

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

given notice for raising a discussion on the Report on the suicide of Dr. Joseph. I think that that should be taken up and I hope that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs will kindly accommodate us. It is a vital subject, agitating public mind.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: There are many motions pending. I had promised one motion every week. We shall examine it if necessary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But what about that motion on the Report of the Pay Commission? The other House has been discussing it for four days. I think that we should be given ample time to discuss it. It should not be treated as a minor subject; it is a vast subject.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: I have got a little time. I have suggested 2½ hours. If the House will agree to it, I have no objection.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Today was non-official day. This was taken away by the Government unilaterally.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: I seek the indulgence of the hon. Member. There also I had suggested it and had announced that it was for 2½ hours. Under the rules, 2½ hours is the maximum time, but if the House is agreeable to extend the time, the House will do it and I do not stand in the way.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Generally, on Fridays we have non-official business. But in this session I find that this day has been suddenly taken away. I do not think that it is a very right practice. We can sit on Saturday, if you like. But the practice of keeping this as Private Members' Day in the interests of all Members for Resolutions, Motions, Bills and so on should not be curtailed in this manner.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): You will agree that this matter may be decided by

the Chairman. He will decide as to when the discussion will take place and for how long.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Sir. As far as parliamentary affairs are concerned, we can certainly ask the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to take it up with the Chairman and see that Government Business is so arranged that it does not encroach upon whatever little opportunity the Private Members have got.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): The hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has just stated that he will have no objection to the discussion and that if the House wants to have it for more than 2½ hours, he will not stand in the way.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He has said it, but about the Private Members' Day, we have to say this because my hon. friend is here, and my hon. friend, as you know, Sir, is always smiling and lovable, and in this matter he will accommodate us. The point that I am making is that the few Private Members' Days which we have got should not be taken away like this; Government Business should not be arranged like this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): These matters will receive the attention of the Chairman.

The House stands adjourned till 2-15 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at quarter past two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA) in the Chair.

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—continued

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, when we rose for lunch, I was referring to some of the

observations made by Raja Jaswant Singh of the Democratic Front. Well, Sir, this is not the first time that he has spoken in that tone; it has been more or less a practice with him to condemn our foreign policy on grounds which—if I may be permitted to say so—are extremely trifling and do not at all have any bearing on the present conditions of the world. Sir, I feel he belongs to a period when personal duels used to decide the fate of the country. He belongs to a martial race; I have nothing to fight with him. In my own way I have some regard for these martial people but it is not right on his part to say that simply because we could not declare war against Portugal, because we could not declare war against Pakistan and because we could not declare war against China our foreign policy has failed. I would like to tell my friend that these are not the days of duels, or of brave people like him fighting with a sword. Now the tactics of warfare have tremendously changed. There are the terrific weapons, the rockets, the atom bombs, and what not. Besides that, the world is closely knit together that any war between two big countries is bound to have its repercussions on the whole world political situation, and is likely to be turned into a world war. So I would like my friend to appreciate the changed conditions, and if he has really a genuine desire to appreciate them, I would very much recommend to him to go outside India—I hope my friends will convey this to him—not only to Asian and African countries but also to Europe and America, and see there what the stature of India is. And why is it so high? It is because of the policy that we have adopted, of non-alignment, and that is why, as I said, Sir, in their statements to the Members of Parliament here, which were made by Mr. Eisenhower, the great President of a great country, recently, and by Mr. Khrushchev, the great Prime Minister of a great country, yesterday, they have paid tributes to the policy of peace and non-alignment adopted by my country. Well, if he does not feel how highly India's

honour is rated, I think, it is our misfortune. Everyone, I am sure even the Communists, our friends, with whom we have to quarrel always, feel proud of our external policy. But to Raja Jaswant Singh it appears that we have not succeeded, because we did not capture Goa. He forgets that the bigger countries have got small places elsewhere regarding which they have their claims. Yet they do not go to war like that. So, Sir, I would not deal any more so far as observations of Shri Jaswant Singh relating to our foreign policy are concerned.

So far as the policy adopted by the Union of South Africa is concerned, I would say this that not only India but the whole world has condemned it, and it is time that they revise their policy of racial discrimination.

Now, coming to the home front, that is to say, the war that we have declared to eradicate poverty, disease, illiteracy and backwardness, it is this problem on which the President—if I may say so respectfully—has very correctly laid greater emphasis. And we have tried to do away with these things through our planning. I am sorry that the planning and the measures taken therein are considered by some parties as if we are going too fast. Without going into detail let me tell them that even this speed, in view of the tremendous problem that we have to face, is really not a sufficiently adequate speed compared to the speed of execution of the plan that we visualised before independence. Sir, I feel that if the name of Mahatma Gandhi will be ever remembered gratefully by the coming generation so far as the liberation of the country is concerned, I have no doubt, so far as the country's economic development is concerned, that the name of Mr. Nehru will be ever remembered gratefully. To me, more than our foreign policy, appeals his devotion to build up our economic position, to change our present condition which economically may be considered to be very low; that is the main thing that the country needs to-

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]

day and for which it is our duty to put in every possible effort in every possible and reasonable manner so that we may attain the object of giving a decent standard of living to our people, reducing the economic disparity between different classes, providing employment to all seeking employment, and above all seeing, so far as food prices are concerned—I entirely agree with my friends—that they are kept under control.

Now, Sir, I would just refer to two other things. The first thing that I want to refer to is our educational policy and here with a heavy heart I have to say that so far as the educational policy is concerned,—I have been repeating it for some years—it has failed and dismally failed quantitatively as well as qualitatively. Sir, according to the Constitution we are committed to have free and compulsory education within ten years. I think it will take us a long time before we can feel that we have made our people at least literate. Sir, whenever I raise this issue, the argument from the Education Ministry is that it is a States matter. Well, Sir, I would say that if it is a State matter what is then the necessity of an Education Ministry here? If they cannot pull up the State Ministers and achieve the object, I would be the first to say: Save us at least the expenditure and abolish the Education Ministry.

Similarly, so far as the quality is concerned you have seen it roundabout, as has been referred by my friend, Mr. Panikkar, the hon. Member opposite Mr. Ansari, namely that there is something seriously wrong with our education. Is it not the duty of the Central Education Ministry to look to this matter? I am glad that now there is a report by Mr. Sri Prakasa that some sort of moral and religious education should be introduced. While I commend the idea of humanitarian and moral education, I want to sound a note of

warning that it should not be such as will give rise to communal and sectarian bias; we will have to be very careful with that.

Similarly, so far as military education is concerned,—while I entirely disagree with the Ex-Finance Minister, Mr. C. D. Deshmukh and fully support Mr. Sapru, Diwan Chaman Lall and Mr. Panikkar regarding it and if I may say so, the very thoughtless suggestion that he has made publicly for the establishment of a judicial tribunal, I agree with him so far as his report regarding military education to our young generation is concerned. But again, Sir, so far as its implementation is concerned, it is necessary to look to the financial aspect as well as to the aspect of getting trained men to train our people. These aspects will have to be gone into very carefully.

Now, I am sorry, Sir, that there has been no reference to co-operative farming in the Address. I do not say that because it is a catch-word or because it has been passed through a resolution. I say so with reference to the agriculturists more than 80 per cent. of whom own less than two or three acres of land. How are you going to improve their condition, I want to ask my Swatantra friends. In these small fields they cannot utilise the modern methods or take advantage of other facilities. That is a matter which, I consider, needs very careful consideration and sympathetic treatment.

Sir, my opposition friends have made a little fun about Panchayat Raj in Andhra and Rajasthan. I do not know much about Rajasthan. But I can say that if there has been anything recently which we can feel proud of, it is that we have started building up democracy from the bottom. I do not say that it is perfect, but we have started on the right line. Let us all put our heads together to see that democracy reaches the very bottom and the very roots of our country.

Lastly, I should like to end with a note of warning. I cannot say much about the alliance of the Muslim League and Catholic Church with the Congress and other parties. (*Interruption.*) My Communist friends have also made these alliances before. So it does not lie in their mouths to say anything against such an alliance. But I can tell you that it is not at all a healthy sign. You may have adopted such a measure in Kerala because you have to adopt measures when you have to combat a very bad sort of malaria or typhoid. But let it be understood that it is not at all a desirable thing and let this tendency be checked so that this disease—which has not only done great damage to our country but in my humble opinion circumscribes and limits one's outlook and perspective and dwarfs the mental and moral stature of a man—is kept under full control. It is against all tenets of modern political life and basic principles of humanity. It harms the individual and the nation. With these observations I join with my friend, Mr. Kapoor, in expressing our deep gratitude to our respected President who has given us the lead by his comprehensive and inspiring Address.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the President's Address has made a reference to the Kerala election. Since he has done that I feel it my duty to bring certain facts before this House for guidance. I must also thank Mr. Akbar Ali Khan for his reference to the so-called unity in Kerala to fight the Communists. I know very well that none of the Congressmen—I mean real Congressmen; there are Congressmen and Congressmen; according to me real Congressmen—are very much enthusiastic or jubilant over their election victory in Kerala. The President said that in Kerala the constitutional machinery is going to be restored. Now the Congress leadership itself is feeling the consequence of this alliance. Today it is the 12th February and even after so many days of the polling they could not decide

as to who should head the Ministry and who should come into the Ministry. That is the difficult situation created out of this so-called alliance.

Sir, certain members of the Congress are very jubilant . . . (*Interruptions*)—friends who are laughing there—over the defeat of the Communists.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): He is laughing over the Kerala Congress.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: But they were not able to fight the Communists individually or singly. Therefore, they have sought alliance not with political parties alone but alliance with those forces against which our national movement has been fighting all these years, and those forces are the communal forces, most die-hard reactionary forces whom our Prime Minister had taken courage to fight and to criticize time and again saying that it was a dangerous force so far as nationalism was concerned. It is that force with which you have come into alliance to fight the Communists.

Now, were the elections in Kerala free and fair? You may say that they were fair but we would say, "no". Why? The election was conducted in one day all over the State. Did you provide necessary security to the people who wanted to vote according to their choice? No. I will name the constituencies one by one where most of the polling stations were captured by communal alliance forces. Only one policeman was posted in every polling station, not more than one. Police squads were allowed to roam about to find out if any untoward incidents were happening. Even that was not effective. The State Government had been informed by the respective parties of the names of particular places where necessary police protection should be given but nothing was done. From many constituencies many people pointed out that such and such places re-

[Shri N. C. Sekhar.]

quired protection by police. For instance, there was Niranjan where three constituencies figured. There is a man called Baby who was an employee in the Navy. He has a trained corps of 4,000 volunteers fully armed with daggers and knives and sticks. These people started reigning over these areas ever since the so-called liberation movement started. In Haripad, Changannur and Tiruvalla the agricultural labourers and the poor peasants were not allowed to exercise their votes in favour of the persons according to their choice. Even police protection was not given to them. On the 1st February the polling was started in Tiruvalla constituency with the murder of a labourer by name Kunju Kunju. The labourers were going to the polling station, when some Congress volunteers came and asked them not to go to the polling station as they would be voting for the Communists. They said 'It is our right to exercise our votes. So we must go.' Immediately they were attacked. One died on the spot instantaneously and 11 wounded people were removed to the hospital. Similarly another incident took place.

