

[Shri Tangamani]

by the 8,000 tons per month supplied by the Government of India. But, since October, 1957, they have not only stopped these 8,000 tons but, at the instance and at the request of the Government of Madras, they have been giving only a loan of 4,000 tons, because the South Zone is created in which there is a free flow of rice, according to Government, from the surplus areas of Andhra Pradesh to Kerala and Tamil Nad. But, what is the experience we have?

Yesterday, in reply to one of my questions, the Deputy Minister was pleased to state that in spite of the free flow of rice from the surplus areas of Andhra Pradesh, during the 5 months only 5,000 tons of rice have been transported to Madras State. At the same time, there is no guarantee that the rice which goes into Madras State will not be moved to other States also. So,...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am sorry to bring to the notice of the hon. Members that in spite of my request, other voices have continued incessantly. Perhaps, it has come to be believed that when the Chair usually draws the attention of the Members to this fact, the Members do not find it necessary to attend to it. I will request again that even if it is necessary to talk sometimes, those voices must be subdued and must be in whispers and not so loud as to reach the Chair or to interrupt the proceedings. I will request the hon. Members to take care.

**Shri Tangamani:** The third point I would like to make out is with regard to Demand No. 83 which is concerned with the Ministry of Communications, under the Head, Posts and Telegraphs. My cut motions are numbers 37 and 38. They deal with the dissatisfaction of the employees over the meagre interim relief granted by the Pay Commission and also the dissatisfaction of extra-departmental staff of the P. & T. over the meagre interim relief of Rs. 2 per mensem.

As the House knows, at the instance of the Central Government employees, led by the Post and Telegraph Department, who gave strike notice to go on strike on the 9th August, 1957—and at the intervention of the Government and of several people in the country the strike was called off—a Pay Commission was appointed. The Pay Commission has come forward with interim relief and that interim relief is Rs. 5 for Central Government employees.

As you are aware, the extra-departmental staff do not come directly under the Posts and Telegraphs. The extra-departmental staff are very low-paid and the interim relief paid to them is only Rs. 2. The dissatisfaction is rampant both in the Posts and Telegraphs and also amongst those who are known as extra-departmental staff.

My submission is that although interim relief is granted, we should not be satisfied with interim relief. There must be a clear directive to the Pay Commission that an early decision must be reached and the final report submitted as soon as possible.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Instead of calling another hon. Member, I think we can resume this subject afterwards.

#### MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT—contd.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The Prime Minister will now reply to the debate on the President's Address.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Finance (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, during the last few days' debate on the President's Address, a very large number of topics have been referred to and it is a little difficult for me to touch on all of them. With your permission, Sir, I shall deal with some of the more important matters;

and, inevitably, I have to deal with them in a rather general way.

So far as the general economic situation of this country is concerned, I shall say something about it. But the House knows that we are going to have various discussions in connection with the Budget in the course of this session. Further, as I think I have stated previously, it is proposed to lay a paper or a memorandum before the House in regard to the Second Five Year Plan explaining the present position and what we are doing and what we propose to do. It is difficult to deal with the matter in bits. So, we thought that a full memorandum on this subject will be more useful to give some idea to the House and to the country as to our present position and our future prospects. So, these matters are going to be discussed and it may not be particularly helpful for me to take them up in bits now. Nevertheless, I shall say something on this subject.

Criticism has been made on the part of the Opposition that the President's Address lacks imagination; there is lack of reality and there is a sense of utter complacency. Well, I do not know if any hon. Member in this House feels or thinks really that the Members of this Government who have the honour to advise the President are complacent. No one, whether this Government or any other, who has to face the tremendous problems which this country has to face can ever be complacent. He may occasionally err, as Governments may make mistakes, as anyone might. But for any one to feel completely happy at the state of affairs would indicate that there is something very wrong about him, whoever he might be.

