

पढ़ कर सुना देना चाहता हूँ जो कि उन्होंने अपने बेटे के बारे में कहा था यह श्री मोहनलाल जी ने अपनी किताब में लिखा है। वह इस प्रकार है : (Interruptions). I want to quote here what Pandit Motilal Nehru has said about his own son to Shri Mohanlal Saksena. I want to remind our Prime Minister about what is parliamentary practice.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Sivamurhi Swamy: He says:

"He is a jewel of a man and a perfect gentleman. He trusts everybody, for he thinks others are like himself. Remember Mohanlal, people will take undue advantage of him. He will be duped and deceived often". After a perusive pause for a moment or two, he concluded: "But he is not to blame. He has led a sheltered life and not seen the seamy side of it".

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Speaker, Sir, for four days we have had this debate, and I believe 40 Members have spoken; I am the 41st. I have tried my best, respectfully and with patience, to follow the speeches—to listen to them myself and follow them. Sometimes it has been a little hard but, on the whole, I believe I have succeeded.

It has been a strange experience to see this varied assembly of the Opposition speak in different terms. Only just now we heard a representative of the Muslim League, a little before, of the Hindu Mahasabha, and a little earlier—yesterday, I think—of the D.M.K. of Madras, all in serried ranks behind Acharya Kripalani and his fellow-generals. In fact, they are all generals; there are no privates in the army.

A no-confidence motion, of course, aims at or should aim at removing the Government and taking its place.

Now it is clear that in the present instance there was no such expectation or hope. And so the debate, although it was interesting in many ways, and profitable, I think, was a little unreal. Personally, I have welcomed this motion and this debate, and I have almost felt that it would be a good thing if we have periodical examinations of this kind.

Shri Tyagi: No, no.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have listened, as I said, with respect to the speeches of the Opposition Members, and tried to understand what troubled them. Some things I knew. But still, what has brought together in this curious array these various Members? It is obvious that what has brought them together is a negation, not a positive fact, not only a dislike of Government, of our Government, but perhaps, if I may say so, it is more—I am sorry to say so—a personal matter against me, both as leader of the Government and otherwise. I do not mean that everybody feels that way. Certainly, it is a negative matter that has brought them together. That takes away a great deal from the strength of the Opposition, and it reduces it. What are they after?—there might be something in it; just to remove this Government; and that too is not within their expectation. So, it really comes to this. They were too full of feelings, huff and anger and dislike, and they wanted to express themselves in forcible language. It comes to that ultimately.

I must confess, and I say so with all respect, that the Members, leaders of the Opposition including, of course, the hon. Member who proposed this motion, have not done justice to this motion or to themselves. I have been rather disappointed at the charges they made. I do not mean to say that all the charges they made had no substance. Of course, you might divide their attack into four heads, namely domestic policy, foreign policy, defence and general corruption, etc. I am not prepared to say, and nobody can, that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

corruption is not a most serious matter to be inquired into, to be eradicated and to be crushed out. There is no difference of opinion about that. There may be a difference of opinion as to the extent of it, and possibly, sometimes, it is exaggerated, and thereby, perhaps, an atmosphere is created which instead of putting an end to corruption gives it a certain licence. However, these are the four main subjects dealt with.

Now, we have been debating a matter of high State policy. Whether the Government comes or goes, the matters we have debated are important matters for the country, for the State. I should have thought that most of the debate would deal with high matters of State policy. Sometimes, they have been referred to, undoubtedly. But, generally, the debate has proceeded on rather personal grounds, personal likes and dislikes, personal criticisms and attacks, which have taken away much of the force of it. The person concerned felt irritated. That is a different matter. But this was an important moment in the history of Parliament. And as a parliamentarian, apart from being a Prime Minister, I had hoped that we would rise equal to that occasion on both sides of the House and deal with the great matters that confront our country and also incidentally deal with the unfortunate Government that is in charge of many of these matters; but, to concentrate rather on the failings of individuals seems to bring the debate down to a lower level.

The three hon. Members, the three newcomers, whose speeches I listened to with great interest and care, Acharya Kripalani, Shri M. R. Masani and Dr. Lohia, perhaps, were a little excited still with their victories in the by-elections and seemed to think that they could make a frontal attack on this Government and all who are parts of it.

Dr. Lohia did me the honour of referring to me repeatedly. I do not wish to argue about myself; it is unbecoming for me; to do so, anyhow, would be wrong. But that did bring the debate down to a singularly low level of the market place.

Several Hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Prime Minister may be allowed to go on. We have had four days' debate.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have met Dr. Lohia here in Parliament, I believe, after seventeen years. I do not remember the exact date, but probably, it is about seventeen years since I met him last. And my recollection of him was such that when I heard him I was singularly disappointed. He did not do justice to himself. I expected better of him than merely clever phrases and personal attacks.

We were dealing with the future of India, not of Jawaharlal Nehru or Morarji Desai or somebody else who happens to be for the time being in posts in the Government. We shall go, of course, even if we do not go because of this vote of no-confidence, otherwise too; in course of time, we shall go; others will take our place. It may be—I do not know about the future—that other parties will come in. And I felt that in a moment like this, to talk in this petty and small-minded way was not becoming. However, that is for each Member to choose how he should speak, and how he should present his case, but it does affect the major case. When we are talking about what really means the future of the country, the freedom of the country, the prosperity of the country and all that, to bring it down to this low level of personal criticism and abuse is not good.