In Aranmula there is a place called Venmoni. There one Chathan, aged 65, was called by the Congress volunteers and told not to vote for the Communists. He being an agricultural labourer, who was oppressed all these years under the caste system, openly said 'If I am alive, I would vote for the Communists'. He was the first to appear before the Polling Station. He went and voted for the Communist. On the same night his house was attacked and he was stabbed to death. This is another instance.

On the second day there was victory celebration in Ettumanur. One Ayurved vaidyasala was attacked and one Damodaran was attacked and his head was pulverised with stones. It was done by alliance volunteers. Similarly one murder took place in Kayankulam. Two brothers were

attacked and one was stabbed to death. His eldest brother ran to the spot and wept over the dead body. Immediately a Circle Inspector by name Uman went to the spot and beat that weeping brother to unconsciousness. These were the things that were taking place even before and after the elections. In Kottarakarai, Pathanapuram, Pathanamthitta, Aranmula, Ramnani, Changanacheri, Changannur, Haripad, Thiruvalla, Alleppey and several other constituencies you go and make enquiries. You will come to know that the election was conducted not actually by the State Government officers but by the Congress alliance people. Most of the polling booths were captured by them. It is against these odds this that the Communists fought the election. The point I want to make is this, that even though you laud this victory, it is not a victory of the nationalist movement which you are supposed to be representing here. On the contrary it was a victory of the communal forces and the Church hierarchy. You have to consider whether this sort of alliance would keep up the tradition of Indian nationalism. You defeat the Communists, we are not worried. You can shoot us down. We are prepared to face even that but here the question is, we, with you, as Indian people, through the nationalist movement, have built up certain values, which you value and which every Indian nationalist values. Do you want to do away with that in alliance with the communal forces and Church? I am not referring to the Christian people but the Christian Church hierarchy headed by men whose loyalty is to those people residing in foreign lands. You are accusing us of being loyal to foreigners, which is not a truth. At the same time here are certain institutions, powerful institutions at that, with their loyalty to Rome or to some other place, influencing the people here in the name of religion and God, in the name of seeing the Congress victorious. So the main force that caused the victory is the communal force which is a great danger to Indian patriotism and the Indian nation.

Again, we are not against the Muslim people as such but against the interest which the Muslim League is representing. Is it representing nationalism, internationalism or is it representing anything else? Everybody knows it. Our Prime Minister himself has declared time and again that it is a dead horse which cannot be supported or resurrected into life but here it was resurrected and you are supporting it. You will reap the consequences one day. Here come, in the name of democracy of course, two forces which are facing each other in our land, as they are everywhere in the world. If you want you will defeat that force; instead of re-organising your own progressive forces to do that, you are aligning with certain other forces which are undesirable so far as our nation is concerned—for what? It is for defeating the Communists. You are going to reap the consequences not in the distant future. That is what we want to warn you of.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Is it a fact . . .

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: Please sit down. I am not going to yield. The Adviser and the Additional Chief Secretary are of course functioning under the Central Government. The Adviser said: "It is not true that the Government officers were taking sides. I have already instructed all the officers to be neutral." But on the other hand what are the actual things that took place? He suspended certain poor lower division clerks who were suspected to have been acting for the Communists. In fact it was not so. There were victimisations on the one side while, on the other side, openly certain officers of higher ranks as well as middle and lower ranks were canvassing for the Congress, the P.S.P. and the League and they went scot-free. If any complaints were filed before the police against any attempt on the life of anybody or maltreatment or attacks on people working for the Communist Party, they would never proceed against them. On the other hand they shut the Communist

workers into the lock-ups and maltreated them. This was how the State Government has been functioning. Further, the State Government was partial so far as the elections were concerned which created a situation in which the parties concerned could not enter the elections in a free manner because the situation created was such. It is against this situation that our party had fought the election there. Since the President has said that the constitutional machinery is going to be restored there, we say, let it be restored as soon as possible, without any procrastination. At the same time the Central Government must see that the law and order situation is brought to a normal condition. Before there were cries that there was no law and order functioning there properly. Let the Central Government get actual reports from the Central Investigation Department there. They will give them the report. In fact in the Kerala State law and order is not there now. Law and order has become a problem. Who rules the State now? It is the police together with the organised goondas particularly in the central pocket of the Kerala State, that is, south of Ernakulam and north of Trivandrum. The police together with the goonda organisation rule them. Another situation is created. What had the Central Ministers and Deputy Ministers done there? They swoop down there. They have every right to move about in any part of India but how they came there; in what capacity? They came there in their official capacities, came and immediately inaugurated certain official meetings, Panchayat meetings, etc. Why? It is to mobize the Government machinery and then they move about and the whole Government machinery is moving behind them. This was how they have mobilized the State machinery on behalf of certain particular political parties.

What sort of speech they made? There was the speech of the responsible Congress President, who was the

[Shri N. C. Sekhar.]

Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh. I am sorry to state here that it was the cheapest of speeches that any leader has ever made. What was that cheap speech? In a speech that he delivered at Trivandrum and I think at Quilon he said something to this effect: "You people of Kerala, if you want rice, we can give you that rice from Andhra, for Andhra Pradesh can provide any amount of rice. Any amount of rice we are prepared to supply you. But you have to do one thing. You must vote for the Congress." Otherwise no rice, I suppose. Is this political blackmail or is it political propaganda? Another Central Minister came, rather a Deputy Minister—Shri A. M. Thomas—who is a native of Ernakulam.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: On a point of order, Sir.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Why? Mr. Thomas is here.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Sir, my respectful submission to you, is that these are matters which could be properly discussed elsewhere. I do not say and I am not in a position to say "yes" or "no" to all these points. So will it not be better if my hon. friend raised these matters in the Kerala Assembly when it meets? Here, for instance, we do not know anything about these things. He says these are fabricated cases and another says they are not at all fabricated. So it is not proper for Parliament to take cognisance of such matters which really belong to local affairs.

DR. R. B. GOUR: There is no point of order.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am only drawing the Chair's attention to this point of order, that this part of my hon. friend's speech is irrelevant and this should not be discussed.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM (Andhra Pradesh): Yes, yes, everything we say is irrelevant.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): Mr. Akbar Ali Khan is right in saying that this is a matter which concerns the State Assembly. All the same, since this matter has been mentioned in the President's Address, Mr. Sekhar has a right to speaking on it. But it is for him to decide on what matters he should speak here and on which not.

SHRI V. C. KESAVA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): But the person concerned cannot give a reply here now. How can he criticise him in this House?

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: I would not have mentioned the names of these Ministers here had they come over to Kerala as Congress leaders. But they came there in the capacity of Central Ministers and after coming there they considered themselves as Congress leaders.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Bombay): Sir, on a point of order . . .

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: Sir, I am not yielding.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): But he is raising a point of order.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: Sir, the burden of the speech of my hon. friend seems to be that the elections in Kerala were not fair and free. But at the same time his party claims to have secured the largest number of votes. These are contradictory statements. If . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: I am sorry to point out, Sir, that my hon. friend over there is not raising any point of order, but is raising arguments.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: If there were corrupt practices, then the proper forum is the court and not Parliament.

DR. R. B. GOUR: We know that.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: There are the tribunals and the Election Commission.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You should go to the Election Commission and if you fail there, you can then go to court.

DR. R. B. GOUR: For that we do not need your advice.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: My point is the Central Ministers came to blackmail the people of Kerala. For instance, the Deputy Minister for Food and Agriculture, Mr. A. M. Thomas came and . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): Mr. Sekhar, please do not forget that you have limited time at your disposal.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: I will take only ten minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): No, you have already taken more.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: This Minister said: You want a shipbuilding yard in Kerala, then vote for the Congress. This he said to the people of Ernakulam. Otherwise the shipbuilding yard will go elsewhere. Sir, this is the sort of tactics that were adopted by responsible people, these Central Ministers who came to Kerala. Sir, these are certain instances to show that the elections conducted there were not fair and free. All the same we found in the elections that we got as many as one million and two and odd lakh votes more than what we got in the last election, and that shows that the people are behind the Communist Party. That is because the Communist Government of Kerala had taken certain popular measures which benefited the people, though not the landlords or those reactionaries of the Church there.

My final point is this. In order to bring about normalcy there and to improve the law and order situation there, the Central Government must take steps to form a Ministry there as soon as possible. The Government should improve the law and order situation there, and take steps for that not in a partial manner, not for the sake of a particular party, but in the interest of maintaining law and order as a whole. The State Government should also take immediate steps against certain criminals who had stabbed persons to death. So many such persons are roaming about who are not booked, these murderers. That is all I have to say now.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am in favour of the Motion of Thanks proposed for the President's Address. I have looked into the amendments tabled on this motion and I have not at all been convinced by any of them. I can say they are all based on minor criticisms. It appears that the opposition groups could not find out any important points to criticise the Government on, and therefore, they caught hold of very small matters.

As regards the policy towards the employees and the Central Pay Commission's recommendations, the intention of the opposition groups appears to be to instigate the employees for making impossible demands. The Central Government will be incurring an extra expenditure of about Rs. 31 crores in accepting the recommendations of the Pay Commission. Still our Critics here are criticising the Government for not doing anything, and that means encouraging the employees to take some kind of unpatriotic action. I would like to sound a note of warning on this point. There are limitations on the Government's treasury, particularly in a developing economy and at such a time for anyone to instigate the employees to make impossible demands is not a good thing.

[Shri Gopikrishna Vijaivargiya.]

Some hon. Members have made the criticism that the Address make no reference to the failures in Second Plan, the policy regarding the land reforms, agricultural production, industrial labour problems and so on. All I would say is that in such a short Address as the President has delivered detailed discussions cannot be had. Probably we may discuss the Second Plan and the Third Plan separately later on. However, the President has made more than sixty points and brief and suitable references have been made to all those points. He has dealt with all those points. And the Government's policy has been quite satisfactory looking to the economic circumstances through which we are passing. The President does not minimise the difficulties that are there. But difficulties are always inherent in a developing and advancing economy. The opposition should co-operate rather than create unnecessary difficulties.

As regards the problem of corruption, Sir, the setting up of a permanent tribunal would invite and encourage a permanent atmosphere of vague charges and rumours against everyone. Dr. Sapru yesterday . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: On a point of explanation, Sir. Nobody, either from our side or from the side of the P.S.P., wanted a permanent tribunal. I am sorry reference is being made to a permanent tribunal being our demand. We have only advocated the setting up of a tribunal to go into the specific cases referred to by Dr. Deshmukh.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVARGIYA: I am coming to that also.

