

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the following dates have been fixed for receiving nominations and for holding election if necessary, to the Indian Central Oilseeds Committee:—

1. Number of Members to be elected—One.
2. Last date and time for receiving nominations—24th February, 1961 (up to 3 P.M.).
3. Last date and time for withdrawal of candidature—27th February, 1961 (up to 3 P.M.).
4. Date and time of election—28th February, 1961 (between 3 P.M. and 5 P.M.)
5. Place of election—Room No. 63, First Floor, Parliament House, New Delhi.
6. Method of election—Proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

#### MOTION FOR ELECTION TO THE NATIONAL SHIPPING BOARD AND PROGRAMME THEREOF

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR): Sir, I move:—

“That in pursuance of clause (a) of sub-section (2) of section 4 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 (44 of 1958), this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct, two members from among the members of the House to be members of the National Shipping Board to be reconstituted with effect from the 1st March, 1961.”

*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the following dates have been fixed for receiving nominations and for holding election, if necessary, to the National Shipping Board:—

1. Number of Members to be elected—Two.

2. Last date and time for receiving nominations—24th February, 1961 (up to 3 P.M.).
3. Last date and time for withdrawal of candidature—27th February, 1961 (up to 3 P.M.).
4. Date and time of election—28th February, 1961 (Between 3 P.M. and 5 P.M.);
5. Place of election—Room No. 63, First Floor, Parliament House, New Delhi.
6. Method of election—Proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

#### MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—continued.

SHRI KRISHAN DUTT (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am happy to associate myself with the Motion of Thanks to the President for his illuminating Address to the two Houses of Parliament on the 14th of February, 1961. The Address, though brief, is yet comprehensive in its content and pregnant with wise implications. The beauty of the Address lies in its dignified restraint and in its tone of dignity.

First of all, Sir, I shall make a few submissions with regard to the India-China border dispute. Each one of us, in fact, every Indian, feels aggrieved at what our neighbour, Communist China, has done on our northern borders, but the question is—confronted as we are with the situation as it obtains at present—what shall we do? It was suggested in this House that we should break off diplomatic relations with China, or do something like that—which in a mood of resentment we feel impelled to do. Now, so far as the first suggestion is concerned, I am perfectly clear, Sir, that it would be a blunder if we broke off diplomatic relations with China; it would harm our cause; it would damage it seriously. It was also suggested that we should cease advocating China's cause

[Shri Krishan Dutt.]

for being seated in the United Nations. I oppose this suggestion also. That thing should not be confused with the merits of the India-China dispute on the borders. Rather it is India's advocacy of China's case for being seated in the United Nations that, in my view, will facilitate a solution to our dispute with China. By virtue of the illuminating report produced by the labours and efficiency of our officials I am of the view that our case has been fully established, but there is something more to do which, I feel, should be done. I think the world needs to be enlightened by a determined campaign of disseminating the facts of our case throughout the world. That is absolutely necessary, and such action as may be possible through diplomatic channels should also be taken to bring round China to a reasonable frame of mind. So much for China, Sir.

May I now submit a few words with regard to the situation in the Congo? The basic factor, in my view, in that situation are the people of the Congo themselves. It is they who in the interest of their own country, being motivated by feelings of patriotism and service to their own country, should make it a point not to fall a victim to the machinations of the foreign powers whether it be Belgium, Western or Eastern powers. They should have the interest of their own country foremost and prominent in their minds. That is the basic thing about the Congo. The outsiders, the United Nations can only help provided the Congolese people put themselves in a position to receive such help. Our great Prime Minister has very wisely and aptly remarked that the United Nations must take effective and prompt steps for the reconvening of the Congolese Parliament which is a repository of true and real power in that country. It is only then that the Congolese tangle could be set right.

We have all been shocked, nay the entire world has been shocked by

the brutal murder of the loveable personality, Mr. Patrice Lumumba, who was the spearhead of the national movement in that country. We grieve over his death and the grief has been expressed all the world over. No doubt the United Nations has been a bit moved into greater activity, i.e., with a sense of urgency to take active steps for helping the Congolese people to get normalcy restored and to return to the constitutional Government. But I feel, still greater pressure is required on our part and on other freedom-loving nations to accelerate that action as much as possible. Without that there is the danger of a graver calamity, a graver situation developing there. According to recent reports certain countries have recognised the Gizenga government there while the United Nations goes on recognising the Kava-vubu administration. That I think is an alarming situation.

Next, Sir, I would take up the Laos situation. The President is perfectly correct in his observations that the only solution and the only effective step that can immediately be taken there is the reactivation of the International Commission.

With regard to Goa, Sir, I am of the view that the policy which is being pursued by the Government of India is the only wise and the right policy that should be pursued. We should not be in a hurry and do nothing in resentment, which can only worsen the situation there without any advantage to the people of Goa.

With regard to the internal situation in the country, Sir, we must recognise and appreciate the great progress which our country has made in all directions—scientific research, atomic energy, fertilizer factories, steel plants, projects, dams and in so many other things—and any person who cares to see must feel that our country has materially progressed, and within a short period of ten years it has done that much which

any other country in similar circumstances could be proud of doing.

Sir, so far as the criticism of the President's Address is concerned, that it has omitted to take note of certain things, one of such things pointed out was that it had not taken note of the fissiparous tendencies which were making themselves felt in the country and causing deplorable developments in one spot or another of our country. My humble submission in this regard is, let us forget such things; let us make them things of the dead past. To give recognition to such objectionable and harmful tendencies is to give them prominence and encouragement. The President has very rightly omitted to make a mention of them. Rather each one of us should try in his own way to do his best by preaching the gospel of love and brotherliness throughout the entire length and breadth of our country.

Keeping in view the international situation as has been taken notice of by our President, and also keeping in view the peaceful life of the country and the progress that it is making, the only conclusion to which we come is that the situation, in the words of our President, both at home and abroad justifies "hope and cautious optimism".

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Chairman, Sir in the course of this debate a good deal of attention has been given to matters pertaining to foreign policy, the Congo or our north-eastern border. In the course of my remarks I shall mainly deal with these matters, but there is something else which has been referred to about which I should like to say something.

One criticism of the President's Address by hon. Mr. Santhanam was that it was too business-like, it had no emotional overtones. In so far as we are responsible, we plead guilty

to that charge. It is a business-like Address, an Address which, I think, ought to be business-like. Naturally, we cannot aspire always to write in a language which may have a great appeal. That is a question of the ability of those responsible for it. But on the other hand, I do submit that on an occasion like the President's Address too much emotion would not be perhaps appropriate.

Then, again Mr. Santhanam said something which has rather surprised me. He took exception to the President referring in his Address to the National Development Council. He said that there is no mention of this in the Constitution, that Parliament has no concern with the National Development Council, etc. etc. That is a very remarkable statement for a senior Member of the House like Mr. Santhanam to make because the Constitution does not mention all our various Ministries, Departments and the methods of working and therefore, Parliament cannot take notice of this and the President should not refer to them. Really, I am very much taken aback by this criticism. The Planning Commission is not mentioned in the Constitution. The whole structure of the Government of India is not mentioned, and, therefore, we cannot mention them. I do submit that that is a very wrong view to take. Obviously the Parliament is not bound, even the Government of India or the Cabinet are not bound by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission is an advisory body. The National Development Council, a powerful organisation representing the Government of India and all the States of India, is a body deserving the greatest respect but it does not bind technically either the Government of India or, I take it, any of the States but that does not make any difference to the fact that according to the procedures we have adopted, it is of the greatest importance—the National Development Council—because it brings together the thinking of the various States in India and the Government of India and any-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

thing that it decides, therefore, has not a constitutional significance but a high official significance, that is, when the people in authority in the States and in the Government think together, naturally, it has all the authority they can give it without binding down anybody.

Now, I would like to say straightway—and I think it appears from the President's Address—that there is not the slightest feeling of complacency in the minds of the Government of India about the conditions in India—internal or external. In fact the burdens that have to be faced by the country grow bigger and heavier, the problems more difficult. For anyone to consider them and make a charge of complacency, therefore, is not correct, but quite apart from this question of complacency, which nobody in the wide world can have today, in no country I would submit from the biggest, from the big ones to the small ones, no country today, no leader of public opinion today in any part of the world, can view the prospects in the world with complacency, but that apart, if we look at the Indian scene with all its ramifications complications, knots, troubles, etc. I think it is quite correct to say, as the President has been pleased to say, that we can view it with a certain cautious optimism. By the normal tests, we can certainly be optimistic but there are other things besides the normal tests which trouble us. The hon. Member just speaking referred to the criticism made about the President not mentioning in his Address certain—well, I presume he referred to or someone referred to—communal disturbances, etc. They are very disturbing, not in the all-India sense but because they bring out something hidden in the hearts of some people here, who forget India, who forget everything and who can only function in a narrow, objectionable, communal way. That is a thing which is of the highest importance; whether the President mentioned it in the Address or not, opinion may differ but I can assure the House that we at-

tach the greatest importance to it, greater than many of the big things that are happening in this country because that represents or that indicates not the soul of India, not the spirit of the Indian people. If that soul and spirit are wrong, it just does not matter what the planning Commission does. It does not matter what the Third Plan or the Fifth Plan may do except in so far as they themselves affected the situation. We attach the greatest importance to it and so far as the Government is concerned, we are going to combat these communal tendencies, these limiting disruptionist tendencies, these barbarous tendencies. I do not wish to use mild words because it is a matter of the greatest importance and it creates disgust and abhorrence in my mind that any single Indian should behave in the manner sometimes people behave in these communal disturbances. Therefore, that is a highly important matter. This House should realise that our planning will not succeed and nothing will succeed if we ourselves go to pieces in our minds and hearts. But look at the normal structure of India—the agricultural and the industrial side. I do submit that in spite of numerous difficulties, we are doing rather well. Again I say that with the full realisation that we have enormous problems ahead and they will be ahead of us. We will not solve the problems of India in the course of a year's or five-year plan even. The task we have undertaken is a tremendous one. When I say 'we', I am referring to the people of India, to this Parliament, who are ultimately responsible, because Governments are only a small part of this entire structure which shares this burden. Now if you look at the statistics or if you look at anything else, the picture, though not rosy, is certainly optimistic. We have got into the habit—whether it is good or bad I do not know—of somewhat under-stating our case. Our statistics—as even the World Bank experts said to us and have put down in their report—were under-stating what we were doing in

the matter of industrial development. They said that the industrial development has gone far ahead of the statistical analysis made on behalf of the Government of India. Now one may criticise that. We are aware that our statistics, though widely organised and all that, nevertheless require co-ordination. We get sometimes opposing figures from the same source and that is not a new thing. Even great and well-organised countries like the U. S. A. produce statistics about the same matter which differed completely. In Japan they differed completely. The food production statistics differed by a matter of 30 million tons—two figures or more. That is not surprising. Nevertheless, we have to improve them but the point is that generally speaking, experts abroad have been surprised at the way we under-state our achievements, and it is well to remember that even in stating them in the President's Address, we tend to under-state it because it is better to do that than to shout at the top of our voice about what we have done or what we intend to do but the fact of the matter is this. Take agriculture which is of the highest and most basic importance. Agriculture is doing well. I do not say that we have solved our problems of agriculture but we are on the way to their solution and we can say with a certain amount of confidence that we can see that the solution is ahead of us, whether at the end of the Third Five Year Plan or even earlier, I cannot precisely say. No country like India can, for a considerable time to come, be entirely independent of the effects of the seasons, of harvests and the like. You see a country of which much has been heard, a great country like China which has devoted itself with tremendous vigour to its industry and agriculture, suddenly in the grip of a terrible famine such as even China has not perhaps known before. So the criticism that is sometimes applied to us can be applied in a far greater measure to China. I am not talking of political matters and all those other matters. But I say that is a

fact, and it is one of the facts of life as they concern us in these huge populated countries dependent on climate, monsoons and the like. Gradually we have to control this by greater production by having reserves and so on, so that such calamities should not come upon us. I cannot guarantee that if it descends upon us, say by a succession of bad seasons, we will not be affected. We will be affected, of course. But we try to provide against it. We have got very large stocks of foodgrains to-day in India. Certainly, part of them are stocks which have come from abroad—imports. But essentially our own food production has gone up, and it has gone up, I should like to remind the House, at a time when the season was not a very good season. Last year it was not a first class season. We had calamities. We had floods. But in spite of them it was a record crop. That is to say, the yield per acre is increasing in India and that is a basic thing. So I have no great apprehension on that score.

Take other things. Take sugar. We have got a glut of sugar. Sugar production has jumped up far beyond our capacity to consume it. A year or two ago we lacked sugar, to some extent, but now we are eager to export it and we have our difficulties. Unfortunately, in parts of our country the cost of production of sugar is higher than in other countries where sugar is produced. So the prices here are higher and sometimes we are asked to take some steps to reduce this price. So it is difficult and we cannot dispose of it. So, broadly speaking, in agriculture the outlook is good.

As for industry, that is a thing which one can measure more easily and it is not dependent—though it is also dependent on certain uncertain factors—not so much, as agriculture. Now, while the House knows there are these big schemes of industrial expansion, basic industries and the like, the House perhaps does not know—it is not the fault of hon. Members for, as I said, our statistics

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]  
have rather ignored it—the tremendous development of small industries in India. That is what the World Bank says, that it is spectacular. Now, the World Bank people are not the kind of persons who speak in a grandiose language or with emotion and overtones. They are tough bankers and when they use that word and say that the industrial development in India, of middle industries is spectacular, well, it has got certain significance which we might as well appreciate. So one sees all these happening.

One sees also at the same time, naturally, the misery, the poverty and many other terrible things in India. And that is what India is today. That is the problem that we have to face. It may be that we made mistakes, it may be that we might have done something better. Somebody else might have done something better. But the point is, whether it be in the field of industry or agriculture or education or health, the advance in India is not only creditable but impressive. Take education. There is plenty of argument about the quality of the education and most of us probably criticize some aspect or the other of our educational problem. It is a difficult problem facing us and the world, in a sense, is also facing the problem and we face it in our own circumstances. But it is no mean achievement that at the present moment 45 million boys and girls are going to schools and colleges in India. It is a good number and it is increasing by one million every year and it is likely to come up to 60 millions by the end of the Third Five Year Plan. Take again health. There is remarkable achievement in the field of health. The expectation of life has gone up to 42; 42 is not very high, of course, but it is very very high in India, for in my youth it used to be 24 and in the thirties or in the late forties when independence came, it was about 32. It has jumped up by some ten years and that is very considerable. Malaria has been wiped out, though not entirely. And so on, I can give these

figures and hon. Members also can find them. But apart from all this, I would submit that any person who keeps his eyes wide open, in town or country, will see that the people are better fed, better clothed, better housed and very large numbers of them move about in bicycles, motor buses and so on. These are not ways of solving India's problems, but these are indicators, pointers.

Now I will put another picture before the House. I think it is correct to say that while the standard of living, broadly speaking, has been going up in agriculture, in industry and so on, it would not be correct to say that landless labour has prospered. I am sorry to admit it, but the fact of the matter is that the question of landless labour in India is a very difficult question, and they have not profited as much certain other sections of the community have profited by the changes. It is also true that the additional income that the country has generated has tended to go a little more than it should to those who possess the good things of the world than to others. Therefore, there is always a certain tendency for the gap to be there and in the progressive economy for the rich to benefit by it. We have to check it, of course, and we have appointed a committee to indicate methods of doing it. There is that tendency. Not only the very rich, but for instance, in agriculture, the better farmer will benefit more. He has got the capacity, he has got the resources to benefit by it. Whatever you give, he profits by it, while the person who is down and out cannot profit by it. That is our difficulty. Therefore, landless labour has suffered. You say, give land to the landless labour. Of course, give them the land if there is the land. Wherever there is land, give it to them. But the fact of the matter is, the problem of landless labour can only be solved by industry essentially, not by giving land. Land should be given, wherever you can, but essentially by industrial development whether it be big industries, small industries, cot-

tage or village industries, by all these methods we have to solve it. You cannot give them the land. Neither is so much land available nor are there ways of absorbing them on the existing land. Some can be absorbed. But I do admit that the condition of the landless labour has not progressed as much as it should and it is a grave blot on the face of our economy.

