocation of railway communications. The people in the border areas are living in extreme panic. One of the brightest and bravest of the officials, in the person of Sadananda Chaliha, recently met his end at the hands of the hostiles under very tragic circumstances which has stirred the whole State of Assam.

It is said that it is very difficult to distinguish a hostile from a loyalist, otherwise how it could have been possible for the hostiles alone to kidnap as many as 27 *goan buras*, village headmen, who were invitees to the inauguration ceremony. It is also said that if the military is withdrawn from the Naga Hills, the hostiles would out-number the loyalists and make the Naga Hills again a hot bed of secessionist activities. I do not hold the view that the hostiles have become as weak as has been held in some quarters.

I may be permitted to read out another news item from *Assam Tribune* dated 18th February, which, reporting the inauguration ceremony, writes:

"For the first time jet planes escorted a convoy of about forty vehicles carrying the delegates in addition to the armoured vehicles and army escorts."

Then it says:

"According to an official report, an army special was attacked by a hostile gang on February 14 last near the Dhansirir station, injuring two persons."

This is the sort of information we are getting. From this we have to consider whether actually the Naga hostiles are becoming weaker day by day.

In this connection I submit that we must not be complacent. We should give all facilities and strengthen the hands of the Convention leaders, but we should not be complacent that whatever is done in Naga Land is all right. We must be prepared to revise, our attitude towards the Naga hostiles. We should be prepared to reorientate our attitude and approach to the Naga problem, if necessary.

I find that there is no mention of the demand for a separate Hill State in Assam which is also agitating the mind of the people living in that area. I do not know how we can deny a separate status to the five hill districts, since we have given the one hill district of the Nagas the status of a separate State. I should not be misunderstood that I support this demand for a separate Hill State, but I am speaking from the point of view of consistency. I wish also to ventilate the reactions of my mind in the matter of handling of the affairs of north-eastern India, namely Assam.

After partition there were our two administrations in the part of the country. One was the Assam Administration, and the other was the Tripura Administration. Manipur was also within Assam then, being one of the 20 districts. Of course, there was a common Governor, with a separate administration. By introducing Part

B States, we separated Manipur completely from Assam. Thus, if become three administrations in that area. After that, by the introduction of the Sixth Schedule in the Constitution we have made the six hill districts of Assam as autonomous districts; although the Nagas did not accept that, we made those hill districts become autonomous districts, and we set by five different administrations for them. Thus, there were in all eight administrations after the introduction of the Sixth Schedule. Then, by a stroke of the open, the six districts of NEFA have been separated from Assam. That became the ninth in the line of administrations. Lastly, the Naga State has now been carved out. Thus, in that part of the country, since after the Partition, in place of having two administrations, we are now having ten administrations. Surely, the House will be able to judge whether we are going in the direction of integration or whether we are not separating one from another by setting up these separate administrations. About oil finds, there is of course very good news. Last year also the President in this Address had made a reference to this. But I come from an area where there are two oil-fields, one worked by the Oil India Limited, and the other by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission. The latter is a public sector organisation, while the former is a private sector organisation with, of course, Government participation. During the last seven years, the Oil India Limited have dug as many as 90 deep wells, whereas the Oil and Natural Gas Commission have dug during the last two and a half years only two wells. The performance of the Oil India Limited is such that with the oil that they would find, they will be able to feed two refineries. As against this, the performance of the Oil and Natural Gas Commission is that of the two wells dug, one has been declared dry, while in respect of the other which was stated to contain some 50 million tons of oil, the position has been contradicted by the hon.

Minister here. So, the performance of the public sector organisation has to rise to the same level, as, if not exceed, that of the private sector organisation.

14.33 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Lastly, I would like to mention a word about the visit of foreign dignitaries. A large number of foreign dignitaries have visiting our country very often, but we are extremely sorry, and our whole people very much dissatisfied at the fact that in none of the itineraries of these foreign dignitaries is Assam mentioned. Nobody goes to Assam. Assam has always been neglected. We hope that at least in future, when the itineraries of the foreign dignitaries are drawn up, Assam would find some place in them.

Shri Mohammed Imam (Chi'ul-drug): I am one of those who characterise this Address as colourless, odourless and tasteless. On a close study of the Address, we find that our national difficulties are being aggravated, and there is a growing threat to the safety and integrity of our country. The Address itself gives no assurance about the steps or measures to be adopted by Government for confronting, and for a solution of, the various problems that face us.

The President has been pleased to refer to the Third Five Year Plan, and he has also referred to the rise in national income. He has also referred to the rise in prices. The other day when Shri Ranga referred to the Third Five Year Plan and offered some criticism, there was some mild stir in this House. I may make it quite clear that I am not against the development of the country or against the progress of the country. Our idea is that any economic planning in our country should conform to, and have some regard for, our economic conditions as also to the availability of internal resources. If

[Shri Mohammed Imam]

this principle is not kept in view, I am afraid we shall be in a tangled web from which it will be difficult for us to extricate ourselves. I am only anxious that the goose which lays the golden eggs should not be killed with a view to mop up all the golden eggs, ultimately finding that there is none.

We have had the experience of the two previous Plans. We know what considerable stresses and strains we have to put up with. We are also aware of the extent to which the people and the common man have been burdened with oppressive taxation. We are also aware of the extent to which the country has become indebted both internally and externally. We are also aware of the extent to which inflation has gone up and is staring at us. For want of time, I would not refer to how the country has suffered and what the impact of the huge debt that we have contracted has been, but suffice it for me to say that the present debts have involved the country in the payment of at least Rs. 200 crores every year as interest, and we are also leaving a huge liability for posterity. I am concerned at the incidence of taxation and the impact it will have on the people if we accept the Third Five Year Plan and push it through. As we know, we have no reserves. The entire expenditure on the Third Five Year Plan, which comes to Rs. 12,500 crores has to be met out of borrowed funds, deficit financing and taxation. The taxation contemplated is about Rs. 1,650 crores. This means, in the course of the Plan, in order to implement it, the *per capita* taxation in the country would be Rs. 40, apart from the taxes which we have already been paying. Just imagine what the plight of the common man will be, and how oppressive the weight of taxation will be.

Again, I may point out that the Indian people have been taxed much more than they were taxed before, and the limit has been reached. Government may say that they levy these

taxes in order to restore the prosperity of the people or to make them happy. I have already said that the theory that the people are always taxed to prosperity is one of the crudest theories. It is a theory which has to be exploded. Taxes must be levied taking into consideration the living conditions, the earning capacity and the taxable capacity of the people. On the other hand, here we find nothing but indiscriminate and unlimited taxation.