15.27 hrs.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Now, there is no question of complacency and more particularly during the past year or two when we have had to face enormous problems, enormous difficulties, many of them

at least not of our making—some may be of our making. There has been a continuous effort on our part, on the Government's part, as, I believe, there has been on the part of this House in Parliament, to face these difficulties realising what they were, whether they were domestic internal difficulties or in the international sphere. So, if it is necessary, I should like to assure the House that there is absolutely no sense of complacency anywhere. But, it is one thing not to be complacent and another thing, shall I say, always to take a view which is on the verge of panic and to think in terms of slogans, or merely to denounce various things in the country. There are plenty of things in this country which nobody likes which we struggle against. I realise also that it is the normal duty of the Opposition to object, to denounce and generally to find fault. I do not complain. But, I would only beg the House to consider these matters in proper perspective with the least complacency and also for the moment to look at it—not from the point of view of a particular party or Government Party or Opposition Parties but as Members of Parliament representing the great Indian people in this House looking at this tremendous and exciting process of history in the making. Because we in this country are making history: whether it is good history or bad history, it is for the future generations to judge. And the world is making history perhaps in a more concentrated way than it has done in the past. So, I would beg this House to approach these big questions taking this perspective into view.

Now, I think that the President's Address has by no means taken a complacent view but a realistic view of the situation and pointed out certain definite hopeful factors. I do submit that nobody can deny that those hopeful changes have taken place in the last few months in this country and are still taking place. That again does not mean that we should rest content with that. It is right that we should point them out

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

as it would be right to point out if the changes were for the worse.

Broadly speaking, the economic situation has improved noticeably and it may be said that the Government are in much better control of it than a year ago. Inflationary pressures have abated and the rate of drawal of foreign exchange reserves has significantly declined.

These are all problems that worried us last year both in regard to credit policy and import policy. The reins are being fairly tightly held and the outlook of availability of external assistance is much better. These are important factors or tendencies.

The President's Address has referred to the index of wholesale prices. I did not quite understand how some hon Members challenged that unless they took some figures which were for a slightly different period. The index of wholesale prices in the last five months or so has gone down by nearly five per cent. Food prices have come down by eight per cent. The index for rice has fallen from 111 to 101, that of wheat from 94 to 86, of jowar from 126 to 104 and of bajra from 137 to 114. I do not say these are very wonderful changes but they are definite trends in a right direction and they have been brought about at a moment when the previous trends were all in the wrong direction. That is to say, not only have wrong trends been stopped but they have been reversed somewhat, undoubtedly, not because of any new harvest coming or anything like that but because of the various policies adopted by the Government in the course of the last year or so.

But, I repeat that while we have a right to be a little hopeful because of this change in trends, we must realise completely that we have to be very careful and cautious and not allow this matter to slip away again in the wrong direction.

There is always with us the problem of internal and external resources. External resources can come, broadly speaking, from our exports

or from such loans or credits that we may get from abroad. I think that the policy we adopt in regard to our exports will bear fruit. To what extent, of course I cannot prophecy because it takes a little time to develop this but it is not right to say, I think, as some hon. Members did, that attention is not being paid to our exports. Attention is certainly paid to the best of our ability and intelligence.

One hon. Member, Shri Nausair Bharucha said—I quote—"I accuse this Government that it is holding back vital information which is of the utmost importance to the nation". He was referring to funds, etc. available to us and how the gap in the Second Plan would be filled and so forth. I do not know; I am not aware of the fact that we have held back any vital information on this subject. Because, how does it profit the Government to hold it back. It is obviously essential for the people to know what they have got to do and what the position is.

The difficulty is this. Take, for instance, the external assistance. We cannot, while we discuss matters, say anything definite about it. Therefore, we have to wait till a definite decision is arrived at. As a matter of fact, many items of information in regard to this have been made public in this House and in answer to questions and otherwise in the public Press and so forth. One knows.

But it is true that these separate items of information do not perhaps convey a connected picture. That connected picture is being drawn up to be placed before the House. As I just told the House a little while ago, we intend placing a memorandum dealing with the entire subject, dealing with the Plan, dealing with the gaps and also dealing how we hope to fill that and so on. The present position, as I said, is somewhat more hopeful or, if I may use the word, considerably more hopeful than it was a year ago.

