

RAJYA SABHA

Friday, 25th February 1955

The House met at eleven of the clock, MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO SHRI THAKUR DAS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform the hon. Members that the following letter has been received from Shri Thakur Das:

"My wife is ailing since the last 15 months and her case is very serious these days. I am unable to attend the sittings of the Rajya Sabha. I, therefore, request you for the last turn to grant me leave of absence from all the sittings of the Rajya Sabha during this Session."

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Shri Thakur Das for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current Session?

(No hon. Member dissented.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

BUDGET ESTIMATES OF THE DAMODAR VALLEY CORPORATION FOR 1955-56.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER, FOR LABOUR (SHRI ABID ALI): Sir, on behalf of Shri Gulzari Lal Nanda, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 44 of the Damodar Valley Corporation Act, 1948, the Budget Estimates of the Damodar Valley Corporation for the year 1955-56. [Placed in Library, see No. S-44/55]

(1) AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE U.S.S.R. FOR ESTABLISHING AN IRON AND STEEL WORKS.

109 RSD.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS OF THE HINDUSTAN HOUSING FACTORY LIMITED FOR THE PERIOD FROM 1ST APRIL 1953 TO 31ST JULY 1954.

THE MINISTER, FOR PRODUCTION (SHRI K. C. REDDY): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following papers:—

(1) Text of the Agreement between the Government of India and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the establishment of an integrated iron and steel works in India. [Placed in Library, see No. S-46/55.]

(2) Annual Report and Accounts of the Hindustan Housing Factory Limited for the period 1st April 1953 to 31st July 1954. [Placed in Library, see No. S-45/55.]

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—continued

SHRI V. K. KRISHNA MENON (Madras): Mr Chairman, on this occasion when the House is considering the achievements of the year behind and the prospects for the future in their essential but broad aspects, it is perhaps permissible to address oneself to the problems from that point of view, in order that we may not lose sight of the wood even if we take care of the trees. The President in his Address has referred at length to the economic achievements of our country, even though the Address according to custom begins with a reference to foreign affairs. It is not necessary to make any apologies for referring to the importance of this economic aspect, though we in this country and in this House are often proud and perhaps legitimately proud of the accomplishments and the contributions we have made in the field of foreign affairs. We have always to remember that it is not possible for

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.]

our country to function in the foreign field with a moderate degree of effectiveness unless there is stability at home. It is also reasonable to recall to ourselves that in various parts of the world—it would not be proper for me to mention particular countries—the degree of involvement, of entanglement, of various other things from which we are free bear a direct relation to economic instability or lack of stability. For all those reasons you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, in the short time I have, to say a few words on the economic aspects of the question, but I have no desire to enter either into any detail or controversy with regard to names and labels that may have been attached to our Socialist Resolution.

I would like to think aloud on the fact that in this country of ours, in this epoch we are facing a kind of economic development which is without a precedent. There is no instance in the world where a country which is undeveloped has to march rapidly towards industrialisation and modernisation in the context of the new political democracy. It is important for us to remember this because when we apply social theories as from other countries where the mechanism of production, the mechanism of industrialisation and the whole mechanics of economic development has preceded political democracy and political democracy has followed and social revolutions have followed this kind of industrialisation as the Industrial Revolution in Europe. We have a situation rather different from what we have in other countries and, therefore, I would like to ask myself whether we could not leave to the future economists and to the future historians to decide as to the kind of revolution that is taking place in our country.

I would like particularly to refer to three or four facts, policy developments that have been announced in the House by the Government during the last year or so. And first of all

I would like to refer to the main objective of our social policy of fuller employment leading to full employment. I say this because it is far more important to look at the content of this rather than the names we attach. If we are able to absorb each year the one million new job-seekers that will come on account of the increase in population and at the same time also absorb the lag there is existing of a degree of unemployment, then our social policy would stand justified. And it is a matter of congratulation that the policy statements are matters of orientation—and we are more concerned in this debate with the direction in which we look.

Secondly, reference has been made to the taking over of the Imperial Bank. I have been interested in hearing this and to me it is not a question of how many Directors are appointed by the Government or how many shares are held, or this and that. The main importance is that it is a revolutionary change, a revolutionary change whereby the National Government, the Government of the country takes under control an instrument whereby credit is funnelled into rural areas. That is of importance rather than the minutiae of its organisation. It is the first instalment of the nationalisation of the banking system. It is a very necessary corollary; it is inevitable in the circumstances of the projects and of the developments contemplated by the Second Five Year Plan. There again, I go back a little—while in Western countries and in the various countries where socialism has developed, the problem was one of obtaining control over production—that was the primary problem that was before them—over primary problem is the increase of production. If we are to raise the standard of life of our people and contribute to greater welfare, then it becomes necessary that the produce of our labours, that is to say, industrialisation and other agricultural development, everything else, where the capacity to produce sufficient goods, to promote our commerce and trade,—in order that our economy may not become dependent

and the political liberty that we have won may not get somewhat conditioned by economic dependence—for all these the most important factor is the increase of production. And, therefore, if we speak about the kind of economy that has got to be evolved, it would be premature, at the present moment, to speak in terms of a particular ideology, particular 'ism' or this or that.

And here we may draw the analogy of our own political development. We have a political democracy of the so-called parliamentary type, but the future historian will record that we are evolving our own parliamentary type—although there is a great deal of quotation of precedent, although there is always argument, what is usually said and something of that kind. While the essence of political democracy is voting by secret ballot and control of the executive by Parliament, parliamentary control of business—essentially in a Parliamentary Government these things are there, but our own pattern of Parliamentary Government is developed from day to day. The same thing will apply to industry.

Thirdly, I would like to speak on another aspect in the development of our economic policy, that is, the scientific attitude that is taken in this development—always not welcomed by those who probably have not the facilities of being acquainted with all the back-room work that goes on. It is not possible to develop an under-developed country and bring it to modern standards until we know the nature of the problem. We all know the nature of the problem—there is a lot of starvation among the people, our industry and economy is backward. But unless we have the data we cannot succeed. Therefore, all the work that goes on by way of production of material, by the statistical institutes, by other organs in the State Governments and in the Central Government and by voluntary organisation—is a contribu-

tion to a scientific approach towards the development of our economy. And that scientific basis is probably one of the underlying features of our development.