I may also refer to the other implications of this unlimited borrowing and unlimited taxation, and the major one is inflation. Inflation has reached its height, and as you know, people are in the grips of a rigorous and cruel inflation. With these taxes, and with this over-expenditure, and with this borrowing, I am afraid inflation will go beyond their control; it will go to such an extent that I think, perhaps, the common man will have to starve. As it is, the prices of the essential commodities are high. For example, rice is sold at one seer a rupee. Take it from me, after all these taxes are levied, the inevitable consequences will be that prices will soar so high that we will be creating a famine and rice, to take one example, may be sold in quantities of half a seer or one-fourth of a seer. It is with a view to protect the common man from taxation, it is with a view to protect him from inflation that I plead that the Plan has to be modified considerably. It should not be as ambitious, or over-ambitious, as is envisaged now, and it must conform, as I have said to the economic position of the State and the people.

The President has said that our national income has gone up by about 6 or 7 per cent. The national income might have gone up, but has anybody considered how far the national expenditure has gone up, how far the earning capacity of the people has gone up and how much they have spent? I agree that ten years back

the *per capita* income was about Rs. 200. As against that, the *per capita* expenditure was about Rs. 120 or Rs. 150. Now the *per capita* income might have gone up to Rs. 340, but the *per capita* expenditure has gone beyond that figure. So his earning capacity might have increased, but his standard of living has gone down. I dread to think of the consequences when the Third Five Year Plan is attempted to be implemented.

Let me refer to another matter that has already been mentioned yesterday—the Jabalpur incident. I know this incident has agitated the minds of all right-thinking and patriotic Indians. These are unfortunate happenings. It is unfortunate that such incidents and occurrences have been of late far more frequent than they were before independence. (An Hon. Member; No, no.). I am going to prove that incidents of such magnitude, intensity and persistence have become very frequent. I am not concerned with communal minorities alone. There are number of minorities in the country. There are linguistic minorities, there are communal minorities, there are political minorities and there are other minorities. I submit that if incidents of this nature go on, the position of the minorities will become far more vulnerable than it is. They need protection.

We know that last year there were the unhappy incidents of Assam wherein scores of lives were lost and property worth lakhs destroyed. That was in the name of language. These incidents were followed by the unfortunate incident at Firozabad which was of a long duration and great intensity. Then we had the incident at Bhopal, and then in some parts of Bihar—I do not know the names of the places. Now there is the incident at Jabalpur. In the course of one year, four or five incidents have occurred. And what is surprising in all such cases is that law and order is surrendered to the riotous mob. I could understand it taking place for

some time, for a day, though it is the duty of the local government and the police and the military to come, curb it and put it down. But I cannot understand how such incidents and riots could be allowed to go on for weeks and weeks together, unless it be with the acquiescence of the local government or the police or, as was pointed out yesterday by Shri Frank Anthony, of the leaders. Is there no police? Is there no military? Why should such incidents be allowed to continue, whoever may be at fault? Is it impossible to round up the culprits and control such incidents within one hour? The very fact that such incidents affected so many persons, with so many persons killed under the very eyes of the police and military and so much property looted and destroyed, shows that there is something radically wrong with our administration and system of Government. The Government must function according to democratic principles. But here I am afraid it is not democracy that functions, but it is mobocracy and law and order is surrendered to mobocracy.

Regarding this incident, I submit the time has come when Government should take some effective measures. If such things are going to occur, it will be a disgrace to the country, it will be a disgrace to the Government and it will be a blot on the fair name of our secular State. I agree that a thorough investigation must be made. Not only that. Steps and measures must be adopted to check and prevent such anti-national incidents.

Shri S. L. Saksena (Maharajganj):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the list of omissions in the President's Address has been given by various speakers. I wish to comment up one, that is about the Banaras Hindu University.

The President himself is the Visitor of the University. Only two years back, this House discussed the Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Bill. By that enactment, the elected Court has been taken away and the elected

[Shri S. L. Saksena]

Executive Council has been abolished. In their place, a nominated Court and a nominated Executive Council have been set up. Several times, we have tried to raise questions about that here, but we have been told that it is an autonomous body. With due respect, I say it is not an autonomous body when everything is nominated by the Visitor and he also does not function in his discretion, because the Education Ministry has taken over the functions of the Visitor. Therefore, I want to say that this subject should be allowed to be discussed because this is the only forum where it can be discussed.

When that Bill was passed by this House, we were told that the Mudaliar Committee had revealed a serious state of affairs in the University, and in that Act provisions were made to combat those things. One of the provisions in the Act is section 30 which lays down a procedure by which any teacher in the University, whose activities were detrimental to the interests of the University, could be removed. You will remember that in the Report of the Mudaliar Committee mention was made of Eastern U.P. a dozen times by name. They said that teachers from Eastern U.P. were responsible for the evils of the University. We said here that some people who were in power there were prejudiced against Eastern U.P. Therefore, that Committee was appointed and their Report published. Now all the powers of the University have been taken away—the elected Senate, the elected Court and elected Executive Council. And what was worse, when the Act came into force, about a dozen Professors, distinguished in their respective subjects and known all over the world—one of them was honoured by the award of Padma Bhushan by the President—were issued charge-sheets. Their replies were received and the Reviewing Committee went through all the processes. They could not find enough

material to remove them. The Reviewing Committee were of the opinion that they were not dangerous to the University.

Then another course was taken. They resorted to the ordinary power in the statutes, that of giving six months' notice and terminating the services. After having gone through the entire gamut of section 30 of the Act, and having considered the report of the Reviewing Committee, the Executive Council terminated the services under the ordinary provision in the statutes that the services of a teacher can be dispensed with by giving 4 months' salary. These teachers went up to the High Court and the High Court rejected their appeal. Then, they went to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court has passed the severest strictures on the conduct of the Executive Council. The Supreme Court after having gone through the entire gamut of the provisions of the Act and after having found that there was nothing against them, has clearly stated that in now dispensing with their services under the ordinary provisions, the Executive Council has acted illegally and wrongly, and, therefore, all of them have been ordered to be reinstated.

I wish to point out that this order was passed by the Supreme Court on the 10th of January and it is surprising that on the very same day—probably this was communicated to the Vice-Chancellor by telephone—the Vice-Chancellor passed an order against all these teachers. Although the Supreme Court declared that the previous order was null and void the order given by the Executive Committee—the Vice-Chancellor passed this order. He says:

"In my opinion an emergency has arisen which requires that immediate action should be taken and in accordance with my powers under Clauses (4) and (6) of Statute 9, I order that Shri Radhey Shyam Sharma, Lecturer in Glass

President

Technology, College of Technology, should not act and function as the Lecturer in Glass Technology, College of Technology, and as a member of any authority of the University and of any Committee of the University and should not do teaching and academic work of any kind and should not do administrative work of any kind and should not perform any function and duty and should not do any work connected with the office and the post which he holds, from the date of this order, until the next meeting of the Executive Council which will give a final decision and/or direction on the subject matter of this order."

