

Saturday, December 23, 1967  
Pausa 2, 1889 (Saka)

# LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Third Session)



सत्यमेव जयते

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

Price : Rs. 1.00

## CONTENTS

|  | COLUMNS   |
|--|-----------|
| <i>No. 31—Saturday, December 23, 1967/Pausa 2, 1889 (Saka)</i>                           |           |
| Short Notice Question—18 . . . . .   | 9505—30   |
| Papers Laid on the Table . . . . .   | 9530—32   |
| Committee on Government Assurances—  |           |
| Minutes . . . . .  | 9532      |
| President's Assent to Bills . . . . .  | 9532      |
| Estimates Committee—   |           |
| Twenty-third Report . . . . .  | 9532      |
| Committee on Public Undertakings—  |           |
| Sixth Report . . . . .   | 9533      |
| Petition <i>re.</i> Constitution (Amendment) Bill<br>by Shri Inder J. Malhotra . . . . . | 9533      |
| Statement <i>re.</i> Cement Distribution Regulation—                                     |           |
| Shri Raghunath Reddi . . . . .   | 9533—34   |
| Bills Introduced . . . . .   | 9534—37   |
| (i) Banking Laws (Amendment) Bill and  | 9534—37   |
| (ii) Civil Defence Bill . . . . .  | 9537      |
| Committee of Privileges—   |           |
| Fourth Report . . . . .  | 9537—42   |
| Motion <i>Re.</i> International Situation . . . . .                                      | 9542—9633 |
| Shri Nath Pai . . . . .  | 9543—55   |
| Shri N.K. Sanghi . . . . .   | 9555—60   |
| Shri J. B. Kripalani . . . . .   | 9560—65   |
| Shri Prem Chand Varma . . . . .  | 9565—69   |
| Shri B. K. Daschowdhury . . . . .  | 9570—74   |
| Shri Amrit Nahata . . . . .  | 9574—79   |
| Shri Prakash Vir Shastri . . . . .   | 9579—85   |
| Shri Sequaira . . . . .  | 9585—88   |
| Shri Bakar Ali Mirza . . . . .   | 9588—89   |
| Shri Swaran Singh . . . . .  | 9589—9614 |



## (ii)

|  | COLUMNS             |
|--|---------------------|
| Haryana State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill  | 9631—66,<br>9668—98 |
| Motion to consider, as passed by Rajya Sabha   | 9634                |
| Shri K. S. Ramaswamy   | 9633—35,<br>9690—91 |
| Shri P. K. Deo   | 9635—41             |
| Shri Randhir Singh   | 9641—52             |
| Shri Shri Chand Goel   | 9652—56             |
| Shri Shashibhushan Bajpai  | 9656— 9             |
| Shri Maharaj Singh Bharati   | 9659—63             |
| Shri D. C. Sharma  | 9663—66             |
| Shri G. Viswanathan  | 9668—71             |
| Shri Sheo Narain   | 9671—74             |
| Shri Ramavatar Shastri   | 9675—79             |
| Shri Bhola Nath  | 9679—82             |
| Shri Srinibas Misra  | 9682—85,<br>9692—96 |
| Shri Raghuvir Singh Shastri  | 9685—90             |
| Clauses 2, 3, and 1.   | 9692—98             |
| Motion to pass   | 9698                |
| Messages from Rajya Sabha  | 9666—68             |
| Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Bill  | 9698—9706           |
| Motion to Concur in Rajya Sabha recommendation to join<br>in Joint Committee— <i>Adopted</i> |                     |
| Shri Raghunath Reddi   | 9698—9700           |
| Bihar and Uttar Pradesh (Alteration of Boundries) Bill                                       | 9706— 10            |
| Motion to consider   | 9706                |
| Shri Vidya Charan Shukla   | 9706—10             |

LOK SABHA

Statement

Saturday, December 23, 1967/Pausa, 2,  
1889 (Saka)

*The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the  
Clock*

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION

PURCHASES MADE BY DALAI LAMA

S.N.Q. 18. SHRI JYOTIRMOY  
BASU : Will the Minister of EXTER-  
NAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that efforts  
are being made on behalf of Dalai  
Lama to make extensive purchases of  
properties like Tea Estates in border  
areas, especially in Kangra and Hima-  
chal Pradesh areas;

(b) whether it is also a fact that  
funds for this are coming from U.S.A.  
and some other Western capitalist coun-  
tries; and

(c) if so, Government's reaction  
thereto ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE  
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AF-  
FAIRS (SHRI SURENDRA PAL  
SINGH) : (a) to (c). As explained in  
the statement laid on the Table of the  
House, certain properties have been  
purchased in the name of the Tibetan  
Industrial Rehabilitation Society. The  
Society receives assistance from the  
Central Relief Committee which is a  
non-official organisation in India. The  
Relief Committee has also received  
contributions raised by a number of  
foreign voluntary organisations. The  
Government of India have no infor-  
mation that any foreign Government  
has made any contribution to the funds  
of the Tibetan Industrial Rehabilitation  
Society.

Under the laws there is no bar on  
foreigners against the purchase of land  
and other properties in India.

2. The Tibetan Industrial Rehabilita-  
tion Society was registered, as a charit-  
able Society under the Society Registra-  
tion Act XXI of 1860—Punjab Amend-  
ment Act, 1957, as extended to the  
Union Territory of Delhi. The Society  
is reported to have purchased lands in  
the following places in Himachal  
Pradesh:—

- (i) At Bir two Tea Gardens cover-  
ing a total area of 295 acres.  
In addition they have purchas-  
ed 16 acres, in the same local-  
ity, for establishing a woollen  
mill;
- (ii) At Poanta (Himachal Pra-  
desh) 12 acres;
- (iii) Sataun (Himachal Pradesh)  
10 acres;
- (iv) Kumarau (Himachal Pradesh)  
9 acres.

These lands have been purchased for  
rehabilitation of approximately 600  
Tibetan refugee families.

3. The Central Relief Committee  
(India) (a non-official organisation) is  
the only body which provides funds to  
the Society. Voluntary contributions  
raised by the aid agencies in foreign  
countries are not sent directly to any  
rehabilitation unit but are channelised  
through the Central Relief Committee  
(India). The Government of India  
have no knowledge that any foreign  
government, as such, has made any con-  
tribution towards the Tibetan Indus-  
trial Rehabilitation Society.

4. Funds raised through the voluntary  
contributions by the people of foreign  
countries have been received through

the following agencies :—

- (a) European Campaign Committee 1966;
- (b) Norwegian Refugee Council;
- (c) Swiss Aid to Tibetans;
- (d) Catholic Relief Services.