Now I would refer to foreign affairs, and refer particularly to two questions—to the Congo and to our border—because reference was made to both these in the course of the speeches in this House. That is natural, because both are of high importance. The Congo question is a question which from the world point of view, is of vital importance and behind it lie the possibilities even of world war. Now, I need not go into the background of the Congo question because the House knows it and we have discussed it in the past. Since then, of course, much has happened, notably the assassination—the murder, of Mr. Lumumba. Now, may I here refer to a type of criticism which sometimes is made in this House on various occasions. Why have we got so excited about the murder of Mr. Lumumba when we were composed and calm when Mr. Imre Nagy was condemned to death in Hungary or when something else happened in some other part of the world's surface or when the Tibetans were being dealt with in some other way? I am sorry this kind of criticism is made, whether it is justified or not, it is for the House to determine, but it does show a peculiar and a perverted mentality, a mentality which is more loyal than the King, a mentality which has nothing to do with India, India's case, India's thinking. It is thinking in cold war terms and bringing those terms to India. In India, we have rejected this and we think and act, rightly or wrongly, according to our own wishes in the matter. Mr. Imre Nagy's case was pointed out. We did not jump about; we condemned that and we disliked that but to bring that in in the present Congo crisis is

to do something which cannot be justified by any logic or reason or thinking except the acceptance of a cold war outlook, and not even that but in a degree much more than the principal areas of the cold war are doing in the world today. It is quite extraordinary that this kind of thing should crop up again and again. Take Tibet. Everything was discussed here. People say, "We told you that you were wrong ten years ago when you did that". I wish hon. Members would move up to this year, 1961, and not remain stuck up in the past, whether it was ten or hundred or a thousand years ago. We have to function today, in the circumstances of today. Am I to repeat every time the reason why we took that action in regard to Tibet in 1950? I have explained, and I believe that most people not only in India but in the wide world, except small coteries here and there, have understood that that was the only possible action which we could take as a nation, whatever we might feel about it. But the argument is repeated again and again for lack of anything else, I suppose, or for lack of thinking as to what the world is today and what we have to face today.

Now, Sir, to come back to the Congo, it is clear that this is not a question of my likes and dislikes or anybody else's; the question is today of trying to prevent a world catastrophe in the Congo, trying to help the Congo to preserve its integrity and independence, trying to prevent foreign forces, whoever they might be, from going and dominating over the Congo, trying to prevent the cold war coming—it has come but to prevent it coming mere fully—into the Congo, trying to prevent civil war and all that. We have no interest in the Congo, although some people, I regret to say, have even presumed in the Congo, not the Congolese but some outsiders in the Congo, and have started a whispering campaign that India wants to send a million or two of her people to the Congo to settle down because we have too much of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

population. We have hardly a handful of persons in the Congo and even in our wildest imagination we have not thought of sending our people to inhabit the Congo but this kind of charge is made, whispers, just to irritate the Congolese people or others against India. We have no interest in the Congo, no selfish interest at all. We have interest, of course, in the countries of Africa becoming prosperous and independent and also the Congo. The Congo will become the test for the other countries of Africa also and for itself. It stands on the verge of disorder and now the Congo has become tied up with the world situation. It is already to some extent being affected by this cold war attitude which sometimes is represented by a few Members in this House too. Fortunately, the great powers concerned are trying their utmost to avoid this but there is that great danger and, as I said perhaps on a previous occasion, it was unfortunate that when this tendency to solve the problem in the right way grows, when President Kennedy had, among other things, endeavoured to follow a new policy in regard to the Congo and in other countries, which was a hopeful policy, just then this killing of Mr. Lumumba took place. The House realises, I hope, from even the news in the newspapers what reaction there has been all over the world, everywhere, about this. Why? Probably, nobody here had heard of Mr. Lumumba six months ago or a year ago, but somehow or the other, he became the symbol of African nationalism, fighting for freedom. He may have made a number of mistakes; probably he did but the fact is he became a symbol in the eyes of the world and because of that symbol, when he was murdered, there was that powerful reaction in Africa, in Asia, in the countries of Europe and everywhere. We have to deal with that live entity—African nationalism—not something slowly asking for reforms but something alive, kicking, and sometimes misbehaving but something very much alive. This live en-

tity is kicked suddenly in this way and as a culminating process to all kinds of things that were indulged in. It upset the mental balance, it angered the people and it was not a matter of disliking this or that. Somebody said—some hon. Member—why do we speak in this language? Why do we talk about gansterism and the like? We should be more neutral in this matter. We are not neutral in this matter, so far as this is concerned. We are not neutral and we feel strongly. If I may say so, in the last year or six or eight months since we have been connected—we have sent some of our Forces there—we have repeatedly stated a certain policy in regard to the Congo. Now, it is not my habit—and it is a wrong habit—to say, "Oh, we warned you previously. We did this previously and if you had followed my advice, it would have been well." This is a foolish way of proceeding but the fact of the matter is that much of the trouble that has come has been there because the policy India had suggested was not followed, and they are going to do now when it may be too late to go back because things have advanced and what was acceptable three months ago is not acceptable any more to multitudes in the countries of Africa or elsewhere. Things have changed. Any country, any major country, can bring about a war; destruction is easy to begin but the final settlement of the Congo problem is not going to take place in the Chancelleries of the great powers; it would be done in the Congo, in Africa, but before that, if other things happen and if they are destroyed in vast numbers, well, things would be different, of course. The whole picture is changed today and whether it is, leave out the Congo, East Africa, Central Africa or Northern Rhodesia, in all these places they are being dealt with a different way, I admit, by the countries concerned but not fast enough to move with the tempo of the times. So in the Congo other countries are catching up to what we said six months ago or four months ago and meanwhile the fact that a policy was pur-



sued or allowed to be acted upon without the United Nations coming down upon it or stopping it has led to all these difficulties. Some months ago President Kasavubu went to New York and he was accepted in the United Nations. There was justification for his acceptance; I do not deny that but there was no justification to consider him the one and only representative of the Congo and functioning as a dictator. That is, while his position was correct, his functions did not become dictatorial because of that. At that time we pointed out—and other countries also—that this position should be defined. There was supposed to be a Conciliation Commission going from the United Nations to the Congo; let us wait for their report. But no; it was insisted that this must be done immediately—a kind of aftermath of the cold war thinking—and that was done with the result that that set in motion a chain of events there and with the help of this backing of the United Nations—the United Nations did not do much but it just gave that little spurt in one direction—other countries, notably Belgium, went in there; not officially sent by the Government, but anyhow they went in there, military people, advisers and the rest.

About Katanga now if anybody tells me that Katanga is a semi-independent province run by the Congolese, I have my grave doubts. I think it is the Belgian advisers there who run it and the Belgian officers who have control—such control as is there—over the forces of Katanga. So this kind of thing happened and the iron entered the soul of the people. They saw this kind of thing happening and then they saw the United Nations sitting helplessly by and the methods of liquidating people, which are not, well, normally done in the modern age, being adopted. You heard about Mr. Lumumba but only yesterday news came in newspapers—I am merely quoting the newspapers; I have no special information—that three plane-loads of pro-Lumumba people, impor-

tant people no doubt, were sent by air from Leopoldville to the Kasai Province. You will remember—the House may remember—that Mr. Lumumba was also sent from where he was kept in prison to Katanga Province to be liquidated and people warned them then that he had been sent there to be murdered there, killed there, and he was killed. Now some very important people, pro-Lumumba people, are sent in three plane-loads to Kasai. Now, the present leader of Kasai Province, who is functioning there as such, is one of the bitterest enemies of Mr. Lumumba and so these people are sent outside the immediate scope of the United Nations functioning there presumably to be liquidated, murdered, assassinated—call it what you will. This is what is happening even in Leopoldville, where the United Nations is there, under presumably the authority of President Kasavubu. Now, we have not formally acknowledged President Kasavubu's Government just as we have not acknowledged any other Government there. The fact is, there is no Central Government there; maybe President Kasavubu's Government and the forces at his disposal are relatively stronger than others because they have got the Belgians and other countries and arms to support them. That is the position and that has led to a number of African, European and Asian countries to give recognition to the Stanleyville Government which is a big province of the Congo, and they recognised it as the Congolese Government. It is open to any country to recognize any Government but factually it has no control over the Congo; it has some control over the Orientale Province. Now we have some great powers and some other powers in Africa recognizing the Stanleyville Government and saying that they will support it with arms and other things while the other people are being supported by some other great powers and so you see civil war, international war, everything coming into the picture and once that kind of thing starts, no man can say where it will end. So one has to take as calm and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

objective the view of this as possible and not be led away by likes or dislikes.

There are various matters; we have said that. I need not repeat what we have said about this position there but it is perfectly clear that things as they are can lead the Congo and the world to disaster. It is perfectly clear that the so-called armies functioning there on behalf of Mr. Mobutu, Mr. Tshombe and others and largely officered from abroad, are dangerous to peace and security and they function in a manner which can only be described as gangsterism. I repeat that word not in a fit of emotion but deliberately because that describes their activities there, what they have done there. And they have to be checked; they have to be disarmed; they have to be controlled and this kind of thing, this major activity of some of the local governments there of liquidating their opponents by having them murdered has to be stopped. And I think there will be no peace in the Congo till the foreign elements go. I do not mind—I do mind but I prefer it—the Congo being left completely to its resources even if they fight and kill each other but these foreign elements must be withdrawn. Of course the right thing would be for the foreign elements to be there under the U.N. and none outside the U.N. because if the U.N. goes, everything goes there. I must make it perfectly clear; much as I have disliked many of the activities of the United Nations or lack of activities rather than activities, their passivity, because they have bound themselves hand and foot by their own interpretation of the Resolutions of the Security Council and could not do anything, but nevertheless if the U.N. goes from the Congo there is no hope for the Congo in our lives. A vacuum will be created which undoubtedly will be filled in by the great powers sending their armies and they will fight each other. So these foreign elements must go

except those that are under the control and direction of the United Nations. How to do it is another matter. There may be difficulties, difficulties really which have grown in the last five or six months by the weakness shown by the United Nations. Six months back the situation was fairly under control; it may be difficult now. However, I will not detail the separate events. Now, the Security Council has been considering this matter from day to day, and not—I am glad to say—in the usual atmosphere of just abusing each other but of trying to find some way out. There is a resolution before the Security Council; there are several but I am referring to the one proposed by

Ceylon, the U.A.R. and Liberia

1 P.M. Now, the House knows that

India is not in the Security Council. We are not there to propose, amend, submit or oppose any resolution. But on such important occasions sometimes other countries not in the Security Council are allowed to be present and even to express their views or the views of their Governments. Because of that India, in common with a number of other countries, has been invited to express her views. But these countries cannot propose anything or vote. Now, this resolution of Ceylon, the United Arab Republic and Liberia, if I may say so, with all respect to the countries concerned, is not exactly the type of resolution which, if I had been given the drafting, I would have drafted. But, nevertheless, broadly speaking we agree with it. I am not criticizing the drafting of others, because that itself is the result of an attitude to bring together numerous ways of thinking. Obviously when a number of people come together, the ultimate draft is not one hundred per cent. representative of any one country. Therefore, one must accept it. Realising that difficulty and realising the necessity of doing something effective and there not being any arguing about words and phrases here and there, broadly we accept this draft of Ceylon, etc. Now, there are two or three matters which have been suggested. Some

amendments have been suggested about that. The first thing is, it has been suggested, that there should be a mention of the Secretary-General in this resolution. There is no specific mention, although there is mention of the Secretary-General's Special Representative in the Congo. Now, the idea is that one should not imagine, because of the recent controversies, that the Secretary-General is out of the picture. Well, it is obvious that he is not out of the picture. He is there. He is the Secretary-General and if the United Nations is to function, it can only function, as it is established today, through the Secretary-General. One may add to this. Whatever one may do in the future is a different matter, so that the authority given to the United Nations to function in accordance with the terms of this resolution is an authority to the Secretary-General. There is no doubt about it, whether you mention it or not. There is mention, as I said, of the Secretary-General's representative in the Congo. Then, there is an important matter. This resolution, as originally worded, calls upon all States to take immediate and energetic measures to prevent the departure of such personnel for the Congo from their territories and for the denial of transit and other facilities to them. That is, it calls upon States not to send people there. It is perfectly right. But it is suggested that there should be an addition to it, directing the United Nations to take all necessary action to prevent the introduction of unauthorised personnel and aid. I should have thought that all this is understood and it flowed even from the earlier Security Council's resolutions which said that the Belgians should withdraw, that the United Nations should do this and that. But somehow owing to a very restricted interpretation of those resolutions by the U.N. people, they have felt rather helpless. Now, when you call upon people to go and tell the other States not to send any, it follows that if they send any, the United Nations should stop them, prevent their coming in

But some people feel that this should be spelt out clearly. We have no objection if it is to be spelt out clearly

Now, there are some proposals about some minor amendments and others. Now, we do not mind minor amendments to it. But we hope that, broadly speaking, this resolution will be adopted and acted upon and that quickly, because every day's delay creates new problems, like this problem of three plane-loads of pro-Lumumba people being sent to the Kasai province, presumably to be slaughtered there.

PROF. DR. RAGHU VIRA (Gujarat): It is 'Kasai' province. 'Kasai' means slaughterer.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Now, I come briefly to our border question. I have noticed, reading the reports of their speeches—I did not have the privilege of being here all the time and I had to go through the reports—that practically every section of the House has praised, has given commendation for our team of officials who went to discuss the border question with the Chinese officials. That report has been circulated. I am glad of that, because I have been conscious during these months not only of the hard labour but also the ability and scholarship that they brought to bear upon this difficult task. Now, basically this kind of conflict between India and China is obviously a matter of grave import to us and I should say to the world. We are criticized for not taking certain steps. It is said: Why don't you go and have this territory vacated which the Chinese have occupied? While I admire the patriotism and the emotional upsurge of hon. Members who tell us to go and push the aggressor out, I do not always admire the thought processes which bring about this sudden demand. What is supposed to be the practical aspect of it? The Government has to think of these practical aspects also and not only of the emotional urges that affect us and which the Government also

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

feels. And I would beg this House to consider this question from the practical point of view. It is not an easy matter to indulge in a policy of action which step by step almost inevitably leads to war. A war between India and China, a war anywhere, according to our thinking, is undesirable. Even a small war may lead to a big one. But a war between India and China is something which no one can welcome. If it is thrust down upon us, that is a different matter. Also, if it is to be war, one has to prepare for it. One does not in a Don Quixotic way go about with a lance in hand to drive out the aggressor. One prepares for it. It is a big thing, which, if started, may last our whole lifetime. It is not some police action or an order to a police station to take an area. We have to prepare for it, strengthen ourselves, in many ways. And the main thing is to be clear in our minds and to be firm and determined in our resolves. That is the main thing, clear in our minds, not merely emotionally—emotionally we are—but otherwise to be firm and determined as to what our position is, what we want done and to prepare for it, whether it takes a month or a year or several years, not to give in and ever to keep that in mind, and meanwhile always to seek methods on one side of solving the problem peacefully and on the other strengthening ourselves by other methods. That is broadly the policy. According to our thinking our trouble at the border is not a dispute with China. It is a question of words perhaps. It is a dispute of course. When we argue about something, it is a dispute. But my point is, it is not a dispute because we have no doubt about our own position in this matter. So far as we are concerned, we are clear that it is not a normal dispute but it is just a claim on our territory which is ours, and we are convinced that it is ours. Therefore, this has to be clearly understood. Now it is very difficult, even in regard to such matters there may be two opinions. Obviously, rightly or wrongly, the Chinese opi-

nion is different, and presumably most of them believe in it. This series of talks between the officials of India and China has, I think, very largely put an end to any doubt that there might be in people's minds about the real facts of the case. That was necessary. We in India being moved just by emotion hardly knew the facts. Perhaps many people who are most moved knew least about the facts. It is necessary, it was necessary, for this to be built up, this factual case, supported by documents, etc. before the world, before other countries, and indeed before even the people of China though unfortunately I do not know how many of them will have occasion to study it this way. Therefore, this great gain has come to us. Let us realise that our case in regard to this border stands, if I may use the word, proven, proved for anybody to see. People, let us say, even in Pakistan have made very extraordinary charges against us in the newspapers and other things, and even some others, in regard to this border problem with China. If they do not accept it, all I can say is that they have not cared—to put it mildly—that they do not know the facts and they do not care to study them. They merely give effect to their animus against India because in the ultimate analysis we have to try to settle this, try our utmost not once but many times, peacefully even though it takes time, because the alternative to it, to any kind of peaceful approach, is war, and if war comes down upon us, we have to defend our country of course, but we should avoid war anyhow and more especially in the present context of the world.