Dr. Sapru yesterday said that we might improve our anti-corruption law and that we should take recourse to the ordinary courts and the High Courts to look into such cases. I was not mentioning about any particular demand of this or that party but there have been references to

permanent tribunals and I was only replying to such points. What is meant by a tribunal is also not very clear. Some Member said that Dr. Deshmukh's charges were being hushed up. I think he was not right. Dr. Deshmukh has not made any charges and when the Prime Minister wrote to him, he did not even forward to the Prime Minister the character of the charges. Therefore, no clear charges have been made and there has also been no hushing up by the Prime Minister himself. Besides, as Dr. Sapru has said, the setting up of such a tribunal would be against the democratic Constitution. We should have clear suggestions and then they might be considered. Ordinarily, recourse must be had to normal courts and the High Courts.

I would agree about the rise in prices. Prices are rising and they must be kept within limits. This is really a serious affair but in this affair also, to say that the Government is not giving attention to this matter is wrong. Government is aware of the problem and the controls, the food zones, State trading, ceiling etc., are all measures to check prices. The country and all the parties should co-operate with the Government in checking the rise in prices. Sir, there is a Farmers Forum going on these days and one of the demands of this Forum is that prices of agricultural produce must be increased. This rise in prices will destroy all our planning and our progress and the scales of pay, etc., of the employees. This is a serious affair and we must stop further rise in prices. Everybody has to make a sacrifice for the progress of the plan. In our country, there should not be concentration of wealth or income—that is mentioned in the Constitution also—so that some may become very rich and some may become very poor. We should have a kind of an egalitarian society where there are neither very rich people nor very poor people. There should be a society in which nobody may exploit anybody else and everybody may co-operate in raising the national

income of the country and the production of the country. There are measures such as ceiling on agricultural land, ceiling on industrial and trade incomes, etc. All these are necessary. At present, even the capitalist economies are agreed, the planners are agreed, that the prices should be checked and that they should not be allowed to rise.

Sufficient has been said about Chinese aggression in the President's Address which has rightly described this as a breach of faith. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta unnecessarily called this phrase as a hard one. I think this is a very proper one looking to the past relations we had with China. This phrase breach of faith shows our opinion and it is a fact also. Yesterday, another friend, Dr. Raghu Vira, gave an alarming picture of Chinese militaristic expansionist objectives. It is probable that most of these things may be correct but we cannot say that our President had not taken note of them. Our President has clearly said that we shall have to be vigilant and alert and should defend our country but at present, there is nothing wrong in having the method of correspondence or negotiation. Any laying of hard and inflexible condition is not good and the Prime Minister's attitude is adequately reasonable and honourable.

One word more about the policy of non-alignment. It is the best and in the interests of our own country. It has been discussed threadbare in both the Houses of Parliament and, therefore, needs no repetition by me. I think even the Opposition parties have nothing very objectionable against it. Therefore, I whole-heartedly support the Motion of Thanks to the President.

श्री कामता सिंह (बिहार) : माननीय उप सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर मेरे कई साथियों ने अपने अपने विचार

प्रकट किये हैं। खास कर मैंने देखा कि विचारों में बहुत कुछ संघर्ष है, विशेषकर कई ग्रहण सवालों पर।

सबसे पहली बात जो मैं यहां कहना चाहता हूं, श्रीमन्, वह है करप्शन को रोकने के लिये ट्राइब्यूनल बनाने की बात, जिसके बारे में श्री देशमुख ने अपनी राय दी है। उस पर काफी चर्चा रही। मैं समझता हूं कि जैसा हमारे कई साथियों ने कहा कि मिनिस्टर के ऊपर तलवार नहीं लटकनी चाहिये, उसे आजादी चाहिये, यह ठीक है। लेकिन मेरा विचार है कि यदि भ्रष्टाचार केवल नीचे के तबके तक रहे, तब तो कोई बात नहीं; उसका इलाज हो सकता है साधारण ढंग से और अगर वह भ्रष्टाचार ऊंचे तबके तक पहुंच जाये तो उसका क्या इलाज हो सकता है? उसका एकमात्र इलाज यही हो सकता है जैसा कि श्री देशमुख ने कहा है। तलवार जरूर लटकनी चाहिये उनके सिर के ऊपर तभी देश का कल्याण हो सकता है।

दूसरी बात मैंने देखी कि योजना के सम्बन्ध में बड़ा सुन्दर चित्र खींचा गया। यहां तक कि कामयाबी पर फख जाहिर किया गया। मैं ताज्जुब में पड़ गया। सबसे बड़ा खतरा मैं जो देश का समझता हूं यही है कि सच्चाई के ऊपर खूबमूरती से पर्दा डालना। मैं समझता हूं कि खतरे से देश को बचाने के लिये सच्चाई को मान लेना चाहिये और उमी को मानने में सचमुच आगे कोई नीति तैयार की जा सकती है, कदम भी उठाया जा सकता है जिससे देश की तरक्की हो सकती है।

जब योजना पर हम विचार करते हैं तो सबसे पहली बात जिस पर विचार करना चाहिये यह है कि कितनी रकम हम लगाते हैं योजना पर, और क्या हमारा लक्ष्य होता है। जो रकम हम लगाते हैं उसका कौन सा अंश

[श्री कामता सिंह]

काम में आता है और कौन सा बेकार होता है। श्रीमन्, आपको ताज्जुब होगा कि आज यह स्थिति हो गयी है कि "लीगेलाइज्ड ब्राडबरी" यह एक शब्द अमल में आ गया है। यहां तक कि इंजीनियरों को काट्रेक्टर्स की तरफ से एक फिक्स्ड परसेंटेज देना ही पड़ता है। इसका नतीजा यह हुआ मैं दावे के साथ कहता हूं . . .

डा० राज बहादुर गौड़ : पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० का नाम ही है प्लंडर विदाउट डिटेक्शन।

श्री कामता सिंह : मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूं कि चालीस से पचास प्रतिशत तक जो लागत हम योजना में लगाते हैं वह बेकार चला जाता है। इसलिये सब से पहली जरूरत प्लानिंग की लिये यह हो गयी है कि यह जो पचास प्रतिशत हमारी लागत बेकार जाती है उसको सही तरीके से काम में लावें। जब हम मानते हैं कि बेकारी की समस्या हमारी बढ़ रही है, यह भी मानते हैं साथ-साथ कि खाद्य की समस्या उसी तरह से उलझी हुई है और योजना में जो मुख्य लक्ष्य हैं उन तक हम नहीं पहुंचे तो उसके बाद भी यह कहना कि कामयाबी हुई है, यह अफसोस की बात है।

तीसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूं यह है कि चीन के सम्बन्ध में काफी बातें हुईं। ठीक है कि चीन ने विश्वासघात किया और चार हजार वर्गमील क्षेत्र को उसने नाजायज तरीके से कब्जे में कर लिया। लेकिन भारत को सरकार कब दोषी नहीं है? भारत सरकार को अपने देश की सीमा का ज्ञान और ध्यान न होना कि कहां हमारी सीमा है और कैसे हम उसकी रक्षा करें, इसी कारण से चीन को ऐसा करने का मौका मिला। अगर चीन के साथ शुरू में ही वह रवैया अख्तियार कर लिया गया होता जो अब किया है तो कब का मामला सुलझ गया होता। अब चार हजार वर्गमील जगह को लेने के बाद

भारत सरकार ने कड़ा रुख अख्तियार किया है लेकिन मामला बहुत उलझा हुआ है। मैं कहूंगा कि ऐसी परिस्थिति में भारत सरकार के सामने सब से पहली चीज यह हो गयी है कि देश की सीमा की रक्षा कैसे हो।

3 P.M.

जब देश की रक्षा का प्रश्न आता है तो नीति का प्रश्न गौण हो जाता है। उस स्थिति में देश की रक्षा का प्रश्न प्रथम श्रेणी में आ जाता है और उसके लिये जो उचित नीति होगी उसे ही अपनाना पड़ेगा। इन सब बातों को दृष्टि में रख कर भारत सरकार को अपनी नीति तय करनी चाहिये। अगर हमने इस तरह की नीति अपनाई तो तब ही हम देश की रक्षा कर सकेंगे और अपनी सीमाओं की रक्षा कर सकेंगे। मुझे बोलने के लिये केवल आठ मिनट मिले हैं, इसलिये मैं किसी भी बात पर विस्तार से नहीं कह सकता हूं। इसलिये मेरा भारत सरकार से यह कहना है कि जब देश की रक्षा का प्रश्न आता है तो नीति का प्रश्न गौण हो जाता है। इसी दृष्टिकोण को सामने रख कर भारत सरकार को अपनी नीति तय करनी चाहिये।

दूसरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है और जैसा कि मेरे मित्र श्री गंगा बाबू ने कहा, सही कहा कि बार्डर एरिया में विशेष प्रबन्ध होना चाहिए और उसके आसपास की जितनी एरिया है उसमें भी रक्षा का प्रबन्ध सुदृढ़ होना चाहिये। उन्होंने कहा कि अगर हमने इस तरह का प्रबन्ध किया तो वहां की जनता में किसी तरह की भी डिमोरलाइजेशन की भावना नहीं आयेगी और वे अपने आपको सुदृढ़ रख सकेंगे। यह बात बहुत जरूरी है जिसकी ओर सरकार को विशेष रूप से ध्यान देना चाहिये। अगर सीमा के लोगों में डिमोरलाइजेशन की भावना पैदा हो गई तो यह एक बहुत बुरी बात होगी।

अन्त में एक, जो सबसे महत्वपूर्ण बात है—जो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी भी कहते हैं—कि देश में एकता होनी चाहिये, कोआपरेशन

होना चाहिये । यह बात सही है लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि इस समय देश में एक तरह की बैचेनी फैल गई है । भारत सरकार और रक्षा मंत्रालय की ओर से देश की रक्षा के बारे में जो प्रबन्ध हो रहे हैं, उनके बारे में जनता में एक तरह का शुबहा पैदा हो गया है। देश की जनता के अन्दर विश्वास की भावना लाने के लिये यह जरूरी है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर रक्षा मंत्रालय को अपने हाथ में ले लें ।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में गांधी जी का नाम ले कर यह कहा कि जब आजादी की सरगर्मी थी तो गांधीजी के जीवन से, उनके नेतृत्व से हमें प्रेरणा मिलती थी । लेकिन मैं यह कहता हूँ कि गांधी जी ने आजादी के बाद जो सबसे अहम बात कही थी वह यह कही थी कि हमें अपना नैतिक स्तर उंचा करना चाहिये, तब ही देश का कल्याण हो सकता है । लेकिन अफ़सोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि उनके जाने के बाद हमारे देश में नैतिक स्तर दिन प्रति दिन नीचे ही गिरता चला जा रहा है और सरकार इस ओर कोई विशेष ध्यान नहीं दे रही है । जिस तरह से हमारा नैतिक स्तर नीचे गिरता चला जा रहा है अगर उसको नहीं रोका गया—नैतिक-स्तर को उंचा नहीं उठाया गया—तो मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि हमारे देश का कल्याण होने वाला नहीं है । मैं यह कह सकता हूँ कि जो देश संगीनों की नोक पर हुकूमत करता है और उसके सामने देश का नैतिक स्तर नीचे गिर जाता है तो उसको उठाना मुश्किल हो जाता है—पंचायती राज्‍य में तो ओर भी गैर मुमकिन बात है । इन शब्दों को कह कर मैं बैठ जाता हूँ ।

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL (Orissa):
Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have heard many hon. Members speaking in most applauding terms about the President's Address. I do feel that the President's Address this year is better than that of last year. Last year the Address was in fact dull and uninspiring but all the same I do not feel so happy with this year's Address as to applaud it

like other hon. Members who have done so. This year the Address strikes a note of optimism, so much so that it becomes complacency. I would like to say, if I am allowed, that it errs on the side of optimism. It is necessary that we should have some amount of optimism or else we shall lose the force to gather momentum for future progress but all the same we must not cross the limit. We have to be within limits. I find the Address at places faulty in its analysis. It does not speak about our failures and how to remedy them and my complaint is in that respect.

