

रोकना होगा, ज्यादा से ज्यादा सेविंग्स करनी होगी। हमें चाहिये कि हम ठीक तरीके से काम करें। कुरप्शन जो बढ़ रही है, उसको रोकें। अगर हमने ये सब कुछ किया तो हम काफी बचत कर सकेंगे और उसी हिसाब से कम टैक्सेशन हम कर सकेंगे।

16 hrs.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, during this fairly long debate on the President's Address many matters have been mentioned and a great deal of ground has been covered. Just prior to my getting up, the hon. Member who was speaking said something about community development schemes, something very derogatory to their working—that is, money being wasted upon them. May I take that up, to begin with, and say a few words about it?

I was surprised to hear him say that and to quote from somebody whom I do not know. Anyhow, the community development scheme has developed into something different and much bigger—that is, panchayati raj—and I would venture to say that one of the most hopeful things in India today is panchayati raj and, connected with it, the community development. I do not mean to imply that all its working all over India is perfect or even good. We will have to remember the extent of it, the vastness of the domain covered by it, and there could be little doubt that in many places it has not come up to expectations. It may be that it was the hon. Member's misfortune to visit some of these places where it has not done well. But this panchayati raj or community development scheme touches the very basic problem in India; that is, I should say, to rouse up the hundreds of millions of our people who live in rural areas, to make their minds work differently. It is a terribly difficult thing to change people's minds. Even here, if I may with great respect say so, I find

it very difficult, even in obvious matters, to change the minds of some hon. Members of the Opposition. People have a way of sticking in old ruts. A thing may be past and gone, and yet they do not realise the changes that have taken place. Now, we having lived for—I do not know—thousands of years as people and attached to various habits—the farmer in the way he ploughs and the way he lives and all that, and others too—it is a very difficult task. And yet, that is the basic task in India. Not all the factories we put in India can solve the problem; they will help to the extent the factories will help the farmer to change his mind.

That is the basic task set before community development and panchayati raj, to develop in the people the spirit of self-reliance and a new thinking of the new ways and understanding of the new world. After considering the whole problem as hundred per cent in India, if we succeed 25 or 30 per cent in India, it is an amazing success, because it covers hundreds of millions of people, and it has the seeds in it of greater success to come. Therefore, let us by all means try to find out how to improve these things, but to run them down means running down something that holds the greatest promise in India.

Now, Sir, in this debate many things have been touched upon and referred to, but the major things inevitably have been Chinese aggression and economic development—the two are connected; I think everyone begins to realise more and more.

The hon. Members opposite have harped back to the Colombo proposals. They have not got over their distaste of them—I put it mildly, they have used stronger language. We had a long debate a little over a month ago in this House, and after that debate we took some action. But hon. Members still cannot get out of the rut of thought in which they have got themselves into, and still discuss it as if we were discussing it a month ago. Much

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

has happened in the month. After this debate we accepted them formally and informed the Colombo powers accordingly. Yet, hon. Members go on saying that it was something dishonourable that we did, by which I presume they imply a great majority of this House belonging not only to one party but several parties acted dishonourably or were foolish enough not to distinguish between honour and dishonour or were afraid. I do think, this way of thinking and talking shows the extremely limited outlook of the hon. Members who spoke these. And, that is my difficulty. We stick to something not seeing the consequences that flow from it, not seeing that things have happened and we remain stuck to certain opinions that we formed probably wrongly to begin with and so we confirm ourselves in wrongness. It is unfortunate, because we live at a time when great speed of thought is necessary, great speed of action is necessary, great appreciation of changes made in the world reactions. I do not pretend to say—how can I—that my Government or I do not make mistakes. We make any number of mistakes, but I do venture to say that, partly, not because of any special virtue in us but because we are responsible, we are in positions of responsibility we have to react to events, we have to watch them carefully and try to do the best that lies in our power.

I have often repeated and I repeat again to this House, that we have to realise that we live in an extraordinary age, an extra-ordinary age in the sense of changes. Well, the world has always been changing and no particular generation has been able to stop the process of change. But, at times the changes are much swifter, much faster, a process started not today but some two hundred years ago, which is called the industrial revolution.

That too was a successor of other changes in the mind, but that brought

about great changes, and that has continued at an ever faster pace. And we, after our independence came to the conclusion that it was quite essential for us to catch up with these changes—not every change, some changes may be bad in the world, but the basic change I am saying—and industrialise our country. There was no other way to meet the problems that confronted us—economic problems, social problems and, if you like, military problems. Well, there is no strength in the nation unless it is industrialised, unless it takes advantage of modern science and technology.

That was the basic thing. We have to get out of our ruts. And, of all people—I do not say of all people, I do not know of all people, but, broadly speaking, almost of all people—we in India who have many virtues have also one drawback or failing, and that is we stick to certain ruts of ideas.

Shri Ranga: And dogmas also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The result is that sometimes, rather often we become left in history. We know our own history and how we have been left in this changing world and others have advanced beyond us, in spite of the fact that the heritage we had was magnificent, very great. We mixed up that heritage, which was very great, with all manner of things, cobwebs and other things, which are attached to that heritage. So, while we almost forgot the real heritage, we stuck to those additions to it.

Now, we have to realise that we have to consider every problem in the context of today, not go on repeating parrot-like something that may sound very good but which has no relation to the facts of today. We have to live in the modern world, we have to face the modern problems in the modern way, keeping our ancient heritage but in the modern way. Of course, nobody here would suggest that we should go to the frontier and fight the

Chinese with bows and arrows; obviously not. Yet, there are such minds which think along the lines of bows and arrows in the modern world and do not get out of it. Come people, who are disgusted with things as they are today, want to change them. But how to change them? They want to return to some medieval period in history or still more ancient period as if that is possible. Nobody can go back to history. One can learn from the past; one cannot repeat the past.