Now, sometimes, in the course of this debate, Members have been rather excited, on the whole, not very much, I should say, in the four days, but still, sometimes.

It will be my endeavour to avoid saying anything which might have the result of exciting people. Of course, naturally, I may say something which is not liked. That is inevitable. But I have no desire to carry on this debate, towards the end of it specially, on a note of resentment and anger.

So, one of my disappointments in this debate which otherwise has been helpful in many ways has been the absence of a larger vision, to which we were looking forward to, and to which we as a Government have failed to come up. That would have been something which would have raised the debate and raised people's thinking, our failure being attached to the larger vision that we should possess or we are supposed to possess. There was hardly any reference to any large vision. When many years ago most of us here, not only on our side but on the other side of the House too, were participating in the struggle for freedom, under the leadership of Gandhiji, we had that larger vision, not only of freedom or of attaining independence, but something more all the time most of us had. There was a social objective, there was a vision of the future which we were going to build, and that gave us a certain vitality, a certain measure of a crusading spirit. Now, perhaps it is true that most of us are lost, are rather tied up in humdrum politics and petty matters of the day. Whether we are in the Government or in the Opposition, we are both tied up that way, and the larger vision escapes us, or sometimes only we have glimpses of it. And yet, if India is to go ahead, as we all want to, India will have to have a vision of the future, always to think of it, and always to judge our present conduct by seeing how far it comes up anywhere near that vision, because a country which has no vision gradually goes down. A country which has a wrong vision inevitably goes down, but a country which has no vision gradually loses its vital

energy and perishes ultimately. I do not think India is going to perish. It has not perished for five thousand years or more, it is not going to perish, but there is something in between, that is existing. I do not want India to exist, I want it to live a full life. I want it to advance, I want the people of India to flourish in every way, not only in the physical, material sense, but in other senses, cultural, intellectual, moral and other senses. It has much to learn from the world and also to give something to the world, because I have been convinced, I am convinced, that India does possess something which it can give to the rest of the world, although it has to learn much from the rest of the world also.

So, I have found in this debate, I am sorry to say, a singular lack of reference to this larger vision that we are supposed to have. Looking at things in perspective, I would say even looking at things in the economic aspect, the social aspect, the planning aspect, the perspective planning aspect, to look at things in some perspective—that is the very essence of planning, where we are going and how do we go?

Shri Masani gave expression to his views about economic affairs, and I am astounded that any intelligent people should talk in the way he did. There is no sense in it, no understanding of the modern world of economics as it is understood today. He said: why have a steel plant? A more astonishing remark it has not been my bad fortune to listen to. What does he expect? We should not have that, we should have small industries? I am all for small industries. We should have what is called no capital intensive works, that take up too much capital, and therefore we should advance like this? Where do machines come from for the small industries? We can get them from Germany, Japan, Russia, wherever you like, and pay heavily for them, go on paying for them. Is this anyone's conception of industrialisation of this country? No country

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

has been industrialised in that way. It is essential if you want industrialisation, as we want it, to have a base, an industrial base. Apart from pure industrialisation, it is essential for our strength, for our military strength, defence strength, to have an industrial base. That is the trouble we have today. We do not lack men, we do not lack stout men, brave men, in this country, but all the stout men in this country are precious little good ultimately when it comes to the use of modern weapons modern industry and all that. Therefore, I say you cannot even remain free in India without an industrial base. You cannot advance, industrialise this country, without an industrial base, and an industrial base means basic industries and mother industries, heavy industries and the like. As soon as that is established, smaller industries flow from them, and the rate of progress is fast. If you do not establish that, well, you remain tied up not only not advancing fast, but you are tied up to other countries who are economically dominant over you, who can prevent your growth, who can lower down the rate of progress. You are not economically free completely. That is not a prospect which I look forward to and I imagine that is not the prospect which this House will welcome.

We want real freedom. Real freedom is not merely political freedom; it is economic freedom in two senses. One in the sense that you do not have to rely on other countries. You are friends with them, you co-operate with them, you take their help, but you are not dependent upon them to carry on either for defence or anything else. And the second economic freedom I mean is economic freedom for the vast masses of our country, that is their having higher standards of living, leading a good life, not only physically, materially, but culturally and otherwise, and putting an end, as far as possible, in stages if you like, to these gross differences that exist in

India, which are not good for any country from any point of view.

It is difficult to remove them suddenly. Remember that we in India have had a background which is not a good background in spite of all our great thoughts and all that. The social background we have had to deal with in India has been a bad background, with caste and tremendous differences, and that has soaked down to millions and millions of our people, and that is why one of the big things that we have to do is to uproot that background, change the way of thinking, change the way of living. It is no good our thinking that the magnificent books we have, the Maha Bharata, the Ramayana and all that are a substitute, can cover up the evils of a bad background of thinking and action. We are backward, backward in our thinking, backward in our lives, in the way we live, backward in the way we treat others. All this caste system, and Harijans and this and that, it is a bad thing. That comes in the way even of bringing in material things. All that is changing, I know, and will change. But we have to have some idea of the demons that we have to contend against, and the problems here are much more intricate and deeper than possibly countries elsewhere might have, just fighting one demon of poverty.

