

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS— continued

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I should like to offer my congratulations to the mover of this motion for the survey he made in his speech which I unfortunately did not hear but which I have read with great interest. In that survey he brought out an important fact, the change in India of the process of modernisation at the same time keeping to our roots. He mentioned that ever since Raja Ram Mohan Roy this process had been going on, later Swami Vivekananda laid stress on certain aspects with great force and great ability. Then he mentioned—I do not think he mentioned Swami Vivekananda—Ghandhiji, all in the same line and said this process was still going on, this process of finding some kind of synthesis between the past of India which is valuable to us—not all of it but much of it—and the present. We can neither exist without that past because we would be rootless, nor without the present because then we would not fit in in this world at all.

Now, Sir, before I proceed with this matter I should like to get a weight off my chest. An hon. Member speaking in the course of this debate—I think his name is Shri Gaure Mura Hari, from Uttar Pradesh—referred to me personally and to my election in terms which caused me great astonishment. He referred to large sums of money that were spent in this election and which I and others connected with me had got from various *marwaris* and to the fact that there was impersonation and all that. So far as I am concerned, the only *marwari* in my election that I knew of was my hon. opponent. There was no other *marwari* that I knew of. But I do submit that it is not very proper for such charges to be thrown about. It is open to him to file an election petition; it is open to him even to tell me, write to me and get my answer,

but without any such thing he was making vague charges in an open speech in the House about money being bandied about. Not only me, but all my family members were included in this charge. He says:

“यह शर्म की बात है कि प्रधान मन्त्री की कास्टिट्यूंसी में एसी चीजें हों। . . . मैं यहां आपके सामने बतला सकता हूं। कि प्रधान मन्त्री के कुटुम्ब के लोगों ने मारवाड़ियों से कितना रुपया लिया है। लेकिन मैं इन सब चीजों को यहां पर लाना नहीं चाहता।”

पहले ले आने हैं और फिर कहने हैं कि लाना नहीं चाहता हूं।

“बात यह है कि आप खयाल कीजिये कि इस तरह की बातों को सदन में लाने में उसका नतीजा क्या होगा? ये मारी चीजें मैंने अपनी जानकारी से बताई हैं।”

अगर उनकी जानकारी इतनी है तो मैं उनसे दरखास्त करूंगा, प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वह मुझे बतायें कि कौन चीज है। मैं कहने को तैयार हूं कि यह बिल्कुल झूठ है, शुरू से आखिर तक झूठ है।

And I take strong exception to this kind of thing. It is not a question that it affects me, I can answer it, but a question of such charges being made in this way. There are proper courses, proper ways of making such charges and I think it is very improper. It was said, I am not quite sure whether it was said here or whether it was said in the other House, in the course of the debate repeatedly that large sums of money had been collected by the Congress for the elections and that the Congress carried on the elections unfairly, etc. One particular statement was made, as I said I am not sure whether it was here or there, that the Congress got Rs. 75 lakhs from the Tatas and the Tatas also paid Rs. 25 lakhs to the Swatantra Party.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: It was said here.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Well, I was not aware of this fact. When I read this yesterday, I enquired from the Congress Office, 'Do you know anything about it?' As a matter of fact we had decided and it was stated publicly that if any organisation openly gave money to a party which was entirely opposed to the Congress, it showed that they did not wish to give money to the Congress because they agreed with its principles but for some other reason and it was better not to accept their money. Of course, we did not go about enquiring into people's motives, what they have said, their head and heart, but if a public statement to this effect was made, I think we should accept that statement, and not accept money from those concerns.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): But Mr. Tata made a statement publicly.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That is why it was said they will not accept money from the Tatas and no money was accepted by the All India Congress Committee from the Tatas but we found subsequently, either before the statement was made or before it was clarified, some sums were paid by the Tatas—some branches of the Tatas because they are not all named Tatas—to some of our local Committees and I tried to discover what was paid by them and I have been told today—there is no secret about it; I wish everybody would come out with the moneys that they have got—that altogether the Tatas paid, the numerous branches of the Tatas, in small bits a sum amounting to Rs. 16 lakhs of which according to our rules 25 per cent. was sent to our Central Headquarters. So our Central Headquarters got Rs. 4 lakhs out of that, not directly but it was the money collected, before our statement had been made, from the Tatas.

Personally I do not know. Of course, it is difficult to know what the hundreds of branches of the Congress received from various people, but speaking about the central fund, I doubt whether the fund of any major Party in India had spent so little money as the Congress, so far as the central fund is concerned. Certainly, I can give the assurance that the Communist Party spent much more.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I can tell you we are not so happily placed. Dr. B. C. Roy got Rs. 20 lakhs from Birlas and the Prime Minister should make an enquiry from him.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra): Since allegations and counter-allegations have been made, would it not be in the interests of democracy to appoint an enquiry committee and find out what the correct position is?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Anyhow, I was referring to certain charges, certain highly improper charges, made against me personally and members of my family for having apparently close contacts with *marwaris*, who helped me in my election, in fact the only *marwari* concerned being the man who was opposing me. And I am not aware of any money having come to me or to any person connected with my election from any *marwari* gentleman.

