

This refers to arms and ammunitions received from foreign Governments. And our Government gave us an assurance on the floor of the House that they would lodge a protest with the Pakistan Government of their collusion with Naga hostiles. I am interested in knowing, and you are also interested in knowing, whether they have received a reply from Pakistan so far or not in regard to Pakistan's collusion and collaboration with Naga hostiles.

Mr. Speaker: After hearing the Member with great respect and patience, I again come to the conclusion that that does not arise here.

श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय : सदन के सामने जो वक्तव्य उपस्थित किया गया है उसकी अन्तिम पंक्तियों में कहा गया है कि 5 और 6 सितम्बर के बाद नागा विध्वंसक कार्य नहीं करेंगे। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या नागाओं ने कोई विध्वंसक कार्य 5 और 6 सितम्बर के बाद किये हैं। यदि किये हैं तो उसका विराम समझौते पर क्या असर हुआ।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: After the 5th or 6th September, no hostile acts have been reported.

Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Nations

+

*293. { **Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah:**
Shri Vishram Prasad:
Shri P. R. Chakraverti:
Shri Kajrolkar:
Shri P. C. Borooah:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether any date has been fixed for the Summit Conference of the non-aligned nations;

(b) if so, who will be the participants; and

(c) the main items on the agenda?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) Yes, Sir. 5th October, 1964.

(b) and (c). The list of countries which have, up to this time, indicated their readiness to participate, and the draft agenda for the Conference, are placed on the Table of the House. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3191/64].

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah: May I know whether the Prime Minister who is going to attend this conference, is placing any specific plan before the non-aligned nations to counter-balance the neocolonialist activities of China and its growing influence among the Afro-Asian nations, so that the expansionist activities of China may be contained successfully by all these nations?

Shri Dinesh Singh: In the draft agenda, the second item deals with this question, and the first item deals with the general international situation. I have no doubt that the Prime Minister will make a statement under these headings.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah: May I know whether the Prime Minister will take any steps to initiate talks for effecting a compromise between Indonesia and Malaysia in view of the recent move of Pakistan to take advantage of the struggle and to pose as a mediator between these two countries?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): The non-aligned conference is not likely to take up any bilateral disputes. It is a separate issue as to whether any action could be initiated by India to decrease the tension that exists today between Malaysia and Indonesia. That will be a desirable objective but one is not quite sure as to what is the appropriate time.

श्री विश्वनाथ प्रसाद : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस कार्यक्रम में भारत

पर चीन के हमले का सवाल उठाया जाएगा, और क्या इसको निपटाने के लिए इस कान-फरेंस में कोई कार्रवाई की जाएगी ?

Shri Swaran Singh: Generally, Sir, bilateral disputes between any two countries attending the conference or a bilateral dispute between a country that is attending and another country that is not attending are not likely to be taken up. The House may be good enough to recall that China is not attending because China is not a non-aligned country . . . (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Nath Pal: How do you reconcile it with the first part?

Mr. Speaker: If China is not a member of non-aligned . . . (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Swaran Singh: The general convention is that bilateral disputes between any of the countries which are attending and a country which is not attending—that also generally is not raised there.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: This position is preposterous.

Shri Nath Pal: Even you, Sir, were intrigued by this position.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of External Affairs has said that disputes between countries that are attending are not raised. But subsequently he said that disputes between a country that is attending and a country that is not attending, that also cannot be raised. Then what can be raised there?

Shri Swaran Singh: You are quite right, Sir. It is a fact that a conference of this nature does not deal with disputes as such between any two countries. The only distinction that I was trying to make was that two countries, if neither of them is attending, obviously that is a matter

which is not discussed. It is a fact that conferences of this nature are held to discuss and review the international position.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: With reference to what?

Shri Swaran Singh: There is no need for being impatient. There is a draft agenda which has been placed on the Table of the House. It is true that any country may have its own particular problem to which it may attach importance but if a conference of this type is to evolve a principle of a general character which might govern international relations it is not a good practice to discuss individual disputes because the entire energy will be consumed in that. It should not be forgotten that in any of these gatherings there will be views held by a group of countries favouring one side of the dispute and another group of countries which might hold a view contrary to that . . . (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Speaker: Let him finish.