So, in our domestic field, not today, but at least 30 years ago, more than 30 years ago, this Congress organisation—and many of the Members sitting opposite were Members of the Congress organisation—took a step which national organisations seldom do, took a step towards the formulation of some ideal of social justice, took a step about land reform. It did not take it, it could not do it, but it formulated a policy of land reform and social justice, and some steps towards the formulation of a public sector. This was the Karachi Congress, more than 30 years ago. Of course, the whole concept of Gandhiji,

although he did not talk perhaps in modern language, was not only one of social justice, but of social reform, land reform. All that was his. It was inevitable that Congress should begin to think that way because we became a party of the masses; even though we were not exactly proletarians or peasants and all that we were influenced by the mass of the people who became members of the Congress and so we were forced to think of agrarian reforms especially and other things too. Gradually this idea developed and ultimately we came to Independence and we passed a Constitution. It talks of social justice. It does not talk of socialism but practically it gives the background of what socialism is in the Constitution. Later this Parliament definitely adopted the ideal of socialism, and the Planning Commission too. If any hon. Member in the opposite side criticised us for not having gone fast enough on the road to realise socialism, I would accept that criticism; we have not gone fast enough. We have been slow for a variety of reasons, some within our control and some not in our control. But I am convinced that there is no choice for India, party or no party; no party whatever it may feel can stop this march to socialism in this country, to democratic socialism. We are perhaps the only country—I would not say only; I do not know—or the outstanding country where an attempt has been made to put this idea of social democracy and try to achieve it by planning. Planning has taken place in other places; they are not democratic places. Other countries which are democratic have not accepted planning. But the combination of the two is rather unique. Of course planning is a thing which everybody talks about now. But planning in the sense of an organised, well-thought out method of going step by step, putting a goal before you and marking out the steps you have to take—that is a scientific process but rather a complicated and

difficult process. Most people think that planning is to put together a number of things and schemes and proposals. They call that planning. That has nothing to do with planning; it is remote from planning. Planning is something which leads from one step to another and ultimately to the goal. It may not be quite accurate because conditions vary and there are many factors, the biggest being the human factor which you cannot wholly control. It is impossible for any one of us here to do that. Parliament cannot by any law say how 440 millions of our countrymen will work; they may create conditions for their work; they may help them and they may advise them. But you cannot force them to do something; human nature being what it is, at any rate in a democratic system you cannot do that.

So India took up this big tremendous adventure and thereby attracted attention all over the world because it was a great thing to do, especially having regard to our background of caste and other differences which we are faced with. We have been at it now for a dozen years or more; we have progressively learnt more. I think that we know more about it than we had when we started at the end of the First Plan. Not only have we collected more material in the shape of statistical material but all kinds of other ideas, discussions with all kinds of people. We have had the good fortune to discuss this matter with people from almost every major country in the world, certainly the countries of Europe, America, Russia, Japan including at one time, I believe, some Chinese people,—two or three specialists came—Scandinavia, Yugoslavia, we have discussed with them not individually but together with them sometimes. That was interesting to discuss it. There was a Soviet man apparently thinking in terms of Soviet planning; there was an American professor or somebody thinking in terms of or in the background of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

America, an Irishman, a Frenchman, a German—was sat together and often discussed it with them. It was extraordinary that although they differed in their ideological outlook—I use a word which is so often used—when they came down to hard facts of the Indian situation, it was extraordinary to see how much they agreed between themselves. The differed somewhere here and there because they realised that it is no good discussing ideological thoughts between themselves here; they discussed here what we had to do to meet a certain situation. They drew up thousands of papers and our Planning Commission is full of the papers they wrote jointly and separately. It was extraordinary to see how much they agreed even among themselves as to what we should do, although one thought on communist lines, another thought on some kind of socialist lines and a third on capitalist lines. But being economists usually they took a problem and had to solve it; they had to come round to that process of perspective planning, of laying great stress on heavy industry and of course other light industries must come. Power perhaps is the most important thing of all. If I could do it I would concentrate on power all over India realising that with the coming of power other things will come, power meaning electric power. So, we built it up. We made mistakes. The first thing that we realised was that it was no good thinking in terms of copying America or copying Russia or any other country. The problems of India are its own problems. We can learn from America, Russia and certainly we should. But the economic problems of India are different. In our colleges, I do not know now, but some years ago the economic books of America and England were taught and there was absolutely no use for that because those countries were thinking more or less of an affluent society in which they lived and they discussed the problems of the affluent society whereas we were a poverty-stricken

people and then we had to learn economics from books dealing with an affluent society. It was not much good. Of course it taught something. So, gradually the idea arose and it has arisen now, I believe, that economics is taught from the point of view of India and not from the point of view of America or Russia, learning from them of course as they have great experience. So, we have gone step by step. We always realise that the fundamental factor was the growth of agricultural production. That is basic, because however much we attach importance to industry—industry is a good thing—unless we had surplus from agriculture, if industry had no surplus, then we have nothing. We cannot live on doles from other countries. So, we attach the greatest importance to agriculture. At the same time we realise that by agriculture alone India will not go forward; however much agriculture may progress, industry has to come—industries of various kinds; heavy industries are the base and we need industries even for agricultural implements; we need small industry which could be allied to agriculture. In India that is very important that you should have some auxiliary industries which should fit in with the agricultural process. I am not at the moment thinking of what Gandhiji had said about hand-spinning and the like, but that does fit in. It is no good saying that hand-spinning is no good in the modern age, that it is not economic. It is useful under certain conditions in certain parts of India as things are. I do not say what would happen 15 or 20 years later. But what I was referring to is not merely hand-spinning but some village industries, preferably with electric power and modern techniques, because whether you do small industry or big industry or the biggest industry, one thing you must be sure of; that you use the latest modern techniques. It is no good using a bad technique, an ancient technique which is out-of-date.

