

(ii) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1960, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sittings held on the 18th August, 1960, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."

(iii) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of Rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (Railways) No. 4 Bill, 1960, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 18th August, 1960, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."

the Air Corporation Employees' Union.

**The Deputy Minister of Civil Aviation (Shri Mohiuddin):** Sir, the statement covers about four pages. If you will permit me, Sir, I will place it on the Table of the House.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** Sir, at least a summary may be given.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the hon. Deputy Minister able to give a summary? I think he is not ready with a summary. The statement may be laid on the Table of the House.

**Shri Mohiuddin:** Sir, I lay the statement on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 67].

12.16 hrs.

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—contd.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru on the 31st August, 1960, namely:—

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

The hon. Prime Minister—

**Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I make a request to the Prime Minister? Yesterday, he referred that the current session of the United Nations Assembly is a very important one and heads of Governments will be probably going. Is there any possibility that the Prime Minister of India is also likely to move? Will he tell the House?

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall endeavour to meet some of the points and criticisms raised on the debate

12.15 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

THREATENED STRIKES BY THE BOMBAY REGIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE AIR CORPORATION EMPLOYEES UNION.

**Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri (Nabadwip):** Sir, Under Rule 197, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Transport and Communications to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

The threatened strike by the Bombay Regional Committee of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

yesterday. Right at the beginning, the hon. Member, Professor Hiren Mukerjee expressed a great deal of indignation at some reference I had made in the other House to the activities of the party of which he is such a shining member. He said, rather warmly, that he was not going to take what I said lying down. Well, it is entirely up to him to lie, sit or stand, it is quite immaterial to me, but I was little surprised at what he said. He used the words, I think, that I had a phobia, a Communist phobia. Well, some people may have it. I am not aware of any phobia that I possess, and certainly not a Communist phobia.

But I do have strong feelings when our national interests are concerned. I do, in spite of my attempt not to be narrow-minded and to think in larger terms of the world, feel rather strongly about this country of mine, and I feel strongly when its interests are not only ignored, opposed, but when people of this country forget the fact that they have a certain duty to this country and stand up for those who have aligned themselves against this country in many ways. I shall go thus far to say that I hope I am strong enough not to stand for India in a matter if I think India is wrong; I am not prepared in theory, in practice, I do not know, I may be moved. I am not prepared to say India is right or wrong, I want India to be right not wrong. But where I believe India is right I am certainly going to stand for India with all my strength and might.

In this frontier matter which we have discussed here repeatedly, I am convinced of India's position, India's stand. The fact that I do not fall into line with some hon. Members opposite who continually demand some kind of warfare immediately for the vacation of these territories of India which are occupied does not indicate, perhaps, that I feel less strongly about this matter but only, if I may say so with all respect, that

I have a sense of responsibility about these things and I do not think it is good enough in such matters to talk loudly without reference to consequences, without reference to what one can do and what one cannot do.

However, the point I wish to say is, this—that have given a specific instance—that the weekly organ, I believe, of the Communist Party, which is called the *New Age* has carried on a consistent, a blatant, a pernicious and a false propaganda on this issue. And I use my words deliberately. I say that propaganda is meant to defame our position. Of course, it begins by saying: "Let us all be friends. Let everybody be friends. We all want to be friend. That is why we are dealing with this matter in a friendly way. I want definitely and I should have liked to know—I asked this question in the other House and there was no answer—as to whether that propaganda in that paper reflects the views of the Communist Party of India or it does not.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta-Central): Sir, If I may be permitted to interrupt the Prime Minister, it is a fact—nobody denies it, it is stated on the paper itself—that *New Age* is published by the Communist Party of India. I do not mind the advertisement which the Prime Minister gives to *New Age* in this House, but I do wish to say that if the Prime Minister can point out anything anti-national stated there ways and means are open to him as head of the Government to take action. We stand by the Meerut resolution of the National Council of our Party. If the Prime Minister wishes us to—(Interruptions.) deviate from it, we cannot oblige him.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: No, no. We are not a court of law here to go into this. I am merely pointing out the fact which I think should be obvious to any reader of that paper that on this issue it has been carrying on a consistent line of propaganda which certainly is very much opposed to the line of Indian thinking. Also,

it may interest them to know that because of this, extracts from this paper are copiously used across the seas in other countries to justify their position. It is interesting.