5. In terms of the provision of the law, under which the Society has been registered, the accounts of the Society have been audited and the Report is available with the Central Relief Committee (India).

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU :** This gentleman, the Dalai Lama, came as a refugee seeking asylum which was granted by Government. Now he is involving himself in political activities as well as in investment effort and exploitation joining hands with foreigners.

In Delhi alone His Holiness, the Dalai Lama has two bureaux which run departments like Press and Information Department, Permit Department for Tibetans who wish to travel within India and abroad, ration department, industries and investment department and many other unseen departments. His Holiness has bought extensive properties in the border areas of Himachal Pradesh, a cotton mill here, some other complex in Bhopal, iron and steel works near Calcutta with the help of Belgians, who are host to the NATO....

**MR. SPEAKER :** The hon. Member is giving information. What is his question ?

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU :** My question is this. As I have just said the Belgians are co-operating with the Dalai Lama who is finding finance from the Yankees.

So far, what is the total amount that has come from abroad for the Dalai Lama and also in the name of the Tibetan refugees including withdrawals from the PL-480 funds which are preserved in India ?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** May I say at the very outset that it is very wrong on the part of the hon. Member to say that the Dalai Lama is

carrying on political activities in this country ? It is not a political activity. These are charitable institutions which he has set up for the rehabilitation of the Tibetan refugees and for helping the Tibetan refugees.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU :** What about the press and information department ?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** As regards the total amount of aid received by this particular society, it comes to Rs. 54.68 lakhs from foreign agencies.

As regards the question whether any money has come from the PL-480 funds or from America, we have no information whatsoever in our hand. Actually, as I have said in my statement already, as far as the Government of India are concerned, we do not know at all if any money has come from any foreign government whatsoever. Whatever money has come has come from various charitable institutions abroad who are collecting money for the Tibetan refugees in India.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU :** His knowledge is very limited.

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** These are private organisations where Government do not come into the picture.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU :** What is the total value of immovable assets that have been brought by the Dalai Lama into India and how much of the same has been sent out within the Government's knowledge ? May I also know the details of the privileges that are enjoyed by the Dalai Lama's and the Tibetan Refugees various establishments in India, and the number of foreigners working for them ?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** I submit I have not got the details of all the valuables and wealth brought into India by the Dalai Lama. All I can say is that as far as this particular society is concerned, he has contributed about Rs. 20,000 when he set it up.

**SHRI UMANATH :** May I know whether the attention of Government has been drawn to certain press reports recently that these officers of the Dalai Lama have become centres of international intrigues and even CIA espionage activities; if not, I would like to know whether there is any check as to how the foreign money that is being received by the Dalai Lama is used within the country, i.e. it is not used for purposes other than humanitarian purposes etc., for which it is meant. I would like to know what arrangement is there by the Government to check it up.

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** There seems to be a misunderstanding in the minds of members that this particular society is run by the Dalai Lama's representatives or by Tibetans alone. This society has a governing body consisting of about seven persons, out of whom three are Indians, three are Tibetans and one is a foreigner and Dr. Gopal Singh, M.P., who is a prominent person, who is known to everybody, is the Chairman of the society.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :** He is a leftist.

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** All the funds which are collected by various foreign agencies and all over the country come to the Central Relief Committee which is a non-official body and it is the duty of the CRC to co-ordinate, to receive these funds, and to distribute them properly. So, a thorough check is kept, the CRC is fully in the picture as to what going on, where the money is coming from etc., and all the activities of the society are fully above board.

**श्री प्रेम चंद बर्मा :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि दलाई लामा जो कि हमारे जिला कांगडा में रहते हैं और वहाँ पर वह जमीन खरीद रहे हैं और उस जमीन को खरीद रहे हैं जो कि गरीब लोगों की जमीन है, वहाँ के लोगों ने उस के लिए प्रोटैस्ट किया कि दलाई लामा को यहाँ पर जमीन खरीदने की इजाजत

न दी जाय मगर सरकार ने उस पर तबज्जह नहीं दिया, दूसरी तरफ दलाई लामा ने जम्मू एंड काश्मीर में जमीन खरीदने के लिए इजाजत मांगी तो सरकार ने जम्मू और काश्मीर में जो काश्मीर के पहाड़ी इलाके हैं वहाँ पर उनकी जमीन खरीदने की इजाजत नहीं दी। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ सरकार से कि वह हिमाचल प्रदेश के गरीब इलाके जहाँ वह जमीन खरीद रहे हैं वहाँ उन के बसने से जब कि सी० धाई० ए० के धादमी जहाँ एक तरफ उन के साथ हैं वहाँ दूसरी तरफ चीन के ऐजेंट भी उन के कैम्पों में मौजूद हैं, तो क्या उन के वहाँ जमीन खरीदने से इस बात का शक नहीं है कि वहाँ पर विदेशी भट्टे कायम हो जायेंगे ?

**श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह सही है कि ज्यादातर जमीन जो उन्होंने ली है वह हिमाचल प्रदेश में है। लेकिन मैं यह मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ कि किसी किस्म की जबर्दस्ती वहाँ की जा रही है या जमीन ऐक्वायर की जा रही है बाई फोर्स। यह तो खुशी का सौदा है। जो लोग अपनी जमीन बेच रहे हैं उसे वह खरीद रहे हैं।

**श्री बलराज मधोक :** क्या यह सत्य है कि दलाई लामा चाहते हैं और उन के फालोवर भी चाहते हैं कि सहास में जहाँ के लोग उनके फालोवर्स हैं और के जहाँ उन्हीं का धर्म चलता है वहाँ वह जमीन खरीदें और वहाँ वह बसें मगर जो जम्मू काश्मीर रियासत के कानून हैं वह उन को इस बात की इजाजत नहीं देते और इसलिए जो जगह सब से उपयुक्त है उन के बसने के लिए और बाकी दृष्टियों से भी, वहाँ वह जमीन नहीं खरीद सकते ?

**श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, जम्मू और काश्मीर के बारे में तो मुझे मालूम नहीं है कि क्या उन से कहा गया है। लेकिन जहाँ तक कि इस का सवाल है कि वह कहाँ रहना चाहते हैं वहाँ नहीं रहना चाहते

हैं यह सब बातें उन के साथ बिस्कस होती है और कहीं उस के लिए पाबन्दी नहीं है...

श्री बलराज मधोक : वह जम्मू काश्मीर में बसना चाहते हैं.....