Some mention was made by some hon. Members about China or Chinese forces extending their occupation area in Indian territory. Now I want to make this perfectly clear that the major advance of the Chinese forces into Indian territory in Ladakh took place in the summer of 1959, about a year and a half ago. Ever since then there has been no advance anywhere.

I cannot guarantee, some little curve in a waste land they may have marched in again, but broadly speaking they have not advanced anywhere certainly not in NEFA, certainly not in the middle sector and I think not in the Ladakh area either. Now what is this talk then about 2000 square miles of more territory being claimed by China? That is an incorrect thing. One very extraordinary fact which stands out during these past years is the changing position of the Chinese Government in regard to these matters and, what is more, the changing maps that come out from time to time. Premier Chou En-lai in a letter addressed to me on the 17th December, 1959 stated that the 1956 map published in China represented the correct boundaries as conceived by the Chinese Government. Throughout this argument we have been asking them to tell us what exactly they stand for, what is their claim, to tell us precisely, not vaguely and generally, to tell us by the precise longitude, latitude, etc., this place, that place, etc. They have never done that. Their maps are vague and so are the claims they advance. So Premier Chou En-lai said this to me in December, 1959. He relied on their 1956 map. This was in response to my letter in which I had pointed out to him the bewildering variety of the delineation in the Chinese maps. The scrutiny of the map which was provided to our officials showed that the line drawn was further west in Ladakh of the 1956 line, that is the map which Premier Chou En-lai had stated as showing their position. That itself was a variation of the previous position which was to some extent set aside by the new map and the new line which the Chinese officials claimed in the western sector specially and to some extent in the middle sector. Again, another thing happened. Take the middle sector, Uttar Pradesh and Himachal Pradesh and Punjab, etc. They claimed previously odd villages in India on this side of the border. Now they have gone one step further and joined up the odd villages. Previously a village was a bulge in the line. Now

they simply joined them up, a series of villages there, so that it becomes a small area rather than a few bulges. That is how these 2000 sq. miles extra in their claim come about. But, as I said, there has been no advance on any territory being occupied ever since the autumn of 1959.

Another thing they claimed, which goes rather counter in regard to the Niti Pass, etc. to the treaty we had with them. Tibetan treaty, I mean. Of course in regard to this border matter our position has been clarified by this report. Some Members said, I believe, that this report brought out certain facts that were not placed before the House previously, that is, that we had hidden them or some such thing. I should like this House to consider one aspect of these questions. Questions are asked in this House and the other House, questions which we find it difficult to answer because any answer to that question is giving information to people to whom we do not want to give it, to our opponents, to those who are opposing it. It becomes difficult. We do not want to keep anything from the House. What the House knows, the world knows. So we cannot always give precise information in regard to border matters, what we are doing, what steps we take to protect ourselves, what roads we are making, where our armies are situated and so on. We do not sometimes want the opposite side to know even an argument lest they might take some other steps in regard to it, if they knew it, too soon. So there is this difficulty.

Apart from the broad lines of our approach, this involved the collection of material and tremendous labour by way of examination of documents, and many things have come to our notice; many papers have come to us from distant countries, which has gradually added to our information. And there is the vital difference between our stand and the Chinese stand. The Chinese stand has been that our border has not been delimited, has not been marked, let us sit down and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

consider it, mark it wherever it may be. Having said that, at the same time, they claim large chunks of territory. Suppose a border is not marked but broadly it is well known. A marking of it may involve, let us say, a few hundred yards this way or that way, a mile this way or that way. There is that possibility. But by no stretch of imagination does that involve large chunks of territory being occupied. But apart from that, our stand is that the border is known, is a defined border, it is not an unknown border. It is not marked down or delimited on the ground everywhere; in small bits it is, because it is frightfully difficult in these glacier regions to go about marking them. Anyhow, it was not considered necessary in the past during the British times, and since we became independent, we did not and could not easily do it. Anyhow, our position is that it is a defined border, it is a known border, known by custom, by practice, by usage, by treaty and so on and so forth. So the question of sitting down with the Chinese people to define it and consider the whole matter afresh does not arise so far as we are concerned. And our case has been strengthened powerfully by the Report presented by our officials. I was glad to find that the hon. Member opposite who spoke on behalf of the Communist Party gave a great deal of credit to our officials who prepared the Report and said that they had presented a very strong case—I forgot his words—almost a case proved to the hilt. I am glad this realisation has come even to doubting minds. But I would add this. It is not enough to realise that and then to proceed to suggest some course of action which does not fit in with that realisation. We must be logical. If that is so, the course of action should fit in with that. It is not good repeating like a mantram, "Oh! let us sit down, embrace and be friends." I am always in favour of sitting down and talking and embracing and being friends and all that. But when we are considering a problem like this, we must know the

nature of the problem and not give any wrong impression to the public of India or to the public of the world as to where we stand or how this is going to be solved. It is not going to be solved merely by some pious declarations or by pure goodwill. I want goodwill always. The fact of the matter is that our case in regard to the border is almost foolproof. It does not require high intelligence to realise how strong this case is and that—whatever the reason may be for the Chinese to do it, it is upto them—they were wrong in doing so, in occupying our territory. The question will only be settled when they leave this territory. That is the simple issue and it is not a question of horse-trading. "All right. You take this, I take this. Let us halve this." It is not a question of that.

Now another question has been whether I am going to China to discuss it. I say I have no immediate intention of going there. I do not quite know myself about the future, about the steps we may have to take from time to time, and whether any of these steps may involve my having to meet Premier Chou En-lai or going to Peking for this purpose, I cannot say. I cannot obviously commit myself saying 'yes' or 'no' to something which will depend on various developments. But in order to settle this question peacefully, I am prepared to go as far as I can, and it is not a question of my prestige being involved. I may go to China or some other place but the point is there would be no justification for my doing so unless some situation arises when a talk is likely to be fruitful. There is a test. If I say that I will go because I am eager to settle it, that does not help; my saying that I will not go there at all, I am too proud to go—is not a right position which I am not prepared to take. But the question of talks only arises when there is justification for it by something emerging out of the talks and what we say in regard to this matter being acknowledged, particularly acknowledged by the Chinese Government. That is the position

I have spoken at some length about this matter because I wanted to make it clear what we stood for. It is a difficult matter—very difficult. It is a burden on us, and I should like to share that burden with this House. I would submit that whether it is the Congo or whether it is our border an approach—an adventurous approach—is not helpful; it is very dangerous and instead of solving problems we make them even more difficult. I think that even though unfortunately Chinese forces still sit on parts of our territory, in Ladakh chiefly and in other parts, even so, India's case is now much better understood and will be understood in the world, and that is a good background for us to take whatever step we have to take.

I might mention one matter, relatively small but in a sense important. Some questions were asked—I forget whether in this House or the other—about the evacuation of Longju by the Chinese. Longju, as the House will remember, is in the N.E.F.A. area, about two or three miles from where our forces are present. Longju in fact is a little village, is the only part of N.E.F.A. territory which is occupied by the Chinese forces. And a report came that Longju had been vacated by the Chinese. Also a report came that probably this was done because of an epidemic. I have information from Tibet and this indicates that a rather bad epidemic is raging in many parts of Tibet. What exactly the nature of the epidemic is, I cannot say. But it is raging there, and probably it is the same that occurred in Longju. We have to take care, apart from political and other reasons, to prevent that epidemic coming down through the Himalayan passes to India, and we are taking steps to that end.

Thank you, Sir.

**SHRI SUDHIR GHOSE** (West Bengal): On a point of information, Sir. In fairness to myself, I may be permitted to clear up one wrong statement which has been attributed to me. Neither I nor anybody else in the

House said in connection with the Congolese crisis that our country should be neutral. Far from it. What I did say is recorded in the proceedings of the House and is as follows:—

“The world has high hopes in his capacity to throw oil on troubled waters, and he would be enhancing his effectiveness in this sort of dangerous international situation if he were to show more restraint and less excitement and if he were to say to the world in very precise terms what is it that he wants the U.N. to do to arrest the deterioration in that situation.”

whereas the Prime Minister. . .

**SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU:** And in that particular matter I was not thinking of him at all.

**SHRI M. H. SAMUEL** (Andhra Pradesh): I merely wanted to know if the Prime Minister is completely convinced that this issue is merely a claim by China for a piece of our territory or whether it has become a political issue also. I am asking this because, if we accept that this issue has now become political, it takes on a new complexion and so requires new steps and new remedies.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All the time new steps are being taken as new conditions arise.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA** (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, in the last week of November the President of the Indian Republic made a speech at the Indian Law Institute in which he asked the lawyers to study scientifically to what extent and in respect of which matters the powers and functions of the President of the Indian Union differed from those of the British Crown

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

And in that context, Sir, he also said:

“This is necessary in view of the fact that our conditions and prob-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

tems are not on par with the British, and it may not be desirable to treat ourselves as strictly bound by the interpretations which have been given expression to from time to time in England."

And then he said:

"I hope I have given an indication of the questions which I have in my mind and leave it to the Institute to define more precisely the scope of the investigation so that more or less precise answers may be formulated."

This speech of the President became the subject-matter of discussion at the press conference held by the Prime Minister, at which the Prime Minister sought to make out that it was a casual reference, that the President said what he had in mind, and he got the impression that he did not have any further things to say on the subject. I have before me the entire speech of the President, and the speech is very carefully worded, chosen expressions are there, and it cannot be said that it was a casual reference or an *ex tempore* speech. It is a deliberate, thoughtful, wise—in a particular way of course—speech given to a very august audience of lawyers. Now, Sir, whether one liked it or not, this gave rise to a serious controversy in the country as to who is supreme, the President or Parliament. It is a constitutional political debate which we are having since the speech had been made. Now, one would have expected that in the Presidential Address these controversies would have been set at rest by a clear and categorical statement that under the Indian Constitution and in its practice Parliament is supreme and that the President is always bound by the advice he receives from the Council of Ministers headed by the Prime Minister. We find no reference to it, and we have been a little disappointed. Are we—after ten years of the Constitution—to de-

bate in the country, in the lawyers' circles and in the courts as to who is supreme, Parliament or President, as to where power rests, in Parliament or in Rashtrapati Bhavan? I raised a constitutional question but no answer is given. Can you imagine such a question being raised in England? I had been a student of constitutional law and had studied it in England. I cannot imagine, in these modern times, the British Crown or the Monarch coming before an audience and publicly stating that the lawyers' society should now engage itself in studying as to who had powers in which matters, to what extent the Crown was bound by the advice of the Council of Ministers and to what extent the Sovereign was not so bound. If such a statement were to be made by any monarch in the twentieth century, it would give rise to very serious political controversies, and even commotion.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT): Is it open to this House to discuss any statement made by the President outside the House or any action taken by the President as such? I think the Constitution does not allow it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I shall explain it. I am not questioning the conduct of the President; I am dealing with an issue, and we are in fact discussing the President's Address; the House is discussing the President's Address. I have carefully chosen my words as not to bring in the conduct of the President. What would have happened in England? That is what I am saying now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, we are now discussing the President's Address to Parliament, not what he said elsewhere. So you please be relevant.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is very relevant. It is the country's situation. You can give me . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are debating that point, which you cannot do.



SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Sir. Then let us treat the point raised by the Home Minister as a point of order where also I have got submissions to make because, here again, the question of Parliament is involved. If we cannot discuss in Parliament, where can we discuss things? Are we to go to the lawyers' societies to discuss such matters? I am not discussing the conduct of the President. I am asking the Prime Minister: who is supreme in our Constitution? What is the interpretation of articles 74 and 75 of the Constitution? Do you require to amend our Constitution to make it absolutely . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with what the President said elsewhere, and you cannot discuss it here, nor can you pass any reflections. I would like you to refer to rule 200, sub-rule (v)—

“reflect upon the conduct of persons in high authority unless the discussion is based on a substantive motion drawn in proper terms.”

We are now concerned with what the President said to the Houses of Parliament. So please be relevant and do not bring in extraneous matter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:

“Shall not reflect upon the conduct of persons in high authority unless the discussion is based on a substantive motion” etc.

I am not discussing the conduct of anybody.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with the speech made by the President to the Indian Law Institute; we are concerned with the speech of the President which he delivered to the Houses of Parliament.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Anyway we are concerned not with the conduct of the President; we are concerned

with the privilege that has come to light following that speech.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with that now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are concerned with it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry; you are not concerned with it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How can you say we are not concerned?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is a discussion on the President's Address.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, President's Address, but at the same time we follow Britain and May's Parliamentary Practice.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I cannot agree with you, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are guided by May's Parliamentary Practice in such matters, and we are entitled to discuss relevant issues. Will you kindly listen to me? We are guided in such matters by May's Parliamentary Practice and the constitutional provisions. And when the Crown's Address is discussed in the House of Commons they say things, and I know it for a fact—I have heard it—that people can raise anything on earth. This is how it is said . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That has not been the convention in this House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It has been. Now I am coming . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry I cannot agree with you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If you think so, I shall not argue with you, but whether there has been this convention or not will you kindly refer to the Privileges Committee?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You know how to raise a question of privilege.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is the convention, Sir, I submit I understand it. If you do not allow me to speak, I do not know where my privilege stands, and the privilege of the House stands.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you can speak on the President's Address to Parliament and not on what he said elsewhere.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not referring to anything and everything he said elsewhere. I have made myself very very clear and I have said that I am not discussing the conduct of the President. When the President says good things, you can refer to them, and when the President says good, bad and indifferent things, you can refer to them but you cannot reflect on the conduct of the President or persons in high authority. I understand that, Sir. We can speak about things, and here I am not reflecting in any way. Anyway, leave that aspect of the matter because I understand your difficulty also and you will understand my difficulty and the difficulty of the Members of Parliament. The Government should make the position clear and if the Constitution has to be amended, it should be amended. After ten years we would not like a state of affairs where people, no matter who they are, high or low, discuss it. We are supreme. The supremacy of Parliament is an established constitutional reality and it has to be buttressed, to be put outside the pale of public controversy and debate. That is all that I want to say. A clear statement by the Prime Minister would have disabused us of all kinds of apprehensions that we may have. Sir, it is unfortunate that we are in the midst of this controversy even after ten years of the Constitution. The only thing that I would ask you is not to treat such

things lightly. Today the powerful Prime Minister may withstand the storm but lesser fries in his place may succumb to certain things and may find themselves helpless in a situation like this. History of all countries where parliamentary practices prevail would clearly remind the nation of the dangers inherent in an approach such as the one we have had in our country.

Now, Sir, let me come to the other aspect of the matter. First of all, about the Congo. The Prime Minister's sentiments have been well expressed. He expressed the sentiments of the nation also in this matter. But then we have to be clear in our mind as to how we set about this matter. Sir, I do not like the Prime Minister's defending sometimes Mr. Hammarskjöld. I am not saying that he should use my language. It is far from me to ask him to do so. We are differently situated in very many ways. But then it is not right. When President Sekou Toure of Guinea is asking the U.N. people to quit in strong protest against the conduct of the U.N. authorities in the Congo, it is not right for the Prime Minister to say something which looks as though he is trying to defend Mr. Hammarskjöld. I do not think it is any of our job. His job, my job is to condemn Mr. Hammarskjöld. I would like him to do so, but if he does not do so, he should not at least support him directly or indirectly. Here, Sir, the U.N. authority failed, and if the U.N. authority failed, it is because Mr. Hammarskjöld was guilty of omissions and commissions, countless ones. First of all he allowed the Mobutu troops to be installed, powers to be ushered, Mr. Lumumba and his colleagues to be arrested and whisked away into prison and thrown into dungeons, and when it came to defending Parliament, Members of Parliament taking action, they failed to take any actions; they pleaded inaction. That is how things went on. Therefore, it is to be clearly recognized as to who is responsible.

Then comes the question of recognition. The Gizenga Government at Stanleyville in our opinion should be recognized. Thus, I think, we can immediately contribute in improving the situation. A large number of countries according to our information and according to the latest reports have recognized the Gizenga Government. The U.A.R. and many African countries, many of them have recognized the Gizenga Government. I do not see as to why we should be standing on the sideline in this matter. The Gizenga Government is the government that continues the work of Mr. Lumumba and Mr. Gizenga as the Prime Minister today has stepped into his shoes there. He is entitled to recognition. Then, Sir, the Governments that have recognized the Gizenga administration are many. I would not name them. They are well-known. Yugoslavia, the U.A.R. have also recognized it, as you have seen, and I think the Government attaches importance to the recognition by them.