After the judgment of the Supreme Court suggesting that the previous orders were null and void, the Vice-Chancellor passes this order; and for the last 2 months these teachers could not enter the University. Probably, even criminals would not have been ordered in this manner.

My complaint is against this Executive Council. Out of about a 1,000 teachers in the University they have only selected some 10 teachers all of eastern U.P. and have framed charges against them. After that these teachers were dismissed under the ordinary law. The Reviewing Committee did not approve of it. What could be worse? The Executive Council has proved that it is partial, that it is inimical to certain people, that it is inimical to the interests of certain people.

I come from U.P. and I claim that this University has, since its foundation, been the one University to which the people of eastern U.P. have been looking for their education. Now, the authorities, the Executive Council of the University is inimical to their interests. I say, they must go when even the orders of the Supreme Court are not honoured. I say this body has no right to exist. I, therefore, submit that the Visitor should have brought this out in his Address—that the affairs of

the Banaras Hindu University are not in proper order.

One thing more. Another professor has been dismissed. He was employed very recently. He has been dismissed as being blind. So far there have been many others; half a dozen were blind. But this professor alone has been chosen by the Executive Council. The Supreme Court has found that that order was null and void and malicious and should not be given effect to.

Shri Naldurgkar: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have risen to support the motion of Shri Bhakt Darshan. Some of the hon. Members have criticised the President's Address as lacking in inspiration, in enthusiasm and that it also lacks a definite policy as far as our frontiers are concerned. But I may also say that all the speeches that have been delivered by the members of the opposition parties in this House have also lacked in suggesting a definite policy.

Do they want that the Government of India should declare war against China immediately? Do they mean that our Government should send armed forces to the frontiers with all the military paraphernalia and go on firing volleys after volleys? It is very easy to criticise; but it is very difficult for the opposition to suggest any concrete step on this matter.

In my opinion, there is a definite policy in the Address of the President. Certain words and phraseology used by eminent persons carry certain important connotations and have a special meaning. This is the case as far as the President's Address is concerned. It has a definite policy, a peaceful but firm policy of progressive preparedness for defence which has the support of our people and which has also profoundly influenced world opinion. The Address says:

"This peaceful but firm policy and progressive preparedness for defence has the support of our people and has also profoundly influenced world opinion. We

[Shri Naldurgkar]

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

14.58 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

The hon. President has suggested:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

15 hrs.

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

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Speaker, Sir, so many hon. Members have taken part in this discussion and have put forward much in the way of criticism, much in the way of ideas or suggestions that I find it a little difficult to deal with all this multitude of good, and not so good, ideas thrown out. No doubt, everything that has been said here will be given careful consideration by the

Ministries concerned. I feel that perhaps it would be better for me not to take up all these multitude of separate points but rather to deal with this question in its entirety, saying something about the broad features. Otherwise, we rather tend to lose ourselves in detail, even though the detail might be, and is often, important, more especially, in the world today and in India of today which is so full of problems.

Now, Sir, first of all I should like to refer to a criticism which has been made strongly and forcefully by Shri Asoka Mehta about the President's Address being odourless, colourless and generally inane. As members of the Government, who are responsible for the President's Address that criticism applies to us certainly. I am prepared to say that that criticism is partly justified. We, as a people, are apt to go to extremes often in our opinions or in our language to extremes of eulogy or extremes of criticism. I myself am often guilty of it; we, all of us, are to some extent; and one has to think, therefore, how far in a State document such as the President's Address one should allow oneself to run away with one's feelings. It is easy to do that and sometimes one has a pleasant glow in doing that. But I feel that, because of that tendency of ours, we should restrain our language on such occasions—not always—and try to be objective and even colourless. Maybe, it is overdone perhaps and the criticism, as I said, may be justified. But the House may remember all the past Addresses—how many are there, I forget, a dozen or thereabout or more—and the language has followed a set pattern of restraint. Whether that is good or bad, opinions may differ—and more especially when one feels rather strongly about a subject, as, I have no doubt, most hon. Members present here do, as I do, when we think of India, its problems and its future; we feel strongly about it. We are part of India; we are emotionally wound up, apart from the intellectual occupations, with the subject and because

of that strong feeling, my own reaction is restraint; restrain oneself not to be led away by one's strong emotions on this subject so near to our hearts and not to be led away, even in judging a situation, by emotion. However, I am merely mentioning this, not by way of an apology but by way of an explanation. It is easy—not very difficult—to be rhetorical. But normally speaking, the problems we have to face, whether it is a problem of our economic development with all its tremendous consequences or whether it is a threat or danger on our frontier, they are easily capable of rhetoric. But rhetoric does not solve them. What perhaps helps in their solution is a certain, rather cold logic and a cold understanding of a situation and a capacity for cold action, backed by warm emotion.

We are all engaged in this country in a task of supreme magnitude and when I think of this task which fate and circumstances have faced us with, I feel both—shall I say—both exhilarated by it and also feel the inadequacy of ourselves in facing this tremendous task. It is not a task of today or this year; it is a task of an age that we face today. It is a task in the long history of India which would stand out—not we; we are small folk before this great task. But this turn, the change that is coming in India to hundreds of millions of people, that indeed is a mighty task by any standard and no one can come up to measure that great task. We are all small folk and we only deal with it with some confidence sometimes, not because of supreme faith in our own abilities to deal with it but a certain faith in this India which has survived through the ages and a certain faith in our people, hundreds and millions of them and a certain faith in this Assembly, this Parliament which deals with it. It is that that keeps us up. Who, however brilliant or great he might be, could imagine that he can face this task unaided or by oneself or by small groups? For, after all, it is a magnificent theme—

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the history of India for the past hundreds of thousands of years. But part of that magnificence attends even to the present age in the last generation or two who laboured and succeeded in gaining the freedom of India, and then, again, without respite, has laboured to raise India to the level that is her own right, a level in internal prosperity, in internal well-being, level in the councils of the world. It is not a small task and not a task which anyone can fulfil in a short period, even of years. And undoubtedly, however well-meaning anyone might be, there will be mistakes made; there have been mistakes made, because the task in a sense is without precedent in this particular context as indeed all national developments are. There is no exact precedent for any nation because the objective conditions in everything that apply to that nation have not been duplicated elsewhere.

