

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can only state his point of order. He cannot make a speech. He has already taken five minutes.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं प्रधान मंत्री से कुछ निवेदन करूंगा। उन्हें चाहिये कि वह अब अपना कोई बयान न दें। अगर वह चाहते हैं कि हम अच्छी तरह से किसी बात की सचाई को खोल लें . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जाय।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरे तर्क को आप सुन लीजिय। एक मिनट में मैं अपनी बात कह देता हूँ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You do not want him to make a statement; he should lay the Statement on the Table.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं आगुमेंट दे रहा हूँ।

Shri Paliwal (Hindaun): You have already ruled that it is not a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He cannot go on making a speech like this.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं एक मिनट में आप को तर्क बता देता हूँ। प्रधान मंत्री अपने बयान में जिम्मेदारी ओढ़ कर के और फिर उस जिम्मेदारी से छटक जाया करते हैं। सवाल जवाब के बिना प्रधान मंत्री का बयान . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point of order. It is to help the House during the discussion of the no-confidence Motion that this statement is being made. He had given the assurance that he is going to make a statement. It is the desire of the House that he should make the statement.

There is no point of order.

The hon. Prime Minister.

302(Ai) LSD—5.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप के इस तरह से चिल्लाने का मुझ पर कोई असर नहीं होगा। मैं एक बात धाद दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

Shri Bagri: On a point of order.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जायें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरा तर्क सुन लीजिय . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry. Please resume your seat. Your leader has raised the question and I have given my ruling.

श्री बागड़ी : कार्लिंग एटेशन नहीं हो सकता है, एडजर्नमेंट मोशन नहीं हो सकता है बोट आफ नो-कोन्फिडेंस से पहले, तो इन के बयान की क्या जरूरत है।

CHINESE TROOP CONCENTRATIONS ALONG THE INDIA-CHINA BORDER

The Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Since I placed White Paper No. VIII, containing notes, memoranda and letters exchanged between the Governments of India and the People's Republic of China, on 23rd January, 1963, further exchange of a large number of communications has taken place. I am placing on the Table of the House White Paper No. IX containing notes, memoranda and letters exchanged between the Governments of India and China between January and July, 1963. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1415/63.]

When I last spoke on the subject of the India-China conflict on 7th May, I placed copies of the Government of India's note of 3rd April, in which we had suggested a series of constructive steps to be taken for the settlement of the Sino-Indian border differences, and of my letter to Prime Minister Chou En-lai dated 1st May,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

which reviewed the events of the last few months since the Chinese massive attack and reiterated our desire for a peaceful settlement of our differences with China and referred to the constructive suggestions we had made. There has been no response to these communications from the Government of the People's Republic of China so far.

Apart from the fact that there has been no response from China to the constructive suggestions that we had made for peaceful settlement of the differences, some alarming developments have since taken place along the India-China border areas which have been causing us concern. The House will remember the hostile and negative attitude adopted by the Chinese Government to the Colombo Conference proposals. The Chinese, in total disregard of the Colombo proposals, proceeded to implement their so-called declaration of unilateral cease-fire and withdrawal and proceeded to set up 26 civilian posts in the demilitarised zone in the three sectors ostensibly "for normal movement of border inhabitants, prevention of the activities of saboteurs and maintenance of public order along the border". Seven of these so-called civilian posts were set up unilaterally in the demilitarised zone in the Western sector in violation of the Colombo proposals which laid down that there should be civil posts of both sides in this demilitarised zone. In the demilitarised zone in the Eastern sector, in which there were to be 16 civilian posts according to the Chinese unilateral declaration, there are today as many as 52 combined military and civil posts and even the pretence of the posts being civilian in character has been given up. There is, apart from these posts, considerable patrolling and probing activity along the borders, particularly in the Eastern Sector.