Thinking like this we tried to proceed. There was the first five year Plan. Then the second Plan came. We got some more statistics and some more knowledge, some more experience and some more heart-breaks. And then came the third Plan in which we are now. We started with difficulties and are still carrying on a little better than we expected. The second Plan was in a bigger scale and achieved much more than the first. The third Plan, in spite of the various difficulties we have had, will no doubt, I think, improve the conditions of the country more than the second Plan made. And so we go on.

So, if you look at this broad picture, it is a picture not of something that produces defeatism; it is an optimistic picture, in spite of the vast difficulties in India, in spite of the population problem on which Shri Frank Anthony laid great stress; it is a good picture, and I am quite sure we shall succeed.

But the basic thing, the main thing in India is the peasant: how to change his mental outlook; how to modernise, how, by making him use the modern tools and modern ideas in a certain measure, to get him out of the rut in which he is living from ages past. With that end in view, we started community development. We succeeded to some extent and then they fell into a rut. There is an enormous capacity in India for people, whatever goodwill they have, to fall into a rut. I may confess that even Governments have that habit; certainly Opposition have it even more. I will tell you why: not that the Government are better than the Opposition; of course not. The Government after all have to deal with day-to-day problems which force them to think. The Opposition has not got to think of them, and it thinks in terms of slogans and criticisms and lives where it is. It does not advance at all.

My colleague the Finance Minister and my colleague the Minister of

Food and Agriculture have spoken of their respective departments with ability and given a number of figures, etc. I do not propose to trouble the House with those points. But I would like to make clear one thing. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia referred to something—he calculated that the income of 60 per cent of the people is three annas per day. I confess that I cannot make out how he arrived at this remarkable figure. I believe he has made various mistakes in his mathematics. First of all, the total he has given is wrong. The chief mistake he has made is, he has confused per family and per capita income. Therefore, he has reduced it by dividing it by five; so it comes down by the division of five. I cannot exactly state what it is. It should be at least five times that; it may be much more. I have not calculated it.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Landless labourers do not get 15 annas a day.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Kripalani may be right about some particular pocket or something, but he said that "27 crores of people have this income". That, I say, is completely wrong on the basis of the facts available in the books.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या प्रधान मंत्री ने हिसाब लगा लिया है कि मैं पांच गुना ज्यादा बता रहा हूँ ?

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : जी हाँ । जो गलती डा० लोहिया ने की है वह यह है कि पर कैपिटल इनकम को पर फैमिली कर दिया है । वह घबरा गए, और फैमिली को उन्होंने पांच क गिना और उस इनकम को पांच से डिवाइड कर दिया ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अच्छा हिसाब लगा लीजिये कि २७ करोड़ आदमियों की आमदनी ३ आने प्रति आदमी के हिसाब से

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

कितनी आती है और एक रुपये के हिसाब से कितनी आती है। इसमें प्रधान मंत्री जी बड़ी भारी भूल कर रहे हैं।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : मैंने हिसाब लगा लिया। इस बारे में मेरे पास एक इकानमिस्ट साहब का नोट है जो कि इस प्रकार है :

"Dr. Lohia has confused per capita income of Rs. 25 per month with family income and has based all his deductions on this simple fallacy drawing naturally absurd conclusions."

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : किसका नोट है ?

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : एक साहब का है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : तो उन सब से शाम के वक्त बात कर लीजियेगा। बड़ा पछतायेंगे आप।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : पछतायेंगे ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : खेती कारखानों का ज्ञान आपका बड़ा कम है।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have ventured to say the main approach of the Government in regard to domestic policy. Of course, excepting the main approach there may be hundred and one variations of it, hundreds of criticisms, many mistakes and faults etc. I cannot go into that. But I do submit that essentially our problem was an economic and social problem and we have tried to look at it in perspective. We are thinking in perspective. We are thinking in terms of 15 years ahead (Interruption). Because Acharya Ranga does not believe in planning he thinks it is a laughing matter for

us to look at it. Enough for the day is the evil thereof. But I suggest, if he reads even the Third Five Year Plan Report he will get some glimpses into our thinking; he will get more, do doubt, if other papers are placed before him.

The planning itself involves very important aspects. There is education which is essential. People grow by education and all other social measures. One of the happiest things that has happened in India is the growth of education. At present 70 per cent of the boys and girls of school going age are going to school and it will be 76 per cent in two years' time. That is what is expected to be. Unfortunately, this emergency and menace from China has, here as elsewhere, slightly impeded the progress we are aiming at. So, if you look at India, you will see many things which break one's heart, poverty, misery and all that, and yet you will see something which is heartening and that is this. All stagnation has gone, or is going, and a certain dynamism has come into life in India. I do not at all wish to miss the fact of the poverty and horrors of the Indian scene even now, but it is changing; that is the main thing. It has got out of the old rut and I think it will change pretty soon. The rate of the change will become faster and faster than in the past.