When I say that I am not guaranteeing the future. I am merely saying

that it is more hopeful for the present. That is to say, during this year that we are beginning, we hope to go through it, that is, to go through the major works of our Plan as intended. We are not going to slow down on that. And we hope that in the next year also, we shall be in a position to do so. We have not got hoards and we cannot say about the next five, six or seven years. That will depend on many factors: our own policies, our internal resources and the external resources that we hope to get. Anyhow, we propose to put before this House in the course of this month or probably in the month of March a full memorandum on this subject

There have been, as usual, a number of references to corruption in the Government apparatus. I do not wish to take the time of the House much now. But I should like to say that the apparatus that we have created last year or the year before to meet this question has worked with considerable success. It is improving daily. Nobody can deny that. Nobody can say that here or in any country in the wide world, everything is all right and there is absolute freedom from corruption. There is that though I think that perhaps there is less of it, much less of it, than most other countries. So, there is no justification for this. I am merely pointing out relatively because it is sometimes made out that we are the big sinners in this respect. I do not think we are. I think we stand rather high compared to many countries, but it is there undoubtedly and we have to make every effort to remove that. And, I submit that the special arrangements we have made, the O. & M. Division, the Special Police Establishment and others have met with quite a considerable success. I have been going through the various steps they have taken, the number of cases they have started, the success they have attained, and I was impressed by them. Of course, there are difficulties and, as the House knows, the real difficulties are that it is never quite easy to get real proof which would

satisfy a law court. One may have suspicions, one may even have some kind of moral feeling that it is wrong, but the rules as they are and the law as it is do not make it particularly easy to deal with it. Nevertheless, we have met with considerable success, and we are constantly pressing every Ministry, every department to be particularly wide awake in this matter and to be in very intimate touch with the O. & M. Division whose special function this is, that is, not only greater efficiency but also greater integrity, lack of corruption etc.

May I add—it is not a subject I am discussing now, because this will come up tomorrow—that this report about the life insurance matter has been sometimes referred to here as an instance of corruption. Well, I have read the report fairly carefully as most Members must have done. I have not found any such charge in it. There may be here and there vague doubts thrown out but, anyhow, whatever else that may be, it has not brought out any such charge.

Then, again, some hon. Members complained, I think Shri H. N. Mukerjee, that there is no mention of rehabilitation in it, or of the Dandakaranya scheme. True, there was no mention in it as there have been no mention of many other important matters. Unless there is something new to be said about it, it was not considered necessary to mention it, not that the question of rehabilitation is not important; of course it is important. Obviously it is, anything which involves the future lives of large numbers of people is of great importance. As for the scheme, it is a very vast scheme as the House knows, and it will take a little time to develop. We are trying to develop it in a small way in a small area first and then in a larger way.

About the food position may I say—well, I cannot say that the food position is to our liking—that it is satisfactory in the limited sense of the word, in the sense that we have built up some stocks. It is a difficult situation, and it can only ultimately be met

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

when we get the results we are aiming at, far greater production. And, I would still submit my own humble opinion that we hope to reach the target of self-sufficiency. I am not prepared to accept—I may be mistaken, of course, but I do want the country to aim at self-sufficiency as the President has said in his Address, not immediately I realise that—and I think it is somewhat a pessimistic view to take that this will take a very long time. I have no doubt that, well, if I may say so, looking at it theoretically, or practically too, it can be done. Whether we do it or not—‘we’ meaning the people of India, the agriculturists—depends on so many factors apart from nature’s vagaries that it is difficult to be definite about it. But I do not think there is any reason for us to be pessimistic about it. I think we can do it, and I think that we will do it.

Another subject that was touched upon was that the public sector is not doing well. I do not quite know what this criticism meant, because it is the public sector that is being built up in a big way. All these steel plants, all these machine building plants and all that are the big foundations of the public sector, not the odd little bits being done. It is the burden of that that we have to carry today, and the tremendous amount of imports of machinery etc. coming are really for the public sector; the private sector comes in in quite a relatively small way in regard to that matter.

Now, some hon. Members talked about atomic energy, and some said that we must immediately start atomic power stations. I am afraid that that kind of progress cannot be made. It is not merely a question of money, although money comes in, but it requires a good deal of preparation before we can think of starting atomic power stations. In the President’s Address some reference has been made to it. That is true. That does not mean we can start them in the course of the next year. The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission has

been speaking about these matters on several occasions and discussing the economics of it because, after all, it is the economical aspect that counts. The factory can be built; that is known. You can build it, but if it is frightfully expensive nobody is going to build it. We are not going to waste money over atomic power station if the power that is produced is much more expensive than the power produced through ordinary methods. That is the main thing.

