

## MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: We take up discussion on the President's Address. Those who participate will kindly remember that we will have a separate day for the discussion of foreign affairs. Shri Sapru.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, I beg to move:

"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 18th March, 1957."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like this House to convey to our revered President our thanks, our very sincere and genuine thanks, for his Address to this Parliament. Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, this House represents the permanent element in our Constitution. It is well known that we are an indissoluble body and therefore, what is happening is that a part of this Parliament is dissolving itself. We continue. Some of us will probably join the other place but that is something incidental. In a world where there is so much impermanence it is not a bad thing to have a body which can supply an element of stability to the constitutional structure that our founding fathers have reared up.

In his own inimitable way our revered President has surveyed the entire situation during the last one year and naturally he could not be expected to say much about the future. So far as the future is concerned, we have the second Five Year Plan and we are expecting a presentation of the interim budget. Then, after the elections are over when we know what the strength of parties in the country is or after the Ministries have been formed, we shall have a programme outlined for the

future. Some of the amendments, I have just had a cursory glance at them, appear to overlook the fact that the President's Address was in the nature of a valodictory Address to Members of Parliament and particularly to those Members of Parliament who were Members of the Lok Sabha. Therefore, without going into the merits of the various amendments which have been tabled, I would say that they seem to me to be singularly inappropriate at the present moment. What the President was expected to do, what the President has done well for us, very well for us, is a review of the existing position in the country. In this Session, which is going to be a short Session, there is to be no controversial measure and therefore it could not be expected that he would enter into controversial matters.

Mr. Chairman, the President has reviewed the entire international situation so far as it effects this country and the world generally. He has reviewed the domestic situation and his Address may be divided into two parts—that dealing with international affairs and that dealing with domestic affairs. Now I agree with your suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that we should reserve a discussion of foreign affairs for the debate which we are going to hold on foreign affairs. But before I develop my argument on internal matters, there is a question which is of vast domestic importance. It is, I would say, exclusively within our domestic jurisdiction but it has assumed international significance because of certain things which have happened recently at the Security Council and I would like, therefore, to say something about that issue first. It will be within the recollection of this House that the issue of Kashmir was raised by the aggressor State of Pakistan in the Security Council. It did not occur to any member of the Security Council to point out that not India but Pakistan was the aggressor. I do not want to reflect in the slightest degree upon the Security Council, but these facts have

[Shri P. N. Saprú.]

had a disturbing effect upon the life of the country. Pakistan's friends thought that it was their duty not to act as impartial judges, but as friends of Pakistan, and therefore, Pakistan was allowed to have a full say and to raise the issue before the Security Council. I would like, before I proceed further, to pay a tribute to the magnificent speech delivered under very difficult circumstances by our representative. He was in a very bad state of health. His doctors were angry with him. They told him that he was taking risks with his life. I would like to pay a tribute to the magnificent manner in which our case was presented to the Security Council by India's Minister without Portfolio, Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon. In that historic performance, Mr. Krishna Menon who spoke for seven and a half hours, surveyed the entire position regarding Kashmir. But even before he had concluded his speech, his accusers had made up their mind. They had a resolution ready and that resolution would have been passed but for the veto of the Soviet Union. This is a circumstance which should make the democracies think. What do they really want of this country? Do they want to drive this country into the arms of Soviet Communism? Mr. Feroze Khan Noon has been advertising that India is in the Communist bloc. But the fact, Mr. Chairman, is that we are not in any bloc, that we are opposed to all military blocs and military alliances. We think that these military blocks have created a very ugly situation for the oppressed and the suppressed peoples of Asia. These oppressed and suppressed peoples of Asia want to raise the standard of living in their countries. These oppressed and suppressed peoples of Asia want a fair deal in their countries. Surely the way to win the friendship of these Asian peoples is not by using pressure tactics to force them into one bloc or the other, but to understand and appreciate their viewpoint and to help them economically. I think, Mr. Chairman, the Western

Powers are doing no justice to themselves. I was happy at the fact that Ghana has achieved her independence. That is something to the credit of Britain. I am happy at the fact that shortly Malaya will be an independent country. But I am unhappy at the fact that Britain whom we have looked upon as a good friend, that the United States of America, whose friendship we greatly value, did not bring to bear upon this difficult problem an impartial approach.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me develop this point and tell the House why I say that they did not bring to bear upon this important question an impartial approach. There is nothing difficult about the facts of the Kashmir situation. They will be within the recollection of hon. Members of this House and I shall just recount them in order to make my point clear.

When the partition of our country took place, we were the parent State in this country. For generations Indian nationalism had stood for the ideal of an Indian nationality. It believed in Indian nationalism and had not worked for a theocratic State. There was a mystic unity, so we felt, underlying this great country and we wanted the people of this country, Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Buddhists, Sikhs and all others to live together under one flag as brothers. That had been our dream. That had been our aspiration. However, we accepted partition in order to facilitate a transfer of power in India. We accepted it as a political arrangement. We did not accept—and we made that perfectly clear—the two-nation theory underlying that partition. Mr. Chairman, my ancestors came from Kashmir and I was told by my revered father that we have some "Saprus" still in Kashmir. That is a fact. And Sir Mohammad Iqbal, I understood from him, was a 'Sapru', I may incidentally say. But does the fact that one Sapru is a Muslim make the Muslim Saprus of India members of a separate nation? I think, Sir,

that a more ridiculous proposition than the proposition that by conversion you can change your nationality could not be advanced. We accepted partition. We have no desire to go back upon this partition. Even if Pakistan were to come and tell us, "Please let us join the Indian Union," we would refuse them admission, because we are happy as we are. But when Kashmir was invaded by the tribesmen and it appealed to us for aid, we could not, without denying our fundamental creed, tell the people of Kashmir, "Go to Hell. Get yourselves massacred by the tribesmen of Pakistan. Get yourselves massacred by the men and the troops which have been sent by Mr. Jinnah and the Pakistan Government." We could not do that. It would have been dishonourable for us to take that attitude. Right up to the 14th of August 1947, we made it clear in every talk which we had about the future of Kashmir that it was open to Kashmir to join Pakistan if she desired to do so, that we would not stand in her way.