It is not my desire to go much deeper into these economic questions because the time before me is limited and there will be some expectation that one should refer to the international affairs and, therefore, I come to that aspect of it. The first idea that comes to one's mind is, since Parliament—this House—had the opportunity of debating foreign affairs, the general orientation and that is all we should say—we cannot say it is a policy, we cannot say it is an ideology—the general orientation of our international relationship, namely, the promotion of the ideas of collective peace and the extension of the areas of peace—the attempt to seek peace rather than by methods of war, preparations for war—that has extended itself into other continents. There again it may be one of those instances that might have passed comparatively unnoticed—the agreement or rather the common statement made by the President of Yugoslavia with our Prime Minister and what is more a part of the statement made by the Prime Minister of Egypt, Colonel Nasser, only a few days ago is of great significance—because this is the first time we have one of the countries of the Middle East which have been the cockpit of contending rivalries for generations and what is more through nascent nationalisation—has been conditioned by necessities and the exigencies of bloc politics—come forward for the first time to say that international disputes should be settled peacefully by negotiation. Military alliances and power entanglements which increase tension and rivalry in armaments do not add to the security of the countries. It is quite true that the statements issued by the Prime Ministers, after formal visits, or even after two days' conversations, have not got the value of international treaties. They are subject to interpretations afterwards. And what is more,

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.]

even decisions, if they are decisions, reached in the context of such meetings may suffer from all the impacts of the forces that are brought to bear upon them. But, nevertheless, it is important for us to realise that the basic conception of the development of international thought, or of the relations between countries based upon mutual respect, based upon the cultivation of peace ideas, and not being entangled in power blocs has now spread in the last 12 months. You will find that a beginning is made in the two great continents. That is a great achievement.

The next point, Mr. Chairman, which has been referred to in the President's Address, is with regard to the Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers. And here again, I speak without apologising for it that the relations of this country with its sister countries have greatly improved. And that is probably one of the great developments that have occurred in the international relations. I do not propose to repeat what I said on the last occasion. But, I think, Mr. Chairman, that the attention of this House should be drawn to the fact that when the conclusions, or rather the final statements, of this Conference were made, all those facts that related to military alliances, all those things that related to military talks, were not part of the general communique, that is to say, that the States which have got their own differences on certain matters in their own private conversations can issue their own conclusions. Now, that is a fact of two-sided importance. First of all, in spite of our Commonwealth relations, and in spite of the fact that our Prime Minister was sitting in the same room for the discussion of common problems of common concern, we have kept aloof from any kind of discussion which would lead to military or political entanglement of that character. Secondly, it is also important that in spite of the fact that the great majority of the countries, perhaps with the

exception of two or three Asian countries of the Commonwealth, were together, we have kept out of the general pattern of our pre-determined politics.

Next, Mr. Chairman, I come to our relations nearer home. And the very first thing which causes us great concern is the position in regard to Indo-China. Mr. Chairman, I am fully aware of the fact that there are matters in this House which have got a wider audience than what we find here, and it is not my desire, nor my intention, to say anything that may cause embarrassment to the Government, or to ourselves, or to those who are associated with us. The situation in Indo-China has always been one of very great concern. The President refers to the special responsibilities that we have undertaken in this matter. I want to say here with deliberation that when India entered into this Commission, she did not go there as an arbitrator between the two rival powers. The International Commission consisting of Canada, Poland and ourselves is a team, and it is on that basis that the Commission has been set up. We are now past six months of the existence of this Commission from the 11th of August, and I think it is a matter for gratification that until this day, no decision of this Commission has been reached by the process of voting. There have been differences and different approaches arising from the nature of Government and thinking of our separate countries or various other reasons, but these differences, either within the Commission, or within the Joint Commission or other parties concerned, have been hitherto ironed out by private conversations. I think it is the process of modern diplomacy, Mr. Chairman to speak about private agreements publicly arrived at. So, those private agreements have been wholesome in this respect, but it would be romantic to expect that this situation will continue without further difficulty. The fructification of the Geneva Agreement, in the sense of the establishment of the conditions of

free elections, whereby the four territories will enter into that process by secret ballot and democratic freedoms is one of the things devoutly hoped for, and we may express the hope that neither the ideological differences that exist between the countries, nor the greater heat that is turned on in the cold war now and then, would in any way affect the position that exists. And this country has a right to look to the Government of Canada and to the Government of Poland to approach this problem in the same spirit in which they began to continue this work. Our officers, our representatives, on this Commission have behaved with remarkable dexterity, judgment and impartiality, and also with courage. We must also hope that the change of Government in France will in no way affect the co-operation that the French High Command has given in the past, and all the problems will be dealt with without great difficulties. It is heartening to think that the States of Indo-China—and I do not want to pick any one out—show indications that, given the opportunity, they will develop into what may be called a South-East Asian pattern of Government. And there is no reason, therefore, for either side to be alarmed, if it is possible to allow these agreements to be worked out free from external interference.

This House will recall, Mr. Chairman, that in the statement issued here in Parliament last year by the Prime Minister, one of the six points in regard to the Indo-China Agreement was about non-intervention. And it is on the basis of non-intervention that the Geneva Agreement had been arrived at. Now it is necessary that there should not be too much heat turned on, and the terms and the spirit of the Agreement must be respected, and particularly those terms which say that those territories shall not be made either the bases or the scenes of operations either for the countries of the East or the West or the North or the South. And it is important for us to make no distinction in regard to this external interference. Everybody

knows, and there is no doubt about the fact, that the people in Indo-China have gone through a sufficiently long period of suffering in the course of their struggle for national liberation irrespective of what our political statements may be in the heat of the moment. We have seen and felt that the one desire of the peoples is to settle down in such a way that the independence of their lands can be secure. And the basis of the Geneva Agreement provides for this good work towards that end, if, as I said, the changes of Government in France and the changes in the relations between the great powers do not create troubles inside Indo-China, and if our two colleagues on the Commission, namely, Canada and Poland, will, whatever may be the provocation, and whatever may be the minor difficulties, continue to work along with us as one team and not as two sides.