श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह : इस के बारे में मेरे पास सूचना नहीं है।

**SHRI HEM BARUA :** The hon. Minister has stated that money has come to the Dalai Lama from different charitable organisations in the world for charitable purposes. In that context, may I know whether the buying of tea estates comes within the purview of charitable activities and whether the Government propose to give the Dalai Lama the legitimate rights to follow his pursuits in this country without any hindrance ?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** Aid from foreign agencies is not given to the Dalai Lama himself. They have given to this particular society, a charitable society registered under the societies Act. And, what was the second part of the question ?

**SHRI HEM BARUA :** Whether the Dalai Lama would be allowed to pursue his legitimate activities in this country without any restrictions.

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** As far as that is concerned, the hon. Member knows that we have placed no restrictions on the Dalai Lama carrying on his activities and all his activities which concern the rehabilitation and resettlement of the refugees. It is only the political activities which we have advised him not to indulge in.

**AN HON. MEMBER :** But he is doing it. (*Interruption*).

**SHRI D. C. SHARMA :** May I know from the hon. Minister whether he is sure of the fact that His Holiness the Dalai Lama is performing only those duties which are necessitated on account of his flight from Tibet and on account of the Tibetans from that country and is he also sure of the fact

that the Dalai Lama is not being given that opportunity of political propaganda which has recently been given to the African League which is doing propaganda against the South African Apartheid policy ? After all, the Dalai Lama will also have the same opinion against Maoism and I think our Government has no good feeling towards that.

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** Sir, the Dalai Lama is our honoured guest. We have not placed any restrictions on his activities. He is carrying on whatever he is doing in regard to the welfare or the resettlement of his countrymen. He is carrying on those activities with whatever help he is getting himself and with whatever help is coming from outside. We have merely advised him that he should not indulge in any political activity which is likely to impair our relations with our neighbouring countries, and to that he has agreed, and there is no demand from his side in respect of the other things that the hon. Member mentioned.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस समय दलाई लामा की अपनी सम्पत्ति कितनी है। उन को फिलिपाइन के मेगासे से पुरस्कार के साथ साढ़े सत्तर हज़ार रुपया मिला है। एशिया पब्लिकेशन्स हाउस से उन की जीवनी प्रकाशित की गई है, जिस की रायल्टी उन को मिलती है। इस के प्रतिरिक्त उन को विदेशों से धन मिला है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस सारी सम्पत्ति में से कितना अंश वह अपने विचार से प्रचार के लिए हिन्दुस्तान में खर्च कर रहे हैं और इस सम्बन्ध में उन का कौन कौन सा साहित्य प्रकाशित हुआ है।

श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह : उन की सम्पत्ति के बारे में आंकड़े मेरे पास नहीं हैं और न ही मेरे पास यह सूचना है कि उन्होंने उस का कितना अंश कहाँ खर्च किया है। मैं बता चुका हूँ कि इस सोसायटी के, जिस के बारे में यह सवाल है, कितने फ़ंड्स बाहर से आये हैं और वे किस तरह से खर्च हो रहे हैं।

श्री शशि भूषण बाजपेयी : क्या दलाई लामा को यह बता दिया गया है कि चूंकि हिन्दुस्तान में जमींदारी प्रथा को समाप्त कर दिया गया है, इस लिए वह जो जमीन खरीद रहे हैं, कल उन को वह शिकमियों को न देनी पड़े ? मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या वह देश में कोई मठ भी बनाना चाहते हैं, जिस के लिए उन्होंने आज्ञा मांगी है।

श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह : कुछ जमीनों तो वे हैं, जो दलाई लामा स्वयं अपने किसी कार्य के लिये खरीद रहे हैं, लेकिन यह सवाल उन जमीनों के बारे में है, जो इस सोसायटी ने टीएस्टेट्स वर्गों में खरीदी हैं, जहां वह फ्रैक्टरी वर्गों सेट-अप करना चाहते हैं, ताकि तिब्बत से आने वाले रेफ्र्यूजीज को कुछ रोजगार दिया जा सके। दलाई लामा अपने लिए क्या खरीद रहे हैं, उस की जानकारी मेरे पास नहीं है और न ही उस का इस सवाल से कोई सम्बन्ध है।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : प्रारम्भ में दलाई लामा शरणागत के रूप में भारत आए थे, तो भारत ने अपनी पुरानी परम्पराओं के अनुसार उन को इस देश में शरण दी थी। लेकिन इस सोसायटी द्वारा स्वयं सीधे रूप में भूमि आदि खरीदने के पीछे क्या भारत सरकार और दलाई लामा का अभिप्राय यह है कि वे दलाई लामा के तिब्बत लौटने की आशा बिल्कुल छोड़ बैठे हैं और क्या भारत सरकार यह समझती है कि अब उन को इस देश के स्थायी नागरिक के रूप में भूमि आदि दी जाये, जिस से वह अपने और अपने सहयोगियों के पुनर्वास की व्यवस्था कर सकें, यदि हां, तो चीनी आक्रमण के बाद भारत सरकार ने इस संसद् में तिब्बत के सम्बन्ध में जो यह निर्णय किया था कि हम तिब्बत को मुक्त कर के वापस दलाई लामा को देंगे, क्या वह अपने उस निर्णय को भूल रही है ?

श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह : यह सवाल तो केवल इस सोसायटी के सम्बन्ध में है। माननीय सदस्य ने तो नीति का एक लम्बा-चौड़ा सवाल उठाया है, जिस का जवाब देने में मैं असमर्थ हूं।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछबाय : इस सरकार में तिब्बत वापस लेने की ताकत ही नहीं है।

SHRI NATH PAI : The Dalai Lama represents in international law the legitimate Government of the Tibetan people. Just as Queen Wilhelmina, when she had to take refuge from the Nazi aggressors in the United Kingdom, the fact that she was alone did not detract from the essence of what she represented, namely the legitimate Government of the Netherlands, the Dalai Lama represents the only legitimate Government of the people of Tibet. As such, he has been pleading, I think, for due recognition from the Government of India and also asking for facilities for travel abroad to carry out his legitimate religious duties and also I think seeking facilities to go to the UN to seek justice for his people and his country at the hands of that body, which stands as the defender of the rights of nations. May I know what is the Government of India's reaction to these different pleas for help and recognition by His Holiness the Dalai Lama ?

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH : This question is also on the same lines as that put by Shastriji. It is a very wide question which involves policy matters. It has been explained on the floor of the House a number of times that it is true that the Dalai Lama was the head of the local Government, but we have also recognised Chinese suzerainty over Tibet.