I would also mention this thing. I would prefer not to mention names—it is not proper here to mention them—but I would mention areas where they function: in the Kangra district, in Himachal Pradesh, in the Lahaul valley, in Garhwal and in the Almora district. It is some kind of an insidious propaganda being carried on in these border districts which are peculiarly delicate. Naturally, it is not quite the same thing as one might be doing in Bombay, Madras or elsewhere. In that very delicate area, for people going and carrying on propaganda on those lines which are broadly, I might say, on the *New Age* lines, it has certain undesirable consequences.

**Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati):** Why do they not name them and find them out? Simply making a reference like this a nothing.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Government are taking steps. We deal with them. The State Governments deal with these people.

Now, I might add that I say this—I was talking about this business—because it is a matter which has nothing to do with any economic policy or any other policy. I do not mind the hon. Member opposite advancing any economic arguments, economic policies, etc. He ought to know that far from having any Communist phobia, we are as a Government, as a country, in terms of the closest friendly relations with the biggest Communist country in the world, that is, the Soviet Union. It has nothing to do with communism. It has to do with nationalism and India's freedom and India's integrity.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** The election will decide. (*Interruptions.*)

**Some hon. Members:** No, no.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** This kind of remark that the hon. Member made

surprises me even more. I did not expect it of him. This kind of forward people who have no relation to India's thinking, India's thought say this: they say that the elections will decide who will win or lose. Whether they win or lose, they are acting wrongly, anti-patriotically, anti-nationally—(*Interruptions.*)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** On a point of order. Here is a statement being made by the Prime Minister perhaps in the heat of the moment.

**Some Hon. Members:** No, no. (*Interruptions.*)

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** The Communist Party Members have been elected to this House; not by the grace of the Congress Party. He said that we act "anti-nationally". This is a kind of statement which goes against the grain of Parliamentary discussion. If they want to push us out of Parliament, ways and means are open to him to do something about it. But I cannot understand this kind of deviation into an unmannerly exhibition of anti-parliamentarianism.

**Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):** Unparliamentary or unmannerly?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It is evident that hon. Members opposite, some of them, have lost all sense of balance.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** You started it.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** At least mine is a right balance; yours is a wrong balance. (*Interruptions.*) There are always two sides to a question—the right side and the wrong side. (*Interruptions.*)

**Mr. Speaker:** No interruptions please.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I have been accused by—not the hon. Member there—his close colleagues outside....

**Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura):** You said once, Sir, wars settle nothing. I say heated words also settle nothing.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am not sitting down for the Raja Sahab. I have been accused of carrying on malicious propaganda about this matter. I have been accused of election stunts and all that. The Communist Party is not lacking in abuse of language. So, I want to make this clear. Government, of course, will take such action as it can, but there are issues, like the issues of India's integrity on which there is going to be no compromise with any party or anybody as far as we are concerned. I put it to him again a straight question: Does his party stand for *New Age* articles or not? It is a straight question. They are in print, black and white.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** It is rather unfair: I do not have the *New Age* here and now in Parliament to give an answer. I say only this that the *New Age* declares itself and rightly so as the organ of the Communist Party of India. I do say also that the Communist Party stands by the Meerut resolution of the National Council of our Party. I cannot go further than that. I do not read every syllable of the *New Age* articles. I have not even got a copy of it before me. I am asked to contradict something which is nowhere in the picture and to which nobody refers.

**Mr. Speaker:** Why does the hon. Prime Minister ask him to accept it? He has already said that it is the organ of his Party.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Thank you, Sir. I shall deal with the other points. Shri H. N. Mukerjee advised us that we should develop diplomatic relations with the African States. Obviously we are going to develop them and we are developing them. Shri Nath Pai referred to India's

policy of "self-deception" in regard to China, the failure of that policy, etc. That is an old argument with which I regret I do not agree. I am yet unable to understand how we might have done something else ten years ago or eight or nine years ago which would have changed the course of events, as people seem to imagine they might. I do not say that our policy always is perfect; that we do not make mistakes. But, in spite of every effort I have been completely unable to understand this type of criticism that is advanced every session every year by some hon. Members opposite.

What is happening in Tibet apart from what we did ten or nine or eight years ago? It is a fact that what has happened in Tibet has been a grievous tragedy for the people of Tibet. There is no doubt about it in my mind. The mere fact that we have given refuge not only to the Dalai Lama but to large numbers of persons, about 22,000, is evidence of how we felt about it and how we continue to feel about it. We regret deeply at many of the accounts and the stories which have reached us as to things happening in Tibet. That is one thing.