And all this has been done with the democratic structure of Government. In fact, if I may say so with all respect, the very fact of the no-confidence motion that we are debating today is a proof of that structure. It will be a good exercise for us to look round a little to the other countries of Asia and elsewhere, specially the newly independent countries and compare what we have done with what they have done or are doing. A few of them have maintained democracy. But, even apart from that, let us see how far they have progressed on the economic and social plane. I am not

going to compare India with China now, partly because I do not know enough about China, about the progress made by China because the reports are often conflicting. But I do know that the cost that they have paid for this economic progress has, to some extent, been a very heavy one in individual and personal liberties. I do not want to take that kind of cost into account while comparing us with other countries. When we compare us with other countries excluding China, the rate of our progress has been heartening. It is no good comparing our rate of progress with, let us say, Germany, Russia or Japan. Shri Masani talked of the miracle of Germany. It is all very good to speak about the miracle of Germany, but Germany was a highly industrialised State before the war with everybody almost an engineer, a trained person, so that when they sat down after the war to build up there was material on which to build up. So, they built on it. Japan did the same. Russia, which is a socialist or communist State, did almost the same, because it had the background, the industrial complex behind it and the trained people behind it. We have to suffer because we have not got that complex. We are trying to build it. We have built it up partly. So, I would submit that in spite of the poverty in India, there is no doubt, it does not require much in the way of statistics to see it, there is greater welfare in India, except in some pockets, than ever before. We can see that in the food they eat. In fact, they eat more and they eat better food. They wear more clothing; they had precious little previously. They have better housing. Schools are growing everywhere and health facilities are growing. Some people have even the temerity to talk about the miracle of India. They talk of the foreigners, what they have seen of the changes in India during the last dozen years which laid the base for future growth.

We have to choose always, whether we are going to give some benefit to people on our ter-

benefit today, or keep it for tomorrow or the day after. Looking at from the country's point of view, by spending the money we have we can get some petty benefits today. But that will not yield any permanent benefit. That is obvious. And one has to find a healthy balance between today's benefit and tomorrow's. All this business of heavy industries we have put in is for tomorrow's benefit, though it brings in some benefit today too. But it takes some years before it yields fruits.

So, the strategy of economic development is first and essentially agriculture, modernisation of agriculture, the training of our rural masses to use new tools and new methods and, at the same time, to lay the foundations of an industrial structure by building the basic heavy industries and, above all, to produce electric power. Middle and small industries inevitably come in their train.

If you got to the parts of the Punjab today, you will see the industrial revolution coming on as you watch it. The revolutionary change that is coming over the Punjab is amazing. The Punjab at the present moment is the most prosperous province so far as *per capita* income is concerned. It is not I—I have no great experience—but Americans coming as tourists who say that it is remarkable how this rapid growth of industrial revolution creeping up resembles what they have themselves experienced in some parts of America. So all these things are happening.

One thing that we have to lay great stress on, apart from this, is that we cannot only think of tomorrow and the day after. People who have not even got the minimum standard of living have to be thought of today. That we all agree. It is always a question of our resources and how we spread them out. It is a complicated question. Some of our advisers have told us, "Forget today. think only of tomorrow." That cannot be done. On the other hand, if

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

we think only of today, we do not make any progress.

The broad picture is that the rate of progress has increased progressively after every Plan. I have no doubt that the progress of the Third Plan period will be substantially higher than that achieved in the Second Plan. In terms of the key growth potential, that is, the infrastructure, the progress has been creditable. National income over ten-year period has risen by 42 per cent as against the growth of population by 21 per cent. Per capita income has increased by 16 per cent. That is not enough, I admit, but it is not so bad as somebody would think.

I think, Shri Anthony talked about production and thought that it will all be overwhelmed by the growth of population. He said that. But the principle thing is that foundations have been laid now by this infrastructure for a rapid rate of growth in the future. I hope that by the end of the Third Plan or in the Fourth Plan we shall progressively approach that stage when we grow ourselves, if I may say so, without too much pushing from outside.

The hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture has said that foodgrains have gone up from 52 million tons to 80 million tons and I expect it to go up in the next three years to 95 million tons or even to 100 million tons. Industrial production has shown remarkable progress. There is no doubt about that. So, has transport and so has power.

In technical education, the degree level intake which was 4,100 in 1950-51 is nearly 14,000 now and is likely to be over 21,000 in 1965-66. For the diploma level the intake has risen from 5,900 to 25,000 and will be 46,000 and so on.

One thing about population. Shri Anthony thought that we should follow Japan's example and encourage abortion. I might mention that even

in Japan this has not been looked upon with favour as it is found that this method adversely affects the health of the mother. The Lady Rama Rao Committee definitely gave its opinion against abortion as a method of population control after examining all the evidence. As a matter of fact, the other methods are growing in use in India. There are at present over 3,000 family planning clinics in the villages and in the towns. The progress of voluntary sterilisation has been much more than expected. Up till February 1963, 334, 477 persons are reported to have been sterilised. This may not appear to be a big number considering the population but it is a steadily growing number. We think these methods are safer than abortion or anything like it.

I do not think I need say much about non-alignment. It has been adequately discussed and Shri Krishna Menon spoke a great deal about it with ability.