And so we are engaged in this task. You might consider as if all of us, the millions in our country, who are actors in this drama are weaving some grand pattern in tapestry, a many-coloured pattern, in which millions of individual threads go in to give it shape and colour. We are a many-coloured country, with many hues and many differences, and yet tied up also in infinite ways. Throughout history that has been so. Today, the high privilege has been given to us, of weaving this pattern in our brief lives and leave something worthwhile for future generations. It is a theme for a great poet, a great writer. How can we deal with it, and so, in our inability to deal with it properly and not to lose ourselves in rhetoric because we feel so much, we try to be matter of fact even though there might be much passion behind those simple words.

Hon. Members criticised and rightly so, because this House is meant for criticism, for searching criticism, and

yet, I imagine that behind that criticism there is a vast amount of agreement about the fundamentals—about the details, of course, there is bound to be criticism, but about the fundamentals there is agreement. Perhaps, there are some hon. Members who even differ in regard to fundamentals. May be. Sometimes I felt, when Shri Ranga was speaking, that he differed almost about everything that we did—external, internal, domestic or other. He seemed to think, and his party seems to think, that instead of giving thought to the problems and their complexity, all that is necessary is to tell us that he stands with God and that will convince him that everybody is in the right. I do not know exactly whether he and his party have got a monopoly in God! I shall think rather poorly of God if that is so. However, it is really extraordinary how, Shri Ranga, sweeping away Planning, sweeping away External Affairs and everything, in the full warmth of his rhetorical address, went on, regardless of facts or circumstances or reason or logic. That is not good enough for us. We have to deal with fact and circumstance.

If you think of our economic condition which is the basic thing and our Five Year Plans and the rest, again they give you a vast field for very legitimate criticism, and naturally so. Do you think that we Members of the Government, who may be sitting here in serried ranks before you, do not criticise each other or criticise our own work? I can tell you that though we do not agree with all the criticisms made, we agree with many things and many of the criticisms, and we could add to those criticisms ourselves. That is inevitable in the nature of things in this tremendously complicated business of planning for India, because, behind these five year plans, all these reports, whatever may come into these documents, lies throbbing of our humanity, 400 millions, and only a superman can deal with these problems with the assurance of certainty. We can only

grope, trying to learn from others, trying to learn from the experience of our own people, trying to learn from our mistakes by trial and error, etc., and go ahead and profit by the criticisms. That is true.

But in criticising or in understanding a certain picture, I submit that we must remember that valid and helpful criticism comes only from an overall look and not taking out a bit regardless of its surrounding circumstances and dealing with it entirely separately. The whole question of planning is the inter-relation of a hundred and thousand and million things in the country. It is not leaving things to chance or dealing with something or put up a Dharamsala here or a Yatimkhana there. That is not planning. You may talk of a Dharamsala and a Yatimkhana and say they are steel works or this or that. All that is not planning, even if they are steel works or anything else. Planning is an attempt to see the life of the nation as a whole. Of course, before you make that attempt, you have an objective and the objective must be seeing the life of the nation as a whole, the progress of the 400 million people here, not measured by this group or that community progressing or not.

Take the question of unemployment which is so vital for us. Of course it is vital. How are we to solve it? I am not going into that question now, but suggestions are made as if it is through the knavery or folly of the Government that the problem of unemployment is not solved or this is not done or that is not done. Now, it so happens that the unemployment problem is a problem of many countries in the wide world and not ours only which increases its population by 50 or 60 lakhs. We must consider it, but it is rather unhelpful criticism merely to wave a flag and say that unemployment is not solved.

First of all, we must have a clear idea as to where we are going to: broadly, and not in detail. Secondly,

we must plan to go ahead in spite of the views which Acharya Ranga was pleased to express. We have to plan to go ahead. Everybody recognises that. (*Interruptions*).

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

Shri Tyagi (Dehradun): Shri Rajagopalachari!

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

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I must challenge all this. Shri Ranga is Acharya Ranga and nothing else. Now, it is possible that we might differ about the ultimate picture. I am not quite sure about the absolute ultimate picture. But we are nowhere near the ultimate picture. So, the question of difference is rather far from us. I do not want my country to be a replica of the United States of America or the Soviet Union or the United Kingdom or any other country. Many new problems have arisen there; from the very fact that they have solved the primary problems, new problems arise. I have no doubt that new problems will arise for us when we solve the primary problems. But I would not go into that now. We can have our own ideas. But for the present we have certain basic, primary problems which are common to humanity all over, which are common to any State where you wish to give a good life or the opportunity to live a good life to every human being living in the State. That is the primary problem before us. Afterwards come other problems. We must always think, I submit, whatever Ministry or department deals with it, of the 400 million people of India. The moment you forget that, you are off the track. Many of our groups forget that fact.

I repeat what I have said. When I have been asked "How many problems?" I have said, we have 400 million problems in India. That is not a fanciful statement. Always this picture of numbers is before me,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

numbers crushed by poverty for ages and struggling hard to get rid of it. It is an inspiring sight to see them struggling hard to get rid of it and raising themselves by their own labours. So, we have to do that.

There are various ways for that. There may be various ways. We can learn from other countries. We can learn from our own experience. But there is not a shadow of doubt in my mind and I submit in the mind of any person who thinks about it that the only way to get rid of poverty in India ultimately and to get employment is through the employment of what are called modern methods of science, industry, etc. There is no other way and I want to convince, if anybody thinks otherwise. How to do it, one may argue about it. That is the only way which succeeded in any country. You may evolve some magical method. Not believing in magic, I have to rely on logic.

We have to do that keeping in tune with our own background, our own genius, our own history, our own capacity and all that. But it is basic to profit by modern scientific technological methods. We may differ about other fields of human endeavour, but in this there can be no doubt. I repeat that you can only raise the levels of India by the use of modern technology and science, which bring greater production and greater wealth and which give you the opportunity to raise the level of the people. Otherwise, there is no opportunity.

We talk about socialism. Some of us—so far as I am concerned, I have been attracted to basic socialistic ideas ever since I was a student at college fifty years ago or more. People argue about it, and there is room for much argument, but if you analyse it, you come back to modern scientific technological methods and there is no socialism unless you adopt them and you produce the wherewithal for people to improve. Otherwise, you

do not. These are general considerations.

Coming to our economy, again many criticisms made are justified and yet, I think those criticisms somehow miss the point. In considering our economy, you may consider agriculture, industry or basic thing—human beings, that is to say, trained human beings, because once you admit the fact that scientific and technological methods are necessary, you must have trained human beings. A man who can deliver a speech and can do nothing else is not good in the world, except possibly that he can get elected to some council or other. He may be extraordinarily good at that, but he cannot build a bridge or put up a steel plant; he cannot do a hundred and one things one has to do today. So, that is necessary.

