

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

should be settled if possible by negotiation amongst ourselves, if negotiations fail by the adoption of "other methods"—that expression which the Prime Minister had used on other occasions, whatever "other methods" may be. That is a point of view which I would like to place before the Prime Minister.

This is the last session of this Parliament. We have worked for the last five years amidst tremendous difficulties in this country. We have tried to act up to our own convictions, we have fought, we have worked together and whatever differences there might have existed amongst ourselves I am emboldened to think that there was none in this Parliament who was not actuated by the highest motives to serve his country during the most critical period of our existence. We need not pay congratulations to ourselves but if a future historian has an opportunity of recording the history of the work of this Parliament during the first five years of the gaining of independence of India, I am sure that we shall be prepared to accept the verdict of any impartial observer as having done our best during the formative period of Indian independence.

May I at the end pay my humble tribute to the Speaker and to you, Sir, the Deputy-Speaker, for the manner in which you conducted the deliberations of this Parliament during the last five years. It fell upon you to create conventions and traditions which you could worthily hand over to your successors and in that respect I am sure the verdict of all sections of the House will be that you have not failed in the great duty that fell upon you.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, I have listened with attention and respect to a number of speeches delivered here on this motion and when I was not present unfortunately, owing to other pre-occupations, I took the trouble to read the report of the speeches delivered. Many kind words have been said by Members about the Address and about the work of Government, and many less kind words have also been said. The President's Address, coming from that high office, nevertheless, as the House well knows, is a statement on the part of the Government and represents in dignified and restrained language the general outlook and

policy of the Government in regard to the matters before the country.

As the President said in his Address, we have met under rather unusual circumstances, and this House itself in the course of this session is not likely to consider any matter of controversy. We have to carry on because Governments have to carry on whatever happens and so we have to cover this interregnum between this Parliament and the next, although this Parliament is in its last stages and the new one is in the process of birth. Naturally, at a moment like this, one is torn by two kinds of emotions: one is of reminiscence as one looks back at what has been done, and the other is to look forward and try to peep through the veil of the future.

It is natural I suppose for many Members to make special reference to the General Elections. Although, important as they are they do not touch the problems before the country, as the hon. Member who has just sat down said these General Elections have been a tremendous experience for all of us here and, if I may say so, for millions of our people. It may be easy to criticise many things that have happened during these elections but I think it is generally recognised in this country as well as abroad that this tremendous experiment has been a great success, and while we congratulate the organisation that worked these elections, as we should, I think, ultimately we should congratulate with all respect the people of India who carried them through. And though some of us may be pleased and some of us may be displeased with some aspects of these elections or the results, I think by and large we will be completely justified in saying that these elections represented, at the time those votes were given, the mind of India. We may not like parts of that mind here and there, there may have been irregularities as some Members had pointed out, but generally speaking they do represent the mind of India then. It may be that six months later the mind of India changes; it may be that people gave their votes under some particular stress, under some particular influence, if you like, or some particular desire to, shall I say, give expression to their displeasure or pleasure and they may change it later; but it is a fair indication of the mind of India and it is a fair indication of the various forces at work in India, forces which were covered up more or less and

which we could not see properly even though close observers might have guessed that those forces were growing and spreading. These elections bring many lessons for us and if we are wise we shall learn them and fashion ourselves accordingly.

I do not wish to say much about these elections, but reference has been made to certain irregularities, etc. I think many of us probably think that even the rules governing these elections, which this Parliament passed, are capable of improvement to simplify these elections somewhat and no doubt when the time comes this will be done.

Some particular points were mentioned by the Member who preceded me and I think they are worthy of notice and consideration. For instance, it is said—I am not personally aware of it—that in some places the ballot boxes could be opened. Obviously, if it is true, it is a matter worthy of enquiry. Personally, I entirely agree with him that as far as possible it should be arranged that counting should take place immediately after polling without any gap period. Of course, everybody would agree with that. Difficulties arise because of lack of persons for doing it and this was the first election. I have no doubt that on the next occasion many of these defects could be got over.

Another thing was brought to my notice—I do not think it was mentioned here—that it is not very difficult to remove the label, the symbol, from the box. Whatever the symbol of the candidate may be it is not difficult to remove it, put something else, so that the whole process.....

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: There is a symbol inside the box which cannot be changed.