Now, Sir, I should like to refer to one or two matters concerning our foreign relations, because hon. Members are interested in them. There is the Kashmir question in the Security Council and this matter has been brought up before the Security Council as a matter of urgent importance. For six or seven years it had not been there and suddenly it cropped up and it was said to be very urgent. Why? Because it was stated that India was on the point of marching on Pakistan or on that portion of

Kashmir occupied by Pakistan. Therefore, it had become very urgent. Now, if I may say so with all respect to the leaders of Pakistan, they know very well that nothing of this kind was going to happen, and knowing that they made these statements. They have the habit of making statements which have no foundation whatsoever. It is absurd to imagine that India is going to march an Army over that part of Kashmir that they occupy or Pakistan. However, they made this a matter of great urgency. We had no particular objection to it, except that we saw no benefit coming out of this debate in the Security Council. Only it was likely that the speeches would embitter our relations still further. That is why we were against it. Otherwise, we had no objection. Now, after making this tremendous plea for hurrying, lest something should happen, a date was ultimately fixed a few days ago. Mr. Zafrullah Khan delivered an address which he did not finish that day. Then, the next date for him to continue that address was a week later. Suddenly the element of hurry was absent now. Now, this being settled to take place a week later rather upset our programme, or rather the programme of our Defence Minister who had to speak on our behalf. He had work here. He had gone there for three or four days to answer the charge and come back. So, when he arrived there, he was told that he had to stay there a week to listen to the concluding part of Mr. Zafrullah Khan's speech. He naturally said that it was very awkward for him. He had important work here and with great difficulty he got the date shifted by one day, I think advanced. Thereupon Mr. Zafrullah Khan said—he did speak on the new date fixed—that he had not been given enough time to prepare his case. Now, this is very extraordinary, Sir. Here is a matter, a pending matter, which for several years had not been there. He has been preparing this case and wanting it urgently. Then suddenly because the date is fixed a day earlier

than he wants, he is not prepared, he says, to put forward his case, because his clerk is not there or something has happened. This whole Kashmir matter before the Security Council or in so far as Pakistan puts it forward is so—I do not quite know what the proper term would be for me to use—unrealistic, and it has so much to do with shouting and abusing and untruth. Now, Mr. Khursid, who rejoices at the title of President of the Azad Kashmir Government, has threatened us recently again that they will resort to war to liberate Indian-held territory. Mr. Zafrullah Khan, in the course of his speech in the Security Council, has said, among other things, that a second tribal invasion of Kashmir will take place if the Council failed to find a suitable solution. Now, Sir, we have got definite information that for some months past the Pakistan authorities have been registering names of tribesmen for 'khasedars' on a monthly salary of Rs. 54. Nearly 5,000 men had offered their services, but actual recruitment has not yet taken place. These figures are for one small bazar area only. Probably it is taking place elsewhere too. These tribals were invited first to function as 'khasedars', that is the name used for the local levies who function in these areas from the British times. They asked these 'khasedars' to serve in their own areas and they agreed to that salary. When they were told that they had to go to Kashmir they were not at all anxious to go there, as perhaps they were likely to meet the Indian Army there. So, many have withdrawn their names. But my point is that here they go to the Security Council with these threats, threats of tribal invasion, threats of war; and I would beg this House to consider how far their whole attitude, that is, the Pakistan Government's attitude, is realistic, because they know that if any such thing happens, there will be war, all-out war. Unfortunately, all their strength consists in the military and they have got from the United States. If they had not got that aid,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

they would have probably talked in a much lower key. And by their threats they seek to get more aid from the United States. I should like the United States Government, which I respect greatly, more especially under its present leadership, to consider the effect, how they counter-balance their own policy by the military aid they give to Pakistan.