The Maharaja, however, did not accede either to India or to Pakistan. He was foolish enough to think that he would be able to lead an independent existence and that he would become His Majesty the King of Kashmir. Well, things did not shape that way. The tribesmen invaded Kashmir. The Ruler and the people of Kashmir approached us and then we sent our armies to Kashmir and we accepted accession. There is no doubt and there can be no doubt about the legality of that accession. That accession is in complete accordance with the provisions of the Independence Act. Kashmir was a contiguous area and we had communications through the district of Gurdaspur with Kashmir. Under the Indian Independence Act, it was open to a Ruler to accede either to India or to Pakistan but it was not contemplated that he would remain neutral. The Ruler chose to accede India but we were not content with the Ruler's word. We wanted to know what the

leader of the body which had fought along with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi and others for the independence of Kashmir from princely rule and which wanted responsible Government, had to say. We wanted to know what the leader of that body had to say. He said, "Well, go ahead, I am for accession to India". We accepted his word but thereafter, it occurred to us that by way of what we lawyers would call super abundant caution, we might give an assurance to the people of Kashmir that after order had been restored over the entire territory, after peaceful conditions had been established we would give an opportunity in some way or other to the people of Kashmir to express themselves on the question of accession. Mr. Chairman, that was a pledge and an assurance given to the people of Kashmir and that pledge and assurance has been honoured. We or rather the Kashmir people, established a Constituent Assembly in Kashmir which completed its work on the 26th January and dissolved itself on that day. That was all that happened on the 26th January and a great deal of fuss and pother was made about it in the Security Council. The integration of Kashmir with India took place in 1947 but the Constitution, in its final shape, came into force on the 26th January, 1957. Now, I should have thought that a responsible body like the Security Council would, when approached by a Member State, address itself to the question of whose legal right it was to be in Kashmir. That question which had been raised by us was never considered by the Security Council; it was never inclined to consider that. There was, however, a deliberate—I hope I am not imputing any motives to them—lack of desire on their part to go into the question: they did not go into the question because they knew that the law was in favour of India. Would that be an incorrect statement to make? Well, Sir, that is a sorry comment on the world's greatest organisation for maintaining peace in the world.

[Shri P. N. Saprū.]

Sir Zafrullah Khan, in the eloquent speeches which he made in the Security Council, as the leader of the Pakistan Government—I am talking about the time when our original complaint came up before the Security Council—, as the leader of a great religious community, the Ahmediyas, said that it was only the Azad people and the tribesmen who were fighting there. Then, when the United Nations Commission went to Kashmir, it found Pakistani troops and Pakistani material in that area. It invited the attention of the United Nations to this fact and thereafter, a resolution was passed on the 13th of August, 1948. Now, we are accused of a breach of faith. Leftist newspapers who are generally friendly to us—and I read those papers with pleasure myself—have started saying that we have gone back on our pledge; but, what was that pledge? In the resolution of the 13th August—I have got a copy of it before me—it was made perfectly clear that Pakistani troops will have to withdraw from territories they had occupied and that we would remain answerable for the maintenance of order in Kashmir. It was said that after these two conditions had been fulfilled, the question of a plebiscite would be considered. Those conditions which were in a way reaffirmed by the resolution of January, 1951, have never been fulfilled by Pakistan.

On whose side, Mr. Chairman, is the breach of promise? Surely not on our side. Some of the countries of the United Nations are a little jealous of the increasing influence which we are acquiring in the Asian world. They do not like to look upon India or India's Prime Minister as the spokesman of Asia. Recently, they had their own trouble with Egypt and in some other parts of Asia. Now, they would like to deflect us by giving us this trouble and they want to say, "Oh, you are talking of our imperialism but what about your imperialism, what about Kashmir?" as if Kashmir was some foreign country

some distance away, six thousand or three thousand miles away—I do not know the exact distance between Cairo and London—my geography is bad—which we had conquered. They talk as if Kashmir was some distant country which India had invaded.

It was a part of the Indian continent. The Indian continent had a unity of its own. Indian nationalism had stood for a certain way of life. Indian nationalism had never accepted the two-nation theory. Indian nationalism had acted fairly by the people of Kashmir. There is no parallel between what we did in Kashmir and what the United Kingdom or France have done or did in Egypt, and I would say this that you can fool some people for sometime but you cannot fool all people for all time. You talk of public opinion, that India must bow to public opinion. Well, I have very great respect for British public opinion. I read the "New Statesman"; I read Mr. Aneurin Bevan's "The Tribune"; I read the "Manchester Guardian" and I have been a reader of these and other British papers for well over 40 years. But I do not think that these papers or the "New York Times", exhaust public opinion in the world. When you talk of public opinion, you have to think of the 600 million Chinese, who are without vote in the United Nations. You have to think of the 200 million Russians whose Government vetoed that Resolution, not because there is any understanding between us and Russia, not because we had toed the Russian line in Hungary—we had been quite frank in our denunciation and in our condemnation of the Russian attitude towards Hungary—but because on merits it felt that it was a monstrous proposition that the country which had been invaded should be asked to vacate its territory in order to make it possible for the United Nations troops to occupy that country and to hold the plebiscite.

Mr. Chairman, we saw the last of foreign troops, of British origin leave

this soil in 1947, and happen what might, we shall not allow the sacred soil of India to be again occupied by foreign troops, whether they be American troops or they be British troops or Russian troops. That, Mr. Chairman, is a fundamental article of faith with us, and while we as a people are inclined to be pacifist I hope that circumstances will not turn us into a warlike people. There is a writing on the wall, which the West must see, must read. We have, during the last ten years, been co-operating with the West and we wish to co-operate with the West. We are not out to foment trouble. Our approach is not the Russian approach; it is not the American approach; our approach is our very own, a peaceful approach, but there is one thing which we will not tolerate and that is false propaganda against the honour of our country, because we value our honour very much, and here in this country we have stood by certain principles and we shall not depart from those principles. I am rather amazed at some of the things that Mr. Suhrawardy says in Pakistan. Mr. Suhrawardy came into power as the hero of a party which was supposed to have leftist leanings. It is the Awami League and the respected leader of that party, Maulana Bhasani, is not in agreement with the line that Mr. Suhrawardy is taking. But Mr. Suhrawardy is a politician who knows how to remain in office once he gets into office and therefore he never considers himself overburdened with principles. We are slightly different; we have got a conscience and we do not wish anyone to say that we are not showing in our dealings with our people or with any people certain moral qualities. We stand up for the application of certain moral principles in politics, and I would like therefore to say that on moral grounds as also on legal grounds we have an unanswerable case in Kashmir. But I will leave these moral considerations aside and I will come to some questions of expediency.

Ten years is a long period in the life of a people and yet these gentlemen of the United Nations thought that the question of a plebiscite in Kashmir was so important that even an adjournment for a day or two of the debate of the Security Council on Kashmir could not be allowed and they thought that the question of the plebiscite was so urgent that Mr. Jarring must be made to report by the 15th of April. What do these gentlemen of the United Nations have to say about these moral issues and on these legal issues? What have they got to say about this fundamental fact that during these ten years the situation in Kashmir has changed beyond recognition? Kashmir is now happily a progressive State. There is a vast drive against illiteracy there; the peasants' lot is very much better than it was before; landlordism has been liquidated and a social and economic upheaval is taking place in that part of the country. Is it imaginable that life which is dynamic everywhere would be static in Kashmir? Do they seriously think that a period of ten years has made no difference in the life of the people of Kashmir? Do they want this continent to be plunged again into communal strife, into civil strife? Do they want it and is it to their interests to encourage this theocratic idea? They encouraged the theocratic idea in Palestine and they are reaping the whirlwind.