Shri Kamath (Madhya Pradesh): On some boxes the labels were altogether missing.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not wish to say anything to the discredit of the election machinery. These are odd incidents. I know personally of a case where a clerk was seen removing one label and trying to put another. He was caught by his officer. If you do it once, it will not have that effect, but if you do it twice, you get the wrong voting in that box. All these things must necessarily be enquired into.

The speech of one hon. Member, Mr. Kamath, I read very carefully, because he did me the honour of mentioning me on several occasions. His speech, if I may say so, rather fell below the level of high debate in this House and hardly referred to any of the important matters. He was more concerned with his own particular election and with the misfortune that befell him there.

Shri Kamath: I did not speak of my misfortune; I spoke of my experience in Madhya Pradesh.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is what I am saying too.

His experience is no doubt of very great importance to him and I earnestly hope he will learn from that experience but perhaps it is not of any great importance to this House.

First of all, the hon. Member referred with great surprise in the course of a question as well as in his speech to the fact that whenever I have gone on tour, whatever the nature of that tour may be, information is sent to the various officers there. Well, I am sorry that Mr. Kamath is so unaware of the normal practice of Government. When a Minister goes anywhere—privately, publicly, secretly, furtively—information has to be sent to various authorities, because he has to keep in touch with his work. He may be required at any moment; papers may have to be sent to him; telegrams may have to be sent to him. So, it is a fixed rule that whenever a Minister goes on tour that information must be sent to a large number of persons concerned with Government work, because the work of Government is presumed to be carried on and if any emergency arises, he may be contacted immediately. That applies—if I may say so—far more to the Prime Minister than possibly to other Ministers.

Shri Kamath: On a point of information, when a Minister goes privately on tour, is his programme sent to the officers there, or only to headquarters here for forwarding his dak?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The programme is sent to everybody in a list of officials, so that he may, if necessary, be kept in touch. Secondly.....(Interruption). It might be easier if Mr. Kamath remains silent for a minute.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Member has any questions to ask, after the Prime Minister concludes, he will answer them.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Is there going to be a question hour after this debate?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let me make myself clear. It is open to the Prime Minister to answer any questions or not. I do not want his speech to be interrupted. After his speech, if Mr. Kamath has any questions to ask and if the Prime Minister is inclined to answer them, he may reply to them. But let there be no more interruptions or running commentary.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Then the hon. Member said something about officials accompanying me during my tour of the country recently. I am not aware exactly to what he referred. I take it that the hon. Member realises that the Prime Minister does not gather prestige from petty officials who may be round about him. The fact of the matter is that, as perhaps many hon. Members know, wherever I went there was some kind of human upheaval. Millions—or at least half a million or a quarter million—of people came and this involved enormous problems of organisation, law and order and the rest. The officers did not come for my sake; I was not interested in them. They were concerned with their problems that arise when a whole city is flooded by a population probably three times the population of that city, or rural area. I hardly came in contact with the officers except occasionally. Sometimes it so happened that when I went to a place and I had some leisure, I discussed the affairs of that particular place: I never mentioned anything about the elections to them.

But the real thing was that this tour of mine has been an amazing experience for me and I think for large numbers of other people. When these vast gatherings take place the whole administration in that area is affected very greatly, and if they are not dealt with on the spot all kinds of difficulties might arise.

The hon. Mr. Kamath referred to what he called a special envoy I sent to his constituency. Well, to begin with, the Prime Minister sent no special envoys anywhere.

Shri Kamath: On a point of personal explanation; I did not say that the Prime Minister sent any special envoy, but that she was introduced there as his special envoy.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: As Prime Minister, I sent nobody anywhere. As the Congress President, I sent one hundred thousand people moving all over the country.

Shri Kamath: That is the unfortunate part of it: the two are one.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I regret to say that I did not think the hon. Member's constituency was so important for me to visit, although I visited many places in India.

Shri Kamath: I realise that. I know that very well. You had no time. So you sent an envoy.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member is so irrepressible that I believe he imagines things and I fear that many of the things he mentioned in his speech in regard to his own constituency may have been the echoes of his own fears.