Apart from future progress, that is to say, probably it may become cheaper in the future, even now some factors are established that in areas far away from the coal fields, far away from hydro-electric power, it will be definitely economical to have an atomic energy station to supply power. There are many such areas in India. Of course, the matter has been considered. Naturally, we can only start one at a time, we cannot start several before our first effort. Where we can start it I do not know nor does anybody else know, but among the places that have been taken at present are the Punjab, Western Uttar Pradesh, South India, Rajasthan and Bombay, that is parts of these areas which may fit in. You cannot just choose any area. It has to fulfil certain needs before you can decide, and then you can calculate the economics of it. Anyhow, this matter is under consideration.

Then, Shri Mukerjee said something about co-operative agriculture, that that is not making progress. That is partly so. I presume he meant by ‘co-operative agriculture’ co-operative farming. That is so. I am myself of opinion that we should encourage co-operative farming wherever we can. But it is obvious that that can only be done, well, of course, with the consent of the people concerned, the farmers concerned, and in a process of development. You cannot suddenly go to a place and say that the people must have co-operative farming. The people will not understand, it simply will not fit in. You cannot do it like



that. You cannot compel them. Nobody can compel them, not only a Government like ours but an authoritarian government cannot do it ultimately, and production will suffer.

What we aim at today is to spread co-operatives in regard to various services, co-operative services, provided that it will later lead to co-operative farming wherever that is considered feasible at first. You cannot do it otherwise. You may and you should have co-operative farming where it is feasible,—where, for instance, Government has a new land or where Gramdan villages exist, because, there, you have a fairly clean slate. You may do it and I would like it generally, but the most immediate thing that appears to me is service co-operative, not merely credit co-operatives but service co-operatives.

May I repeat here, what I have often said previously, that co-operatives in my thinking have to be intimately concerned with the people. I mean to say it is not some kind of official imposition, officially run. I do not think a co-operative which has too much of an official element in it is a real co-operative. It must depend upon the people, upon the people's initiative and because of that I think the co-operatives should be relatively small.

I know, only yesterday or the day before, I saw a criticism from an eminent foreign observer, commenting about some organisation pleading for large co-operatives. The eminent foreign observer served in the civil service here in those days. Well, from his point of view, what he said may be correct, but then his point of view does not appeal to me, because my point of view is entirely based on developing the people there, getting their support, co-operation and their self-reliance and all that, and not merely by some official change from above bringing about a temporary result.

The real aim is the growth of our people, their co-operation fitting in with that and their self-reliance. Therefore, I do believe more firmly

than ever that the co-operatives we have should be relatively small, that is to say, village co-operative, or a co-operative of two villages, where people know each other more or less and can easily function together, if you like, as a large family. These small co-operatives have to be linked up naturally to form, if you like, larger entities, 20, 30, 40 or 50, and they can form a larger council for other purposes. We should concentrate on these service co-operatives, that is to say, fertilisers, manures, good seeds, marketing and there are so many other things that the co-operative could do, and always keeping in view that co-operative farming should be aimed at wherever you can get the consent of the people.

Now, I talk about co-operative farming. Why do I do it? Not because I think it is some kind of ideal which is obvious. I am not at all sure that co-operative farming of that type will suit every part of the country. I do not know whether it will suit a rice field or a wheat field; certainly a wheat field, I do not know. But the main point is this. Where you have got these very, very small holdings, as inevitably in India you must have, there are a great number of people who have an acre or two acres, and they cannot make much progress with their resources and with the two-acre farms. They have to function in a very small way, and therefore it becomes essential that either you have to have a big farm—you do not want big farms owned by an individual—or a co-operative jointly looking after a bigish area of land when they have some resources.

So, for me, there are two reasons to think of joint farming. One is this reason that I have said. The other is that it is a higher form of social organisation for the land. It is not merely farming, but a co-operative spirit coming in in their various types of activities.