SHRI NATH PAI : I also asked whether the Dalai Lama asked for facilities for travel to neighbouring Buddhist countries in connection with his religious duties. What is the Government's reaction to that ? I also asked whether he wanted to go to UN. (Interruptions). UN happens to be in

America. (Interruption). What is the reaction of the Government of India to his desire to go to the UN ?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** The hon. Member is aware that the Dalai Lama recently paid a visit to Japan and other places. Our permission was asked and we gave it gladly. In future if he comes forward with such requests, we will certainly consider them. About the UN, such a request has not come to us from him yet.

**SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH :** I am glad the Government have repudiated certain allegations about the intentions and motives of the Dalai Lama in this country. Since there is a large exodus of Tibetan refugees to our country because of the Maoist activities there, do the Government propose to give some more assistance to the Dalai Lama and the charitable institutions he is running for rehabilitating the Tibetan refugees in conformity with our traditions of giving asylum to the people who have been forced to leave their country ?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** In addition to whatever is being done by the Dalai Lama and his organisations in this regard, Government of India have their own schemes for the rehabilitation of the Tibetan refugees. Both the schemes are going on in a parallel way.

**श्री एस० एम० जोशी :** जब दलाई लामा भारत आए थे, तब चीनी हुकूमत के साथ हमारे रिस्ते-नाते आज जैसे नहीं थे। जब से उन्होंने हमारे देश पर आक्रमण किया, तब से वे हमारे दुश्मन बने हुए हैं और, जैसा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कल कहा है, वह सिलसिला लगातार चल रहा है। ऐसी हालत में क्या हुकूमत इस बात पर विचार करेगी कि हम लोगों ने उस वक्त दलाई लामा पर जो शर्त लगाई थीं, उनको ढीला किया जाये और अपने लोगों के हित और अच्छाई के लिए वह जो सुविधायें चाहते हैं, वे उनको दी जायें ? जैसा कि बताया गया है, वह लद्दाख में अपने लोगों को बसाने

भादि के लिए कुछ जमीन चाहते हैं, लेकिन उसमें कुछ दिक्कतें आ रही हैं। क्या सरकार उनको वहां पर जमीन दे कर उन लोगों को वहां बसाने की इजाजत देगी ?

**श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह :** मैं पहले ही बता चुका हूँ कि लद्दाख और काश्मीर के बारे में मेरे पास कोई इतिला नहीं है। लेकिन मैं इसके बारे में मालूम करूंगा। मुझे मालूम नहीं है कि उन्होंने अपने लोगों को लद्दाख में सेटल करने के लिए इजाजत मांगी है और वह इजाजत नहीं मिली है। यह पालिसी का मैटर है और मैंने पहले ही इस बारे में जवाब देने में अपनी मजबूरी जाहिर की है। अगर माननीय सदस्य इस सोसायटी के बारे में कुछ इनफ़ॉर्मेशन चाहते हैं, तो वह मैं दे सकता हूँ।

**SHRI NARENDRA SINGH MAHIDA :** Sir Dalai Lama enjoys a special status in our country. May I know whether his properties are exempt from wealth tax or income tax ?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** I have no information on that point. I require fresh notice to answer that question.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** May I know whether the activities of all the Tibetan refugee establishments or institutions which are functioning at the moment in this country are all guided or looked after by the Central Relief Committee; if so, may I know what is the number of American and British citizens who are working in this country now attached to these various organisations and whether they are given any special privilege or immunity of any kind ?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** According to information in my possession I can only say about this particular society which has been registered recently. I have no information about the other institutions. (Interruption).

**SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, you are always very kind to me.

MR. SPEAKER : Be kind to Dalai Lama.

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Sir, we always share the sympathy towards Dalai Lama. That is a different matter. As far as Dalai Lama is concerned he is an enemy of a foreign country and we have given shelter for all his activities in India. As far as India is concerned, India can take the matter to the United Nations and advocate Dalai Lama's affair. But is it proper for us to aid Dalai Lama and go to United Nations and canvass against a country which is very detrimental to our interests? He must be a guest, but he should not bring India into difficulties. May I know from the hon. Minister what steps the Government of India has taken to secure our interests before giving protection to Dalai Lama?

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH : Our country's interests are always upper-most in our mind. We always take care of that. As far as giving asylum to Dalai Lama is concerned, as the House has already been informed, we have done it on humanitarian grounds. That we have always done and any civilised country would do that. Regarding the other question about raising the matter in the United Nations, it has not been raised and therefore there is no question of raising it here now.

श्री हेम राज : मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि चूंकि बहुत सारे तिब्बतन रिफ्यूजीज ने यहां पर जमीनें खरीद ली हैं, तो क्या उनको इण्डियन सिटिजनशिप के टुकूक हासिल हो जायेंगे? क्या यह भी सच है कि दलाई लामा यू० पी० में बसना चाहते थे, लेकिन धर्मशाला के लोगों ने गवर्नमेन्ट से रिप्रेजेन्ट किया कि उनको धर्मशाला से हटाया न जाय और धर्मशाला में ही रखा जाय?

श्री सुरेन्द्रपाल सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझ को नहीं मालूम कि दलाई लामा यू० पी० में बसना चाहते थे और उनको वहां बसने नहीं दिया गया, इसलिये वह वहां चले गये। जहां

तक सिटिजनशिप का सवाल है, तिब्बतन लोग जमीन नहीं खरीद रहे हैं, लेकिन तिब्बतियों को बसाने के लिये सोसायटी जमीन खरीद रही है, ऐसी सूरत में अगर वह सिटिजनशिप लेना चाहते हैं तो हमारे कायदे और कानूनों के मुताबिक ले सकते हैं।

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री : माननीय मंत्री जी ने बताया कि दलाई लामा हमारे सम्मानित प्रतिथि हैं, बहुत वर्षों से प्रतिथि हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इन सम्मानित प्रतिथि की सेवासत्कार में भारत सरकार ने जब से वह हिन्दुस्तान में आये हैं, तब से लेकर अब तक कुल कितना रुपया खर्च किया है तथा इस रुपये के खर्च करने का जस्टिफिकेशन क्या है?