But I would ask Archarya Kripalani to consider whether he was right in saying—I believe he said it—that Panch Sheel was Panch nonsense. Now, I should like him to tell me which part of Panch Sheel is nonsense. I will repeat to him: the first is independence; the second is non-aggression, non-interference; then, about the third—what it is. . . .

Shri Nath Pai: Mutual respect.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Territorial integrity.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is No. 4 or No. 5.

Shri Nath Pai: We know it better than you.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I was surprised to hear him using the word 'nonsense'. I submit that Panch Sheel is the only basis for international relations. Anything else is not civilised relationship and leads

to trouble, conflict and war. The fact that China after subscribing to Panch Sheel breaks it and attacks us does not make Panch Sheel wrong. Obviously, the fault is of China, if you like to say so. But the Panch Sheel is not wrong, the principles underlying international relationships.

Shri Hem Barua: There cannot be no unilateral implementation of Panch Sheel.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am submitting that Panch Sheel is a right principle to lay down. The implementation may be wrong from one side or the other. That can be examined. But it is a principle that is not only right but a civilised principle which must exist between countries unless they are mutually at war and so to some extent the present major conflict between Soviet Union and China is based on that. China does not believe in peaceful co-existence. It says so and Russia says, it does. Of course, behind that lie national conflicts between the two.

Now, there is one thing more. It was said by Acharya Kripalani as well as by others that I hid from Parliament the fact of Chinese aggression for a long time. I have dealt with this in the Lok Sabha previously and I do not want to go into any detail because it can easily be seen—my previous speeches and answers. And I do submit that this is entirely a wrong idea. What happened was that in 1958—it was end of 1958, late autumn—we first heard of the Aksai Chin road being made. We did not know where it was exactly. We sent two sets of people separately to find out where it was, whether it was in our territory or not because Aksai Chin road spreads out behind that. It took months for them to come back because all these are real mountaineering expeditions. One of them came back after some months and the other was captured by the Chinese. All this took months. We wrote to the Chinese to say that we had sent some people on our ter-

ritory and whether they knew anything about them, and that they had not yet come back. Thereupon, they replied, "Oh, yes. They transgressed our territory and we arrested them. But now as we are friends with you, we are releasing them." That was the first regular information we had that Aksai Chin road had been built in our territory. That was in 1958. In October 1958 I think we sent a protest about this matter to the Chinese Government. About this time—end of 1958, beginning of 1959—the Tibetan rebellion took place against the Chinese rule and our attention had been rather diverted. The Tibetan rebellion took place; people came from Tibet; later the Dalai Lama came; many refugees came. And in our subsequent communications to China those things took rather the first place. But reference was continued to be made about this Aksai Chin road.
17 hrs.

We first informed Parliament about this in 1959—I forget the exact date at the present moment, but it was in 1959. It might be said that we might have informed them three or four months earlier. We must have been waiting for the reply from them; and as soon as the reply came the Tibetan rebellion and other developments took place, and we informed Parliament. There was no long delay in it, and there was obviously no desire to hide anything from Parliament.

Now, Acharya Kripalani has said that we should break off diplomatic relations with China. He asked: why don't we declare war? All I can say is that it would be very unwise for us to do so. It may be a brave gesture. But in our opinion it would be unwise; it will not help us in any way, and it may hinder us in many ways. Nothing comes in the way of our strengthening our defences, as we are trying to do to the best of our ability, and at the same time always to keep the door open, whether it is Pakistan or whether it is China, for peaceful settlement, provided it is honourable and in keeping with our thinking.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

Now, Acharya Kripalani said something about our defence, and I asked our Defence Minister to give me a note on this question and I shall read that note. I wanted to be sure that what I said was correct.

"Shri Kripalani has alleged that the decision taken to drive away the Chinese Army as announced by the Prime Minister on his way to Ceylon was taken without any consultation whatsoever with the officers incharge of the Army in NEFA, that it is a political decision arrived at in Delhi and that it was astounding that military decisions of the battlefield should be taken without consulting the Army Headquarters at the spot by civilians. He has challenged the Government to publish the NEFA Enquiry Report as people have reason to believe that there has been treachery.

The Enquiry Report cannot be published in view of the secret nature of its contents and the security risk involved. But the Defence Minister intends to make a statement relating to the contents to the extent they can be disclosed on the floor of the House during the session.

The allegations made by Shri Kripalani are absolutely without foundation. Decisions on important matters—and decision with regard to the attitude to be adopted in case of attack by China was an important matter—could only be taken at Delhi. There could not be one decision; a number of decisions had to be taken as the situation developed from time to time. Those decisions were taken by Government in full consultation with the Chiefs of Staff and other senior Army officers concerned and in the light of their expert advice. This applies particularly to the decision that the Army should not withdraw in October-November 1962 from its forward positions in NEFA. While decisions of a certain nature can only be taken ultimately by Government, it is incorrect to say that decisions were taken without consulting the

appropriate army authorities. The charge of treachery is of course baseless."

This note the Defence Minister has given me. I may mention this, because it was on my way to Ceylon that I was asked by the press correspondents about the frontier situation. I told them that we intend pushing them out. I do not see anything wrong about it, and that, as a matter of fact, was our decision, our military decision; the date was not fixed; and that was the only thing that I could say at that time, and I refused to say anything else.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The press report then was that Government had ordered the Army in NEFA to push them out, not that it was intended to push them out, but they had ordered the Army to push out the Chinese.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That may be so; it might have been that. We had told the Army to push them out.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: You had issued instructions to the Army.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But my point is that that was not a sudden inspiration which I had. That was the result of talks with the Army generals and others, and on their advice—not their advice that I should say it to the press.