Now, we come to the problems in the Far East. There is a Conference that is sitting today in Bangkok. There are three Asian partners to this Conference. Our Government has expressed itself with clarity and with dignity for what we stand for with regard to what is called the South-East Asia Defence Organisation. We do not think it right or proper that a group of powers should sit down somewhere and allocate to themselves an area of protection below certain latitudes. It is also unfortunate that in this area fall certain States of Indo-China. At the same time, I think we should be glad to take note of the statement made by the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom before he left for this Conference that it was not the intention—he is one of the partners—to raise the question of Formosa at Bangkok. That is to say, at the present moment S.E.A.D.O. is not extending itself, as far as that statement goes, into the dimensions of the N.A.T.O. of spreading itself further from the areas of the latitudes defined. The Treaty itself provides for the extension of the area of protection just as they like. It must be our fervent hope—and we can only express

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.]

our hopes in this matter because they are sovereign countries and we cannot really object to their taking what course of action they wish to take, but we are entitled as a sovereign country to say what we think about it. We think that these little pacts—after all there are only two or three great powers in the world in the sense of possessing powerful armies and economic power—of which a small country is a party reduce that country very much to the position of a supplier. Speaking for myself—and I emphasise the words 'speaking for myself'—these little pacts where undeveloped countries are involved share the characteristics of colonialism. There is always the danger of their territories being used for the purposes of these pacts. Secondly, there is the danger, a danger of which we have become free since independence, of their troops being used abroad either under the doctrine of 'Asians fighting Asians' or at least of fighting materials being taken away from them. Thirdly there is even the more sinister circumstance which works over a longer period of economic subordination.

So, it is a matter of regret to us that, instead of turning itself into a council of protection by co-operation between Asian countries, the S.E.A.D.O. as it has emerged is likely to become another stumbling block in the way of Asian co-operation, but at the same time it will be a mistake on our part—and I speak with deliberation—to spend a great deal of time in a frontal attack on an Organisation of which we are not members and on which we have already expressed our opinion. We have little doubt that the right method, the right palliative, to this question is the success of our policy, i.e., greater economic stability, our greater capacity for non-dependence economically on other people, countries and spheres, our greater capacity to raise commercial products that can earn foreign exchange, our greater technical skill and, what is more, our

infinite patience in being able to deal with people with whom we do not agree. This is the only way to success. There is no way of our combating powerful countries who have gathered themselves together, rightly perhaps—and I do not want to question their motives at all—except by showing by example the success that attends our own method, and I believe that the recent statement of Col. Nasser and our Prime Minister is a small instalment of this process. This again shows how closely domestic and foreign policies are related to each other. It is a great mistake to imagine that domestic and foreign policies are separate from each other. This is our approach to the S.E.A.D.O. We hope that nothing will be done at Bangkok which will add to the frictions, add to the difficulties, that we are facing in Indo-China, Formosa and elsewhere.

In the Far East the other most difficult problem, a problem which the world somehow or other thinks is our special responsibility or something of special concern, or in connection with which we have some special contribution to make, is the threatening situation in Formosa. I think that here again it will be necessary for us to take a calculated and cool view of the situation. On the one hand, it is wrong to say that we are on the verge of a world war. On the other hand, it will be wrong to discount that there are ingredients in this which may make for conflagration. Our own position, our own policy has been fully stated with regard to the legitimate claims of China. It has been referred to in the President's Address, but over and above that claim, we have another concern and that is that all questions and all difficulties may be solved peacefully, and therefore rightly or wrongly we find ourselves in a position where persons with responsibility, countries, States and Governments, are looking forward to us for some assistance in this matter. So far as I can understand it, our position in this is exactly the same as it was in Korea or Indo-China. Our Government and our peo-

ple do not want to rush in or claim for themselves or appropriate to themselves any particular field or any opportunity, rostrum or position in international affairs. If it so happens, as it happened in Korea or Indo-China, that both sides are anxious for us to be included in the endeavours that are being made and if we ourselves are sure that we can make a positive contribution, then we have a duty to enter. I say this because we found that, while near war raged in Formosa, all eyes were turned at the meeting of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers largely because of the presence of our Prime Minister in that place and on account of the close association and close contact of the U.K. and Canada with one of the parties concerned. I here express my personal view that the main parties in this business are the Governments of the U.S.A. and of China in Peking. So, it is not for us at the present moment to give public expression to any method or any form in which a solution of the difficulties can be found. It may lie a short way off and it may lie a long way off, but one thing we may say and we have said that it is necessary to take some initiative in the matter. That is to say, a beginning has to be made somewhere, so that the present tensions can be lowered and in the context of lowered tensions a new situation can arise. We are happy to see that there are forces working in this direction, and if these forces do not work, there would be a more acute situation, where mighty armies or mighty armed forces of two countries are poised one against the other. It is no personal reflection on Chiang-Kai-Shek to say that the Government of Formosa has a vested interest in war because it is only through war operations that they can ever hope to get on to the mainland. Therefore, our attention and our energies should in the first instance be exercised in terms of thinking of what is immediately possible and not of the ultimate solution. This ultimate solution depends upon factors of which we have no complete knowledge, nor do we have any direct con-

trol over them. But as time goes on, if a beginning is now made, we should get somewhere. Our own position in regard to China, in regard to international treaties, our own position in regard to the U.S.A., all that is well-known, but I think this House would make a mistake and our country would make a mistake, if they do not at the same time realise that in any conflict it is not sufficient to think of the rights and wrongs of any side. We have to think of the consequences, and the consequence in this case, if there is no resolving of these difficulties, is the likelihood of war, and having that in view and taking into account the great feeling and public opinion in the U.S.A., the power of that country, and what is more, that the vast masses of the population of the U.S.A. are devoid of any imperialist ambitions and that, whatever be the question at issue, they are moved by considerations of what they regard as an idealistic venture, it would be a great mistake from the realistic point of view to disregard the opinion of the United States. That does not mean that we have to agree with it. Our business as non-committed people, as people fundamentally wedded to peace, is to try and not apportion blame and responsibility but to see whether the doors which are now open to us, however narrow the opening may be, are not closed because at some stage or other, negotiations will be necessary and our proximity, our relations with China and also our relations with the Western world may come in for some use. In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say these last few words. In the course of the debate in this House, in the writings, in the press and everywhere else, one cannot help thinking, particularly in view of the limited success of the useful contribution we have made in international affairs, that we are likely to think that we have a solution for everything. The world does not rest upon our shoulders. We can make a contribution and the appearance that this country may give is 'If only it were left to us, we could solve a lot of problems'. Sovereign countries are

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.] jealous of their own position. They have their own views and what is more, this is really not a dispute in which we are the principal parties but of course it is a dispute from the consequences of which we cannot escape. Therefore both in regard to that, Mr. Chairman, and generally in relation to international affairs, I am speaking for myself, I will lay myself the injunction that restraint in the expression of opinion about other countries is one of the greatest contributions we can make for international understanding because we have neither the power nor the desire to act as correctives or to admonish other people. We would not be successful if we try that and what is more, we don't like it when other people comment on our affairs and such comments and restrained admonitions are best administered by Governments through the normal diplomatic channels. Therefore if we continue to exercise the restraint that we have been doing in regard to that, we should be making a great contribution.