Then, Sir, the foreign troops, the Belgian troops, should be expelled from that country altogether. Many of them are there and, as you know, it is they who sometimes openly in military uniform and sometimes in civilian clothes, conspired against the independence of the Congolese people, instigated Col. Mobutu and Mr. Kasavubu in their hooliganism, gangsterism and violence. That is why I say this should be properly taken note of. These people should be arrested and punished. Today again from Elisabethville we saw three plane-loads of patriots being removed to Katanga to be butchered, for assassination. Can that not be stopped? Does not the United Nations have enough power to intervene in this matter and stop it? Why is it not being done? Are we to be mere onlookers when we, members of the United Nations, see patriots being dragged out of their homes, put into planes, taken to the slaughter-house, butchered before our eyes following Mr. Lumumba's death. These are my questions today. Today Mr. Lumumba

is no more, his colleagues are no more. But many a Lumumba will be reborn in the whole of Africa in order to avenge the dastardly murders committed by the colonialists. It is important.

The powers of the United Nations—the United States—are behind that, with Mr. Hammarskjöld as their watchman. Let there be no mistake about it. Mr. Hammarskjöld must be removed. As long as he is there, nothing can happen. Mr. Hammarskjöld, as the Secretary-General, has forfeited all his right to be there, and the only thing that we can do is to join with other countries in demanding his instantaneous and immediate removal from seat.

Now, Sir, let me come to the question of South Africa. I understand that a delegation from South Africa is visiting the capitals of the Commonwealth countries. The Prime Ministers' Conference will be held very soon in March. They demand—well, we have met them—that South Africa should be expelled from the Commonwealth. I think our Prime Minister is fully sympathetic to their cause—we know it—but action is needed. Therefore, in this case it is essential that this time the Prime Minister takes a very firm stand and presses for the expulsion of South Africa from the Commonwealth. It is important for inspiring those people who against overwhelming odds are fighting the policy of apartheid and racial white supremacy. It is important also for isolating the South African Government and the present State from the world public opinion. Therefore, I think this step should be taken. Expulsion of the South African Government from the Commonwealth is all that could be done at that level to begin with. Then, of course, this would be followed by economic and other measures. I think it is time that we act against the South African Government, and in this direction steps should be taken. I hope the Prime Minister or the Home Minister would make it clear as to where they stand in regard to this matter.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

The Algerian National Government should be recognized. It is good that their Prime Minister came and was received in Bombay. Many countries have recognized it. When we are in sympathy with them why can't we recognize them is something which I do not understand.

Then, Sir, about the question of Goa. Now Portugal is in trouble. Portuguese people are fighting. Internal troubles are there and the Government there is challenged within Portugal. As you know, the rebellion or the mutinee or the rebellion of the Santa Maria is an indication of how things are developing in Portugal and Lisbon itself. Here is the time for us to take decisive action. The Salazar regime is isolated considerably. It is isolated at home. It is isolated in Africa. It cannot act. Now, today when it is so isolated and exposed before the world, here is the opportunity for the Government of India to take decisive action for the liberation of Goa, Daman and Diu. Nagar Haveli and Dadra should, of course, be immediately integrated. The liberation of Goa is very important and steps should be taken for that. The opportune moment has come.

As far as Indo-Chinese relation is concerned, I do not want to say very much. All I can say is that with all our belief in negotiations—our considered view in this matter has been stated in a resolution passed by the National Council of our Party now in session. Yesterday the Resolution was published in full in almost all the papers and, therefore, I need not read out any portions of the resolution. I think, consistent with our policy, consistent with the broad objectives that we pursue in the world, whatever the difficulties, we have to explore the path of negotiations and we stress in that Resolution that after the publication of that, it is clear that a solution has to be sought on a political basis. Now all these things are clearly stated in our resolution and I

hope that hon. Members would kindly study the resolution carefully.

Let me come to the internal situation of the country again because I began with the internal problems. Here in Jabalpur we have had very violent, ugly, riots. I am not going to give the position openly. I have reports of the many things that are happening there but the only thing I would ask is this. How is it that the minorities there are not guaranteed their rights? How is it that protection is not extended to them by the authorities there? It is a bigger question. The blame may be on the minorities' side also but the fact is that one-sided riots have taken place, very severe riots, in recent times. Jabalpur, Saugor and other places became the scenes of riots and many people were killed. In this connection all I would say is that, according to my information, the local authorities there behaved in a very irresponsible manner and failed to discharge their responsibilities and I would not go into it except that I would demand a judicial enquiry in this matter and the enquiry should be extended to the conduct of the police officials and other officials in Jabalpur and in the vicinities where riots took place because the point that I make is that there were complaints. They did not take any step on the 3rd and 4th February. On the 7th February everyone complained. Some officers left Jabalpur when they knew that something was brewing, that the situation was likely to take a bad turn and even the military was at one time withdrawn. It is very difficult to understand as to why, when everybody knew, when rumours were spreading, uncontradicted by the Government—and the Government should have contradicted them—why the Government or the authorities remained complacent and did not act vigorously in order to prevent the riots. We have seen from the report that when the military came on the scene in a particular area, rioting stopped and no riot took place. At the same time in Jabalpur both Hindus

and Muslims are trying, and in some places they have succeeded in maintaining peace, and they are trying to restore peace but the officials and others do not take the co-operation of the public. It goes to the credit of both Hindus and Muslims in Jabalpur and the other members of the other communities, who are trying to repair the damage and restore peace. They had been doing it even during the riots. They should be given every encouragement and co-operation and their support should be enlisted by the Government.

About the Assam situation, we were told that a Central Minister would go. Where is he? Has he gone there? Rehabilitation is not progressing in Assam. The refugees are there in Assam itself. Why do you blame the refugees who have come to North Bengal? It is clear that no undue influence is coming in the way. It is because the steps are not being taken effectively with a view to creating some kind of assurance among the refugees that they can go back to their own places. We were told that a Central Minister would go. Where is he? Who has gone? How long has he stayed there or was it mere words here? It looks as though when the hon. Minister makes speeches, he wants to get away by making assurances which he knows at the time of making that they would not be fulfilled. I think the Government stands charged today for letting down Parliament in this matter in so far as they have not kept their promise. They have not kept their promise. Another promise that they have not kept is the one about enquiry. Why was not the enquiry—an over-all enquiry—held? That promise was made. Why do they shirk their responsibility in this matter?

As far as the West Bengal Government is concerned, so long as these refugees are there, the economic burden or financial responsibility

should be taken by the Central Government and the West Bengal Government should be given adequate cash to look after them to make good arrangements for their relief and rehabilitation if they remain in West Bengal. That is a moral obligation on the part of the Central Government. In the course of the enquiry very many things have come to light. Today we know that the Inspector General of Police sent many many reports to the Home Ministry. It is no longer a secret. Mr. Dutt said so. What have they done? What action have they taken against the Central Intelligence Bureau at Gauhati when their files were destroyed and not brought to the notice of the authorities who should have been shown them? There is a hush-hush policy and a conspiracy of silence is going on. Yet it was the task of the Central Intelligence Bureau there or subsidiary branch here, to keep the Government informed and demand action on the part of the Government and see that the process of law was brought into operation with a view to preventing what happened there.

Then let me come to another instance. Everybody wants that when a foreign dignitary comes to this country, he or she, as the case may be, should be given all due reception. We are not opposed to it. Whatever dignity is there should be respected but a terrific wastage is taking place in the matter of receptions to the British Queen. Lots of money are being spent for this. If this had been the first occasion when we were receiving the foreign monarch or dignitary, perhaps some of the expenditure would have been understood because for the first time we would have received them. Some dignitaries have come and gone. Such of the things necessary for extending some colourful receptions are there. Even so, why so much money is spent, I cannot understand. The Prime Minister said that some people

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

criticised that enough was not done and others criticised that a lot of money was being wasted. I would like to know who are the people who criticised the Prime Minister saying that not enough is being done. Why this story then? On the contrary, the criticism is published in the Press and otherwise that a lot of unnecessary wastage is taking place. It is not good. Then why was the British Monarch welcomed at a certain reception as the Head of the Commonwealth? For the life of me, I cannot understand it. The Prime Minister never welcomed the lady as the Head of the Commonwealth but why another dignitary, perhaps higher-up in the constitutional sense, welcomed her as the Head of the Commonwealth? Was he advised by the Prime Minister, I would like to know? Why this servility? I cannot understand why there is this attitude of cringing before them. Are we suffering from some inferiority complexes? We are a Republic. Our status is the same as that of any other country. The Head of our Republic is as great as any other Head and his status is the same as that of any other. We do not recognize any Head over us. How is it that at a formal reception some people received her in this particular manner—not as Madam but as the Head of the Commonwealth? It is contrary to policy and one has to explain it. Then, when the Royal Party went to Jaipur—you may send tigers if you like and I shall come to that later—why was the Ministry bypassed? We are a Republic. We have the Governments. It is the Chief Minister of Rajasthan, or the Governor of Rajasthan who should have been called upon to take charge of the matter. They were given a back seat and the Maharaja and Her Highness—another Maharani—flourished in the Royal glory. Is it right? That became an occasion of inviting all the Maharajas. I do not know if the tigers also met in the jungles to celebrate the occasion but certainly the Maharajas met.

2 P.M.

Then, Sir, about the tiger-shooting business, I do not say much, for it has become the subject matter of strong criticism, in Australia, in Canada and so on, and in the newspapers. Some people say that the tiger was taken in a cage from here as was done in the case of a Crown Prince of Germany. I do not know. There is much controversy and people in these countries look upon it as something that reminds one of the imperial days. Somebody said the magic lantern days of the Princes are gone. I think it was an Australian paper that wrote it. Many other papers have done so and many wellknown journalists are writing and asking, "Why all this"? There are many other things you could have done. If they wanted to shoot tigers, you could have said, this is a non-violent country and we do not like to kill tigers, or some such thing, and said that it was not nice to shoot tigers in this manner. We shall see about it later on. But now the whole thing has happened in a most distressing and disappointing manner. And the Ministers? Where were they? Whether they were hanging about near the *machhan* when the tiger was being shot, I do not know, but they were not prominent when the party took place in the Palace at Jaipur. Well, all this does not go well with our present position. It is against the republican spirit, against the democratic spirit, even when you receive a personality of that type in this manner. Therefore, I say we have shown wastefulness, servility and a tendency to hug the past and to ignore constitutional propriety, to please Maharajas and so on. We are opposed to all this sort of things.

Another point I would like to point out in this connection. You know, we have celebrated thirteen years of independence. But there are long-term political prisoners. This is a political question. In West Bengal there are thirty of them, in

Madras more than twelve, in Andhra Pradesh two. Many of them have spent ten to twelve years in prison, or even more. Now, political conditions have vastly changed since the time charges were framed against them or when they were tried. One would expect some kind of a gesture towards them. Recently Shri Kansari Halder who is a Member of the Lok Sabha has been sentenced to transportation on a charge which relates to the years 1947, 1948 and 1949. Sir, the former Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh did a good thing by releasing political prisoners before he left. Why these political prisoners are not released is a matter I do not know. This is an all-India political question. There are human considerations also. Why should not the Government take the initiative to get them released, by giving the proper advice? I have given notice of a Constitution (Amendment) Bill, to extend the President's powers so that he can exercise his prerogative and get them released. Sir, I submit that in view of the changed situation, it would be a good thing and it would be a welcome gesture, it would be the right thing for public life, if the Government were to release all these long-term political prisoners who have suffered for so many long years in silence of the prisons and one would expect them to be released after such a long period of incarceration. This is a matter to which the Government should give its thought.

Another thing that I would like to refer to on this question is about the State of Madras. Why this State is not called Tamilnad and why it should still be called Madras, I do not know. Every other State is called by its proper and right name. Therefore, Madras also should be called Tamilnad. It is a very legitimate demand made by the people of Tamilnad that their State should be renamed as Tamilnad and I think we can accept this demand by a mere change in the Schedule to the Constitution and I may inform you that by another Bill

I have given notice of, I want amendment of the Constitution so that Madras may be renamed as Tamilnad.

Sir, it is a good thing that political opportunism should come to an end. In Orissa the Ganatantra Parishad and the Congress Party formed the government and today I think that government has come to an end. Dr. Mahtab is resigning. The honeymoon period is over. I do not know in what mood the lovers are parting from each other. But between them they have made a mess of all these things and created an ugly climate in the political life of the country. When they want, they hug the Muslim League. When they want, they rush to the Akalis. When they want, they go to the Ganatantra Parishad. Like that they go on. And the result is fissiparous tendencies grow, because if the ruling party indulges in such a wholesale manner in political opportunism and if they throw away principles, then, of course, disintegration begins, firstly in some people's minds and then in public life. The solution is not found by appointing an integration committee of the A.I.C.C. If it were so simple as getting things done through an integration committee of the A.I.C.C. then we could have all integrated here and thus integrated India. That way it is no good. The behaviour, the policies and the attitude of the ruling party, these are of fundamental importance.

Sir, next about the economic situation, I do not want to say very much. I would only like to say that it is a highly complacent picture that the President has given us when he says that national income is rising. It is true that national income has risen to a very small extent. But here Mr. Naba Gopal Das, one of your I.C.S. officers who has recently retired has written in "The Commerce, Jubilee Number," of January, 1961:

"Whatever the cause, the stark fact remains that there has been no increase in the real *per capita* in-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

come even as a result of the massive expenditure which was undertaken during the Second Plan."

And this is more or less supported by an article published in the "Economic Review" brought out on the occasion of the Bhavnagar Congress where it is stated that there is no real improvement in the standard of living of the people.

"According to Dr. Rao's estimate, *per capita* income of India in 1931-32 was Rs. 65, at 1931-32 prices, a period of depression. Now in 1958-59, *per capita* income is estimated at Rs. 300 (approximately) in terms of 1948-49 prices. But prices in 1948-49 are on the average five or six times higher than the 1931-32 level. This shows where we stand compared to thirty years ago."

He has tried to make out that in terms of the real national income, the *per capita* income has remained static compared to 1931-32. In another article in an economic weekly, Dr. Rao points out how the *per capita* income is lower than what is estimated by the Government. In any case the increase is exceedingly slow. So it is not right to give a sort of self-adulatory picture. The growth in national income is exceedingly slow and unless this growth is stepped up, it would not be able to keep the existing population even at the existing standard of life. In order to cope with the population growth of 2 per cent per year, we require at least a 6 per cent. growth in the national income which is not the case now. The *per capita* national income's growth is only about 4 per cent. so far at the end of the Second Five Year Plan. So this is the position.

As for the distribution of the increased income, you do not require any committee to inquire into it. Everybody knows where it goes. You can find it out by looking round. The money is being grabbed by a very small section of rich people, the spe-

culators the profiteers, the industrialists, the monopolists and so on. The increase of about Rs. 1,700 crores which is mentioned today, has gone to a very small percentage of the people while the overwhelming section of the people get only a very small percentage of this income. This is a very dangerous phenomenon which needs to be carefully studied. Unemployment is growing and there is not much reference to it even. At the end of the Second Plan, we shall have more unemployed than at the start, and it is estimated that the Third Five Year Plan will start off with a backlog of seven million unemployed people and probably at the end of the Third Five Year Plan, there will be twice as many unemployed unaccounted for under this scheme. It is a serious state of affairs—a phenomenal growth of unemployment. It is something which should make the Government sit up, and we think it is this policy which has led to this kind of unemployment. Mr. Mahalanobis has pointed out in an address that in order to provide jobs for those people who come to the labour market every year—about 33 lakhs of people enter the labour market every year—we have to step up our economic activity by at least 40 per cent, whereas the growth of economic activity is less than 10 per cent. Here we are in the midst of a situation where the labour force is not harnessed to production and the gulf between the two, that is to say, on the one hand the millions of labouring people and on the other hand the means of production, whether land or others, is widening. The result is complete social imbalance and this kind of unemployment. Where is the policy of stemming up this process? I am not asking this to be abolished overnight but it should be stemmed, arrested and resisted. Today, even in the world's capitalist countries, the unemployment trend is rising and Government should show greater exertion with a view to arresting this process and create more employment opportunities. In this connection, land reforms in the interests of the peasantry is of vital import-



ance and also the creation of small-scale and medium industries because they are the institutions where you can create employment opportunities apart from giving jobs to those people who are idle in the countryside. Now, no such indication is there. Prices are rising and a 6 per cent. rise has been noted in the current period. Between November, 1959 and May, 1960, bank credit expanded by Rs. 200 crores or so and when the slack season came, there was not much contraction. As a result of this, the Finance Ministry has come to the conclusion that quite a good part of the money which led to the credit expansion in the banking sector has gone into speculative and non-essential purposes. I am quoting their words. What was the Reserve Bank doing? The Reserve Bank should have controlled it. The Reserve Bank failed and the Ministry of Finance admits it. It goes hand in hand with deficit financing. Credit or monetary expansion takes place not only in the public sector; it also leads to the expansion of bank credit. Now, the bank is playing this role and, therefore, nationalisation of the banks is an essential task before the Government and I think we cannot any more delay this matter. It is not an ideological question at all. Today, in the interests of the economy, for controlling financial operations, in order to curb the monopolistic and speculative operations, it is very very essential that we nationalise the banks and take the institution entirely in the public sector, subject to Parliamentary and governmental control. The powers of the Reserve Bank, whatever they are, are not at all adequate and it is admitted by the Reserve Bank authorities themselves from time to time and also by the Finance Minister.