Sir, I have got very great respect for the western world and I want to be on utter terms of friendship with it but I would like them to ponder over the situation. The duty of the statesman is not to accentuate differences, and therefore, Mr. Chairman, apart from all considerations of law, apart from all considerations of morality, there are valid reasons, of what you would call expediency in the highest sense of the term, why the Kashmir issue should not be reopened; if it is to be reopened, then it can only be reopened in our favour because Pakistan is in occupation of a territory to which it has no lawful right. Do you

[Shri P. N. Saprú.]

think that the people of Azad Kashmir would like to join with a State which has denied liberties to Azad Kashmir or to its own people? Compare our administration of Kashmir with the administration of Azad Kashmir.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): The so-called Azad Kashmir.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Yes; the so-called Azad Kashmir. Or compare what we have done for the poor people of Kashmir with what Pakistan has done for the poor people of Azad Kashmir or for her own poor people. We want to be friendly with Pakistan. Our master taught us that we cannot conquer hatred by hatred. We can conquer it only by love and I would like that message to be carried into every home in this country.

Mr. Chairman, just imagine what the situation would be in Pakistan, what the situation would be in India if we were to review that question. We have had 40 lakhs of refugees from East Bengal. Do they want this exodus to increase? Mr. Suhrawardy in a speech, which I liked, on the question of joint electorates in Pakistan said the other day that Pakistan was one nation and there were no two nations. But this very gentleman is trotting out the two-nation theory with reference to Kashmir. Mr. Chairman, it is a strange world in which we are living. I would therefore like to say this that a message should go forth from this House strengthening the hands of our Prime Minister in dealing with this Kashmir issue. Let there be no mistake about it. There are people who would go further than the Prime Minister in regard to the Kashmir issue. There is no one who wants to go less for than the Prime Minister. It is not as if he had an emotional attachment to Kashmir because his ancestors came at some distant date from Kashmir that the Kashmir issue has assumed importance. The Kashmir issue is important because it is a test of our

fidelity to the secular principle and there shall be and there will be no compromise, no surrender, on our part to the United States, the United Kingdom or the Security Council.

Sir, I have spoken with some heat on this question. I had intended to take only a few minutes but in talking about Kashmir I am afraid I have taken a lot of time but before I close I should like to make a brief reference to some domestic problems. There are questions of high finance which I do not understand. I know my limitations. If it was a question of law, I would say that I understand it; if it was a question of international politics, I would say that I understand it but if it is a question of finance, I know my limitations. But I would like to welcome the assurance of the President that a control or check will be kept over rise in prices. I do not mind what you do to the richer classes. I came into trouble the other day for saying something about a certain class in this House. I have sympathies for the working classes and for the lower middle class and I must say that the burden of indirect taxation must not be too heavy on those classes. We have, Mr. Chairman, to plan for a socialist economy. The Congress is a socialist organisation. Socialism is not the monopoly of the Praja Socialist Party or the Socialist Party and therefore we have to approach these questions from the point of view of broad justice. We must conserve our foreign resources to the utmost limit possible and it may be desirable for that purpose to limit our imports but I am glad that we are making arrangements to get wheat, rice and cotton from abroad for purposes of easing the price situation in this country.

The second thing I wanted to say was that we must pay more attention to our educational programme in the implementation of the Five Year Plan. The programme is all right; I am not criticising the programme but there are two points that I wanted to make about educational reform. The first

is that in putting forward these plans for the future the Finance Minister and the Education Minister must bear in mind the lot of the village teacher. He gets today a miserable salary and it is these teachers who will be responsible for giving a direction to the thought of our future generation. I would also like them to bear in mind the needs of the woman teacher in our villages. In every country where the experiment of compulsory education has been tried and has succeeded, reliance has been placed upon the woman teacher. There are many married woman teachers; there are many married women who would like to work as teachers. And

12 Noon they should be employed in part-time capacity and housing facilities should be provided for them in our rural and urban areas. It is a very vast question. I have taken a lot of time and I do not want to go into the questions of university and secondary education, but I should like to say one or two words about scientific education. I myself am a very great believer in the humanities. I know no science. That is one of the defects from which my education suffers, but I think that if we are to compete with the countries of the world, we must develop scientific education in this country. We must produce a large scientific personnel or technical personnel in this country. I read the other day that in the U.S.S.R. they have the largest number of scientists. They have more scientists or more scientific personnel is produced in the U.S.S.R. than in the United States, Britain, France and Germany put together. Now, I think that we should lay emphasis upon science. We should also lay emphasis upon fundamental research because without fundamental research applied research is not possible. That is so far as education is concerned.

I should like, Mr. Chairman, to say a word about our health programme. I think that we have in the Five Year Plan a good health programme, but we need to increase the supply of

scientific practitioners and I would like to stress the word 'scientific practitioners' very much in our rural areas. Our rural countrymen, the men living in our villages have a right to the best medical treatment available and we must pay attention to the nutrition of our people. I think it is very faulty. We must pay some attention to the question of dietetics. I think the average man needs to be taught proper habits in regard to diet and we want him to be a healthy man because a healthy nation is a strong nation; a healthy nation is a wise nation; a healthy nation is a nation that makes contribution to human thought and human endeavours. It is by working for these objectives that we shall achieve the aim of a socialist State. In the past, in our attempts I think that we have had a dynamic approach to the problems of our country. Let it not be said that we can only think in terms of the past. Let us fix our gaze at the future. Let us not make gradualness an excuse for inaction. I think that in life there is a place for caution, but it is unwise in a world pulsating with new ideas, in a world in which we were left behind hundreds of years, to think too much in terms of caution, I mean too much in terms of gradualness. We should, therefore, move boldly forward. I have never been able to understand the controversy between public enterprise and private enterprise in this country. There is a vast field under the Five Year Plan for private enterprise. I find that there is a Forum for Free Enterprise in this country. Well, what is that forum going to achieve which our Government is not helping it to achieve in a reasonable way, because if socialism means anything it means this that we must have the direction and control of investments in our hands? It means that we must be prepared, we must be able to control strategic points in industry at any given time. Provided these conditions are fulfilled, provided our capitalists will treat their workmen as comrades, as brothers, in a ceaseless battle against poverty, disease and

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

squalor, there is scope for private enterprise. We may have our own views about public enterprise. We may in the ultimate sense believe in State ownership and State direction—but there is scope in the India of today for private enterprise and I think we should all put our shoulders to the wheel and endeavour to make our country industrially great. The question of heavy industrialisation has become very important for us because of our defence requirements. We are not purchasing arms from the Soviet Union. We are not having free arms like Pakistan. We have heard the cry of 'jehad'. And Mr. Firoze Khan Noon—I had the honour of crossing swords with him when he was here—has now developed into a great statesman. Well, Mr. Firoze Khan Noon threatens us with war or plebiscite. Now, believe me, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing that I hate more than national Chauvinism, believe me, there is nothing that I hate more than this talk of war. I have never thought in terms of Hindus, Muslims and Christians. It is something foreign to my habit of mind, to my thought, but believe me that we love the country's integrity very much. After centuries we have won freedom for our motherland and we shall not allow ourselves to be browbeaten by those men, by these so-called satesmen who never worked for the freedom of their country. Freedom came as a gift to them because the British wanted to quit India and we had to pay a price for it, for their quitting. While there should not be any desire on our part to be aggressive, while we should be always willing and ready for settlement and compromises and all that, provided fundamental principles are not involved, we should be a little careful so far as our defence is concerned. I am quite sure that our army is strong enough to meet any challenge. I am quite sure that—I am not speaking in the language of a Junker—our youngmen are spirited enough to give a good fight. But we do not want that situation to arise in

the country and we do not like this bombast in which Pakistan indulges day in and out. These pacts have created a very awkward situation for us. The other day the American Ambassador in Pakistan said one thing. He was contradicted by the State Department the next day. We have in President Eisenhower a humane statesman, a man who genuinely loves peace.....