Shri Kamath: I know it better. You were not there; I was there.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot evidently deal with rumours, in regard to what a person said or did not say. I do not know anything about it but I have no doubt that in these vast elections—in fact I have referred to them elsewhere—many things have been said which were grossly improper, but I do not want to take up the time of the House in discussing these petty details of these elections. But I do agree with what the hon. Dr. Mookerjee said that we should look at the elections as a whole. I have myself had certain complaints and I sent them to the Election Commissioner, who had received them directly also, but on some occasions it was not possible for the Election Commissioner to deal with every complaint that was received. He told me that he did not have the staff for the purpose. I said that where possible we would help in supplying the staff. I believe, I am certain, that what could be done was done. We left it entirely in the hands of the Election Commissioner to do what he thought fit to prevent abuses. It would not have been proper for us to intervene in any other way. Whenever there is a serious complaint, I hope it will be examined, but what is more important is this, that the elections as a whole should be looked into to see what defects have been observed and could be remedied, because I entirely agree with the hon. Member that it is highly important to see that the process of democratic elections does not fail. If it fails, of course, democracy itself fails.

Now, I referred to the elections, but really what I should have liked to say to this House was about the bigger problems that face us. Even though this particular House may not deal with them, the country continuously faces them and we, in another capacity, many of us, will continue to deal with them. The President refers in his Address to foreign affairs—international relations. I should like to say a few words about them, because there are some people in this country who often criticise our foreign policy, though, I believe, that criticism grows less and less as it becomes more and more obvious that this foreign policy has justified itself. We have been told often enough that we have no friends in the world, but that has been a strange misreading of current events or happenings in the rest of the world. I do claim that we have not only friends but that we are friendly with every country in the world, and what is more, that those countries, big and small, whether they agree with us or disagree with us in a particular policy that we might adopt, look to us, if I may say so, with a certain respect, because one thing is recognised—that we decide for ourselves, sometimes perhaps not rightly in their opinion, but we do decide for ourselves and we try to pursue a line of policy which we consider right and not something which is imposed upon us from outside. That has come to be generally recognised, and therefore the respect for India is growing, and I think it would be worth while, if it was possible for hon. Members to take a tour of the world and then find out how India stands in the eyes of the world, in the eyes of the common people of the world.

I do say that they will discover in that voyage of discovery that the common people of the world hold India and India's policy in high respect, even though sometimes they do not like it or agree with it. Is that a small achievement for a country newly coming to the international field? We have passed through stormy weather, both internationally and nationally, and we have thrived to the best of our ability to keep on an even keel. We have not perhaps been dramatic about it. We have not behaved as some people believe we should behave in foreign affairs or in domestic policy as we ourselves have behaved when we were an agitational party or group, because what may be convenient for an agitational group in the market place may not be suitable or fitting in foot down upon this cry that private

I do not think that in any vital matter we have changed that policy or that outlook, though we have to adapt it to changing circumstances. When we speak or the President speaks in a restrained and dignified way, I have seen comments made that it is flat and stale, that there is no fire of the market place in it. Of course not. The Address of the President of the great Republic of India has to be in a dignified and restrained way. The Government of India speaks and I hope acts in a dignified way, in a restrained way, but we have to look not at the restrained way but at the contents of what is said or done. The President refers to the upheavals in the Middle East, in North Africa, in Western Asia, in a dignified and restrained way, saying what we feel about it, saying that we used to feel about it and what still influences us. We have not changed, but we have to deal with the situation in a different way, not by passing a resolution in the Ramlila Grounds in Delhi. Governments do not pass resolutions in that way. Yet sometimes some hon. Members and some gentlemen of the Press imagine that because our tone is somewhat different, therefore we have weakened about anything. I would beg the House to look round the world for a few moments—the problem of Korea, the whole Far East problem, the problem of the Middle East, Iran, Egypt, Tunisia, the problem of Central Europe and the rearmament of Germany. In all the arguments that have been going on in the United Nations, tremendous problems, difficult problems, in which great countries are involved, the force of circumstances has been such that those great countries have had to whittle down their policies, sometimes, if I may say so with all respect, to climb down from their perch. They have to. Let not hon. Members get into imagining that the Government of India should sit in a high perch and deliver homilies to the whole world, threatening the world, perhaps, with some consequences if they do not carry out India's behests. They do not say it in so many words, but the policy they advocate leads to it—that they should take charge of the world, whether it is Africa or Asia or anywhere else. That surely would not only be gross presumption on India's or any country's part but it would be completely out of keeping with the way responsible Governments function. In spite of these great problems in Asia and Africa and Europe it is no small achievement that we are friendly—and when I say 'friendly' I am not speaking in some formal language but in the real sense of the word, our relations are friendly with those great countries.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

who in another plane appear to be in conflict with each other. It is an astonishing achievement that we have their confidence and that we respect their confidence although we do not agree with this or that matter with which they are bound up.