Then, Sir, secondly, I would like to refer to the Chinese border. I would like to mention that in today's papers or yesterday's, it is stated that the Chinese Government published twenty-two notes exchanged between the Governments of India and China during the last four months and the Report of the Officials. Now, we have not got these papers and it is quite clear whether the Report or the notes were published in full or extracts from them. But there is some mention in today's papers about the latest Chinese note to us. This note has not arrived yet in full. We have received a summary of it by telegram, and I should not like to deal with it in detail till we have seen the full note. But the position is that this Chinese note and those some other notes, have been protesting vigorously against what they call our intrusion into their territory. I should like hon. Members here to keep this in mind when they talk so much and draw attention to Chinese intrusions, how the Chinese look upon the position, how they think we are all the time attacking them or preparing to attack them. The fact of the matter is that some time ago, some years ago, a year or two ago, it was decided that we should avoid, that is, both parties should avoid sending patrols so as not to have conflict, military conflict. It was not exactly an arrangement, but it was mentioned. We told them even then that we had every right to send patrols on our own territory and not send across that. But therein lies the difficulty. What we call our territory they call their territory, so that they send patrols into our territory. We object

to them. We send patrols. They say, "You are coming in our territory". They go on protesting, and we have, therefore, continued to send patrols and we have established a number of check-posts too. Sometimes the check-posts are behind their check-posts, behind their lines. It is not a straight line. And this has rather annoyed them, our progress in this way, and hence this last note. There is nothing to be alarmed at, although the note from the telegraphic summary threatens all kinds of steps they might take. If they do take those steps, we shall be prepared for them.

One rather interesting thing I should like to mention. I have seen in a Pakistan paper, I think, that the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan has said that he is not aware that the Chinese have occupied any part of India. It is rather extraordinary how limited his information is of the fact which is known all over the world. But apart from his other information, when I went to Pakistan a little over a year and a half ago—I went to Karachi and I went to Murree and Pindi—in Murree and Pindi I thought that I might discuss this Chinese question with President Ayub Khan more to know—I did not want to discuss so much on our border—what the position was on that part of the Kashmir border on which they were at the present moment, having occupied a part of Kashmir, they have to face the Chinese. So I told them of our maps, I showed them our confidential maps as to where we thought the Chinese were and where we were, and asked them what the position of the Chinese was on their side of the border. Well, I did not get much help from them because I found they knew less than I did even on that side of the border. But we did discuss it, and so it is most surprising that the Foreign Secretary who, I think, was present at that time said that he knew nothing about those matters at all.

One thing more. It has appeared, I think, in the Press today that a Naga

group of about 150 persons have managed to enter Pakistan crossing some Indian territory, Indian territory of about 60 miles at its narrowest or more round about Cachar. We had heard that they were going there some days ago, and we had alerted our people; still it is not easy. When people go in dribblets, in twos and threes, through forests, they manage to get through. They did come into conflict, some of them, and some of them were shot down by our police force, but in the main they got through. Why they have gone there, I do not know. It is possible that they might have expected Mr. Phizo to be there. They have gone to help him or welcome him. According to our information Phizo is still in London, and there is no immediate possibility of his going there, though, of course, he might. Anyhow these Nagas, about 150 of them, after some casualties managed to enter Pakistan, and apparently they were in touch with the Pakistan people because some Pakistan troops met them at the other end. They disarmed them, I think. Whether I would call it "disarmed" I do not know, it is not perhaps quite correct. Anyhow they left their arms here and then went with them. These Naga groups have lately been pressed hard by our security forces and have been driven right up to the Burmese frontier and some beyond that. The Burmese soldiers came into contact with them, and I do not exactly know what is happening, but they are in contact with them and at one time we learned that they surrounded them. Perhaps it is somewhat exaggerated. It is possible that our four airmen are with those people in Burma at the present moment.

One thing more. In a communique issued by the Chinese Government it is stated:

"As a further evidence of Indian bad faith the paper quoting a despatch from Taipeh. Formosa stated that some 2,000 Tibetan youths

recruited from refugee camps in India were about to undergo special training in Formosa so that they might become the future leaders of Tibet."

It is absolutely wrong. We have, as everyone knows, a large number, about 30,000 or so, of Tibetan refugees here. We have been particularly interested in giving opportunities of education and training to the young people among these refugees, and we have tried to settle them more or less permanently. Most of them are being settled in agricultural areas, naturally *we cannot settle them everywhere*, because they cannot stand a very hot or a very wet climate. Fortunately the Mysore Government gave us a piece of land, about 3,000 acres or perhaps more, I forget, where 3,000 of these persons have been settled, and the Orissa Government is giving us another patch of land and the Madhya Pradesh Government also. So, we do not want to send too few of them but enough in numbers to lead a community life and keep up their own traditions as well as modern things. We have in fact rather deliberately taken them away from the frontier. There are some in the frontier working at the roads etc., but most of them are away and many of them will also be removed. So, this story which has appeared in the Chinese Press communique is completely wrong. I do not know where they get their facts from. The editorial took exception to the recent visit of the American novelist, Miss Pearl Buck, to Darjeeling. Miss Pearl Buck certainly came here on behalf of an American Society to help these refugees, and she visited some of the refugee camps. Then again they went on the editorial ended with the words—

"The United States imperialism and the Chiang Kai-shek gang are making active preparations to enable Tibetan serf-holders to ride once again on the backs of the people of Tibet."

