[Shri Mehr Chand Khanna]

effects of about 49 families, and minor injuries to 3 or 4 displaced persons sleeping near Shri Acharya. Shri Acharya himself suffered severe burns from which he died. He was in very weak health on account of his advanced age and could not stand the shock of the burns.

2. The injured persons were given prompt medical assistance. All the injuries were of a minor nature. The 49 families who suffered loss were immediately provided with residential accommodation. 17 maunds of food grains were collected and distributed to them. Cash doles for a period of two months were also distributed. Quilts were provided to protect the families against the cold weather. Wearing apparel was also obtained from neighbouring areas and distributed to these families as immediate relief. Milk powder was distributed to the children of those affected. Cash donations and contributions to the extent of Rs. 550 were collected and paid to the family of the deceased, Shri Acharya, for performing his last rites. Arrangements have also been made for all adult male persons in the families affected by the fire to be employed on Public Works.

3. The fire was purely accidental. Prompt action was taken to bring it under control and thereafter to afford relief assistance to those in temporary distress. Consequent upon the measures taken, normal conditions have been restored.

TRIPURA MUNICIPAL LAW (REPEAL) BILL*

The Minister of Health (Shri Karmarker): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the repeal of the municipal law in force in the Union Territory of Tripura.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the repeal of the municipal law in force in the Union Territory of Tripura."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Karmarkar: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

12·27 hrs.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT—*contd.*

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri T. N. Viswanatha Reddy and seconded by Shri Ansar Harvani on the 15th February, 1960, namely:—

"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 8th February, 1960."

The hon. Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this subject has been under debate in this House for a full week and a large number of Members have spoken on it, some in favour of the motion and some in opposition to it. There are, I believe, about 240 amendments tabled; and, in the course of discussion, a large number of subjects have been touched upon. But, by and large, it may be said that this discussion has been almost a discussion on foreign affairs; and in regard to foreign affairs too, rather limited to our border issues with China and even that has been further limited to the invitation I have issued to Premier Chou En-lai in this connection. Therefore, Sir, I think, perhaps, it would be better for me also to concentrate on a few of the important issues raised—more important points raised—rather than perambulate over the whole field of these 240 amendments.

*Published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II—Section 2, dated 22-2-60.

I do not deny that some of the other matters which have been mentioned in this House in the course of the debate are important from certain points of view; but, I cannot, within any limited space of time deal with these scores of matters. Now, therefore, I shall begin by dealing with this very important issue relating to foreign affairs, relating to our border, relating to the intrusion of Chinese forces on our territory and recent steps which we have taken in regard to this matter.

The way this debate has been conduc'ed, and some of the statements made in this debate, have raised other matters too in relation to this particular subject. That is to say, it has been said by hon. Members—I only repeat—that there has been a change. No' only a charge of reversal of policy has been advanced; but, rather it has been said that the Government, and particularly I suppose I, as being the Foreign Minister, have been unfair to Parliament, and have not been quite honest, that we are dying down, we have surrendered, we have submitted to some kind of national humiliation. It has even been said that there is no instance in history like this and our sincerity has been doubted. That, of course, raises the matter on to a different level from the criticism of a certain policy. I hope to deal with that criticism, but I wish to point out, at the commencement, that if the Government is charged, as it has been charged by some hon. Members opposite, with submitting to anything that may be considered "national humiliation" or "surrender", then it is a matter of the highest importance for this House and this country to be clear about it.

12.31 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

No Government which even remotely is responsible for anything that may be considered "national humiliation" is deserving of continuing as a Government. No Foreign Minister or Prime Minister who is even indirectly connected with anything which means dishonour to India in any respect has any business to continue in his office. Therefore, it is a matter of very serious import what the view of this House and of the country is on this subject.

Now, may I add something which was not said in this House in this connection and which is reported in this morning's papers by the Press? I do not wish, normally, to quote from the Press without verification, but as I have to speak on this subject now, and it is relevant, I am taking the liberty to refer to this matter. It is a report of a speech by one of the respected Members of this House, of the Opposition side, Acharya Kripalani, who, it is said, has said that India had been "betrayed by leaders of the present Government". Further it is stated he has said: "How can we do anything when our honour is in the hands of dishounourable people?".

Now, Sir, that is a clear charge, and if there is, as I said, even any remote justification for that charge, then, it is not for me to stand up here and take the time of the House but to retire to my shell and leave it to others who are more honourable to conduct the affairs of this country. I know that our respected friend, Acharya Kripalani, sometimes allows his words to run away with him; sometimes he says things which he might perhaps regret later, and I do not know if this was one of his outbursts at the spur of the moment or a definite charge after thought. But even a thing like this said at the spur of the moment from a person in his position has implications of far-reaching character, and no Government, nor can this House treat this matter as a light utterance said at the spur of the moment. Sir, it is no matter of joy to me to refer to this, coming from an old colleague, but the House, I hope, will appreciate that to be charged with dishonourable motives and to be charged to be parties to "national humiliation" is something that is very painful. Individuals aprt, there are people in this House,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

many of them, who have spent a good part of their lives in trying to uphold the honour and freedom of India, and if in the afternoon of their lives they are told that they have betrayed the honour of India and submitted to humiliation their country, which they sought to serve with such ability and strength as they had, then the matter goes beyond parliamentary debate into some other field.

It will hardly be suitable or fitting for me to stand up before this House and claim its indulgence for a defence of my motives or honour. After, broadly, 50 years of being connected in some form or other with India's service, if that kind of charge can be made, well, it is open to anyone to make it and it is open to anyone to believe it: I do not propose to say anything about it.

Now, Sir, it is said that I have been unfair to Parliament, that I did not say anything about this to the Rajya Sabha, I did not say anything about this invitation and this was not mentioned in the President's Address. First of all, may I say, as the House knows, that the President's Address is a statement of policy of the Government? It should be remembered, it is the Government that is responsible for it, and it is not right or proper for our respected President's name to be brought in debates like this. If the President's Address has anything wrong in it or objectionable in it, it is the Government to blame not the President, and it is open to hon. Members to criticise or condemn Government because there is some such statement in it which they disapprove of.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Nobody has criticised the President.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am venturing to say that it should be realised because—nobody has criticised the President, but the President's name is brought into the picture and, incidentally or accidentlly, it becomes a subject of controversy—it is not right.