Price rise is going on. When are we going to check this price rise? In the beginning of last year we were told. I think somewhere in the middle of last year, that the Chief Ministers would meet after the National Development Council meeting and

formulate a price policy. The National Development Council could not take the decision. Are we not entitled to know from the Government as to what had happened to that? Did the Chief Ministers meet? If they had met, what policy have they followed? We are entitled to know. It does seem from the newspapers that this decision was forgotten almost as soon as it was taken. The Chief Ministers met, exchanged pleasantries and courtesies and they came to many decisions but when they departed to their respective States, they forgot them at the all-India level. Here also, nothing has been done even when we are going to launch formally the Third Five Year Plan, to have a clear-cut policy to hold the price line in the interests of the consumers and the public and to curb the speculators and the monopolists. This is a serious state of affairs. Here again Government has miserably failed. As far as land is concerned, the Kerala Land Bill has been tampered with in the interests of the landlord; in Orissa land legislation has been brought again in the interests of the landlords and the Maharashtra Bill is the same thing. Who controls this policy? What is your accepted policy? Mr. S. K. Patil, our Minister, goes to Bombay and says that State trading is dead and buried. Who became the undertaker if it is dead? Well, I say, Mr. S. K. Patil became the undertaker of State trading. It was clearly bruised, assaulted and molested when Minister Jain was there, but when Mr. Patil came, he gave it the final kick. It was killed and he became the undertaker of State trading but how is it that the Prime Minister talks about State trading on the one hand and Mr. S. K. Patil on the other publicly announces in a gloating manner that it is dead and buried. Whom to believe the undertaker or the Prime Minister is the question that I put. You answer. We live in such state of uncertainties on all such matters. Since independence, we have spent Rs. 1500 crores for food

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

imports alone and there is no knowing when these imports and the consequential drain on our resources will stop, no knowing at all. At the same time, we find that even the State trading scheme is ceremonially buried. The President's Address contains eight pages but one would expect, when the President comes in a horse carriage in that manner, great things of the past and so on, the Address would be elegant, pleasant to the eyes just as the carriage is. It should be stout as the twelve horses that pull that carriage but nothing of the kind is there. Are we now to live under the Viceregal umbrella and look forward to things like that? We want some vigorous statement of policy, clear admission of mistakes and steps to rectify the mistakes. That is how we should handle such matters.

**SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE** (Bihar): The President's Address is not a thesis that everything should come in it.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Anyway, you know everything. When Mr. Lumumba was killed, news came and in every capital where mankind lives with goodwill, there were demonstration. It is but understandable that people would come out in the streets, and demonstrate; all over the world, in the capital cities and villages, men and women came out in protest against this crime against humanity. In our country too, I am proud to say, people came out in Hyderabad, Bombay, Calcutta and Delhi. Africans also came out, I can understand that, but I cannot understand why the Africans have been arrested in Calcutta. One should respect their emotions, I know that when Mahatma Gandhi was killed people came out in the streets of Calcutta and demonstrated, one should have understood that feeling. Today they are coming out. Five Africans were arrested. They are foreigners but should we have arrested them when they were going to

present their case and demonstrate before the Belgian establishment in Calcutta? It is not right. In Bombay the procession is beaten up by the police. It was a procession to demonstrate public anger, revulsion and indignation against this colossal and diabolic crime. In Hyderabad people have been assaulted for demonstrating by the police and they included even members of the legislature. They are not going to do anything which is not normal. Now I would request the Government to ask their State Governments to stop such things. This is not a small matter. Africa today is roused; the whole of mankind is roused; the conscience of the entire humanity has been stung today as never before and in that context of universal wrath and anger, if our young men, workers, peasants, intelligentsia and others, men and women, demonstrate in the streets we should be proud of it and we should facilitate their expression of public opinion against the murder that has taken place in the Congo. That is what we should do. But here I find the Government takes a rather narrow, rigid, bureaucratic attitude in this matter. Sir, I mention this thing, because it would not bring credit to our country. You see how Sekou Toure, President of Guinea, reacted, how Ghana reacted and how at the State levels we have reacted. We should not react in this manner. If we do not react otherwise, what will the people outside our country think of us in this world? Sir, I wanted to speak before the Prime Minister because some of the questions are such that they should be answered by him but I do agree that even the Home Minister can answer them but he should answer; he should not skip them.

The last question I want to put to him is about the victimisation of the Government employees. Still there are 600 to 700 people who remain under victimisation, dismissed, suspended. Why are they not being reinstated in their positions? That is the question I want to ask.

Then there is another thing. Today I read in the papers that "The Hindustan Standard" a daily paper of Delhi was closing down. What happens to the workers, the journalists and other employees? I would like to know that. I cannot understand why the L.I.C. should have recovered the loan from the "Ananda Bazar Patrika" Ltd. by getting them to sell this property instead of their house estates in Calcutta because here there is the question of employment. There are various types of properties mortgaged with the L.I.C. by them and I think the loan could have been easily recovered by compelling them to sell some of their properties, shall we say, in Chowringhee and other areas from which they make such an amount of money and where employment is not involved. Why was this done? It was because the occasion was taken by the Company, the "Ananda Bazar Patrika" Ltd, to sell this thing at a very high price, when they were running at a loss. Now, this should not have been allowed because it goes against the public policy. They should have been compelled not to take this course under the plea of clearing off the debts to the L.I.C. of selling this running newspaper and making so many people unemployed. So we would like to know from the Government what steps they are going to take to see that the interests of the journalists, pressmen and other employees are safe and secure. It is again a question of policy.

Sir, these are some of the points I had to make. Before I sit down, again I would like to mention that as far as the Congo is concerned, we must take vigorous action. We are not helpless today. The entire Arab world is with us; the socialist countries are with us and many people in the Western countries are demonstrating and expressing their support to the cause of Congolese independence. We must not allow the imperialist powers like the United States, NATO and so on to drown the independence of the Congo in the blood of

its people. We must bar their way. The United Nations has failed to discharge its responsibilities because of the role of Mr. Hammarskjöld and it is our task today of the peace-loving and freedom-loving nations, especially the Afro-Asian nations, to intervene in this matter in such a way that the Mobutu-Kasavubu-Tshombe gangs are dissolved, disbanded, called to account and made to pay for the crimes they have committed not only against the Congolese people but against the entire mankind. Where the United Nations has so despicably and miserably failed in the discharge of its responsibilities we should step in unitedly and collectively to see that these African people who are achieving their independence after centuries of enslavement, sorrow and suffering, are today not again manacled, tortured, mutilated and murdered in the manner in which they have murdered Lumumba. It is a matter of conscience for us. Our independence shall shine more if we take proper actions there. Our glory shall be even greater than it is today in the world if we recognize the Gizenga Government and extend every possible assistance to that Government in order to enable it to withstand the colossal conspiracy and the heinous crimes that are being perpetrated against the Congolese people and their independence before our eyes. Sir, freedom has no frontier. Freedom and liberty have no frontier that way. We today live in a world, function in a world, which is inseparable from the point of view of peace and freedom. Today when one sector is affected by the imperialists, by the hooligans and gangsters that these Mobutu gangs are, it is our task as the champions of independence and liberty to mobilize public opinion within the United Nations Organization and outside, call upon every nation worth the name, and see that right action at the right moment is taken. The Congolese can never be denied their independence but the question is, are we going to be the partisans of that freedom or are we going only to look on as the murderers and criminals under

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

the colour of the United Nations carry on their degradations, crimes, villainy and foul acts? That is the question today I feel here is a national issue. Yesterday you saw the demonstration in Delhi where Congressmen, Communists and the P.S.P. spoke from the same platform symbolising that great national unity that has come about over this matter. Today we want this national sentiment, this national unity, this universal anger to be translated into effective action which shall throw that Mobutu-Kasavubu-Tshombe gangs into the dustbin of history and shall clear the path for Congolese independence, so that when Prime Minister Lumumba—I say Prime Minister because he was the Prime Minister—is killed, the successor Government led by Mr. Gizenga could take its rightful place in the Congo itself and in the comity of nations. Our independence, our loyalty, our professions to the cause of independence of the Afro-Asian people are put to a moral test and I have not a doubt in my mind that if we advance in this matter, if we set about the task in the same spirit in which yesterday the three parties appeared on the platform in the Delhi *maidan*, we shall give a magnificent and worthy account of ourselves.

Finally, I pay my homage—and I am sure hon. Members will join with me—to the memory of Mr. Lumumba and his colleagues. I know it is the kind of martyrdom which creates many fighters. In his martyrdom what has perished is not Congolese independence; in his martyrdom has perished the last moral semblance of imperialism and I have no doubt in my mind that inspired by his great martyrdom and sacrifice more and more of those brave sons of the Congolese people and millions in Africa shall rise and strike deadly blows against imperialism so that once and for all it becomes a thing of the past, so that Belgium, the United States, NATO powers and all those who flourish on the suffering and misery of these people are

expelled from Asia and the African personality, as the Prime Minister puts it, comes to assert itself. This is all I have to say and I wish the President's Address was a little warmer in this respect, not that I say that he should speak in my particular way.

I am very grateful to you for the time that you have given—perhaps because the other speaker is not there. None the less, but for your grace I would not have got that time. The earlier thing that I said, I hope the Home Minister—forget the President—will answer as to where our parliamentary democracy stands. Is it supreme or is it subordinate? Is it subject to the fiat of the executive head or is it sovereign which can fully assert itself? Thank you.

SHRI R. S. DOOGAR (West Bengal): May I submit, Sir, that if the House agrees, we can have a break for an hour for lunch and reassemble at 3.30.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House will meet again at 3.30.

The House adjourned for lunch at half-past two of the clock.

The House then reassembled after lunch at half-past three of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

PROF. DR. RAGHU VIRAR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to speak in favour of the Motion for extending our thanks to the President for delivering his Address to us. The President's Address is a brilliant exposition or rather a statement of what had been achieved during the past few months and what is coming in the near future. Of all the things that the President has mentioned, the most important, in my view, is the report that has been laid on the Table of the House con-

cerning the Sino-Indian border. I have given all the attention that is due to this report. I have gone through the report from cover to cover and I find that the work has been done extremely well. Everybody has commended it. And may I suggest to the Government that the persons, not only those whose names appear on the title page, but also others who have contributed to it, should be adequately rewarded? Our Government is not as liberal in giving rewards and as strict in giving punishment, as perhaps it should be. One should start with rewards and I suggest that the persons who have been responsible for writing this report and who have quashed every Chinese point in great detail to the satisfaction of the legal mind, be properly rewarded.

Now, I come to some of deficiencies of the report. The report purports to be a historical review. The word 'traditional' has been extended to go back as far as the sixth century A.D. and it is contended by the writers of the report that from the sixth century A.D. up to our own times the frontiers, between China and India, have been as they are today. Now, this is going too far. I am a student of history and as one who is interested in Tibetan and Central Asian history, Turkestan and Tibet being the two countries which line our borders, I cannot subscribe to this view. History will not subscribe to this view. We should have said that for the last 150 years our frontiers have been these, but to go beyond that, it is going too far. From the view point of a lawyer, the case has been well argued. But there are many things which have been put wrongly. To mention one or two things only. To suggest as the report seems to suggest that Chinese and Indians have always been separated by the crests and watersheds, which have been carefully detailed in the report, is to suggest that the Chinese presence was there on these borders. Now, that is not correct. The Chinese were hundreds and hundreds of miles away. It would have been more correct to have used the word 'Tibet' and the word 'Turkestan' when going

back to the historical ages, and not the word 'China'. Using the word 'China' for the historical past gives an absolutely wrong view of the situation. Another thing which comes out is that Indians have not gone beyond these crests and watersheds. Now, that is also equally wrong. It is as wrong to suggest that the Chinese were on the other side of the crest as to suggest that the Indians never crossed these crests and watersheds. I shall just refer to a few things. Khotan and Yarkand which are on the other side of the watershed are as much Indian as Gilgit. That area was definitely permeated by the Indian presence and not by the Chinese presence. Words ending in 'kantha' or 'kent', for example, Tashkent, Samarkand, Yarkand, have been specially provided for by as great and ancient an authority as Panini himself. Panini provides for names of cities ending with the suffix 'kantha' which has have been changed to 'Qand' or 'Kent'. He gives the names of four cities out of which two still exist. One is Dakshikantha or Tashkent and the other is Ahvarakantha or Yarkand. May it also be known that Yarkand was as much a part of Indian culture or Indian atmosphere, as Gilgit or Bal-tistan, or even more. The river Yarkand has a beautiful name. For the benefit of those who are not students of history, I shall tell them that this name is Sita. The name of Oxus is 'Vakshu'. Now, the entire region was an Indian region. Hundreds and hundreds of Sanskrit sales receipts have been found in the Sandy ruins of cities in Central Asia. Now I go further and take such names as "Demchok", "Rudok" and other names in Tibet. The Chinese at one stage came forward and said that these names on the Indian border were Tibetan names, and, therefore, they were Chinese territory. Our team has not made any special study of the problem, but I have, and I may tell for the benefit of the House, again, that in this region the Tibetans and the Turks, who bound our crests, have been in the habit of translating Indian names. 'Demchok' is a translation of the Sanskrit word

[Prof. Dr. Raghu Vira.] 'Shamvara'. The word 'Niti' pass is the Sanskrit word 'Krauncha'. The entire Mansarovar region is on the other side of the crest and is known as 'Krauncha-dvipa.' We go further eastwards. There is the big lake known as 'Tengri-nor'. This is a Mongolian name, which came into being only in the 16th century. It is 'Devasarovar'. We go still further east and we come to the name Brahmaputra. Tibetans call it 'Tsangpo'. Unfortunately, there is a mistake. 'Tsangpo' is simply Brahma. 'Bu' meaning "putra" in the course of history has changed to 'Po'. And then I go a little further, still further east. There is a mountain which is known as 'Kangri-karpo' in Tibetan. Its Sanskrit name is "Shvetagiri". We are all well acquainted with Dhaulagiri in Nepal. So, this entire region was permeated by Indian presence. I shall not go into the political problem, but I must repeat it with all the strength that I can command on the facts of history that the Indians were never confined within the crests and watersheds that form our boundary today.

Now, Sir, I come to the second point. This report is a legal document. As a legal document, it is a splendid document. In any other country this legal document would not have been cared for. But in our country a legal document has a vast value for the one reason that our leadership is greatly drawn from the legal profession. We all know how many of us in this country, who have fought for the freedom of India, belong to the legal profession. Our Prime Minister himself, though he has not practised law very much is still a lawyer. He has had the training of a lawyer. So, this document has been written from the point of view of law, which is a splendid document. But then this very fact that many of us are drawn from the particular legal profession, puts certain limitations on us and those limitations are that we stop after producing something which is legally commendable, which is legally defensible or irrefutable. In

another country where the leadership is not drawn so heavily from the legal profession, the border problem is a military problem. It is not a legal problem. Now, that we have produced the volume, there is something that must be done beyond it. We have been informed often in this House that we have made protests. Protests are a useful thing. That should be done. As the Prime Minister himself said a day or two ago, protests are intended to be put on the record. Well, they are being put on the record. The Congress party some time ago passed a resolution for vacating the aggression, to do everything to have the aggression vacated. Now, what are the possible and practicable means for vacating the aggression? One of these means is the political means and political protests. Protesting is an art, and I may draw the attention of the House to the kind of protest which was entered into by Mr. Khrushchev. It was with such vigour that the whole world trembled. It was a protest which had effect. It is a protest which has continued its effect up till today. So, if we want to make protests, we should see that protests have an effect, and to have an effect the protests have to be made in a manner that all our friends stand by us and all our enemies are afraid that something will happen. Unless something happens, protests have no meaning.