Shri Nath Pal: He has finished; he has sat down.

Mr. Speaker: Because so many of you stood up he has sat down.

Shri Swaran Singh: I sat down because you stood up, Sir. Even if they had stood up I would have sat down. I was saying that a draft agenda had been placed on the Table of the House and an item refers to the general discussion of the international situation.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: We have read it.

Mr. Speaker: Still, if he wants to clarify or draw hon. Members' attention to a particular entry, he is entitled to do so.

Shri Swaran Singh: In the very nature of this draft agenda there is not much scope for raising bilateral disputes and India has been pursuing

a policy that bilateral disputes should not be raised in this conference.... (Interruptions).

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, on a point of order.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Sir, on a point of order . . . (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: How many points of order?

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: The Minister says that it is not a good practice to raise any bilateral dispute. But all disputes necessarily are bilateral, and as a matter of fact, would you kindly direct the Minister to read from the very statement which is sought to be laid on the Table of the House which says that one of the main functions at this conference would be to discuss the safeguarding and strengthening of world peace and security and the promotion of positive trends in the emerging international forces, and so, this question arises directly, and no amount of short-circuiting the question could prevent such issues that would possibly be raised.

Mr. Speaker: That is what I am trying to explain: that questions of the maintenance of peace may be discussed, but not the particular question of dispute between any two countries. I have heard him, and the Minister also.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I beg to call your attention to what the hon. Prime Minister said while replying to the debate on the no-confidence motion, particularly with reference to a suggestion made by Shri Menon, that he will, at this conference, take up the question of bringing about a reconciliation—having a team or some such thing set up—between Indonesia and Malaysia, and he appreciated the suggestion made by Shri Menon. The reply of the hon. Minister of External Affairs runs absolutely counter to that. That is my point of order, and I would rather like the hon. Prime Minister to explain the position.

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Everyone has a point of order to raise. Am I to call everyone? Is Shri Kamath also rising on a point of order?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Yes, Sir. I am sorry to say that the Minister has tried to beat about the bush with considerable dexterity, but I must point out—with due respect to him—in view of the light that you yourself have shed upon this matter, that at Belgrade, in 1961 when the first non-aligned conference was held—that is why it is called the Belgrade type conference now—the matter of dispute as regards the nuclear test treaty which was concluded by a treaty later on was raised, and I remember very well that the United States Government was condemned in no uncertain terms, in categorical terms, for the alleged violation of certain agreements. And now, the Minister says that disputes cannot be raised, disputes between two nations as such. My hon. friend Dr. Singhvi has rightly said that a dispute is bilateral; one country may be attending the conference and another country may not be attending; India is attending and China is not attending. So, the point of the question which my hon. colleague Shri Vishram Prasad asked was, whether any attempt would be made at this conference to enlist the sympathy of the countries attending the conference in favour of India and against China. How is it not relevant, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: These questions are being raised as points of order; if hon. Members have read the statement of the Minister, they will find that it is not a point of order. I have heard; no points of order as such have been made here. (Interruptions). Order, order. The only thing that hon. Members are stressing is that either the statement is not correct or it varies with the statement....

Shri Hem Barua: It is rather a confusing statement.

Mr. Speaker: May be

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of information, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I am now dealing with the points of order; should I give priority to the point of information now? I would appeal to the hon. Members that they should give latitude to the Prime Minister that he might consider there what points have to be raised, what he can raise there in the circumstances that arise there, and not bind him to just give expression as to what he would raise there, or would he be precluded from doing this or that, and so on. (*Interruption*).

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. If hon. Members are so desirous, they might give notice of any discussion, and if I feel that the statement is . . .

Shri Swaran Singh: There is the foreign affairs debate.

Mr. Speaker: Yes; the debate on foreign affairs is also coming up and hon. Members can raise all these things there, whatever they want. But this time ought not to be spent for having that discussion now. (*Interruption*).