It is another thing for us to make gestures which can only be described as helpless gestures of indignation. We do not think—normally every case has to be judged by its merits—whether such gestures are profitable or dignified for a Government like ours to make.

Shri Nath Pai said that he was hurt and humiliated at my saying something about Goa and Africa. He must have misunderstood me. What I said was, that the events that were happening in Africa—a large number of new countries becoming independent—must lead, I think, to the ending of the Portuguese empire in Africa. In that connection, I said Goa also will have to go out of Portuguese possession. It surely will not go by some magic thing happening

elsewhere. It will go because of our efforts and our decisions and I expect, as I pointed out, this train of events which is happening certainly has an effect on our own decisions and the steps we may take at the right moment.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh talked about, I understand, a place called Pupsang Khad, a village four miles on our side of Shipki La. I can assure him and others who might be under any misapprehension that this village is completely under our possession. There is no question of anybody else being there. It is true that it is in that small area there, which is claimed as Chinese, but it is in our possession.

Then, he said something which I was quite unable to understand, something about foreigners there and something about diplomats not paying enough attention to our border areas. I really do not understand what foreigners are there. So far as I know, there is only one foreigner, possibly two, in that area in NEFA. One foreigner is Dr. Varrier Elwin, who is our adviser.

**Shri Jaipal Singh** (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): He is an Indian citizen now.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I was going to say that. Dr. Verrier Elwin who came from a foreign country became an Indian citizen. But even if he was a foreigner, it makes no difference to me in this matter, because he is our adviser and we attach high value to his advice and to his experience and to his great love and attachment for India, and more especially the tribal people. I am very glad that we have the advantage of having his advice. He has nothing to do with many of our other activities in the tribal areas, whether they are military or other. He advises us on social and other matters.

As for diplomats going there, again I do not quite understand what is

meant. Who are the diplomats? We do not permit foreign diplomats to go there. We do not encourage them to go there. If he referred to our own officers, they have to go there when business calls them; they are not supposed to wander about.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh** (Sasaram): About diplomats, I meant the northern area; not our territory, but Tibet and the entire area around Tibet, which was previously the centre of meeting ground for three empires.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I have quite understood it now.

Shri Mahanty was pleased to say that our patrols on the border were not doing any good. I am surprised.. .

**Shri Mahanty** (Dhenkanal): I did not say they are not doing any good. I said they were ill-equipped.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not know what standard of equipment he has in mind, and how he judged about the equipment of our people there. I really do not know. May be if you judge our patrols in the normal American standard, they may be ill-equipped, because the Americans have to carry about all kinds of things which no Indian trooper has, because they can afford it. But as a matter of fact, our soldiers there are very well equipped. This is what we think and I just do not understand how Shri Mahanty or any hon. Member can make a remark like this, without knowledge of the facts.

I think Shri Mahanti also talked about Gen. Thimayya's visit to Italy and about his having a look at their mountaineering school, and concluded that we must be very backward in this, because Gen. Thimayya has to go there and look at it in Italy. Surely this is a very extraordinary conclusion to arrive at, because you want to learn what other countries are doing in regard to anything—

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

warfare, etc. As Gen. Thimayya had to go to England, we agreed to his stopping in Italy, because Italy has a good mountaineering establishment, to have a look at it and its equipment there. I may say that most foreigners who know do not share Shri Mahanty's opinions about our soldiers.

Some hon. Member asked why we keep these talks that are going on with the Chinese officials secret. I really do not understand this question. They are talks going on about which I do not know the details—I get a report on the second or third day—examining papers, maps, references, etc. They are taking place in the public market-place. They are confidential talks. What kind of statement am I to make, except to say, as the House knows, that these have nothing to do with coming to a settlement or anything. The officials cannot arrive at settlements. But there is a mass of material and we thought it best in the circumstances for this material to be examined carefully. It may be, of course, that there are differences of opinion about some papers or documents. Anyhow, it does help in future consideration of that matter and that examination has been taking place first in Peking and then here.

There is one little word that is often being used here; we talk about Tibet or any place like that—'buffer State'. I wonder whether it is realised by those who use it that it is rather an insult to call any place a buffer State. A buffer State means something between two Strong States. Factually, it may be correct; but it is not a nice thing to say about any State that it should be a buffer State or it was a buffer State. A buffer State means a helpless thing, between two independent States, which cannot do anything. It may be that in the past that was its position, but it is no good using that word in this context.