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

Well, whatever may happen in the future, at present it is pretty obvious who is riding on the backs of the people of Tibet.

Well, Sir, having disposed of some of these foreign matters, I should like to deal now with the main subject of the debate. And I do not know if it is worthwhile for me to deal with every point raised, and I do not remember all of them, although I have noted them somewhere. Apart from constantly blaming the Government for administrative lapses, etc., which is the right of any privileged person to do and which we welcome, one thing I should like to lay stress on is that in criticising the Government the criticism becomes valid and helpful only if it is given in a balanced way. Many of the speeches delivered by hon. Members opposite would show that all the activities in India, governmental, administrative, etc., are evil, root and branch. All the world knows that it is a false criticism. Even if there is evil, if one gives a balanced criticism, one sees good in what is happening in India. I do submit that what is happening in India is not only fundamentally good, but also fundamentally progressive and advancing in spite of the many lapses and it is a thing which is recognised all over the world as such. Somehow, it is a misfortune with some hon. Members here not to see the good and only to see some bits of evil, which may be true. In a vast country like India, in a dynamic stage, growing stage, for anyone to say that there is no evil, would be absurd; there is plenty of evil; there is plenty of wrong doing, and the administration often fails to come up to expectations to fulfil the targets set. But I do submit that what has been done is remarkable and has drawn the attention of the world to it. And it is a process of historical change. It is not that we, the Government, take the entire credit for it—we do take some credit for the direction in which it is going and the push we give to it—but the credit really goes to the Indian people and

everyone, because these vast changes do not take place by a government decree. Some direction may be given to the change and, as I said right at the beginning of my speech, in a sense the historic changes began over a hundred years ago. Raja Ram Mohan Roy dealt with certain intellectual aspects of it but the impact of Western industrialism came to it gradually, science, etc., and in the last few years, it has been given a more pointed direction, and when we talk of modernising India, it means that. Perhaps, some hon. Members do not approve of it. The hon. Member who represents the Swatantra Party here said that the Government is out to destroy the basis of Hindu culture because we brought in that Hindu Succession Act. To him, evidently the basis of Hindu culture is to maintain the old method of succession wherever it may exist. In other words, he wants no real change to take place in India and the social life of the people. He calls that Hindu culture. Hindu culture is something deeper, I imagine, something much bigger and greater than his conception of it. But as I was saying, this change has been taking place all this time, for the last one hundred years or so. It has been channelled a little more because of our knowledge of the events, because of our conviction that the main purpose that we have to serve today is the material advancement of India. I do not by this, mean that material advancement is the only advancement that India requires, but, anyhow, material advancement is essential, poverty must be fought and removed. Because of that we are taking some measures about land reform, about the abolition of the zamindari and the rest; because of that, we have said that we aim at socialism. It is rightly stated—and we are criticised—that our march towards socialism is slow, that the disparities are great and sometimes grow greater. That is what I call a legitimate criticism. Although I do not think that all the criticism is justified, it is a legitimate

criticism which we ourselves are worried about. But the main thing is to realise how we are going to get rid of this poverty. We are not going to get rid of it by giving doles to people. It is only by increasing our wealth, our production that we can get rid of poverty. It is only in that way that we can get rid of our unemployment. We cannot get rid of unemployment by some temporary dodge like the prison does, making people break stones or some such thing. We may give doles occasionally. It is only by increasing production, and production can only be increased by modern techniques and modern methods and no others will do. If that is so, then we have to think of modernising our techniques, and modernising them in a way so as to give results. If you start with modernising your techniques—that is, industrialisation—you have necessarily to lay the base of it. It is not good enough to start a few textile mills and call it industrialisation. Industrialisation must start at the base that is, the mother industries, machine-building, steel, chemical, etc. And therefore we decided to concentrate on heavy industries and power which is absolutely essential. And all these matters I beg of this House to consider. We talk so much of capitalism and the like. Capitalism and Communism both although very, very different in their outlook, agree about this. They want industrialisation, they want modernisation. The only difference is as to where the products of industrialisation should go. Anyhow, that was the line of thinking—Five Year Plan, etc. People make very fine plans, do this or that. But they forget the whole rationale of the argument. You cannot get rid of unemployment in this country without industrialisation. That is basic. You can lessen unemployment, you can give employment by lowering the standards that exist today—lowest they are—and I do submit that what is normally called capitalism cannot solve this question without creating greater and greater misery