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): Are you sure of that?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Absolutely, I have no doubt about it. We have been witnessing a situation in Britain which is developing in favour of progressive radicalism. There will be enough discussion on these matters on the day when the debate on the international situation takes place. I would like to say that we should take interest in our defence matters.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry for the time that I have occupied.

DR. D. H. VARIAVA (Bombay): Sir, I want to make one proposition. Certain words were used by my hon. friend about the ex-Maharaja of Kashmir, and I think that those words should be expunged with the consent of the Member and by your order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): What are the words that were used by him? Nothing struck us.....

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Not the present Maharaja.

DR. D. H. VARIAVA: But the ex-Maharaja.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prof. Kabir.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR (West Bengal): Sir, I have very great pleasure in seconding the motion moved so eloquently by my friend, Mr. Sapru. After his long discussion about foreign affairs, which in the



beginning, he told us, he was not going to discuss today as we have a separate day allotted for that task, I do not propose to say anything at all about foreign affairs beyond saying that it is a continuation of our internal policy, a policy of friendship to all and enmity to none. Nor do I propose to discuss Kashmir today after the very long, eloquent and elaborate discussions of my hon. friend. He has expressed the feelings of the people of this country, and there is no doubt whatever that by and large the country is behind the policy of the Government in making a peaceful settlement of the problem which will recognize the right of the people of Kashmir to accede to this country as they have already done.

I would only like to refer to two facts. One is that sometimes Pakistan bases its claim on the contention that India was divided on the two-nation theory. I do not think that is correct, because if India had been divided on the two-nation theory, why was there need to hold a referendum in the North West Frontier province? Why was it necessary to have a vote in the Legislature of undivided Bengal in order to decide whether Bengal would come to the Indian Union or accede to Pakistan? The second fact I would like to mention is that Kashmir acceded to India towards the end of October, but Pakistani infiltration, whether it was official or not, had begun as early as August. Long before India came into the picture, the people of Kashmir were opposing this infiltration and invasion by the Pakistani people. These two simple facts are often ignored that India was not divided on the basis of the two-nation theory, and that the people of Kashmir resisted as long as they could the attack by Pakistan. When they found that by themselves they were not able to resist the military might of Pakistan, they acceded, as they had every right to, to the Indian Union. Further, we should not forget that the struggle for liberation in Kashmir, the struggle for the right of the people to govern themselves, was

a part of the Indian national struggle. The leaders of Pakistan today or yesterday had never taken any part in that struggle, nor had they expressed any sympathy with the people of Kashmir in that struggle.

As I said earlier, I do not propose to discuss international affairs or Kashmir today. I propose to confine my remarks to the internal situation within the country. We are grateful to the President for the very lucid survey he has made of the developments which have taken place in this country. Everyone will admit that it is a sober statement and there are no exaggerated claims. He has also, as I shall soon have occasion to show, drawn our attention to certain difficulties and dangers which face the country and for which adequate measures will be necessary. But whatever may be the point of view from which we look at the progress of India in the last ten years, I think it will be universally admitted that within ten years the steady, orderly progress of India compares favourably with the progress achieved by any country in any part of the world at any time within ten years after the immediate attainment of independence. I do not think there is any country in the world which has made comparable progress within ten short years after the attainment of independence. If it be said that some of the other countries had special difficulties, so had we. We were faced by the partition of the country. We had the migration of millions, we had the complete unsettlement of the social and economic life of the people on account of these grave facts. Nevertheless India has weathered the storm. I would give a few figures—I do not propose to go into detail, the second Five Year Plan and the reports we have had from time to time, the reports of the Estimates Committee, and so on, give us figures in greater detail—but I would like to draw the attention of the House to one or two significant facts. We have increased the national income in India from a little over 9000 crores in

[Prof. Humayun Kabir.]  
1950-51 to almost 11000 crores in 1955-56, an increase of almost 18 per cent.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Andhra Pradesh): At what price level?

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: At the same price level, and the *per capita* income has gone up from Rs. 255 to Rs. 283. It is not a figure to boast about, I quite admit that an income of a little less than Rs. 300 is not a figure about which we can be proud. Nevertheless an increase has begun, and as anyone who has anything to do with social dynamics knows, the most important thing is to get things moving. Once the process of change and development begins, it goes on with accelerated pace. We have broken the inertia of the country, we have broken the inertia of the villages, we have broken the habits of lassitude and despondency among the people, and today there is no doubt whatever in my mind that the country will go on progressing at an accelerated rate.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): What percentage of the people have increased their income?

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: Every one, though it may be in different proportions. If you look at the statistics, the *per capita* consumption has also gone up from about 243 to 266. This would give us a rate of investment which was originally about Rs. 12 *per capita* but is now Rs. 17 *per capita* per year. These are not very big figures, but the point I want to make is that the inertia has been broken and the process of development has begun. I could have also referred to the great hydro-electric projects, to the steel works and other factories. These are things which stare us in the face. There has been at times a tendency to say that nothing has been done, as if all the roads that have been built are so many illusions, as if the factories that are working are so many mirages, as if

the hydro-electric projects that exist are there only in one's imagination.

But it is not merely a question of statistics. However, I would like to give one more figure because I think that it is significant. The Nagpur Plan for road development in 1943 laid a target of about 331 thousand miles of which about 123 thousand miles were to be pucca. That was the target to be achieved in 20 years. And the Nagpur Plan, when it was framed, was regarded as an ambitious plan, perhaps beyond the capacity of the country. But already we have almost attained that goal. Just before the first Five Year Plan the mileage in the country was a little less than 250 thousand with about 97 thousand miles of pucca road, while at the end of the first Five Year Plan it had already come to almost 320 thousand miles. Three hundred and thirty one thousand miles was the target set by the Nagpur Plan to be achieved by 1963, and in 1955-56 we had already come to over 316 thousand miles and about 121 thousand miles of tarred road. It is also gratifying to find that the people themselves built over 44,000 miles of roads in Community Project and National Extension Areas.

Now, Sir, I place a special emphasis on this road development because roads mean not only mobility of goods and men, but also mobility of ideas. To have good roads is one of the most important factors in developing that emotional integration of the country for which we are all so anxious. As people move about from one area to another, as they come into contact with one another, the identity, the similarity and the commonness of the Indian people is emphasised. We recognise more and more that in spite of our diversities, we are a unified nation. The ideal of India that there shall always be unity in diversity and all differences shall be reconciled is thus increasingly achieved.