The hon. Member, Dr. Mookerjee, referred to Kashmir. And I want to be perfectly frank with this House about it. The questions he put are certainly difficult questions, but that is no reason why we should not be frank with each other and frank with the country. Although we cannot of course shout out from the housetops every governmental activity—there are secrets of Government, not so much secrets of ours but secrets of others, of other countries, which we have to keep—I do believe that the right policy with our own people is a policy of absolute frankness with them. They respect that frankness. And in regard to this matter of Kashmir the question comes up again and again, and some hon. Members put it forward “Withdraw this case from the United Nations or the Security Council”, or, as the hon. Member said something about one-third of the territory there “If you cannot get it by this means, adopt other methods”. What does all this mean? Let us be clear about it. What does “withdrawal of the case” mean? How does one withdraw a case? Have hon. Members thought of that? Is it that we send a letter to the United Nations “We withdraw our case, we have had enough of you”? What exactly does that mean? It means that there is no method of withdrawal in that sense. It can only mean, ultimately, our breaking with the United Nations. It is not a question of just withdrawing, possibly, some resolution or some motion put before the House—“withdrawn by leave of the House”. First of all, where is the leave? It cannot be done. Of course, as an independent country we can tell them “We have nothing more to do with you”. It is open to us to do that and take the consequences of the same. But there is no question of withdrawal of anything that is seized. And suppose we did not go there, somebody else goes and we are pulled up. So it cannot be done. We are there not only because of, if I may say so, the obvious compulsion of events, but I say we are there through our voluntary choice also. We went there voluntarily. Nobody forced us to go there. And whether we went there or not, if I may say so, if we had not gone there, the question would have

gone there otherwise. Do not imagine that the question would have remained in mid-air.

1 P.M.

Now, having gone there and respecting the idea of a world organisation dealing with such matters, it is right that we should remain there even though sometimes things happen which we dislike. We have made it perfectly clear that something which is contrary to our honour, to our commitments to the people of Kashmir or to our own people we are not going to agree to, and nobody is going to impose that upon us. That is one thing. But short, of that we are going to pursue this to the end, however long it may take, because the way of peace is always the better and the shorter way, however long it may seem, and the way of war is not only the longer way but no way at all to solve a problem. And when the hon. Member, Dr. Mookerjee, tells me “Adopt other methods to do this” he talks of the way of war, because these are the only other methods that he is referring to. There is no other way. And does the hon. Member think that by adopting that method we are going to solve this problem of Kashmir? Does he think that by saying good-bye to the United Nations and adopting this method we shall be serving the cause of our own country or the cause of the people of Kashmir or the cause of the people in the world? I put it to the House. It is not so. We will solve no problem except that we will get into enormous difficulties everywhere and we may injure other people a lot, but we will injure ourselves in the process terribly and everything we have stood for will not only receive a shock but may possibly also suffer for a generation. It is not a small matter. We have to act and speak in a responsible way when we deal with these difficult situations.

In a military sense we are, compared to the great countries of the world, weak. We have—and I am proud of it—fine Defence Services, a fine Army, a fine Navy and a small, but fine Air Force. And I want to tell this House—and not formally but with intimate knowledge, because I meet our young men in our Army and Navy and Air Force—that they are a very fine lot of young men. Here may I remind the House of a recent accident, something that might have been a terrible disaster but which only a miracle averted from being so? It took place, in which that young man,

the Flight Commander who was in charge of that aircraft behaved with amazing calmness and courage. We have fine human material, but compared to the great countries we are not a military power, we are a weak country. But look at the great military powers today, the biggest. When they get entangled in war it is not easy to get out of it. They do not know what to do. See what is happening in Korea: interminable truce talks. Because the fact of the matter is that every country involved in it is tired of that war. And rightly so. They want peace. They do not think in terms of their great armed might and say "by other methods let us solve it". Because there is no solution that way. There is only an extension of trouble and conflict and disaster that way. So for us to talk loosely about these "other methods" is not a wise thing to do.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: It was your language on another occasion.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I used that language, the hon. Member will remember, when a grave crisis arose in East and West Bengal. Obviously, nobody here I presume, however peacefully inclined he may be, can rule out other methods when certain contingencies arise. It is obvious.