and greater disparities. Normally, when a country is advancing, there is dynamism in it, disparities are created, must be created. Nobody can help it. In every country, even a socialist country, they are created. You can lessen them somewhat, you raise up the lower levels. That is essential, of course, and you try to prevent higher levels from going higher. But the tendency in a dynamic economy is for disparities to be created. In order to remove disparities are you to remove all incentives and are you to remove all the persons who work hard? Take a peasant. The peasant who works hard will earn more and create more. If he has a little initiative, he will use some modern ploughs and other things. Now, are we to punish him because he earns more, because he is cleverer and he works hard—it is a small example—because essentially it is not right to suppress initiative, to suppress hard work? It is also not right for unfair advantage to be taken by individuals of the work of others. Now you have to balance all these things and try to get over the essence of the capitalist economy, that is, the acquisitive economy. The acquisitive economy was never an ideal of India. All these words and phrases that we use, we use from Europe, like left and right and all this is from Europe, and they do not necessarily fit in in India although many of the basic principles can be applied here. So we decided on socialism and I am absolutely convinced that only going in that direction can we succeed in not only ultimately getting rid of unemployment and in raising our standards higher, but having a kind of life in the country which is worthwhile, where everybody has a chance. Everybody cannot be equal, but they should have equal chances. We have done so pragmatically, we watch, and we make mistakes, but I do submit that the kind of effort that we have made has attracted attention all over the world because of its novelty, that is, in a democratic context we are trying to

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]
bring about a planned socialistic economy. It is not being done anywhere else. Naturally we have to face enormous difficulties, and the real difficulty, apart from other difficulties, is the basic fact of 440 million people, who have to be changed in their thinking, in their methods of production, in their actions. Ultimately they can only be changed, I suppose, by education and by the work they do, the kind of work they do. They are changing, I believe, and that is why I attach the greatest importance to this panchayati raj. One may criticise the panchayati raj; one may criticise anything because, ultimately, the criticism means criticism of the human beings employed. Human beings fail often. In the panchayati raj the peasants come, and they become panches and sarpanches and Adhyakshas. They fail, they quarrel, but it is essentially a revolutionary thing, because it puts the burden on them; it puts the responsibility on them; it makes them self-reliant. If you meet the panches of a panchayati raj area today, there is a world of difference in the questions they put to you. Previously the questions were, "Give us this, give us that." My immediate answer now is, "Take it; you have the authority. If you want roads, schools, go and build them; go and spend money on them. Why ask me? You have got the money." Now their questions are different. They do not ask us, "Give us this." They ask us, "How we can get this? We want help." They know they have to do it themselves, but they want some help from us, some ideas from us as to how to do it. They put their real difficulties before us. And I think panchayati raj is the biggest thing that is happening in India today, because it is affecting and will affect 300 millions of our peasants, or more, will change them and make them more self-reliant, and gradually modernise them. I think—if I may use a phrase—panchayati raj plus electric power will change India; nothing else is necessary; of course, many other things will help also but this electric power going all over the

villages is very necessary, because they will not change without electric power; they will still continue in their own way, and yet the old ways are changing; I have said previously and I should like to say it again, the powerful effect it had had on my mind to see millions, literally millions of bicycles—it is not a small matter—millions. Every village has got dozens of them. If I go to a meeting in a rural area, a dozen or two dozen bicycles are stacked up—people coming from roundabout. It shows, of course, certain rise in their standard; otherwise people would not have bicycles. But what is more important, it shows a going from one stage of existence into another; their going from the bullock-cart to the bicycle is a more effective change than from the bicycle to the automobile—that would come too some time. And so, using a new plough is a big thing. Using a tractor, it may or may not be necessary, but a new plough is essential. These changes are taking place essentially, and added to that is the co-operative movement which is spreading in the villages; it is not always very satisfactory, but still it is spreading fast; it is changing the whole countryside, and education. All these are revolutionary factors—power. We think so much of the big schemes that we have, and they are worth thinking about. We have Bhakra-Nangal, Hirakud, and all that—it is important—but the revolutionary changes that are happening in India are due to widespread education in the rural areas, specially women's, girls' education, the co-operative movement, the panchayati raj, and electric power wherever it is going. These three or four things taken together will change the whole face of India, and I am sure in about another ten years' time the difference should be very marked, noticeable.

Much is said about balanced regional development. Well, all our Five Year Plans have laid it down, and in the Third Plan it is laid down as a definite goal over a reasonable period. All regions of the country should realise

their potential by economic development and should attain levels of living not far removed from those of the nation as a whole. Initial development inevitably takes place in the most advanced areas to gain the momentum for development. What are we to do today? Some are poor States, Orissa for instance. It is really so, and every State has its poor areas. Are we to suppress a State that is active and going ahead, because it is going ahead? Manifestly not; it is absurd. Take Punjab which has not got a single basic industry. I say so because basic industries are demanded by every State; Punjab has not got a single basic industry. What it has is good agriculture and agriculturists and small industries in vast numbers, and Punjab is the most prosperous State in India. There is Bihar, which has got a connection of enormous industries in its eastern part, iron ore being there, and coal and other things, all kinds of things; it is amazing how many thousands of crores of rupees have been spent there. And yet Bihar is one of our poor States. It is interesting to realise this that putting up basic industries does not raise the status. In the long run it will do good, of course, nationally and even in the State. Because the state of agriculture in Bihar is backward, that is why Bihar is backward, in spite of the big industries that it has got. In West Bengal we have got big industries but the state of agriculture is not good. In Uttar Pradesh, part of it, it is all poverty-stricken people, while generally speaking, in Maharashtra and in Madras, things are much better not because of a few big industries but because agriculture is progressing more and small industries are progressing more. Now, we must aim at balanced development but balanced development, if it means preventing a State or an area which is going ahead, which can go ahead, simply keeping it back, it is a folly.