Now, Sir, these are only statistics, and statistics are never so impressive and real as the impact of the people

when you come into contact with them. I have travelled fairly widely for the last 25 or 30 years all over the country. Recently also I had the occasion to go from one corner of the country to the other. I have found that in the last five years particularly, there has been a change in the temper and tone of the people everywhere. There is a new hope in them. Well, I do not say for a moment that all our objects have been achieved. There is a great amount of poverty yet and many things yet remain to be done. But the people look forward with confidence and hope, and they are becoming conscious of their power day by day. I would not say that they are fully conscious yet, but they are becoming conscious that they are the real masters of the country and the fate of the country shall depend on their achievements, their efforts, their endeavours and their struggles. And this growing sense of responsibility of the people is, I believe, Sir, one of the most welcome developments in recent years.

Now, Sir, if we compare this stable and orderly progress of India with countries elsewhere, and particularly with some of our neighbouring countries—I have said it earlier also—we shall find that our progress would compare favourably not only with our neighbouring countries in Asia, but also with any country in Europe or South America. I would perhaps add even North America—in the first 10 or 15 years after the attainment of independence. If we consider why India has been able to achieve this progress, to my mind, the main reasons for this progress are two. If I had the time, I would have liked to develop this theme, because, I believe, this is a matter which is of great interest to all students of social dynamics in this country and elsewhere. But as the time at my disposal is very short, I shall only briefly mention the points.

To my mind, Sir, the first reason why India has achieved this stable progress in an orderly manner, with-

out any disruptions, disturbances and conflicts is this: Of course, I am aware that recently there has been some evidence of fissiparous tendencies here and there, but when we compare our progress with what we see elsewhere in Asia, I would say that, by and large, India has shown that the forces for unity, for consolidation and for unification are far stronger than the forces which tend to divide the country. I would say that this solid and stable progress of the country is due primarily to the political ideal which this country has held before itself, the idea of a co-operative commonwealth in which we have sought to avoid conflicts.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Socialist.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: Well, socialist also. A real co-operative commonwealth will always be socialist, and I do not think it is necessary every time to give all the adjectives which one adds to the concept so long as we understand what we are talking about. I know that the hon. Member, Shri Gupta, is an intelligent man and he surely does not need to be given every single detail every time.

Sir, I was saying that this country has held before itself the ideal of a co-operative commonwealth in which social injustice shall be eradicated and in which the interests of all communities, areas and classes shall be recognised and protected, and in which there shall be no violence. This, I believe, Sir, is one of the main reasons why India has been able to achieve the progress which is in marked contrast to the progress achieved elsewhere in the world. Later on, I may have a word to say about this when we discuss the First Five Year Plan which we have just completed and the first year of the Second Five Year Plan into which we have launched.

The second reason, Sir, why India has been able to achieve this stable progress is that we have had a Party

[Prof. Humayun Kabir.]

and a leadership devoted to this ideal of unity and non-violence. There may have been occasional individual aberrations here and there. No political party is perfect. There are individuals who may have failed, but the Party and the leadership as a whole has held before the country this ideal of a co-operative commonwealth—'socialist', if that will satisfy my friend, but I do not think it is necessary to add it, because it is there already included. There may have been individual aberrations, but nevertheless, the country has held together because of this ideal of unity which has been placed by a political party and a leadership of the highest quality.

I would also like, Sir, to pay a tribute to the various services of this country. They have also contributed to this progress. If the services had been disrupted as in some of our neighbouring countries like Indonesia or Burma, perhaps, in spite of the leadership and the political organisation, these striking results may not have been achieved. This fact is sometimes forgotten. I think that they also, the services, deserve a word of praise. For these reasons, our First Five Year Plan achieved a degree of success which perhaps no First Five Year Plan of any other country has achieved. I am not forgetful of the tremendous advances made in certain directions by some of the countries of Europe, and recently of Asia. Take the Soviet Union itself. They have made a tremendous progress in the development of their heavy industries, but now, after 30 or 40 years, they are realising that their planning was onesided, and that the consumer industries did not receive the attention which was necessary in order to maintain the social health: and today, every important Soviet leader—take for instance Mr. Khrushchev, who is probably one of the ablest men in the world of politics today—has been emphasising again and again that the salvation of the Soviet Union and the salvation of Soviet

economy will lie in the development of its agriculture, in the production of more and more consumer goods and in providing more and more housing. Housing has been placed as one of the crucial points in any programme pertaining to the rehabilitation of the Soviet economy. And that is true of Eastern Europe also. The recent difficulties faced by these countries have been due not so much to any foreign pressure as to internal troubles, and these internal troubles developed because the consumer industries were not given the attention that they deserved.

I would therefore submit, Sir, that in the First Five Year Plan and still more in the Second Five Year Plan, there has been a proper balance maintained between the different needs of national life. There is an attempt to reconcile the interests of all the classes; there has been an attempt to reconcile the interests of the village and the town; there has been an attempt to reconcile the claims of consumer industries and production industries, and there has been an attempt to reconcile the claims of heavy industries and of cottage industries. And this has been possible because of the spirit of democracy, the atmosphere of democracy and the atmosphere of free criticism which prevails in India. Every one has the right to criticise the Plan and to make any constructive suggestions. The Members of this House will remember that when the Second Five Year Plan was being framed, the Draft Plan was actually sent to all the universities and colleges, and even students were asked to make their comments. Our Plan has had the benefit of criticism from many quarters, and it has been examined from different points of view, with the result that we have been able to avoid some of the mistakes and some of the dangers which planning in other countries has had to face.

I would not say, Sir, that we have achieved everything. I have mentioned again and again that much remains

to be done, and the greatest danger to this country would come from a spirit of complacency. And there also, Sir, I think the President's Address is remarkable, because he has pointed to two of the most serious difficulties which face the country today, and he has suggested that the Government and Parliament should pay proper attention towards meeting those difficulties. He has rightly pointed out in this respect that we must have more production of food and we must have a proper balance of development between the heavy industries and the consumer industries. The two particular dangers which he has stressed are what I would like to discuss in the few minutes left to me.

The first is the danger of inflationary pressures. There is no doubt whatever that if inflationary pressures go beyond a certain point, they become a threat to the economy of the country. All our plans may founder on this rock of inflation unless it is controlled in time. But I find, Sir, that there are attempts already made to check this inflation. If we look at the index figures, we shall find that while in November and December 1956, there were certain threatening tendencies, in January and February 1957, they have been partially controlled. Of course, they have not yet been fully controlled, because it takes time to control such inflationary pressures but, nevertheless, there are indications that the Government are fully aware of the necessity of watching the situation and taking necessary steps.