Shri Kamath: Even today?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But I am referring to the present position in Kashmir when we find Kashmir—that part of it which is under the Kashmir Government today—making remarkable progress economically, socially, politically, all that is happening there. And for us to put an end to all this and rush ourselves into war would be a breach of our pledge to the United Nations, and no country likes to be held up before the wide world as a breaker of pledges.

Then, the hon. Member referred to certain incidents in Jammu recently where there was trouble, and said that their views should be respected. Certainly their views should be respected although it so happens that these views which are put forward in terms of closer union with India mean a break up of Kashmir completely. They know it; they have been told so. A fundamental axiom about Kashmir by which we have stood up is this: that the people of Jammu and Kashmir will decide their future. That is the basic thing. We are not going to decide by war or by any method of coercion. We will not allow any power to decide it by coercion or

war. If the people of Kashmir are going to decide it as a whole, the question is to give them an opportunity to do so. If a certain small group in Kashmir wants to compel and coerce others to decide it according to their wishes,—it is open to them peacefully and constitutionally to give expression to their wishes in the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir—if they want to do this in any other way, the only way to meet it for any Government is not to permit them to create trouble. I was surprised and amazed when the hon. Member referred to some people he met yesterday who had come from Jammu. I have not met them. But, I know something, perhaps a little more than the hon. Member, not as the Prime Minister, but in my other capacities, about the internal conditions in Kashmir and Jammu Provinces. I know about this particular movement rather thoroughly. I know of no movement in India which is so thoroughly misconceived and mischievous as this movement in Jammu which is so entirely opposed to the interests not only of Kashmir and Jammu, not only of India, but to every interest that we stand for. It amazes me that people, in the name of India, in the name of union with India, should work in a way to injure India, injure Kashmir and to give help and encourage the enemies of India. Surely, there must either be something wrong about their thinking apparatus, or what they say they do not mean. It is not a question of students at all.

Then, the hon. Member referred to the flags. I do not quite understand why he should refer to that with the warmth that he did. At every Union function, our flag is honoured in Kashmir. Undoubtedly it is honoured everywhere. But, Kashmir has got a flag of its own; or if you like, it has two flags at the present moment. There is the Maharaja's flag and there is the Kashmir Popular Movement's flag. There are two flags which they display on various occasions. When the Yuvaraja is there, his flag is displayed. The popular Movement displays its flag. You want us to go down and say, 'Put an end to all this'. Why should we? These things are left to various developments as things grow. And specially at the present moment, when the matter is being considered on the international plane, for us to do anything like that would immediately mean again pushing ourselves in, imposing our will, and that is wrong.

Then, coming finally to his question about one-third part of Kashmir, what we have said is this. One-third part of Kashmir in constitutional law is a

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

part of the Jammu State and therefore sovereignty abides in the present Government of Kashmir. But, we have said that, and we have said that so clearly, although we claim that and although ultimately it will be decided by the people of Kashmir, even in regard to that, we are not going to take to military measures to recover it. We have made that perfectly clear. Let there be no doubt about that. If others take military measures, we shall meet them whatever the consequences may be. Even though we claim that part, even though it rightly and legally belongs to the present Government, we do not propose to settle that issue by armed might but by peaceful methods. But, there is another aspect of this question, because these questions are not merely legal and constitutional. When the time comes for decision to be taken about that part as well as other parts, we do not propose, and I am sure the Kashmir Government would agree with us, in that, to impose any decision by the bayonet or gun. It is the people who will decide.

Another fact has to be borne in mind. In the course of the last three or four years since this Kashmir trouble arose, all kinds of inner changes have taken place partly due to certain migrations of population and partly due to other developments which make the question not quite so simple as it might appear to be. All that has to be considered. Personally I should like proper conditions for a plebiscite in Kashmir. Not because I have any doubt about that. I think the Constituent Assembly at the present moment is perfectly entitled to decide. In fact the very process of election has shown which way it looks. It does not contain any representative from that part of Kashmir State, naturally, which is in the hands of Pakistan. I should like a proper Constituent Assembly—this is a proper one; when I said proper, I meant addition of other people to it—to decide this. If there are difficulties in that, I want a plebiscite to be held as early as possible all over the State and let that plebiscite decide. I have no shadow of a doubt about what it will decide. I want to put an end to all these questions in a peaceful way, in a right way, so that it may not leave trails of bitterness behind, and feelings of revenge etc., of its being imposed and so on and so forth. Because the hon. Member put this question to me, about Kashmir, I have ventured to answer it.