For our part, the Government of India have not only scrupulously ob-

served the Colombo proposals but also refrained from impeding in any way the declaration of unilateral cease-fire and withdrawals made by China. We had hoped that the friendly advice of the Colombo countries would exercise a moderating influence and the Chinese will accept the Colombo proposals. We expected that they will, in any case, adhere to their unilateral declaration. This hope has been belied as the Chinese have acted, not only in violation of the Colombo Proposals but in violation even of their unilateral declaration by establishing a large number of military posts in the demilitarised zone and resorted to offensive patrolling and probing in the border areas.

This is not all. They have inducted fresh troops into Tibet and augmented the strength of their forces along the border. The strength of the Chinese forces along our borders today is larger than what it was at the time of the unprovoked massive attacks in October 1962. Apart from this augmentation of Chinese forces, a further development has been the forward movement of these troops to camps and strong points nearer the Indian border than they were last October. There has been, during the last few months, considerable activity by way of construction of barracks, gun emplacements, storage dumps and airfields near the Indian border. There has also been great activity in the construction of roads, laying of underground telephone lines and construction of inter-connecting subterranean trenches along these border areas. Chinese land and air intrusions into Indian areas and Indian air space have also increased considerably, particularly during the last few months.

All these activities make it clear that the augmented Chinese forces are consolidating their position immediately to the north of the Indian border with a view to maintaining a

state of permanent tension in those areas. They might even be contemplating using these forward bases that they have consolidated for another thrust into India.

It is difficult to gauge Chinese intentions. That they are not exactly friendly is, however, clear. We understand that on 17th July the Chinese Government presented a memorandum to the Heads of Missions of the Colombo Conference countries in Peking citing the so-called military provocations by India. It may be that, consistently with their past practice, this might be a move to justify their renewed aggression against India on the specious ground of "counter-attacking in self-defence". We have brought these developments of Chinese aggressive activity along our border to the notice of the Governments of the Colombo Conference countries.

The militant and aggressive attitude of China has been much in evidence in recent months not only *vis-a-vis* India-China relations but in the wider field of international relations including their attitude to the recent partial Test Ban Treaty which has been acclaimed by almost all countries and people of the world as a significant first step towards a relaxation of international tensions and a promising move towards purposeful measures of world peace and disarmament.

We hope wiser counsels will prevail and China will revert to the paths of peace. We want a peaceful settlement of our border differences with China and we have repeatedly made constructive suggestions regarding the series of practical steps to be taken to this end. The Chinese authorities, however, have not only not responded to these constructive suggestions but intensified their aggressive preparations along our borders. In the context of unprovoked massive Chinese attacks to which we were subjected last October-November, we

have to take note of these aggressive developments, face the facts of the situation and calmly and resolutely intensify our defensive preparations to resist any further threat to our territorial integrity.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hosangabad): On a point of clarification. Is the Prime Minister in a position to categorically assure the House that his Government and armed forces are today better prepared than they were last autumn to meet the mounting Chinese threat which may any time deteriorate into a massive invasion?

An Hon. Member: Of course, they are.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): May I ask this as a supplementary to it? He said we should be prepared to meet any further thrust. Does it mean that the Government of India is not contemplating any steps, apart from the Colombo proposals, to procure the vacuation of the territory occupied by the enemy?

Shri Hem Barua: May I put a question?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How many persons?

Shri Hem Barua: My name is also there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, he may put his question.

Shri Hem Barua: From the statement just made by the Prime Minister, it is evident that the Chinese intentions are very militant and aggressive, and they have created about 52 combined military and civil posts in the eastern sector. I am perturbed about one thing only, and I want a clarification from the Prime

[Shri Hem Barua.]

Minister. Last time we had our military posts in NEFA and yet unfortunately we suffered reverses. This time, as far as my information goes, we do not have any military posts in NEFA; except that we have extended our civil control over NEFA, NEFA is almost a no man's land.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Please put the question.

Shri Hem Barua: Because we do not have any military posts in NEFA, I want to know from the Prime Minister how he proposes to defend NEFA and Assam, the whole eastern sector.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not in a position to talk about where military forces should be kept. That is for the defence advisers and army people to decide as to what is most desirable and what is likely to bear the greatest results. Obviously, we are going to defend Assam and NEFA.

