

15.06 hrs.

DEBATE ON PRESIDENT'S
ADDRESS—contd.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have to apologise to the House, to begin with, for not having been present here most of the time when this discussion on the President's Address took place. I was engaged in the other House for a good part of the time. But, I have taken the opportunity to read the reports of many of the speeches delivered here. So, I am in some possession of what was said.

To begin with, may I associate myself completely with what has been said by some Members, notably the Lady Member who moved this Motion and other Members in their reference to our President? This as the President has said in his Address, is the last Address he is going to deliver to this Parliament. It is true that he will, no doubt, address the opening Session of the next Parliament also. It is rather an odd practice that is growing up here for the old Parliament and the new Parliament to overlap somewhat and the old Parliament to meet after the elections. It seems very odd to others as well as to ourselves. But, for some reason or other, we have got caught in this because of these dates. Perhaps, this might be avoided if the dates of election were somewhat different. However, we are likely to have, in the course of a month, another Address from the President addressed to the new Parliament. Although we shall have the pleasure of listening to him again it is a fact, as the House knows, that our President will end his term of high office in the near future. I have no doubt that every Member here and others outside will feel deeply grateful to the President and will rejoice at the fact that we have had during these initial ten years of our Republic, and a little before, his wise guidance and his personality which gave dignity to our Constitution.

As time goes on, the old Captains and Generals pass away, and naturally, all of us feel, this gap and the country itself faces the situation in a somewhat different context, not only because our problems are different, but the fact that thus far, many of those who have guided the destinies of India were associated with the struggle for freedom gave them a peculiar competence, to deal with them—competence in the sense that they bridged the gap between the pre-Independence period and the period after Independence in the minds of the people. When that gap no longer remains there or when the story of our Independence is a matter for history, to be read about in books, the context will, naturally, be different. Now, no one else could have bridged that gap more than our President. And it was very fortunate for us, that we had the great advantage, the great honour of having him as the Head of our State during these many years. We would like to wish him, more especially as he has been through a serious illness, good health, and many years; although he has not presided over the destinies of our nation, we hope that his good advice will be available to us whenever it is necessary.

Now, this Address of the President, naturally, and especially because another Address will be coming in about three or four weeks' time, was rather a survey of the past than a looking into the future, although he could not avoid, and he rightly dealt with, the future, here and there; yet, it was more a catalogue of some of our achievements and some of the problems that face us. Those are factual matters, and it may be, as some hon. Members say, that it is rather an optimistic account of what has happened, and that many difficult problems remain. I do not personally think that it is too optimistic, but that is a matter of expression really. The fact remains that much that we would have liked to do, we have not done, and many problems remain unsolved, and even as we solve some

problems, others arise to the their place, and the situation can never be looked upon in a complacent spirit.

Our problems are problems that can be divided into two categories, problems external to India, and problems internal to India or domestic problems. External problems are important, because they affect us, as they affect the world, and, therefore, we have to pay attention to them. But, at the same time, the main time of this Parliament is naturally spent on thinking about internal problems because internal problems affect our very lives, the lives of hundreds of millions from day to day, and in effect, internal progress ultimately governs what we may do externally, because a weak nation, a nation which is beset with internal problems which it cannot solve, cannot play an important part in external affairs.

Before I proceed further, I should like to refer to a piece of news which came in this morning's papers, and which announced the long hoped for agreement between the leaders of the Algerian people and the French Government for a cease-fire. I doubt if we can easily find in the records of history even, such an intensive struggle as the Algerian people have lived through during the past seven years and more, such intense suffering, such large numbers of casualties, and killings, almost a substantial portion of the population of Algeria suffering because of this. Surely, no one can deny that if a price has to be paid for freedom, the Algerian people have paid much more than any price that could have been laid down. And apart from the principle involved of freedom and independence, they deserve it, because of this price that they have paid.

We should like to send our greetings and good wishes to them on this occasion. May I add that I should like to congratulate the other party, that is, the French Government under President De Gaulle also, because while we may disagree with much that has happened, done by the

French Government there, we must recognise that all kinds of difficulties and extraordinary conditions came in his way, but he adhered to his resolve to grant, or to agree to, the independence of Algeria, and, therefore, he deserves credit for it? In coming to this agreement, there have undoubtedly been a number of compromises in which both parties have given up something to which they attached importance. But whatever has been given up does not come in the way of independence. That is the important thing.

Although this tremendous hurdle has been crossed, there still remain grave difficulties in Algeria and in France, because as hon. Members might know, a secret Army Organisation has grown up in the past, which has given a great deal of trouble, and which is functioning—I do not know how to describe it—in a typically cruel, callous and Fascist manner. All I can hope is that this will cease now, and if it does not cease, that would be dealt with adequately.

I hope that the Algerian people, after having paid such a heavy price for their independence, and been conditioned by it,—because it is the price that they pay in suffering and sacrifice that conditions the people,—will grow, rapidly grow and progress and become a bulwark of peace and co-operation in the world.