The first of such steps is the annual review of the Second Five Year Plan. This introduction of an annual assessment and as a result of that assessment the decision to alter the allocations between different sectors and different types of activities is a very salutary check. I have no doubt that if this check is exercised carefully, it will go a long way in meeting the danger of inflationary pressure. The second is the raising of food targets and building up of large stocks and

in this direction also considerable steps have been taken. Here we have to acknowledge with gratitude the help which has been given by the United States by the credit facilities they have given us in supplying wheat, rice and cotton. This will help us in checking inflationary pressure. Then recently the Central Warehousing Corporation has been set up. This also is an essential measure if food stocks are to be preserved at the necessary points in the different parts of the country. This measure also, I have no doubt, will go a long way in checking any inflationary pressure that may develop.

There are certain other additional measures which I would like Government to consider. I would suggest that the first step may be a certain re-examination of the allocation of the resources between long-term and short-term projects. I think one of the criticisms one can legitimately make against the First Plan and to a certain extent this would apply even to the Second Plan, is that at times there is a greater emphasis on long-term projects than on short-term projects. In the First Plan there are certain hydro-electric projects of which the first net return will not be available till 1986. The Plan came to an end in 1956 and if you have to wait for 30 years before the first net return comes, this is a matter which requires examination, especially in view of the inflationary pressures which are developing.

I would request the Planning Commission and the Government continually to keep in mind the economic situation in the country and to survey it in order to find out where funds may be diverted from such long-term to short-term plans. I am not behind anybody else in the desire that our heavy industries should develop and I agree with all that my hon. friend Mr. Sapru said about the necessity of developing these heavy industries as quickly as possible but we have also to remember that if heavy industries are developed at the cost of light

[Prof. Humayun Kabir.]

industries, if heavy industries are developed at the cost of consumer industries, soon a situation may develop which we found in Poland and in Hungary and which is incipient in many other countries of the world. There should be continuous examination and if need be, in order to relieve some of the inflationary pressures, at times some of the funds may be diverted from these long-term heavy industry projects to projects for developing consumer industries.

This is the principle responsible for giving such great impetus and emphasis in the Second Plan to the cottage industries, to supplying many of the consumer goods through cottage industries, and simpler procedures where the rate of production is not very high but a very much larger man-power is employed. The main purpose has been to provide employment to the people and to relieve possible inflationary pressure. The same principle, I believe, should be applied also to the question of allocation of funds between heavy industries and light industries. I would go further and say that the same principle should apply as between these basic industries and the social services.

I entirely agree with the hon. Mr. Sapru that far more should be done in the field of social services. I have never concealed my disappointment that especially in the field of education the rate of progress envisaged in the Second Plan is not only short of our capacity but it is also short of what has actually been achieved in the last 5 years. The rate of expansion in the First Plan is higher than the rate contemplated in the Second Plan and I think that is a matter which requires very careful looking into.

I would also say that in order to relieve this inflationary pressure, the principle of pricing for the various new services and benefits conferred by the State on the people should be more carefully examined. I would say one last word on this particular point.

We are pledged to a socialist economy. We are pledged to eradicate all inequalities of income between the different sections of the people but nevertheless so long as this country accepts mixed economy and a certain area of the economic life is reserved for the private sector, there should be as little interference as possible with the operations of that sector within the general principles laid down by the industrial policy statement of the Government.

Now the last point I would like to touch upon is the question of foreign exchange. The President in his speech has very rightly pointed to the need of conserving and expanding our foreign exchange resources. This is a matter which has become specially urgent in view of the fact that at the end of the first year of the Second Plan, the situation is more serious than we had contemplated at one stage. If I remember aright, in the Second Plan the expectation was that there might be a shortage of about Rs. 150 crores of foreign exchange at the end of the first year of the Second Plan. If I am not wrong, the actual deficit in the current account of foreign exchange at the end of the first year of the Second Plan will be almost twice that amount. From one point of view, this may be regarded as the result of an acceleration in the development of heavy industries. We are going more quickly ahead with some of the programmes for heavy industries. The import of steel and iron in particular has been much heavier than had been originally planned. Also our exports have not kept fully up to our expectation. Of the various major fields of exports three deserve special mention—tea, jute manufactures and cotton manufactures. While in tea there has been some improvement, and I believe that there is room for further improvement, in jute and cotton manufactures the position is not very hopeful, partly because of foreign competition and partly because of increased consumption within the country. For these reasons, I don't

think it will be possible to increase our earnings of foreign exchange substantially by expanding to a large extent the export of these three commodities.

But there is one other field which has been left almost untouched and I would request the Government and the Planning Commission to pay special attention to that. This is the field of export of ore and coal, particularly of iron ore. In December when discussing this subject, I had suggested that we should develop a fully mechanised port for handling ore exports at Geokhali near Calcutta. Since that time the urgency of the measure has become even greater. We find from the Second Plan that the target for the export of ore is only about 2 million tons a year. This seems to me, if I may use the phrase, a ridiculously low figure. We have one of the largest iron ore deposits in the whole world. If I am not mistaken, probably 21 to 22 per cent. of the total reserves of the world are contained within India and we produce steel today at the rate of not even 1·5 million tons. At the end of the Second Plan it will be probably 4·5 million tons. Even if we produced 100 million tons of steel a year, our own iron ore is sufficient to last us for probably 250 to 300 years. If that is the position, and our production is only 4·5 million tons and even with the production of 100 million tons we would have enough for 200 to 300 years, to say that iron ore should not be exported from this country seems to me to be utterly unjustified. In fact we cannot develop production within this country, we cannot set up the steel mills unless we import capital goods. The import of the necessary capital goods can be paid for only if we increase very largely our export of iron ore and other mineral ores.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): Don't you feel that Khandla port should be developed for the export of iron ore?

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: That is 800 miles away whereas Geokhali will be only 150 odd miles away. Moreover, dependence on Khandla port would create additional difficulties because it would mean undue pressure on the Railways which also, as hon. Members of this House are aware, are working under pressure. The Second Plan itself recognises that even with the proposed development of railways they will not be able to handle the traffic which will be offered at the end of the Second Plan.

In fact this whole programme of industrial and transport development and export of mineral ores are linked together and I believe that if the Geokhali port is fully developed, it will relieve the Railways. It will give some relief also in the matter of our coastal shipping and also foreign shipping. The imports which come from abroad are now partially unloaded at Vizagapatam and the goods are sent by train. Half-loaded ships come upto Calcutta. The development of Geokhali would solve all these problems and also enable us to develop our coastal shipping on a larger scale.

Here is another field which I believe the Government should pay special attention to, because shipping is an area which if we develop, will pay for itself in almost no time. Within about 10 to 15 years the capital investment will be recouped. Further, ships will be earning foreign exchange from the very day on which money is invested in them.

Sir, these are some of the suggestions I would make in regard to easing the foreign exchange position and I believe that if we can tackle these two problems—the problem of inflationary pressure within the country by increasing our production of consumer goods and by a judicious distribution of the consumer goods within the country and by building up larger food stocks and by increasing the supply of cloth and the problem of foreign exchange by developing the export of ore—then the major

[Prof. Humayun Kabir.]

hurdles in the way of the Second Five Year Plan would be overcome.