I now come to the final observations I wish to make. While we sit here discussing these minutiae of foreign policy, the world at present stands in the shadow of war. These atomic weapons have now reached a stage where everybody privately recognises that nobody can win a war. It has now been stated that a Hydrogen bomb explosion in the mid-Pacific will immediately affect 7,000 square miles. It is known, though always it is not admitted by the Governments concerned, it is known and supported by highest scientific authorities, that the mere explosion of these bombs without even a war can make life on this planet almost impossible, can destroy not only human beings but vegetation and every form of life. The radio-activity would be of such a character even by these experimental explosions if we are to continue them in any quantity that there would be deterioration of created life in the world. What is more, there is no protection against them but truly, we

have come to a stage of war when defence is attack and as Lord Montgomery said: The safest place is near the enemy the hope that he will not kill himself (*Cheers*). But even that has gone away because while in our ancient traditions, there might have been Gods that controlled the winds, science does not control the winds and though these radio-active ashes can be blown to any place so as to affect vegetation, life and anything, but at the same time I realise that humanity is not likely to be coerced into peace by terrors of war because the bludgeon and the axe that were used then were as terrific to the people at that time as the H-bomb is to us; I think with intelligent people and what is more, with the advance of civilization over the millennium, it should be possible to convince the world that war, if you like to put it that way, no longer pays, i.e., it does not achieve even the immediate objective of aggression, viz., conquest. There would be no victors or vanquished. Today the powers are so balanced. The Soviet Union and the U.S.A. possess horrific weapons or capacity which can destroy each other's countries and therefore the use of them cannot result in a vanquished country to whom terms of peace can be dictated and what is more if the purpose of one country or the other is the liberation or conquest of the other, the country to be conquered or liberated would not be there. Therefore war has become a business that has been sterilized. It has become sterile and it therefore falls to us to think whether the time has not come for us not merely to entrust this question of disarmament to those who have the arms because they don't seem to come to agreement. They are still discussing whether it is better to kill somebody with 9" gun or a 19" gun. The effect is the same. What is more, even if there is an agreement about the total banning of atomic weapons, in the present state of scientific knowledge, once the war starts even without atomic weapons, humanity has not so far advanced in war-time to keep the word that they will not make them

and therefore there is this only one alternative to this, viz., war must be out-lawed as an instrument of policy and you have come to a stage when this country and other countries of the world, irrespective of their military weakness, irrespective of their economic backwardness, irrespective of their new entry into international politics, irrespective of the fact that they may be ridiculed, have to come straightforward on the platform and declare that war must end. There can be no solution of any problem by war and it is that basis, which for the first time on its first introduction into the international forum, will suffer a great deal of ridicule. Our Government have made so many attempts to make contributions in the field of disarmament. We have asked for an armament truce, we have asked for the stopping of experiments of explosion, we have asked that there should be budgetary limitations. We have asked that the inspection of these weapons which are the stumbling block to establishing disarmament could be worked out in certain ways. I will not go into the details. We have done all this. But all this consideration today is in the hands of those who have the powerful weapons of destruction. I am not saying that their motives are not right. In fact I do know that there is not a Government in the world, there are not a people in the world who want to make war but the question is whether the set-up will lead to war. It is a great mistake to speak of nations right or left, north or south as war-mongers or peace-mongers. They are all interested, and are moving today motivated by fear in the context of Hydrogen bombs or in the context of the advance of science. What is more, we are coming to a situation which is even more dangerous than the possession of these fearsome weapons by the countries of the world. We have not passed the age of national revolutions. We have not passed the age when a few aeroplanes and guns are creating changes of Government and creating conditions of chaos in various countries. The time is coming, if all news that we read is true, when the production of the atomic

weapons on a mass scale, large-scale production, mass production as you say, would come. That means the smaller atomic weapons which are produced on a large-scale would be available to forces inside a country or to smaller nations and it would be even more difficult to control that kind of use than there is at present. For all these reasons, we have come to the position when we have unequivocally to proclaim that there is only one way of avoiding war and that is to end it by outlawing it

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about the international and economic questions referred to in the President's Address and we shall have many opportunities during the budget discussions of referring again to these topics. I should not, therefore, like to discuss them at any length. But the problem of the Far East to which the President has referred is so important that I venture to ask for a clarification of the President's meaning. "Unfortunately," says the President, "other conflicts still continue, endangering the peace of the world. Among these, the most serious at the present moment is that relating to the Far East and, more particularly, to Formosa and the off-shore islands of China. My Government recognises only one government of China, that is, the People's Republic, and considers that the claims of this Republic are justified. I earnestly hope, however, that these difficult problems will be solved peacefully and by negotiation."

I should first of all like to understand what the position of the Government is with regard to the island of Formosa. Is our Government committed to the view that it belongs to China and that it should be placed as soon as possible under the authority of the Democratic Republic of China? Sir, here on our own continent, there were two territories which formed an integral part of India—Pondicherry and Goa; and yet in the case of Pondicherry, we agreed to a plebiscite in order to decide whether it

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.] should be placed under the control of the Government of India. If the method of plebiscite were possible in Goa, I am sure that it would be welcomed both by the Government and the people of India. We recognise the historical fact that although these territories might be geographically connected with India, they have been long separate from the rest of country, and that therefore it is only fair that their people should be allowed to decide their future for themselves. If the Government of India have abandoned this view in the case of Formosa, I should like to know the reasons for that. Why can't we, while being friendly to China, hold the opinion that although Formosa might have formed part of the Chinese Empire before it was transferred to Japan, it has not been part of China for about sixty years and that this fact requires that the people of Formosa should be allowed to decide what their future should be. It is undoubtedly important that Formosa, if it decided not to throw in its lot with China, should not be used by any power unfriendly to China, to launch an attack on it. Internationalisation of Formosa is one of the methods by which this can be prevented. But I do not want to discuss this question at this time. I only want to know what the position of the Government of India is, and whether in its opinion, it is impossible that the same method should be used to solve the Formosa question as was used to solve the question of Pondicherry and as can be used in the case of Goa, if only the Government of Portugal will be as reasonable and statesmanlike as the French Government has been.

Sir, I should like next to refer to another matter which seems to be of no little importance. Article 18 of the Constitution.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing the Constitution, Dr. Kunzru.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: No, Sir, we are not, but I have to refer to article 18 of the Constitution because a particular policy adopted by the Government seems to be at variance with

the spirit of that article. That article says:

"No title, not being a military or academic distinction, shall be conferred by the State."