I shall not refer to Goa, because we had recently some debate on the Goa Bills. All I would say is, and I repeat what I said then, that we can now say that we have completed the independence of India. That is an aspect of this question which many people outside India do not realise fully, namely that this is a part of our independence struggle, that our independence was not complete till this was done with. Naturally, our independence struggle was directed chiefly towards the British, because the British Dominion was a great part of India, but it included in its scope

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

any colonies that any foreign Power might have in India; there were the French, and there were the Portuguese.

The House may remember that in the course of our independence struggle, Mahatma Gandhi did not particularly want us even to carry on agitations in what were called then the Indian States. Even then, nobody imagined that the Indian States would be outside India, outside Independent India. But he felt that we must concentrate on the major obstruction; that was the British Dominion in India; and in the Indian States, he felt that our struggle against the Rulers there, justified as it well might be, was a rather false struggle, because behind them was the British Government, and the British Government could take shelter, because we shall have to fight others and not the real trouble-maker there. So, he advised us, and advised the Congress movement not to directly carry on agitations in the States. Of course, the people of the States could do so. It does not matter whether that was the right policy or the wrong policy. I am merely mentioning it to show how our attitude towards Goa and the French colonies was determined by the fact that we concentrated on the so-called British India as it was, feeling that the rest would inevitably follow. We never forgot either the French colonies or the Portuguese colonies; we never forgot them. But we did realise that they existed there because of the fact that the British Power had agreed to their coming back. So far as the French were concerned, they came back after the Napoleonic wars; during the Napoleonic wars, they had to give them up. The British agreed to that. So they came back. So far as the Portuguese were concerned, it is patent that they could not have held those colonies but for the protection of the British Power. That was obvious. And so we thought that

when the British Power went from India, these would automatically revert to India. We tried to get this done peacefully.

We talked to the French Government. The French Government at first raised many legal and other points, but at any rate, they talked. We talked and they talked, both in a civilised manner about a question, and ultimately we came to a decision, an agreement. With the Portuguese, the facts of history were not admitted. The present context was not understood by them. They still lived in the 16th or 17th century. It was difficult to talk. Indeed, they did not talk to us. They refused to talk to us about the future of Goa, except in terms of our admitting that they would exist there, which we could never do. We sent a Minister to Lisbon, opened a Legation there and presented Notes etc. which they would not accept. So we withdrew our Minister. The House knows what has happened since then.

So that what I want to lay stress on is this, that Goa was a part of our struggle for independence as much as any other part. Our concern was that foreign countries held parts of India. Whether they were the British or the Portuguese or the French or any other was a matter of details. The main thing was that India must be free of any foreign control. And we have had that.

Most people in the west seem to imagine that by some right or other, right of conquest, if you like, Goa was part of Portugal, and we did wrong in taking any steps, any forcible steps, to acquire it. I did not particularly like even those steps. Not because I thought at any time that those steps were wrong; I think we were completely justified in law, under the United Nations Charter and everything, in taking those steps, taking into consideration the fact that Goa was part of India, that Goa was a colony. So I think we were right

in that. Nevertheless, I hesitated to do that, because this kind of thing has effects and consequences in other places; this might be made a precedent for some other country to apply violence in the wrong place at the wrong time. But, as the House knows, we were compelled by circumstances to do so. However, that is over.

Unfortunately, we have still to look after a fairly large number of Portuguese soldiery—about 3,500 or so. Of course, they are being treated well. They live in their old barracks where they used to live before—and have everything. Indeed, immediately, after the Goa operation, we offered to the Portuguese Government to take them away. We made no bargain. We did not want anything in exchange. We said, take them away. Some people suggested that we could have bargained with them about the future of the Indian residents of Mozambique and Angola. We are much interested in the future of those residents, but we refused to bargain. We thought that would be dealt with separately.

So we have told them repeatedly, 'We shall hand them over to you; take them away.' But the matter has not yet been apparently decided. I said this on the last occasion here. A day or two later, a message appeared in the Press apparently emanating from the Portuguese Government saying that they had made a suggestion to us and they have received no answer. But we have received no suggestion at all, unless it be that it is on the way via the Brazilian Government, via the Egyptian Government and various governments. That might take some time. Even then, it has been several days since this happened and no suggestion has come. We have even gone so far as to tell the Portuguese soldiery that they can go themselves; anybody can shift for himself and go and make his own arrangements, and we would facilitate his going from there.

This, unfortunately, creates a situation in Goa which comes in the way of normality returning, when 3,500 soldiers are there under detention. They are not treated as prisoners of war in detention. Our Army is there to look after them. We have, as a matter of fact, removed a great part of our Army and Civil police that went there. We would have removed the rest except for a very small number, if these soldiers had not been there.

However, these matters will no doubt be settled soon. It is unfortunate that it takes a little time, for a simple thing like this. Other matters in too in Goa are gradually being resolved, and I hope that Goa will settle down and make progress.