Sir, the third point that I am anxious to make is that we cannot possibly regard China as our neighbour, because demographically China is not our neighbour. Our neighbours are Tibet and Turkestan. Now that they are under the heel of China, it is a different matter, but our neighbours are Tibetans and our neighbours are the Turks. Only they are now under the political control of the Chinese. This makes our situation a bit easier, because all the military roads that the Chinese have made up to the Indian border pass either through Turkestan or through Tibet, and in order to be able to put these roads on a secure military basis, in

order to make these roads reliable for use at the proper time, the Chinese have been forced to bring huge populations to guard these roads, which clearly means that the Chinese do not trust or have no confidence in the local populations, that is the Tibetans and the Turks, to come and stand their side.

Sir, there is another thing to which attention has to be drawn in the military way, and that is the food situation and all kinds of mental attitudes of the population which is now on our border. Only the Chinese armies are there. There are no Turks in that army, there are no Tibetans in that army. They are purely Chinese. They are Chinese mostly from the areas of Canton and Hangchow. Of course there are some from the north too, but mostly from the central areas, and the central area's climate is almost the same as the climate of Calcutta. These people are being ill fed. They were well fed in the beginning, but now the feeding is poor, the clothing is poor, and the medical care is poor. Their look-after is very very meagre. These poor people, these soldiers who are on the crests and on the passes in the Himalayas are anxious to go back, and they would be glad to go back. This is not the first time in the history of China that Chinese armies have gone away from the Tibetan plateau. These things have happened at least half a dozen times. In the history of China whenever the Chinese soldiery has occupied some big or small part of Tibet, after some time not being able to stand the cold and the other peculiar conditions of the high plateau, they had always to go back. The last such incident happened in 1911 when there was a revolution in Peking and the Manchu dynasty came to an end, and all the soldiery, more than two thousand men in the city of Lhasa, distributed their arms or sold them to the population and ran away. Some even came to India, and through Calcutta they took the sea route and went back to China.

This is the time when we should take stock of the situation. We are peaceful. Peace is nice, but then guarding peace is essential too. I have to point out again that according to some of the authorities who have been reporting events in the Soviet Union, there have been reports that during their discussions in Moscow at the last meeting the Chinese and the protagonists of Chinese pointed out—even the Albanians—that now China was a much stronger power, and a definite instance was given of the Chinese power by way of her having put her paws on the Indian territory and thereby frightened the whole of Asia. So, Sir, allowing China to continue is not allowing peace to continue. The peace of China in which she is forging the consolidation of her hold on the Indian soil is not congenial to the peace of Asia. It is adding to the power of China to do all that she wills, and that the Chinese will is not a will of peace, that is quite certain. The Chinese have started saying, and it is one of their most recent slogans, that the dragon never vomits, meaning thereby that whatever the Chinese have swallowed will not be given back, and they say that there is no counter to it. But I am happy to be able to find out in the Chinese Buddhist literature a passage which says that the dragon which is known as "Lu" in Chinese is afraid of only one thing, and that one thing is Indra's *vajra*. Indra's *vajra* can be commanded only by India. It can be commanded neither by Nepal nor by Pakistan nor by any other country of Southern Asia. So here is our clear duty, to stand by ourselves. I am not pleading for Tibet, I am not pleading for another country. I am pleading for the continuity of this nation. So, the question for us now is whether we shall wield this Indra's *vajra*.

Thank you, Sir.

THE MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AND MINORITY AFFAIRS (SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA): Sir, on the 16th February a question was put in this House by Shri Faridul Haq

[Shri Mehr Chand Khanna.]

Ansari regarding the rehabilitation of those migrants from Assam who are in camps in West Bengal. I answered that question fully and gave all the information that was required in the matter. During the course of the supplementaries two hon. Members—one was Dr. Kunzru and the other Shri Bhupesh Gupta—went into the general question of rehabilitation of the riot-affected Bengalis in Assam. I then stated that the question being only of a limited nature, all those supplementaries could not arise out of that. After that Shri Bhupesh Gupta gave notice of a "Half an hour Discussion", and he also tried to raise this very matter this morning. I, therefore, feel bound in my duty to say a few words in the matter and clear the misunderstanding that has been caused.

Sir, everybody has condemned the language riots in Assam, so I need not go into that aspect of the matter today. What we were concerned and we are concerned today is whether all those unfortunate persons who suffered on account of the language riots in Assam have been rehabilitated fully or partly or to what extent and what remains to be done. Sir, I will divide this question into two parts: Those who left Assam and came to West Bengal and were lodged in the camps in North Bengal, and those who stayed within Assam itself. As regards the first category, various figures have been given, some in Bengal and some in Assam, but about a month and a half ago a meeting was held in Calcutta at my initiative between the Rehabilitation Minister of West Bengal, the Finance Minister of Assam and myself where certain decisions were taken with a view to assessing the magnitude of the problem in Bengal itself and the measures to be adopted in regard to their rehabilitation in Assam. The decisions were unanimous, and the main decisions were that an immediate census of all those migrants who were lodged in camps in West Bengal by the West Bengal Government would be undertaken, and undertaken by the

officers of the West Bengal Government. We would have a form in which necessary information would be given by the migrant—how he came, when he came, what he was doing in Assam, what losses he had suffered, whether he was owner of property, whether he was a tenant, whether he was a shopkeeper, and so on. And that form before it was distributed to the migrants in the camps, was approved by all the three Ministers. We got those forms printed and every migrant was given four copies to fill up. The arrangement was that when these forms had been got filled up by the Government of West Bengal, they would be sent to my Ministry and immediately on their receipt, I would despatch them to Assam. We have got nearly six thousand forms from the migrants who are living in camps. So the total number of migrant families in camps in West Bengal, according to the forms supplied to me by the West Bengal Government, is about six thousand. Maybe the number of persons may be twenty-five thousand or twenty-six thousand, but the total number of families is six thousand. We got those forms between the 15th and the 18th of January from the Government of West Bengal. They were immediately despatched to Assam and we have started receiving those forms back. Now the names of all those persons who are considered to be *bona fide* migrants are there, and we have conveyed those names to the Government of West Bengal so that immediate arrangements are made for their being sent back to Assam. Now when they go, we will give them free railway passage, we will give them journey allowance and we will also give them some kind of ration money for a period of about a fortnight so that during the period they leave Bengal and reach Assam, they are not put to any avoidable hardship.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: How many have actually gone back?

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: I am just coming to that point. Bear with me for about five minutes.



I got those forms back from Assam on the 15th February. The arrangement was that immediately the forms were received by the 18th January. They would go to Assam to be verified by the district officers and that between the 15th and the 28th February these forms would start coming back. The first batch has come in. There is one category of people who are accepted as eligible, *bona fide* migrants. We are conveying their names to the Government of West Bengal today. A few hundreds have only come so far. The second category is of persons who received rehabilitation loans after these disturbances in Assam and instead of going back to their original places or their residences for rehabilitation, came away to Bengal and got themselves admitted into the camps. It was agreed among the three Ministers that those who have already received rehabilitation loans or assistance should immediately be asked to leave the camps and their names removed from the camp register. That is the second category of people. Then, as regards the category of people who are considered to be ineligible by the Government of Assam for such assistance, the matter would not rest there. Their case will be further examined by a joint team of officers of the Ministry of Rehabilitation, the Government of Assam and the Government of West Bengal, so that all those who are *bona fide* migrants can go back and that there is no difficulty in regard to them. When these names are sent to the Government of West Bengal, whether these people will leave the camps or not it is beyond me to say at the present moment. But due to the Bengal press and to some of the opposition leaders who to my misfortune have been visiting some of these camps in north Bengal there may be a tremendous amount of reluctance. But I have been told by the Rehabilitation Minister of West Bengal that they will try and do their level best to see that those who come from Assam who are eligible and for whose rehabilitation the Assam Government has taken full responsibility go back as soon as possible.

So this is one aspect of the matter which I wanted to place before the House.

The second aspect of the matter is about the rehabilitation of the riot victims in Assam itself. When this question was asked three days ago, we asked the Government of Assam to give us the latest information. We have only today received a telegram dated the 19th February. I would only read out extracts from it and they will give all the information. The telegram is as follows:—

“Affected families who were within Assam have returned to their homes. Also over 1725 families from West Bengal so far. 12940 families given rehabilitation benefits in the shape of gratuitous relief grant and loan, corrugated iron sheets blankets and clothes for children. Families who suffered due to arson are being given without security loans of rupees one thousand in the case of the agriculturists and rupees one thousand five hundred in the case of non-agriculturists in addition to gratuitous relief. Clear Government instructions issued to ensure that all agriculturists receive this loan in full before end of February positively. Government decision announced regarding assistance to rebuild destroyed educational, cultural and religious institutions.”

This is the uptodate position. It is very difficult for me to say whether every single family has been rehabilitated but I can only say this. I have had talks with the Chief Minister of Assam, I have had talks with the Finance Minister of Assam and their officers had also been to see me. And they assured me that they would see that every eligible family was rehabilitated. I can assure the House that everything possible is being done and

[Shri Mehr Chand Khanna.]

I shall try my level best and see that the matter is expedited.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Mr. Deputy Chairman, unlike most of the other speakers, I should like to begin the few remarks that I will make on the President's Address with matters that are nearer home than those which are far away from us and which concern other countries much more than they concern us. Sir, I am grateful to the Minister of Rehabilitation for giving us detailed information on the rehabilitation of refugees from Assam. What he has given us is welcome but I would like to have an assurance from him that things which happened last year in Faridabad are not going to be repeated. With all his kindness, the Minister of Rehabilitation has not been able to bring that spirit in the officers in his Ministry and, therefore, what happened in Faridabad happens again. I hope we will not have a repetition of such things in the rehabilitation of the people in Assam. Before we have dealt with what happened in Assam, something equally terrible has happened in Jabalpur. Where are we going? What way is this country going? I would most humbly request the Prime Minister to spare a little more time for what is happening at home, inside the country, even at the cost of his time and thought for what is happening in international affairs.

4 P.M.

Sir, next I shall come to two paragraphs in the President's Address. We are very happy to know from the President's Address that the Chambal river project and the Gandhisagar dam and the Kotah barrage are going on well, and that five units of 90,000 kilowatts are being commissioned at Bhakra. Sir, this is all very welcome news. But I would like to ask the Government what they are doing about the two unfinished schemes of Gujarat, that were started even before

the First Five Year Plan. Neither has the irrigation promised to the agriculturists reached them; nor even a beginning has been made in the matter of power generation. This year the last monsoon failed, and in spite of huge ditches and trenches dug up, the agriculturists were looking with hope that some water would come and save their crop. Unfortunately that was not the situation. The land has been thrown waste; it is made unsuitable for growing crops because of the operations of the irrigation Department, because of the huge canals dug at some places correctly, and at some places wrongly. No effort is being made to correct the wrongs and to make water available quickly to agriculturists: I think it is very wrong that the affairs of this department should go on like this at a time when the country has been suffering from acute shortage of foodgrains. Sir, it is very easy to import millions and millions of tons of foodgrains from America or from any other country. That, I submit, is not the solution to the food problem of this country that is taking us more and more into debts, which posterity will have to pay, for how many millions of tons of foodgrains, I cannot say. Our Food Minister had gone to America and made a big deal for foodgrains. He got applause, photographs, television etc. everywhere in America, and even in India. What is going to be the result? When those stocks arrive in India, the price of foodgrains will go down. At least an atmosphere will be created and the agriculturist will not be enthused to grow any foodgrains. Is that a happy situation, Sir?

The next point I would like to refer to is what the President has said about the oil refineries:

"New sources of oil have been discovered notably in Ankleshwar in Gujarat and in Sibsagar in Assam. It is expected that trial production will commence this year. Work on two refineries is proceeding, and a third refinery is also going to be established."

Sir, after the debate that we had on oil exploration in Gujarat in the last Session, the Minister of Oil, as promised, came to Ahmedabad where he summoned Members of the Legislature and prominent citizens, and the Chief Minister arranged a meeting. I received an invitation and I was also present. The Minister of Oil, he himself saw what the people of Gujarat felt in this matter. Since then I have tried to go a little deeper into the matter myself. The Minister himself admitted that two different types of oil had been discovered in Gujarat. One is Cambay oil, which also proves the existence of a very rich oil-field, and there is the good oil discovery at Ankleshwar. Cambay oil is heavy and thick; it contains a lot of wax. So there is practically no talk of having any pipeline. So the original talk of a pipeline from Cambay to Bombay had to be abandoned, because of the structure of the oil rather than for any other reason. But the oil that has been found at Ankleshwar, qualitatively speaking, is a very rich oil; it is rich in petrol, aviation spirit and kerosene, which this country needs very much. So the refineries in both the places will necessarily have to be of different types depending upon the needs of the two places. About the Ankleshwar refinery I have been told by the experts, experts whose advice the Government of India has taken in Assam, and I do not know why they do not take their advice when it is a question of Gujarat, namely, that the refinery at Ankleshwar will be something very much simpler, and to talk of a long pipeline would be a lot of waste of money. The cost of the pipeline would be much more than the simple type of refinery that will be required at Ankleshwar, to remove the few impurities of the oil and to give us, what we need very much in this country, kerosene, high speed diesel and furnace oil of which we are short. The two refineries at Bombay follow the catalytic process which produces too much of aviation spirit and petrol. So we are surplus in them; we have to export them, and we have to import crude oil from outside. Sir, here is a source which

will enable us to save this foreign exchange, and instead of going into this costly business of laying a pipeline when our pipeline plant is already full for five years with the pipeline work of Assam, when there is no possibility of manufacturing it in the next few years in this country, it would be waste of foreign exchange to import the pipes. Besides, it would be cheaper to establish a refinery at Ankleshwar on a very much simpler scale and a simpler process so that the much-needed kerosene oil, of which we are short, and the furnace oil would be available to us easily. There is, of course, an additional reason, Sir, Gujarat has no coal, but Gujarat has a lot of industries, and because of the way the Congress Ministers manage the two hydro-electric stations, no hydro-electric power is economically available to us. So in Gujarat power is available at  $2\frac{1}{2}$  annas per unit whereas power for the same type of industry is available at  $1\frac{1}{2}$  anna per unit in Bombay. This is an additional reason why both the refineries should be established in Gujarat. Refinery gas could be used to run generating stations, and when all this is coupled together, petroleum products, and particularly kerosene could be had, and the gas which is wasted could be utilised for generation of electric power. The current that would be received would be very much cheaper than what is being made available today. Besides, we are importing coal into Gujarat from a thousand miles away. Already there is acute shortage of good coal because of the steel plants having gone into commission. The difficulty of wagons is another thing. When there is such a shortage of coal, when our steel plants require more coal, the most practical thing would be to put up the two refineries there and get the industries of Gujarat switch over to the cheaper furnace oil. I hope, Sir, the Minister of Oil, who has been adamant against this, will revise his decision. I must tell him once again and remind him of what happened in Assam when he tried to lay a pipeline to take oil out of Assam. Sir, the people of Gujarat will resist

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel]

any move to take even one drop of oil outside Gujarat for refining. The oil must be refined there. Sir, it is not a question of the oil being the nation's property or not being the nation's property, or its being Gujarat's property or not being Gujarat's property. It is a national waste, and it is the need of Gujarat which is also the need of the nation. Because the Government is going wrong, the people of Gujarat must warn Government that if a certain Minister is going to take up this attitude, the whole of Gujarat will combine and resist any such move. I think the Chief Minister of Gujarat made the mind of Gujarat sufficiently clear to the Minister in his talks in front of the members of the Legislature publicly as also in his private talk.