Secondly, Sir, I propose to give some dates, because it seemed to me that some people had in their mind that we have been juggling about with dates or with one occurrence following the other and trying to suppress the facts, sometime in the Rajya Sabha debate or in the President's Address. Now, apart from what I am going to say, I hope the House realises that it would be extraordinarily folly for me to say something and to say something else a week later or five days later. It is ridiculous. I could not consciously be guilty of it; of course, I might make a mistake or something. I could not, according to all the canons of propriety and diplomatic procedure, say something in this House or the other or refer to it in the President's Address, when that matter has not borne fruit by delivery of a letter to the person to whom it was addressed. I could not do it. It is highly improper. I tried my very best to get these procedures through of sending a reply so that I should be in time to place those papers on the first day this House met, the Parliament met. Unfortunately, there were delays right through. A good part of the month of January we worked on the subject, and the result of our labours is embodied in the note that was presented to the Chinese Government earlier this month. Many people were involved in these labours. The month of January is a very heavy month for us. In the middle of the month, there was the Congress Session and other things happened and then came the Republic Day celebrations and in the course of these Celebrations, eminent guests came here. There was Marshal Voroshilov; there was the Prime Minister of Nepal; there was, later of course, Mr. Khrushchev and then the Prime Minister of Finland. It was a very heavy month for us and I was very anxious to expedite this matter. It required a great deal of investigation—not to justify our claim to

ourselves—but to state the facts in an organised way so as to bring conviction to any person who read them, and, we hope, even to the mind of the Chinese Government. The result of that was the note. That was considered. As Foreign Minister I had naturally to consider it on several occasions. Later, it was put up before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Cabinet which considered it at length on several occasions. Having considered and finalised that note, the question arose about the answer I should give because the Chinese note contained a repetition of the invitation to Premier Chou En-Lai for us to meet. We gave thought to it and we came to the conclusion not to refer to it as such in that note because it was thought, after considering the whole case from our point of view, that a separate letter should be sent. Now all this was finalised—the note was finalised—round about 31st January and about the same time it was decided to have this letter sent. It was considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Cabinet. I do not exactly know the date but it is immaterial. Within those two or three days all the papers were ready together. Naturally, they were parts of the same process of consideration and decisions and I signed that letter on the 5th February. I was not going to sign the other paper because it was going to be signed by our Ambassador, prior to delivery to the Chinese Government. We could of course have sent that note and letter by telegram but then we thought it better that the Ambassador should deliver it himself and therefore, the Ambassador had to take it from here. It was given to the Ambassador and he ultimately took it and the matter was finished so far as I was concerned on the 5th of February. The Ambassador took it—I am not quite sure; I think he went for a brief visit to Madras for a day or so and he came back and took it—on the 8th and he left Delhi on the 9th and delivered this letter on the 12th in Peking—the note and the letter. Therefore, the note is dated the date of delivery although in actual fact this was a single transaction. In fact, the note preceded in a sense the letter. If you read that letter itself, you will see that it refers to the note which was going to accompany it. Now the letter is dated the 5th and the note the 12th because it was signed there but it emerged from here at the same time.

Some people imagine that this was some kind of a very deep diplomacy, good or bad, so as to arrange the dates in such manner, before Mr. Khrushchev's visit or overlapping it or something like that. I confess that I am not so clever in these matters. I was anxious that this should be, as I said, finished before Parliament met and I might place all these papers before this House and the other. But the decision that it should not be sent by telegram but rather the Ambassador should himself take it inevitably involved a few days' delay to reach there. This House met on the 8th February. That very morning our Ambassador took it from us and we gave him a few days to reach and he delivered it. The moment we knew he had delivered it—the Prime Minister of China was not available and it was as a matter of fact delivered to the Foreign Minister because we did not wish to lose time—we placed it, on Monday next, before this House and the other.

I might mention another thing here. Mr. Khrushchev was coming here a little later; I think he arrived on the 11th of this month and my first talks with him were on the 12th. It had absolutely no relation to this matter of delivery or writing; it had been previously considered and settled. In the last few weeks we have had the privilege and honour of welcoming very distinguished and very important leaders, world leaders—President Eisenhower, Mr. Khrushchev, Marshal Voroshilov, Prime Minister of our neighbour country, Nepal, and the Prime Minister of Finland. All kinds of speculations appear in the newspapers as to what I discussed with President Eisenhower or later, with

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Mr. Khrushchev. Now obviously, I cannot, in answer to questions here or elsewhere, give out the content of confidential talks; it will be impossible for any talks to take place with other leaders if those talks were reported in this way, publicly. Nevertheless, I shall go some distance, to some extent, in telling the House about the approach I made to these talks, not the content of the talks.

For instance, I had many hours' talks with President Eisenhower and naturally we discussed a large number of questions beginning always with the world situation, the prospects of the summit meeting, disarmament, lessening of tension in the world and going on to individual areas of the world and discussing them. Fortunately for us, we have no problem with the United States to discuss; we have no problems with the Soviet Union to discuss—no controversies or problems. So we discussed broad issues.

12.49 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

I was asked the moment President Eisenhower went away. Did you ask him help for the Five Year Plan? These matters are being discussed by our representatives with the representatives of other countries and of the United States. They are more or less public matters. But so far as I am concerned, I thought it highly improper that I should embarrass our distinguished guest by asking him to do this or that for us. That is not my way of approaching these questions. And although some people did not perhaps believe it—it is a fact that we discussed everything including our Five Year Plans—I did not ask him precisely and definitely to come and help us. He knows exactly our needs. At that moment it was not the right thing for me to do. It is a minor matter because we have understood; he understood me and I understood him. I do not normally go about making demands, especially from distinguished guests who come here.

So also with Mr. Khrushchev. Our talks lasted—I do not know—for three or four hours or may be it was more than that; five hours altogether, and we discussed every subject within our ken. Again, we started all our talks always now-a-days with the summit, what is going to happen there, with disarmament, the prospects of disarmament for the reduction of world tension, plus, both with President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev, the tremendous revolutionary upheavals happening in Africa, a most important thing in the world today, and with other world questions with which we are not directly related but we are related because they affect the world.

People thought no doubt that I would talk at length with Mr. Khruschev about our troubles with China and that I would appeal to him or beg of him or request him to come to our help or bring pressure on China. I am rather surprised that people should think so. At any rate, that is not my idea of diplomacy or of treating a distinguished guest in this way. As a matter of world survey and our own problems, I did refer to our border troubles, with him, and very briefly in half a dozen sentences perhaps. I told him that this is out case; it is all for your information. Because I felt that not to refer to it was itself wrong when we were discussing our problems. But I did not ask him to do this or that for us; I did not ask him to bring pressures to bear. That, I thought was none of my business. It is for them to consider what they are going to do and how they are going to do it. There the matter ended. It was a brief talk on this subject, maybe lasting a few minutes.

The only thing that I can say about these talks is this. Whether it was President Eisenhower or whether it was Mr. Khrushchev, they were good enough to be exceedingly friendly to India, to us, and to our aims and objectives. That is all that I wanted and it would have been embarrassing for me,—and for the other party,—to try to put questions to either of them and demand an answer. That is not the way, I think, the right way, to behave.

So, this question of our answer to the Chinese Government had no relation to Mr. Khrushchev. It so happened that the answer had been sent three or four days before. Naturally the letter and the note had already gone, and it was delivered just about that time.

I should like to refer to another matter. In the course of the criticisms, some hon. Members referred, and referred repeatedly particularly to one item,—to the failure of our diplomats in China and the failure of our defence, not now, but in the last ten years. I would wish that our diplomatic personnel were not mentioned in this way in our debates. They cannot of course say anything nor indeed can we say very much or lay on the Table of the House as to what were the reports that they sent or not. It is not quite fair. I would however say this: that broadly speaking, persons in our diplomatic service, more especially our senior diplomats, have a very high position in the diplomatic world. They compare very favourably with their brother diplomats from other countries. They are respected everywhere and respected not merely because they convey messages from us—anybody can do it—but because they are men of worth, of understanding, understanding our point of view and understanding the other point of view, and they have done great service to us.