One thing more may I say? I have said that I am placing White Paper No. IX. In addition to that, I am placing on the Table copies of Premier Chou En-lai's letter of 2nd August, 1963 and my reply thereto dated 14th August.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He has not answered the question whether his Government and armed forces are better prepared than last year.

Shri Nath Pai: He referred only to the further thrust. What about the existing occupation? What does he propose to do about it?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not quite understood.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The question is whether the Prime Minister is in a position to categorically assure the House that his Government as well as the armed forces are today

better prepared than they were last year to meet the mounting Chinese threat which may any time erupt into a massive invasion as he himself said.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I think so, definitely. (*Interruption*).

Shri Hem Barua: My question has not been answered. It was a pertinent question. Is the Prime Minister prepared to give the reply? He has not given any categorical assurance in that respect. It was the Prime Minister who revealed on the floor of this House that not to send troops to NEFA was a military decision and a political decision also. I wanted to know whether we are prepared to defend NEFA and what measures have we taken in that respect. (*Interruption*).

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I have to make another submission, about a different matter altogether. I have written to the Speaker and to the Prime Minister also to see that the report of the enquiry made by Justice Das is placed on the Table of the House. We are discussing the no-confidence motion on the 19th. Only 17th remains as a working day before that. I hope the Prime Minister will place the report here tomorrow. The Speaker had sent me word that the Prime Minister, after making some other statements, will place that report.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is for the Government to decide.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It is for the Government to decide, but we must know whether they are doing it tomorrow or any other day. We would like to have it before the no-confidence motion is discussed in this House. Let us know whether he is placing it on the Table tomorrow.

Shri Ranga: It is for you to advise or direct the Government.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I cannot force the Government.

Shri Ranga: Either advice or direction can be given by the Speaker. It is a very important matter, and prior notice has already been given by my hon. friend. Surely we would expect the Government to be prepared to place the report on the Table of the House in order to enable the House to have a discussion on that motion.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I wanted to make a reference to it on the first day, but the Speaker promised me that he had sent word to the Prime Minister about it. So, what is the reply of the Prime Minister? I want to know whether he is going to place it tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is for them to decide.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The Speaker had considered it and it was the Speaker's assurance that he would write to the Prime Minister about it.

Shri Hem Barua: The report must be placed on the Table of the House.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I propose, Sir, to make a statement about the matter referred to by the hon. Member, that is, the report of Justice Das. But, as I have stated previously, I am not able to place the report on the Table of the House. I have consulted again the Chief Justice of India and Justice Das and they are unable to agree to my placing it; or else, they said I could place bits of it, taking off the most important part of it. That, I think, is most undesirable—to leave out all the vital parts. Therefore, I am not going to place it, and I have said that in the last session too. But I am going to make a statement on this question tomorrow.

Shri Nath Pal: It is a very important question.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It raises a very important question of principle.

On the last occasion, when the Prime Minister said that he was not going to place the report of the judge concerned on the Table of the House, it was our feeling—and we gave expression to it at that time—that if a matter is mentioned in Parliament and an enquiry is made in pursuance of the announcement by the Prime Minister in Parliament, it is part of the privilege of Parliament, the right of Parliament, the prerogative of Parliament, to have complete copy of the report presented. This is a matter of concern to Parliament. It is purely a technical matter. I feel also that it is unfair to Parliament and unfair to the Minister concerned that the report is being withheld. I have a definite feeling that the Minister was pursued by certain elements, particularly the oil companies, who do all kinds of things—bribery, murder, subversion of Governments in different countries. It is their way, and that is why he was hounded, and perhaps for a technical default he has been pushed out, while other Ministers are going on in this Ministry who have done very much worse things. (*Interruption*). It is only fair to the Minister concerned and it is fair to Parliament that whatever enquiry is made by the judge is placed on the Table. As the Prime Minister said, the judges only permit something to be placed here. The judges do not have the final say in the matter. Parliament is supreme. The Prime Minister is answerable to Parliament. Therefore, the Prime Minister is under an obligation, moral as well as constitutional, to place this matter entirely, in fairness to the Minister and in fairness to Parliament, before the House. (*Interruption*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I beg to disagree with the arguments of Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

Shri Hem Barua: I want to refer to.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: About the same matter?

