(b) to (d). Do not arise.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: May I know what are the points of difference between the Assessors and the Government on the designs, because it has taken an unusually long time to come to a decision in this respect?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: There is no question of difference of opinion. You may remember, Sir, in the last session I had replied that the Board of Assessors have submitted their recommendations and the Government desired that a big size model of the design placed first should be made. Two big size models have been prepared and they are now being studied.

Shri Radha Raman: May I know, whether, in view of the desire on the part of the Government to have those two big size designs of the original design which was selected or which was recommended, any opinion has been expressed on those big size models by the Board of Assessors?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: The Board of Assessors have already made their recommendations. The Government wanted that the models should be prepared so that the Government could decide on the design after making a close study of the details of the scheme. As I said, the models have just been prepared and are now being studied.

काम दिलाऊ दफ्तर

*५३१. **श्री नवल प्रभाकर** : क्या श्रम और रोजगार मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि काम दिलाऊ दफ्तरों में क्लर्कों के कार्य के लिये नाम दर्ज करना बिल्कुल बन्द कर दिया गया है ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो इसका क्या कारण है ?

श्रम उपमंत्री (श्री आविद अली) : (क) जी नहीं ।

(ख) सवाल पैदा नहीं होता ।

श्री नवल प्रभाकर : क्या मैं जान सकता हूं कि इस समय कितने ऐसे व्यक्ति हैं जिन्होंने अपने नाम दिल्ली एक्सचेंज में लिखाए हैं ?

श्री आविद अली : यह तो बहुत से हैं, संख्या के लिए नोटिस की जरूरत होगी ।

श्री नवल प्रभाकर : पिछले एक वर्ष में ऐसे कितने आदमियों को एम्प्लायमेंट दिया गया ?

श्री आविद अली : यह फिगर्स कई दफे यहां पेश कर दिए गए हैं । अगर आनरेबल मेम्बर को उन की और जरूरत है तो नोटिस दें, वह पेश कर दिए जाएंगे ।

Finance Minister's Interview to New York Correspondent

+

*532. **Shri Kumaran:**
Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:
Shri A. K. Gopalan:
Shri Vasudevan Nair:
Shri Narayanankutty Menon:
Shri Bibhuti Mishra:
Shri Khushwaqt Rai:
Shri H. N. Mukerjee:
Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:
Shri Vajpayee:
Shri T. K. Chaudhuri:
Shri Bimal Ghose:
Shri S. A. Dange:
Shri Parulekar:
Shri Sadhan Gupta:
Shri M. Elias:
Shri Panigrahi:
Shri Nana Patil:
Shri Matera:
Shri Goray:
Shri Ghosal:
Shri Jadhav:
Shri Yajnik:
Shri Sarju Pandey:
Shri Dasaratha Deb:
Shri Prabhat Kar:
Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri Tangamani:
Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:
Shri Halder:
Shri Balasaheb Patil:

Shri Sugandhi :
Shri B. C. Kamble:
Shri B. Das Gupta:
Shri Fatehsinh Ghodasar:
Shri Nath Pai:
Shri Easwara Iyer:
Shri Kodiyan:
Shri Kunhan:
Shri D. V. Rao:
Shri Ramam:
Ch. P. S. Daulta:
Shri Punnoose:
Shri V. Raju:
Shri Amjad Ali:
Shri Braj Raj Singh:
Shri Naushir Bharucha:
Shri Manay:
Shri D. A. Katti:
Shri Warior:
Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:
Shri N. Shivaraj:
Shri Biren Roy:
Shri V. P. Nayar:
Shri Mohamed Imam:
Shri H. N. Sonule:
Shri E. V. K. Sampath:
Shri Yadav:
Shri Assar:
Shri Drohar:
Shri B. C. Mullick:
Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:

Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to the statement made by **Shri T. T. Krishnamachari**, Finance Minister, in an interview given to the *New York Times* on the eve of his departure for Washington; and

(b) whether this statement indicates any change in the basic principles of India's foreign policy?

The Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Yes.

(b) No. There has been no change whatever in the basic principles of India's foreign policy. No such change in the policy of the Government was suggested by the Finance Minister, and this has since been made clear both by him and by the Prime Minister.