I would say this. So far as China is concerned, because we have always attached great importance to the relations of India and China, we have sent our senior most and best men there. It is a record of our highest class men going there. One of them who was there at the crucial moment of the change of Government there, with the success of the revolution, is now a Member of Parliament. The ones who went before him or after, especially after, have been our senior and experienced diplomats, and we are very grateful to them for the very fine work they have done in exceedingly difficult circumstances.

So far as our defence is concerned, that is a larger issue. But during this period of ten years or so, that have elapsed, the responsibility of defence for anything that has happened is of the smallest. In fact, it is not at all their responsibility. Whatever basic policies we have followed are the responsibilities of the Government, or, to limit them still further, they are the responsibilities of the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister; if you like, of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Cabinet. But in the final analysis, certainly they are responsibilities of the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister. Therefore, while this House is completely justified in criticising the Foreign Minister on the ground of policy, I do not think it is quite fair to drag in others who had no responsibility and no immediate contact with that policy.

Now, one thing has surprised me; that in the course of this long debate, reference has been made so often to this letter of invitation. I do not remember—I may be wrong of course—any hon. Member referring to the long note which accompanied that letter. The note was, as I said, dated the 12th of February, and signed by the Ambassador on that date. The letter contains no policy. It is the note that contains the policy of the Government of India in regard to this affair. It is a long note which took weeks of consideration, hard thinking, revision, etc., and finalising. No reference was made to it. You talked about reversal of policy; you talked about national humiliation and all that. But the paper that contains that policy was not referred to at all in this House. It was a carefully drafted document and that has been set aside, and the mere fact taken that we have invited Premier Chou En-lai. It seems to be very odd. That letter was just a kind of addendum to the note. It is the note that contains the policy, that contains our clear enunciation of where the Government of India stands in this matter. Now, as nobody has referred to it, I presume. . . .

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): No reference was made by the Opposition, but it was referred to by us.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry; I stand corrected.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): If I may say so, even Shri Masani had a word of praise for it.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): It was referred to generally, but there was no disagreement on the contents of that note.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): Because it was appreciated. (*Interruption*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry. My point is, when you talk about policy, so far as policy is concerned, it is contained in that note and note only. You may object to my invitation, if you like. That is a matter of opinion, but it has nothing to do with policy. They used big words—reversal of policy—and in big terms—what Shri Masani said, what Acharya Kripalani said and to some extent what Shri Asoka Mehta said and others said. Surely one should say whether one agrees with the policy laid down in the note or not. As I said, it may be a wrong step, in the opinion of some Members, that I invited the Chinese Premier. Criticise it if you like, but that is not a step of policy. One must distinguish between these two things.

13 hrs.

Now, I should like to refer to another matter. They have said that I have gone back on what I have said. I do not wish to weary the House by quoting what I have said previously on this occasion, but because this charge has been made so much I am compelled to do it. Broadly speaking, I have always said—not only about Premier Chou En-lai, but everybody—that I am always prepared to meet anybody, subject to convenience, subject to something; but I shall never say 'no'. Of course, sometimes a meeting may be more desirable and sometimes less desirable, but I never say 'no' to a meeting, because that is the training I have had throughout my lifetime.

I have always distinguished between adhering to a policy and refusing to deal with the opponent or the enemy. If I have faith in myself, my people and my policy, I can meet anybody and discuss it. It is only people who lack faith in themselves who dare not talk about something to somebody whom they dislike. Politics is not a matter of likes and dislikes: if you dislike somebody's face, you would not see him. We represent great countries. When one country is faced with conflict or possible conflict with another country, it is no good condemning this country or that country. A people and a country should never be condemned. I lay it down as a proposition. Its policy may go wrong; its Government may be opposed, but we should never condemn a whole people.

Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra): Who has condemned? To whom are you referring?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is one of the basic things that I have learnt. We never—some people might have in the opposition benches—condemned the British people throughout our long struggle. We fought them—we did not condemn them—and we made friends with them when the time came.

I have proceeded on this basis always and more especially in this particular case of India and China, which raises world issues of enormous significance, two mighty countries in Asia facing each other in conflict with each other, having this tremendous dispute which, as I said previously, may not be a matter of weeks or months, but may be a matter of years and generations, if necessary. These are big things, because neither China can put us down nor can we put down China. It is patent. If that is so, one has to proceed thinking, not of short exhibitions of temper, but on the long-term basis, how we are to maintain our honour, dignity, integrity and everything that counts for us, and yet always, keep the door open for some way out of this conflict. It may take

years before you can pass through that door or anybody else can, but it should never be closed. That is my experience from such history as I have learnt and such experience as I have gathered.

I have met many of the great leaders—political and other—of the world and tried to learn from them. I have read some books also about this subject and most of all, during the last half a century, I have lived through historic epochs. To no small extent, many hon. Members here and I have ourselves been actors in the great drama of India. So, with such experience as we have got, we have to face issues. We have to face an issue today of a greater magnitude than any we have faced previously. It is not casual talk I am indulging in, because as I said, in the context of history, two of the biggest countries of Asia and of the world, I say, have come face to face with each other, angrily face to face with each other. What are going to be the consequences? I do not know. I cannot peep into history, into the future. But I do know that when such a thing occurs, it requires all the wisdom, all the strength and perseverance of a nation to face such a contingency. I have pleaded for that wisdom and at the same time, tact and patience.

What have I said about this matter previously? Hon. Members quoting my previous statements, have said that I would meet him when a meeting would bear fruit. Even there, I never denied that I will not meet him. I said on the 5th November:

> "This business of meeting. My general approach, our general approach, again if I may refer to my dim and distant Gandhian past, is always to meet, always to discuss, to avoid strong language, but to be prepared always for strong action in so far as one can be prepared, and above all avoid, getting excited and afraid."

With all respect, I would venture to present these sentiments of mine to some hon. Members opposite.

Then, on the 16th November, I wrote to Premier Chou En-lai:

> "I am always ready to meet and discuss with Your Excellency the outstanding differences between our countries and explore avenues of friendly settlement . . . It is necessary, therefore, that some preliminary steps are taken and the foundation for our discussions laid."

On that very day, 16th November, I spoke in the Lok Sabha as follows:

> "Premier Chou En-lai also suggested in his letter that the Prime Ministers might hold talks in the immediate future to discuss the boundary question and other outstanding issues between the two countries. I have always expressed my willingness to discuss any matter in dispute. But, if such a meeting is to bear fruit, as we want it to, we should first concentrate our immediate efforts at reaching an interim understanding, as suggested."

So, I should like the House to observe that at no time have I said that I will not meet. It always depends on certain circumstances, in a changing situation. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Rajendra Singh *rose*—

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not prepared to give in. Allow me to proceed.

An Hon. Member: Sit down!

