

Agreement regarding Non-intervention in Internal Affairs of States

*511. **Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state whether major powers have come to any agreement not to interfere in the internal affairs of other sovereign countries in the context of the discussion on the subject in the U.N. last September?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): A Special Committee established by the United Nations General Assembly considered the question of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States from August to October 1964, at Mexico city. The Committee was unable to arrive at a consensus on the application of this principle of international law in view of differences among major powers on the question and it submitted a report on its deliberations to the XIX session of the General Assembly. The report was not considered as the XIX session recessed without conducting its normal business. This matter is now before the General Assembly at its current session.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: May I know what is the nature of interference and intervention which is in view of the countries where such intervention is taking place and the countries responsible for such intervention?

Shri Swaran Singh: This was one of the important points for which a consensus could not be developed, i.e., what should be the definition or content of intervention. Some cases are obvious—where intervention takes place in other countries; but there can be other surreptitious or creeping types of intervention and efforts are being made to find some formula which should cover all types of intervention. But unfortunately, no consensus could be achieved.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: What is the Government's own view regard-

ing the question which I have put, i.e., regarding the intervention? What is India's contribution in the matter?

Shri Swaran Singh: The Government of India's representative participated in this; he made an effective contribution and took a very effective part in this. We feel that all types of intervention should be covered.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I want to know whether the Government of India have a clear mind as to what is the nature of intervention which they would consider to be an intervention, what is their own contribution and what have they done in the matter.

Shri Swaran Singh: As I said, our representative took a very active part and we are of the view that, not only armed intervention, but all other forms of intervention by sending a saboteur or creating conditions which may be described as subversive should be covered by the term 'intervention'.

Pakhtoon Movement

+

- *512. **Shri D. C. Sharma:**
Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaia:
Shri Krishnapal Singh:
Shri Basumatari:
Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:
Shri Jagdev Singh Siddhanti:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have taken any decision to support the Pakhtoon movement; and

(b) if so, the nature thereof?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) and (b). The Government of India have on a number of occasions clearly enunciated its support for the legitimate aspirations of the Pakhtoon people.

Shri D. C. Sharma: If I had understood the Minister aright, he had said that he was going to invite Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan to India in order that he could carry on his activities here. May I know whether any invitation has been sent to Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan and if so, what is his reaction?

Shri Dinesh Singh: As has already been mentioned in this House, he would be most welcome in this country whenever he likes to come.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The question is whether any invitation had been sent.

Shri D. C. Sharma: If no invitation has been sent to the great patriot, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, may I know in what way the Government of India and the Ministry of External Affairs are going to support the Pakhtoon movement? Will they have a liberation government here or will they give some funds or will they send some emissaries or will they do something else?

12.00 hrs.

Shri Dinesh Singh: The question of an invitation to Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan is not linked with the main question. As I have mentioned, this has been conveyed to Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan that he would be most welcome whenever he wants to come here, and the Ambassador has conveyed it I am not quite clear about what is referred to by 'invitation' as such.

So far as the support to the movement for Pakhtoonistan is concerned, the Government of India have announced that they have every sympathy with the legitimate aspirations. Now, it depends on how the events develop, what action is taken and what is asked for.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: May I know whether it is a fact that some organisation has been formed here to help the Pakhtoonistan movement, which is a 4000-men-strong movement in

Pakistan? May I know also whether it is true that the Government of India have decided to support and patronise this particular organisation and help Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan?

Shri Dinesh Singh: There is an organisation called a *jirga*, Pakhtoonistan *jirga* or something like that. It consists of some Indian citizens some people from Afghanistan and some people from the Pakhtoonistan area. We have not discussed the question of any specific help with them; they have not asked for any specific help.

Mr. Speaker: Now, we shall take up the short notice question.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of order, Sir. I did not want to take the time of the House during the Question Hour by raising the point of order. As far back as the 23rd March, 1965, that is, about seven or eight months ago, you, Sir, had observed:

"Therefore, I hope that in future, when a parliamentary delegation is sent outside or inside the country, the Speaker at least would be taken into confidence and he will be consulted."

Mr. Speaker: That was for the future . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You said so in March, that is, about six or seven months ago. Even now, you were not consulted. Why is it that your direction is not being complied with? . . .

Mr. Speaker: I had said that Government had got that right and afterwards the Prime Minister had agreed that the Speaker would be consulted. . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That was at that time in March. It was said then that this would be considered for the future. May I know why Government did not consult you now?