If you look at paragraph 2 of the Address, you will see that the President says:

"The needs and achievements in economic and social advance are understood by our people, in town and village, in increasing measure, as basic and vital to the improvement of their conditions and standards of living and as important to their daily lives."

In this sentence there is an implied accusation against the people that all along the people had failed to understand the intentions of the Government and they did not co-operate and that is why the progress has been halting and slow. But I would like to say that all this time the Government did not realise that their method of implementation was not democratic and it was a sort of imposition and people had failed to be interested in those schemes and in their implementation. It is true that there is some improvement in the attitude of the Government now and they are realising this but still the position is not satisfactory and I feel that they must realise in a better manner and proceed in a speedier manner so as to achieve satisfactory progress without any loss of time.

For this I feel that the supreme need of the moment is a clean and efficient administration. The President has not laid proper emphasis on this aspect and that is why I feel unhappy. He has of course realised

[Shri Harihar Patel.]

this. If you look at paragraph 58 of the Address you will see that the President says:

"Our vast resources and the qualities of our people have become engaged in the tremendous tasks of construction and progress that lie ahead of us. In these, the quality of our administration into which must be imported an ever-increasing sense of urgency, rationalisation of procedures, the emergence and development of greater confidence at all levels, and the avoidance of waste of manpower and time, must be an urgent consideration."

This is good but my complaint is that the emphasis should have been more and this supreme need of the moment should have been highlighted in a better manner.

Sir, I have not much time to touch on other points. I would only like to say a few words about another problem. Most of the hon. Members who have spoken about the division of the bilingual State of Bombay have welcomed the President's announcement that his Government propose to introduce a Bill for the reorganisation of the present Bombay State and to reconstitute it as two separate States. At this moment I would like to draw your attention to such problems in other States. One hon. Member, Mr. Misra, has already spoken about it, and that is the question of the restoration of Seraikella and Kharsawan to Orissa. The House must be knowing the Seraikella and Kharsawan were previously with Orissa and then some administrative inconvenience was posed as a difficulty and these two small areas were taken over to Bihar and at that time it was said that as soon as those difficulties were removed, those areas would be restored to Orissa. Now the difficulty which was pointed out then was the existence of Mayurbhanj as and independent State and therefore lack of contiguity between Orissa and

Seraikella and Kharsawan. After Mayurbhanj was integrated with Orissa that difficulty is no more there and the Government should have restored these two areas to Orissa but it has not been done.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: What is the percentage of people who speak Oriya? I know only 20 per cent. people are Oriyas in Seraikella and Kharsawan.

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL: We have already established our claim by constitutional methods. In the first election a candidate stood for election from that constituency of Seraikella and Kharsawan on this particular issue of restoration of these two areas to Orissa and he succeeded. In the second general election also it was announced as one of the demands that Seraikella and Kharsawan should be restored to Orissa. The election was contested on this demand and in the second general election also our candidate won. Now, on the question of constitutional methods, we have already ascertained the desire of the people to be integrated with Orissa. Not only that. In the State Assembly of Orissa also a unanimous resolution has been adopted demanding this. Even about thirty members of that Assembly resigned their seats expressing this demand. All the same Government have failed to take note of it. Now, I will refer to the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. The Commission, of course, did not recommend in clear words that these two States should be restored to Orissa. If you go through the Report, you will find that they have admitted that the percentage of Oriya-speaking people there is considerable and there is a good case.

[MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

In spite of all these material facts existing there, it is really regretful that Government have failed to take this into consideration. If the Government will take into consideration only

demonstration, violence and loud slogans, then the future of democracy is not very happy here. Constitutional methods and peaceful methods should also be recognized by the State, when we speak so much about the necessity for solving all our problems peacefully. Thank you.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Chairman, at the very outset, I will just for a moment draw your attention to the translation of the President's speech in what is called a language which is soon going to become the principal official language of the country. Now, Sir, on page 2 of the Address, this is how the English Address reads:—

"My Government, therefore, pursues a policy both of a peaceful approach, by negotiation under appropriate conditions, and of being determined and ready to defend our country."

Now, this is an important sentence in an important document dealing with the approach of the Government of India, as laid down, for solving the problem on our northern borders. But here is the Hindi translation. Of course, it is not the principal official language. Therefore, hon. Members did not bother about it, but nevertheless it is going to become the principal language. My friend, Professor Dinkar, must take care of his language a little more. This is the Hindi translation:—

"इसलिये मेरी सरकार, उचित शर्तों के साथ और उचित अवसर पर, शांतिपूर्ण बातचीत और इसके साथ ही दृढ़ता से देश की प्रतिरक्षा की तैयारी की नीति का अनुसरण कर रही है।"

Now, here I do not know how "under appropriate conditions" could be translated to read:

"उचित शर्तों के साथ और उचित अवसर पर"

This is going to be the official language of the country. My friend, Prof. Dinkar, will take a little care of it, I hope. However . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: However, that is a different matter.

DR. R. B. GOUR: However, I want him to take care a little. Otherwise, no serious document could be written in the principal official language of the country. Let us accept it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Please go on.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Then, Sir, I come to that particular portion of the Address and those particular series of amendments that we have moved which relate to the labour situation in the country. The Address deals with what is called the Code of Discipline in the industry. That has been evolved at the 16th Indian Labour Conference in Naini Tal in the year 1958. But the Address fails to take note of what the Address had mentioned last year. What happened to it? If hon. Members and the Government are keen to refer to it, they could see that last year's Address mentioned about workers' participation in management. We thought that the President's Address this year would refer to it. At least I had come prepared to note as to what the achievement in the field, which the President expressed in his earlier Address was. I should have thought that many industries might have come up in the country where workers were participating in management. It was said that fifty units would be taken up for workers' participation in management. Now, nothing has happened. In twentyfive units they say there is something of the nature of participation in the management, But each case differs widely from the other in the manner and scope of participation

[Dr. R. B. Gour.]

in the management. There is no uniformity. In fact, there are cases where workers' participation in management is absolutely nominal. There was the case of the Hindustan Machine Tools where the Union-Management Joint Council was there. The whole thing was according to the model agreement that was evolved by the Indian Labour Conference. But that is not functioning. Where the unions are demanding that such participation should be there, why is it that the Government are not accepting it. They are ignored even in the public sector? That has happened. In the railways, we have demanded a simple thing. Let there be joint councils at the various levels on the railways, with representations of the union and administration, so that so many problems of delay, etc. can be tackled at that level. That has not been done. That was accepted long ago. About two or three years ago the Railway Minister accepted it, but nothing has been done. We see that that there is a certain machinery in the case of the P. and T. Department. But they do not want to extend it and develop its scope in order to see that there is workers' participation in management. There are collieries in the public sector, Singareni collieries, for example, but in spite of the union demanding it, the Government will not have it. Shall we take it that you want participation not of workers, but of the particular unions which are of your choice, which you want? And if they do not exist in that particular industry or they do not command the necessary confidence in the labour, then you will not have workers' participation in management. Let us be very clear about that.

Then, Sir, he says in his Address that a lot of expenditure has to be incurred by the Government of India on the Second Pay Commission's recommendations, but he does not take note of the great unrest that has already been generated among the Central Government employees. Not

only that. Much more than that is the fact that major policy questions have been sabotaged by the Central Government in these matters. The Indian Labour Conference is a responsible tripartite body representing the Central Government, the State Governments, the labour organisations and the employers' organisations. The Indian Labour Conference, in the year 1956, in the very capital city of Delhi, gave a unanimous recommendation about certain minimum wage fixation policies and norms. Now, the Central Pay Commission asks the Government of India, the Finance Ministry. I am quoting from the Pay Commission's Report, page 63:—

"The Commission wish to know whether the Central Government now stand committed to the adoption during the current Five Year Plan, of a policy of need-based minimum wage, or pay, determined by the norms laid down by the Labour Conference; . . .

What is the Finance Ministry's reply? The Central Government is a party to this Conference, the Labour Minister is a party to the Indian Labour Conference. Here is another Ministry of the same Government which comes round and says:

" . . . The Government desire me to make it clear that the recommendations of the Labour Conference should not be regarded as decisions of Government and have not been formally ratified by the Central Government. They should be regarded as what they are . . ."

It means that the Central Government wants to reject the recommendations of the Indian Labour Conference, wants to brush aside, wants to play them down. With what courage can you ask private employers to accept those norms and give those minimum wages?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please speak slowly.