Shri Rajendra Singh: Look at the behaviour of some hon. Members!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will resume his seat.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have listened to strong language from the opposite side, objectionable language and unparliamentary language, if I may say so, and I would beg of them now to listen to some parliamentary language. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): When he says there has been strong language from the opposition, it means that

[Shri Hem Barua]

there was first strong language from the other side.

Mr. Speaker: The proceedings will show where strong language has been used.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: On the 27th November, I said in the Lok Sabha:

> "It is true that, much as one might desire a meeting, that meeting itself, unless it is held under proper circumstances or a proper atmosphere, with some kind of background and preparation, may lead to nothing. It may fail; it may do harm. It is a matter of judgment. It is true that any such meeting which has the faintest resemblance to carrying out the behests of another party is absolutely wrong. I do not wish to delay anything. I am not trying to escape from the very idea of a meeting. I want it. I welcome it as early as possible, but there must be some preparation, some ground for it."

In the Rajya Sabha, I said on the 22nd December:

> "The point that is brought out throughout that letter (the letter of Premier Chou En-lai) is a strong desire to meet. So far as I am concerned, whenever the time comes, whenever it is suitable, I shall avail myself of that opportunity, because the issues are too serious for any other course to be adopted."

In my reply to Premier Chou En-lai on the 21st December, I said:

> "I am always ready to meet and discuss with your Excellency the outstanding differences between our countries and explore the avenues of settlement. How can we, Mr. Prime Minister, reach an agreement on principles when there is such complete disagreement about the facts? I would, therefore, prefer to wait for your promised reply to my letter of September 26 and our note of November 4, before we discuss what should be the next step. I wish to add that it is entirely impossible for me to proceed to Rangoon or any other place within the next few days."

Then, at a Press Conference, on the 8th January a question was asked of me:

> "Do you project a meeting between yourself and Chou En-lai at some date near enough?"

The answer was:

> "I am not projecting the meeting at present, but I cannot rule it out. It depends on circumstances because, as I said, we do not, I hope, act in terms of closing any doors which would help. I don't rule it out at all but, at the present moment, that is not in view."

That is to say, the meeting. I was asked further about the conditions for a meeting. My reply was:

> "I don't think it will be proper for me to lay down conditions 1, 2, 3 and 4, this must be done, this kind of thing. When two countries take up those rigid attitudes, then any question of considering a matter becomes difficult. All kinds of things happen. National prestige is involved, apart from other things."

Finally, a straight question:

> "Does it follow that you would be prepared to meet Mr. Chou En-lai unconditionally?"

My answer:

> "It means, first of all, that I am prepared to meet anybody in the wide world. There is nobody whom I am not prepared to meet. That is number one. The second is, one wants to meet people when one thinks that the meeting will produce results, good results, and not bad results. These are the two main considerations. One

does not rush to a meeting simply because a meeting is talked about. A meeting may be mistimed, misjudged and, therefore, produce bad results. On the other hand, if there is any chance of a good result, a meeting should be agreed to.

So, it is difficult for me to say precisely when, where and under what conditions, a meeting might take place, but I cannot rule it out."

Here is a series of quotations from what I have said in the Lok Sabha, in the Rajya Sabha and in the press conference, and you will see the same stream of thought running in my mind—never refuse the meeting and try to get the meeting in the best of circumstances, as good circumstances as possible, and consider from time to time whether it is more desirable or less desirable.

When Premier Chou En-lai invited me to meet him within a week or so at Rangoon, apart from the physical difficulty of my going to Rangoon, I reacted against this proposal—I did not like it—for a variety of reasons. I did not quite see why I should go to Rangoon or anywhere else for that meeting but, above all, I did not like this, well, shall I say, "come next week" business; and above all, the invitation to the meeting was contained in a document, in a letter which laid down the Chinese view-point, and it wanted some principles etc., settled so as to meet to discuss some principles. Now, if I had accepted that meeting, it would not have committed me, of course, to anything, but the background was the Chinese letter to me. That would have been the background, although I was not committed to it. I wanted to clear that up. I was not going to him with that document, because I did not agree with that document, and I wanted to wait as I have said, for a subsequent longer letter in reply to my letter of September 24th. That is why I said "I shall consider this question later". So, when the letter and other papers came and we considered this and we drafted a reply to be sent, we felt—I felt and my colleagues in the Cabinet Committee felt—that since we have discussed this for a considerable time, it would be desirable in the balance to propose a meeting in India between Premier Chou En-lai and myself. Now, my letter to him does not commit him to anything, that is our case, just as his letter has not committed me. But it does make a difference on the basis "after this letter we meet", a considerable difference, to my meeting after his letter.

Shri Hem Barua: Where is the difference in facts?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Hon Members opposite, well, I do not challenge their greater wisdom in these matters. . . .

Shri Hem Barua: I am not referring to our wisdom. I want to make one submission. Whatever the Prime Minister has read, is that a vindication of the criticism levelled by the Opposition? We said that no purpose would be served by a meeting to discuss the principles unless and until differences on facts are resolved. Till then we should not meet. Where are the differences on facts: we wanted to know that. We did not say that he should not meet Premier Chou; but, at the same time, facts are there to be resolved.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am very sorry that my reading out all this has not been completely absorbed by the hon. Member's mind yet. That is my difficulty. My difficulty is, and I am quite frank with you, that there are certain vested interests opposing any settlement between India and China. I am quite frank. *(Interruptions)*.

Shri Rajendra Singh: I condemn it.

Shri Hem Barua: Where is the question of vested interest . . . *(interruptions)*.

Shri Goray (Poona): The only vested interest is our love for this country. There is no other vested interest.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): It is a political interest.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: By vested interest I mean mental, psychological interest, and not vested interest. . . .

Shri Hem Barua: The Prime Minister has failed to clarify this issue. Whenever he accuses our wisdom or our intellect, we have not yet submitted to that accusation. He failed to make the issue clear before us.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Am I, Sir, as I have done in fact, meekly to its ten to charges of dishonour and unfairness?

Some Hon. Members: Shame, shame. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Is it the idea of the opposition that I should patiently listen when they say that I am bringing about national humiliation? I would rather be unwise than be a traitor to this country. These are charges brought against me and if I speak calmly on this subject in this House, it does not mean that I do not feel strongly about this subject. I honour this House and its conventions; therefore, I speak calmly. I am angry at the kind of things that have been said in this House, not only angry at what has been said from the other said but from this side too. I think it is unbecoming.

Shri Rajendra Singh: You concede that now.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let him go on.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am endeavouring to reply. . . .

Shri Rajendra Singh: We concede that you are the first patriot in the country. We do not challenge your patriotism.

An Hon. Member: Order, order.

Shri Hem Barua: Why should they say "Order, order"?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I did not interrupt a single Member when he spoke, except.... (*Interruptions*) I cannot understand why hon. Members cannot listen patiently when they do not like something.

Mr. Speaker: I have always said that the hon. Minister must be allowed to go on, and if they have any serious points of doubt, at the end of the speech, if I consider that any clarification is necessary, I shall allow one or two questions.

Shri Hem Barua *rose*—

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no question of any clarification. I am not giving in to anybody. Sir, I appeal to you, if I do not give in, can another hon. Member get up and go on interrupting me?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: For six days or five days I have listened to this debate, and except once. . . .