Now the most important thing at present happening on the world scene is the disarmament Conference that is taking place in Geneva, to which we have sent a strong and able delegation. We feel strongly about disarmament. Our whole attitude has been, as it often is in foreign affairs, not to push ourselves forward too much but to help others. It is obvious that disarmament, although it concerns every country in the world, can only be brought about if the big nuclear powers agree. In the ultimate analysis, it is not merely a question of votes; it is a question of agreement by those powers. We have, therefore, tried to help in this agreement being achieved.

So far as we are concerned, in the course of the past few years, we have made repeated proposals in regard to disarmament in the United Nations. It is interesting to note that a number of our proposals when made were fiercely criticised; a year or two later, they were quietly adopted or some other country put forward those very proposals and they were adopted. The whole approach to this question is so full of suspicion, lest something might happen which might cause this country or that country some harm or injury, that every proposal is hardly considered on the merits but with that suspicious outlook. I do not blame anybody for it because

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

it does involve grave problems. Disarmament does; although it has appeared today in the context of nuclear weapons, which makes it vital, disarmament is, after all, something which has never happened in the world. It is a new phase of the world's existence that we are gradually groping after. The weapons may have been bows and arrows, may have been breech-loading guns, may have been anything, but no body has ever talked of disarmament or at least effected it previously—some people have talked about it. After the First World War, the old League of Nations had a Disarmament Conference or some such thing. They appointed a Preparatory Commission for disarmament. I happened to be in Geneva then, and they went on talking the preparatory commission went on talking, for years. They produced reports, fat ones, a number of them, pointing out the difficulties of disarmament—and that was a time when there were no nuclear arms. So, you can imagine how much more difficult it has become when nuclear weapons have come on the scene, with the choice offered to humanity of either disarmament or no survival at all. So, it is no good criticising anybody or condemning anybody because it involves grave issues of national safety, and every Government has to be careful about its own safety. The only difficulty is that each person considers his safety in the context of being much superior to the other to make sure, and you cannot have everybody being superior to everybody else, it is impossible for even two.

At the present moment not much progress has been made in this committee on disarmament at Geneva. Various proposals have been put forward, they are being discussed, and I believe they have agreed lastly, at our response, to meet informally and secretly and not in public all the time. They might have some public sessions, but most of the work will be done privately, because it is impossible in these conferences to discuss anything

very seriously in public. I do not think that we need be very much alarmed at the fact that during these few days not much progress has been made. That is natural because the countries are putting forward their own viewpoints without yielding to anything else, but I hope the next development will be more accommodation to the others' view points.

The literature on the subject is tremendous now. Hon. Members may think that one is either for or against disarmament, but it is not so simple as that. It really is extraordinarily intricate, and some of us who have had to study it to a little extent have been amazed at the complexity of the problem, but there it is. The fact is that if we do not solve it on this occasion, conditions are likely to grow worse there will be more and more arms, always of a later pattern, more dangerous pattern, and it may go completely out of hand once the nuclear weapons and their progeny spread to a number of more countries.

One thing appears to me to be clear. Everybody has agreed in theory—by everybody I mean that the United Nations has said so and even the Great Powers like the Soviet Union, the United States Government and I think the United Kingdom Government have agreed—on complete and wholesale disarmament. What more can you have? But it is in translating that that all the difficulties occur. Still, it is well to remember that the agreement is on a very wide field. The disagreement is highly important because it comes in the way, but really the basic things have been agreed upon. Now, even if you start with this idea of agreement on this complete and wholesale disarmament, naturally it does not appear overnight: you have to do it by phases. Then the difficulty comes as to what should be the first phase, what should be the second. Thereafter it was agreed that in any phase or any step that was taken, nothing should be done that made one Great Power weaker than the other rival Power, that is, the relative pro-

portion of strenght should be maintained in partial disarmament etc. That is also agreed to, but however much it may be phased, it seems to me that the first phase must be a substantial one, must be a striking one, must be such as to strike the imagination of the world. There is no good saying: all right, let us reduce our arms by ten per cent or five per cent. That will not affect anybody, it will be a jokking matter. So, while it has to be phased, the first phase has to be a striking one.

One thing else I should like to say in this connection. It was unfortunate, I venture to say, that last year the Soviet Government started a new series of atomic tests, nuclear tests. I do not know that reasons, I mean the military reasons, because military people always want these tests, and I know for a fact that military people in all these countries having nuclear arms are constantly pressing their Governments for more tests so as to improve their weapons. But one after it led to the United States Government have some tests, they had underground tests at that time, and so the way was opened for this kind of thing unfortunately. Recently it was announced by the United States Government that they would start a series of new tests overground, atmospheric tests, within a month, I think, or some such period, unless a treaty banning all tests was evolved before then. If I may say so with all respect, it is very unfortunate that that was said just then, just on the eve of the disarmament conference because in a sense it came in the way of the success of that conference to some extent. It may have been thought that it would expedite matters in the conference, but it is hardly likely that the conference will produce firm treaties within a month or so; and it would be very unfortunate, I think, if the United States Government started these tests while the conference is meeting, because there is no doubt that the moment the United States Government started, the Soviet Government—it has said so—will start it also. Then this disarmament confe-

rence will progressively lose all significance while the real thing is happening outside, while the tests are taking place. Therefore, I would beg the Great Powers concerned to consider, not to have any tests while the conference is sitting, while they are making every effort to reach a settlement on these matters.