Now, however, certain distinctions are being conferred and the excuse for that is that they are not "titles" but only "decorations."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): They are superior to the Constitution.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: They cannot be used, as suffixes or prefixes to the names of those on whom they are conferred. They are, therefore, regarded as entirely different from the titles that were previously bestowed by the British Government while they exercised authority in this country. But there seems to me to be no essential difference between those titles and the decorations that are now being awarded. Legally, what the Government says may be right, but I submit that morally speaking, there is no difference between the two.

Let us consider, Sir, the rules relating to the award of these distinctions. Take the case of the Padma Bhushan. It is further said in the rules that the decoration shall be awarded for distinguished service of a high order in any field, including service rendered by a Government servant. And rule 4, says that the decoration shall be worn by men on the left breast, etc. Now, when you consider these rules, what exactly is the difference between the old titles and these decorations? I have no doubt that in the course of a few years, men will run after these decorations as eagerly as they did after the titles so long as they were in vogue.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): Even now they do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There is a queue standing.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: The object of abolishing the titles was to prevent the demoralisation that they brought about. I am afraid that the practice

of awarding decorations, if continued, would soon bring about the same kind of demoralisation among the people. I suggest, therefore, that although legally the Government may be entitled to award decorations this practice should immediately be brought to an end in the best interests of the country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are appealing to the Home Minister.

PROF. G. RANGA: He may be the next person, who knows?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There are many of them. Promotions are too many on that side.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Lastly, Sir, I should like to refer to a statement read out on behalf of the Finance Minister by the Minister for Revenue and Civil Expenditure, Shri M. C. Shah. This statement related to the observations of the Public Accounts Committee on certain contracts entered into by the Indian High Commission in London, for the supply of vehicles and other goods to the Defence Ministry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing the Budget now.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: No, Sir, we are not. This is not a question of the Budget at all. I am not going to enter into the details of this matter now but the last sentence of the statement that was read out by Mr. Shah raises a question of great importance. That sentence ran as follows: "I trust that in the light of the explanation given in the statement sent to the Public Accounts Committee and what I have just said, the House will treat the matter as closed". Sir, when Mr. Shah read out the statement, he also placed on the Table a copy of the explanation sent by the Government to the Public Accounts Committee. Now, Sir, if the explanation has been sent to the Public Accounts Committee, we must await the views of the Committee on the statement submitted to

it. I could understand his saying to the Public Accounts Committee that the Government hoped that the Committee would treat the matter as closed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Government has expressed the hope that the Committee would treat the matter as closed.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): I may inform Pandit Kunzru that the Chairman had kept the matter open.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary to pursue that now.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ (Madhya Pradesh): We are discussing the President's Address.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Whether the Chairman said anything or not, I am referring to what we are concerned with and that is the attitude of the Government.....

PROF. G. RANGA: That is the point.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU:and the policy adopted by it. How could it with any propriety ask us, over the heads of the P.A.C.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is the expression of hope or a recommendation to the P.A.C. to treat the matter as closed. It is only that.

PROF. G. RANGA: It is the attitude of the Government which he is criticising.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: This statement does not say that the Government has asked the P.A.C. to treat the matter as closed. On the contrary, the Government, in the last sentence of the statement, asks us, whatever the views of the P.A.C. may be, to treat the matter as closed. I cannot possibly accept that view.

PROF. G. RANGA: It may be a slip of the tongue.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: The position of the P.A.C. is a very difficult one.

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

Soon after the publication of the statement that I have referred to, the correspondent of a local English daily wrote that the Congress Party Whips would see to it that the Government view was endorsed by the Committee. I hope that the P.A.C. which has done its work so far with independence and impartiality, would continue to exhibit the same qualities whatever pressure might be brought to bear on it, but if it is a fact that the Government Whips will be asked to intervene.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kunzru, why do you accept that correspondent's speculation as authoritative?

PROF. G. RANGA: Then the question of breach of privilege comes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They have not contradicted that statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sit down; Dr. Kunzru is in possession of the House.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Till Mr. Shah read out the Finance Minister's statement in this House, I should not have thought that the Government would come to us and ask us, without knowing the view of the P.A.C., to treat the question of the contracts relating to the supply of vehicles and other goods to the Defence Ministry as closed. In this situation, we have to be careful. Our suspicions should not be held to be altogether unreasonable. I am, therefore, compelled to say that the Government would be acting most unjustifiably and contrary to the spirit of democracy if it brought pressure to bear on the Committee through the Members of its Party in the Committee to make it agree to the Government view.

PROF. G. RANGA: Through the Whips, not the Members.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: There is just one more word that I should like to say before I sit down. I have already expressed my view about the decorations now awarded by Government to

people, who, they think, have rendered distinguished service to the country. I am sorry to say, Sir, that even if the award of these distinctions was justified, they have conferred these distinctions in some cases on persons whose work and conduct was adversely commented upon by the P.A.C. I do not want to mention names.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think that you can make personal references at all.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Why do you say, Sir, that I am making any personal reference? I am not referring to any one by name.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That does not matter.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: We are now dealing with the Government's policy in this matter and if we are not to refer to it here, where are we to refer to it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You cannot discuss the discretion or the views which the President has. That is not permissible. I have asked the Home Minister to speak at 12. He has to go to Lucknow and, therefore, I wish you to wind up.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Whether the Home Minister goes to Lucknow or not, it is not my responsibility.

PROF. G. RANGA: It is not Parliament's responsibility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I expect the Members to be considerate to others' conveniences.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I am quite prepared to concede that but you will forgive me for saying that it is rather hard on a non-official Member that you should ask him to curtail his speech in order that the Member of the Government, who enjoys every kind of privilege in this House, should have an opportunity of explaining his views at length, views from which I differ.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have stated your views.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I have stated them in the briefest possible manner, but I am quite sure that if he gets up to speak and goes on till 2 P.M. he will not be asked to sit down. This kind of difference ought not to be allowed to prevail between official and non-official Members.

12 NOON

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Parliament wishes to know the views of the Government.

PROF. G. RANGA: That is a different matter.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: However, Sir, I have so much respect for you that I am bound to fall in with your wishes. I wanted to say something more on this subject, but in deference to your opinion I shall not do so now. I may take another opportunity of expressing my views on these subjects at greater length. I hope that my hon. friend the Home Minister will not have reason to complain that I stood in his way and did not give him sufficient time to explain the policy of the Government.

THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT): Mr. Chairman, I consider it a privilege to serve in this august House under your kindly eye and inspiring guidance.