Some one stated that the Integration Council had not met since last September. That is a very valid criticism. The real reason, of course, is that we

were all busy with elections. We could meet at election time but the atmosphere was not suitable. I think it should meet soon and I hope that it will meet by the end of this month.

I should like to say a few words about the communal troubles in West Bengal and in East Bengal. I have got before me a big headline "Blanket Ban On Riot News: Nehru Responsible For Blackout". This is about the blackout of news from Malda. Why should I be responsible for it? Why the newspapers should publish this, I do not know. The newspapers in India would object to any such statement that I can bring pressure on them to publish something or not publish. As a matter of fact, I did not do anything about it. I said nothing. I got my news from the newspapers as well as from other sources. In Malda, it was very unfortunate that a little conflict arose between some Santhals and some Muslims on some small matter. Then came the Holi and again this led to some conflict between the Santhals there and the Muslims. Some coloured water or some coloured powder was thrown. Some Muslim huts were burnt down and I think, I do not exactly remember, in the first place four or five Muslims were killed. In fact, some of them were killed when the huts were burnt down and they were burnt down with them. It is very deplorable and very sad but the type of publicity given to this thing in Pakistan is something amazing, and because I did not join in giving publicity of that kind, I am supposed to be responsible for blackout of news here. When one reads Pakistani papers, one can understand how awfully excited the average reader there must be to read this happening in India. I do not blame the people there but newspaper statements and authoritative statements by people in authority about these things, of hundreds of thousands of corpses being taken away in trucks and hundreds of women being raped and abducted is most extraordinary, sometimes without any basis in fact. So, the result of all this was the rising of feeling in some

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]
places in East Pakistan, in Dacca and Rajshahi, where riots took place. Now, it is interesting to see how in those riots naturally publicity of a different type was given in Pakistan. Something had occurred there, riots there, but the Pakistani publicity which had gone on full steam ahead with or without reason suddenly reduced its tempo. There were some further troubles in Malda from the 16th to the 20th and the visit of some outsiders did no good. It incited the people there and this was followed by the troubles in Dacca and Rajshahi.

One hon Member raised the question of police verification of people joining Government service. I do not exactly know what he was referring to, but I gather that there is no police verification of that type. Some kind of verification takes place which is an old practice not about political opinions but of other matters. We are trying to put an end to this. Of course, if there is some patent factor against that person, it is a different matter but not political reasons.

There was some talk about providing adequate machinery for ventilation of grievances.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, about police verification, I have just got a letter, a circular issued by the Home Ministry. I will pass it on to the Prime Minister and then he should look into this matter. This is being done.

MR CHAIRMAN. Yes

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Is the hon Member interested in Government service or what?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Sir. I am not.

MR CHAIRMAN: He does not wish to join Government service.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not, Sir. I must say that despite the fact

that the Prime Minister is there, I would not like to serve the Government.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I think it is very important that there should be an adequate machinery for ventilating the grievances of Government employees and I understand that the Home Ministry has been giving much thought to this and the matter will come up for consideration of the Cabinet soon.

One thing more, Sir. I was not here then, but I have read the report of Mr Annadurai's speech here, in which he talked about a separate State, an independent State of the Dravida country. Now, I have never taken this cry very seriously because it seems so baseless, so little to do with any reality, so little to do with the various currents in the world that I could not take it seriously. I think it must be due to some local reason which has really no outside effect. I still am inclined to think so because it is inconceivable to me that any such separation can ever be effected without breaking India into a thousand bits and if ever such a thing is attempted, it will have to be resisted absolutely with all one's force. I do not think, I repeat I do not think, it is seriously meant. If they say that it is because the South is ill-treated, well even if that is so, it is open to it to get better treatment. And this applies to other States also and has nothing to do with the North or the South. One may say that each State has a grievance. That is a different matter and, as a matter of fact, this cry is not found at all in the other States of the 1 P M South like Andhra, Mysore and Kerala. It is solely confined to some people in Madras. Looking at it from a larger point of view, one sees how the tendency in all the rest of the world is for larger conglomerations. We hear so much about the European Common Market; but behind it is something deeper that is political—the Rome Treaty hints at it—that politically the western European

nations should come together to form a political entity. That is the tendency everywhere, because therein lies their safety; therein lies their progress. And for India to start in a different way which might result in a kind of Balkanisation, is manifestly so outrageous an idea that I cannot conceive of it. It was bad enough for Pakistan to be cut away from India. Well, we did it consciously; perhaps we did not realise the consequences then. But there it is and it is done, and it cannot be undone and it should not be undone. But to start trying to think of doing that kind of thing in bits of India, really it passes my imagination how any man could even think so, even from the narrowest viewpoint of a local area.