The subject of disarmament is complex as I said, very complex, and the more one tries to understand it, the more one realises the complexity of the problem, but behind all this physical complexity lies the fear and hatred of one country against another; and fear and hatred are bad companions and lead one to wrong results. Now, that is why I have been anxious that we should not be driven into fear and hatred to much in regard to our own problems. Our problem of the border aggression by the Chinese, is a serious matter for us, serious for the present of course, but serious for the future. No country with any self respect can ignore such a problem. Nobody has suggested that it should be ignored, but I am merely saying that. And it is a serious problem because, to imagine that it can be solved easily by war is a misapprehension of the facts of the situation or of the effects of a war in dealing with such matters. If one is driven into a war, well, one is driven into it, and one does one's utmost to win it, but normally speaking, and looking at it even in the context of disarmament and all that is happening in the world, it would be an utter absence of prudence to rush in into some step, the end of which we cannot see.

Therefore, I have often stated that while we adhere to our position firmly—and the House only two days ago may have seen the recent correspondence on this subject with China—we should still make every effort to solve this question by settlement and peacefully. If, unfortunately, that is not possible, then, we may have to think of other means. But, there should be no jumping in into methods which close the door and bar any approach to peaceful settlement

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

because we are dealing not only with the present evil but the future relations of the two greatest countries in Asia which geography has placed side by side for ages past and which neither of them can ignore; and neither of them can with the greatest power in the world, with the greatest effort in the world defeat the other and conquer it. The result is, it will be a continuing struggle, tussle, war etc. It is not an easy matter for any responsible person to see this kind of long-term hostility with a permanent neighbour. And, at the same time, one cannot be complacent about it. Therefore, we have to create conditions in which such a settlement is possible.

Among those conditions is general opinion in the world. In a sense, you might say that world opinion is with us. I do not say that world opinion makes a finality to anybody; but it does make some difference. And, in this matter, it may well be said that world opinion has been strongly in our favour and has not appreciated the Chinese attitude. And, the second part, of course, is that we should strengthen ourselves and prepare for all consequences.

Now, to say briefly something about our internal situation. Much has been said by hon. Members about it in many of the suggestions made by them and many of the criticisms made by them, which I partly accept. Some I accept; some I do not. But, generally, there is no doubt that much can be criticised and we should endeavour to meet these criticisms. I have no doubt that whatever hon. Members have said here will be carefully considered and kept in mind and efforts made to meet those criticisms.

Hon. Member, Shri Tyagi, referred to certain basic matters. That is about the fall in standards and values in the country, as exhibited in the elections and in various ways. I

must confess that I am greatly worried about this; greatly troubled in mind about this. I do not think we have become, as a people, less virtuous than we were just as I do not think that we suddenly became terribly virtuous, fundamentally virtuous when we were serving under Gandhiji. We all have, all of us, got combined the devil in us. Some things bring out the divine element in us; and some things the devilish element in us. It all depends upon circumstances. The virtue of Gandhiji was that he drew out the best in us. It does not mean that the rest had disappeared. It was there; it came out even during his lifetime in communal troubles and this and that; it came out in murders and in a terrific way while he was alive after the partition. What could be worse than that? That really humiliated us before the world.

But the fact remains that there are certain developments in our public life which are deplorable and standards appear to have fallen. People are the same. But, it may be that the process of democratic elections—good as I think it is, both in theory and in practice—does help to bring out these evil traits in our character or in any character unless we hide it; because democracy requires more training and more capacity for permitting the person who does not agree with you to function than anything else. It is a higher form of civilisation; leave out all else. Democracy is meant for civilised people, not for uncivilised people. If people are basically uncivilised then democracy is no good for them; they can have dictatorship or whatever they like. We do not pretend to be civilised. We are not always too civilised—any of us—and the devil takes hold of us. And, the devil seems to be particularly obvious and present everywhere at the time of elections. And, so people do and say things which are totally indefensible in any civi-

lised society; but they pass off in election time.

I do not wish to go into these elections. Some hon. Members here criticised the elections and accused, I believe, the Government and the Congress of wrong things, of corruption and what not. Well; I have seen something of these elections myself. I have wandered about all over India. I do not pretend to say that all the Congress candidates were virtuous angels. But I do say—that is my impression—that I was shocked beyond measure at what the opponents of the Congress did in these elections. They were beyond excuse—of course it is a weak word. Some of the things done were so abhorrent and abominable that I was amazed at them. I do not wish to name any party or anybody. But they lacked the commonest decency. Maybe some individual Congressmen had done so. But there it is not an individual Congressman or an individual member of a party but groups functioning in that way, and large numbers of them.