I should like to say a few words about international affairs, but before I do that, there is one matter I should like to mention just to indicate the curious types of problems that we

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

have to face in this country and how nobody can ever go anywhere near complacency in this country. Recently, we have had the problem of the official language for India. This House will discuss it and I am not going to discuss that problem. I have no doubt in my mind that when the matter comes before this House,—by the Committee which has been appointed by this House some suitable proposals will be made by agreement—this House will gladly accept them.

But why I am referring to it is this. Partly because of this,—partly may be for other reasons—there are a group of people in South India, in the Madras State especially, who talk about an independent state, separate and cut off from India. This may be a matter with a comic element in it, but it is a serious enough matter when even a few individuals talk in that way. It shows how skin-deep is this unity, that people can talk; and see the other reactions of it. One of these is, there is a new party I see from the newspapers. It was started a short while ago, which wanted to have this independent Tamil State, and what is more, it will incorporate Ceylon in that State.

Now, the response to this kind of talk is amazing. Immediately we see reference being made to this in the newspapers from Ceylon, angry reference, frightening reference; "Oh, it is all right; the present Government of India, they may not do it, but who knows? And these people have the eyes on us". This creates tremendous problems, this kind of wholly irresponsible attitude.

When, some months back, I was in Ceylon, I told them, and I used strong language. This particular development had not taken place then. I said that I find sometimes people in Ceylon have a fear that this great big country, India, may swallow them up. I said that it was a totally unreasoned fear and any person, any individual who thought of that in India, who talked about it, was talking nonsense. I gave some reasons for it. It is quite absurd

that India should do that. It is in the interests of India—it is not a question of our being idealistic—that Ceylon should be, an independent, friendly country, our neighbour, with whom we have friendly relations. How does it profit in anyway? Not only we go against our policies but we make ourselves a laughing-stock in the world. Why add to us these burdens? This is feudal thinking. It is not the thinking of the modern age, thinking now you can add a little territory and a little zamindari to your bit of taluk. It is quite absurd in the modern age to think of adding territories. We do not want one inch of territory from anybody, except of course what is ours should be ours—a place like Goa—and that is a different matter. Apart from that, we do not want an inch of territory. I want to make it perfectly clear; whether it is Ceylon, whether it is Pakistan; we did not want the slightest change in regard to the agreement about Pakistan coming into existence. We do not want to put an end to Pakistan. It would be not only wrong but an egregious folly for anyone in India to do so and add to his burden and the country's burden and put an end to all our progress by these new burdens.

16 hrs.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I am sorry to have to intervene. But, from year to year I have been raising one particular problem, and now the Leader of the House has made it so definite about territorial aggrandisement or whatever language he may care to use. Does it mean that we will no more demand the Chittagong Hill Tracts?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It raises a new point. My answer would be that we cannot make any change to the Chittagong Hill Tract except by agreement, if it ever comes. At the time when partition took place, it was accepted even by the partition-makers that Chittagong Hill Tracts did not or should not have, gone to Pakistan. They did go and we do accept it as

a fact. It was a wrong decision, and we accept it as a fact. If by agreement it can come to us, well and good, not that I want a part of a territory, but because the people, Buddhists chiefly, do not fit in elsewhere.

I will now refer to foreign affairs briefly. In foreign affairs, for a long time past, indeed for hundreds of years, foreign affairs have meant apparently the projection of the European point of view on the world; that is called foreign affairs. Naturally, because Europe was a dominant continent and it controlled the destinies of a great part of the world. It was stronger militarily, economically and politically and so there was the European thinking, the thought of the world with Europe as a central factor of the world, just as possibly the Englishman in the 19th century would have thought of London as the central factor and the hub of the world. To some extent that was a fact too.

So, it gave rise to this thinking, this Europe-centred thinking of foreign affairs. Then the United States of America came into the picture. They had come in gradually of course. Till then, they had an isolated life. Now, by force of circumstances, and by various historical developments, they began to play a tremendous part in the world. We began to think after the end of the war of this century that it is American-centred. The world view becomes American-centred view. Others are nothing. Europe is an area attached to it.

Now, all those view-points have some justification in them; I do not deny it. They have their great problems; I do not deny them. Other factors can intervene, apart from it. Of course, the development of the Soviet Union is a very vital and important factor, which did not fit in with the Europe-centred view or the American-centred view. Here comes a new picture of the Moscow-centred world.