It is a matter of regret to me that Dr. Kunzru should have felt a little hurt at the fag end of his speech. I on my part would ever be prepared to make way for him. He is one of our foremost public workers and I have always entertained a great regard for him and the words coming from him deserve respectful attention. I must confess however that today I was rather surprised and perplexed when I heard him making comments on matters about which no indication had been given anywhere. I don't

know how far it is fair. The Address of the President did not refer to the matters on which he laid emphasis. No notice of any amendment was given by him or by any other person. After all the Government cannot be expected to take unlimited time of this House by dealing with matters which do not arise out of the President's Address or the amendments but are sprung upon the House at the eleventh or the twelfth hour. So far as the points raised by him are concerned, everyone knows that Formosa has been internationally recognised as being a part of China and we have accepted the present Government of China as being the legitimate representative of the Chinese people. So long as we adhere to that opinion we have to treat the present Government as being entitled to hold its opinion and to press for the acceptance of its views on Formosa. More than that I am not prepared to say.

I only am sorry that Dr. Kunzru's is the solitary voice of a singular character with regard to Formosa. I will just recite a story which comes to my mind. When a play of Bernard Shaw was presented and everybody acclaimed and expressed his appreciation, there was one particular individual who raised a voice of dissent. Bernard Shaw said: I am sorry, but you are the only one man whom I find here. You can have my company but we both will be overwhelmed by this large body which holds a different opinion.

Well, Sir, so far as the Public Accounts Committee matter and the hope expressed by the Government that the question will be treated as closed are concerned, Government was expecting that hon. Members and those who had taken an interest in the matter would examine the question in the light of their explanation in a detached manner without any prejudice and without being deflected from the right course by any preconceived notions and pre-possessions. That hope of the Government may not always be realised. But it was no

[Shri Govind Ballabh Pant.]
more than the expression of a hope and I believe that most of the Members will accept the explanation and the hope of the Government will be fulfilled and realised.

Sir, so far as the question of titles goes, I do not know whether these medals which are being presented by the President can really be the subject-matter of discussion in this House. But apart from that, the Government should be deemed to have consulted expert opinion before adopting a particular course. The Government cannot itself be a party to any unconstitutional course or conduct. So what Government has done cannot be against the Constitution. Moreover the recognitions are not titles. They are no more than a humble tribute on the part of the spokesman of the State to those who have raised the country's status and elevated the general level of social life by their selfless service. I do not see why anybody should or could have any objection to that.

Sir, the President's Address has been discussed during the last two days. It is a solemn pronouncement giving a survey of the principal events and policies. It is a matter of gratification that this Address has on the whole been received well in this House; the jarring notes have been very few. On the whole the collective opinion of the House seems to be in favour and in support of the statements made in the Address. Some hon. Members have tried to pick holes, but the Address has nevertheless emerged unscathed and intact. Some amendments had been notified but none seems to have developed any of the propositions set forth in these amendments. Some casual remarks have been made but nobody has felt safe about his own ground, and apart from giving notice of the amendments even those who had given such notice have not pursued them further.

The Government, Sir, respects the opinion of this House and even of

individual Members. It will be the endeavour of Government to take full note of every suggestion made in this House. After all we who are in the executive today owe allegiance to this House and the directions that we receive must be carried out by us.

So we understand our part but I wish that we could get more of enlightenment and more of sober and practical guidance. Even in a Democracy opposition is not meant only for barren futility. Its contribution is expected to be constructive so that those who are charged with the responsibility of administering the affairs of the State may get assistance, guidance and even inspiration from the collective opinion and wisdom of the House and benefit thereby; but if that is not forthcoming it is a great handicap. Besides, the approach should be a sound one. Often observations are made that nothing has been done. I personally feel that the situation as it exists today is clear enough.

The fundamental facts are, I believe, obvious and indisputable. So far as external affairs go, we are proud of the achievements of our Prime Minister. Even in this House and also in the other, the exponents of a different policy, wedded to a different ideology, have given their bouquets and their plaudits to the Prime Minister and the Government for their foreign policy. It is really something remarkable that within a few years of our achievement of independence the status of our country should have risen so high. The prestige that we are enjoying today is one about which we can speak only with a thrill.

It is a matter of immense joy to us that we have in spite of our numberless physical and economic handicaps successfully contributed towards the preservation and maintenance of world peace and we have succeeded in saving the world when it seemed to be almost on the brink of a precipice and on the crater of a volcano. For this we have to thank the traditions, the soul and the genius of India. It had

been suppressed during foreign rule but the moment we came into our own, our heritage began to inspire us and we have been able to accomplish that which nobody could have dreamt of a few years ago.

I would not go into the details of our foreign policy. They are well-known. Only I wish that even in our internal affairs we could quite remember that the principle of co-existence is one which deserves the homage of everyone. We may differ in our views; we may differ even in social opinions but that is no reason why we should not join our hands together in raising the general level of living and of life in this country.

I personally would appeal to all hon. Members of this House, to whichever party they may happen to belong, to shed artificial conjunctions and blind prejudice so that we may all pool together our resources to enable the skeleton to move with a little flesh and to have a small bit of cloth to cover its nudeness. That is what we have to do and sometimes I am amazed that while so much lies to be done we should be fighting over words which do not mean much by themselves but can be pressed into service for polemical reasons, for starting and maintaining fruitless controversies.

While listening to the speeches in this House I felt some people seemed to be greatly perturbed over the use of 'socialist pattern' in the President's Address. I would have thought that genuine socialists would have welcomed the approach. Nobody spurns any offer which brings the other man closer to him even if it does not result in a complete coalescing of the two. But here some of our friends seem to be greatly worried. One would have suspected that perhaps they were afraid that they were going to lose their trade mark. Perhaps the wares of their trade were being shifted away from their monopolistic grip; otherwise I do not see why they should have felt so unnecessarily upset. But I must say that the facts of the situa-

tion, apart from anything, cannot but lead one to the conclusion that the only pattern of society that you can develop in our country can be a socialistic one. The reasons are plain. We are an under-developed country. We have to raise the stature and the status of the common man. We have to produce more; in order that we may continue this process of greater and greater production, every person here must have the purchasing power which will enable him to make use of the goods that we produce.