This is a matter for very serious consideration for us, how we can meet the situation in the interests of everybody, not in the interests of anybody, any Government or any organisation.

I said the other day here something to which exception has been taken by some newspapers. I said that we had asked the Home Ministry to collect posters, leaflets and books etc. issued at the time of elections. We cannot easily collect what has been said; but we can collect the printed word or the printed picture, just to see in which direction things are going and to avoid them if they are bad, to take steps to avoid that kind of thing happening.

In fact, we have taken some steps in the recent amendment of the Representation of the People Act. But, may be, that will come up in election

petitions and the like. I said that, first of all to know the trend of people's thinking and people's actions during the elections; and, secondly, to help us to prevent them.

Now, to my amazement some newspapers have said that it is very wrong, very unfair. I see nothing wrong, nothing unfair. We have not said that a particular party should be condemned or we have not said that all the leaflets of a particular party :

Shri Tyagi: May I remind, Sir, that only lately we have amended the Representation of the People Act wherein we have said that any publicity with regard to election, a copy has compulsorily to be submitted to the District Magistrate. So, every little thing is there in the possession of the Magistrate.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It should make it easier to get them. Anyhow, we have asked the State Governments and the District Magistrates to collect them. And, I hope that when these have come we should have an exhibition of them for the benefit of Members of Parliament and others. Maybe, some are not available. We should have tried to do it before the elections; that would have been a better time but it did not strike us. But it is an important question that Shri Tyagi has raised, important but not easily capable of getting hold of. Of course education is an important element in shaping people's minds and making them better beings but something much more than that is necessary and above all it is necessary that those who are, or think they are leaders of people should function in a particular way and should set an example to the others. That perhaps is the most important of all.

Now, Sir, we had before the elections the National Integration Conference and I deeply regret that this has not been followed up by a meeting of the council. It became very

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

difficult to hold a meeting of the council when these election processes were going on. I hope that before long a meeting of that council that was created then will take place because national integration is, I suppose, the most fundamental thing of all and all the tendencies which have been so obvious in this election, caste tendency, communal tendencies and the like which are harmful and which disintegrate the country have to be met as far as possible unitedly. Hon. Members know that a party has risen in the South. I forget. . . . (An Hon. Member, D.M.K.). Yest D.M.K. It talks loosely and wildly about separating from India.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Complete sovereignty.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes. It is still more unfortunate that the party is supported by people who should be wiser. It shows what I said earlier: how elections upset our thinking apparatus and put passions in control of us and of others. Here is a fundamentally wrong thing to which every Indian must object, stoutly object and not only object to a point but object to any point. As I said one day, there are some things which could not be accepted here. If it is war, it will be war but it will not be accepted. When I find that not only the people who talk about them but others encouraging such parties and asking people to vote for them, it shows that something has gone wrong in somebody's thinking completely. So, these questions have to be met; these are fundamental questions.

Now, for the rest they are domestic questions like the Five Year Plan and agriculture and industry and all that is contained in the Plan. I would not go into this question except to say that we have always attached the greatest importance to agriculture. I am glad that agriculture is looking up and I have no doubt that it will look up. The general outlook is favourable. There is this business of giving

priority to agriculture over industry. You cannot give any priority because the two have to move together. Agriculture cannot go ahead without industry going ahead. In fact agriculture and industry cannot go ahead without a certain modern outlook coming into the mind of the agriculturist or the industrialist. I do not mean the big industrialists, but a person engaged in industry. That is happening. I found very definitely this time because I toured all over India in a rapid way, from the far south to the far north, east and west, and so I got a rather comprehensive picture of crowds no doubt—not of individuals, within a month. There are many pictures that I saw and which were very pleasing. I have no doubt that generally speaking, whether in the countryside or in the towns, there was much progress. Above all, I was looking at human beings. I am interested in human beings; I am not interested in any big buildings. The human beings were better; they were better fed, better clothed and generally more wide awake.

Having said this, I shall also say that—in parts of the country they were pretty bad—pretty bad, in the sense of poverty, etc. and usually these parts that were bad were the old talukdari ridden tracts, old zamindari tracts and old jagirdari tracts. It is extra-ordinary. The talukdari system may have gone, the Indian princes may have ceased to function as princes; the land-lord system may have gone. But the effect of long ages of suppression under that system continues till today. There is all the difference in the world between an ordinary peasant in the ryotwari system who is progressing and the ordinary peasant in the old talukdari system in Oudh and elsewhere. He is better a little but his progress is slow because ultimately the progress comes out of him. It is not merely facilities that are given to him. He is afraid still; he could not get out of the fear