Shri Krishna Menon had said something about the kind of Army that we have inherited. It is a good Army from the point of view of the soldier, but it was not a modern Army. It is all very well for it to go and function as a part of the British Army in the Great War; and they did well. All our efforts have been concentrated on gradually modernising it. The modernising process is so expensive; if we take the whole Army, it would involve about Rs. 1000 crores, taking the Army even as it was. And with the continuous pressure on us, on not spending too much, I know, and my

colleague the Finance Minister knows very well how repeatedly demands were made from the Defence Ministry or the Army Headquarters for more expenditure, but we discouraged them; sometimes, we might have cut them down too; they were in such fantastic figures, in geometrical proportion, or in astronomical figures that if suddenly somebody asks for Rs. 500 crores it will be difficult to give it, and it is always difficult except when you are faced with a war situation, when the country and Parliament and everybody thinks differently. That is what has happened now. As regards the amount we are spending now, the taxes that the Finance Minister has put would probably have met with much stronger opposition if there had not been this war or semi-war situation facing us. Even so, the process of modernisation was given some start.

There is one thing that I must say, and that is that I am surprised at Acharya Kripalani talking about the Army and saying it has no clothes and no shoes, as if we send them naked to the field: I do not understand this. I think my hon. friend said in his speech that they did not have shoes or boots.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I said that it did not have shoes for those high altitudes; I was referring to mountain boots with which they can work in snow. I have made my point very clear. I did not say that they had no shoes.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Everyone had stout boots.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: But stout boots do not work there.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They do work; but it is true that for going in the snow, you do want snow boots.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: That was my complaint. That was all my complaint. They did not have snow boots.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Everyone had blankets, shoes, clothing etc. What happened was this; they did not take more blankets because they had to carry them. So, they said 'Send them by air afterwards'.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: But there is a Government communique asking from the people all those things, such as blankets, pull-overs, and everything else.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Of course.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That was after the debacle.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is perfectly true, because. . .

Shri J. B. Kripalani: You had nothing.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We were giving these not only to those people at the front but also to others, even to newcomers, because new people were also joining the Army. But everyone of them had two blankets, plus two more which they had to take but which they had left over, because they did not want to carry them and they had said 'Send them by air'.

Shri Ranga: That was not enough.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not said anything about Pakistan. In fact, very little has been said about Pakistan by hon. Members who have spoken, except that some reference has been made to Shri Rajagopalachari's kind offer of Kashmir to Pakistan. Our policy consistently will be, will continue to be, to seek some settlement with Pakistan. It is not a question of settlement about Kashmir or some other matter, but a settlement which removes our bitterness against each other and brings a feeling, which creates co-operation between the two countries. There can be no other objective to aim at.

One of the Members of the Opposition Parties talks, I am sorry to say,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

very irresponsibly about things like Akhand Bharat and the like. They do talk about that. That is in the programme which they issued. They may not have said so here. That is very harmful. It is not merely folly, but it does harm, because it frightens the people in Pakistan, that people here want to upset Pakistan. Nobody here wants to do that and can do that, and it would be extreme folly if India ever tried to do that; it would ruin India, ruin Kashmir and ruin Pakistan.

I feel we may have been wrong in minor things. But I think that throughout these many years since Pakistan came into existence and the Kashmir trouble arose, we have always looked forward to a settlement of it. But a settlement does not mean our doing something which is completely wrong from our point of view, Kashmir's point of view and the people of Kashmir's point of view. That is a different matter. We shall continue to do that.

Indeed, I may say even about China that we shall always leave the door open for an honourable settlement with China, whenever it may come. It may not come soon; it may come later....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It must not be too wide open.

Shri Hem Barua: They may walk in if it is too wide open.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Only a little open. Keep it a jar.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We are living in a strange world, and if I may submit, our foreign policy—that is a test of it—has succeeded in putting us vis-a-vis other countries in a far more advantageous position than China is. It is no small matter that we have not only the goodwill but the active help of great powers like the United States and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has been

helping us in various ways and, as the House knows, in regard to Kashmir, it has been our staunch supporter.

Shri Prakash Vir Shastri delivered a 15-minute address to the House in which he managed to put in as much condemnation and vituperation as it was possible within 15 minutes. I was surprised and pained to hear it, because many of the things he said had no basis. But he was evidently angry and he expressed himself. It is now too late to talk about the subject of corruption. It is obvious nobody here can have any two opinions about corruption. It must be rooted out and it is a tremendous headache to all of us, how to deal with it.

Shri Jashvant Mehta (Bhavnagar): Question.

An Hon. Member: Question.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If they say question, I do not know what they think. It is, if I may say so, a result of the democratic process, and I am a little afraid that as this process grows, for instance it is going down to the villages, it may bring with it its painful accompaniment. We have been trying to deal with it, and we have dealt with it. Hon. Members are probably thinking more and hearing a lot about Ministers and the like. Many of these complaints that are made come to me, or are sent to me, and we, first of all, have them thoroughly examined. We get some kind of explanation, that is the procedure adopted, from the person concerned, from the Minister concerned, and if there is anything even *prima facie* worthy of an enquiry, we first have private enquiries. Thereafter, we decide whether any other enquiry should be made or not. As a matter of fact, most of these complaints that have come, and which are talked about in the newspapers, have provided no ground at all after examination. They are exaggerated.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Was it an impartial examination?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Impartial, of course. The man who examined was impartial, he had nothing to do with that.