Mr. Speaker: I cannot allow it to be raised in this manner now.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Your authority is being set at naught; your direction is being disregarded by Government. Will you allow this to continue in this parliamentary set-up? What will happen to good parliamentary traditions? Are they to be set at naught?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Since you have permitted Shri Kamath to raise this point, may I make one submission? This is a very important issue. There are certain precedents in this regard. It is not here only that this question is being raised. I think that we are going just the wrong way.

The Speaker has his own limitations and his own powers. I have made enquiries about it and I understand that the Speaker in the UK never interferes in the appointment of any delegations whatsoever. Therefore, if we have to devise certain set rules, then let us sit down and find out how it is going to be worked out.

As a matter of fact, there are certain Government delegations, and there are certain parliamentary delegations. I do not think that any impression should be created here that all that is being done here is being done in the wrong way. I think that there is a lot of correspondence going on between you, Sir, and the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs on this subject. Therefore, the Prime Minister....

Mr. Speaker: Even earlier I said that Government had got that right to send delegations. I have never denied this right.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Let certain decisions be taken and let all the Members be informed of them so that there may be no suspicion and doubt in the mind of anybody as to where we stand, where the Speaker stands and where the Government stand.

Shri D. C. Sharma: May I submit very respectfully that in every demo-

cratic country of the world, the Speaker has the sole right. I do not know from what source my hon. friend Shri Harish Chandra Mathur has drawn his information, but I would submit that even in the UK it is the Speaker who selects the parliamentary delegations....

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: No.

Shri D. C. Sharma: ...and he is responsible for their conduct abroad and he is responsible for getting reports from them, and he is responsible for creating a good-will in this country as well as abroad. I do not know why it is being said that the Speaker should keep himself away from everything and the Speaker should only sit in the Chair here for an hour and a half and then do nothing more. I submit that it is your prerogative to appoint these parliamentary delegations.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): Why should we blindly follow the Speaker of the House of Commons even if he does not exercise his prerogative? Certainly, you have said something which we all welcome. I hope Government will abide by that. A healthy precedent should be introduced.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I do not think it should be carried any further.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Why not? This is an important matter.

Mr. Speaker: We are discussing it here now, I have very cordial relations with the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Government as a whole, not one Minister as such. What has the Prime Minister got to say about the future?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): In so far as parliamentary delegations are concerned, it is entire-

ly your prerogative, Sir, to appoint or to select the members. I have no doubt about that. But Government has equal right and authority to send delegations abroad; they can nominate. But as the Speaker had expressed his wish in this House that he should also be consulted when Members of Parliament are selected, I said we would abide by it, and we would certainly consult the Speaker.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: They should not be described as parliamentary delegations. That is the point.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Hon. Members will please resume their seat. Shri Sharma would also sit down.

It does not look nice that we should pursue this matter in the open House in this manner. There is nothing that has to be discussed.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: If there are complaints about the Members of Parliament who are selected, that perhaps does not come under you.

Mr. Speaker: No, no.... (Interruptions). Order, order.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You are the paramount officer of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Short Notice Question. Shri Nath Pai.

Shri Daji: Before you pass on to that, please hear us. We are also anxious to be heard.

Mr. Speaker: Everyone has not been heard.

Shri Daji: The same question cropped up in connection with the delegation to Nagaland and their report.

I submit that we are not here to challenge the right of Government to send their own delegation. But there are two types of delegations which

we should clearly clearly understand. One would be the parliamentary delegation. This would be there only if it has been sanctioned by you. The other would be a delegation of parliamentarians. When a delegation of parliamentarians goes about, it is described as a parliamentary delegation. That is what we object to. We do not object to any number of delegations of parliamentarians going about, nominated by Government. But there is a distinction which has to be observed between a government delegation consisting of parliamentarians and a parliamentary delegation.

Mr. Speaker: He has explained it. There is nothing more to be discussed.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We should build up a parliamentary democracy here. They are not helping us to do it.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Member exercises restraint, things will be easy. Shri Nath Pai.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Speaker, if I remember right, you called me three times. If I have not been able to carry out our wish and put the question, it is not due to any disrespect to you but only due to the respect for, and fear of, the stentorian voice of those who preceded me.

Mr. Speaker: It was my inefficiency and incapacity to control the House that was responsible for it.

Shri Nath Pai: I was just pleading my inability to follow your advice immediately you called me. You called me three or four times.

Mr. Speaker: I am confessing my incapacity.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Who doubts your capacity?