Mr. Speaker: I can only say this much. No side should cast aspersions on the honesty or the motives of the other side. All of us are engaged in the common endeavour to see that this matter is amicably settled.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I enquire, when we are called dishonourable persons, when we are said to betray the country, is that an aspersion or not?

Mr. Speaker: It is.

Shri Hem Barua: I did not dispute the honesty. . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am anxious that neither side need attribute motives to the other side. The doubt is as to what are the changed circumstances which have necessitated such a kind of policy of requesting that he may come here. That is a legitimate ground and the hon. Minister may explain it. Beyond that,

to say that the hon. Minister has let down the country, or done something else, or attributing motives is not right, nor is it necessary for this side to say that others have a vested interest.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What I said was this. I should like to explain myself. Some hon. Members—I am not referring to all hon. Members of the Opposition, but certainly some individuals here—are so passionately committed to the cold war attitude. That is what I call a vested interest, that is, this cold war attitude of Shri Masani, for instance. Shri Masani and I, I regret to say, are farther removed than any two human-beings can be, in thought. Shri Masani dislikes any kind of a step taken by any country, not by India alone, which might reduce tension. You see it is a basic attitude. While I proceed with this, I will say this. It is not a question of vested interest of property and money but of mental commitment to certain ideologies. Now, for instance, take another vested interest of the other kind, that is, of the Communist Party.... (*Interruption*).

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Poor fellows!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They quite fail to understand a national movement, a national feeling, a national upsurge in the country.... (*Interruption*). Here are two.. (*Interruption*). That is what I meant. This cold war attitude, I think, not only now but always is a wrong attitude.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): Attitudes are common to all.... (*Interruption*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am making a general statement that the cold war approach is always and, I say, inevitably a wrong approach whatever happens. That does not mean weakening in meeting an opponent or an enemy. Of course, not. But that mental attitude towards cold war is the one basic lesson that I, and I hope others, learnt from Gandhiji. I do not mean to say that I have acted up to that lesson always. That is my failing. I lose my temper and do all kinds of things.

Shri Ranga: We are all comrades in the same way.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But I do believe that that is a right attitude when dealing with individuals, groups or nations. More particularly when you have to deal with the conflicts of big nations that attitude has very far-reaching consequences. When you have to think of that in the context of the world today you have to be very careful. Any man with the least sense of responsibility should realise this attitude, which increases tension, bitterness and hatred, is not a good attitude. It may end ultimately in the destruction of the world and so on. So, I was venturing to say that this mental attitude is wrong. It may be honestly held. I do not say that people who indulge in cold war are dishonest. But it is an attitude which comes in the way, apart from its being basically wrong, because the cold war is based on violence and hatred. The hatred may be justified in the sense that the other party may be wrong. But nevertheless it is a wrong attitude.

Secondly, apart from being a wrong attitude, it closes one's mind and prevents considering a changing situation as it changes. We have got a fixed mind which was fixed, let us say, five or ten years ago. The situation may change but we apply the same canons of interpretation to it. So, I would venture to say that in regard to these border issues if this House approves of the note that we have sent that is the policy. That is the policy note. I take it, if I understand it, that people do approve it. I am not quite sure of hon. Members of the Communist Party as to whether they approve it or not. I do not know because their approach is somewhat different. But there it is.

The Communist Party has been carrying on a big propaganda that the two Prime Ministers must meet. If there is anything which would pre-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

vent any meeting it is that propaganda of theirs so far as I am concerned, because it is obvious that their objective in their propaganda is something entirely different from my proposal. They are trying to hide, if I may use the word without disrespect, their opinions and feelings on this subject, not to express them clearly enough—some of them, not all—by shouting, "Let the two Prime Ministers meet". Then they need not say anything about the question. But it is not on that basis or on that argument that I have proceeded. After all, I have to explain.

I do not know if this meeting will take place. I hope it will. But anyhow I thought it my duty and in the Committee my colleagues thought it our duty to take this step. We took it after full consideration of its consequences. Then if we took that step people objected to it saying, "What? You say that he will be our honoured guest." What else, may I ask? How else can we treat anybody whom we invite to this country? How else? Here again comes that cold war mentality of hatred. No reason, no logic, no graciousness and things are said here which, if I may say so, bring little credit to India. It brings little credit to India to say these things, which could be repeated, about the leaders of great nations with whom we may be in conflict. How do we speak of those leaders?

May I say what I have just now said, that we must never speak ill of a whole people. So also, we must not speak ill of the leaders who represent those people. For the moment they are not individuals. They represent those people. I may be a person with many failings and you may condemn me. You may do many things. But I feel sure that even those who have not a particular soft corner for me will resent if any outsider insulted me, the Prime Minister of India, because then I become a symbol of this Parliament of India apart from my failing. So, others are also symbols and something should not be said which bars any consideration of any problem, which closes people's mind and which brings in too much passion and anger. That is all that I have to submit. That does not mean our not criticising the policy of another Government or opposing it or fighting it.

I think it was Shri Masani and perhaps some other hon. Members too who talked about forming a bloc of South Eastern Asian countries, of Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia and India. I do not know if this is some kind of revival of the old idea of a third force.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: That is not.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is not.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Can't be.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Whatever it may be, I should like the House to consider that this kind of thing means nothing at all. First of all, I am happy to say, we are in the closest friendly relations with these countries, with Nepal, Burma, Indonesia, Ceylon etc. This kind of reference to other countries in this fashion is often found rather irritating by those countries as if we want to dragoon them into something. They do not like it. They are independent countries, very friendly to us often with common interests. But the moment any element comes in "Oh! they want to exercise some pressure on us, Oh! they are in trouble; they want our help"—whatever it may—there is this element of making them do something which they may not like to do. That is never a right approach to any country, if I know anything about relations between two countries. There are all kinds of pressures—pressures on all countries, on our country, on their countries. To imagine that they would yield to some pressure, is not correct. They have to judge according to their situations, internal and external politics. The main thing that we aim at is friendly relations, cooperative relations and I am glad that we have got them.

I do not wish to say much regarding defence, that is, the border question. We have already informed the House that we have to adopt in regard to defence not only a short view, the immediate dangers, to protect ourselves, but the long view also. We cannot exhaust our energy, our strength, in some short view and have nothing left for the long view. So, both views have to be taken, and undoubtedly they involve burdens on us, and I am sure the House will agree to our carrying those burdens because, after all, the basic policy of every country, the basic foreign policy of every country is to protect itself; other policies come later. I have talked about various approaches to foreign policy, but the basic approach of foreign policy is always to guard the interests of the country, other things follow it. Of course, we want to guard those interests, not in a narrow way, not in that type of ultra-nationalist way which does not look at the world, but we want that to fit in with world developments and world peace and all that; and in fact, in the long run it is those world interests that also come to our help. So, looking at defence from this point of view, it is not for me to tell you, and I cannot tell you, what exact steps we take on our borders, because that kind of thing is not said in the public, but we are taking all the necessary steps available to us on our borders. We are trying to build roads, airports etc., whatever it may be.