complex; he could not take any step forward because others oppose him. I have never been so convinced as during this tour of the disastrous effects of these systems, whether land tenure or others, which suppress a human being, just like our friends Harijans have been suppressed for ages past. As I have always said, we must have merit and we cannot afford to give up merit for anything; in our administration we cannot put third-rate men simply because they are Harijans; I refuse to accept that; it makes a nation third-rate. What I am saying is that one can understand how ages of suppression have bitten into their minds and souls. They are only gradually coming through it; they will come up no doubt but it takes a little time. We who have been more fortunately circumstanced in the past in spite of factors which discouraged us had opportunities to grow. So, I felt rather dejected at these parts of India which are still backward. They are making good slowly. They are still afraid and full of fear of the ex-talukdar, ex-prince, ex-this and ex-that. They are influenced and influenced sometimes in the way they were in the old times. Some people have pointed out: O, the Congress has many rajas and others among its candidates. It is true that we had a number of rajas and others but there is all the difference in the world to have a raja conforming to your programme and policy and a raja conforming to his own and adding to it the prestige of another party. This thing is not in theory; it is obvious. One can go and examine it in these areas and find what the popular impression is. The popular impression was spread that the old princely system is coming back. In fact, people are coming to those people who had been elected and asking them all manner of things which they cannot do. They have been elected now—their bosses—and now they ask them to do things for them which they might not have done or could not have done when they were princes. This is extraordinary. I

suppose these feudal elements are playing their last cards in India, whether they are zamindars or princes or others, not realising that their day was over and is over and nothing in the wide world can bring back, can change the course of history.

16 hrs.

Only, perhaps what hurts me is in regard to the way we dealt with them, because I doubt if you will find a parallel in the whole of history for the generous way we have dealt with such an element in India. However, that is a passing phase although it is an annoying phase.

The real thing in these five year Plans, etc.—we have got the Plan and I will not go into it—is, I think, the Plan is on right lines. We may make some minor changes here and there. The real thing is its implementation. That is most important. The real things are these. One aspect which has not been forgotten in the Plan but which came before me more vividly is that in some parts of the country greater amenities should come to the people—little things,—say, water supply in Rajasthan. The thought of it is irritating—that people cannot get good water yet. In some places they have to go miles to fetch their water. Whatever Plan there should be—of course in the Plan it is certain that every village should be given pure water and maybe by the end of the Plan this will be done—greater importance should be attached to the common, basic necessities of human life which everybody in India should have.

Secondly, the administrative aspect is important, because all the Plans ultimately depend on the administration that functions: the administration not so much at the top, because I do believe that our administration at the top is a very good administration. It may be slow-moving occasionally; it may be, if you like, bureaucratic occasionally, but it is an

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

able administration, and it has adapted itself very largely to the needs of the situation. But, when you go down the scale, the administration is not so good and is often lacking in integrity. This is a problem which has to be met and faced, because all the Plans in the world will not succeed if the administrative apparatus is not turned up to them.

In the final analysis, I would say that our progress consists in many things,—I am saying in physical terms—but most of all, in electric power and iron and steel. Electric power requires a great deal of investment. We are trying to progress, but the progress is rather slow. The moment every village in India has electric power, our problem is not ended but our problem speeds ahead at an express rate. It changes the mentality of the people and the working habits of the people. Iron and steel is most important because almost everything requires iron and steel. I am rather regretful, I am rather sorry, that the progress in iron and steel has not been as rapid as we wanted it to be. In the second Plan too progress had been slow. In the third Plan, we are nearly doubling the number of plants of the second Plan and in the third Plan, we have a very big plant in view, Bokaro, which, apart from the target at the initial stage—one million—was supposed to double it—two million—add which can come up to ten million tons per annum, by way of production. There is enormous potential about it. Something has been done; some preliminary reports have been made, but it has been unfortunately held up for a variety of reasons. It is unfortunate because holding it up means the effect will take place after three or four years, when there will be a gap and we would not be able to fill the gap. I mention the importance of iron and steel because there are some people still in India and some businesses concerned with iron and steel who do not particularly fancy further plants

growing up. I cannot understand how they can do so, but of course the scarcity of iron and steel will push up the price and they may profit by it more. But I cannot understand any other reason.

Then there are, of course, exports. They are very vital and the are growing as the President has said in his Address. It is a good trend but it has to be worked up much more.

Dr. Sushila Nayar said something which I do not understand. She said that waterlogging was due to Bhakra-Nangal. This is the first time I have heard of it—that Bhakra-Nangal should be responsible for waterlogging in the Punjab.

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): The seepage from the canal has caused it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not so, because there is no seepage from the canal, since all the canals are lined with cement. How can there be any seepage when they are lined with cement?

Dr. Sushila Nayar: They are not all lined, Sir. That is the point.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know which canal she refers to. The waterlogging has taken place because of the old canals in the Punjab, not be Bhakra-Nangal canals. That is what I am pointing out. It is not the Bhakra-Nangal canals that have done it, but the older canals that have no lining. I cannot speak with absolute authority now, but this is my impression, and no Bhakra canal has been constructed without lining.

I do not think it is necessary for me to go into the details of the Five Year Plan. We have discussed that and we shall no doubt discuss them in the future, and the next Parliament will discuss them also. But I would like to request this House to consider this picture as a whole. There are

innumerable points to which attention should be directed, where there are failings. But look at the picture as a whole and look at it in the context of things in India, because you cannot separate the picture from the context. Look at India in the context of Asia and look at India in the context of the world today. I think you will find that in various ways we have done rather well in the context of Asia or in the context of the world.