Mr. Annadurai again accused the ruling party of receiving funds from the Tatas, Birlas and even the Mundhras. I don't know where he got all this secret information from. Then he repeated something that Mr. Rajagopalachari had said, that is, before elections the Government should resign, that there should be a kind of President's Rule all over. With all my respect for the high ability of Mr. Rajagopalachari, I can only say that sometimes he says things which do not show much thought. Every five years, for six months the country stops functioning in a sense, except in a routine way, just to have the elections.

The result would be that the whole country would be in a static state, never able to go far ahead. This is manifestly impossible, not only impossible from the point of view of the parliamentary democracy that we have got, but also from the point of view of any method which requires quick action and change. Now, the present Government, the Congress Government, which has been functioning ever since independence may be good or may not be so good, may even be bad. But I do submit that the fact of this Government functioning with an ideal, with objectives,

has given this country stability and very considerable progress. I am not saying that others are not intelligent or able. Others may be very intelligent. But the mere fact of the stability of the Government functioning without changing frequently, having some fixed ideas in which direction to go, itself is very important.

Finally, Sir, I should refer just briefly, to the Disarmament Conference or Committee which is meeting in Geneva and to the test ban talks. Behind the Disarmament Conference there is the Berlin question. It appears, one might say, that the Berlin question is, in a sense, approaching some kind of solution. The solution is not obvious, but still one has a feeling that it is approaching a solution. If it does manage to get solved, it is a great thing and disarmament itself will be easier. Anyhow, disarmament has become now something quite essential. It is not like anything which may or may not be. There is no escape from it. The escape from it is only the escape into war. There is no middle way. And so, both from the point of view of saving the world from war, saving future generations and utilising these vast sums that are spent on armaments, for the betterment of humanity, it is essential that disarmament should take place. Meanwhile, we have to face this question of tests, of a ban on nuclear tests. Unfortunately, nuclear tests have begun again. I have no doubt that the military people who hold strong opinions about the tests, they may be right from the military point of view. I don't know, but I do think and think strongly, that in such matters, military opinion cannot be the over-riding factor. They simply think in terms of being stronger than the other party. Even that is not, if I may say so, very intelligent, when each party thinks the same way, and makes advances in the same direction. But where strength has become almost useless, in the sense of protecting yourself, because both parties are strong enough

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

to destroy each other and a great part of the world, then some other way has to be found and this testing and thereby finding some new weapons and stronger weapons, is certainly not the way. That is not the way, because apart from the harm it does, as I said elsewhere, eminent scientists have said that millions and scores of millions of unborn children are affected by it. You do not see the harm as in an earthquake, but the genetic effect of it is tremendous, of maimed and distorted and idiotic children, not now, but gradually. But apart from that these tests make any agreement on disarmament much more difficult and that is the tragedy. I still earnestly hope that these tests will be stopped and more effort will be made to arrive at something, some understanding in the Disarmament Committee. Even in that Committee, the distance that separates the two main protagonists is not too great. They are getting nearer. But still suspicion and fear come in the way. I don't know how one can get rid of them except to decide to take the risk, because the danger of not taking the risk is the greatest risk of all.

That is all, Sir. I am grateful to the House for listening to me so patiently, and it is time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, in view of the fact that all kinds of exaggerated reports are appearing about what has happened in Malda in the Pakistan press and also some exaggerated reports, perhaps, of what is happening in Pakistan, I would request the Prime Minister to get a report from our Deputy High Commissioner in Dacca and get it published in the press here, so that we may know exactly what is happening. In the same way, it would be useful perhaps, for the Government of India to make known officially exactly what is the version of the happenings in Malda, because these have to be controlled somehow or other and unless this is done, tension will grow. I

think in this matter the Government should have consultations with the Pakistan authorities as to how this kind of thing can be checked mutually, under some kind of *ad hoc* agreement and so on. This is a suggestion which I want to make, because I am getting a little worried about what is appearing in the Dacca press, the exaggerated reports of things in West Bengal, for instance.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I might mention that in Malda things are normal now more or less. The Governor of West Bengal went there and this curfew and other things have been removed and it is apparently normal. Naturally people's feelings do not become normal easily. What the hon. Member suggests, it is all very well, but when something happens to excite people or people excite others, it is difficult to control them.