So, we live today at a moment of extraordinary changes and one would have thought that the great and terrible experiences that all of us have had in the last two months because of the Chinese aggression and invasion would have shaken us up. Some hon. Members accuse our Government of complacency. Well, I am no good judge of it. I cannot speak for this government or for myself, but one thing on which we are certain is that we are not complacent; that is my view. We may make mistakes, any number of them, but how can anyone who has to shoulder responsibilities and take great decisions at a moment of crisis be complacent? He may make mistakes, he may take wrong decisions, but he cannot be complacent. It seems to me that complacency consists in repeating the same thing regardless of events, regardless of factors, regardless of the context in which we do it. That is the grievance I have, to some extent, when these matters are considered in that unchanged way. It really amazes me—to talk about the Colombo proposals, to hear hon. Members wax eloquent about a thing which is over and done with.

Shri Ranga: Are they dead? Let us be clear about it. What is the good of saying it over and over again?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They are not dead.

Shri Ranga: There you are.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: And they cannot die.

Shri Ranga: As long as we live.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In spite of the hon. Member's speeches or dislikes, things have happened. Since then, we have accepted them, and we have accepted them because a great majority of this House approved of them. A great majority of this House approved of them because a great majority of this House have previously approved of another proposal that we have made about the 8th September position, and it follows naturally. If some hon. Members are left out in the cold and cannot keep pace with others it is not my fault.

Shri Ranga: November 14th is still alive. The resolution that we passed on that day was a unanimous resolution. It is not to be upset.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The discussion lasted five days. Members of all parties have said what they wanted. They have criticised the Government and said that they do not approve of the policies of the Government. Now the reply is coming. Let us hear it.

Shri Ranga: We will always refer to their mistakes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He will have patience.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry the hon. Member, whom I respect greatly, although I completely and absolutely disagree with his mental thinking, is somewhat unfortunately lost in the backwoods and he cannot even see the clear light of the sun.

Shri Ranga: The only thing is that I am not an ostrich. I know where the ostrich is.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): The hon. Prime Minister has invited that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I will therefore venture to say that I hope and wish to deal with a few points raised.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

by hon. Members, but I want to carry this argument a little further because we must have clear thinking, above all at this moment of crisis.

We have had this tremendous experience, an experience which shakes up a nation and which did shake us up. It has shaken us up and let us at least profit by it by remaining wide awake. I do not mean to deny that we, as a Government, or if I may say so with all respect, this Parliament or the people as a whole have been rather out of touch sometimes with reality in the past. I ventured to say so three days after the Chinese massive invasion in a broadcast that I delivered. But, nevertheless, we have to think what the problem is, in what context it is specially when we talk about military matters. It is obvious that no victories on the battlefield are won by speeches there or here. Other things have to be prepared for victories in the normal course.

Obviously, the two major things before us are this Chinese invasion and, in a sense connected with it and with our thinking, the economic development of the country. Economic development is intimately connected with it because nothing else can strengthen us. Hon. Members may think that help from other countries will strengthen us. That is correct but only in a measure. It is correct that it does strengthen us, but even to use that help we have to have economic development; and, anyhow, one cannot live in the hopes of continuous streams of help coming to us year after year and decade after decade. At some time or other we have to build our own strength, with the help of others as we are doing, but nevertheless it must be our strength. That strength consists in advancement in science and technology which should be applied to all our processes, agricultural, industrial etc. That is a basic thing. The two are connected—all else are either parts of this or are of secondary importance—that is, firstly, the immediate issue of the Chinese

aggression and how to meet it or repel it and, secondly, development in the country.

We have had this question of development before us ever since we became independent. Everybody has it. Every country has it. Yet, there is a difference. There are many countries round-about us here in Asia or Africa who talk about development and seek help from other developed countries but who have no consciously regulated view of development. Consciously regulated view means roughly a planned approach to it. The planning may be slightly wrong or right, but a planned approach means a logical, reasonable approach, an approach to which, unfortunately, the learned Acharya opposite me does not agree. That is just it. I am glad that we had agreement about this matter at least. But that is the whole basis of my argument, that is, that the one thing that is absolutely essential in an developing country now—it is admitted by almost every intelligent person in this country or maybe in other countries—is that planned approach is essential. The nature of the planning may slightly differ here and there, but the major facts of planning are the same.

When we plan we may consult others. We consult experts from America, from England, from Russia and from countries that are capitalist, socialist or communist we consult them. Apart from certain basic differences, nevertheless, when we come to later things to be done, it is quite extraordinary how they agree, because once they get out of their ideological differences and conflicts, they have to consider it from the scientific point of view of a planned approach. It will surprise hon. Members, we have had all manner of persons coming from dozens of countries in the world, eminent technicians, eminent statisticians and the like, some of them professors in communist countries, in Poland, etc., some of them professors in American Universities and others. And yet, when they have sat down together

with us, they have, broadly, generally speaking, made the same observations and pointed out the same mistakes that we have committed. Because, today, we are slightly, not wholly, getting out of that old habit from which the world has suffered and from which some hon. Members opposite suffer greatly, of thinking that the world is confined to communists and anti-communists and nothing else. The fact is that the world today is a scientific world. There is no such thing—I hope even Prof. Ranga will agree—as communist or capitalist chemistry or a communist or capitalist gun or mortar. There is no such thing. It is a product of science and technology.