Now, apart from all these great developments, other developments have taken place during the last dozen

years or so, resulting in the independence of many countries in Asia. Therefore, there has developed a new angle in Asia of looking at these problems. We are even now a good deal impressed and conditioned by the European thinking, because we have ourselves been brought up in that way, or the American thinking, or sometimes Moscow-thinking, whatever it may be. I am not talking of communism. I am talking of political thinking.

So, this development of the independent nations in Asia naturally leads to, what might be called vaguely, the Asian way of looking at the world. I do not say there is one Asian way; Asia is a big continent, and there are different ways of looking at it. It is a change from the European-centred view or any other view. Of course, the right view, ultimately, I take it, will be neither European, nor American, nor Moscow, nor Asian, but a proper world view, which can be developed.

But, because of various factors, it is a painful process, the adjustment of the mind. Many difficulties have arisen and are arising in other parts of the world, because they cannot quite adjust themselves to this thinking, that there can be a so-called Asian view, see conditions of Asian countries in a way which is somewhat different from their own view. They talk about it and express some resentment at that fact.

Let us take India. It is unaligned, uncommitted. It has not fallen into line with their policy. Their policy or approach takes for granted that the policy must emerge from Europe or America or Moscow, whatever it may be, and that the other countries cannot develop their own view-points, which they have to develop, apart from everything else, because of geography. Because, geography counts a great deal in these matters. A country develops its world view or its political or international view, not only because of other factors like history, tradition etc. but because of geography.



[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Since India has to take a world view from Delhi, naturally it looks first of all to the countries round India, then further afield and so on. It approaches the problems that way. The view of a country in the North Pole about the world may be different from that of a country near the Equator. So, there is this development, this new angle, this new approach, which might vaguely, broadly, rather incorrectly be called the Asian approach. Anyhow, it is a movement which is different from the European-centred view or the American-centred view or the Russian centred-view. Not that these views are against somebody; I am not saying that.

It is not hostile. Because we do not align ourselves with the European-centred or the American-centred view, it does not mean that we are hostile to Europe or America or Moscow. We are thinking on slightly different lines, sometimes in line with them, sometimes not. Anyhow, the viewpoint, the approach and the way in which we look at the world is somewhat different.

Now, there is one basic fact which I have said previously, and which I repeat now, about this European-centred or other-centred view. To us, the attitude that has been taken in regard to China is really a thing which really cannot be logically explained. It is practically—I am not talking ideologically—a fact that a great country like China being by-passed, ignored which, in a sense, seems odd, unrealistic. So also in the case of so many other things that are happening in Asia. These problems are judged, not from the point of view from which Asia might do, regardless of policies and others, but from some other European-centred or American-centred or some other-centred viewpoint.

In other words, a number of new forces have gradually developed since the last war in Asia. They do not fit in with those other viewpoints which have been traditionally held by other

countries. We talk about anti-colonialism. We know very well that in many countries in Asia colonialism has ceased to be a force and countries have become independent; in Africa too. Well, we welcome it, and we think this trend will continue. And we realise that sometimes it may take a little time to bring about that change. It cannot be brought about quite suddenly.

But, nevertheless, the fact remains, as we see it, how some colonial countries stick on, adhere to, their colonies, in spite of everything. Of course, the most glaring example of the present day is what is happening in Algeria; other places too. Our attitude always has been one of friendship with France; friendship, of course with other countries too. But we have admired so many things in France, their high culture and there are so many other things and we were happy to come to a peaceful agreement and friendly agreement with France in regard to Pondicherry. I am very sorry that *de jure* transfer is still not being done. I do not know what to do about it, except to remind them from time to time. I am told, whenever I remind them, that it will be coming soon. But in spite of our friendly feeling for France, a country with its history, with its struggles for freedom, with its high culture and high intellectuality and all that, it does come as a deep shock—what has happened and what is happening in Algeria.