The question today, I think, that confronts us is not so much of increased production as of increased opportunities of consumption. Even today we have seen that as a result of the four years' working of the Five Year Plan the volume of goods that we are producing is not supposed to be inadequate for the purchasing capacity of our people with the result that prices have sometimes tumbled down and have given cause for thought. What we need today is that there should be equitable distribution. We should aspire for an egalitarian society not on any theoretical or merely ideological grounds but unless every man is clothed and enabled to live a good and full life from cradle to grave, we will not be discharging the duty that we owe to our people or to the world. It is because of the compulsion of these facts that one has to accept the socialist pattern. Besides, we have our own Constitution and we have pledged ourselves therein that we will work for a society in which justice, social, political and economic, will prevail. We have our Directive Principles. We have the history of the Congress. In these circumstances, what we have done is no more than what would be inevitable in an evolutionary process. In the circumstances, any doubts that we may entertain in any quarter, I think, are either self-produced or due to lack of knowledge of the economic developments that have been taking place in our country.

We want, Sir, to apply our minds to the problems which are facing us

[Shri Govind Ballabh Pant.]

and one of them is the complex problem of unemployment. It is a problem of tremendous magnitude. I do not accept that there has been no increase in employment in recent years. That is wrong. We have spent several crores of rupees during the last four years of our Plan—something like 1,200 to 1,400 crores have, I think, already been spent. Well, of course, when money is spent, then either in the form of labour or in the form of goods or in the form of commodities and ultimately in the form of labour itself, some *quid pro quo* is obtained for it.

So, considering the progress that has been made in the agricultural and in the industrial field, it would be idle to suggest that there has been no increase in employment. But while there has been an increase in employment, while there has been considerable expansion in our industrial and agricultural production, the fact remains that what we have to do is tremendously more than what we have been able to achieve. So, let us concentrate on that and see how we can achieve that. We have prepared a Plan and we have been working on it. We are engaged in drafting another Five Year Plan and we shall in the natural order and in the ordinary course, devote our energies to the implementation of that Plan. Well, unemployment can be removed only by carrying out the work of construction of a great and new India in a methodical way.

But some of those who shout about the existence of unemployment would not allow the avenues of employment to function in a normal way. There are members of a Party which has made it its rule to thwart, to obstruct, the implementation of the Plan. Whenever any measures are taken, they denounce the Plan and they ask the people not to co-operate. I would ask them to ponder over their attitude. Do they want poverty to be perpetuated so that the creed of subversion may find some asylum within the

broken bones of the skeleton? Do they want to deepen the pangs of unemployment so that they may find a congenial soil for the germs which only subversive sources can supply? I would otherwise have been able to find or to offer an explanation.

Sir, we want progress in our country. We want to go as fast as we possibly can and my own feeling is that the money handicap need not come in our way. As we produce more, our capacity for circulating more money *pari passu* increases. As it increases we produce more and so on, the spiral goes on rising and expanding too. In that way we can do a lot, but in order that we may be able to do so, it is necessary that public order should be maintained. If there is disorder, if there is interference with the normal flow of life, then inundations follow and even safe and fertile regions are overflowed. So, we have to take particular care that way.

The first condition of progress in our country is non-violence—non-violence in spirit, non-violence in action, non-violence, if possible, in thought too. But organised violence is the enemy of progress. In these days, perversions, inversions and distortions—once used to be called by the lofty name of 'Satyagraha'—are pressed into service to clog the wheels of progress.

I am sorry, Sir, that there have been certain developments in the small State of Manipur about which an amendment had been notified here. It is a small State on the borders of Burma and Pakistan. The population does not exceed seven lakhs. Three languages are spoken and I doubt if any one of the three understands the other two. Then, the people there are simple, unsophisticated, guileless, easily to be carried away.

In that State, which is one of the 'C' Class States, a movement was started in November last year by a particular political party demanding

immediate establishment of a legislature and a Ministry in that State. Well, that Party itself stands for merger of that State with Assam. The Part 'C' States Act was passed only, I think, about the end of 1951. The Parliament as it then existed almost accepted unanimously—I might even drop 'almost'—the proposal that Manipur should not have a legislature.

After that we know what happened in the solitary PSP-governed State in the country, and that too over an agitation, more or less, of a similar character. The demand was that the southern part of Travancore should be amalgamated with Tamil Nad. It was resisted by the PSP-sponsored Government and it led to very dismal consequences—lathi charges, arrests of hundreds shooting and what not.

AN HON MEMBER Also looting

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT Well I think, you know better. All that was there, but it is strange that after all this experience and after the resistance offered by the PSP to this demand—and I think they were right so far as I am concerned, that when the States Reorganisation Commission is sitting—to demand an immediate change in the status of any part of our country is nothing but what one would think of in a mid-summer night. Well, that is what happened and the people there being simple followed the lead. And this agitation started in November 1954. Long after, all that had happened in Travancore-Cochin had been noticed, perhaps with real gloom and sorrow, by the PSP people and there had been that historical controversy started by one of their foremost leaders about the propriety of having recourse to shooting, but after all this agitation was started there. The officers were prevented from entering into their rooms, the passages to the Secretariat were blocked, the main roads were blocked. At one time, one of the Councillors was kidnapped—almost—so that he might be compelled to put

in his resignation. Now, I have never come across a more senseless agitation. And, so long as this spirit continues, I do not know how the progress that we all desire can be achieved.

My sympathies are entirely with the people of Manipur. I personally feel that we have not done our duty by the tribal people. While men from very distant countries have come to serve them, we have ourselves failed to do our part in a befitting way. I think we have to make amends for that. We should provide all possible facilities to enable them to lead a better and a fuller life. We should do all we can to preserve their rich culture, and, at the same time to make their lives better, less hard and more comfortable than they happen to be at present.

Dr Katju, I think, in December, made a declaration in Parliament that so long as the Report of the States' Reorganisation Commission was not available, nothing could be done, but after the Report had been received, the recommendations of the Commission along with public opinion of the people of the State would be taken into consideration. But still this sort of disastrous campaign goes on, and I am sorry that it should go on.

I appeal to all those concerned, who can help us with their good offices to put an end to this sorry chapter. I do not want to have recourse to violence or force under any circumstances, but under no circumstances, so far as I am concerned, will I allow public disorder in any part of this country. Come what may order will remain till the end. I would not allow hundreds to be jailed or to be thrown into dungeon simply because one man is given a free licence and latitude to carry on a sort of suicidal war from day to day, unchecked, unhampered and uncontrolled. That will not happen.

I want the democratic way of life to thrive in our country, so that every

[Shri Govind Ballabh Pant.]
man enjoys the climate of fellowship, comradeship and friendship with every one else in the society, and feels joy in the welfare of the whole, and realises that he cannot himself have a good day, if others are in the shade. That is what democracy demands. It can thrive only on a correct cultural background.