श्री सुरेन्द्रपाल सिंह : यह एक बड़ा बसीह सवाल है। जहां तक उनकी मदद करने का ताल्लुक है, फिर भी जहां तक उन्हें जरूरत पड़ी, वहां तक उनकी मदद की गई—यह सेंट्रल रिलीफ़ कमेटी तिब्बतियों की मदद कर रही है। इस कमेटी के सालाना खर्च के लिये हम कुछ ग्रान्ट्स-इन-एड देते हैं, लेकिन दलाई लामा की तरफ़ से कोई मांग नहीं की गई है।

SHRI KARTIK ORAN : It is very nice of our government to extend traditional hospitality to the foreigners who come and seek political asylum in our country. Today Dalai Lama has come; tomorrow some Russian will come, the next day some Chinese, the fourth day some Americans, then the English and others. Now, we are very particular in rehabilitating foreigners. Here I would like to draw the attention of the government to the fact that wherever big projects are coming up the Adibasis are being displaced and no attempt has been made to properly rehabilitate them. I would like to know from the government whether it is not a fact that the foreigners occupy an advantageous position in India in the matter of rehabilitation whereas the Indians are treated as second-rate citizens?



**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** I think the remarks of the hon. Member are not fair. It is true that foreigners have no restrictions and they can buy property wherever they like and settle wherever they like and whenever they like. That is done on humanitarian grounds. But to say that we do not treat our own people well is not correct. Every possible help is given to our citizens.

**श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त :** हमारी सरकार ने कुछ शर्तों पर तिब्बत चीन को दिया था, लेकिन चीन ने उन शर्तों को नहीं माना और वह पूरी तरह से बायोलेसन कर रहा है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार चीन के होस्टाइल एटीचूड को देखते हुए तथा यह देखते हुए कि चीनी वहाँ पर तिब्बतियों को खत्म कर रहे हैं—क्या सरकार दलाई लामा को तिब्बत का इण्टीपेन्डेन्ट-हेड स्वीकार करेगी और उनकी पूरी तरह से मदद करेगी ?

**श्री सुरेन्द्रपाल सिंह :** यह सही है कि तिब्बत में भ्रान के बाद चाइना ने वे शर्तें पूरी नहीं की हैं जो उनको पूरी करनी चाहिये थीं तथा वे वहाँ पर तिब्बतन्त्र के साथ ज्यादातियाँ कर रहे हैं। जहाँ तक दूसरे सवाल का ताल्लुक है उसके बारे में पहले भी यहाँ पर कहा जा चुका है, उससे ज्यादा मैं कुछ नहीं कहना चाहूँगा।

**श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त :** आप जवाब दीजिये, क्या हर्ज है।

**MR. SPEAKER :** The question began with the purchase of some tea estates. Then the whole of the Tibet question, China question and America question came in. Because today there is no question hour and the hon. Minister also was kind enough to answer, I permitted these supplementaries, though they are not strictly relevant. Now, on this question the whole policy is being covered, not only Tibet but also America and even CIA.

**SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA :** May I know whether the Dalai Lama and any of his organisations before buying

this property took the permission of the Central Government or had any discussion with the Central Government ?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** I can only reply in regard to the properties purchased by the particular society, which is a society registered under the Societies Act. As I have stated in the statement itself, there is no bar on any society buying any property anywhere. So, the question of taking any permission does not arise.

**SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA :** Before buying these properties, had any of these organisations taken permission or had any discussion with the Central Government ?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** They did not have to take our permission.

**श्री रवि राय :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत का हित इसी में है कि भ्राजाद तिब्बत के प्रतीक दलाई लामा को हिन्दुस्तान में पूरी भ्राजादी से काम करने दिया जाय, लेकिन सरकार का रुख उन को भ्राजादी से काम नहीं करने देता है क्योंकि सरकार इस सिद्धांत को नहीं मानती है कि जहाँ राम हैं, वही भ्रयोष्या है। शरणाथियों को जो ज़मीन दी जाती है और दलाई लामा को व्यक्तिगत सम्पत्ति बनाने के लिये जो ज़मीन दी जाती है, उस में फर्क करना चाहिये। सम्पत्ति बनाने के लिये उन पर पाबन्दी हो, लेकिन तिब्बत के शरणाथियों को ज़मीन के लिये उन पर पाबन्दी न हो, वे हिन्दुस्तान में जहाँ बसना चाहें, उन को बसाया जाय—मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस के बारे में सरकार का क्या रुख है ?

**श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह मामला भ्रसल में दलाई लामा का या उन के जो भ्रपने ऐडवाइजर्स हैं या उन के वह नागरिक हैं जोकि उन के साथ भ्राये हैं उन के बारे में हम कोई दखलभ्रंदाजी नहीं कर सकते और जिस तरीके से वह बसना चाहते हैं उस के लिए वह स्कीम बनाते हैं और यह सोसायटी

भी उस का एक अंग है। अब इस में हम क्या कर सकते हैं? वह यहां भेजें या वहां भेजें। बाकी जो कुछ इमदाद वह चाहते हैं वह हम देते हैं। उस के मुताबिक स्कीम बनाते हैं तो अब उस में गवर्नमेंट क्या कर सकती है?

एक माननीय सदस्य : जमीन शरणार्थियों को देनी चाहिए लेकिन यह दलाई लामा जो जगह जगह प्रापरटी खरीद रहे हैं वह तो ठीक नहीं है।

श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह : दलाई लामा जो भी प्रापरटी खरीद रहे हैं वह लोकल जो लाज हैं उन के मुताबिक ही खरीद रहे हैं और जैसे और लोग खरीदते हैं जायदाद, जमीन बगैरह, वैसे ही वह भी खरीद रहे हैं तो उस में हम क्या करें?

SHRI R. K. SINHA : Sir, while I protest against the equation of Ram with Dalai Lama, because I belong to Ayodhya, I want to put a question that political or economic rehabilitation of Dalai Lama is one thing but taking the chestnuts out of the fire for foreign powers is another thing. Some negotiations are being carried on by America and China in Warsaw. The American-supported countries in the world are very lukewarm about Tibet. It appears that Tibetan lobby is much more enthusiastic about Dalai Lama here. Shall we bother about the interests of our country or the interests of foreign powers? We should look at the problems in the context of our national interests.

MR. SPEAKER : I don't think any reply is necessary.

श्री इत्हाक साम्भली : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी माननीय मंत्री ने बतलाया है कि इस सोसाइटी को दूसरे मुल्कों की इमदाद मिल रही है मगर उन्होंने उस की पूरी तफ्सील नहीं बतलाई। मैं आप के जरिए से दरखास्त कर्खा कि वह मेहरबानी करके यह पता

चलायेंगे कि किन-किन मुल्कों से उन को कितनी-कितनी इमदाद मिली है और क्या आयन्दा वह इस तफ्सील को पार्लियामेंट के सामने रक्लेंगे?