**Shri Jaipal Singh:** I am prepared to agree with the Prime Minister; but, to be a buffer State is also a compliment because it takes the shock; it is able to take the shock.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Some question was put to me, perhaps by Shri Hiren Mukerjee, about the extension of the jurisdiction of our courts to Pondicherry. The Government of India, have decided as a matter of policy to remove the appellate jurisdiction of the courts in France over Pondicherry and steps to that end are being taken.

A question was raised about the registration of Goans as Indian citizens. So far as we are concerned, we are perfectly willing to do that. There are certain legal aspects involved, which are being examined. But *de facto*, of course, we have treated them as Indian citizens.

Some hon. Member asked me about the canal waters agreement. I should have liked to place this full agreement before this House as soon as it is finalised. It is rather difficult to deal with it in a patchy way. Nevertheless, I should like to state broadly what it is. It is generally based on the World Bank's proposal of 1954, the salient feature of which was the allotment of the waters of the Indus, Jhelum and Chenab, except for minor uses in Jammu and Kashmir, to Pakistan and the Sutlej, Ravi and Beas to India. A transition period during which Pakistan would construct canals, etc., to replace supplies hitherto received by her from the rivers going to India was to be fixed, India contributing towards the replacement works and allowing to Pakistan progressively diminishing supplies from the eastern rivers during this transition period.

The main features of this treaty are: Pakistan should build these replacement works, presumably, we hope, in ten years' time, and during these ten years we supply water to them, though in a progressively diminishing degree. And Pakistan is going to

be helped in building these replacement works to some extent by us, that is, financially, to the extent that we are going to deprive Pakistan of the water that Pakistan has been getting so far, we are helping it to build these replacement works. But, in effect, Pakistan is going to build on a much bigger scale with the help of a number of countries and the World Bank. So, large sums of money are going to be given to Pakistan by the World Bank and by a number of other countries. We have, of course, nothing to do with it and that is not a part of our agreement. That is between the World Bank, Pakistan and the countries concerned. We are going to make an *ad hoc* contribution spread out over ten years.

Then, there is the transition period, as to what we should do during this ten year period. And although this should not cause us any difficulty, it really took a long time to decide how much water we are going to give, in what form, what the payment should be in these ten years etc. That too, I believe, has been settled now. The ten years begin from April 1, 1960, this year, the date on which the treaty comes into effect; it is given some months retrospective effect. This period of ten years can be extended to a further period of three years at Pakistan's request. But the extension is subject to a reduction in our contribution by 5 per cent. in the first year, by 10 per cent. for two years and by 16 per cent. for the three years. India will have no responsibility for their canals, etc. The water to be supplied by India to Pakistan from the eastern rivers during the transition period is to be of a diminishing scale, and roughly this ten year period is to be divided into two phase. 1960-66 and 1966-70. I need not go into the details of the phases.

One question that troubles many people is what the effect of this agreement with Pakistan is likely to be on the Rajasthan Canal. According to present plans, the Rajasthan Canal will be ready to carry some irriga-

tion water up to 1200 cusecs in 1961, 2,100 cusecs in 1962 and 3,000 cusecs in 1963. Thereafter, it is proposed to enlarge the capacity in such a way that by about 1970 the canal would be developed to 18,500 cusecs. We are trying to provide water to the Rajasthan Canal throughout this period in an increasing degree. In the first two years, it does not matter, they can take any quantity, but much more later. But partly this will depend on some water of another scheme which is, in a sense, allied to this, that is, the Beas scheme, effecting the damming of the Beas by us. This is a bigish scheme and, although Rajasthan Canal will be getting water throughout in an increasing quantity, the full supply will come only from the Beas later. Now, because we are accommodating Pakistan to a considerable extent, the World Bank has promised us aid for the construction of the Beas dam.

Then the treaty provides for a permanent Indus Commission, consisting of Indian and Pakistan Commissioners. Each Commissioner would be the representative of his Government for all matters arising out of the treaty and will serve as a regular channel of communication on all matters relating to the implementation of the treaty. The permanent Indus Commission will take the first steps to iron out any differences between the two sides. The treaty also provides for neutral expert to whom differences of a technical nature would be submitted for solution. A court of arbitration has been provided to deal with the major disputes on the interpretation of the treaty. Broadly, this is the position.