Acharya Kripalani shrugs his shoulders. I am afraid it will be Acharya Krapalani a lot of good: if he went about the world, just trying to understand what is happening in the world, surely he could have understood more even about what is happening in Asia than from sitting here in Delhi.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): As a roving ambassador?

आचार्य कृपालानी (सी.म.डी.) : मैं तो चुप बैठता हूँ, आप मेरे ऊपर क्यों बिड़ रहे हैं?
Are we precluded even from smiling?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I referred to him because he smiled rather contemptuously when I said that. I think that, as many people have said, one of our thriving industries in this country is to run down our country; to run down what has been done by this country, not by this Government—it is a thing of today or tomorrow—but by the people of this country. I think it is not right to run down our people. Our people are ordinary people like all the other people in the world. They have their weaknesses and they have their good points. But still it is my personal opinion that they are very fine people, taking it on the whole and it is because I have faith in these people and it is because I am proud of those people that I trust in the future of this country.

These elections have brought out many wrong things; nevertheless it was a fine thing to see this election take place in this vast country with

hundreds of millions of people involved, and the administration itself involving millions of people. It is a thing without a parallel in any part of the world, which has impressed the world. But apart from that, if you look at what India has done in the last 10, 12 or 14 years and compare it to any country in Asia—because it is difficult to compare it with the USA or the Soviet Union; you cannot compare it with those which have been functioning for long years—we have been building almost from scratch upwards and if you compare it with countries in Asia or maybe with some countries in South America and elsewhere, you find we compare very favourably with them, in spite of our failings and the mistakes that we have undoubtedly made. We have been marching painfully step by step, but we have been marching—that is the main thing—and not going back.

But for the people who are against this, partly because their whole concept of human progress is different, who call themselves as conservatives and the Swatantra Party, the others are not against this march ahead. I remarked the other day that the Jan Sangh was about 200 years behind the times. Objection was taken to this by a noted Jan Sangh leader in Delhi, who said, "What? We are 2,000 years behind the times, not 200 years." It is open to him to say that, but certainly he has nothing to do with the present day times. Therefore, either this country has to decide—as it has now decided—whether it is going forward or backward.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): I do not want to interrupt the Prime Minister, but I would like to seek a clarification. We never claimed that we want to take India 2,000 years back.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I did not say you claimed that. First of all, I did not say that applies to every Jan Sangh member. But a gentleman in the Jan Sangh said something like that; I forget his exact words.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : एक चावल देखा
जाता है, सब नहीं देखे जाते ।

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (New Delhi): If somebody says something, can he say that is the view of the Jan Sangh? Let us know who has said it.

पुनर्वास तथा अल्पसंख्यक-कार्य मंत्री
(श्री मेहरचंद खन्ना) : बड़ी प्रायेशिव
पार्टी है ।

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: It is more progressive than many of you.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We are not discussing the Jan Sangh; there is nothing there to discuss. What are we to discuss? They have no policy, except the wrong things they say. Let us not get into that.

We have to be clear about our aim. I submit that the aim in our third Five Year Plan and previously is the correct thing. We have to be clear about the broad way to it in agriculture, industry, education, social service, etc. I do think that what has been put down there is correct. It may be slightly changed here and there. First of all, you have to be clear about planning. There are some hon. Members in this House who object to planning at all. What is planning? It is an intellectual exercise to see what best you can do in the circumstances. If they object to any intellectual exercise in dealing with the nation's problems, they are welcome to do without intellect. I do not know why the nation should do without intellect. It is extraordinary to me.

Take another thing—joint farming, which was made so much of in these elections and made so much of falsely and wrongly. They went about saying, "Your lands will be taken away from you", which is completely wrong. I do firmly believe that joint cultivation in conditions like those in India is desirable; it will produce

more and it will be more for the benefit of the peasant, because they have such small holdings that they cannot progress and they cannot use modern implements. We have said that there will be no joint farming except by consent. Even so, they can walk out of the joint farming after two or three years if they do not like it. The ownership of the land belongs to them.

I can tell the House an interesting fact. It has become a political controversial matter, but in the year 1908, I think—I am not sure—Rabindranath Tagore, presiding over the Bengali Provincial Conference for the first time, and I think that was the last time also, pleaded for joint farming. Why? He was not concerned with political problems, socialism, communism or anything. He pleaded because he argued that conditions in Bengal were such that that was the only way to solve this problem and to make progress. What is more he started it in his own zamindari. People seem to think these are completely new notions emanating from some horrid place to spoil the sacred soil of India.

So, we are going forward with certain definite ideas and I would venture to say that the President was completely right in saying that these elections indicate that those broad ideas are not only acceptable to the public, but they agree with them fully and they want to encourage them. Indeed, the criticism was more for the delay in giving effect to them than for the ideas themselves. We do not have any rigid doctrinaire attitude. Having some ideas about the picture of our objective and the way we are going to achieve it, we proceed pragmatically. We learn from experience, I hope and with painful step, we go forward.