Shri Ranga: There is the Lysenko system.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Today, almost all the things that we use in the world from day to day are products of science and technology which is the same whether the approach is communist or capitalist. There is difference, of course, in other matters between communism and capitalism. Basically, the thing is, the world we live in is a scientific world, resulting in technology and all that. Because it is a scientific world, any approach that you make must be based on science. Otherwise, you lose yourself in the quagmire of illogic and lack of reason. Every country that is considered a strong country today is, normally speaking, a prosperous country, a developed country. That is, a developed country is both a prosperous country and a strong country, relatively strong country from the point of view of military affairs. You cannot be strong unless you are technologically, industrially, scientifically developed. Some may be more strong than others. That is a different matter. That is the basis of it. That development has to take place. It cannot be imposed upon one. You cannot give a gun to me and make me developed. I may use the gun and do some damage with it. But, until I go through the process of manufacturing the gun, and lots of people do that, a gun is not so useful as it might

otherwise be. That we have to develop. That is the whole essence even from the military point of view of our Five Year Plans and the like.

Behind military strength lies a developing nation, lies developing science and technology. That is why the very month or 2 or 3 months after we became independent, we laid stress on the development of science and started a fine magnificent series of national laboratories, national institutes which cover the country today and which have put India in a fairly advanced position in the ranks of scientific and progressive countries. That is the basis. Technology comes from that. You have got technological institutes. It is not putting up a mill here or a mill there. That is not industrialism. That may result in the man who owns it making a lot of money. That is a different matter. That is not industrialism. We have to develop a mentality among our hundreds of millions of people which comes from industrialism, a mentality whereby they will use better ploughs and the rest. We have to have specially trained people in vast numbers. Therefore, it may sound rather odd, to fight the Chinese, we have to encourage this process as much as possible. As I have ventured to say previously, this Chinese menace is not a thing of today or tomorrow or the day after. It is a long-term thing, because I should like hon. Members to remember that this is, historically speaking, a tremendous development; this conflict of China and India is a very big thing for India and for Asia and for the world even. I should like it to be seen in that perspective and we should be prepared for that perspective. That does not mean that we think of what is going to happen five or ten years later and forget our duty today. It is a continuing duty—That is what I am trying to point out,—from today onwards, and, therefore, we must not think of finding some sudden solution of it by some magic wand or some magic help that we may receive to put an end to it. We want all the help, we can and we shall try to get

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

it, and we are trying to get it; there is no argument about it. But the fact remains that real strength can only come from inner growth, and we must keep that in mind.

Therefore, this war situation that we have to face is intimately allied to the other problem, that is, of development in the country. The President has been pleased to point out that these are the two major problems; and development, of course, is necessary anyhow, war or no war. We want a prosperous country, but because of this war situation that becomes doubly important. Some people, without thinking, without clearly thinking, seem to think that because there is a war situation, therefore, we must allow the developmental part to be put on the background. They are utterly absolutely wrong, for, that is the real fundamental way of strengthening yourself to meet the situation.

Shri Ranga: Nobody has said that. It is only your socialist plan that we object to. You do not want to give up your dogmas even in this crisis.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have often felt inclined that there are many institutions in Delhi or some institutions for the Members of the Opposition to go to and learn what the modern world is. (*Interruptions*)

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of order. (*Interruptions*)

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): He is the Leader of the House, and if he will lead the way, we shall follow him. He is the leader of the biggest party. Let him show the way and we shall follow him.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have always considered myself a student, and I still consider myself a student.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We are with you in that.

Shri Ranga: He does not realise his mistake. He goes on repeating it. He

seems to think that he alone is the sanest person . . .

Shri Hem Barua: If he thinks himself a student then we would like to go with him, to these institutions. Why should he isolate us? (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker: There are lessons to be learnt here, and let us all try to learn them.

Shri Hem Barua: Does he mean institutions like the Udyog Bhavan and the Vigyan Bahavan?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Without his company it would be uninteresting.

Shri Ranga: I suppose that even there he would be the leader.

Shri Nath Pai: Today's performance is more than that of a professor to a student.

Shri Priya Gupta: Better a lecturer than a student.

Shri Hem Barua: Does he mean the Udyog Bhabhan and the Vigyan Bhavan?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Again that is being repeated.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: A grave crisis has overtaken us. That is evident. The question that arises, a very important question, is whether the basic policies that we have pursued have weakened us to face this crisis or strengthened us. I am not referring to all manner of mistakes we may have made or weaknesses that Government or the administration may have shown. I am talking about the basic policies that we have pursued because if they are wrong, if they have weakened us, then obviously we should change them, and change them considerably.

Now, what are these basic policies? In the domestic field, we have followed a course, as I have said, of planned

development. I have already referred to it and I would beg to say that that planned development has had an objective before it, as stated right in the preamble of our Constitution, of promoting justice, social, economic and political.

Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar): And cumulatively falling national income?

Mr. Speaker: Can he not contain himself?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is extraordinary how the truth of my words is evidenced so frequently by what hon. Members opposite say.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He is the Leader of the House. He looks happy.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If you analyse social justice, it means justice for all, equal opportunity for all, thereby releasing the pent-up energies of a whole people so that they may take their place as equals with others. Social justice has no place at all in it for feudalism and relics of feudalism. It has no place for many other things that we have to put up with today, the great discrepancies in people's conditions and opportunities. But anyhow, I am for the moment not talking about what we have failed in achieving, but rather about our policies. Our policy of social justice inevitably leads to some structure which should be called socialism.

Shri Ranga: No, Sir.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): It is a lone voice in the country.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not, again, speaking of socialism as some fixed, dogmatic, doctrinaire system, but, broadly speaking, of what flows from that concept. Therefore, our objective has been socialism or a socialist structure of society leading to equal opportunities for all, and a measure of affluence for all, a measure

of prosperity for all. Any sensitive man will feel it is scandalous—we may not act up to it—that some of us should be rich and prosperous and others should starve or should lead miserable lives. Any social system which permits that or which encourages that is definitely bad. There is no good looking back to the medieval times or to more ancient times to justify it by some saying or evidence.