DR. R. B. GOUR: This is the position. Is the Finance Ministry here only to sabotage the recommendations and the decisions of the Labour Ministry, the approach of the Labour Ministry? I am not talking of any major policy question, which may be a matter of difference between we in the Opposition and you on the other side. Here is a decision which is in accordance with the approach adopted by the Labour Minister and here is the Finance Minister. The Finance Ministry generally comes in in the case of banking disputes. The bankers want a tribunal because they want long litigation. The bankers want a tribunal because they need not go with their secret documents. The Labour Ministry says a commission will be better, but the Finance Ministry is backing the bankers. Now, is the Finance Ministry's role only to sabotage the recommendation of the Labour Ministry, which they have evolved in consultation with the employers' and employees' organisations? That is a serious question. What does the Pay Commission say and why is there unrest among the Central Government employees? We know that long ago, Dr. Aykroyd, the nutrition expert, when working in Coonoor, suggested certain norms, 2700 calories. After freedom, now, the laboratory has been shifted to Hyderabad. Now, 2700 calories are not needed. Now, only 2200 calories will be needed. Before freedom an Indian employee needed 2700 calories. Now he requires only 2200 calories. That is the decision which we have been informed of. Sir, the Central Pay Commission has suggested, and Dr. Aykroyd has suggested cereals, milk and vegetables etc. in certain quantities. The Central Pay Commission wants every Central Government employee to take one ounce of groundnut every day. They say, they cannot afford to give so much as that is not available. Now, about the eggs they say that there are so many to be

given. Then about milk, they say how can they give so much milk to all the employees? We ask them whether they have tried this one ounce of groundnut, and there is so much of groundnut. So, this is the new norm that we have been given, economic norm. They say that one ounce of groundnut an employee should eat everyday. They say that the present salary is quite all right. What they have done is to give them a little extra, they have given it as gratis. When the actual fixation comes, after the provident fund and other deductions are made, the actual pay packet they will take home will be less than what they are getting now. That is the position. When that is the position, how can you think that the Central Government employees will accept for a moment what is mentioned in the Address of the President to the Joint Session of Parliament? What is it that they are demanding today? They are demanding that you convene a conference of the representatives of all the Central Government employees and take a decision. The Pay Commission has reduced the caloric value of the diet. The Pay Commission has reduced the wage fixation norm recommended by the Labour Conference. But what the Government has done goes even further, as if to add fuel to the fire. The Pay Commission has said that alternate Saturdays will be holidays, that 26 Saturdays in a year will be holidays. Government of India have said "No, one Saturday every month". That means only 12 Saturdays as holidays, and they have knocked out the other 14. And then the leave facilities have been knocked down. The result is that you are taking 13 months' work for 12 months wages.

In the total national output what is the contribution of the Central Government employees? You will be surprised that in whatever manner you compute the contribution of the Central Government employees to the national income, the rise in the total

[Dr. R. B. Gour.]

national income between 1948-49 and 1957-58 is less than 50 per cent., but the Government employees' contribution to it is more than 50 per cent. The Government employees have contributed to the national income. The Government employees have contributed to the developmental activities under your plans. When they demand more pay, you say "no". That is the position. They have not demanded the moon. They have demanded only a tripartite conference and have said "Let us discuss these problems and reach a settlement and then matters will be properly worked out".

The last point I would like to say before I conclude is that injustice is being done to the bank employees, all the commercial bank employees. They are demanding a Bank Employees Pay Commission. On the 13th February, I am told, the Labour Minister is going to meet the bankers. Let us give a warning to the bankers that they will have to accept the Pay Commission as the Labour Minister is advising. Let us tell them that the terms of reference will be binding on them, and there should be no monkey tricks about that. Let there be peace in the banking industry, let there be a peaceful solution of the question. The State Bank of India employees' charter of demands has been submitted. This public sector bank refuses arbitration. The employees have submitted a strike notice. What are we to do? Should we not persuade the State Bank to accept arbitration? Should not the Government of India intervene and bring about arbitration for the dispute in the State Bank? The Reserve Bank of India which claims to be the arbiter of justice in the entire banking system does not want its own employees to go in for arbitration. The Reserve Bank of India employees have submitted their charter of demands. This is the position. If the Reserve Bank of India and the State

Bank of India which are in the public sector do not accept arbitration, if they do not accept the settlement arrived at the 17th Indian Labour Conference held at Madras recently, then they will not have the moral authority to persuade the private employers to do the same. I take this opportunity again to ask the Government of India to see that by their authority, which they should wield in relation to these public sector industries and these undertakings like the State Bank of India and the Reserve Bank of India, these disputes that are there are solved properly through a direct settlement or through arbitration or through a Commission.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Chairman, I must begin with an apology to you and to the House for not having been present for the greater part of the time during this debate on the President's Address for three days. I wish to assure the House that no discourtesy was intended. I have lost by my absence, not the House, but as the House knows, we have now a distinguished visitor in Delhi and because of my preoccupations—I had to meet him, attend to him, and go to various functions—it made it impossible for me to come here frequently. I have tried to remedy that lapse partly by reading the notes prepared by my colleagues of the speeches and addresses and partly by reading the actual speeches, the record of the actual speeches, in the small hours of the night. Naturally that cannot take the place of attendance and listening. All I can say is that I am deeply sorry that I should have been put in this position by circumstances.

Now, Sir, in the course of this three days' debate many points have been referred to. Even as I came in just a few minutes back, an hon. Member opposite was speaking with some force about the Reserve Bank employees. Now, I do not wish to go into that

matter except to suggest for consideration that the Reserve Bank employees are the best paid in India. This fact might be remembered. It is sometimes thought that the profits of the Reserve Bank are like the profits of some private concern to be divided among the employees. The Reserve Bank money, obviously any bank money and more especially the Reserve Bank money, is the nation's money which it collects for various purposes. On the merits I wish to say nothing at the present moment except to express my regret at the way this matter is brought forward by some of the employees, the language they use, the letters they write, and I have seen some of them which are highly objectionable.

Now, Sir, again I do not wish to refer to a large number of small points, important as they might be in their different contexts. I propose to deal with two or three major points. Among the smaller points I was a little surprised to hear Mr. Dahyabhai Patel talk of the Government's lapses in regard to oil in Gujarat. That surprised me because that is one of the things in which the Government has not only not been negligent but has been paying every attention to it, and my colleague, the Minister in charge of Oil, is well known to be very enthusiastic and constantly to be trying to push this work. If difficulties have come, and they have come, they are not due to Government's fault but due to circumstances. The other day a very high official of the Russian Government dealing with this matter was telling me of the accidents they had had in their earlier days in the oil industry, tremendous accidents, loss of lives, bursts, etc. And these things happen, and to blame the Government for them does seem to me to imply a certain ignorance of how these things work. Of course, it is open to the opposition to blame the Government if there is no hail or shower or eclipse. More especially when valid

grounds for naming it are absent, they have to search for something to say, and in that something they usually go back to certain fixed complexes, antipathies and the like, and they come up every time regardless of context. One of those antipathies, as some hon. Members seem to possess, is in regard to the Defence Ministry and the Defence Minister. It is like King Charles's head. It comes up again and again regardless of any fact, circumstance, like or dislike. I am sorry I am not a physician to cure people of their allergies and their antipathies, but I should venture to suggest to the House that criticism in regard to these matters should really be directed to me who holds himself responsible for these matters. Undoubtedly, hon. Members are entitled to criticise. Whether that criticism is justified or not is another matter. But the responsibility is mine both for the members of my Cabinet as well as for the major lines of policy that we pursue, in particular in regard to foreign policy and defence policy. And so I would suggest to them certainly to criticise, but perhaps to try to do so forgetting a little their allergies and antipathies, because the line of their criticism, if I may say so with all respect to them, is wrong in regard to our Defence Ministry which, at the moment, at a rather crucial moment, not only in our period of history in India but particularly so in that of the Defence Ministry, has to deal with these burdens which have arisen today. That type of criticism can only lead obviously to much harm in the country and outside. That is obvious. Again, I do not say that criticisms should not be made; I am really pointing out that this type of criticism cannot be made lightly because it has repercussions outside the country; it weakens our apparatus with which we deal; it produces all kinds of confusions in the minds of those who are supposed to be outside the pale of normal politics—I mean the Army, etc. And so it should not be lightly made as Mr. Dayabhai Patel makes it or some-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

one else does. I am a little distressed at the way these matters are dealt with when we have to face severe trials, severe crises, and we say all the time that we have to do so with unity of purpose and unity of effort. Now, it may be that the Government does not represent that unity of purpose which is so desirable, and no doubt the Government may be criticised, may be blamed. But, nevertheless, I would venture to say that there are occasions, there are certain points which, unless there is an overbearing necessity for bringing them, one does not repeatedly refer to them without doing harm. So far as I am concerned, naturally, I am responsible for the members of my Cabinet. It was I who ventured to appoint them, and I have them in high regard; otherwise, I would not have them. I have them in high regard for their capacity and for their ability. And I should therefore like the criticism to be directed against me. It is not an easy matter to face these various problems and difficulties not only in regard to the question of our border or other internal problems or the Five Year Plans, but also so many other questions that are ever before us. But on the one hand, we talk about unity of effort and on the other, there is a hue and cry like the one I have mentioned or like the other hue and cry which hon. Members opposite referred to, about corruption in high ranks. And for once, the leaders of two parties opposite, the Communist Party and the Praja Socialist Party, found themselves in complete agreement in talking about corruption in Government. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta in the course of his speech apparently, from the record that I read, got rather confused, and he referred sometimes to the fact that some names had been mentioned to me and asked why I did not place them before the Cabinet and why I did not place them before Parliament; at another moment, he said that names had not been mentioned to me. It is really surprising, the light-hearted manner in which this kind of thing is done. I do not object to cri-

ticism, and I get plenty of it and my Government gets plenty of it. But I do think that there are certain standards which we should observe, and when we bring serious charges, well, if they are justified, they should be brought, but they should not be flung about in the air just to vitiate the atmosphere, create lack of faith, create confusion in people's minds and thereby, I believe, do injury to the national cause.

I shall take up this matter right at the beginning—this question of corruption. Now, either this House or this Parliament believes in the personal integrity of the members of the Government or the Government as a whole or my personal integrity or it does not. Proof apart, if it does not, naturally it has a right to say on and a right even to remove them from office. For my part, I do not wish to depend upon some odd vote or other. There are policies which I hold and which may be criticised. But if it becomes a question, at this time of my life and the life of many of my colleagues in Government, of their personal integrity being challenged, then it is a serious matter. It deserves, wherever necessary, the fullest enquiry. And I should have thought that even those who differ from us would at least do us the courtesy in the afternoon of our days not to make charges which they cannot themselves justify and not to repeat charges upon others. And I wish to assure this House that any specific charge made will be enquired into whoever it is, whether it is I who am concerned or anyone else is concerned, however high placed he may be, provided—I shall make that proviso—that I am going to have an enquiry only when it seems to me that there is some at least *prima facie* substance in the charge. I cannot go about making enquiries because any odd newspaper or individual makes charges. The other day I was reading a newspaper—not a widely circulated newspaper—in which I was amazed to see the fantastic charges against myself in regard to money matters. I

was just amazed. I was just amazed, but what has one to do with a little paper somewhere in a State—not in Delhi, somewhere? I cannot go to court because a paper with a circulation of three hundred or four hundred copies makes those charges, charges against my daughter again of want of integrity in finances. These things hurt but one faces them and one gets hardened in public life. But it is, if I may venture to say so with all humility, somewhat different, if responsible, respected Members of Parliament or of this House circulate such stories.