Nobody, no Government, in India or anywhere else in the world, can go forward without the great help it can get from the public. It is impossi-

ble for these large schemes to be implemented through governmental agency alone. We have received a great deal of help from the public and we have also had to face a great deal of the natural heritage of ages, i.e. the inertia of this country and all that it has brought with it. A little while ago, this House will remember the great excitement exhibited all over the country, aided by many people belonging to many parties, including, I think, the Congress Party, when a few planets came near each other—the *Ashtagrahi*—the great excitement about it and the vast sums of money, energy and time spent on it. That is the sort of thing which we are fighting. I do not want a single vote under any misapprehension. We are really fighting superstition wherever it occurs. I am not denying anything that may or may not happen, but I will not submit to superstition. Whether I get a vote or I do get a vote, whether my party gets a vote or does not get a vote, there are certain things we must stand for. We must stand for a reasonable, logical, intelligent approach to the nation's problems and not the approach which usually is made by Acharya Kripalani which is none of these things.

Acharya Kripalani: I would only say that most of the higher people show their horoscopes from time to time, almost every day.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member will remember that I said "all parties including the Congress Party". I did not exclude the Congress Party.

We are all members in a certain milieu out of which we have all grown. We are all a bit superstitious. We try to get over it. We live in a certain context of society, but let us now in our saner moments acknowledge that it is wrong. We may ourselves do wrong things occasionally, but we may acknowledge that it is wrong and not praise it or encourage it. After all, we are dealing with vast problems. We, this Parliament,

has shouldered responsibility for the governance of India for five years and many of those who are here will continue to share that honourable burden. We have tried our best to carry the torch and not allowed it to be snuffed out by anything. After this Parliament ceases to be as it will be in a fortnight or so, it will hand that torch burning brightly to the next Parliament.

So, Parliament after Parliament, generation after generation, the torch has to be kept alight and we should march forward. This can only be done if we can see the future, if we have some idea of the future and not remain statically where we are satisfied with our own superstitions and customs, satisfied with the way of life when the way of life in the wide world is changing, when we talk about the scientific inventions, of people going to the moon and so on. I am not interested in going to the moon. This world is enough for me. But I am interested in the science which produces, which gives the power to humanity to go to the moon. That is what interests me and I should like other people to be interested too and to develop that habit of searching for the truth in the physical world—certainly they can search for it in the spiritual world, I have no objection, but the physical world for the moment is enough for me—and to find out the truth of nature and try to use it for the profit of humanity and the country.

That is what is happening in the wide world today and, if it is not suddenly suppressed and put an end to by the disaster of war, it will surely achieve its object. And, we in India can help the world. But the best way we can help the world is to help ourselves in this business. I think we have created a new atmosphere in the country to some extent and, personally speaking, I am always thinking of that atmosphere more than even the other things, because that will affect a large number of people's thinking and this is a common matter for all of us, to whatever party

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

we might belong, to help in doing, in creating, so that when our time is up this torch which we all individually and severally hold may be handed over to worthier hands.]

Mr. Speaker: Shall I put all the amendments together, or am I required to put any amendment separately?

Shri Tangamani: Amendment No. 51 may be put.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: Amendment No. 19 to 24.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put Nos. 19 to 24.

Amendments Nos. 19 to 24 were put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put No. 51.

Amendment No. 51 was put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put the original motion. The other amendments are not pressed, and they are deemed to be withdrawn by leave of the House.

The question is:

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

That the Members of the Lok Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 12th March, 1962."

The motion was adopted.

16.26 hrs.

UNION DUTIES OF EXCISE (DISTRIBUTION) BILL

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): Sir, I beg to move*:

"That the Bill to provide for the distribution of a part of the net proceeds of certain Union Duties of Excise among the States in pursuance of the principles of distribution formulated and the recommendations made by the Finance Commission in its report dated the 14th day of December, 1961, be taken into consideration."

Sir, I may just speak a few words to explain what it is. The States are at present entitled to get 25 per cent of the net proceeds of Union Excise Duties on eight articles, namely, matches, tobacco, sugar vegetable product, coffee, tea, paper and non-essential oils. While reducing the States' share to 20 per cent. the Commission has increased the number of shareable excises from 8 to 35 by including all major items other than motor spirit on which excise duties were collected in 1960-61. This recommendation would have a far-reaching effect. At the present levels of taxation, the States stand to get Rs. 34 crores more next year as their share of basic excise duties than what they would have not under the existing arrangements. But what is more important is the fact that as a result of the inclusion of almost all the major revenue yielding commodities in the divisible pool, the States' share would go on increasing progressively from year to year through this source. In determining the share of each State, the Commission, while retaining population as the major factor of distribution, has also taken into account the relative financial weaknesses of the States, the disparity in their levels of development and the

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.