Only a few days ago, an incident occurred which I think is likely to be numbered among those relatively few instances of horror which affect the whole population, which is numbered, if I may say from Indian history as something like the Jallianwalabagh here. Many worse things have happened in India since then, much worse than Jallianwalabagh, but nevertheless Jallianwalabagh was a thing which very powerfully impressed the whole generation of India and possibly changed the current of history in India. Now, about this bombing the other day by French planes of that

village in Tunis—Tunisia near the Algerian border—I think it is called Sakiet—we are not depending upon partial accounts, because people from other countries have given full accounts including French journalists, American journalists, British journalists and other Red Cross people and the facts are pretty well-known. The facts are shocking beyond almost belief that such a thing could be done. Apart from the horror of a 100, 200 or 300 persons being bombed and I think, 20 or 30 being killed and the whole village being wiped off, the fact that this should be done in this way is itself more important than the unhappy deaths. It has a powerful effect—it is bound to have—in countries in Asia and Africa. Of course, even in Europe and America it has had very powerful reactions. I do not know what to say except that if this kind of policy is to be persisted in and approved of, then there is only greatest disaster ahead in Africa.

The House knows that certain rather remarkable developments have taken place recently in Western Asia, in what is called the Middle-eastern region—the Union of Egypt and Syria and possibly as a consequence of that, rather as a reaction of it, the Federation or Union—I am not quite clear which—between Iraq and Jordan. We heard of the Union between Egypt and Syria and it was obvious that this was a popular union; that is the people in both those countries were eager for it and celebrated it when the first news came in a big way. Well, naturally if the people of both the countries want this union, we are happy and congratulate them and the representatives of those two countries. Now this has set in motion some forces which I do not quite know yet where they might lead to. If the Iraq and Jordan people want union, we are happy. But if it is merely a political counterpoise, then one does not quite know what the result of that may be.

There is a third aspect of it of which we do not quite know what might happen. There are ominous sounds coming from Israel. I say

“ominous” because there is some danger that as a result of what has happened here, Israel might precipitate action, might take precipitate action, which would be bad, because one never knows, when that kind of thing happens, where that might lead to.

I have talked about many things. But, the most important problem and subject in the world today is the basic subject of disarmament and cold war, that is, the relationship between the two major military groupings. That is the basic thing. Everything depends upon that. That has become even more an urgent matter since this new phase in the world, the Sputnik era, the Explorer era, all this has come in. Because, now, a false step or even an accident might give rise to that tremendous disaster from which there may well be no escape afterwards. Therefore, it has become the most urgent and important matter that something has to be done.

The other day, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom said that it was something that we had kept the peace, even this peace, a fevered peace. No doubt, it is something better than war. No one can call this very satisfactory peace. It is hardly peace except that killing is not being undertaken on a large scale. Therefore, this question of disarmament and the question of some kind of settlement or approach to a settlement of the various big problems which affect these two great military groupings has become of high importance.

This has been discussed in the United Nations repeatedly and the present position there is that talks on disarmament have ended. No progress was made after they had raised high hopes last year. Another Disarmament Commission of 25 was formed. Nobody quite knows whether it can function satisfactorily or not because no Disarmament Commission can function with any hope of results unless the two super powers are in it obviously. Basically it is

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

for the United States of America and the Soviet Union to agree. I do not mean to say that others can be left out. Not at all. Unless these two agree, there is no disarmament. Therefore, this Commission of 25 can only function satisfactorily if both of them accept it and function there. If either party goes out, it is an one-sided affair.

As you know, there has been talk of a high level meeting, summit meeting and the like. There have been many letters exchanged between the authorities in the Soviet Union, the United States of America and other countries. We would welcome a high level or summit meeting. Not to have it or to refuse to have it would be harmful. But, it is obvious, at the same time, that one does not meet with a blank mind. There has to be some kind of mental or other preparation for it. It has been suggested that a Foreign Ministers' meeting should take place. Now, we are not opposed to it. But, we feel that a Foreign Ministers' meeting, constituted as things are today, might not lead us forward, but might even lead to more rigid positions being taken and thus make it more difficult for the other high level meeting. Therefore, some kind of thinking has to be done. It is being done, I believe, everywhere, perhaps on an informal level, private level, so as to prepare the ground for a high level meeting which ultimately, I think, has to be held. A high level meeting has also big psychological reactions in the world, good reactions, unless, of course, they quarrel—that would have bad reactions—which a Foreign Ministers' meeting can never have. And what is wanted in the world today are these psychological changes, this gradual relaxation of tension, freedom from fear, which can be brought about if this matter is dealt with from a high level, but, as I said, that has to be preceded by some quiet informal talk, meeting etc.