Some are still under examination, some I am examining myself, having got reports from both concerned, the one who accuses and the accused himself.

Then there is the Serajuddin matter. There has been, of course, Mr. Das's enquiry, but apart from that, there are four or five cases that are going to the courts, and I think, I am not quite sure whether they have actually gone there or are going in a day or two. It will deal with all the Serajuddin affairs. Then there is some connection of Orissa people with Serajuddin. As a rule, these matters should be dealt with by the State, but we, nevertheless, sent for papers etc., and my colleague, the Finance Minister and I examined many of them. Some of them have been, I think, as some one said, referred to the Public Accounts Committee. First they were referred to the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and the Leader of the Opposition. After accepting that work he rejected, he would not do it. Then it was sent to the Public Accounts Committee as a whole, and I think that the Public Accounts Committee is a very suitable body. It contains Members of several parties, and the Accountant-General is there to help them, and it is right they should go into this matter. It affects governmental moneys also.

For instance, the present Deputy Chief Minister of Orissa, right from the beginning, almost *suo moto*, sent me and the Home Minister a long list of moneys he had received from Serajuddin, he was not a Minister then, and he said: these I have received, these were received by me for the Congress; every month he sent me

Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000 or something like that, and I have spent it for two purposes, for Congress and for giving scholarships to poor students. And there it is. It has been examined, and it fitted in with some entries in Serajuddin's books too. There was nothing to examine because he admitted the thing, and he was not a Minister at that time at all. The only question was whether it was properly spent or not.

So, all these things are being looked into as far as we can, but the main thing is what process we can devise to deal with this major problem. It is not an easy matter and I hope we shall devise some process. There is of course, for officials, the special police establishment and every month I receive a report from them giving me a list of cases examined, cases started in a court of law or cases in which departmental action has been taken. It is a good and substantial report. Quite a number of people are punished that way.

But as I pointed out that something if possible has to be done. Of course mere measures like this may not succeed in routing out such an evil. In this matter we naturally want the co-operation of the public and of Members, Opposition and others.

Before I finish, I should like to say one thing. We have got a very hard task which is not only internal—that of course it is—but I am now talking about the menace on the border, a very difficult one. We must stand up to it, face it and strengthen ourselves. But everybody knows how strength in such matters depends not only on arms, armies and armaments but on the morale of the people, on the unity and morale of the people. We saw some evidence of this unity and morale in November, December and January last. I would beg of the hon. Members to consider how far this morale is strengthened, the sense of unity is strengthened by this motion of no-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

confidence or by the strikes that had taken place in Bombay. As a matter of fact if hon. Members had occasion to read the Chinese Press which I see every day; how they gloat over these things. How they gloat over this motion of no-confidence.....

(An Hon. Member: Pakistan too). Of course. It encourages them. I believe one of the reasons, perhaps a major reason, they attacked us last October was the feeling in their minds that India was faced with many disruptive tendencies and if they gave us a blow, we will split up into fragments. They were mistaken of course. The opposite has happened. The fact is there that apart from what they may think, what effect we may have on our Army and our own people if they feel that we quarrel too much among ourselves; it must demoralise them. Anyhow, personally I am grateful for having had this motion of no confidence and I think it has done us some good to hear speeches and to make them. Thank you.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक ऐसा सवाल उठाया गया है तीन आने और पन्द्रह आने का, जिसके बारे में मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं आप से ...

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : तीन आने और पन्द्रह आने वाली बात अगर सही है तो मैं इस सदन से निकल जाऊंगा और अगर वह गलत है तो उनको प्रधान मंत्री बने र ने का कोई हक नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान के २७ करोड़ आदमियों

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस वक्त तो बैठ जाइये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : प्रधान मंत्री ने मेरे दिमाग को ओछा कर दिया है। मैं

उनके दिमाग को ओछा, भन्दा और डरपोक कहता हूँ।

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I am sorry—with your permission and with the permission of the House, if you do not mind, I will sit and reply.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have to apologize to you and to the House for having even for a little while lost my temper. I considered the ex-Defence Minister's performance as an insult to my country; yet I think I should have kept my temper. I am sorry for that.

However, it has been a long discussion and it will require of me some time to be able to answer all the criticisms that have been levelled against me personally and against this no-confidence motion. I had not mentioned in my speech even one name, even in connection with bribery and corruption. My speech was in general terms. I wanted to keep the discussion on this motion on a very sane level. And it seems some of the Congressmen did not give me credit for my preliminary remarks when I said that it was with great sorrow that I was obliged to move this motion. It was a call of duty and it was a call of conscience, as I said, and I tried to represent my country people here. I brought in no personalities at all, but a very senior member of the Cabinet taunted me with the wisdom of Mrs. Kripalani.

Some Hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Why was Mrs. Kripalani's name brought in? I will tell you. Because I do not keep my wife under a purdah and I do not mind when she disobeys me, and I am not ashamed to take her with me when I go out in company. These are the people who may be doing