Therefore, in the domestic field, our policy has been, first, of course, bettering the lot of our people—a welfare state—but aiming at social justice and socialism so as to give equal opportunities to all. Apart from the justice of it, the rightness of it, there is no other way, because once you give people political democracy, their minds begin to wake up. They do not submit to much that they submitted to previously. They make demands. So social problems arise. They make demands which we cannot fulfil, unless we change the social structure to some extent.

These have been our planned approaches towards socialism. It is true that we have attached great importance to democracy. But that very concept of democracy which we have adhered to or which we will adhere to tell us that democracy is not complete by merely remaining a political democracy. It has to become an economic democracy; only then democracy is complete. Therefore, again we come back to the ideal of a socialist structure of society. And this can only be achieved in the modern world or in any world with the help of science and technology. I do not call it socialism for everybody to be poor and starving, everybody to have the same lack of opportunity. That is not socialism or advance. Therefore, the only way to achieve this is through science and technology and to direct the products of science and technology into right channels so as to benefit the large mass of the people. Therefore, I submit that the policy that we have pur-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

sued of a planned approach to this end, to this desired end, is right in the domestic field.

The foreign field, however much we may discuss it from time to time, is after all secondary to the domestic field. It becomes primary suddenly when there is an attack or aggression on us, or when something happens to work us up—that is a different matter—but generally, the domestic field governs the foreign field. If we are prosperous in this country, if we are strong, our voice is heard everywhere. If we are failures in our own country, nobody listens to us. Therefore, ultimately it is the domestic field that counts. But domestic policy and foreign policy are more or less tied up. It is absurd to have a domestic policy which differs completely from the ends of the foreign policy.

In foreign policy we have ventured to lay stress, considerable stress, on peace, peace in the world. I would submit that that was right, and that is right. That does not become wrong because the Chinese Government believes in war. The Chinese Government believes in many things which are utterly wrong. They have strayed away from every canon of international behaviour, from their own high civilisation which they have pushed away. Therefore, we stood for peace and for co-operation with all nations. That simply means that we cannot co-operate with somebody who will not co-operate with us, but we are prepared to co-operate, to be friends with other countries. If I may respectfully say so, some people, quite a number of people, have said something to the effect that we are isolated in the world. What that means I do not know. I know something of the world, too, and I think the position is quite the reverse. There is hardly a country which is so much honoured as India anywhere. I do not mean to say that we are not criticised—we are criticised, and there is much to criticise in this country as

in any other country—but we are honoured, and we are honoured principally and chiefly, apart from our ancient heritage, because of the memory of Gandhiji, and secondly because, to a small extent, I do not say more than a small extent, we have endeavoured, according to our dim lights, to follow that—not completely, of course, I admit that; we cannot, in the circumstances. But they have seen that we have put noble ideal before ourselves and we work up to them.

We have adhered to the democratic method and yet tried to do things which no democracy, working through democratic methods, has tried to do yet. It is a new, novel example in the world's history that India has been trying to do—i.e., build herself up by planned economy, planned approaches, and yet retain the democratic method.

So, we are by no means friendless in the world. We have plenty of friends, but though we may have many friends, each country decides its foreign policy not on high principle, but on material interests. That is what we see round about India, in the countries surrounding us, how their policies have changed, often unfortunately very wrongly changed, not because of any principle. In fact, the thing that is obvious is that the changes that have taken place are wholly without principle. But one cannot measure one's own policies by the failures of others to adhere to any principle. As a result of the policy pursued in regard to other countries, it was inevitable, both because of our background and practical considerations of today, that we should have a policy of non-alignment which is largely accepted by this House, I believe and even by many hon. Members on the opposite side. I would explain again non-alignment. Simply, put in a different language, it is freedom of action. Non-alignment is not anything else but a measure of independence and freedom of action and

complete friendship with other countries. It does seem to me essentially right. It is odd that when we started talking about this policy of non-alignment many years ago, we were among the very few countries mentioning it. Gradually in the course of these ten or a dozen years a large number of countries have adopted it—chiefly the newly independent countries. Because it seemed to them the right attitude for a newly independent country to adopt and it came naturally to them. But what is more important is this. The people and the countries that looked rather askance at this policy of ours to begin with gradually began to appreciate it and we had arrived at a stage when almost everybody, every country that counts appreciates that policy. I do not mean to say that they appreciate it so far as they are concerned; they may be members of power blocs. But situated as we are, they appreciated it. The only extra-ordinary thing is that some people, some hon. Members, like in other matters, still disagree with us. They disagree with the whole world and they will continue in the rut of thought into which they have got by some peculiar process reasoning or lack of reasoning.

Shri Ranga: We remain in isolation and we do not recognise it today.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: These are the two major domestic policies that we have pursued and I venture to say that they were right and they are right and they will continue to be right in the changing world. Take non-alignment. The mere fact that it gives us freedom of action does not tie us and we can adopt to a changing world. Now, here is a country, our neighbour country, Pakistan which, inspite of being very much aligned is wandering about all over the place without any principle or any adherence to anything worthwhile. It was extra-ordinary.

Shri Ranga: Has India freedom of choice?

Shri Tyagi: My hon. friend wants to be aligned bothways . . . (Interruptions.)

Shri Ranga: Yes. She is playing with two; there is no bigamy there.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So, I do venture to say that the policies we have pursued in both these important fields are right. Events have shown them to be right. They are right in principle, theoretically but practically they have been shown to be right and therefore, we must adhere to them, both in the domestic and in the foreign field.