I think it was Shri Bhakt Darshan who again repeated this business of foreign aircraft flying over our territory. I believe he said that some ex-servicemen, ex-soldiers had told him so. Now, I can assure him that our Air Force is very vigilant in this matter, and our Air Force has assured us that no such thing has happened. Apart from the fact that our own aircraft are flying frequently there,—it is very difficult for an average man to distinguish aircraft at 30,000 feet; no doubt, it is 30 to 40 thousand feet—apart from that, this is a route by which the Soviet service flies to India twice or three times a week, I forget how often—the TU 104—and they see the strange thing coming. Apart from that, when Mr. Voroshilov and Mr. Krushchev came here, there were so many flights in that connection to bring them, their parties, to bring things for them, take back things, constant flights, and therefore they probably mistook this for some kind of foreign, enemy aircraft which was intruding on our air space.

I need not say much about the situation in the Naga Hills Tuensang Division. I think that certainly it is infinitely better than it has been in the past. Nevertheless, it is true that sporadic troubles take place and it is exceedingly difficult to put an end to them. But the major improvement there is not more or less of this kind of sporadic trouble, but a change, I think, in the mind of the Naga people, which is the real, basic, helpful thing that is happening, and I hope that will bear fruit.

Now, I should like this House to consider our problems in that larger context of the world. We can never foreget the world, we are too closely knit to it to separate ourselves, and in the world today the major thing that is happening is this approach of the leaders of rival countries trying to find a way out, trying to go ahead with disarmament and solve or lessen the tension which exists. This is of tremendous significance because, if this is not done and if the world continues in any other way, then all our problems will be solved by vast destruction which is not the destruction of war, but practically, if these atomic and nuclear weapons are used, a curse on the world from which it cannot recover even—this atomic radiation spreading out and creeping everywhere. Therefore, these are of the utmost importance, and therefore we should endeavour in our own way to help. We cannot do very much, we are not among the World Powers in the sense of military prowess or

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

financial prowess; nevertheless it so happens that we have gained some prestige in the world as a people, as a country which is devoted to peace, and that is one reason also why the problems affect us, whether they are of Pakistan, or whether they are of China. We have to face these problems bravely, we have to face them with strength, not giving in, not surrendering, but we have always to remember that our language and approach fits in with the temper of the world which aims towards peace today. So, we have today to look at it in this big way.

One of the big things that is happening today in the world, one of the very big things, is the revolutionary ferment in Africa. Recently we had this French atomic test in the Sahara. Well, it is a deplorable thing, I think, deplorable by itself, deplorable because it begins another series of atomic tests and we must regret it, and we have tried our best, and the United Nations, indeed, have expressed themselves previously against it. But far bigger than this French atomic test in Africa is what the people of Africa are doing today, rising up, sometimes rightly, sometimes wrongly if you like, but nevertheless in a state of tremendous upheaval. That is what is happening, and it is obvious that so far as we are concerned, our hearts and our good wishes must go out to them in this tremendous upheaval.

In this connection, all kinds of new preblems will arise in Africa affecting the world. One of the biggest problems has been the racial problem. The House knows how the South African Union Government has fixed its policy on the basis of racial discrimination and a master race and *apartheid* etc. We have suffered, the people of Indian descent have suffered from it, but far more the Africans have suffered from it. Now, what is going to happen in Africa when the greater part of Africa consists of independent nations standing on their dignity, not accepting in the slightest degree any kind of racial discrimination, well, the future will show. But obviously, things will not remain as they are today.

In this connection, may I say that I welcome the recent statement made by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Macmillan, addressing the two Houses of Parliament in Cape Town. It was, in so far as policy is concerned about racial discrimination, a clear and forthright statement. Naturally we feel strongly about this, and I earnestly hope that what Mr. Macmillan has said will be the firm policy in all the countries over which Britain holds sway.

I would wish that some of the leaders of the African people who are in detention or in prison, leaders of note, leaders of influence without whom no settlement can be made, are released, because unless they are released there can be no settlement of these problems.

Then I would say just a word about Goa. The first thing is that I should like to assure the House, because there appears to be some mis-apprehension, that we are going to take no steps which in any sense might prejudice the liberation of the Goan people. We have been, to some extent, rather restrained from taking any further steps, because we have been waiting, to some extent, for the decision of the World Court. The problem before the World Court has nothing to do directly with Goa; it has to do with Nager Haveli. Nevertheless, it has been a restraining factor in our consideration of this important problem. That decision, I hope, will come within a month or so.

Another subject which has been dealt with at some length in the debate, or at any rate, referred to repeatedly, was the question of corruption. Now, if you deal with the question of corruption, there can be no two views about it, that every possible and feasible method should be

employed to deal with it, to suppress it and to put an end to it.

Shri Asoka Mehta seemed to imply that I denied that there was corruption. Of course, he has got a very wrong impression. What I have said repeatedly is that while there is a good deal of corruption in our administrative services and elsewhere, I do think that the references made to it give it greater importance, that is, it appears by these references to be more widespread than actually it is. I certainly think that in the higher services the standards are fairly high. I do not deny that cases occur. In fact...

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Not very high.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In fact, since we established a Special Police Establishment to deal with this matter, they have had a good deal of success in this. I do not know if hon. Members pay much attention to monthly hand-outs that are put in the Parliament Library from the Special Police Establishment as well as annual reports. Anyhow, a new annual report will be coming out, I think, in a month or so.

Shri Rajendra Singh: I submit that the integrity of the Police Department, however high it may be, is not above suspicion.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member may also suspect sometimes the judiciary. I am not saying that only the police should deal with it, but it is the police that starts cases, our Intelligence Departments. If they are not good, change them. But you connot deal with them in an *ad hoc* way.

Anyhow, I should like to give some brief report. I am placing a note on the Table of the House, a note called 'Review of the Work done during the year 1959' by the Special Police Establishment. [*Placed in Library. See* No. LT-1919/60].

The number of cases relating to bribery, corruption etc. was 917 in 1959, including pending cases from the year before. 1671 cases were investigated during 1959. Of these, 264 were sent for trial. 501 were reported for departmental action, and 101 were dropped for want of proof. Of the cases sent to trial, 190 resulted in conviction of the 363 sent for departmental proceedings, 325 resulted in punishment, 1164 public servants, including 207 gazetted officers were involved in the new cases of 1959. 118 Government servants were convicted in courts, including 10 gazetted officers. Among private persons convicted, as the House well knows, were Ramkrishan Dalmia and Haridas Mundhra. Monthly press releases are being issued about the work of the Special Police Establishment, and copies of these are sent to the Library of Parliament. I shall place a note on this.