जैसा कि मंत्री जी ने अपने जवाब में फरमाया है कि इस सोसाइटी को फौरन एड मिलती है और इस में फारनर शामिल हैं तो क्या सरकार इस सोसाइटी को खास तौर पर इंटरनेशनल बोरडर बाली स्टेट्स जैसे कि कश्मीर, उत्तर प्रदेश, हिमाचल प्रदेश, असम और दूसरी बोरडर स्टेट्स में जमीनें खरीदने की मुमानियत करेगी ताकि वे रियासतें इंटरनेशनल साजिश का अड्डा न बन पायें?

[ادھیکش مہودے - ابھی مانیہ منتری نے بتایا ہے کہ اس سوسائٹی کو دوسرے ملکوں سے امداد مل رہی ہے مگر انہوں نے اس کی پوری تفصیل نہیں بتلائی - میں آپ کے ذریعہ سے یہ درخواست کرونگا کہ وہ مہربانی کر کے یہ پتہ چلائیں کہ کن کن ملکوں سے ان کو کتنی کتنی امداد ملی ہے اور کیا آئینہ وہ اس تفصیل کو پارلیامنٹ کے سامنے رکھینگے -

جیسا کہ مانیہ منتری نے اپنے جواب میں فرمایا ہے کہ اس سوسائٹی کو فارین ایڈ ملتی ہے اور اس میں فارنر شامل ہیں تو کیا سرکار اس سوسائٹی کو خاص طور پر انٹرنیشنل بورڈر والی اسٹیشن جیسے کہ ہماری کشمیر - اتر پردیش - ہماچل پردیش - اسام اور دوسری بورڈر اسٹیشن میں زمین خریدنے کی ضمانت کریگی تاکہ وہ ریاستیں انٹرنیشنل سازش کا اڈہ نہ بن پائیں -]

श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जहां तक यह सवाल है कि यह इमदाद, यह एड कहां से आती है तो वह तो मैंने स्टेटमेंट में दे रक्खा है और माननीय सदस्य यदि मेरे स्टेटमेंट को पढ़ेंगे तो वह सब उन को मालूम हो जायगा। अब यह कि कितना उन को कहां से रुपया प्राया है इमदाद के तौर पर वह मैं पहले एक सवाल के जवाब में बतला चुका हूं।

अब रहा यह सवाल कि यह इजाजत बोरडर स्टेट्स में दी जाय या न दी जाय जमीन आदि खरीदने के लिये तो उस के लिये तो लोकल स्टेट के लाज ऐप्वाइ करतें हैं चाहे वह सोसाइटी हो या कोई और सोसाइटी हो और वह इंडिया के अन्दर जायदाद, जमीन आदि खरीद सकती है और उस पर कोई बैन नहीं है। यह लोकल लाज के ऊपर डिपेंड करता है और वहां की स्टेट्स जब उन्हें जमीन खरीदने से मना नहीं करती हैं तो फिर हम क्या कर सकते हैं ?

श्री इसहाक साम्भली : चेअरमैन साहब, हम नागालैंड और दूसरी जगहों पर इंटरनेशनल साजिशों के शिकार हो चुके हैं तो इस चीज को सामने रखते हुए क्या हम मुमानियत करने पर सोचेंगे ?

[چيرمين صاحب - هم ناکالينڈ اور دوسری جگہوں پر انٹرنیشنل شازشوں کے شکار ہو چکے ہیں تو اس چیز کو سامنے رکھتے ہوئے کیا ہم معانت کرنے پر سوچینگے۔]

श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह : उस में कोई साजिश नहीं है।

श्री शिव नारायण : अध्यक्ष महोदय, भारतवर्ष की अपनी सम्यता रही है। मेरे मित्र ने राम का नाम लिया। मैं अयोध्या के पड़ोस में बसने वाला हूं। राजा रामचन्द्र जी ने विभीषण को शरण दी हम ने भी अपने देश में दलाई लामा को शरण दी

हुई है तो फिर इन विरोधी दल वालों को उनके द्वारा यहां पर स्थान और जमीन खरीदने और वहां पर रहने में क्यों आपत्ति होती है ? दूसरे में अपनी सरकार से जानना चाहता हूं कि उन की आप तिब्बत के केस के लिए यू० एन० ओ० में अपील करने में सहायता क्यों नहीं करती है ?

श्री महाराज सिंह भारती : जो सवाल नहीं थे उन सब का जवाब तो आ गया। अब मैं आप के द्वारा मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूं कि जो दरअसल सवाल है उस का भी जवाब आ जाय। सवाल यह है :

“क्या यह सच है कि सीमा क्षेत्रों में, विशेषकर कांगड़ा में और हिमाचलप्रदेश के अन्य क्षेत्रों में चाय बागानों जैसी सम्पत्तियां बड़े पैमाने पर दलाई लामा के नाम में खरीदने के प्रयास किये जा रहे हैं”

दूसरे सोसाइटी के नाम में भी कोई सम्पत्ति ली जा रही है या तिब्बती शरणार्थियों को बसाया जा रहा है या उन की मदद की जा रही है, इन सवालों के जवाब प्राये ही नहीं। सवाल तो सीधा यह है कि दलाई लामा जो साधू हैं, सन्यासी हैं, श्रीलाद नहीं, बच्चा नहीं, धार्मिक गुरु हैं तो क्या उन्होंने अपने नाम में सम्पत्ति खरीदी है ? मंत्री जी का उत्तर यह है कि एक सोसाइटी बनी हुई है तिब्बतियों के लिए उस ने लोकल लाज के मुताबिक सम्पत्तियां खरीदी हैं लेकिन जो सवाल पूछा गया उस का जवाब अभी तक नहीं दिया है और इस पर ३५ मिनट हो गये हैं तो अब तो मेहरबानी करके मंत्री जी सीधा जवाब दे दें ?

श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सवाल किया गया था कि क्या यह सच है कि दलाई लामा ने भी अपने नाम से यहां कोई जायदादें खरीदी हैं तो मैं ने कह दिया कि उस के आंकड़े हमारे पास नहीं हैं। अलबत्ता जो जमीन उस सोसाइटी ने खरीदी

हे उन का ब्यौरा मैं ने अपने स्टेटमेंट में दे दिया है लेकिन उन जमीनों के प्रन्दर दलाई लामा को हक नहीं पहुंचता क्योंकि वह तो सिर्फ उन रैफ्यूजीज के लिए बनाई गई है जो कि वहां से आये हुए हैं और वह तो उन्हें कुछ रोजगार देने के लिए और इमदाद देने के लिए हैं। वह तमाम जमीनें उस सोसाइटी ने खरीदी हैं। बाकी दलाई लामा ने क्या जायदादें वहां पर खरीदी हैं वह एतिला मेरे पास नहीं है।

**SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM :** The Minister was pleased to say that real estates were purchased but he does not know the extent. Does he at least know the quality of tea grown and if we drink that tea does he think that our relations with China will become worse than what they are?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** I do not see any reason why any property purchased by the society should have any adverse effect on our relations with China. It is purely for charitable and humanitarian purposes and politics is not involved in it there at all. I do not agree with the hon. Member's view that it will affect our relations with China.