Opinions may differ as to the progress made by us in those policies. I venture to say that in both these, progress has been considerable. In the domestic field no doubt many of us would have liked to have gone faster. But we have to work. It is not merely a question of Government's functioning or this Parliament functioning and fine speeches being made and resolutions passed. It is after all dependent on the mass of the people working, mass of the people understanding the position and working in that direction. Of course, we this Parliament and the Government have to give a lead and help the process. But essentially we have to set the whole nation working, whether it is for war or peace or for both. I think that it is easy to say that we have not succeeded in many things, that we have not progressed as we ought to have progressed. But nevertheless, the progress that we have made in these last dozen years has been quite remarkable. It would have been remarkable even if we had made no such progress, compared to—(Interruption).

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He is speaking in paradoxes.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I shall explain myself. The mere fact of our

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

continuing as a democratic entity, functioning as a democratic entity, in spite of all the storms and stresses that we have gone through, is itself remarkable. If, in addition to that, we measure the progress of any country roundabout us, in Asia or Africa, one might see the difference. We have had democratic structures being replaced by *coup d'etat*s or revolutionary violence into autocracies, into authoritarianism, into something that we consider very undesirable. This is happening, has happened all over. So, this comparison itself brings to light what we have achieved.

If we agree to these basic principles and policies, what we have to do today is to examine not the principles, because they are proved to be right, but the implementation of those principles; it is in the implementation that we have often failed, and the implementation requires a great deal of capacity to work for millions of people as well as the capacity to lead hundreds of thousands. It is a difficult business. We have to create, if we want to develop industrially, a strong industrial base; that is, not merely odd factories here and there, but a strong, logically-organised industrial base out of which other things come. We have built a good part of the base, not complete by any means, but we are on the way to its completion; probably in another six, seven or eight years we would have made enough progress to stand to a large extent on our own feet. That is the theory behind it, and inevitably that would have made us even from the point of view of military necessities more or less independent; not entirely but more or less. I mention this merely to say that there is no question of being prepared for war except by going through this process. The other process is getting a large number of weapons of war from other countries, buying them or getting them without payment or on easy payment system. When a crisis occurs one does that and we are doing it

today. But it is not strength. We must realise that even ammunition required for these weapons is a crushing burden, continually to get ammunition, unless you manufacture them here. So we have essentially to build up our industrial machine which becomes, when the need arises, a war machine. And meanwhile we have to rely for whatever things we need on what we can get from outside. That is what we are trying to do.

There is one thing I would like to say about the response of our people to the Chinese invasion. We have all described it as a wonderful and spontaneous response. But what lies behind it? Why did they respond in that way? You may say, it is because of the love of the country. That is true; but, even that means that they have got the concept of the country. Why should people near Cape Comorin respond with great fervour to this invasion in the far north-east of India? It is because they have got that concept of India in their minds. It is a very fine thing; you must realise it. Further, it is because the challenge is made to the India of today; that is to say, however much they may criticise the India of today and the Government of today, they appreciate what has happened to India in the last 10 or 12 years, which they are not prepared to lose. It means that. Otherwise, there are only a few intellectuals who get warmed up by some theory. But the common people visualise these things as not merely theoretical, but practical things and they responded in this magnificent way, because, if I may say so, they appreciated what had been done in India since independence and they did not want to lose it.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): It is all self-praise.

Shri Ranga: In spite of you, they have united.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): You are demeaning that magnificent response by claiming partisan credit for it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is not a party affair at all.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I did not venture to say it is a party affair.

Shri Nath Pai: You are giving it that colour.

Shri Ranga: Before we became free, when we were getting united, there was no Jawaharlal Nehru as Prime Minister. He was only one of the fighters for freedom. We all rallied round you as well as Mahatma Gandhi. But now you are only a Prime Minister and we know the result.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He is still a fighter, I hope. (*Interruption*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We have to face a military problem. But if we consider it as a purely military problem, we shall make a grave mistake. It is a political problem also in the larger context and therefore, from both these points of view, military and political, we have to prepare our people and make them a nation armed militarily and with clear ideas politically. Lack of political appreciation of the world we live in and of our country will weaken the military effort. Our people must feel that we and they are labouring for a better future for them, where every Indian can have a chance and we have rid ourselves of our terrible poverty. A socialistic ideal is essential to create that feeling among our people, apart from its desirability otherwise. We have made progress, but even now there are reactionary elements in the country, which confuse the issue and make it more difficult to progress.

Hon. Members have asked, what are we doing now about all this? I cannot easily go into the lists of what we are doing in the military field, what we are trying to build ourselves, what factories we are putting up,

what we are trying to get from others, etc., partly because it would not be a right thing for me to do so and partly because I do not know what ultimately we will get. We are getting many things. There are many other things we want, and we are trying our best to get them. The main things that we want are machines to build things ourselves—aircraft, training for special aircraft, etc. All those things we want.

I need not say much about the question of air umbrella. The other day I made a statement. So, I think it should have made the position quite clear. As it was thought—this business of air umbrella—it seemed to me quite a wrong thing, because it really meant, if you analyse it in that way, that we do not build anything important ourselves, anything worthwhile ourselves and we rely on others to do that job for us. That is a bad thing both psychologically and actually, because at the end of the period, whatever they might have done, we remain as weak as we were. Secondly, this impression in our people that other people are going to do our job is a bad impression. It weakens them and creates a mentality which might be called the Maginot-line mentality—something like a protecting cover, they are standing like chowkidars with lathis ahead, we are free of thieves or scoundrels coming in and we can live happily. It is not a right mentality to create, in any country, in the people. Psychologically it is bad. But, as I have said enough, we are trying our utmost to get the assistance of other friendly countries to give us what we require, whether it is in the air or in the field.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I submit that the word "umbrella" itself with some of its former political associations is an unhappy word?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I agree with the hon. Member completely in this matter.