Now, about this particular matter of corruption, first of all it is obvious that all of us here are deeply interested in the eradication of corruption. It is obvious. In any Government, they have to be, and the whole of our background in the past has been such. I do not pretend to say that there is no corruption. Of course, there is corruption in various places, in various services. I cannot say that about everybody. But my point is that we are all deeply concerned about it and trying to the best of our ability to meet it. So far as the normal police processes are concerned, we have a special department dealing with this matter alone. We have the best men in it. That department has on the whole done rather well, I think; that is to say, it has pursued every case brought up before it—either they have dropped a case because there was no proof at all or, if there was adequate proof, they have gone ahead, started cases in law courts or initiated departmental action, whatever it may be. And I get a monthly report from it, and it is not a matter of small men being involved; fairly high-placed officers and others are involved too, and they have been punished. In court cases always there is this difficulty that the courts are not satisfied unless there is, what might be called, hundred per cent. evidence to prove a charge; our whole legal system is based on a charge being completely proved; nobody is considered guilty unless he is proved to be guilty. The only

exception to that is apparently in Parliament, where everybody is considered guilty unless he somehow proves his innocence, more especially the Ministers and the like. So we are all interested in this and this matter is being pursued and we are all the time concerned with now to expedite those processes because, if we go to a court of law, it takes years, and then the effect of the case goes; people forget about it. At the same time, as Mr. Sapru pointed out yesterday, we do not wish to upset, in this matter or any other, the basis of our legal system; it is a serious matter to do that. It may be and I for one shall gladly consider any way or having a summary procedure which does not take so long, provided it adheres to those basic principles for which we stand. One has to choose. There is this argument—as Mr. Sapru also pointed out yesterday about summary procedures—that it takes you perilously close to authoritarian Government, and I do not know if this is realised by those who suggest it, but it does take you perilously near that. It may have its advantages sometimes, but I take it that this House, in the balance, does not favour it. And now a kind of mentality is produced consciously or unconsciously or deliberately in favour of this kind of thing. We admit that everything feasible within the ambits of the basic principles and law should be done to eradicate corruption. I have no doubt that many Members may have good suggestions to make. Let us consider them; let us sit down and consider them. Something has been done, and I would venture to suggest with all humility but with some confidence that while there is a good deal of corruption round about in this country, nevertheless, it is infinitely less than what is talked about. After all, I am not denying that there is corruption, specially in the lower circles, but the impression that is being given, let us say, to a foreign observer who comes here and who talks with people or reads papers, or to those foreigners who do not come here but read about this constant talk, all this makes them

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

think that this country is a sea of corruption. I am amazed at this because this country—I do not wish to make invidious comparisons, but it is so—stands high up in the list in so far as the integrity of public work is concerned.

Now, coming to this particular matter, about a year ago, in May last year, or maybe June, I forget, there was a seminar organised by the Planning Committee of the All-India Congress Committee at Ootacamund, and a number of eminent people were present there, Congressmen and others. In discussing various matters various sub-committees were formed, and one such sub-committee discussed this question broadly, of standards in public life, corruption, etc., and it was pointed out by some members present there—stress was laid on summary procedures—that the thing must be quickly done and all of us felt, I myself felt it; it is an exasperating and frustrating experience to see years pass before a person I considered guilty of almost a heinous offence being let off or lightly dealt with. There was one case where I was so exasperated by a certain official's doings that I felt that he should be dealt with then and there, law or no law—I was so angry. Well, this is an old case, some years old. Now, the State Government dismissed him—what I considered very adequate of course. I should have thrown him out of my window if he had come to see me—I was so angry with him. After two or three years he went to a court of law and represented that he was wrongly dismissed, and three years afterwards, because of some flaw somewhere, he recovered all the arrears that were due to him for three or four years, and there he was. Now what is one to do with that? Now, it may be that our rules which protect these things go too far. However, we are not worried about this. Now this matter came up before that committee and we discussed it, and at that time the first suggestion was made about

some kind of a tribunal to deal with such matters. I did not think, at that time it did not even strike me, that this had to do with any special cases or highly placed Ministers or others; the matter did not strike me; it may have been in the mind of some. I thought it was a case of dealing with those found corrupt—whoever it may be; it may include a Minister, of course—generally speaking. Later Mr. Deshmukh referred to the appointment of a tribunal in the course of a speech, which he was completely entitled to do, and anything that Mr. Deshmukh says, I think, deserves attention, certainly my full attention. After a little while I asked him if he could be good enough to tell me some of these cases so that I could, myself form some idea of what they were, or whether to institute further enquiries or not. To that Mr. Deshmukh replied that he felt that if he did this, his informants might get into trouble, and therefore he was not prepared to disclose their names. Thereupon I said, "Please do not trouble to tell me the names of your informants"—after all why should they get into trouble if what they say has substance in it—"Tell me the cases, what it is". Of course I cannot enquire on that basis. Mr. Deshmukh however felt that he could only do so, not in that informal way but if some formal steps were taken. Now, I am not criticising Mr. Deshmukh at all, but I wish the House to consider what my function and my duty was in the circumstances. Till a few days ago it did not strike me that these so-called cases referred to any Minister of the Central Government. I say so because Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said that there were four or five Ministers of the Central Government, four present Ministers and one previous Minister. He said that. Now it did not strike me at all till a few days back when I heard a lobby rumour to this effect. Now, it is a very extraordinary thing that a number of our Ministers, highly placed Ministers, should be dealt with in this casual way. Obviously, however highly placed a man may be—in fact,

more so because he is highly placed, he should be judged by strict standards; if he fails to keep up those standards, he should be punished; I have no doubt about that. But my submission to the House is that this kind of thing, this kind of vague bandying about, the old women's gossip going about from ear to ear without any attempt to say what it is, is not a fair thing to anyone, and it creates a bad atmosphere everywhere.

Now, Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha said that his party had proposed some kind of a tribunal some time ago. I was not aware of that; that is my fault, but having given much thought to this matter I cannot think how such a tribunal can be appointed, a permanent tribunal. I can ever understand that, for a particular case, one, two, three cases, somebody is appointed, but I cannot understand a permanent tribunal to sit and invite complaints. I have had some training in law although it is rather old, but my friend, Mr. Sapru, who has held the high office of a Judge of a High Court, said something about it—which seems to me completely true—that, under our Constitution, under the rules and conventions that we work under, under the very basis of our principles, such a thing would not fit in at all. I think so. I do not myself see where it would come in the scheme of things that we have. Certainly change the scheme of things if you like. Anyhow, the point is that a permanent tribunal of this type does not seem to me desirable, feasible or in keeping with our constitutional machinery.

I am myself sometimes criticized for being in a hurry, for doing things which I should take a little longer to do. So I am not, normally speaking, one who wants to delay processes; rather I want to expedite them. I would certainly like to expedite these processes too. But after a good deal of thought I do not think that that is the way to put up a tribunal. Apart from what Mr. Sapru said, that would mean every person who has a griev-

ance, who has a grouse, rushing up to the tribunal, whether he has enough matter or not does not matter, to gain publicity by shouting etc. Who is going to pursue everyone for defamation, libel, slander, etc.? Most of them may have no substance even. So it will convert this country into a place where no Government can function adequately and where the newspapers and the public are constantly dealing with, or thinking about, or gossiping about charges and counter-charges. So I submit that that is not a procedure which can be done. But I invite the House to bring any definite case to my notice and I shall certainly try to enquire. I cannot give up my responsibilities; I cannot say that. But I shall enquire into everything that is written or mentioned to me.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): May I make a submission, Sir. Some time back the Prime Minister was reported to have said that he did not know whether such a tribunal, as is proposed by Shri Deshmukh, existed anywhere else in a democratic country. I saw a letter to the Editor in the Punjab Tribune from somebody,—I do not recall the name—in which he pointed out that such a tribunal has existed for a number of years in Sweden and Switzerland. The name of those tribunals were also mentioned. But as to what is the composition, the jurisdiction and who appoints them, that I do not know.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: It is not a tribunal, but a committee of the House.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Yes, yes. I have a vague idea that there is something which is quite different. I cannot go into it because I have not got the facts. But if I may say so, there is a slight difference between the way affairs are managed in Sweden and Switzerland and the way they are managed here, I mean the way charges, etc. are made here. It is a committee or an individual appointed to look into the names, not

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]
 a tribunal, finally to judge these things. However, I was pointing out that I am prepared for any serious charge made against any person who occupies a high position, for that matter to be considered not by me, although it is my right in the beginning to consider it. to ask the opinion of a highly placed person in whose judgment all can trust, as to what I should do, or whether there is or there is not enough evidence or grounds for not proceeding with it—that I am prepared to do. So, I do suggest, therefore, that in this matter let us be strict, but let us also be careful that you do not permit an atmosphere to arise in this country in which every man is blaming and condemning every other person. It is a well-known fact in life that the persons who shout most against corruption are the corrupt. It is the old story: "Stop the thief". It is quite natural. I am not saying that this kind of thing is done by others. But it is a fact. Once you create that atmosphere, the person who is the safest is the corrupt person because he is shouting the loudest against everybody. Every person, every government employee who might be re-trenched or dismissed for something makes these charges against all his officers, against a Minister sometimes. Sometimes he goes to Members of Parliament with some papers he has stolen from the Ministry and makes these charges, which I am sure the Member of Parliament, if he had investigated them, would probably find out that there was little or no truth. Without that investigation he cannot say either.

So every person when he is superseded comes up with this question. Now, are we going to have a system? On the one hand we are told that people should not be promoted by seniority alone, but on merit. The moment merit comes in, every person who is superseded has a grouse, and often questions are asked in Parliament: "See partiality has come in".

Now what are we to do? If it is a question of merit, I cannot, unless he serves under me, judge all his merit nor can anyone else judge of it. It is only the persons who deal with them who can judge their merit and I have to accept that—the judgment may be wrong—just like in the Army you have to rely on your senior officers, or committees whatever it is, to judge merit. If they went by seniority, the Army would be just no good at all as everyone knows.

I have taken a long time in dealing with this matter because I would like hon. Members to realise that—we are all colleagues, we have been colleagues and we are colleagues even though we may differ from each other—in a matter of this kind, on the one hand we have to try to keep the highest standards, at the same time this kind of mud slinging does not help to keep our standards or even normal decency in public life.

Now, Sir, there are two other matters I wish to deal with principally. One is this border question. I do not quite know. One hon. Member, Shri Jaswant Singh, talked about—this is not the border—our cringing and appeasing Pakistan, cringing everywhere. Now, I am prepared to admit that I am not so gallant and brave as Mr. Jaswant Singh, but I have doubts about his conclusions and his wisdom nevertheless. If his idea of governing the country or dealing with another country is to go about bravely striking about or waving a sword, a lathi or a fist that is not my idea, and that is not, I believe, the idea of any person versed in these affairs. How are we to deal with these matters when such remarks are made which represent a state of mind which will get this country into indignity and disgrace all over the place? "Cringing to Pakistan"—I do not know what he calls "cringing to Pakistan". If he says being friendly to Pakistan is cringing to her, then I am going to be friendly to Pakistan.