The question that was really arising is about the proposal to have a tribunal, standing independent tribunal. I have ventured to say in the other House and here too in answer to questions that I do not think this is desirable or feasible. Some very eminent people with high qualifications, judicial and other, have also advised me that this is not a feasible proposition even under the Constitution of India. Apart from the constitutional difficulty, I cannot understand—there may be other ways—how this particular proposal can be said to be a helpful one. I think that if a tribunal sits down and invites applications from all over, then complaints will simply paralyse the administration, and there will be hardly any work done, and all the mind of the country and everything will be involved in these arguments, charges and counter-charges. So, I cannot understand that particular proposal. I can, of course, understand, any specific charge which has been made being investigated by any suitable tribunal, whatever it may. That is a right thing.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

You have, at the present moment, a certain apparatus, whatever it may be, police etc., the law and so on. Anybody can take a person to a court for it, although I must confess that that appartus is a slow-moving one. We want to expedite it. We want your help, your suggestions to do it. If any other proposal is there for us to consider, let us consider it. But one thing I cannot understand is this. A specific proposal, a specific charge, can be investigated. But one cannot investigate charges which are not charges but just vague declamations.

I remember, I hope I am right, that my hon. friend Shri Tyagi many years ago talked about corruption and my old colleague Shri C. D. Deshmukh replied to it saying it is no good making these vague charges, bring the specific instance, and I shall enquire.

Shri Tyagi: I was on these benches then, not a Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Naturally, if he had been a Minister, he would not have said that. But there it is. Wherever it is, one can enquire into charges that are made. There are procedures. This Government, and this House, in fact, have taken action in regard to enquiries about big action, in the past, involving some of the most important persons in the land.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Certain charges have been made during the course of the debate. Is the Prime Minister prepared to constitute some sort of tribunal for enquiring into those charges?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am glad the hon. Member has reminded me of what he said. I remember he referred to the U.P. Minister, and a contract being given to his son. Is that the case?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Of course. I was not allowed to name the Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I had forgotten about that matter. So, I am grateful to my hon. friend. When this matter was raised, as is usually done by me, I immediately wrote to the Chief Minister and to the Minister concerned and others. While we were enquiring into this matter, which enquiry I continued, a case for libel or a kind of defamation was started against the persons who made the charges. Those cases are still going on. This matter was also referred, I think, to the Election Commissioner, in a slightly different context. That is also going on. However, I proceeded with my own way of enquiry. Whether it is satisfactory or not, it is for the House to judge. I did not wish to interfere when the case was going on in the law courts, but I got all the charges, with such evidence as could be stated by those who made the charges; I had answers to these charges; I did not look into them; I did not think myself competent to do so. Having got all that, I sent them to the Law Minister, and the Law Minister examined them very thoroughly and wrote a long note on it which I sent to the Chief Minister; and it was shown to the people who made the charges; it was shown to the Governor. I was in a difficulty. I could not publish it because the case was going on. That is my difficulty. And it is still going on. But, in that particular note, I must say, since I am asked, although I do not wish to come in the way of the law.....

Dr. Sushila Nayar: It would not be right for the Prime Minister to express an opinion when the cases are *sub judice*.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am inhibited from saying it.

Mr. Speaker: He need not give us the benefit of his conclusions at this stage.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am saying that I sent all this.....

Shri Easwara Iyer (Trivandrum): On a point of order. It would be unfair for the Prime Minister to say anything about a matter which is pending in the court. If he says that there is nothing in the charge, then the court may be influenced.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That has been my difficulty during all these months. Otherwise, I would have said many things, but I am merely saying this.

Shri Ram Krishan Gupta (Mahendragarh): May I know whether any such case has been received from the Punjab?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have received. In the past year or two, quite a number of things have come and they have been examined and reports have been issued. It is true one or two cases have come fairly recently—by 'recently', I mean in the last few weeks—and they are being dealt with now.

Shri Tyagi: I wonder if the Prime Minister has the authority to investigate cases which are forwarded to him by private persons about Ministers in the States. It is only a private matter.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not a question of legal authority. My investigations only go to the extent: is there a *prima facie* case to be dealt with or otherwise? I cannot go beyond that. I cannot punish a person.

Mr. Speaker: I may say at once that it is the responsibility of the Centre to constantly watch—not to interfere—the manner in which the constitutional machinery works in the States.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes.

The other day a leader of the Swatantra Party, Shri V. P. Menon, said that he knew of partiality and impropriety occurring in the case of Congress Ministers. Whenever I see any such thing, I write to the party concerned: 'Give me some information'. Immediately I had a letter sent to Shri V. P. Menon to enquire what this was about. He did send a reply which was not very helpful. He said, 'I would like to look at the files etc.' As it is, he is prepared to make a statement without looking at the papers! However, I have inquired into this matter. This matter is twelve years old—the matter to which he referred—that is, 1948. It was a matter connected with his own Ministry, of which he was Secretary and Sardar Patel was the Minister. I think it referred to some Ministers of the old Madhya Bharat Government and Vindhya Pradesh Government. I won't go into details. But we inquired into it. We decided to start prosecutions; in fact, I am not quite sure if they were not started. The matter was then considered fully. I think it was referred to the Solicitor-General and the Attorney-General. It was considered by Sardar Patel, of course, and Shri Rajagopalachari. They both sent up a note to me, a final note, saying 'we considered fully these cases; there is no substance in them. This was the report of the Attorney-General too, and they should not be proceeded with'. I accepted their advice, the advice of senior colleagues and the Attorney-General. What could I do? They were all rather petty cases, petty in the sense that there was some confusion about travelling allowance etc. They were withdrawn.

Another case was about a gentleman of the name of Sardar Narmada Prasad Singh. He was later involved in a much bigger case about insurance scandals and he absconded, and remained absconding for a long time. Then he was apprehended and he spent some time in prison.

I mention this, that here after twelve years Shri V. P. Menon makes a statement.....

Dr. Sushila Nayar: The gentleman concerned in the case was in the PSP at that time.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Maybe. It does not matter.

Here Shri V. P. Menon, a prominent member of the Swatantra Party, throws out this charge of how Ministers have been misbehaving and committing improprieties. And when we go into this matter, we find it was a matter of twelve years ago when Shri V. P. Menon was Secretary of that Ministry, Sardar Patel was there, Shri Rajagopalachari was consulted, so was the Attorney-General, and a certain action was taken. It does seem to be rather unfair that these charges should be bandied about—thrown about—in this way.

I have taken a lot of time, but there is just one major matter about which I should like to say something, that is, planning. Shri Asoka Mehta said that the President's Address had given no indication about the outline of the Third Plan and when it would be available to the House. The National Development Council meeting is going to take place on the 19th and 20th of March. It is hoped that before the end of April, the Planning Commission will publish a Draft Outline of the Third Plan for consideration by Parliament. Meanwhile, as the House knows, there is an Informal Committee of Members of Parliament of all Parties which meets sometimes to consider the Third Plan. The tentative approaches to the Third Plan—I would repeat they are tentative; some of this information has appeared in the Press; I am repeating it more authoritatively—the tentative approaches of the Third Plan are (1) increase in national income of at least 5 per cent. per annum; (2) total investment of Rs. 9,950 crores; (3) in the public sector, investment of about Rs. 5,950 crores, with a total developmental outlay of Rs. 7,000 crores. The latter figure compares with Rs. 4,800 crores of the Second Plan as originally drawn up. In the private sector, including agriculture, small industry, housing as well as organised industry—investment of about Rs. 4,000 crores. This compares with the present estimate for the Second Plan of Rs. 3,300 crores.