Shri Ranga: The word "umbrella" has gone and "armada" has come.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member opposite, I think, in his speech asked me, what he calls, some particular questions for which he wanted clear answers I do not know how far I can give clear answers to all his questions at present moment. He asked me: "Are we at war with China or not?". Well, obviously, in the technical sense we are not. That is obvious. But behind that technical sense lie many other things. That is a different matter, and I might say that we have entered into a period of conflict with China which is going to be a lengthy period which may occasionally sometimes be actual war and at other times not a war. But the conflict continues and we live on the brink of it all the time. Therefore, we have to be prepared for it all the time—I do not know if that is an adequate answer—and, we can never be sure of what developments may take place in the near future.

Shri Priya Gupta: Are we preparing for a war or for a conflict?

Shri Ranga: We are living in an emergency.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Whether it is war or conflict the preparation is the same.

Shri Priya Gupta: I see.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The preparation is identical and, if I may add, if it is negotiation, even then the preparation is the same, because no negotiation can take place, it has no value, unless it has the strength behind it.

Shri Priya Gupta: In respect of war it is the same?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: At the present moment, so far as the present position in these border areas is concerned, we consider ourselves completely free to do what we like, to send our forces where we like, but we

do consider ourselves bound down to some extent by the so-called Colombo proposals—that is, having accepted them we do not want to go beyond them—not that the question arises at all . . .

Shri Ranga: That means they are not dead.

Shri Hem Barua: But there was a gap between the Chinese cease-fire and the Colombo proposals. What did you do during that gap?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I may venture to say that we consider ourselves completely free to go into and implement the Colombo proposals as accepted by us. That is not quite the same as the Chinese view of the Colombo proposals. Anyhow, these questions do not actually arise at the present moment. As I am telling you, our army is free to do so. They have to decide when to go where to go and how to go. That is for them to decide.

Shri Nath Pai: That is not very convincing. Basically, it is a political decision. You are avoiding your responsibilities. Basically, the decision is political. If you do not like to face it, that is different. We cannot accept the position that it is a military decision. We fail to understand how to move to the border is a military decision.

17 hrs.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Defence Minister has not a free hand, I believe.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The political decision has been made by us; I am talking of the present moment; day after tomorrow it may be different. That is to say, in terms of the Colombo proposals we can send our troops or our forces anywhere. That is the political decision. Whether in those terms the army sends them immediately, tomorrow or the day after is a military decision.

Shri Nath Pai: That is implementation.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Its implementation is up to the army.

Shri Ranga: May we seek a clarification? He said that it is up to the Army. Army is also a department of this Government and there is a Cabinet Minister in charge of that. Are we to understand that the army and the Cabinet Minister are free to take any decision and then go ahead? What did the Prime Minister say when he went to Ceylon?—"I have asked our troops to march". Was it a military decision, or political decision, or the Prime Minister's decision?

Shri Tyagi: Should we inform the enemy what we are going to do?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Hon. Members will appreciate the little fact that something has happened since the middle of September.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Very much.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What I said then was not my decision alone; it was the viewpoint of the military people too. They wanted to do it. Otherwise, I would not have dared to say anything like that. It is obvious.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The then Defence Minister also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Now, for instance, there are two places, Thagla Ridge area and Longju which, under the Colombo proposals, as accepted by us, were sought to be left out of the other proposals and were to be discussed by us, that is by our emissaries, with the Chinese Government in the course of implementation. Now, because of that, for the present we are not sending any of our armed forces to the Thagla Ridge area and Longju. Apart from that in the whole of NEFA we can go anywhere, we can send our armed forces anywhere, subject only to the decision of our military people as to when to send, what to send and

how to send. In the same way, in Ladakh too, we are free to send our forces where we like within the limits of our agreement, according to the Colombo proposals.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What agreement? There is no agreement.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Within the limits of our acceptance of the Colombo proposals; I am talking of the present—a different situation may arise tomorrow—I am talking of the position as it is now.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, on a point of clarification. The Prime Minister himself says that the Chinese have not accepted the Colombo proposals. So, we are not bound by them when they have not agreed to them.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They have not accepted them. As a matter of fact, that need not come in our way at all, because we have not implemented that part too. Because, practically speaking, there are difficulties.

Shri Hem Barua: It depends upon the acceptance by the Chinese also, for its implementation.

Shri Ranga: Drop the word "agreement" then.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry, there is no "agreement" in that sense. What I have said in regard to the Colombo proposals is that it is no doubt a limit which we have not reached yet, which our army has not reached yet. That is what I said. This is a matter which is a continually changing matter. It will depend upon what the position is. It is an obvious thing for me to say that here it is not a question of advancing, waving a flag: It is a question of advancing with strength enough to face any odds and the Army has to think of that. We cannot tell them to go here or to go there. They have to decide whether they can go there. They can go within a certain range.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

I would repeat one thing. Whenever we think of war a large number of amateur strategists arise who are constantly advising us as to what to do and how to carry on a war or our preparation for a war. All of us have some views about it, but if it really comes to any warlike operations, one has necessarily to depend upon the experts who are there to advise us and who have to carry it out.