May I now just refer to certain broad features to which I referred yesterday also? One matter to which I would like to draw the attention of the House particularly is how the world is drifting more and more to violent methods and deeds. Only two or three days ago the Prime Minister of Jordan was assassinated or was blown up, and others too. Whatever

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

one's views may be on anything, the adoption of such methods is bound to lead to chaotic conditions. In fact, we have to decide really, bearing in mind what we are aiming at, what kind of society we are aiming at. That applies to foreign policy as well as to domestic policies. If we are aiming at what one would call a good society, I submit that it cannot be built up on the basis of violence and hatred. We are, at the present moment, drifting rather rapidly from an ordered world to an anarchy. And this spirit of violence which is growing is a challenge to us. Unless we have a sense of national discipline, we cannot check this.

I think it was Dr. Ram Subhag Singh who directly or indirectly criticised our officers and diplomats. I do not know what he called them. I should like to say that in our External Affairs Ministry we have been served by men of very considerable ability, men who are, if I may say so, dedicated to the cause they serve. I should like to pay my tribute to them; not only to them, but to others too.

Then a point was raised as to why a Deputy Secretary is talking to the Chinese officials. Apart from the fact that Deputy Secretary happens to be our best expert on the subject, just as the head of our Historical Section is an expert, regardless of his status in the hierarchy, normally in such talks people talk to others of an equal status, and if we choose a Deputy Secretary it is because the Chinese have chosen somebody of that level. So, he talks to them. But the fact is that the persons who are dealing with this matter are our experts on these questions, and they are dealing with them very well.

Today happens to be the last day for one of our most distinguished civil servants, Shri N. R. Pillai. I have been associated with him, in some way or other, ever since independence, but very closely associated as our

Secretary-General during the last eight years, and he has been not only a valuable adviser but a good friend during this period. And his going away will certainly create a certain blank, not only in our External Affairs Ministry, but in those who have advised us. I am sure, the House would wish him well.

Before I finish, may I refer to rather an interesting passage written, I think, 125 years ago by a well-known French writer? Almost one might think it is in the nature of a prophesy. I should read out just a part of it. This was written by de Tocqueville in 1835.

"There are at the present time", he says, "two great nations in the world which started from different points but seem to tend towards the same end. I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed and while the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere they have suddenly placed themselves in the front rank among the nations and the world learnt of their existence and their greatness at almost the same time."

This was written 125 years ago.

Shri C. D. Fande (Naini Tal): They are still growing.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I indicate that I would gladly accept the amendment of Shri Jaganatha Rao to this motion?

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I did not say something bad. I only said that you have said that war can settle nothing. I said that heated words also can settle nothing.

Mr. Speaker: I shall put Shri Jaganatha Rao's amendment to the vote of the House.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta—East): Our amendment (No. 9) also.

Shri Jaipal Singh: What about amendment No. 8?

**Mr. Speaker:** I will put them one after the other. Is any other substitute motion being pressed?

**Some Hon. Member:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will put No. 8 first. No. 9 will come later

The question is:

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

“This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, is of the opinion that the policy pursued so far which aimed at vacating Chinese aggression has been halting and lacks in purposiveness and therefore all possible steps be taken to vacate Chinese aggression on Indian territories.” (8).

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker:** I will now put amendment No. 9 to the vote of the House. It is a long one. I need not read it.

*Amendment No. 9 was put and negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker:** Now I will put amendment No. 1. The question is: That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of the said policy.” (1).

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Speaker:** All other amendments are barred.

12.54 hrs.

MOTION RE: SITUATION IN ASSAM

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now take up the next item on the Order Paper. Shri G. B. Pant.

**The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant):** The hon. Prime Minister will move the motion.

**Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes):** May I make a humble submission? I hope you will agree with me. Perhaps the whole House will agree with me that as the hon. Prime Minister has already had a really hard time—not hard in putting his points across, I do not mean that, but a very arduous time—may I humbly suggest that we go into recess for an hour so that he may also get some rest..... (*Interruption*).

**Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur):** Half an hour.

**Shri Jaipal Singh:** I need at least an hour for myself. I cannot rush and eat. I am pressing the wish of the House and I am only hoping that it will come from the Chair.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru** indicated dissent.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Prime Minister is always fresh.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have been considering in a somewhat diffused way international affairs. We come now to the domestic scene and to some things that have happened and are happening in this country which have been grievous to all of us and which have caused an enormous amount of sorrow and misery. Not only the actual sorrow they have caused but in the context of things the consequences of what has happened in Assam and Bengal are so far-reaching that everyone of us, I hope, will appreciate them in considering this question. We have had trouble in India—I mean, serious trouble—even since independence on many occasions, but the kind of thing that has happened in Assam is rather of a new type and a new type in the big way. It does rather shake the foundations of our country and our unity. Therefore in