Shri Hem Barua: Yes; it is of vital concern, and we are vitally concerned. There is a large group of people who are corrupt in this country, and also a Minister has indulged in corrupt practices. Therefore, we should have the entire report before us in order that we may get a correct picture about that man.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is for the Government to place or not to place the report on the Table. The hon. Members may make comments as they like when the discussion comes up.

Shri Hem Barua: It is doing injustice.

Shri Ranga: The House was told that an enquiry was instituted into the NEFA affair, the manner in which things were conducted or misconducted there. The Defence Minister informed us that the report had been submitted by Gen. Henderson-Brooks, and the Government have been considering it for sometime. We were hoping that we might be able to raise it also in the House as soon as possible. I hope the Prime Minister would be able to accede to our request. We were hoping that this report would be placed on the Table of the House before Monday, or at least on Monday, so that the discussion can be conducted and the no-confidence motion in regard to these matters be conducted with full knowledge of that report.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: About this report, I think before the Prime Minister says something, already there is . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Do not make another speech.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I am not making another speech. I am only reminding you of what has been said in this House about the report of Justice Das. The Prime Minister had promised to give the conclusions of the report, but now there is a demand that the entire report should be placed. I think it is fair that the entire report

is placed on the Table. Mere conclusions will not satisfy the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may make comments, but it is for the Government to take a decision.

Shri Ranga: We ask for guidance from you but you call us to order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I cannot force the Government. You have made your arguments. The Prime Minister said that he will be making a statement.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री का जो स्टेटमेंट था उस में यही कहा गया है कि हमला हो सकता है, और उस के लिए देश को तैयार रहना चाहिये। सरकार तैयारी कर रही है, हमले का सामना करने के लिये तैयारी हो वह तो ठीक है लेकिन मान लो कि हमला न हो तो क्या प्रधान मंत्री जी यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि जिस भारतीय भूमि पर अभी विदेशियों का कब्जा है, जो हमारे देश की भूमि अनुचित तौर पर शत्रु के कब्जे में है, उस के लिए क्या तैयारी है और क्या अपनी छीनी गई भूमि को फिर से वापिस लेने की हम तैयारी कर रहे हैं ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. That matter is over now.

Shri Ranga: We ask for guidance from you but you call us to order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I cannot force the Government. You have made your arguments. The Prime Minister said that he will be making a statement.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब दास कमीशन की नियुक्ति हुई तो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह कैसे उन्हें वचन दे दिया कि उन का जो इस पर प्रतिवेदन होगा उसे सदन पटल पर नहीं रखा जायेगा। उन्होंने आखिर ऐसा क्यों कहा ? इन्क्वायरी

कमिशन बिडाने का मतलब यह होता है कि उस के द्वारा जांच हो और उस की रिपोर्ट सदन की टेबुल पर रखी जाये ।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : माननीय सदस्य को मैं समझता हूँ यह याद होगा कि , चीफ जस्टिस साहब ने इस बारे में सुप्रीम कोर्ट का जज मुकर्रर करने और जांच करवाना इस शर्त पर मंजूर किया था कि उन की रिपोर्ट पेश न की जाय । वह रिपोर्ट पार्लियामेंट में रखी न जाय और न पबलिश की जाय । यह उन्होंने ने कहा था । इस की बावत मैं ने पार्लियामेंट में कह दिया था । अभी कोई २, ३ या ४ हफ्ते हुए मैं ने उन से इस बारे में फिर सलाह की और उन की राय पूछी । व अभी भी अपनी उसी पुरानी राय पर कायम हैं । उन्होंने ने कहा कि वह रिपोर्ट पबलिश करना और पार्लियामेंट में पेश करना नामुनासिब बात होगी और एक गलत प्रसीडेंट कायम करना होगा क्योंकि यह एक स्टैंचुटरी इन्क्वायरी नहीं थी । यह दूसरे किस्म की है । इस में न जज प्रोटेक्टेड हैं और न और लोग । ऐसी रिपोर्ट हमेशा प्राइवेट ही होती है । चीफ जस्टिस ने अपनी पुरानी राय दुहराई कि इसे पबलिश करना या पार्लियामेंट में पेश करना मुनासिब न होगा ।