One thing, lastly. He mentioned about Dr. Graham. When the Security

Council passed the resolution which, *inter alia* appointed Dr. Graham, we made it perfectly clear that we were not accepting that resolution and we were not bound by that resolution, because it contained many matters with which we totally disagreed. It contained many other matters to which we had no objection. But, still we said that we did not accept that resolution and we would not act up to it. But, we said this, and we repeated it, that we have not the slightest objection to Dr. Graham or any one else coming to India and that we would gladly not only treat him with courtesy, but discuss the subject of Kashmir with him, if he came to discuss it, if you like, as a mediator, but that we would not discuss or act up to the resolution of the Security Council. We have followed that course throughout. When Dr. Graham was here, if I may say so to the House, Dr. Graham did not once refer to the Security Council resolution: that is, as if it was not there. He did not mention it even. The question did not arise. We discussed other matters. Whether we agreed or not is another matter. He discussed the question as a Mediator, making suggestions; with some we agreed and with regard to others we pointed out our objections and there the matter ended. He went back and presented a report which was merely a factual report. Then other things happened and there were other discussions there and we sent our representatives. In the course of these discussions a certain plan which came to be known as the Dever's Plan was shown, rather informally, to our Military Advisers there, not by Dr. Graham, but by his Military Advisers. That plan represented some kind of an intermediate stage, and there was much in that plan to which we have no objection, and we were prepared to discuss and possibly vary it. But then it transpired that Dr. Graham himself did not press it forward and there was no further discussion and there the matter ended. Long afterwards a paper was published by the U.N. Secretariat containing the "Dever's Plan" which was something far more than what we had seen or which had been mentioned to us. And naturally we referred to this matter and we asked our representatives there whether they had seen it. They had not and so we asked our representative, Sir B. N. Rau, who happened to be in Delhi and he said, "I have never seen it", but he had seen that part of it which had been shown to us and which has been published as a U.N. document as an annex to Dr. Graham's Second report to the Security Council. That Sir B. N. Rau

had seen and there it is for anyone to see. But Sir B. N. Rau told us that he had never seen this other "plan". We sent for our Military Adviser who was there at the time, and who was back here—Gen. Thimayya—and he said he had never seen it. Therefore it was quite clear to us that the addendum to the Dever's Plan was not shown to us. And Dr. Graham not being a direct party to these talks did not himself know, and possibly he might have made a mistake. Anyhow, this is what happened.

And now the Security Council has again given a certain period to Dr. Graham to continue his conversations and to attempt to find out a solution. In pursuance of our policy with regard to a further attempt being made, we have no objection and.....

Shri Kamath: If the Prime Minister is likely to go on much longer, we might hear him after lunch.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If you would permit, I should like to finish soon.

And so if Dr. Graham comes here now we have no objection. He can come. We want to solve this problem. I can understand the irritation of hon. Members of this House at the prolongation of this business, just as they feel about the continuance of the Portuguese and French possessions in India; that these irritating little footholds should continue to come in our way. Nevertheless we decided to pursue, there too, the way of patience and of peace because we know they are bound to come to us. Why should we create trouble for ourselves and others by trying to expedite that process by other methods?

Now, I should have liked really to have talked to this House and drawn the attention of this House to certain constructive activities of the country, because I do feel that enough attention not only of this House, but of the country is not drawn to those activities. I remember, in other countries, when something of this kind is done, there is the tremendous propaganda machine which begins to work all over and everybody talks about it, saying that the country is going ahead, that it is progressing, that this thing has been built and that. But in this country, while something on a bigger scale—perhaps three or four times as big as what is done in the other country is done, the only occasion when it comes up before this House normally is when some criticism is made as to how much money has been spent on it. Of course, it is right that

303 P.S Deb.

this House should carefully check this kind of expenditure. That is perfectly right. But I should like this House also to consider that this country is going ahead with magnificent enterprises. We have been building up in this country those great river valley schemes about which the House knows, and also the great Sindri fertilizer factory. Now it is said that money was wasted and there was delay over this fertilizer factory. You can examine it and you can punish the man, cut off the head of the man. That is another matter.