Sir, I was very happy to hear this morning some of the remarks of our Prime Minister. We are very pleased with the work done by the team of Indian experts who prepared the case against China. Ours is really a good case. There is no doubt about it. Of course, our friend, Dr. Raghu Vira, has thrown new light because of his study of the subject and the Sanskrit language which only makes the argument stronger. Our case is strong, there is no doubt, but what are we doing? We say that our Army is good, our jawans are good. I quite agree, but what is our Government doing? The world is going to judge you by your actions. What have you done in Kashmir? What have you done about Goa and what are you going to do about China? That is how the world is going to judge you and not by simply repeating, "We are not going to tolerate any aggression". You can do it emphatically, you can bang your fist on your palm theatrically as long as you like but the world is going to judge you only by your actions. And, may I ask, Sir, what have you done? Sir, the world will also judge us by our Defence Minister, the same Defence Minister who kept the fact of the aggression a secret from Parliament and from the people for five long years. While the Chinese were infiltrating

into India on their own, at the invitation of the Government in the name of cultural delegations and what not—they were welcomed, garlanded, received everywhere by Municipal Corporations, by business bodies and a large number of cultural organisations that have grown all over India, even supported by State funds—are we sure that all of them came purely on the mission that they set, or were they coming here to find out how much prepared we were, what was our strength, and is it not because they saw through what we said and the difference between what we did and what we said that they had dared to advance further and further, that they had dared to revise their maps again and again? Now we are told that they want 2,000 sq. miles more than what it was last year. This is a very unhappy situation. The Prime Minister said this morning that if we are to meet this aggression we must be prepared. May I ask in all humility what is the Prime Minister doing to prepare the nation? Sir, across the border, in Pakistan, not only young men but we see films and pictures of young girls taking drill with muskets on their shoulders. Are we training sufficient young men? What is the use of saying, "We are not going to allow even a foot of our territory being taken"? Are we preparing for it? Are we preparing to resist aggression?

Then, while we are not preparing for that, there is growing internal weakness. There have been two warnings—the happenings in Assam and the happenings in Jabalpur. In this state of affairs we would be taken quite unawares by any enemy and it will be the failure of this Government if they do not take measures in time before any serious catastrophe overtakes us.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we have been discussing the Address for the last three days. My friend, Dr. Ray, has moved the Motion to express the gratitude of this House to the President. I stand here to support that Motion.

Sir, many points were raised in this discussion, and it is a matter of great satisfaction that this morning the Prime Minister intervened and answered all those questions that had been raised in the form of doubts or criticisms. After that, three speakers have spoken—Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, Prof. Raghu Vira and, just now, Mr. Dahyabhai V. Patel. First of all, I shall confine myself to the observations made by these three speakers and then place before this House some of my views on some points which have already been touched upon and some points which have not been touched upon.

Sir, I will start with my friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel. He has accused us and our leader saying that he should give more time to internal matters compared to external matters implying thereby that we give more than required attention and effort to external problems and less to our internal problems. Sir, this charge is refuted by the trend of the speeches made by speakers from all parties during these three days in which substantially and on broad outlines the policy of the Government, so far as the international affairs are concerned, and the policy of the Government, so far as the economic development of the country and other relevant matters are concerned, have been fully approved. My friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, forgets that in this world, which is getting closer and closer every day, we cannot afford to ignore international affairs. He has forgotten that when the Suez Canal was attacked, how much more we had to pay and to that extent our Five Year Plans got a set-back. Similarly, if the situation in the Congo gets worsened, if the United Nations fails there or if civil war takes an ugly shape, the big powers are bound to intervene and there is no doubt in the mind of any man who studies these currents that it will lead to a big war and a catastrophe to the whole world. In such circumstances, if we give some thought to these international affairs which are becoming

day by day acute and serious, is it something wrong? Is it not for the defence of the country? Is it not for the progress of the country? Is it not to keep the world at peace?

Similarly Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, in his usual ferment, spoke although his colleague, when he spoke the other day, supported fully the Government policy. I am glad to see that for the first time the Communist Party in this House has come to support India so far as the China-India border question is concerned. It is a healthy sign and I welcome it most heartily. Now Mr. Gupta wants us to take active action so far as the Congo is concerned. When we say things here, we should fully examine the responsibilities of the statements that we make. I would ask him what he means by active action. Does he mean that we should condemn the U.N.O., that we should condemn Mr. Hammarskjöld, that we should condemn everything and thus see that the whole thing actually transforms from cold war into a shooting war? In the world today there are two powerful blocs—one headed by Russia and the other by the U.S.A. They have different policies regarding the Congo affair. I am glad to say that the position and the policy of India have been fully vindicated when the new President of the U.S.A., Mr. Kennedy, has, in his recent statement, agreed with the policy of India that unless we controlled the unruly elements and unless we recalled the Parliament, there is no third alternative to the present position. It is not only the Congo, although we are deeply interested in the Congo because it is a country that has been under colonial domination for years together and it has come up now, and we do not want that it should go down by civil war and other difficulties or through the machinations of colonial powers, particularly Belgium. At the same time it would be wrong to say that such action should not be through the U.N.O. or through its support. Otherwise it will not be only the conditions of the African countries that are being liberated now that

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan,]  
will have a set-back but the position of the U.N.O. and world peace will also get a serious set-back. So we have to do our best to bring the two big powers who are looking at this problem in a slightly different way, together because that would reflect in the Security Council and the Security Council will reflect in the Congo. So I can assure my friend, Shri Gupta, that it would not be right to go beyond the limit to which we are going and we shall fight the cause of the newly liberated country for the sake of the principles which we hold dear and which we have pursued for years together.

Prof. Raghu Vira and some others before him also wanted similarly some drastic action so far as China is concerned. It is a very sad affair. As we all know—I need not go into the history of our relations with China—the message of the Buddha went to China and that brought both China and India still closer and nearer, but it pains me to see that on a matter, which I consider very unimportant from the point of view of the Chinese or, if I may be permitted to say so, even from the point of view of my country, there is some difference. It is not so crucial but what is crucial is that these two giant countries, these two great people who have lived in peace and friendship and which have a great message to carry not only to the people of Asia but to help in the maintenance of peace in the world by their friendship and unity, have fallen asunder. These were the countries that took up the Panchsheel. We were the countries that asked the world to accept the principle of co-existence in spite of different ideologies and it is a matter of great pain to me to see that now on such a matter which, in my opinion, is not anything fundamental either from the Chinese or our point of view, we should not agree. Here I join with the other friends who have paid tributes to our officers. They have really done a very good job and I do hope that having that material before them, having the world

situation before them, the persons in authority at Peking would reconsider the situation and see in calmer moments whether the lands that have been occupied illegally by them are really more fundamental or important for their country, for Asia and for the world or the friendship with India. I do not go to the extent suggested by some that diplomatic relation should be broken. I am against it. I do not go to the extent suggested that there should even be economic boycott. I do not approve of it. I share the optimism of the President in the Address that—of course with caution—we still hope that there will be some settlement between China and India and if my humble voice could reach outside my country, I would again appeal to them and say: 'Consider the position. The whole Parliament is unanimous. In fact there are people who want the Government to go ahead but the Government is restraining and keeping the whole thing in balance'. We do hope that some steps will be taken after reading these reports and the material accumulated and some move will be made by China so that negotiations may begin.

I would now refer to two things which have not been referred to. I refer to disarmament and to the question of the policy of apartheid of the Union of South Africa, which has been mentioned in the Address. I have no doubt that the Government will do its best to see that this question of disarmament is taken up and that every effort will be made when the Prime Minister goes to the United Kingdom to see that a Summit Conference between Russia and the U.S.A. as well as others is convened as early as possible.

Regarding the Union of South Africa, Sir, I feel it is high time that our Prime Minister, when he goes to the next Commonwealth Conference, should make it clear that this is not a political question, but that it is a humanitarian question. It is a question of justice and fairplay to human-beings and the policy there is one that has been

condemned continuously by the United Nations and the judgment of the International Court of Justice has also been given against the Union of South Africa regarding South West Africa. If after all that still the Union of South Africa defies these opinions, then the only honourable and right course for India would be to refuse to sit with the representative of the Union of South Africa in the next meeting that might be called—of the Commonwealth Conference. Let it be the last meeting where the Prime Minister sits with the representative of the Union of South Africa.

Regarding internal matters, I fully appreciate the contention of my hon. friend, Shri Channa Reddy, regarding regional backwardness and the special necessity for giving particular attention to those regions which are backward industrially. So I do hope that his observations regarding the new plant for electric articles and the project at Pochanpahar for irrigation will receive due consideration.

Next, Sir, I have to refer to another matter—an affair which pains me very much and about which I feel very much concerned. Sir, at Jabalpur things have happened and in Madhya Pradesh within the course of three years such things have happened twice. You will remember that when I was speaking on the Assam riots, I pleaded that the Assam government should resign constitutionally. A Government that cannot protect the lives and properties of innocent citizens does not justify itself to remain in power and, Sir, I repeat that in connection with Madhya Pradesh and I think it is high time that the Katju Government submits its resignation. I have nothing against Dr. Katju or his colleagues. But one thing is clear and that is that within the course of three years twice such disturbances have happened and his government and his machinery have not been able to control and check it. How painful

it is when our Prime Minister is fighting for fairplay and for justice to all people who are in distress in the world, that in our own country things like this should happen. I condemn the initial act that has led to this conflagration. But I condemn most severely the acts that have followed and that have cost the lives and property and honour of our citizens.

When I say this, I cannot but protest against the statement that President Ayub Khan had made on the 16th of February at Dacca. Sir, if we impartially examine the matter, we find that from the time of the partition of the country till this day, whenever irresponsible statements are made, which are uncalled for and unwarranted, difficulties have increased, the situation has deteriorated and things that were improving, they got a set-back. Sir, after the partition, who has saved the minorities especially the Muslim minority? Believe me, Sir, it was the martyrdom of Mahatma Gandhi that did it and it is the continued effort of Jawaharlal Nehru at the risk of his own life, that has saved the minority—the Muslim minority. These people, they gave statements there. How does it help? I can assure you, Sir, when this Jabalpur thing was going on, I did not come across any man in any party who was not sorry for the things that had happened there. In fact, the other day the Congress Working Committee also—I wish they had done it earlier—passed a resolution asking for a high powered and impartial enquiry committee. This morning the Prime Minister expressed his resentment and disapproval of what had happened. The bad legacy that was left by the communal parties and the communal activities we are trying, as I said, with the blessings of Mahatmaji and the efforts of Jawaharlal Nehru, to set right. And there are persons in government and out of government who feel that so far as the minorities are concerned, they can live only with the goodwill

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]

of the majority and they are trying to have the goodwill of the majority. So far as the majority is concerned, they are also feeling that justice should be done and that there should be fairplay and the minorities should be given their due constitutional rights. That feeling is also coming and we try to improve the situation. While we are doing that, such statements give false hope and create a wrong mentality in the minorities as if they are very sympathetic, although nothing comes out of it. At the same time it alienates the sympathy of the majority community. I am not saying this under any emotion or passion, but I do say let things of this place be managed and tackled by us. The greatest service that President Ayub Khan can do to help the minorities here is to look after the minorities who are under his care, in the best manner possible, and do justice to them, give them fairplay and give them political, economic and other rights. In that way, I think he can really help us, not by giving statements. I do hope that these will not have any effect on the people here and we all feel sure that the majority and the minority know their responsibilities and will do their best. We are very sorry for this. Let all possible rehabilitation and other measures be adopted to give relief to those who have been unwarrantedly and unjustifiably disturbed from their homes and from their occupations. With these words, Sir, I support the Motion.

SHRIMATI PUSHPALATA DAS (Assam): Mr. Deputy Chairman, everyone, maybe not everyone, but the majority of hon. Members who have spoken here have said that the President's Address has omitted many things, that it is not a catalogue of facts. But in the very first paragraph of the Address it has been stated that last year was a year of stress and strain. This signifies that the President has included all those events in the world abroad and also

internal disturbances. This time, Sir, I was not in a mood to speak, for I believe that talk is silver and silence is gold. But silence becomes cowardice when it is timid. The other day when my hon. friend Shri Biren Roy spoke, he gave me the inspiration to speak because in his own speech he contradicted himself.

Mention was made about our internal situation. We discuss both internal and external things and when we discuss the situation in the Congo, I discuss it as a citizen of the world; when we discuss our internal situation, I discuss it as an Indian. When I go to Assam and when people ask me as to from where I come, I say that I come from Darrang. There I behave as a Tezpurian because it is connected with the family, with the district. When world problems are discussed, I discuss them as a world citizen. If I remain backward, then world's progress is retarded. In this way, we will have to discuss the world situation in a calm and cool atmosphere. I liked some of the arguments put forward by Mr. Akbar Ali who spoke just now. I have the same approach with regard to the foreign policy of our country as well as the policy pursued in respect of internal affairs. I am not proud of what happened in Assam and the figures quoted a little while ago by Mr. Khanna, the Minister of Rehabilitation, show the correct picture. Let me tell you, Sir, that all the people in the refugee camps are not genuine refugees; there are some bogus refugees also there. I want to ask Mr. Roy as to whether he has gone and enquired into the camps as to how many families are there. I myself toured the affected area. If some criticism comes from some irresponsible Member of my party, I do not put much weight on it but when it comes from Dr. Kunzru, I take it very seriously. I enquired about it; I wrote to my State and I also enquired from Mr. Khanna. When I toured that area along with Mrs. Kr. palani, we ourselves were given some wrong figures which we believed in the beginning. After



enquiry, we found them to be wrong. Mr. Roy spoke and one friend told me, why don't you contradict? I agreed that I would speak. He used the word "massacre." He spoke *ex tempore* and perhaps he was not conscious of it; it came out without his knowledge perhaps. If 27 or 30 persons die, it is not a massacre but I say that if one heinous crime had been committed in my State, that is a crime to be condemned. Even if there is a crime, we are ashamed of it and as a person coming from that place, I also share the responsibility. Let it be *goondas* or anybody; perhaps we created that atmosphere and that is why it happened. Mr. Roy said in his speech that he wanted the oneness of India. I too want not only the oneness of India but of the world. I would quote one sentence from a great writer of Bengal which I like very much:

*"Ājker dinā bēg āchhey, ābēg nei."*

In today's world, there is quickness, rapidity, but no emotion. Yes, right emotion is lacking. I like emotional people, I like sentimental people, I also like poetic people but that emotion must be controlled and stopped at artistic point; otherwise it becomes vulgar. Today we have demonstrated our emotion. Today we are shouting and condemning the foreign policy of China, of Portugal, but if we behave as the Chinese have behaved, what is the difference? If we behave like the Portuguese Government or like the Belgian Government—what is the difference? What is the difference between the cultures of India and the cultures of the other countries? Even as a slave country we were respected but for what? We were a poor nation but with all that we were respected on account of the philosophy we had inherited from our ancestors. Today, our stand must be on that philosophy of non-violence—love. Who will kindle that light? I belong to a political party but I feel that for the emotional integration of the country, political parties would not be able to help. I think, Sir, great writers, philosophers, thinkers, intellectuals, will

have to solve this problem. In today's world, everyone respects Tagore, everyone respects Shakespeare; even in the Communist countries great scientists are respected. While I was in Poland, Dr. Grocha was invited to America because he was one of the greatest scientists. The Tagore Centenary celebrations are going on all over the country and the world irrespective of creed or colour; every community will observe it. I feel that the world's problems could be solved peacefully not by the political parties. This is my conviction. Today, we are criticising the reactionary elements in the Congolese people. After all, political parties consist of men, not gods. We are human beings with all our weaknesses and we are setting up a bad precedent for our future generations. Panchayati Raj is very good—decentralisation—and that is what Vinobaji wanted, every village must decide its own destiny. He also appealed at the time of the First Five Year Plan that some area must be given to those *Gaon Sabhas* where small industries could be started by them. In that way, every village can become self-sufficient in its own way. There was criticism at that time that it would mean dual government. Whatever it is, today every one of us wants regional development. Every Member, before he finishes his speech, says that there should be regional development. Oneness will come only when all the regions become self-sufficient in their own way. That is the only answer to this question. Feeling of oneness will be possible only when every region is developed. In the Third Five Year Plan, importance is to be attached to the development of small and medium industries and the development of under-developed regions. Even though we have the Chittaranjan Factory, the Sindri Factory and all these big projects, because the people have not seen them with their eyes, they ask, "What have you done for us?" Lots of things have been done but they do not feel it because they have not come to the stage of economic independence and a sense of frustration has crept into the middle classes

[Shrimati Pushpalata Das.]

especially. That is why, when a question was put to Vinobaji he said that he was not against machines if they could solve the unemployment problem. Let the villagers decide their own fate. I have seen some of the *grandam* villages as well as Community Project areas. I toured North Lakimpur district, the eastern part of Assam, and saw some such areas. There is not the least force used there. The moment force is applied, the whole beauty of it is gone. In one village, six families refused to join the *Gaon Sabha* and they were not forced. They remained independent but next year, when there was famine, because they were alone, they starved. Villagers helped them; the others had cultivated in a co-operative way. Then these six families themselves joined the *Gaon Sabha*. That is why I say that India's message of peace can be given only by the philosophers and thinkers not by people who are in power. There are exceptions, of course. India today is heard with respect because it is the land of the Buddha, Gandhiji and Nehruji. That is why we are listened to with respect. The other day a Member from my own party spoke—I forget his name—and said something about the Nagas. Only yesterday the ceremonies in connection with the inauguration of the interim set-up for the Naga Land were over.