At this stage, the plan for industry is being drawn up from the point of view of the economy as a whole, not public sector-private sector. What we require are physical targets. Distribution as between public and private sectors would come later, keeping in view naturally the broad policies of Government in regard to such matters. Our approach broadly is that there is a broad policy, but then there is a pragmatic approach. We want to do the job and the sooner we do it the better, keeping in view that broad policy. Now Government are considering the lines along which the general public should be given an opportunity to contribute to a limited extent to the capital of State enterprises in industry and allied fields.

It is obvious that this requires a very great effort, and I repeat something the Planning Commission has said—it is so obvious, but still I repeat it because it is important—namely, the following conditions have to be fulfilled: (1) increase in agricultural production, (2) all public enterprises being carried out with economy and efficiency, yielding the maximum returns feasible, (3) in construction programmes, the cost being kept to the minimum, (4) administrative efficiency and speed, and (5) maintenance of prices at reasonable levels.

Now, Sir, I really am ashamed to take up so much time of the House, but they will bear with me for a little while more. We have come up against problems in a particular context for which there is no parallel. There is a parallel of industrial development, there is a parallel of planning in the Communist countries, but there is no parallel of this kind of combination, of a measure of planning with this apparatus. That creates certain difficulties. In the highly developed countries, it was institutional reforms leading to the Welfare State, including a system of progressive taxation which was able to defeat growth of inequality, because normally when industrialisation takes place, if it is left unimpeded and unchecked, it leads

to greater inequality. The rich become richer, the poor may not become poorer, but the gap widens.

I am saying this because, it is very obvious, in this House some persons quite unconnected with modern thought and modern conditions talk about *laissez faire* and going back to an economy where there is no kind of planning or control. As I said, in those western countries and highly developed countries—I mean 'western' or anywhere—there were institutional reforms leading to the Welfare State, these including a system of progressively high taxation, because, otherwise, without these checks the inequalities would have increased. The pressures from trade unions and this and that are supposed to keep down these. Otherwise, the contrast between riches and poverty would have grown. That is why we are compelled. If we leave things to chance, we would grow industrially in a sense; but we would grow at the expense of the gap between the rich and the poor widening and not lessening. Therefore, come in the various types of institutional changes and controls.

14 hrs.

Of course, in a nation we can control whatever the difficulties. But in the international sphere—I am talking about economy in the international sphere—obviously, there is no controlling authority and so international inequalities are growing. In spite of our efforts, rich countries are getting richer and richer and poor countries are making much slower progress.

In the communist countries, the main thing we have seen is the relentless and cruel mobilisation of man-power. They mobilise their people and achieve results undoubtedly. We do not wish to do that. But, now the question before us is nevertheless the mobilisation of man-power not to that extent but to a considerable extent.

In the course of this debate, reference was made by some hon. Members to the speech delivered by the Governor of the Reserve Bank. I think the question the Governor raised is an important question and we have to bear that in mind because this spiral of wages and prices, etc. is a dangerous thing for us to get into. Not only our Plans are affected but there can be practically no planning at all. We can only deal with these matters by evolving social policies, not by leaving things to chance, by evolving social policies aiming at desired ends. That is planning. The free market that is talked about by Shri Masani and his colleagues and *laissez faire* are just primitive ways of dealing with complicated situations.

Just a word. I think Shri Braj Raj Singh referred to the Nalagarh Committee Report and....

Some Hon. Members: Shri A. P. Jain.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Myself.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Anyhow I should like to assure him that I am informed by the Planning Commission that it has been accepted broadly and it has been included in the next year's programme, I do not know how far in detail.

I think Shri Asoka Mehta referred to an article by Mr. Lipmann, an American columnist....

An Hon. Member: Shri Khadilkar.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, Shri Khadilkar. That article was a very interesting one, as often Mr. Lipmann's writings are. I should like to read two or three sentences from that article because they do pose a problem for us to consider. He says, writing about India:

> "What troubled me was the disparity between the revolutionary objectives of the Third Five Year Plan and the mildness, the almost Victorian mildness and the normality of the Indian political system. I asked myself whether the gigantic economic revolution can be carried out by Parliamentary politicians and civil servants without the dynamism and the discipline or an organised mass movement."

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

It is an American conservative liberal rather, not any firebrand who is writing this. And, this is a problem which is before us and we shall have to solve it.

We have to face gigantic problems, tremendous enterprises. We plan for them and the planning itself, I venture to say, is not bad. It aims at big things. But the question comes, is this apparatus of ours—I am not referring for a moment to the basic parliamentary apparatus but rather to the way it functions—is it adequate? I think that the basic apparatus is adequate or can be made adequate. But I think we must realise that the way it is at present functioning is not adequate. I say so with extreme respect to the way we function in this Parliament—I am all for parliamentary democracy and I do believe that, apart from minor changes here and there, that is a good system specially suited to us. So, I am not challenging that basis. But I do wish to say that we are functioning more and more in a—what Mr. Lipmann says—Mid-Victorian way, not realising the urgency of our problems and are arguing, throwing our problems like shuttle-cock from one place to another.

Our other apparatus too is a good apparatus but a slow-moving apparatus. We are trying hard to think of how we can expedite that apparatus—our administrative apparatus—how to give more responsibility to people so that they can decide quickly. In the old days, the British days, the problems were simpler and they evolved their perfectionist apparatus with checks and counter-checks and all that. Now, we have got the same apparatus with unpleasantly complicated social problems and the checks and counter-checks are so much that tremendous delays occur. The only way to deal with this—and in this matter ultimately the communists and the capitalists both agree—is to expedite matters by giving a responsibility to people—dispersal of responsibility. It may go wrong; it may be a loss; but there is no greater loss to a nation than delaying. Even the cost in money is very great but the real cost is that you do not come to grips with the major problems you are dealing with.

I have ventured to take a lot of time of this House. On various matters, in the ultimate analysis, whether it is the border trouble or whether it is anything else, it is our economic growth that counts. That is the only thing that gives us strength to face danger from abroad and danger from within. And that lead can only be given by this House unitedly, not by trying to pull each other down, but, in these basic matters, by giving a united lead to work for the benefit of the country.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): On a point of clarification, Sir....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will have other opportunities.

I have to inform the House that amendments Nos. 55 and 141 are out of order under rule 343, as anticipating discussion on a resolution regarding quitting the Commonwealth, moved by Shri Braj Raj Singh on the 12th February, 1960. That is part heard.

Regarding the other amendments, I would like to know from hon. Members whether they want any particular amendment to be put to vote separately.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: None, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Then, I will put all the amendments together to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos.—1 to 7, 10, 15 to 24, 26 to 42, 47 to 54, 56, 64 to 69, 96 to 110, 114 to 121, 134 to 140, 142 to 151, 155 to 171, 181 to 184, 187 to 194, 201, 207, 209 to 213, 215 to 221, 224 to 226, 229, 230, 232 to 240, 85 to 94, 172 to 180, 195 to 197 and 208 *were put and negatived.*

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Members of the Lok Sabha assembled in this Session