Shri Kamath: Cut off his head?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Certainly, if Mr. Kamath can manage it.

Shri Kamath: If you will let me do it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But what I want is to call the attention of the House to this building up of a new India which is taking place all over, and that too under the most tremendous difficulties and strains. Take the Chitaranjan Locomotive Works which have grown up and are producing locomotives. Take the Hindustan Aircraft factory and so many other things. There are those magnificent national laboratories which are producing very fine results apart from laying the foundation of our future progress. It is a long list and I would like the House and the country to know about these. But somehow our minds are concentrated on certain negative aspects and on finding out—as of course, we should—whether we have erred. We certainly should do that, but I think it is also right that we should think of the achievements that are taking place in the country.

Well, it is said that comparisons are bad and one should not compare—and certainly as Foreign Minister I do not like to compare my country with another country—but it would be interesting if this House and hon. Members sometimes compare the past three or four years in this country with what has happened in other countries, in Asia, Europe or America—barring none of them. You may compare the circumstances under which we have functioned, the context of things after independence and the partition and these migrations and all that, and see what has been achieved here, in the realm of foreign policy, in the realm of domestic policy, in the realm of building up a structure in this huge country, and compare it with any other country. I do not mean to say that we are superior to other countries. That kind of vain-glorious

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

approach is wrong. But I think when you compare these, you will find that we have done rather well, and we have done much better than most countries. We hear so much talk about corruption in this country. Let us meet this corruption and this black-marketing with the severest measures that we can devise. I agree to that. But compare all this with other countries. See the state of the world, the state of other countries, see some of them going down, some of the biggest and most powerful countries. And I think you will come to the conclusion that we as a Parliament, we as a Government, we as a people can hold up our heads high before the world.

Dr. Mookerjee referred to hundreds of thousands of people from Pakistan—I mean from East Pakistan—coming and voting and being urged by the Pakistan authorities to vote for the Congress. I really am astonished to hear this statement. I do not know what proof he has, but it so happened that we enquired from Dr. Roy about the border areas and he said it is true that some few people might have come across the border as the people there come and go. But this large-scale statement of hundreds of thousands of people coming and voting, I cannot understand. Of course only those can vote whose names are on the electoral rolls. They cannot suddenly come up, vote and go away. Maybe some on the rolls might have crossed over and come back again. Possibly that might have happened. And as regards the other statement that the Pakistan authorities sent them to vote for the Congress is one for which there can be no justification, it is sheer guess-work.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: It is true.

Shri Kamath: Has reports reached the Prime Minister of some Muslim League candidates displaying Pakistan badges and raising slogans of "Pakistan Zindabad" in Madras?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Well, I have had no special report, but I read something in the papers. I entirely agree with the hon. Member in his thinking that it was highly objectionable. As a matter of fact, I have taken some action about it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put the amendments to the vote of the House. Hon. Members will kindly indicate whether they propose to press their amendments.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma (Uttar Pradesh): I beg leave of the House to withdraw all the three amendments.

Amendments were, by leave, withdrawn.

Dr. Deshmukh (Madhya Pradesh): I beg to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Shri D. S. Seth (Uttar Pradesh): I thought I would have an opportunity to speak but as I have not had the same, then the only alternative is that I withdraw my amendment.

Amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Bihar): I beg to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Shri R. Velayudhan (Travancore-Cochin): I would like my amendments to be put to the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

At the end of the motion add the following:

"but regret that many elected members to the Legislatures and Parliament are either detained, or under warrant of arrest or are imprisoned and that many political organisations including the Communists Party of India is banned in the States of Hyderabad and Travancore-Cochin."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

At the end of the motion add the following:

"but regret that the Government failed to solve the problems of food and clothing."

The motion was negatived.

Shri Kamath: I would like my amendment to be put to the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

At the end of the motion add the following:

"but regret that the Address makes no reference to the unsatisfactory manner in which the General Elections have been conducted."

The motion was negatived.

Dr. M. M. Das (West Bengal): I beg to withdraw my amendments.

Amendments were, by leave, withdrawn.