I believe it is true to say that everywhere today, whether it is in Europe or whether it is in the United States of America or whether it is in the Soviet Union or indeed in many parts of India, minds are in a state of ferment; they have come out of their old grooves and they feel that something has got to be done, that it is not good enough repeating the old slogans. And you see instances of this.

When the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom came here, he talked about a pact of non-aggression. What exactly he meant by it he has not clarified, but even some talk about it shows that people are coming out of the old ways of thinking.

Then you know there is a proposal, originally from Poland, for an area in Central Europe comprising several countries being made atom-free, that is, no atom bases, no atomic weapons there etc. It does not take one very far, from a military point of view it does not make very much difference if Poland and Czechoslovakia, or East Germany and West Germany and may be one or two other countries, are made free of atomic weapons, but even such a step would create a new atmosphere and lead to other steps.

Then there is an American who delivered a series of lectures the other day in England, Mr Kennan, a man of considerable experience in his own line, who advocated an area of dis-engagement, that is more or less the same, but he went further than the Polish proposal, he wanted all armies to be withdrawn—not only atomic weapons, but all armies. Again, that by itself will not solve the problems of the world, but this indicates the way people are thinking more and more, people who thought otherwise previously.

All these are hopeful signs, and so far as we are concerned, we naturally would like to help in every possible way in easing the path to some kind of a settlement, or some kind of a

conference. We do not want to push ourselves in anywhere, in a conference or elsewhere; we made it perfectly clear that we do not want to go to a conference unless other parties concerned want us to go. If we can help, we will help. So that, while on the one hand, the dangers have become much greater in the world, on the other hand, there is a much keener awareness in the world of these dangers and a keener desire to meet them some way, and a coming out of the old ruts and grooves of thinking, which are hopeful signs. What will happen in future I do not know. We can go on working to the best of our ability.

We work in the international sphere, but everyone knows that we can only function with any kind of effect there if we have the powerful backing, and a backing supported by understanding, of the Indian People. Of course, these subjects are not party questions in India. Maybe some people differ here and there, but broadly speaking, they are not party questions.

Also much will depend upon how we function in India itself. If in India we become a party to conflicts, internal conflicts, internal disintegration, then obviously our voice does not count for much abroad.

People have talked about, in connection with our Five Year Plan and all that, the financial element. Obviously it is a very important element which cannot be ignored. But in the final analysis, it is not the money that is counted that is so important but the element of human energy and human faith that we can put in the country's work. That ultimately is a thing that can move mountains, and that can get us over present difficulties. It was in the measure that we brought that human faith and human energy in our previous difficulties, whether it was in the struggle for freedom or later, that we succeeded. I cannot measure, nor can anybody measure nor can any statistical apparatus measure human

faith, but we can feel it, and we can help it on, and we are ourselves influenced by it. I firmly believe that our country has that human energy and human faith which will help us to overcome all the obstacles that face us.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members are aware that there are as many as 200 amendments moved. I have received a letter signed by a number of hon. Members that amendment No. 196 may be put to the vote of the House. Is it agreed upon on behalf of the Members of the Opposition?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr Speaker: That will be the only one which I shall put to vote specifically. Thereafter, I shall put the other amendments together to the vote of the House. I shall now read out amendment No. 196 ...

Order, order Hon. Members ought to be in their seats while I am standing. It is very improper that they should be standing. Again and again, I have referred to this that there is no order observed in this House. Some kind of respect is due to the Chair. Order, order.

Amendment No. 196 reads:

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the following important and urgent matters:—

- (a) the food crisis in West Bengal, Bihar, and eastern districts of Uttar Pradesh;
- (b) prevailing unemployment;
- (c) ever-increasing corruption;
- (d) separation of judiciary from the executive;
- (e) decentralisation of power;
- (f) declining standard of living;
- (g) fixation of ceilings on income and expenditure;