Shri Kumaran: In view of the fact that the *New York Times* correspondent who interviewed Shri Krishnamachari has repeatedly affirmed that the statement published in the newspaper was a verbatim report of the interview, and also in view of the fact that a lot of confusion prevails in the public mind over this controversy, may I know whether the Government would advise Shri Krishnamachari to clear up the smoke enveloping the whole affair instead of taking shelter under the Prime Minister?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The first fact, I believe, is correct, namely, that an interview was given. The second fact may be partly correct. That is evidenced even by this question—that a number of Members were led to become somewhat confused on this subject. Otherwise they would not have put in this question. About the third point, if the hon. Members will take the trouble to read rather fully the speeches delivered by the Finance Minister,—I believe they have been placed in the Library of this House, printed copies,—I think this doubt could be removed from their minds.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: May I know whether it is a fact that the Finance Minister stated that one of the reasons for which India wants to build up its defence strength is to defend India against some possible attack from the People's China and the Soviet Union and whether that does not indicate any change in the basic principle of India's foreign policy?

Mr. Speaker: It consists of two questions.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think the first statement made by the Hon. Member is correct at all. I do not think the Finance Minister said that. He said something which might sound similar to that but which was different.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: May I know whether in that statement there had

been any reference about the leader of the Communist Group here and, if so, whether the Prime Minister will ask the Finance Minister to deny that—the contents of that part of the statement?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Any reference to the Communist Group?

Mr. Speaker: To the leader of the Communist Group.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I believe there was a reference to the leader of the Communist Group in this House. There is no question of denying it. Such a reference was made.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Could I know if the Finance Minister has specifically denied the report in that interview as an envisagement of hostile relationship of our country with countries like the Soviet Union and China and, if so, whether the Finance Minister would be directed to put in a categorical denial to that effect?

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Shall I answer it?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: You may.

Mr. Speaker: I will call both the hon. Ministers.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I would only say this. I do not know exactly what the hon. Member means by calling upon the Finance Minister for any categorical denial. Here was an interview in which hypothetical questions and situations were considered and the Finance Minister said something about it. Let us make it clear if there is any doubt. I do not know if the hon. Member wants to know what the Finance Minister has felt about it; he can read his speeches and know what he said.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The position is this. The hon. Members want me to make a categorical denial —of what? Supposing it is something, that I am alleged to have said, by somebody. I would not like to be unfair to that young man who reported an interview that took place. Maybe, I think perhaps it was for about 15 minutes or probably a little more, and he has tried to dramatise that interview. If the hon. Members read that interview, he has dramatised it: my taking up some folder that I had. I read the report again this morning. In dramatising it, he has drawn, perhaps what he felt quite rightly, a conclusion from something that I said. But I think hon. Members are less than just to the intelligence of an ordinary person if, in the present context, completely torn away from anything that exists now or is likely to exist in future, he said that we envisaged any kind of conflict between Communist China and Soviet Russia and India. In fact, I am not sure if I mentioned Russia at all. Probably, what I really mentioned was that there would be no chance of conflict so far as China is concerned. But it is quite possible,—nobody knows—we have seen some trouble in Burma also—there may be some trouble in the border areas, in which case I did mention that some friends in India are likely to take advantage of that trouble. That is a fact that I did mention and I do not think there is any use in denying it. But, in so far as it relates to any foreign power which is friendly to India and is likely to remain friendly in future, I must say that there a categorical denial can be made and should be made. And I am taking this opportunity of making it.

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

Shri Hem Barua: It is a fundamental question—

Some Hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: If an interview is given by any hon. Minister and some correspondent makes a report, I am not going to allow, hereafter, this House to be used as a forum for the purpose of every hon. Member coming up and asking the Minister to clear up the position. For example, a report appears in the papers; the report will be contradicted or explained. The Minister is always alert. Inasmuch as some other country which is friendly

to us is also involved—he has referred to it here—and there is some misunderstanding or confusion in the minds of one or the other, they wanted him to clear it up. And I have allowed this question. He has now categorically said that he had never meant that, and that it was far from his intention.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I want to know one thing. If the Finance Minister denies the statement made by one correspondent by which the relations of our country with other countries will be disturbed, what is the remedy for it?

Mr. Speaker: That is why I allowed this question.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: What about the man who made the statement? The question was allowed and there was a denial about the statement. But what about the correspondent who has reported something which, according to the Finance Minister, he never thought of?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members know that if any statement is made on the floor of the House and any correspondent misreported it, certainly I shall take such action as is proper because it is misreporting what has occurred in this House and it is a privilege of this House. So far as the statements outside are concerned, all that the members can do, they have done here. And the hon. Minister has denied it. More than that, I am not able to envisage what can be done.