Broadly, I would remind this House, although we are taking every step to prepare ourselves, even so, we do not rule out any possible settlement by negotiation. It may be unlikely—probably, it is—but to rule it out would be wrong. That has not been our practice at any time. I have previously referred to a reference of this matter to the International Court of Justice at the Hague or even to a proper arbitration by a number of countries. It may be unlikely that China accepts it. That is a different matter, but I think it is a right course for us—right in itself and right from the point of view that the world is appreciating it.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I hope, you will do that after consulting this House.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Obviously, I cannot commit the country to such a step without coming to this House, but I have already stated it in my letters to the Chinese Prime Minister about two months ago or a month ago—I forget when—and made this suggestion. Suppose—it is an unlikely supposition, but suppose—he accepts them; then it becomes rather awkward for me to back out of that.

Shri Nath Pai: Accept what?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The reference to the Hague Court or something like that.

Shri Nath Pai: He dare not.

Shri Hem Barua: He has made that clear.

Shri Nath Pai: He dare not face an international tribunal; rest assured.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Then, may I refer to some other matters? Some people have suggested that we should put an end to the state of emergency. At the same time they have also criticized the Government and the administration for not keeping up the mind of emergency, if I may say so, among the people. Is it not obvious, apart from other reasons, that if we put an end to the state of emergency, everybody will lose all thought of an emergency?

Shri Ranga: No, Sir; they have a greater sense of patriotism.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I must confess that what is obvious to me finds difficulty in appreciating by Professor Ranga. But one thing is certain—I do not say that that is the sole test of that—that once we did that the whole country will feel that the danger is past or that something has happened and they need not be taut and ready for any crisis. That is one reason. The fact is—I want this House to appreciate it—that the danger is not past. I do not know what may happen in the next two, three or four weeks in the month of March or April; I have no notion at all. I know that we have been preparing for everything and we have to go on strengthening ourselves. This process of strengthening will go on not only for a few weeks or few months but, maybe, for a year or two. That is so. Because, we want to be prepared for every contingency. To imagine that there is no possibility of any new crisis suddenly arising, will be completely wrong for us.

Shri Ranga: Should you keep it on taking away civil liberties, and giving all the freedom to the Congress party to carry on as they please all over the country, treating the rest of us who differ from them as traitors?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order; it is not a speech.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as Defence of India Rules are concerned, there have been some arrests and some objection has been taken to preventive detention, etc. Nearly all these arrests have taken place at the instance of the State Governments, certainly with the general approval of the Government of India, not individual approval of individuals. But, the fact that they took some such action. . . .

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Are we to understand that the Central Government did not send any directive to the State Governments?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I just ventured to say with the general approval of the Government of India, not in regard to any individuals. Where they considered any persons dangerous from the point of view of war effort, etc., they might take action: that is our general direction to them. But, the choice lay with them how to do it. Since then, we have repeatedly asked them to re-examine these cases and where they did not consider it necessary, to release them. In fact, about 200 or so persons, who were originally arrested, have been released. This process of re-examination is continuously going on.

About Kashmir, I would like to say a word, though not much. Because, I feel, having decided to talk with the Pakistan Government, it will not be proper for me to discuss this matter in the House or in public although I must say, the recent new development, which has induced the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to go to Peking to sign a treaty with them about their border. . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Our border.

Shri Nath Pal: Which is their border? We claim Kashmir as part of India.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: They have usurped our border

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes. . . has come as a shock. It has come as a shock not only because of the basic facts of the situation. But, the extraordinary thing is the timing of these events. The House will remember that when first my colleague Shri Swaran Singh went to Rawalpindi for the first series of talks, the day before the talks were going to begin, an announcement was made that an agreement in principle had been arrived at between China and Pakistan about the border. It was an extraordinary timing: just the day before. Now again, when he is going in a short time, they go. The least that it shows is. . . .

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We knew all the while that they were being invited. Peking was inviting. Mohammed Ali was invited. This gentleman was invited.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Nevertheless, the timing is significant. I think one is justified in thinking that this timing cannot be fortuitous or accidental. It is deliberate. Therefore, it does not indicate any strong desire on the Pakistan Government's part to arrive at any agreement. That is a matter. We gave some consideration to this as to whether we should continue these talks in spite of this visit of Pakistan Foreign Minister to Peking at this moment. We came to the conclusion that we should adhere to our previous resolve and not back out of these talks because of this, although, naturally, the talks will be affected by it. So, probably, I say probably, I do not know what might happen in the next week or 10 or 12 days, probably, subject to that, I shall request Shri Swaran Singh again to journey to Calcutta to continue these talks.

Shri Hem Barua: This is going to be the last.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We should re-orientate our policy.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Because, one has to balance various considerations. We thought that it would be desirable for us to break on this issue. Hon. Members here know all the background. But, for the world at large, the fact that will stand out is that we have broken these talks, not that they have gone to Peking. That will be very much before them.

Then, there are one or two other matters that I should like to refer to. One is that many Members have referred to corruption and maladministration. It is a favourite subject and a right subject to refer to, though perhaps, very often, the reference gives an exaggerated picture. Anyhow, it is a vitally important thing on which there cannot be any two opinions. And I can assure the House that we have been doing our utmost, and I do not know if Members see these things or these papers get enough publicity, but every month, I think, I receive a long list of persons in the Government service, who, after due inquiry, have been either proceeded with in the law courts or departmentally and punished.

Recently, there was the Vivian Bose Enquiry Report, which I hope, every Member has got now, for, it is a document worth reading, not only because of the particular things mentioned in it, but even more so because of the background in which such things can happen. It is true that the background is somewhat different now, because many of these things happened in the early days of our Independence, when some new laws that we have passed were not functioning. Nevertheless, it is important to consider what action should be taken not only to punish the guilty but to prevent such things from happening again as far as possible.