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I will allow only supplementary questions now.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: In spite of your ruling on the two points of order, I still have a valid point of order to raise and I should be allowed to do so.

Mr. Speaker: That my decision was not correct?

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: The points which were raised were not the points which I intend to raise. Your decision was perfectly right in those cases. My point of order is that this Parliament by a unanimous resolution condemned

the Chinese aggression. We are with you when you say that the Prime Minister should be given full latitude in deciding how to do it. But the Minister of External Affairs has called the naked aggression of China on us as a dispute. I want to know from you—this is my point of order—whether the External Affairs Minister can describe the aggression by a nation as a dispute and thereby limit the decision of this Parliament and bind this Government and the Prime Minister in the non-aligned conference not to discuss this matter?

Shri Swaran Singh: May I say . . .

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The point of order cannot be answered by the Minister; it is to be decided by the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: If it is only the point of order, then the answer is "no". But whether the Minister of External Affairs has actually done it or not, that is quite a different affair.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। यह हो सकता है कि दो देशों के आपसी झगड़े वहाँ पर न आयें लेकिन हालांकि मैं उस पर बहस नहीं करना चाहता। वह गलत बात है। लेकिन उसको एक सिद्धान्त के रूप में व्यापक बनाया जा सकता है और बनाया गया है और वह यह कि क्या दो देशों की सीमाओं को बलपूर्वक बदलने का प्रयत्न साम्राज्यशाही और उपनिवेशवाद है, चाहे वह गोरे करें अथवा रंगीन करें। इसलिए क्या इस प्रश्न को प्रधान मंत्री वहाँ उठावेंगे, चलावेंगे और पस करवावेंगे ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यही मेरी मुश्किल है कि मैं हर रोज कहता हूँ कि प्वाएंट आफ ऑर्डर का मतलब तो यह होता है कि कांस्टिट्यूश का कोई उल्लंघन किया जाय, अवहेलना की जाय, रूख जो है प्रोसीज्योर के, उनकी बेजाअतगी की जाय। प्वाएंट ऑफ ऑर्डर तो रक्खा इसलिए गय बा

कि स्पीकर की इमदाद की जाय ताकि कहीं गलती न हो उसको कारवाही चलाने में मगर बजाय इसके कि स्पीकर की इमदाद की जाय उसको कहा जाय कि यहां गलती हुई है और क्लर्क के मताधिक कोई चीज की जाय, यहां तो उल्टे उसके काम चलाने में रुकावट डाली जाती है। प्वाएंटेड ऑफ़ आर्डर बनये इसलिए जाते हैं ताकि आगे जान न चल सके। इसलिए मैं मेम्बर साहबान से अग्रील कहूंगा कि प्वाएंटेड ऑफ़ आर्डर का जो असली मतलब है उस पर हम रहें और इस कौशिश को न करें कि चूंकि हमें एक इनफोरमेशन लेना हो या एक मिनिस्टर ने जो बयान दिया हो उससे अगर एक्स्ट्राफ हो, और उस पर कोई बहस करना चाहते हों तो इस तरह से प्वाएंटेड ऑफ़ आर्डर बना कर रख दें। अगर मेम्बर साहबान मिनिस्टर के उस बयान के खिलाफ हैं और उस पर वे बहस चलाना चाहते हैं तो वह प्वाएंटेड ऑफ़ आर्डर से नहीं हो सकता है। उसकी बहस किसी और शकल में हो सकती है। उसके लिए वे नोटिस दे सकते हैं लेकिन उस मामले को इस तरह से प्वाएंटेड ऑफ़ आर्डर से नहीं उठाया जा सकता है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इरादे के बारे में कह कर आपने अच्छा नहीं किया यह तो मैं पहले कह देना चाहता हूँ। मेरा कभी भी यह इरादा नहीं रहा है कि आपके काम में गड़बड़ मचाऊँ। दूसरी बात यह है कि यह जो गलत सिद्धान्त की बात कही.....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : डा० साहब, आप हमेशा यह क्यों समझ लेते हैं कि जो मैं कह रहा हूँ वही खाली आपके लिए ही है और बाकी दूसरे मेम्बरान के लिए नहीं है ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अब हजरत—हुजूर, मेरी ही बात के ऊपर तो आपने यह सब फरमाया है.....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : हजरत साहब मैं ने ...