Sir, the picture India presents is one of optimism, of confidence, of success and strength among the people. Before I conclude, I would like to refer to the remarkable evidence the Indian people have given of their democratic political sense in the elections which are just completed. All over the country, by and large, the people have shown judiciousness in the selection of their candidates. It is true the Congress has won and has had a very magnificent victory, perhaps one might admit that in certain cases a victory even more optimistic than what we had hoped for. At the same time, the country has also given a warning to the Congress. The electorate has also unseated many important people. By administering this kind of shock to the ruling party, the country has indicated that while it is satisfied with the present rate of progress, it will not always be so satisfied. And I have to confess that some of us have also from time to time, been guilty of mistakes. We have lost touch with the people at times. Sometimes we have tried to impose our wishes upon the people; and wherever this has happened, wherever the representatives of the people have ceased to be representatives and have lost contact with the people, wherever there has been an attempt to impose anyone on any particular constituency or area, or to impose any particular programme, there has been a reaction from the people. This is desirable, because in a democracy, this is one of the salutary checks. This is a salutary check, because in this way the country expresses itself. I have every hope that we will progress with the policy of cooperation between all classes. I would say, of cooperation between all parties, because the Opposition also has a very important part to play. The Opposition also by its constructive criticisms has an important part to play in the service of the country and the regret comes when the Opposition

is not a responsible, constructive Opposition. If at any time the Opposition forgets its real role and is destructive for the sake of destruction.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Opposition is giving you the right treatment.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: I am not speaking of any particular individual. I only said, if at any time the Opposition forgets its role.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): He does not understand what a co-operative commonwealth means.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But the....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: If the cap fits any particular gentleman, I cannot help it. I have not referred to any particular party or individual. I have only said that if the Opposition forgets its role, then it not only loses its own chances of ever coming to power, but it does a disservice to the country. I am happy to find that the experience which this country has gained in democratic elections is creating judgment and political sense among the people. I am very glad that this time, in different parts of the country, there is an increasing awareness among the people. I remember in one particular area where I had been, there was a big meeting held and a particular candidate asked those in the meeting to pledge him their support. A villager stood up and said, "You are asking us to do something illegal." The candidate was taken aback and asked, "How am I asking you to do something illegal?" The villager replied, "The Constitution has given us the secret vote. If here in this meeting, we pledge you our support, then the secrecy of the ballot is lost. We have heard you. We shall hear others also and then we shall vote. But we will not tell you for whom we shall vote."



Now, that is the kind of consciousness that is growing in the country. If this democratic feeling becomes general and if ultimately with growing education and increasing communication, we develop in our country a constructive, co-operative socialist commonwealth, then this country will not only provide to its people a life of comfort, a life full of material and spiritual richness, but it will also serve the world by strengthening the forces of peace, progress and prosperity for all.

SHRI SATYENDRANATH BOSE (Nominated): Sir, I would like to say something about the export of ore which was referred to just now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That you can do later. I will now place the motion before the House. Motion moved:

"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 18th March, 1957.' "

Now, there are thirteen amendments proposed. Of these the first one, that of Mr. Kishen Chand, is out of order. The others may be moved.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, I move:

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

'but, while fully supporting the stand of India on Kashmir, regret that the handling of the case on behalf of India shows lack of foresight.' "

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

'but regret to note that Government have not taken steps for

the early incorporation of Goa in the Indian Union'."

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

'but regret to note that in spite of the deteriorating foreign exchange situation, Government have not acquired foreign concerns which are repatriating huge profits, capital and savings of their foreign employees'."

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

'but regret to note that in spite of the Government's assertion regarding increase in food production, Government have failed to arrest the rise in food and cloth prices without corresponding increases in wages and without benefiting the agriculturist by better return for his produce and that, in spite of heavy expenditure on the Five Year Plans, Government have failed to arrest growing unemployment in the country, especially amongst the educated young persons'."

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO (Orissa): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that no proper and effective priority has been fixed for the speedy industrialization of the country, especially in the long-neglected areas'."

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

'but regret that there is no indication of any positive steps to allay the roused passions in some parts of the country as a result of the re-organisation of States'."

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

[Shri P. C. Bhanj Deo.]

'but regret to find no firm declaration of effective steps to implement the declared policy to see that Goa becomes free from Colonial domination'."

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

'but regret to note that no specific indications are given for the fulfilment of the hope that considerable external finance will be forthcoming from friendly countries for the implementation of India's Second Five Year Plan'."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the improper use of the State apparatus and the Governmental machinery by the ruling party for furthering its electoral ends'."

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the popular demand that India must quit the Commonwealth, particularly in view of the aggressive plans of the British Government against our country'."

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

'but regret that the Address does not clearly indicate any concrete line of action for rebuffing the Anglo-American designs on Kashmir or for meeting the grievous threat to the freedom and security of Asian-African countries caused by Eisenhower's Middle-East Plan'."

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

'but regret that the Address does not propose any effective measures to bring down prices or to arrest the growth of unemployment or for otherwise improving the economic situation'."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The original motion and all these amendments are now before the House.

Yes, Dr. Bose, you wanted to say something.

SHRI SATYENDRANATH BOSE:

Sir, I wanted to say something connected with what my hon. friend Prof. Kabir said about improving our foreign exchange position by exporting ores. He said that we still have tremendous reserves of iron ore and we could very easily afford to export some and then, of course, buy iron from outside; ore is thus really worked somewhere else and is given back to us as iron, increasing the price, I do not know how many fold. But what I would like to say is that there is just this aspect of the question which the economists and legislators should think about. Even supposing we have enormous reserves of ores, all these ores are not of the same uniform quality. Their qualities differ and naturally if you want to export your ores, it will be really those ores that are of the very best quality that will be required by others. Therefore, it will mean that if we want to get foreign exchange, we must agree to deplete ourselves of the best quality ores that are now available, and the best quality means that it is easily worked, without any very disagreeable properties and so on. So, if we at once increase our export of ore and we do not sit down at once to smelt our iron ore in our own country, and thus utilise the resources which nature has given us, it will mean that we will be left without much good quality ores at the end. Ultimately, when the country becomes ready, when the workers are properly educated and when we have erected the steel plants,

by that time, considerable amounts of good quality ores would have vanished from our country and we would be short of the good quality ores. Thus, export of ores is not a very good suggestion.

Similar is the case of coal. We hear that we have got tremendous reserves of coal. But all this coal is unfortunately of a very low quality. We had been merrily burning away all our good reserves with the result that when the need appears of getting good quality coal for the principal metallurgical processes, we know we are hard put to it to find such coal in the quantities that we want. So we have to utilise various expensive processes in order to conserve our slender reserves.

The question of improving foreign exchange is not one which can be tackled easily. Of course, if we say that for the moment we can sell even the best things that we value, then let it be things like diamonds and other gems which are brilliant in themselves and highly prized but which do not help to build our industries.