Let us all, therefore, apply our minds, to the problems that face us, dispassionately, and with a desire to solve them, and with a determination that the era of foreign rule having ended, what is left behind and is still lingering—poverty and unemployment—will also be destroyed and will find no place anywhere in any corner of this great ancient and big country. Let us take that pledge, and let us apply ourselves to that.

Then there has been a lot of argument as to why in Travancore-Cochin a Government of a constitutional type should have been set up. Everybody knows the story of Travancore-Cochin. Then, is it the wish of the House that every year we should have general elections in States? And, if that be not their wish, is it their wish that the President's Rule should come in as often as you can manage to introduce it? Is it not an act of self-denial on our part?

What happened in Travancore-Cochin? Just some time ago an election was held, because no Party there was in an absolute majority. There were groups, and they could not function together. An election was held, and I think it was completed only in March last year. After that, what may look as somewhat odd, a Party which had only 19 Members was allowed to function. Well, it was again an act of self-denial. And the Leader of the Party of 19 Members declared at that time that he would not stay for a day more any time the Congress wanted him to go away. But many things followed. As I said, there was an agitation, there were murders, there were lathi-charges, and all that.

And the people felt that a change had become inevitable. Of course, the 19 Members, whose number had slightly gone down by that time, were not allowed by sufferance to continue further.

Then, after that, what was to be done? The Leftist Parties wanted the Rajpramukh to try them, but they could not form a majority. These 19 Members while going out from a place to which they had no right wanted to put an end to the Assembly itself. Well, of course, there is no place for gratitude in politics, but there must be, I think, some restraint, so that decency may be maintained. They did not like anybody to come forward, but there was a majority and the Rajpramukh installed them in office. What was wrong about it, I do not know, but there has been a lot of hullabaloo about it. I do not yet realise why. I think that what was done was quite proper and what was the duty of the Rajpramukh to do.

There have been also other complaints about the Andhra elections. Well, I will not deal with that matter here, because I had something to say about it the other day. Moreover I am pressed for time, and Dr. Kunzru having always made a concession to me, I will not impose any greater strain on him.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Go on.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT:
With his blessings I will say only a few words more. Shri Ranga referred the other day to the important question of the decline in the prices of agricultural products. I myself attach considerable significance to the remarks that he made. I think that the Government should be alert and watchful. If the millions living in the countryside have no purchasing power, then nothing can be done in this country. So, care has to be taken to see that some parity is maintained, that wherever there are surplus products, money is poured in through constructive works so that the purchasing power is raised, and along

with that the question of having ceiling and floor prices may also be considered, but the question is one which merits consideration and a serious one too. I took the step of announcing that, if wheat prices went below Rs. 10, wheat would be purchased by the State, and it did go down below that in U.P. Whether that course would prove effective everywhere, I cannot say, but the question should be considered whenever it arises.

Some reference was also made in this House to Goa. It is but natural. It is really—I would not say impudent but—inconsiderate on the part of the Portuguese Government that they should resist this natural and legitimate claim of India. They seem to forget that, even when we had no authority, we succeeded in wresting power from the greatest imperialistic State of the day, and to imagine that they could now retain Goa shows bankruptcy even of imagination. So far as the Government is concerned, it has taken effective steps to maintain peace in the world. It stands for non-violence and that is its creed. I only hope that they will yield under the tremendous strain imposed on them. The Government has taken economic measures.

The people of Goa have every right to determine their future, and we know what their wishes are. So, it is not a question of taking away anything from Portugal but it is a question of the population there which intelligently, deliberately, after full thought, want to link their future with that of their motherland, being kept forcibly from doing so. So far as India is concerned, they have naturally our sympathy. The Government is doing whatever it can consistently with its principles, and I think the pressure of the people and of this Government will prove fruitful. I am using the word 'pressure' as Dr. Kunzru had used it several times. From whom he was then apprehending pressure, I do not know, but so far as I am concerned, I will go on pressing him for doing the right

thing not only now but always and hereafter.

Well, Sir, I have taken more time than I ought to have, and I thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With the permission of the House, many of the amendments are being withdrawn. Those which are to be pressed are three in number. I shall put those amendments to the vote first.

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21 and 23 were by leave withdrawn.

The question is:

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

'but regret to note that while discussing the economic situation in the country no mention has been made of any substantial and adequate steps which the Government propose to take with a view to achieve the socialistic pattern of society and to disabuse the mind of the people from a general feeling that it is merely slogan-mongering'."

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 the Address does not contain an adequate appreciation of the hardship of the agriculturists due to fall in agricultural prices and high prices of manufactured goods and the Government's failure to guarantee an economic price to the agriculturists'."

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 neither records the failure of the

[Mr. Chairman.]

Government to arrest the growth of unemployment in the country nor does it indicate any steps to check it in the future'."

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 21st February, 1955'."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I want to direct your attention to a telegram which I have received.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you have received a telegram, you come to me and show it to me, and then we will discuss it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May we have the pleasure of your.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: We proceed now to the third reading of the Imports and Exports (Control) Amendment Bill, 1954.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

THE IMPORTS AND EXPORTS
(CONTROL) AMENDMENT BILL,
1954—continued

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the reason for speaking at this third reading stage is to impress on the Government that this extension of time limit should be utilized effectively in our national interests and not in the interests of the monopolists and pro-

fiteers. We made a number of points in the course of our debate and the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill in trying to answer thought it wise to evade the issues by trying to be an imitation of his superior a little. He discovered a number of errors and went on to catalogue them as 1, 2, 3 etc. He is also suffering under a very great error and it is this that he is still thinking that he and his Government can fool all people for all times. Sir, as you will see, it is stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons of this Bill:

"The balance of payments position, though slightly easier, will need to be watched closely and continuously to ensure the availability of foreign exchange for the purchase of goods required to sustain the rapid industrialisation envisaged in the Second Five Year Plan. On the export side also, it will continue to be necessary to rely on export controls to safeguard the interests of the consumer in respect of items that are primarily required for home consumption."

These are two important objects which have been stated in the Bill where the Government seeks the extension of time. Sir, we know, as we have said before that in the general principles, we are in support of the Government because such a measure is necessary. In fact our complaint is that the Government don't have enough controls over our foreign trade so that the foreign trade is diverted to serving the interests of the nation and the consumer, from serving the interests of the monopolists. Therefore there is no doubt about it that we stand for even greater and wider control of the foreign trade of our country. That is called for in the interests of our economy but to say this thing would not end our story. What we particularly would like to impress upon the Government is that whatever measures you may acquire, they should be utilized for achieving the objects that have been set forth in this particular statement.