May I mention also another matter? Some Members drew my attention to. . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Will Parliament have an opportunity of discussing that report?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Undoubtedly, but we have not put it up. . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: An opportunity of discussing it early?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Discussing it early? That is difficult, because the Finance Bill will take up most of the time. But there is another thing. We have referred that report to some eminent lawyers and asked them not only to go into the individual cases—that, of course, is a matter of detailed examination—but we have also asked their advice as to what else we can do apart from proceeding individually. So, I think that we should wait for their report and then bring it up before the House.

There is another matter that I should like to refer to. Some hon. Members have drawn my attention to some reports in the Calcutta newspapers, apparently about some papers, account-books and other things being attached by the police, and it is said that in these account-books occurred the names of some Ministers, Central Ministers, State Ministers etc. I heard of this for the first time two days ago—or perhaps three days ago, I am not sure; immediately, I enquired and I wanted to know something more about it, and I have asked for a report about this, so that we might find out what it is and we shall, after finding it out take necessary action.

About the National Defence Fund, various people have drawn attention to the fact. . . .

Shri Priya Gupta: In regard to the anti-corruption drive, let there be a forum for the Ministers also to be tried in case of complaint. That is my submission. The Home Minister has said that Ministers are not Government servants as such, and so, there must be some forum to look into complaints of corruption against the Ministers.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot talk about forums.

Mr. Speaker: Not the public forum.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: About the National Defence Fund, some charge is made that coercion and compulsion is being exercised in these collections.

Shri Priya Gupta: What about my submission?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If that is so, I am very much distressed, because we have made it very clear, repeatedly clear, publicly clear as well as privately clear, that there must be not an atom of compulsion or pressure exercised. For, it spoils something that has been magnificent. The way the public have contributed to this Fund has been truly very heartening, and to have that record spoiled by an odd case of compulsion etc. is not good. I can assure the House that the Finance Minister, I and others have tried our utmost, and we will go on trying, to prevent that.

One or two words more, about gold policy. I would not say much about it. I take it that almost all, if not all—I dare not say 'all' lest Acharya Ranga might....

Shri Nath Pai: No, no. It is Comrade Dange who has opposed that—your progressive friend. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: He has not heard the end of my sentence. What I was saying was this, that so far as the general policy underlying it is concerned, I hope that if not all, nearly all persons, all Members, will agree to the implementation of it. There may be difference of opinion and some suggestions made. That is a matter which should continuously be under the consideration of the Finance Minister. But I am not going into that matter because I understand there is going to be a full debate on it very soon....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Monday next.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:...on the 5th. The matter might be discussed then.

There is just one other thing—I have taken so much time of the House—a proposal made by some hon. Members about NEFA, Nagaland, Tripura and Manipur, all being made into a homogeneous province with Assam. I think that on paper it would sound very nice but it would create great difficulties and will not be liked by the people concerned. That is a very important consideration. We cannot take a step today which goes against the will of the people concerned there.

Another criticism has been made about NEFA being treated as a kind of reserved area where people are not allowed to go easily. To some extent, that is true. That has been so. But the House will remember that NEFA has been the special responsibility of the Government of India in the External Affairs Ministry, with the result that it has had more attention paid to it than most other areas. It is not a question of keeping it apart from India, but certain changes should take place in a manner that they may fit in instead of creating difficulties and irritation among the people who live there. We have to go on with the process of integration, but without gaining the goodwill of the people, the integration would be superficial. Therefore, for the moment—specially at this stage from the point of view of border troubles—it will not be desirable to make any major change in the constitutional arrangements there.

Shri Hem Barua: How do you propose to bring about a comprehensive Indian mind so far as these people are concerned?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is coming slowly.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They won't get a comprehensive Indian mind if they get the idea that the average Indian goes there to exploit them.

Shri Hem Barua: I know that. That must be stopped, from whatever source it comes. But the policy of segregation, with the rest of the Indians not being allowed to go into that place, must not be persisted in.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Chinese are exploiting them all right.

Shri Hem Barua: On the other side of the line, the Chinese are coming in and going out, and fraternising with the people there.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What I ventured to say was that the process should go on, as the hon. Member suggests. It has to be gradual to fit in. If you upset them, it is difficult to soothe them down again.

I am sorry I have taken so much time. May I now say a few words about prices? Much has been said about prices. Oddly enough, some Members have complained of rising prices and some have complained of declining prices.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: There has been a debate already.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know. The fact that Members have complained of two entirely opposite tendencies indicates that prices have, on the whole, been stable.

Shri Hem Barua: That is the easier solution!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: One must judge of wholesale prices, and wholesale prices have, on the whole, been stable. In fact, there was a slight declining tendency up to December. Since then, there has been some rise, but of a marginal character only. As for retail prices, it is very difficult to have even very correct information about the whole of India, but we are

trying to get as much information as possible. But on the whole even retail prices have not changed very much. Nor has there been any market fluctuation in the price of manufactured articles. In regard to cloth, the supply position is good, and prices have been at a relatively satisfactory level. The fact remains that the question of prices is a very important one and I believe is very much in the mind of the Planning Commission and other Ministries that deal with it.

Thank you.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: By your leave, may I put one question, arising out of this?

Mr. Speaker: No questions now.

Am I required to put any particular amendment separately?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The first part of my amendment covers what Shri Ranga's amendment contains. You may therefore put Nos. 7 and 8 together.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I would like my amendment, No. 6, to be put separately.

Mr. Speaker: Then I put amendment Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 9 to the House.

(The amendments were put and negatived).

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

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

"but regret—

- (a) that in spite of continued occupation of India's territory by the Chinese communists and the need of emergent action to combat it, the emphasis laid in the Address on peaceful methods is calculated to undermine the morale of the people and to rob the national crisis of its content of urgency and the proclama-