

SHRI S. V. RAMASWAMY: True. It is an *ad hoc* arrangement. We wanted to start on a clean slate in the Third Five Year Plan, as has been suggested by the Financial Commissioner and as has been accepted by the Committee. On the whole, it is evident from the speeches in this House that the recommendations of the Committee have found favour generally. Here and there there have been expressions of the view of certain Members that the Committee may have been unduly lenient to the Railways. Pandit Kunzru, on the other hand, pointed out that the recommendations of the Committee place a considerable strain on railway finances. But he was himself the first to point out the basic circumstances underlying the recommendations. Government has a large development plan, as he said, on account of which it has to raise more and more resources, for which reason it would have to ask the Railways also to follow its general policy. This, indeed, is a fact which the Committee have recognised.

To sum up, I would recommend to the House that they accept the conclusions of the Committee, which has discharged ably its exceedingly difficult task. With these words I commend the recommendations of the Convention Committee for your approval.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this House approves the recommendations contained in the Report of the Parliamentary Committee appointed to review the rate of dividend which is at present payable by the Railway Undertaking to General Revenues as well as other ancillary matters in connection with the Railway Finance *vis-a-vis* the General Finance which was presented to Parliament on the 30th November, 1960."

The motion was adopted.

THE APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS) NO. 5, BILL 1960.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI SHAH NAWAZ KHAN): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1960-61, for the purposes of Railways, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, all the details have been explained fully in the Explanatory Memorandum which has been circulated to all hon. Members.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Where is the Explanatory Memorandum?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has been circulated.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): It was the other thing, but the Railway memorandum has not been circulated.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think it has been circulated.

SHRI SHAH NAWAZ KHAN: Sir, we have been lucky to have discovered very large deposits of very high grade coal in the Singrauli coalfield which is near Churk in Mirzapur district, and the Planning Commission has given top-most priority to the development of this coalfield. The Railways are keeping pace and they want to be well in time to be able to provide railway line to connect the coalfield to Pipri railway station which is on the line between Churk in Mirzapur District and Garhwa Road in Bihar. This very small amount of Rs. 61,000 is required for this purpose. It is for the period until the next Budget is introduced.

The question was proposed.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have no objection to the Rs. 60,000 which they seek to appropriate. This is in order to construct a railway branch line connecting the Pipri railway station to the Rihand Dam site. I want to know whether in the Budget Estimates of 1960-61 we framed this was not visualised. The Rihand Dam was a project of the Second Five Year Plan, so it was known and it was known also that a power-house would be constructed on the Rihand Dam site. The sanctions accorded to the proposal of the Rihand Dam site must have also assessed the needs of the power-house, and the fact that coal will have to be transported to the dam site for the thermal power station should have been known before. By the Memorandum that has been supplied to us one can guess that the Railways have been informed of this demand at a later stage, a stage after the Budget was passed. But the blame exactly for bringing forward the Supplementary Demand is not on the Railways. I feel that this Demand should have been included in the Budget, and it seems that there was lack of co-ordination between the planning authorities of the Rihand project, the Coal Development Corporation and the Railways.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Reddy, you can continue after lunch. The Prime Minister will make a statement.

STATEMENT RE. SITUATION IN THE CONGO

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): I am grateful to you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity of intervening. There was a Motion for Papers—I believe it is so called—from one of the hon. Members of the House opposite about the situation in the Congo. Just at the present moment the Security Council

is discussing this very matter at great length. Nevertheless, I should like to draw your attention to certain aspects of the situation. It is a very dangerous situation, and not only dangerous for the Congo but for the whole of Africa, and not only for the whole of Africa but for the future of the United Nations itself, because if the United Nations cannot deal with the situation and fails, then naturally its capacity to deal with any other situation or similar situation will also go.

Another fact should be remembered that recent developments there have been a matter of not only deep concern and anxiety but in a measure even of anger to many people in many countries in Asia and Africa. A number of countries have had their representatives thrown out, a number have withdrawn their contingents in the U.N. Force, and no one quite knows what other developments of this kind may take place later. There is a danger not only of the civil war which is practically taking place in a small way now, of the civil war spreading but of foreign intervention on a bigger scale, because, as things are in the world, if one major Power intervenes, its opposite number on the other side wants to intervene also and comes in to create some kind of balancing intervention.

“ So, Sir, the situation is a dangerous one. We have to consider it from this larger point of view. We have also to consider our own attitude and whether we should keep our personnel there or not. Now, we did not send any combat troops to the Congo. We have sent our Armed Forces there for specialised work like hospital work—we have sent a full-fledged field hospital with 400 beds—and for signalling, transport, communication work and the like. These people are not armed in the normal way. They may have some small arms, our officers, but, as I said, they are not fighting troops. Their number is