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

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

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

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If you look at agriculture today—much has been said about Agriculture—I think you will notice a very marked change in our agriculture, i.e., the process of change is going on. I think that that process is the result of the past dozen years' work and facts and circumstances. I am not taking the credit for it. A hundred factors have gone into it and there it is at work. I have no doubt in my mind that it is moving in the right direction and that we have taken a turn. There is going to be extremely difficult work ahead, but we have taken a turn in the right direction and food production will grow.

We are dependent and we are likely to continue to be dependent for a

fairly considerable time on nature, monsoons, etc. We can lessen our dependence progressively by keeping stocks, resorting to intensive agriculture and so on, which we are doing. Nevertheless, we are dependent. As hon. Members know very well, a country like China is dependent, in spite of all that it has done. It has done a great deal in the improvement of agriculture and yet, it is facing one of the most terrible famines in the whole history of China today. So, there it is—certain factors which you cannot ignore, which you ignore at your peril—and a criticism without keeping that background in view is not helpful.

I think that agriculture is improving to the extent it is becoming modern, to the extent it is using better ploughs, better seeds and various other better things which everyone knows. The farmer has to become a more modern farmer. There is no other way and to the extent he is becoming co-operative, he is improving. The type of farmer that Acharya Ranga has in view and which he stresses is the self-sufficient, self-contained, isolated, ignorant man; that is the farmer of his conception. There can never be any progress in that way. The whole experience of the world tells us that. It is all very well when there is plenty of land, plenty of everything and people had a fairly low standard of living when you can carry on like that, but no today. So, I feel that agriculture, broadly speaking, is doing well.

Coming to industry, the spectacle in regard to industry is not merely satisfying; it is electrifying and spectacular. It shakes one up—the rapidity with which changes are taking place in this country. I do not know if this House realises it or not, because we live in these surroundings and we do not quite realise what is happening round about us. We are used to it. But a person who comes and has a look at it from outside, a competent observer, is amazed at what he sees in this country in regard to industry.

One knows about the big industries more or less, but few people know about the revolutionary change that is coming over India in regard to the middle and small industries. We see the description of them by competent observers from outside.

I do not imagine that I attach more importance to observers' opinion than to our own. I merely say so because the observers are critics of ours and they are not likely to run away with the praise of us unless they were compelled by circumstances. When people like bankers, a community of people who are not normally very loveable, individuals apart of course, describe this as spectacular progress, it has some meaning.

The other day I was reading an article by a very eminent financial editor of a great newspaper and what he said astonished me. I do not know where it is now. He said about small and middle industries in India: "It is growing up everywhere in a wild rush and scramble". Observe the words "wild rush and scramble". He was astounded. He criticised in his article many things but he said the whole of India is seething with growth, dynamism. These are the impressions that outside people get. Here we are sitting, pulling our hair over our eyes and weeping and wailing that nothing is being done. It is extraordinary this missing the reality, missing the substance of things for certain superficial things which are bad, which are admitted as bad. I admit they are bad. Of course, there are bad things, infinite number of bad things in our country. But there it is.

Here we are living at this historic moment of India with enormous changes coming every day among a vast number of people in a variety of ways, whether it is the farmer or whether it is the educational apparatus which we criticise often and rightly criticise; and yet that educational apparatus is revolutionising India. We must keep this in view—our educational apparatus. I criticise it, everybody criticises it; but realise that in

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

spite of all that criticism and the criticism is justified often nevertheless, it is playing a tremendous role in revolutionising India. All these vast numbers, today I am told—I do not know, they grow from month to month in numbers—there are 45 million boys and girls in India, which is a considerable number, growing by a million every year, which by the end of the Third Plan will be over 60 million and so on. Boys and girls, in millions—and girls, I repeat: because they are the revolutionary factor, because when the home is revolutionising everything is revolutionising. So, from a hundred directions all these are being done.

So, if we look at this question in this broad way, one feels not only a sense of elation but a sense of triumph, not one's own triumph because we are cogs in this mighty wheel—Parliament, State Assemblies, and millions of people working in factories, the field, in education and in what not. It is an enormous factory of India, if I may say so, working more and more efficiently. It is a tremendous task and I should like to convey, not merely in rhetoric but in simple language, the excitement of looking at this picture, of thinking of this picture. There is a tremendous excitement in it.

If you read the Five Year Plan report, well, certainly it is rather bald in quoting facts, and literary qualities are not found there; but, nevertheless, if you analyse it, if you look at it and go beyond the details to the skelton, it is throbbing with life and blood of a vast number of human beings because it deals with a vast number of human beings, their progress in a multitude of fields and all that. That is an approach which may be called an emotional approach but there is something in it and if we have it and analyse these things then we are likely to get a truer picture than sticking at every small part of it which may not be to our liking.

So, I submit that our economy is passing through a very difficult stage and inevitable stage, a stage which is a welcome stage, because out of that difficulty we emerge into better times. We can never emerge into better times without passing through that difficult phase. We are doing that and it is nothing to be sorry about. No country goes ahead without passing through these difficulties, whether it is agriculture or whether it is industry. And I could go more deeply into the industrial things, what is happening in India, what gains we have made, to support my argument, but I shall not take the time of the House in that way.

I forget now, I think it was Shri Ranga who, among other things, talked about our forgetting the handloom weavers and introducing powerlooms and thus driving people out of it. Now, that exhibits two things. First of all, he did not know his facts. Secondly, he does not realise, as I wish he would, that it is through better techniques that we advance, not through sticking to old techniques. We do stick to old things for social reasons where a change-over might do harm immediately. That is a different matter. But it is through higher techniques that a country advances. Now, take this handloom business. I have some figures here. The handloom industry is an outstanding example of rehabilitation of 2½ million handlooms and handloom weavers; that is, far more people are working now than there used to be. The production of handloom cloth has risen from 850 million yards in 1951 to 1,860 million yards in 1960, an increase of about 150 per cent. 40 per cent of this increase is in the co-operative sector which shows how co-operatives are creeping up and advancing.

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

An Hon. Member: Co-operative farming.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, and something about our forgetting the Nagpur Resolution. He said that. Well, I can assure him that he is wrong in thinking that any of us has forgotten it. It is not only there, but it is being worked out, not only in our minds but in our actions, and co-operation is growing in India fairly fast. There are two things—service co-operatives and joint farming co-operatives. It is true that the service co-operatives are growing much faster. We are laying great stress on them to spread them out; the other is also growing. We deliberately wanted it because the whole idea of co-operation is not a mere idea of goodwill and people have to be trained for it. We want to take them step by step because our ideal is that wherever possible and wherever agreed to, we should have agricultural joint farming. But we are quite content if for the moment we spread out the service co-operatives everywhere. And we have little doubt in our minds that many of them will take the next step. It is up to them to take that step. We are not going to compel them to do that. And joint co-operative farming, remember, does not mean their being deprived of their land because their ownership also will continue.