This is our policy. But being friendly does not mean giving in principle or showing any infirmity about dealing with important matters.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: That is exactly what I mean. We have given thousands of square miles of our land to Pakistan.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: All I can say is that Mr. Jaswant Singh and I differ very greatly. I am not aware of this type of charge having been made except perhaps by one or two persons.

Because I am referring to Pakistan, may I say that I am happy about the border agreements and we shall endeavour to go on trying to widen the sphere of co-operation and agreement? But again I say that it does not mean our forgetting our responsibilities and the vital interests of the nation. The other day, Field-Marshal Ayub Khan mentioned something about—what is it—mutual defence or common defence or some such thing . . .

4 P.M.

AN HON. MEMBER: Common defence.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Yes, common defence. He has referred to this matter on many occasions and almost every time with a different emphasis and in a different context. I pointed out that we would be very happy to co-operate in an ever-increasing measure with Pakistan but the difficulties about this common defence were very serious. One was that defence is closely allied to foreign policy and so far as I know, our outlook on foreign policy was very different—Pakistan's and ours—and even if we removed our problems and went, even then, unless some changes occurred in our minds, our policy would be different.

Secondly, in practice, I did not quite see what this would mean and so on and so forth. Lately, Field-Marshal Ayub Khan has pointed out more or less clearly what he means

by common defence. He means—he has said clearly—that this can come only after the Kashmir question is settled in his favour. So you will observe—I am not criticising him—that this common defence was not the real issue at all but something else—the Kashmir issue—and more or less on the plea of common defence or whatever it was, this was raised. You see, that itself shows the complication of the matter. One cannot deal with these major matters affecting the country's interests, which we have been carrying on for 10 years, in this way. We get into a fright about something and talk about common defence. I am pointing out how these points are entangled. You cannot isolate them. I said that the foreign policies were different. The evidence of them may be that Pakistan has preferred to join some military alliances—SEATO, CENTO and maybe some other. That is merely an evidence of it, which is a clear evidence, while we do not wish to join any alliance of that type but it is deeper than that. The whole approach is different. I have found often in the criticisms made, even in the course of this debate by hon. Members, of our policy, whether it relates to China or whether it relates to Pakistan or whether it relates to any other place, going to the back of it, there is either a complete disagreement or a misunderstanding as to what the policy of non-alignment is. There is that basic misunderstanding. Even though sometimes they may talk 'Yes, non-alignment is good', but they really do not understand it. Indeed our policy is something more than non-alignment. Non-alignment is a negative thing. Ours is a positive policy. I hope a positive policy of friendship and trying to gain the goodwill of other countries while firmly adhering to our principles. Non-alignment is one basic expression of it but only a part of it. Hon. Members opposite seem to imagine that foreign policy consists in threats to other countries and in other manoeuvres like tying oneself to others, etc. One hon. Member, Dr. Bose I think, was dis-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru] pleased that we have not formed some kind of joint military or other alliance with Indonesia, Burma and Nepal.

DR. A. N. BOSE (West Bengal): I did not say 'joint military alliance'. I only suggested a common policy.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Common policy about what? May I respectfully suggest not only to Dr. Bose but to some other Members also that we should be a little careful in mentioning other countries. They are very sensitive and rightly so. They are proud of their independence. They do not like their names being bandied about in our Parliament as if we are some kind of an authority to deal with them as we like—it is a very ticklish question—as if we are merely to decide that this and that country should do this and that country does it. In fact that is a very worse way of building up that common policy to which Dr. Bose refers.

Then, again one or two odd Members expressed their regret that we allowed circumstances, to arise which led to the recent border agreement between Burma and China. It is very extraordinary. We should not come in the way, according to him, of that agreement. So far as I am concerned, I welcome that agreement as I welcome every settlement of a difficult problem. I might say that that agreement is more or less on the line of some such agreement 2 or 3 years ago. It is not a sudden development. It is a gradual development. Why it was not done in these 2 or 3 years and why it has come about now is another matter but it was basically agreed between the Burmese Government and the Government of China two or three years ago and the Government of Burma was good enough to keep us informed 2 or 3 years ago and later of many of these developments. There has been not the slightest difficulty in our relations with Burma over this issue or any other issue and we have been glad that they have come

to this agreement because one matter less in conflict is good for them and good for the world.

So I would like this House to keep in consideration the context in which things are happening today. Naturally we function in our corner of the world, in India. Naturally we are concerned with everything that affects India's interest—the border, this, that and the other—apart from the internal policies and planning. Nevertheless all these things are directly or indirectly connected with world happenings and we live today in an age of the most amazing revolutions in everything. What is happening in Africa today is an astounding revolution. The whole of Africa or large parts of it are shedding their colonial status with an amazing rapidity. No one knows what is happening but here is a live movement shaking the world to some extent or will shake the world. In Asia we have seen all kinds of things happening and among the other things that have happened, has been what has happened in our country and what has happened in China; the two major happenings in Asia, in India and China, are great developments. Look at these things in this vast field of revolutionary changes in Asia, Africa and all over the world. Then there are the technological changes and scientific changes which are really changing the way people think about these matters. Some people think that even biological changes are coming to the human race, I do not know. But there is no doubt about it that basic changes have been coming in the last 150 years or 200 years. The industrial revolution has powerfully changed the living conditions, life, the context and the content of life in a part of the world which is industrially and technologically advanced. Now, those processes are going on in India. Those processes, in a different sense, are going on in China. New worlds are being created. In India we are on the way to

technological maturity. It may take 5 years, it may take 10 years or it may take 15 years but we are on that way and we are going pretty fast. There can be no doubt about it, whether our policies are right or wrong, that we have set India on the course of technological changes or industrial revolution. There is no doubt about it. Nobody can stop it. We cannot stop it, nobody can. We may get into difficulties. Take again, the approach to education which in the ultimate analysis is one of the greatest liberating forces in the country. That is what is happening, all these revolutionary happenings. And in all these revolutionary happenings, these two giants of Asia, India and China, come into major conflict. It is a very serious thing for us, for China, for Asia and the world. It is not a small thing, not a light thing, to be talked about lightly and for hon. Members to suggest: "Issue an ultimatum." We are not dealing with a minor matter, of a trade union issuing an ultimatum that they will strike if their demands are not fulfilled. Two major countries are concerned, two essentially powerful countries. The power may be greater on one side or less, but essentially two powerful countries, geographically placed against each other. We feel and we think and the President has given expression to it, that China has not behaved properly to us. We have been let down in many ways. You may, if you like, say that our policy was such that we permitted them to do so. You may do that, though I do not myself see how any policy could have made any major difference, any policy of ours, I mean. However, you may say so. If that is so, we are in error, we are guilty of it. But the major thing is we feel that we have been let down, that injury has been caused to our principles, and indeed, to our frontiers. And we have to face that situation, face it with the right policy face it with the right strength, face it, as everyone knows—and that is the result of a right policy—with a measure of unity.

etc. Now, no doubt, so far as strength is concerned, we should try to build up our strength and utilise it to defend our frontiers. And so far as policy is concerned, that should support it. But I venture to say that we should always aim at peaceful settlements. Peaceful settlement does not mean appeasement, the giving in to anything that we consider wrong. I do not understand why it should be thought that there are only two policies, one of ignoble submission and the other vulgar aggression, in the world. I do not understand this, as if there is no civilised approach to a problem left. but only weak surrender or the uncivilised approach of brawling and shouting. Surely we have to and I hope we shall function in a more civilized way, adhering to our principles, adding to our might, to our strength, and yet functioning in a civilised way, realising that what we are doing today may have effect on generations to come, in this changing revolutionary world. That has been our policy.

We are accused repeatedly that we hide things. The fact is—and I have spoken about it in this House and elsewhere previously—that there is nothing that we have hidden from Parliament, from the country, except if you like, the fact of what happened in the Aksai Chin area about which we got confirmation in October 1958, when we immediately wrote to the Chinese Government, when we found that a road had been built there in the northern Aksai Chin area. We wrote to the Chinese Government and we were corresponding for a few months when the Tibetan rebellion took place. Now, you may be justified . . .

DR. H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): When did the Government first get the information about the building of the road through Aksai Chin?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: We got what?

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: The Prime Minister said that he got it confirmed in October, 1958. When did he first get information about it?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That I think was either late in 1957 or early in 1958. I am not quite sure about my date. The hon. Member just now referred to information. Our first information was from some very rough Chinese maps which we saw in a magazine and on a very small scale which did not give precise information but which drew our attention to this. Thereafter we sent some of our people there to find out and it took them six months to go there and come back. It was round about October that we wrote, may be September or October 1958 when we got their report. Immediately after, within a week or ten days, we wrote to the Chinese Government. This correspondence went on till early in 1959 came the Tibetan rebellion.

Now, I am prepared to accept that it would have been better to have placed all this before the House, all that we had discovered at that time. But we thought it better to correspond and find out exactly what was the position. Apart from this particular incident, there is absolutely no basis for any person to say that we were keeping facts from this House. It would be foolish for us to keep back facts. It is true that in diplomatic matters we do not come with every move, every letter, every message, to newspapers or to this House. It is true you cannot conduct diplomacy or any kind of foreign relations on that basis. But in this particular matter, it has come to this, that we have placed every letter, every fact about this before the House in various White Papers. And I may inform the House that we have just very recently addressed a communication to the Chinese Government in reply to their last letter and in due course that would also be placed before the House.

It is not for me, it would be unbecoming of me, to talk rashly about the brave steps that we are going to take and what we are going to do. That is not the normal language of responsible people speaking for a government. But I have said it before and I may repeat it. However, I need not repeat what the President has said so well in his Address. Look at the President's Address. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I believe, did not like one or two phrases in it. What the President says, if you would be good enough to read it again, does not lack in firmness anywhere. It is a firm statement of India's position in this matter, at the same time laying stress on our desire for friendly settlements. Friendly settlement does not mean giving up basic principles or a basic interest. Nevertheless it is and should be our function and that of every government to try for friendly settlements, because there is no alternative to it. It is all very well saying—you go and do this or that. But there is no alternative in India, in Germany, in France, in America or Asia, there is no alternative to friendly settlement. A friendly settlement may take a long time and that friendly settlement may be upset by the opposition party and war may begin. That is a different matter, because every kind of folly might be committed and we should be prepared to meet every contingency like that. But the only reasonable approach is to be firm in your position and try as far as possible to reach settlements in a friendly way. The President has said quite firmly what—our position is, about our deep sorrow at what we consider a breach of faith from a country with whom we have been friendly, with whom we had concluded an agreement, laying down the very principles which are talked about so much, about Panchsheel. Nevertheless our desire is for peaceful settlement.

Let it be understood quite clearly that though we talk about friendly settlement, I see no ground whatever

at the present moment, no bridge between the Chinese position and ours. That is to say, our present positions are such that there is no room for negotiations on that basis. There is nothing to negotiate at present. It may arise later, I don't know.