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : हजरत साहब मैंने नहीं कहा। हजरत का शब्द मेरे मुँह से निकल गया था मैंने उसी वक्त हुजूर आपका कह दिया था।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं ने तो हजरत साहब कह कर आपकी इज्जत की थी। अननीय सदस्य ने तो सिर्फ हजरत कहा था लेकिन मैंने उन्हें हजरत साहब कह दिया।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उसके बाद एक व्यापक सिद्धान्त की बात थी...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप बैठ जाइये। मुझे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब को सुनने दीजिये।

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : जो डा० लोहिया ने अभी कहा वह जैसा आपने कहा वह प्वाएंटेड ऑफ़ आर्डर तो नहीं था। लेकिन जो सवाल उन्होंने पूछा उस में तथ्य है इस मानी में कि जहां तक एक व्यापक सवाल है, जनरल सवाल है इस बात का कि क्या कोई देश दूसरे देश पर आक्रमण कर सकता है सिवाय एक जिसमें कोई ईसाफ और न्याय की बात न हो। तो ऐसा एग्जेशन ऐसा आक्रमण और हमला यहां कहा तक मुनासिब है, जायज है ? इसको बचाना चाहिए दुनिया की शांति के लिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि उस रूप में यह प्रश्न नौन एलाइंड कान्फेंस में उठाया जा सकता है।

जहां तक मलयेशिया और इण्डोनेशिया के डिस्पूट की बात है वह जो मैंने कहा वह सोलहों आने जो स्टेटमेंट मिनिस्टर श्रीकृष्ण एक्सटरनल एफेयर्स का है, जनरल बात उस के अन्दर नहीं आती है। इण्डोनेशिया और मलयेशिया के डिस्पूट के बारे में वह तो एक तरह का यहां सोझित सवाल है, एक हद तक महसूस है। उसका भी बड़ा असर है। साउथ ईस्ट एशिया में या दुनिया में शांति का खतरा

उससे हो सकता है मगर वह सवाल एक हद तक जरूर सीमित है, महदूद है। पहले यह कोशिश थी कि मलेशिया और इंडो-नेशिया मिल कर आपस में बैठ कर बातचीत करें। मैंने जो उस रोज अपनी स्पीच में कहा था, बहुत कुछ मैंने श्री कृष्ण मेनन की बातें मानां थीं लेकिन मैंने कहा कि जो उनका प्राइडिया है, जो उनके विचार हैं वह मुझे अच्छे लगते हैं और अगर हम किसी तरह पर बातचीत करके आपस में बातचीत करके कोई सवाल तय कर सकें तो वह ठीक ही होगा। लेकिन हर एक मसला या सवाल कान्फेंस में उठाने का नहीं होता है। बहुत सी बातें उसके बाहर तय हो जाती हैं। इसलिए अगर हम वहां कुछ एक दोनों में रास्ता सोचें कि किस ढंग से दोनों नज़दीक लाये जा सकते हैं तो वह हम जरूर कर सकते हैं बाहर भी और दूसरे तरीकों से भी। बस मुझे इतना हँकहना है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : चाहे गोरे करें या काले यह उपनिवेशवाद या साम्राज्यवाद है क्या इसे आप बतलाने की कोशिश करेंगे ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप से तो उन्होंने इतिफाक कर दिया।

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: What is the further point of order that he has? I am not allowing any supplementaries now.

Shri Nath Pai: You had called me.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but after this statement of the Prime Minister I think I need not allow any supplementaries.

Shri Nath Pai: May I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this will be a very dangerous precedent. You had called my name to put a supplementary. If the supplementary is to be presented to

you in the form of a point of order, it may be that you are setting up a premium—perhaps you did not intend to do so. I earnestly said that I wanted to put a supplementary and I did not want to raise it in the garb of a point of order. I wanted to put a straight, simple and general supplementary. You said that you would allow me. Now you are saying that you will not allow any supplementaries.