Take another thing. Take the production of sugar, how sugar has jumped up suddenly and provided us with enormous surplus. Take something else. Take steel. Now it reminds me of something slightly different. You may remember, some of you, what Lenin said once in the early days of the Soviet Revolution. He said Communism is Soviets plus electricity. I am prepared to accept that for India saying, not communism, but progress is panchayats plus electric power—a slight variation of the theme. Electricity is the main thing. Electric power means the motive force for changing things, for modernising things, for modern industry, modern agriculture, everything, and the panchayat is the panchayat, whether that is small panchayat or big panchayat which is Parliament, whatever it is, mainly small panchayats; that, plus

electric power, will change India.

I may mention to you with some diffidence that there is one matter which troubles me about our planning and that is that our electric power is not advancing fast enough. We are trying to do so. No doubt, we are advancing, but it is not fast enough to my liking. But there it is. There is no question of my liking or anybody else's liking. We have to do so many things and balance them. We have to give up many things that we like for the time being.

I was mentioning steel. In steel, I am credibly informed that so far as capacity is concerned we have fulfilled the targets laid down for the Second Five-Year Plan. Acharya Kripalani said, I think, that we had not done half of that—some such figure he gave; I forget the exact figure. He felt that we had fallen far behind. That is not quite correct. It depends on how you look at it. It is true that although we have got the full capacity, that is, the machines etc. for that full target, these machines will not produce the full results suddenly because, just like a new car, it takes a little time to tune in. But the production capacity that we had laid down is there. It is completed and in the course of next year or 18 months more and more will be produced till it not only produces that much but other factors will come in and more will be produced. So, so far in spite of difficulties and in spite of many things steel has come up to expectations. Now our chief concern must be to increase it.

Shri Dange gave some very remarkable figures. I was not here unfortunately but I read his speech in the official records. I nearly turned a somer sault when I read them. I shall try to give what he said. He said that Czechoslovakia produces 100 million tons of steel: some such thing.

An Hon. Member: No.

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

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

Shri Muhammed Elias: He said that it produces 6½ million tons today and that in two years' time it will go up to 13½ million tons.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am very glad to learn it. But I hope he will correct the official record. He has given amazing figures. I will read them out.

An Hon. Member: It is "uncorrected".

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Shri Dange said:

"Considering the vast size, the vast population and our needs, what is being done is nothing for a country of 400 millions. Even if you (India) go to 400 million tons of steel, what is it? 12 million people of Czechoslovakia has got 600 million tons of steel production...."

An Hon. Member: 6½ million tons.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: My be. He goes on to say:

"The fashion is to have too many independent countries. A small country like Luxembourg produced 300 million tons of steel....."

Shri Tyagi: How much per capita?

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

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

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know it is an obvious mistake. But this shows how even trained intellect runs into obvious mistakes.

I just mentioned power. I was sort of repeating what Lenin said. But really I would like to add that steel

and power are the two basic things which will control the nation's growth. Even now some people seem to think that we are rather overdoing things in steel. I should like to say with supreme confidence in this matter that you can never produce enough steel. I do not know about a hundred years hence. I am talking about the present age. It does not matter how much steel you produce, you will be short of your requirements. It is an extra-ordinary thing. Here is the Soviet Union producing, I think, 71 million tons and increasing its production by several millions every year. I think by the end of their present Plan they are going up to 94 million tons or something like that and they are prepared to buy our iron and steel as much as we can sell them. There is never any surplus in a growing dynamic country. It is only where people think in static terms or, as private enterprise often does, in terms of high prices, scarcity of the commodity and the demand being greater, that this idea comes up, namely, "Oh! there will be over-production". There is no such thing as over-production except that there is over-poverty in a country and you remain static. Therefore steel and power have to go ahead and it is absolutely essential for us here and now today to think of increasing our steel production by setting up new plants, by setting up the fourth, the fifth, the sixth, the seventh and the tenth plant. This will have to go on. I want to make it perfectly clear that it is in the measure and on the advance in our steel production will depend our advance in agriculture, leave out industry. Even today our agriculture is suffering for lack of iron and steel. Though we produce more, we consume even more because a dynamic economy means consuming much more. Therefore it is of the utmost importance for us to go ahead with our fourth steel plant. I am rather sorry that it is has not got moving as I should like it to from now onwards. We are waiting for some magical date when it will be said that the Third Plan starts today. This, I take it, is some kind of a reflex

of our habit in our country of waiting for auspicious dates for doing anything.

In regard to planning, if I may say so, there are no periods of planning. Planning is a continuous process. A period only comes in for you to test how much you have done. Otherwise, there is no date. I was told only yesterday by the eminent guest from the Soviet Union who has come here, Mr. Kosygin, the Deputy Prime Minister, that they have given up their old conception of planning periods because it made people think in set periods while planning was a continuous process. It never stops. So he said, "Now we plan every year for five years and not for five years which are being reduced and become four next year and then three years, two years and one year and then we again start with another five years. No. Every year we plan for five years. The five years remain. Next year the five years are four years overlapping and one year more. So you never end the five years. It goes on and on." Whether it is clear to this House or not I do not know because it is not completely clear to me. But the point is that planning is a continuous thing. If you can do a thing today, it has to be done today. You should not wait for a date to do it especially in basic things like iron, coal and power. You are always short of them.

Now take coal. Coal also has done well inspite of many difficulties in the way. I hope I am right in my figures. 60 million tons are being produced now. That is, again, the capacity for producing 60 million tons has come about now. The difficulty has arisen in transport and it is a fairly serious difficulty for the time being. Of course it will be got over in three, four or five months, but it is a present difficulty. The difficulty has arisen because we have gone ahead faster in other matters. It is an odd thing that if you do not advance equally on all fronts, you lag behind. There is a bottleneck. Now, coal is there. Last year, we got complaints that steel manufacture was suffering for lack

of coal. We bustled about and tried to do our best about coal and coal came up to standard. Then, we found that there was difficulty about its transport to various parts of the country. While steel was waiting and coal was there, transport came in the way. Improvements were made. There was much swifter movement. They started moving them on Sundays which they did not use to. There were various other things. Even so, at the present moment, there is a gap: not a big gap, but there is a gap which will not be filled fully till more wagons and all that are ready.

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

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

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Every Acharya?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We are all human beings.