In the course of his speech he asked what action has been taken by Government and why there is not an order to 'shoot to kill.' Sir, I think that is a wrong advice because I happen to know these Nagas a little. I myself toured with Phizo in 1946 in the Naga Hills area. He is a great orator but no doubt an ambitious man. He wanted that Assam should join with the Nagas and secede from the Indian Union. Why? Because he felt that India would neglect that eastern corner. I tried to persuade him. He was not very popular at that time in the Naga Hills but who made him popular? We made him popular;

our Government made him popular. He was pampered when he should not have been pampered and he was ignored when he should not have been ignored. Sir, I have faith in these Nagas. Most of our friends here may not know the history. In the last great world war seven Nagas kept the borders safe for seven days, when there was not a drop of water; when on the Manipur Road regiment after regiment was crushed, seven or eight Nagas of the Assam Rifles kept high the honour of India. That is called the Battle of the Tennis Court. When Mr. C. D. Deshmukh went to the Naga Hills he was thrilled to see this spot; he was surprised how from a tree top seven Nagas fought so valiantly against Japanese aggressors. When at last the military reached that place it was with great difficulty their lives could be saved. These are the kind of people. Their energies could be harnessed if they are tackled properly. Now that this interim body has been formed, let them be entrusted with the duty of quelling the disturbances there and I am sure they will be successful with the help of the Government. So it is not a right advice to say that there should be 'shoot to kill' order.

Sir, in today's papers we have seen the two resolutions of the Congress Working Committee about internal disturbances and about external affairs. I endorse that resolution about the external affairs, especially the last portion, where about the Congo it is said that it must be with peaceful advice and only in extreme cases force should be applied. I only wish and pray, let not that time come when we will have to apply force. About these internal disturbances the Congress Organisation is thinking seriously. There was a mention about Gandhiji by Mr. Akbar Ali Khan. Sir, who killed Gandhiji? Did Nathu Ram kill Gandhiji? No, Sir; all of us killed Gandhiji. We created an atmosphere of communal disharmony in which he was killed. Emotional integration could be brought about

only by understanding. That was possible when thinkers and writers created a suitable atmosphere. Let me tell you my own experience. In my young days I used to carry two books with me "Chayanika" by Tagore and "Agni Veena" by Nazr-ul-Islam. I liked those two books because I like the philosophy, the outlook of those two poets. In "Agni Veena" Nazr-ul-Islam says:

"Bala bir, bala unnata mama shir,  
Shir nehāri āmār natashir oi  
shikhar himādrir.  
Bala, vishwēr māhākash fāri,  
Chandra suryya graha tārā chhāri,  
Bhulok dyulok golak bhediā,  
Khodīr āshan ārash chhedīā,  
Uthiāchhi chira-vishmaya āmi  
vishwa-bidhātrir,  
Mama lalāte rājtikā jwale  
dwipta jayashrir."

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON (Kerala):  
Please translate it in English.

SHRIMATI PUSHPALATA DAS: It will take time. The theme is the greatness of India. He is describing the height of India's culture and how it will shine in the world. In Tagore's "Bharat Theerth" he wrote about the greatness of Indian culture:

"Hey more chitta punya tirthē  
jāgore dhīre,  
Ei Bhārater mahāmānaber  
sāgar-tire,  
Hethay dūrāe dubāhu bārāye  
nami naro-devatāre  
Udār chhānde paramānande  
bandad kari tāre."

Again he says—

"Keha nāhi jāne kār ābhāne,  
kata mānusher dhārā  
Durbār srote elo kothā hote,  
samudre hole hārā.  
Hethāy Aryya, hetha Anōyya.  
hethay Drāvide Chin,  
Saka-Hun-dal, Pāthān, Moghal,  
ek dehe holo līn."

That is our culture, Aryans, Dravidians, Sakas, Huns, Pathans, Moghuls—we have assimilated everything into one culture. Nazr-ul-Islam was a Muslim poet. He wrote about Shakti, Durga and Mahakali in beautiful verse:

"Mahākāler kole eshe  
Gouri holo Mahākālī,  
Smashān chitār bhasma mekhe  
nām holo mār ruper dālī,  
Tabu mayer rup ki hārāy,  
She je chharriye āchhe  
chandra tārāy,  
Mayer ruper ārati hoi  
chandra suryyo prapip jwālī."

Again he says—

"Anna diye trijagate annadā  
mor dārāy pāhe,  
Bhikshu Shiver anurāge  
bhikshā māge rājulālī."

This Muslim poet has written about Annapurna, Goddess Durga and Mahakali. How did Kali become Mahakali? Kali became Mahakali by her love of Mahadev Trinayan. She became a beggar because she loved that great beggar Mahadev. That Muslim poet writes about all these. Look at this fusion of culture, a Muslim poet writing about Shakti. Nazr-ul-Islam became a Muslim Leaguer afterwards. Why? Who is responsible for that? Aren't we? We created such an atmosphere that he had to become a Leaguer. So, Sir, we will have to search our hearts as to why these internal disturbances are going on. What right have we to advise the Congolese people if we fight between ourselves inside our own country for power? Sir, it is the power which is at the root of all evil. We have got towering personalities like Panditji and that is why our prestige is high abroad even though we are suffering from so many weaknesses. We feel proud when we talk of Asoka the Great. When was Asoka known as Asoka the Great? Not when he was following an expansionist policy. When he extended his territory all round, we never called him Asoka

[Shrimati Pushpalata Das.]

the Great. Asoka became great when he was conquered by love and affection. That is the psychology of the people. We can never conquer anyone by force. Nowhere in the world has it been possible. With love and affection you can win over. Ours is a message of peace and non-violence and our foreign policy is based on that. I do not mean by that that we must be cowards when an attack is made on us. The Chinese came but they had to go back from Longju. Negotiations are going on with them. We believe in that message of non-violence. Non-violence was preached not only by Gandhiji but by Buddha, Jesus Christ and all those great religious teachers. But non-violence was never applied in politics or economics. Gandhiji was the first to apply it in the field of politics, and economics and his great disciple Vinobaji is experimenting. Sir, men have experimented all over the world on how to kill humanity. Our research has gone to the moon, to the jupiter and to the venus but have we done any research on how to win over hearts? With the human heart we never did any experiment; there we have failed. We want peace. Who in this House will say that he does not want peace? Nobody even he who believes in violence will say that he does not want peace. But how can peace be showered on us if we do not deserve it? That atmosphere can be created—I strongly feel—by the great intellectuals. Today we are suffering not only from physical starvation but intellectual starvation, mental starvation and spiritual starvation. The only ray of hope I find is in men like Vinobaji. When I say Vinobaji I mean Vinobaji, not his followers. Similarly when I say Gandhiji I mean Gandhiji, not his followers because they have not been able to reach that stature but the ideal, the aim is there.

Sir, the whole world is looking at us. As an Indian, as a citizen of the world, I pray, for the hope that the

world has reposed in India. Let India rise to the occasion; with her message of peace let her stature be raised in the comity of nations; let her deliver and kindle the light of hope for peace and progress for all humanity; let her be the real inheritor of that great heritage which she has got from her ancestors.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR (Bihar):  
Mr. Deputy Chairman, I thank you for the courtesy. Our country is today confronted with so many catastrophes, difficulties, problems and so many subject matters which we have discussed here and which we will be discussing later on. In short, our country has been facing so many problems and so many circumstances today. Thanks are due to the President for his historical and illuminating Address. He has thrown light all round, on all the aspects of things which took place the year before and which are existing before us today and which we will have to face hereafter. The President's Address has received a historic reception not only in this House, but it has received a very splendid reception outside also. There is no doubt that things which have been discussed in the historical Address of the President are worth taking into very serious consideration and after passing the Motion of Thanks we will go out to act upon that. It cannot be denied that our country, in spite of our limited resources and so many situations—natural and unnatural—which have been created since ages past, has progressed by leaps and bounds in various aspects and various spheres of life. There is no doubt about it that the President has kindly thrown the correct light over the development of the country in the various spheres. It is more than correct and today it stands for us as a guiding and illuminating feature for our future improvement and future development. In view of the present developments, who can deny that our country, with its limited resources and with all the other limitations, has shown to the world that, whatever it may be—whether it is up to the mark, up to the standard

according to the estimation of the other progressive countries of the world or not—we poor Indians have got the intelligence, have got the capacity, have got the courage and have got the patience to develop our country? In a way, we are passing through various difficulties and various limitations. In spite of that our capacity and our courage has not been daunted. We have not been discouraged. We are going on with speed on the road of progress, on the road of development. The President has rightly pointed out the advance made in the field of agriculture, in the field of industry and various other fields and those things have been enumerated with facts and figures. The data has been given, and now those things are before us and before the world to be seen and to be examined. But that is not enough. I would say that our country has suffered so much for centuries past in the various fields of development and various spheres of life such as education, health, industry, agriculture, social and political aspects and so many other things. Of course, that requires greater attention, greater energy and greater effort to develop and develop to that extent till we have at least made up those deficiencies from which we have been suffering for ages past.

I expected in the President's Address at least one thing. The future development of the country, the future progress of the country cannot be in a greater and greater degree than what we have already achieved, unless we have one thing and that thing is our national and emotional integration. Without such integration we cannot do anything. Let me say with regard to what was just being referred to by my various friends in the form of various fissiparous tendencies and incidents in Assam and in other places, it is all due to lack of national integration. That much of national integration has not been developed as yet amongst us, that sort of national and emotional integration which will strengthen our hands, strengthen our spirit, strengthen our soul, strengthen

our national stand, so that we may correct ourselves if such circumstances befall us, as they are prevalent in Jabalpur and Assam. The fault lies with us. Also, the fault lies with our Government. The fault lies with our organisation, that we did not consider it so important. This question of national integration was not considered so serious as it deserved. I still say that all our efforts will become fruitless unless there is national integration. It will be bankruptcy of administration if we do not pay greater heed and attention to the immediate development of national integration in the country. The country is being integrated in all spheres, in all aspects of life, except this one thing which has got its root, where our social and political life has got its root. That root is not being seriously taken into consideration and that sort of national integration is not being developed. It was developed some time back, in the time of Bapuji. In the time of Mahatma Gandhi that national integration was started. Later on, it was disintegrated. We were expected to look after that, we were expected to carry on that development which was started during the time of Bapuji. You should put down all sorts of anti-national activities. You should put down all sorts of fissiparous tendencies and communal background in responsible places. You are to look after the lives and properties of the people and to make them responsible who are in the administration, in politics and in the organisation. And then you expect that national integration. Only then this sort of communal harmony will be achieved. As a Persian poet has said:—

दरमियाने काअरे दरिया तख्ते बंदम करदई ।  
बाज मी गोई के दामन तर मकुन होशियार बाश ॥

दरिया के अन्दर एक तख्ते के ऊपर बांध कर हमको आपने डाल दिया है और उसके बाद हमसे कहते हो कि दामन तुम्हारा भीगने न पावे, होशियार रहना ।

You have put us surrounded with all sorts of fissiparous tendencies, with all

[Shah Mohamad Umair.]

sorts of anti-national tendencies and then you expect that such anti-national and communal things will not happen in the country. It is bound to happen in a greater degree so long as we are not going to correct our own stand. Our stand should be that we have got our own 'Swaraj', our own independence. The English people are no more here to disturb our harmony. We are masters of our own fate and our own destiny. The first and last thing should have been that we should not have committed blunders in our selections in the different spheres of life relating to persons who are to be selected for positions of responsibility. Here it is not the case. One of my friends told me that the Muslim League was not what it was then at that time. I say that the Muslim League was not so strong at that time when the country was divided. Let me tell you that the Muslim League was not so vocal at that time when the division of the country took place as Pakistan and Hindustan. The Muslim League mentality in certain persons and in certain sections is strong today, and that staunchness for the League is being supported by us, is being encouraged by us. You are condemning your own men, you are condemning your national elements, you are not going to look after them at least to safeguard their political honour rather you are going to condemn the national elements, and you are going to encourage men of this sort of fissiparous, anti-national and communal tendencies, and you want that incidents like Jabalpur and Assam should not take place in the country. They are bound to take place. At present we are not doing justice to our own selves and to our own attitudes which we should have done after having achieved independence. However, I wish that this sort of reference should have been made somewhere in the President's Address. Anyway, the President is such a glorious and such a masterly figure in the country that he must have certainly entertained such feelings in his mind, and it is because

of this loftiness and this greatness that he is being admired throughout the country, he is being politically worshipped. I certainly expected a word in his Address that this sort of justice was required and safeguard against persons of this sort of anti-national and fissiparous tendencies was required. Certainly I wish that this would have been there.

Sir, I think it would not be out of place if I say that on China, Congo, Laos and other problems which have been referred to in the President's Address, sufficient light has been thrown by different speakers in this House, and the President himself has shown a splendid control on his expressions and words. The President has shown a wonderful control on his attitude and expressions, showing his own greatness there, showing how international problems can be tackled. He has shown the way to China, he has shown the way to the Congo, he has shown the way also to Laos, and he has also shown the way to us as to how we can manage things and how can we carry on under such circumstances.

Sir, with these words I am simply out just now to support the Motion of Thanks which has been so ably moved by my friend, Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray, and at the same time to express my sentiment that we have to exist as effectively as our history of the past six thousand years impresses upon the world. And now when we have got the same power and the same authority, when we have got the same opportunities in our own hands, at least it should be expected that a rule like the one of the Vedic period would be established which had its criterion in the performance of law, justice, help to the poor, giving guidance and light to nation where needed, and so on. These things are still possible, and in the circumstances in which we are living it is possible for us not to ignore our national background, our national characteristic, whatever that may be. Sir, it was thought by the

nationalist elements of this country that after the achievement of independence the old sufferings and the old hardships had gone and that they had now entered into a rosy regime. But this is what the great historical poet Jagannath Azad says:

अकल ने यह समझा था कि तूफान गये,  
जिन्दगी एक सकून पायेगी हैजान के बाद,  
लेकिन ऐ जौके नज़र ज़रा शौर से देख,  
कितने तूफान नमदार हैं तूफान के बाद ।

यह इस वक्त के नेशनलिस्ट एलिमेंट्स की जिन्दगी की मिसाल है। उन्होंने यह समझा था कि जूता खाने के बाद, तमाम ह्यूमिलिएशन के बाद, जिन्दगी एक सकून पाये, लेकिन हुआ इसके बरअक्स जैसा कि जगन्नाथ आज़ाद का कहना है कि कितने तूफान नमदार हैं तूफान के बाद। आज हमारे पास जवाहरलाल जी जैसा इंसान मौजूद है जिसको वंडर आफ दी वर्ल्ड कहना चाहिये। अगर जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी की तारीफ की जाय तो वन वर्ड में इतनी तारीफ हो सकती है :

There are seven wonders in the world. But he has added to that as the eighth wonder in the world.

आज दुनिया के आठवें वंडर के अपने घर में रहने के बाद क्या हम यह उम्मीद कर सकते हैं कि अपने इस घर के अन्दर, अपने इस मुल्क के अन्दर, अपने इस राष्ट्र के अन्दर, जिस की बागडोर जवाहरलाल जी के हाथ में है, किसी किस्म की कमी, किसी किस्म की कमजोरी बाकी रह जायगी ? हम को इसकी उम्मीद है कि जो कुछ कमी और जो कुछ कमजोरी बाकी है वह उनके हाथों मिट कर ओर दफा हो कर रहेगी ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Home Minister will reply tomorrow. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at seventeen minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 21st February, 1961.