**SHRI G. S. REDDI :** Is it not in consonance with our secular policy to allow Dalai Lama to preach, propagate and practise Buddhist religion in our country?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** The Dalai Lama is at perfect liberty.

**MR. SPEAKER :** The more I wait more new people are getting up. Even people on the back benches who were talking among themselves have come to the front benches and are anxious to ask supplementaries.

**SHRI S. S. KOTHARI :** Will the Government keep a track of the land purchased by the Dalai Lama from time to time directly or indirectly and see that those lands are dispersed and are not in strategic areas so that a Tibetan enclave is not created? Some

Members may laugh at it but after two, three or five years you may have a new problem that a Tibetan enclave may come up and some political insurrection or something may come from there. In view of past experience would the Ministry take note of it and carefully watch how the Dalai Lama acquires more and more lands? He is a guest and we welcome him but not at the cost of national security. It is going to happen after ten years. I shall show it if I am here in the House then.

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH :** The Government of India does not interfere with the functioning of private organisations. As regards the lands purchased by this society and how they are utilised, I may assure the hon. Members that the Central Relief Committee, through which all the funds from foreign countries as well as from India are channelised for this particular society, does keep itself fully informed of how they are utilised and the activities of the society are absolutely above board. There is no reason whatsoever why the hon. Member should doubt its *bona fides*.

**श्री सत्य नारायण सिंह :** यह बात सुनने में आई है कि दलाई लामा हिन्दुस्तान छोड़ कर बाहर जाना चाहते हैं लेकिन सरकार उन को इस बात की इजाजत नहीं दे रही है मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि उस में कहां तक सच्चाई है और अगर वह सच है तो उस के पीछे सरकार का क्या इरादा है।

**श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह :** मैं पहले भी कह चुका हूँ कि जब दलाई लामा ने जापान बगैरह जाने के लिये इजाजत मांगी थी तो उन्हें वहां जाने की इजाजत दे दी गई थी अभी उन्होंने कहीं बाहर जाने के लिए हम से इजाजत नहीं चाही है। जब मांगेंगे, तो हम उस वक्त देख लेंगे।

**SHRI TULSHIDAS JADHAV :** May I know whether Dalai Lama has accepted the nationality of India and if not, how has he got the authority to purchase land and property here?

MR. SPEAKER : This question has been asked at least half a dozen times. The unfortunate thing is that many of them who put the questions either were not present here or if they were present they were somewhere else. Now the same question is being repeated. Exactly the same question was asked when they were in the Lobby or somewhere else. I have already allowed 40 minutes for this.

If the hon. Minister wants to reply, he can.

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH : If the hon. Member takes the trouble of going through that statement, he will find that there is no bar on foreigners against the purchase of land and other properties in India.

श्री श्रीचन्व गोयल : जो तिब्बती बच्चे हैं उनकी शिक्षा का क्या प्रबन्ध है। उनकी शिक्षा भारतीय अध्यापकों द्वारा दी जाती है या तिब्बती अध्यापकों द्वारा ? उनके अन्दर क्या इस प्रकार की भावना कायम रखने की व्यवस्था है कि उन्हें एक दिन अपने देश के लिए स्वतंत्रता प्राप्त करनी है ?

मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि यदि दलाई लामा अपने देश की स्वतंत्रता के प्रश्न को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में ले जायें तो क्या भारत सरकार उनकी सहायता करेगी ?

श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह : यह प्रश्न इस सवाल से नहीं उठता है। मैं क्या इसका जवाब दूँ।

SHRI RAJASEKHARAN : May I know whether the Government of India is aware that there is a proposal by the Tibetan Resettlement Association in Mysore to have the Tibetan refugees and also the landless people settled in Mysore State. If that is true, is the Government of India going to allow the scheme ?

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH : I have no information about it.

श्री मुहम्मद इस्माइल : मंत्री महोदय ने बताया है कि एक सोसाइटी के जरिये से

तमाम काम हो रहा है, जमीनें खरीदी जा रही हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि बैस्टर्न कंट्रीज से और खास तौर से यू० एस० ए० से क्या इस सोसाइटी को रुपया पैसा मिल रहा है ? हम लोगों ने अनलाफुल एक्टिविटी बिल पास किया है जिस के अधीन ये तमाम चीजें आ जाती हैं। इस वास्ते कम से कम यह तो बताया जाय कि बाहर के मुल्कों से और खास तौर से अमरीका से रुपया इस सोसाइटी को मिलता है या नहीं ? क्या इसकी खबर आपको है या नहीं है ?

श्री सुरेन्द्रपाल सिंह : यह तो स्टेटमेंट में लिखा हुआ है कि इस सोसाइटी को इमदाद मिलती है। फारेन एजेंसीज का नाम भी लिखा हुआ है। यह ठीक है कि जो फारेन एजेंसीज हैं वे प्राइवेट एजेंसीज हैं और वे रुपया एकट्टा करती हैं और इकट्टा करके भेजती हैं। लेकिन उन मुल्कों की गवर्नमेंट्स उस में शामिल नहीं होती हैं। वे रुपया नहीं दे रही हैं।

श्री रणधीर सिंह : सियासत में एक पालिसी होती है, मास्टरली इनएक्टिविटी। क्या इस पालिसी का नाम आपने सुना है ? यह पालिसी लार्ड लिटन और लार्ड रिपन ने बोर्डर एरियाज के लिए तय की थी। इसका मतलब यह है कि फ्रंटियर पर फ्रंटियर के ही आदमियों से काम लिया जाए और दुश्मन से लड़ाया जाए। इस पालिसी के मानेलेख और बड़े कामयाब नतीजे निकले हैं। हिन्दुस्तान के फ्रंटियर्स पर और तिब्बत की सरहद पर मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस पालिसी के तहत काम आप कर रहे हैं। नाथु ला, चो ला, हाट स्प्रिंग आदि जो इलाके हैं, हिन्दुस्तान और तिब्बत की जो सरहद है वहां पर क्या दलाई लामा के साथ जो तिब्बती आर्ये हैं या अपने आप आए हैं उनको डिप्लाय किया जाएगा, इन फ्रंटियर्स पर उनको आबाद किया जाएगा ? हिन्दुस्तान और चीन के बीच तिब्बत को बफर स्टेट बनाने के लिए क्या दलाई लामा के आदमियों से काम लिया

जाएगा और उसके लिए जरूरत पड़े तो वहां उनके लिए जायदाद भी क्या खरीदी जाएगी ? मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आपने इस पर गौर किया है ?