For instance, take one thing, The whole production system received a blow from the general strike. It cost us a lot of money. Apart from the money spent, in production, in iron and steel, especially in coal and railway traffic, it just put back the clock. All these things happened. It is not planned things. Sometimes, planning is wrong or some additional demands occur. It is a frightfully difficult thing to plan so as to make everything fit in exactly in a huge country like India. I admit, it may be due to somebody's mistake. But, somebody's mistake is our mistake in that. In these matters, I have given instances.

In this particular matter, if I may finally say, so far as the industrial sector is concerned, it is marching pretty fast and well. There are mistakes. Yes; there are justified criticisms. It is advancing fast. I have not the shadow of a doubt that India will industrialise itself more and more rapidly. In agriculture, there are

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

always doubtful elements. But, I believe we have turned the corner and we will advance. One of the reasons why I say so is something not directly connected with agriculture, but the coming of the Panchayat Samithis, which, I think, is going to have a powerful effect on agricultural production.

I may deal with some foreign policy matters. First, to come back to our friend Acharya Ranga, he made rather remarkable statements about our Defence and about the appointment or nomination of the successor to the present Chief of Staff of the Army. He said, why was it done so early. If Shri Ranga had tried to find out, this is a common practice and a very right practice in most of the countries. Normally, the successor is appointed several months ahead for a variety of reasons, one of them being, the successor himself comes and overlaps. He sits there and sees for some time at the headquarters to get into the run of things. There are other reasons too. It is a normal thing. It is always done in England and most other countries. Here, it is always done. There is nothing remarkable about it.

As for appointments, I do not know how much hon. Members have gone into these matters. Most of the appointments, of course, are made by Selection Committees of senior officers. There are some, right at the top, which are made finally by the Appointments Committee of the Cabinet, at the recommendation, naturally, from the Defence. They consider the names and that is the practice followed throughout.

As I am referring to Defence, I would like to say that Shri Asoka Mehta, I believe, made a suggestion with an element of complaint in it that a proper White Paper on Defence or something like that is not produced here as it is in England. I am not fully acquainted with the British practice.

Some Hon. Members: United States.

Some Hon. Members: United Kingdom.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: My recollection is that White Papers are produced there for special things. For instance, in regard to type of weapon to be used, weapon meaning nowadays some of those very modern weapons, usually aircraft of a very particular type, without human control, which is controlled from a distance, electronically controlled, and all that. However, we should be very glad to and we shall, go into it. I have been asked to say so by the Defence Minister who will now come. He is engaged in a committee.

Some Hon. Members: He is here.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We would look into this matter and present before the House such information as we can. Obviously, information about troop movements and the rest is not normally supplied. Information which may help the enemy or the prospective enemy is not normally given out to the public. That is obvious.

In the matter of Defence, we started Independence by breaking an old tradition of the Army which was that all the thinking was to be done in Whitehall, that is, United Kingdom thought and laid down policies, and further that nearly all the important production was to be done in the United Kingdom: not in India. We had Ordnance factories. Previously they practically did nothing at all. Very little. After the first World War, the exigencies of the war forced them to produce some things here. After the Second World War, again, they were forced to produce more because they could not get them. Undoubtedly, our Ordnance factories got a boost because of those wars and because of being cut off from England. Nevertheless, important things were all made there. So, both in regard to any planning and thinking, etc., it was a business of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

April, 1951, this number had been increased to 25, and most of the important routes were covered. I am talking about NEFA. A little later, this number was further increased all along the NEFA border and the middle sector, i.e., Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh etc. In 1954 these checkposts moved closer to the actual border in NEFA and the middle sector. I am mentioning this, that this fact was given thought to by us even in those days.

In Ladakh, again, in 1951, some checkposts were established. This is a vast area. In these checkposts, army units were stationed at various places in Ladakh, rather distant from each other, and expeditions were sent to the furthest limits of our territory from 1951 onwards both by the police and the army. These expeditions were in the nature of mountain expeditions, mountaineers and others a group and others, a group of ten or 15 persons of ten or 15 persons going ahead. In 1954, in order to strengthen the administration,—there was no immediate threat to us, but nevertheless, in order to strengthen the administration—checkposts were taken over by the Central Government in Ladakh and further checkposts were established. The only area where we did not establish checkposts was the uninhabited area, the Aksaichin area—not that we did not want to, but we were busy with the other areas, and also it is a very difficult area. Even there, expeditions were sent. Between 1950 and 1959, 16 such expeditions were sent to various parts of Ladakh.

There were some seasonal caravan routes in the Aksaichin area which had been used for a long time past by caravans. The Chinese used them also in the past, when we did not connect it with any kind of aggression. It was a common practice. This is right in the northeastern bit, about the road which came up here. This was not supposed to mean sovereignty. It was a caravan route being used by any

party. This is a central Asian route. There were very few roads or routes there, and it was supposed to be open traffic.

In 1955—we did not know this date then, we found out later—the Chinese started levelling the caravan route for the purpose of using it as a motorable tract. It took them about a couple of years. It was not clear to us then whether this proposed motor way crossed our territory. The first suspicion that this might be came to us in 1957, from a map published in Peking.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: It took two years.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Two years, probably two years.

We did not even then know definitely whether this transgressed our territory. The map was a small map, about half a magazine page. We did not know, but we began to suspect it. As we did not have proof, we did not protest then.

In the following summer, that is in 1958 summer, two patrol parties were sent to locate the two extremities of this road, about which we had heard. A patrol party which went to the south located the road as actually crossing our territory, a corner of our territory. The other party did not return for some time. We thereupon drew the attention of the Chinese Government to this party which had not returned, and enquired from them, and to the fact of the road having crossed our territory. This was first on the 18th October, 1958. The first party had returned about a month earlier and the second party had not returned. It was only when the two parties returned that it was confirmed that the Chinese were using this corner of Indian territory as a highway. Even then, no Chinese posts were established west of the highway. The route parallel to this road was used by our army expedition in 1958, and they did not detect any

evidence of any Chinese intrusion. After that October letter, we were corresponding with the Chinese Government, we were waiting for their reply to our protest. Replies take two or three months in coming, and I think the first one came either in December or January. Then this went on. In March, 1959, disturbances took place in Tibet, this uprising in Tibet; and other correspondence with the Chinese Government took place. In June, 1959, one of our patrols was sent towards Lanak La along the Chang Chenmo Valley, but no Chinese were found there. It thus appears that the major consolidation of the Chinese hold west of the highway took place between June and October, 1959. This was detected by some of our patrols which were moving north to establish posts at Chang-lung Lungpa and other places; this led to the Kongka Pass expedition where shooting took place and a number of our policemen were shot down.