अब मैं प्रोफेसर रंगा के प्वाइंट का जवाब देता हूँ ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : जब यह रिपोर्ट किसी के सामने और सदन के सामने आयेगी नहीं तो वह है किस काम की ?

श्री राम सेवक यादव : अभी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो कहा उस के सम्बन्ध में मैं एक चीज की जानकारी चाहता हूँ । जब प्रधान मंत्री जी स्वयं समझते हैं कि उस प्रतिवेदन को आना चाहिये । उस को पेश न करना और पबलिश न करना ठीक नहीं है तो प्रधानमंत्री जी ने कैसे इस शर्त पर इन्क्वायरी कमेटी नियुक्त करना मान लिया ?

श्री बागड़ी : कहीं राज यह तो नहीं है कि कुछ और मंत्री लपेट में न आ जायें ।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Professor Ranga has referred to the enquiry that has been taking place in regard to the military operations last October and November. The enquiry has taken place and, I believe, the report has been presented to the Chief of Staff of the Army who has given his own summary of it to the Defence Minister.

Shri Nath Pai: Only a summary even to the Defence Minister?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: He has given a summary. The other papers, no doubt, are open to the Defence Minister also. It is for the Defence Minister to answer this. But as far as I know his mind, and I entirely agree with it, he will make a statement about this report. It is quite improper he thinks, and I agree with him, to place a report of that kind before Parliament, to publish it in any way or place it here. It is not proposed to do so—he will make a statement about it—because in these matters it is not only not desirable to publish them but it will be harmful actually to our military preparations etc., to publish that report on these operations last year.

Shri Nath Pai: The report refers to a past act and not future preparations. We want to know what went wrong and who is responsible for it. National security is not involved in it, the security of some individuals may be involved.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If the hon. Member will permit me to say that, perhaps our army people in the Headquarters and in the Defence Ministry are sitting in a better position to judge of these matters than he is (Interruption).

Shri Ranga: Sir, it was in the wake of the defeat that we had sustained there that this enquiry came to be instituted and General Brooks was invited to conduct this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would request the hon. Member to wait till the Defence Minister makes the statement.

Shri Ranga: May I request that the Government make their statement. . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Prime Minister has told the House that the Defence Minister would make the statement.

Shri Ranga: I would request them to make the statement if possible tomorrow; if not, at least by Monday.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think he will be ready for a number of days to make that statement, so far as I know, because it is a difficult matter for him to go into the matter, consider it and prepare the statement from all those papers which are under his consideration. I have not seen all the papers yet myself; I have seen a very brief summary of it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I submit, Sir, if I may say so, with all respect to the Prime Minister, that he has unfortunately missed one aspect of the matter, that is, the No-Confidence Motion which will come up before the House on Monday. In the course of the debate on that No-Confidence Motion this particular matter, the national humiliation last year, the debacle last year, will figure most prominently, I am sure. Therefore, the House will be handicapped, I submit, if it has not before it the report on why things went wrong, why everything went wrong in NEFA last year. Therefore, I submit to the Prime Minister and to his colleague the Defence Minister, that even if they do not place the full report—I hope they do agree to place the full report on the Table of the House at least as detailed a statement as possible giving the conclusions, the findings and also other relevant and cognate matters may be laid on the Table of the House by tomorrow 12.00 noon

because on Monday we are starting the debate.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I would convey the hon. Member's desire to the Defence Minister. But I am almost sure that he cannot do so by tomorrow or by Monday. He told me previously. He refers to the No-Confidence Motion that is going to be taken up on Monday. This matter was decided a few days ago. But the other matter about the report and the preparation of a statement is a big matter and it has been under his consideration. It will take some time. The House will surely agree that nothing should be done which might affect adversely our defence at the present moment (Interruptions).