Let us not dispose of the good ores because, once we export them, we would not get them back. By these ores we will not only be able to improve the quality of our iron produced but we will also be able to progress towards increasing the prosperity of our country. In regard to this point, I am very happy to hear that the social dynamics are now such that we have just begun to move. For heaven's sake, don't put a spoke in the wheel of progress by exporting the valuable materials which, an ordinary country which is just beginning to industrialise can easily use instead of going for difficult processes and use of poor materials at the end.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: A word of personal explanation, Sir. I am afraid the hon. Member who has just spoken did not hear what I said. I said that in order to develop our

steel mills, we require foreign exchange for which, as a short-term measure, some of our ore may have to be exported.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have heard two very good speeches, one by the **Mover** of the Motion and the other by the seconder. Regarding the Mover, I may say that he spent nearly forty-five minutes in trying to explain to Members of Parliament that the case of India about Kashmir was strong and was right. I do not see the occasion for it. I do not think there is a single Indian who disagrees with the policy of our Government regarding Kashmir. We are all united about it and to labour that point for 45 minutes in connection with the Motion on the Address is quite out of place. I entirely agree with all the points that he has made there; every Indian agrees with him but that does not mean that we accept the Motion of Thanks and I have sent in certain amendments.

Regarding the seconder, I have to say this. Mr. Humayun Kabir was very eloquent on the point that during the last ten years India has made greater progress than any other country in the world in this short period of ten years. Probably, he was comparing the progress made by other European countries or the Western countries in the sixteenth Century or the fifteenth Century when the technological advances were not as great as they are today. When we compare the progress of our country today, we must compare it with other countries similarly situated in the Western parts of the world where technological advances have been made. Mr. Humayun Kabir did not mention that there is a Directive Principle in the Constitution which says that illiteracy has to be brought to an end within ten years. During the last ten years, what has our Government done to achieve that ideal, to conform to the Directive Principle of our Constitution? The Congress Government wants to keep the voters illiterate

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

because wherever the voters are literate, for instance, in Kerala and West Bengal, the Congress has been defeated and where the voters are illiterate they have been re-elected. My contention is that in a Motion of Thanks, Mr. Kabir should have laid great stress on the fact that during ten years our progress so far as literacy is concerned has been very meagre. Whereas other countries have got rid of illiteracy in a period of three years, we have not made any progress at all. Sir, these are the two main points raised by the Mover and the seconder and now I come to the amendments that have been given notice of by me.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: They are full of regrets.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I begin by saying that this Address by the President is full of the acts of commission and omission committed by the Government.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL (Bihar): I want to know one thing. He says that literacy is responsible for the voting that has taken place in a particular way in Kerala and Bengal. According to that logic, perhaps the third position will go to Orissa and the fourth to Chota Nagpur.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: If Kerala is to be accepted as a good example, then his Party has done the worst.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I am trying to point out a few facts. Mr. Humayun Kabir has said that our country has made the largest amount of progress. He is an ex-Secretary of the Education Ministry of our Government and he completely forgot to mention anything about illiteracy.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: I did speak about Education.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: My time is limited and I must hurry up with the large number of acts of omission and

commission committed by our Government during the last year and point out to you, Sir, that though there may have been some progress, the large acts of omission and commission are so vital that there should be some expression of regret that the President has not drawn attention to them.

I submit that we agree about the question of Kashmir and about the stand taken by India in the Security Council but the Mover of the Motion asserted that our representative at great sacrifice to his health very ably put our case across. I submit, Sir, that there may be a feeling among a few persons that if a speech is lengthy, full of quotations and full of various points, then it is a good speech; it is a good representation of the case. You have been, Sir, an advocate and a lawyer and you must have realised that when a case is being argued out, it is not the length of the argument or the enumeration of facts and figures which win cases. In spite of his effort for eight hours, in spite of a speech of eight hours' duration, the result is that our representative could not convince even one person out of the eleven about the rightness of our case. You know, Sir, that when a lawyer loses a case, he always says that the Judge was biased or that the Judge was wrong or that he did not understand the case. He would always say that he was a very good lawyer and that he represented his client's case very nicely. When an argument is weak, they try to attack personalities. That is a very inferior way of representing a case. You must argue on facts. We are trying to prove that under similar circumstances, some years back, when the Hyderabad case which was more delicate and more serious came up, it was argued out by a Member of this House. I refer to Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliar and in that delicate situation, he handled the case so ably that it was taken off the records of the Security Council and we succeeded. We have had other representatives who have dealt with very delicate matters and presented our case so

nicely that we have won. Here, because a Member speaks for about six or eight hours, he is in bad health and he tries to win our sympathy by simply sacrificing his health in trying to argue out a long case, that does not justify the statement that our representation has been good. I maintain, Sir, that our latest representation to the United Nations has presented the case of India very badly, and a very good case, a perfect case, has been spoiled by that; a case which should never have been lost has been lost because of the arguments. Who is interested to hear a long speech of six or eight hours? I suppose our countrymen may be fond of long speeches but foreign countries, especially the Members of the Security Council, are not interested to hear a speech for eight hours showing all the fine points that have been enumerated by Mr. Krishna Menon.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may continue in the afternoon.

#### THE BUDGET (RAILWAYS), 1957-58

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Government of India for the year 1957-58 in respect of Railways.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR EXPENDITURE OF THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT (EXCLUDING RAILWAYS) IN 1956-57.

THE MINISTER FOR REVENUE AND CIVIL EXPENDITURE (SHRI M. C. SHAH): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants for Expenditure of the Central Government (Excluding Railways) in the year 1956-57.

1 P.M.

#### STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURE FROM THE CONSOLIDATED FUND OF THE KERALA STATE

THE MINISTER FOR REVENUE AND CIVIL EXPENDITURE (SHRI M. C. SHAH): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement of Expenditure from the Consolidated Fund of the Kerala State authorised under section 70 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956, for the last five months of the financial year 1956-57.

Sir, section 70 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956, permitted the Governor to authorise the expenditure from the Consolidated Fund of every new State for the last five months of the current year. Although the Act did not expressly provide for the regularisation of this expenditure by the State Legislature, it was considered desirable that the expenditure authorised under that section should be approved by the Legislature. The powers of the Legislature of Kerala are exercisable by and under the authority of Parliament by virtue of the Proclamation issued by the President on the 1st November, 1956. These Estimates are accordingly being brought before the Parliament.

Sir, as the hon. Members would have an opportunity to examine the Budget of the Kerala State for the year 1957-58, which is to be presented to the Parliament shortly, I do not propose to deal at length with the Estimates for the current year. The Revenue receipts for this period are estimated at Rs. 13.04 crores and Revenue expenditure at Rs. 13.74 crores, leading to a Revenue deficit of Rs. 70 lakhs. In addition, the Estimates include Rs. 8.23 crores for Capital expenditure, Rs. 1.31 crores as net payments of Loans and Advances by the State Government and Rs. 18 lakhs for repayment of the Permanent Debt. Of the Capital expenditure, the main items are: Irrigation—Rs. 1.45 crores; Industrial Development—Rs. 69 lakhs; Civil Works—Rs. 3.17 crores and Electricity Schemes—Rs. 2.53 crores.