Thus, the ordinary caravan route across the Northern Aksai Chain area was gradually used by the Chinese in the early fifties, first as a pure caravan road and then as a motorable road. Later, it was improved for motor traffic.

The real Chinese advance, however, took place after the Tibetan uprising and in the middle of 1959. This, of course, has nothing to do with the maps. About the maps, we have been protesting for a long time previously. So far as the maps were concerned, we have been protesting about those for some years past, but an actual protest was sent to them about the Aksai Chin area specifically in October, 1958, as I have mentioned, after we had received information about this motorable road. Correspondence about this was being carried on with the Chinese Government when the Tibetan uprising took place in 1959. It was about this time that the Prime Minister brought this matter up before Parliament in August, 1959.

Since the autumn of 1959, there has been no further aggression on our territory by the Chinese, even though their maps had varied.

Now, there are two points that I should like to mention. One point, as I have just stated, is that since August, 1959, the position might be said to be stabilised where it was then. There has been no further intrusion by them, and we are fairly well protected to prevent such an intrusion.

The second point is that the charge made against Government that we hid this fact of Chinese aggression, is, I submit, not quite fair or correct. The fact is that it was known to us for the first time when the two patrols returned, it became definitely known to us about that little corner, that the caravan route was being changed into a motorable road. And we wrote to the Chinese Government in October, 1958. And we were waiting for their reply. We did not wish, in a matter of this kind, to come to Parliament without investigating and finding out what their reply was. Their reply came, rather an inadequate reply came—I forget now, I think,—probably in January. We replied again, and enquired further. And then, suddenly, in March came the whole Tibetan uprising, which became a larger issue to which this was tacked on, because we were always talking about this. And in 1959, when this major advance took place we brought this matter immediately before the House.

As a matter of fact, we have been taking steps all along, from 1951 onwards, on this border. We had taken steps much more effectively on the NEFA border; it was a very difficult border; there was no administration for hundreds of miles; and we concentrated on that, and concentrated with such effect that we have been able to prevent any incursion on that border; apart from that little village, that Longju business, otherwise, there has

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

been no incursion, because it has been prevented. Since then, we have taken other steps to strengthen our posts everywhere, and our road programme has been getting on very well.

I have not touched upon the various other matters, and I have taken a long time already. About the Congo, the House may have seen that yesterday, a resolution was passed by the Security Council; yesterday or rather the day before, for the first time, the Security Council has passed a resolution on the Congo, since its resolution, I forget, in August or September or somewhere then. In spite of these troubles happening in the Congo, the amazing thing was that the Security Council looked on and remained silent. That was not because they were not interested but simply because in the Security Council itself, there was a tug of war, and this was reflected on the operations in the Congo, but there it was. For the first time, they have passed a resolution which, in our thinking, is a good one, in so far as it goes. In some matters, we would have liked it to go a little further, but in so far as it goes, it is a good resolution. Now, the question is how far it would be acted upon.

Unfortunately, the previous resolutions of the Security Council passed last year, to begin with, were not bad resolutions, but by what we thought as a strained interpretation of them, it was said that nothing could be done under those resolutions. I trust that the present resolutions would not be interpreted in that very limited and restricted way.

A question does arise now, and I said something about it this morning here in answer to a question, about our sending the Indian Armed Forces there. The Secretary-General of the UN asked us to send some Forces some time ago, about three weeks ago or so. On the one hand, we felt

that the United Nations must continue to function in the Congo; their withdrawal would mean disaster. On the other hand, the UN was actually not functioning; it was sitting there merely; we did not want to send our people there to be insulted from time to time, and to do nothing, to waste them there in a sense. So, we were in a difficulty, and we pointed out this difficulty to the Secretary-General and said that if we would be convinced that the UN was going to adopt a vigorous policy there, then, we might consider sending some of our Forces. Well, that position remains the same except that the recent resolution of the Security Council has made it appear that a vigorous policy will be pursued, and, therefore, the possibility of our sending some Armed Forces has come nearer.

I am afraid that although I have taken a great deal of time, I have not touched on many of the criticisms etc. which have been made. But there is one thing more, Sir, which I might explain, if you would permit me, and that is about this tri-junction between India, Burma and China. First of all, I should like to say that it is not right for any hon. Member to criticise Burma in regard to this matter. Burma has done nothing, unless, of course, Burma could simply refuse to deal with China; that is a different matter. Burma has been carrying on these negotiations with China for three, or four or five years, I forget, for how long, since quite a long time ago. And step by step, they have proceeded and come nearer. Actually, the terms of the future treaty were fixed when General Ne Win as Prime Minister went to Peking long before the present Prime Minister U Nu came back to the Prime-Ministership. And so it is a long process, a gradually developing process, till it was absolutely finalised on this occasion, and it was signed when Mr. Chou En-lai went there. We could have no grievance, no objection, to what was done there.

We cannot ask any country not to make a proper treaty with China because China and we have fallen out. That would not be a legitimate reason to say that, unless that treaty affects us. But this does not affect us except to the extent that a map was attached to it. The wording of the treaty does not affect us at all. A Chinese map was attached to it, and that shows that corner with two passes; the Chinese line shown there is not as shown in our maps, in accordance with our line. This was pointed out to the Burmese Government and to the Chinese, of course. The Burmese Government made it perfectly clear to us, before the signing of the treaty, that they were not accepting that interpretation of the map; that was none of their business, that was a business for India and China to determine, and they are bound by the terms of their own treaty and their own boundary. So they adopted a perfectly straightforward attitude in this matter, and I was a little sorry to find a trace of criticism of Burma in this House because of this.

There was mention made of Nepal too. One hon. Member spoke with some warmth about recent happenings in Nepal, that is, not approving of them. Another hon. Member accused me of saying something in regard to these recent happenings which it was not right for me to do—I should not say anything about Nepal. Now, it is always difficult in such moments what to say and what not to say. All I said in this House was that I was deeply distressed at the turn events had taken in Nepal and this failure of democracy etc. That was all that I said, although, I must say, I felt much more strongly about it.

But hon. Members sometimes imagine that we should issue directives to other Governments, tell them what to do and what not to do. That

is a kind of thing which obviously we neither want to do nor can do but which irritates the other Government very much. Whenever Members in Parliament say anything like that, it does no good; it does not advance the cause of India; it has the reverse effect. I hope, therefore, that hon. Members will, when dealing with our neighbour countries, with whom we are friendly, we want to be friendly and we are going to be friendly, remember this suggestion that I am submitting to them, that we cannot treat them as if the fashioning of their policies must necessarily depend on our good wishes.

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

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

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

All the amendments were put and negatived.*

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

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

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

The motion was adopted.

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