Shri Nath Pai: We are interested in strengthening the defence (Interruption).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: How can the hon. Member opposite judge of that, I cannot understand.

Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar): How can the Prime Minister judge of it (Interruptions).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot judge of it. This is the view of our army staff, our Defence Ministry, such of it as I know, and I entirely agree with them. I have not seen all the papers even. In fact, I might say, those papers.

Shri Nath Pai: You are ignoring the supremacy of Parliament in all these matters.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have never heard that supremacy of Parliament consists in disclosing secret documents to the disadvantage of the country.

Shri Nath Pai: They are not secret matters. The world knows them. Sir, I want to submit how it raises a matter of fundamental privilege of the House and the country.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is a matter of opinion.

Shri Nath Pal: It is not a question of opinion. It is the basic thing. There are certain privileges of the House. We are entitled to know what went wrong and how it went wrong. Sir, I want to say one sentence and let Him ponder over it. Certainly, the Prime Minister wishes that we do not fall into the same pitfalls again, that lessons and inferences must be drawn and we must be on the guard. How can we believe that these things are being done that steps are being taken unless we are told what went wrong, who was responsible for what went wrong? It is not in a spirit of vengeance that we are seeking this information. We want to avoid.....

An Hon. Member: And we want to know who did a good job.

Shri Nath Pal: Exactly, also who did a good job. May I, Sir, remind him of his promise that he made for the first time in the Rajya Sabha. He has given an assurance then. I do not recall the exact word and therefore I do not want to pin him down to any word but, broadly, the implication of his pronouncement in the Rajya Sabha was that the Government is bound to hold a full-scale enquiry, find out what went wrong and tell Parliament. That was the assurance. Whether there was an assurance or not, it is our inherent privilege to know in such a vital matter. Let us not raise the false bogey of future defence preparedness. It refers to a past occurrence. Military chanceries of every country are doing this. May I conclude, Sir, by saying this, that after the debacle at Dunkirk, soon after Parliament was told what went wrong and how they failed. Certainly, we want to know it, and I do not see any convincing reason for which he can deny telling the country what are the findings of this report unless it be that too many people whom he wants to shield are involved.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That is the real reason.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated Anglo-Indians): Sir, may I make a request to the Prime Minister? I agree with him that the publication of certain parts of that report may be entirely undesirable so far as it deals with military preparations, so far as it may impinge on our preparations in the future. But I think he owes it to himself and to his Government to allay a lot of statements and rumours that are going about that this debacle was largely due to direct political interference from Delhi like orders to the troops not to fire on the Chinese, deliberate limiting troops to 50 or 51 rounds..

Shri Tyagi: How do you know that?

Shri Frank Anthony: I want this thing to be cleared. That is what I am saying. The rumour is that even during the actual operations the Minister hamstrung his generals, he would not allow them to implement the decisions that they had taken. We want answers to these. Surely, in fairness to the Government these things should be told to the House.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The answer is that they are completely baseless, without the least truth (*Interruption*).

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Sir, it is quite true that the Prime Minister may tell us that the allegations made from this side may be very baseless. But we would like to get a confirmation in our mind and those of us who are not making any allegations may be told definitely, on very good foundation and with good confidence that the allegations that have been made are baseless. How are we to know that the allegations that are made are baseless. It is in the interest of the Government that the facts that have been recorded or brought out by this enquiry are placed before the House so that baseless allegations may not be made and rumours may not go on spreading. We are all very much surprised to know how it was that a whole army of 16,000 men could not lift their finger or do anything to the Chinese community. That is why we want to know how this debacle came across.