Mr. Speaker: Because the Prime Minister has made this whole statement, I appeal to Members to desist from that temptation at this moment.

Shri Nath Pai: There is no question of any temptation. There is no temptation of any kind in the discharge of a duty.

Mr. Speaker: Temptation of putting a question.

Shri Nath Pai: No temptation—it is a very unhappy word I think if you will call it 'temptation'.

Mr. Speaker: I am not well up in English; sometimes I commit mistakes.

श्री नाथपाई : हम यहां मोहवश होकर काम नहीं करते बल्कि हम अपना कर्तव्य मानते हैं इसलिए पूछते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बहुत अच्छी बात है।

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, my point of order is this. The hon. Minister for External Affairs said in specific terms that disputes between two countries would not be discussed at the conference. At the same time, he said this much also that this Sino-Indian border dispute would not be discussed there because there may be some groups of countries attending that conference which may support China and some groups may support us. Because of this apprehension of a division there in the conference he said—that is another reason—that this dispute would not be discussed there. But, Sir, when I listened to the Prime

Minister, if my knowledge of Hindi is good enough, I understood him to say that this thing can be discussed at the conference. He made a reference to the situation in South-East Asia and said that it can be discussed in the conference.

Mr. Speaker: Is the point of order being raised in this form?

Shri Hem Barua: These are two statements made by two ministers, one by the Prime Minister and the other by the Minister of External Affairs. There is a big gap between the two statements.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Shri Hem Barua: The point of order is this, whether a minister in the same breath can contradict another minister making a statement? Are we to follow the statement of the Prime Minister or the statement of the Minister of External Affairs?

Mr. Speaker: Whoever he chooses to do.

Shri Hem Barua: Then there is this further question whether there can be

Mr. Speaker: What is the interpretation of any rule or construction that is placed on any article of the Constitution that I am required to answer this point of order? He might just point out to me whether in this point of order as enunciated by him I would be required to put any interpretation of any article of the Constitution or put any construction on any rule of the Rules of Procedure.

Shri Hem Barua: It is difficult to carry all the rules in our memory.

Memorial for Jawaharlal Nehru

+
 { Dr. L. M. Singhvi:
 Shri Shree Narayan Das:
 Shri A. S. Saigal:
 Shri P. K. Deo:

*294. { Shri Yashpal Singh:
 Shri Bade:
 Shri S. C. Samanta:
 Shri M. L. Dwivedi:
 Shrimati Savitri Nigam:
 Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah:
 Shri P. L. Barupal:
 Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
 Shri N. R. Laskar:
 Shri D. D. Mantri:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have drawn up a comprehensive plan to honour the memory of the late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru;

(b) if so, the broad features thereof;

(c) whether this has been entrusted to a Committee; and

(d) if so, the composition thereof?

Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Shri Lalit Sen): (a) to (d). A National Committee has been formed on August 17, 1964, in connection with the Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund; the President is its Chairman, with many other leading citizens as its members. That Committee has set up a Programme Sub-Committee to formulate concrete schemes in this regard. In view of this, Government have not set up any other Committee for this purpose.

डा० लक्ष्मीनल्ल सिखरी : क्या इस समिति के गठन में किसी विशेष माप या मान का अनुकरण किया गया है; यदि हाँ, तो वे माप और मान क्या हैं? क्या इस समिति के सदस्यों का मनोनयन करने के लिए वर्तमान प्रधान मन्त्री ने स्वयं कोई प्रादेश दिया था?

प्रधान मंत्री तथा अन्य शक्ति मंत्री (श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री) : जी नहीं। इस सम्बन्ध में एक मीटिंग बैठी थी कुछ थोड़े से लोगों की, जिसमें वाइस-प्रसिडेंट साहब ने खास तौर पर इनिशिएटिव लिया। उसमें उन्होंने यह कार्यवाही की कि हम लोग भी उसमें शामिल हों। उसकी दो तीन मीटिंग