Shri Hem Barua: There was a rejoinder by Mr. Rosenthal, correspondent of the *New York Times*. He sticks to what he has reported in the paper. At the same time, he says that he leaves the rest to the conscience of the Finance Minister. It is an important matter. Therefore I want.. .

Mr. Speaker: I am really surprised at this. That man persists that he is right. The Finance Minister says he is right. I am prepared to take the word of the Finance Minister in preference to that of that man. The Finance Minister has, both inside and outside the House, categorically said that it is not so. Still, hon. Members want me and this House to allow a discussion over this matter, saying that the *New York Times* correspondent is correct. I am not going to allow any statement to be made trying to put this matter..... (*interruptions*).

Shri Hem Barua: There was a lot of flare up in the press.

Mr. Speaker: What can be done now?

Shri Hem Barua: In future we shall have to have tape recorders.

Mr. Speaker: Let them do anything they like. What can we do?

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: May I point out that the denial.....

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow any more questions on this subject.

Several Hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: I will ask the hon. Members to keep away from the House if they persist in getting up together. Hon. Members ought not to stand up that way; that is No. 1. Then, until I call them, they ought not to speak

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I want to make a submission. You permitted this question to be put on the Order Paper and more than 50 members have signed this question because it is an important question. We wanted.....

Mr. Speaker: He need not explain all this to me. He can say. I allowed this question and it is an important question.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I want only to know that in view of the report of the interview being rigidly adhered to by the correspondent concerned and in view also of the rather tepid nature of the very qualified disclaimer issued by the Finance Minister previously, this House is certainly entitled to know the state of facts. So, I ask the Prime Minister to find out and let us know, if not today, tomorrow or the day after the correct position.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister has said that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Whatever the rules of this House may be, it is for you to interpret them. We do not want to come in the way of any elucidation of any problem that arises in the minds of members. Personally, I was prepared and I am prepared to explain, in so far as I can, anything that arises out of this matter or any other. In fact, I welcome this question so that we may be able to say clearly what the facts were. The facts have been clearly stated.

First of all, if the House has any doubt—I don't think it has any reason to doubt—that any kind of variation of our policy was intended by anybody, that doubt had to go and I hope it has gone completely.

Secondly, in the last question my friend, Mr. Hiren Mukerjee, has said about the report in the *New York Times* and said one thing has been denied by the Finance Minister and affirmed by the correspondent who reported it. Well, Hiren Mukerjee may have some knowledge of the person. I have some knowledge of the press also and, in my younger and less wise days, I even indulged in writing and reporting to some extent. To catch a phrase here and there or to say quite categorically that you have told a lie to the correspondent is not fair to him or to anybody. Here are people approaching the subject from different view points, getting different impressions of the words without any tape recorder or anything and then recording it. After I heard the Finance Minister, I get the impression that what the correspondent got was obviously a wrong impression. But I am not prepared to say that he has deliberately done that, or that he is deliberately falsifying anything. In the course of a conversation, there is greater difficulty sometimes in explaining something to another man, when our mind is occupied with one thing and the mind of the other person— I won't say it is a closed mind— is thinking of something else. So, this misapprehension, misunderstanding arose. It ought to be cleared up. There is no use of going about and accusing each other of deliberately falsifying unless there is any purpose behind it. We have avoided doing that. But, hon. members who put this question are prefectly justified in having this matter cleared up and I hope it has been cleared up.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: All that can possibly be done has been done.

Land Reforms

\+

*533. **Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:**
Shri Damani:

Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to conduct an all-India census to ascertain the extent to which various land reform programmes have been actually implemented; and

(b) if not, whether there are any other schemes under way in this direction?

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): (a) The Government is aware of the urgent need to investigate how far Land Reform legislations enacted in the country have been actually implemented. For this purpose, the Research Programmes Committee of the Planning Commission has set up a Committee of Direction on Land Reforms to evolve a suitable technique and lay down a uniform pattern of enquiry into the progress and effect of Land Reform measures.

(b) Does not arise.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: When will hat uniform pattern of enquiry commence?

Shri S. N. Mishra: We have written to the members to send us a note, giving their suggestions about the