MR CHAIRMAN: There are 22 amendments.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON (Kerala): On the basis of the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister that verification by police will not be continued hereafter, I do not want to press my first amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What he has said is that in view of the statement the Prime Minister has made that it is not desirable that such a practice should continue and also in view of the fact that we have agreed to supply him with whatever material we have got here at our disposal, we always reciprocate good gesture by good gesture and, therefore, we do not press this particular amendment.

MR CHAIRMAN: There are 22 amendments, 1 to 6 by Mr Solomon, 7 to 15 by Ganga Sharan Babu and 16 to 22 by Mr Gaure Mura Hari. I hope they will all be good enough to withdraw the amendments with the permission of the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know, Sir, you have got great persuasive

influence but even so you should not try to persuade us but on the contrary allow us to impress upon the Government that they should answer in such a manner that we feel inspired and encouraged to withdraw

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA (Bihar) So that your persuasion is not needed

MR CHAIRMAN You are inspired
†Amendment Nos 1 to 15 were, by leave, withdrawn.

MR CHAIRMAN Mr Mura Hari is not here So I will put his amendments to vote

The question is:

16 "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely —

'but regret that the Address does not suggest any measure to eradicate poverty in the country'

The motion was negatived

MR CHAIRMAN The question is:

17 "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely —

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address for abolishing inequalities and fixing the maximum and the minimum limits of income in the ratio of 10 : 1'

The motion was negatived

MR CHAIRMAN The question is:

18 "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely —

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the nationalization of foreign capital'

The motion was negatived

†For the text of amendments see cols 1099—1101 of Debate dated the 30th April 1962

MR CHAIRMAN The question is:

19 "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely.—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the appointment of a committee to enquire into the irregularities and misuse of government machinery by the ruling party during the last General Elections'

The motion was negatived

MR CHAIRMAN The question is:

20 "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely —

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address for the scrapping of the current Five Year Plan and formulating a new plan which will be beneficial and suitable for a country like India'

The motion was negatived

MR CHAIRMAN The question is:

21 "That at the end of the motion the following be added namely —

'but regret that the Address does not explain the pattern of socialism which Government want to adopt and which is constantly discussed'

The motion was negatived

MR CHAIRMAN The question is:

22 "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely —

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the steps for the solution of the border problems with neighbouring countries'

The motion was negatived.

MR CHAIRMAN: Now, I shall put the motion. The question is:

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

"That the Members of Rajya Sabha assembled in this session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 18th April, 1962'."

The motion was adopted.

MR CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2:30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at twelve minutes past one of the clock

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.

THE BUDGET (GENERAL), 1962-63—continued

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE (Gujarat)
Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we are discussing today the Budget (General) proposals which seek to put an extra burden of Rs 71.7 crores in the full year on the community, nearly 40 per cent of which is in the form of direct taxes and 60 per cent in the form of indirect taxes. These taxation proposals have been defended by the hon. Finance Minister on chiefly two grounds, firstly that according to the Third Five Year Plan the nation has committed itself to raising vast resources through taxation and, therefore, it is our duty to levy taxation with a view to mobilising resources in order to make the Third Plan a success. He has defended his taxation proposals, secondly, on the ground that a study in his Ministry has convinced him that the overall effect of the tax-

tion proposals in recent years has been progressive in the sense that a larger burden falls on those families whose expenditure is higher rather than on those whose expenditure is comparatively low. In considering these two justifications for the Budget proposals, I am sure, Sir, the House will admit that we will have to go a bit deeper in order to appreciate fully the implications of the arguments with regard to the proposals before us.

Sir, the Third Five Year Plan talks of mobilisation of resources, but it also talks of the rate of development, the rate of rise in national income, the rate of rise in industrial production and agricultural production and so many other things. Therefore, we cannot take only one aspect of resources mobilisation without also taking into consideration the other aspects of the rise in national income and the general health of the economy.

From the Economic Survey, which has been supplied to us, we find that the health of our economy is not so sound as it ought to be. The national income is not rising at a rate as it was envisaged during the Third Plan period. Agricultural production is showing mixed trends. On the one hand, as far as cereals, jute production and sugar-cane are concerned, there is an increase, while on the other hand, as far as pulses, cotton and certain other commodities are concerned, there is stagnation.

Sir, looking to the various figures that have been given in the Economic Survey, one is inclined to think that the rise in agricultural production in certain things is due to extensive acreage rather than an increase in productivity in agriculture as a result of planned development. The Prime Minister this morning told us that one of the factors on which depended the revolutionisation of our society and our economy was electricity generation. But we find that electricity generation is actually falling during the last two years instead of rising and this has posed considerable difficulty to industrial concerns to make full use of their installed capacity.