To say that we would not have anything to do with them or to issue an ultimatum to them is not wisdom or statesmanship. That kind of thing is not done by responsible mature countries. It is only the people who talk without acting up to their talk later on who may do that kind of thing. That would be a thing almost entirely opposed to all that we have done in the past in regard to foreign policy and the like.

May I just mention one thing? Perhaps the House knows that we have prepared an atlas of the India-China frontier and copies of this atlas have been placed in the library of Parliament and I think a copy each has been sent to the leaders of the principal parties in Parliament for their convenience.

Two subjects I have dealt with and the third I had in mind to deal with was the question of planning. Now, the real question for us to be clear in our own minds is this: Do we believe in planning or do we not? If we do not believe in planning, as for instance, some people do not, then, of course, it is a different matter and there is no common ground left between us to discuss but if we believe in planning, we might of course have different views about planning, the content of planning, we may discuss, we may argue because planning today, apart from certain basic approaches or principles,—is becoming more and more not an ideological procedure but a scientific approach to desired ends. Either you believe that there can be no such thing as a scientific approach and you leave things to chance, to what is called an open market, to Adam Smith

and what not—if you believe in that, then it is a different matter but I do not believe in it. There are very very few persons who believe in it, except some odd relics of a past age who may still think in that way but it has no relation to reality. No party in the wide world believes, no real political party of any kind, socialist, communist or capitalist, believes in that sort of thing. Get hold of any professor who has studied these matters. Whether he is a professor or a man belonging to any party, you will find an amazing commonness in the approach in regard to what should be done because it has become now a known procedure of how to develop a country on a technological basis, with heavy industry, with light industry and the others. It is a calculable thing. Of course, one factor, which cannot be calculated is the human factor, how much energy, how much hard work, how much ability, the human beings of a country would put in in a job. That is an uncertain factor. The others are known factors which any expert to whatever party or ideology he belongs will probably be able to state clearly without much conflict. We had people here from America advising us, discussing these matters. They are not communists, they are not socialists and technically speaking, they are not planners or anything but as experts in certain matters they discuss the matters with us and it is surprising how they agree with others of a different school of thought. This is so because of the scientific approach now but there is this uncertain factor of a unanimity of effort and the hard work to be put into it. That again leads us to this conclusion that if we are all the time criticising each other, we do not want to get unity of effort. Criticism, yes, in regard to improvements, constructive criticism, but if all the time we are thinking of running down or preventing something being done, then obviously the best Five Year Plan or any plan in the world will not succeed. Inevitably, we have to shoul-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

der the gravest of burdens; there is no help for it but to shoulder them. All kinds of demands are made to add to those burdens, however justified those demands may be. It is clear that there is no reality about our desire to make good in the Five Year Plan. It is not realistic to have all these, forgetting the basic thing. As the House knows, we have a small but very good committee of Members of Parliament in regard to planning. It has met several times, a few times, and it will meet more in the future, I hope regularly this Session because, in this matter our approach is to gain the goodwill and co-operation and even criticism of others. It is not a party approach at all, though as a party we may have some views in regard to a certain matter. That is a different matter but, as I said, it is a question of more and more scientific approach regardless of parties and ideologies except for those who do not believe in the basic thing called planning and that, I think, is not a realistic approach but we cannot do anything about it. I will not say much about this matter because I hope we shall discuss this repeatedly, not only in committees but whenever necessity arises, in this House itself.

I have not been able to deal with many matters I had in mind but I hope I have been able to put before the House some major aspects of these questions referred to in the President's Address and which are in the minds of Members of this House. It is clear that we are passing through a stage of history in our country which is of crucial importance. I said we live in a revolutionary age, technological and other developments, but I fear sometimes that the age is going a little faster than our minds and we are speaking the language of the past age or employ past slogans not realising that they are not very realistic today and in these moving changes our traditional society is becoming a different

society. Sir, I would beg that these matters, therefore, should be considered from the point of view of the age in which we are living, the present day problems, forgetting the past slogans and times.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would seek only a small clarification. I am glad the Prime Minister gave a little attention to what I had said. I did not personally bring any charge against any Ministry. I only stated what had been stated by Mr. Deshmukh and drew the attention of the Prime Minister to the newspaper report. In fact, I did not even mention any names although I have them; they may be right or wrong. I would like to know the present position. Mr. Deshmukh has said something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No discussion now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not want a discussion, Sir.

I do not want this question of a general tribunal to be set up permanently to be gone into now. Mr. Deshmukh has said certain things. He would not give the materials to the Prime Minister and I cannot help it. I would like him to give, but the point is, how is the matter going to be tackled even provisionally, or, is, there going to be a deadlock? That is what I want to know.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is rather difficult for me to reply to this matter. It is not fair to me or to Mr. Deshmukh because I have great regard for Mr. Deshmukh and I want to deal with any matter that is in his mind but the question is, how best to deal with it without going into this process which, I think, will be wrong, this tribunal business. Otherwise, I am prepared to deal with it and in fact, if I may say so, I am still in correspondence with him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

1. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but, while welcoming the realisation by Government even at this late hour of the aggressive intentions of China, regret to note the Government's failure—

(1) to keep the Parliament and the people of India informed of the incursions of China into our territory over a number of years;

(2) to take timely and prompt measures, both defensive and diplomatic, to meet the threat to our sovereignty by forcible occupation by the Chinese of thousands of miles of our territory; and

(3) to make the Chinese forces vacate all our territories forcibly occupied by China'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

2. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added namely:—

'but, while cordially welcoming the bold expression in the Address 'of being determined and ready to defend our country' regret that the Government have given no indication of the measures they would adopt to back their words by deeds'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

3. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret to note that in spite of the Government's assertion in attaining a record level of food-grains production, Government have failed to arrest continuous rise in the price levels and cost of living'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

4. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the intention on the part of Government to appoint a tribunal to deal with serious cases of allegations of corruption existing in high places'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

5. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that it is not firmly laid down that Government will not enter into any negotiations regarding the minor adjustments in our Northern Frontier with China until the aggression on the Indian territories by the Chinese forces is vacated'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The questions is:

6. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of Government's programme of the steps to deal with the increasing difficulties experienced by people in many consuming centres due to non-availability of essential commodities and prevailing high retail prices'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

7. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention in the Government business before Parliament of presenting for consideration and adoption of even broad outlines of the Third Five Year Plan'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

8. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention of the intention of Government to consider the legitimate grievances of Government employees against the recommendations of the Pay Commission'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

9. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention of the serious situation developing in some University centres resulting in their closure for long periods and of the Government's programme of dealing with such unfortunate situations'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

10. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention of the appreciation of the growing labour unrest in the country and reconsideration of the procedure to be adopted by the employers and the Government to deal with it'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

11. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no mention of the appreciation by Government of the urgent necessity of bringing cultivable waste land under plough and the maximum utilisation of irrigation facilities so as to augment the agricultural production without which rapid development of the economy is not possible'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

12. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that while promising higher targets in the Third Plan, the Address does not indicate any significant change in policies and methods, so urgently called for in the light of the experience of the first two Five Year Plans, in order to ensure all-sided economic development on a bigger scale under the Third Plan'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

13. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not lay down any policy to ensure the rapid growth of the public sector and distribution of land to the tillers of the soil in the context of the Third Five Year Plan'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

14. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there are no indications of concrete steps in the Address to make the economy really self-reliant or for overcoming economic dependence'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

15. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address fails to take any note of the growing penetration of foreign private capital in the private sector'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

17. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address fails to take note of the growing unemployment, including middle-class unemployment, in the country under the Second Plan and does not indicate any concrete step to arrest this growth of unemployment under the Third Plan'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

18. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address fails to take due note of the fact that despite rise in industrial production, and productivity of workers, there has been a decline in the real wages of the workers and employees'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address fails to indicate any change in the food policy of the Government to ensure continued rise in production, adequate stocks with the Government, fair price to the peasant and cheap food grains for the consumer'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

21. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address presents an incorrect assessment of the working of the Constitution

inasmuch as it fails to take due note of the growing inroads into the fundamental rights, guaranteed by the Constitution and other forms of attacks against democracy'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

22. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the failure of the scheme of Labour participation in management of industries, mentioned in the 1959 Address of the President, due to the hostility of the Public Sector industries, the Central and State Government and the big business in the country to any efforts at democratisation of industrial management'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

23. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the failure of the employers both in the private and the public sectors to implement the Code of Discipline in Industries in right earnest and the denial of recognition to majority unions and the refusal to set up proper grievances machinery as is obligatory under the Code'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

24. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the serious unrest among the Central Government employees and the working people in general, due to the rejection of the unanimous recom-

[Mr. Chairman.]

mendations of the 1957 Indian Labour Conference concerning the need-based minimum wage by the Second Pay Commission'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

26. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address fails to take due note of the fact that performance of the Second Five Year Plan in respect of the declared four principal objectives namely, (i) the increase in the national income, (ii) the expansion of employment opportunities, (iii) the rapid industrialisation of the country and (iv) reduction in disparities of income, has been far below the targets and commitments;

and further regret that the Address makes no concrete proposals for the fulfilment of the above objectives under the Third Plan'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

27. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that while speaking of better career opportunities for the scientists and technicians, the Address fails to take due notice of the problems of better pay, honourable conditions of service, etc., for scientists'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

29. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address reconciles to India's continued dependence on foreign countries

in the matter of foodgrains instead of taking vigorous measures for achieving self-sufficiency in food'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

30. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address fails to indicate effective agrarian reforms with a view to ensuring distribution of land to the tillers of the soil, and for otherwise reorganising our agrarian economy'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

32. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not show any positive response to the former Finance Minister Shri Deshmukh's proposal for the appointment of an impartial high-powered judicial body to investigate into complaints of corruption and abuse of authority on the part of men in high places'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

35. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that there is no indication in the Address for substantially improving India's foreign exchange earnings through a correct export-import policy, diversification and radical reorganisation of the country's external trade and similar other vitally urgent measures'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

36. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address takes a view in regard to the foreign exchange position of the country which is not in accord with actual facts'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

37. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that no steps are proposed in the Address to bring down the prices of kerosene and other petroleum products whereas fresh concessions have been given to foreign private oil companies for exploration'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

38. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address fails to take note of the continuous rise in prices of necessities of life and the cost of living of the working people and to indicate measures to bring down the prices'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

39. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not take due note of the fact that the recommendation of the Second Pay Commission and the Government decisions thereon have caused legitimate disappointment among large sections of Government employees'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

40. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address fails to note that whatever little increase in emoluments has been given by the Pay Commission in respect of some categories of Government employees, is far too inadequate compared to the rise in cost of living index and rise in prices'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

46. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not take correct lessons from experience that the resources for the planned development of the country could be substantially found from the State-owned industries and through a policy of progressive nationalisation of certain specified industries'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

"That the Members of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 8th February, 1960'."

The motion was adopted.