MR. SPEAKER : Now, the whole debate will be concluded by Mr. Kachwai. Mr. Kachwai.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : मंत्री महोदय ने अपने वक्तव्य में बताया है कि किसी भी देश का कोई भी भ्रादमी यहां ज़मीन खरीद सकता है, उस पर कोई रोक नहीं है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या मंत्री महोदय ने इस पर विचार किया है कि पहले वह अपना रजिस्ट्रेशन करवाये और फिर ज़मीन खरीदे ताकि सरकार को इस बात की जानकारी रहे कि फलां-फलां भ्रादमी बाहर का यहां ज़मीन खरीद रहा है ? क्या आपने कोई भ्रादेश निकाले हैं कि बिना रजिस्टर करवाये हुए कोई विदेशी यहां भारत में ज़मीन नहीं खरीद सकता है ?

मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि दलाई लामा के जो साथी हैं या जो उनके साथ लोग आए हैं क्या उन्हें गुरिल्ला युद्ध की ट्रेनिंग दी जा रही है या फौजी ट्रेनिंग दी जा रही है ताकि वे वक्त आने पर चीन के खिलाफ ठीक ढंग से संघर्ष कर सकें ?

श्री सुरेन्द्रपाल सिंह : जहां तक रजिस्ट्रेशन का सवाल है यह सोसाइटी रजिस्टर हो चुकी है, इसलिए कोई एतराज नहीं उठना चाहिये। जहां तक . . .

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : सवाल यह नहीं है। आपने यह कहा है कि कोई भी विदेशी भारत में जायदाद खरीद सकता है। क्या यह खतरनाक बात नहीं है कि कोई भी आए और यहां आ कर जायदाद खरीद ले ?

श्री सुरेन्द्रपाल सिंह : इस वक्त यही कानून है कि कोई विदेशी यहां आकर खरीद सकता है।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : इसको ठीक करो।

श्री सुरेन्द्रपाल सिंह : यह सोसाइटी रजिस्टर हो चुकी है। इसके एम्ज एंड प्रावजैक्ट्स सब हमें मालूम हैं। इसलिए कोई एतराज की बात नहीं है।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : कोई भी विदेशी यहां ज़मीन खरीद सकता है जो यह कानून है यह गलत कानून है। उसे आप ठीक नहीं कर सकते ? यह बड़ा खतरनाक है कि कोई भी आ कर ले सकता है।

श्री सुरेन्द्रपाल सिंह : कानून गलत है या सही है, हाउस ने बनाया हुआ है और इसको बदलना भी हाउस के हाथ में है।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : नीति सम्बन्धी प्रश्न का उत्तर कौन देगा ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह पालिसी मॅटर है। कैबिनेट को इनके बारे में डिशिशन लेना होता है। मिनिस्टर नहीं ले सकता है।

11.45 hrs.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

AUDITED ACCOUNTS OF INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ETC.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD) : On behalf of Dr. Triguna Sen, I beg to lay on the Table :—

- (1) A copy of the Audited Accounts of the Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, for the year 1965-66, under sub-section (4) of section 23 of the Institutes of Technology Act, 1961. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2188/67].
- (2) A copy of the Punjab Local Authorities (Aided Schools) Haryana Amendment Ordinance, 1967 (Haryana Ordinance No. 9 of 1967) promulgated by the Governor of Haryana on the 3rd October, 1967, under article 213(2) (a) of the Constitution read

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

with clause (c) (iv) of the Proclamation dated the 21st November, 1967, issued by the President in relation to the State of Haryana. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2189/67]

ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION OF INDIA

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Report of the National Research Development Corporation of India, New Delhi, for the year 1966-67 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon, under sub section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2190/67].

STATEMENT CORRECTING ANSWER TO UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 4931 RE. HINDI TELEPRINTER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI I. K. GURJAL) : I beg to lay on the Table a statement correcting the answer given on the 19th December, 1967 to Unstarred Question No. 4931 by Shri Prakash Vir Shastri regarding Hindi teleprinters. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2191/67]

RICE-MILLING INDUSTRY (REGULATION AND LICENSING) AMENDMENT RULES ETC.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION (SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE) : I beg to lay on the Table :—

- (1) A copy of the Rice-Milling Industry (Regulation and Licensing) Third Amendment Rules, 1967, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1465 in Gazette of India dated the 30th September, 1967, under sub-section (4) of section 22 of the Rice Milling Industry (Regulation) Act, 1958.

- (2) A statement showing reasons for delay in laying the above Notification. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2192/67].

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Sir, when the Minister lays a statement showing reasons for delay in laying the Notification, let him assure the House that this delay will be avoided in future. Otherwise, what is the use of raising this matter, Sir ?

MR. SPEAKER : I agree.

11.46 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES MINUTES

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : मैं सरकारी आश्वासनों सम्बन्धी समिति की क्रमशः 20, 21 और 22 सितम्बर, 23 और 24 अक्टूबर, 6 और 7 नवम्बर तथा 19 दिसम्बर, 1967 को हुई पांचवीं से बारहवीं बैठकों तक के कार्यवाही सारांश सभा पटल पर रखता हूँ।

PRESIDENT'S ASSENT TO BILLS

SECRETARY : Sir, I lay on the Table following two Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament during the current session and assented to by the President since a report was last made to the 8th December, 1967 :—

1. The Taxation Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1967.
2. The Court-fees (Delhi Amendment) Bill, 1967.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

TWENTY-THIRD REPORT

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal) : I beg to present the Twenty-third Report of the Estimates Committee on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Twenty-ninth Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha) on the erstwhile Ministry of Transport and Communications (Department of Communications and Civil Aviation)—Civil Aviation Department.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS

SIXTH REPORT

SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL (Dabhoi) : On behalf of Shri Surendranath Dwivedy, I beg to present the Sixth Report of the Committee on Public Undertakings on contracts entered into by Rourkela Steel Plant of Hindustan Steel Limited with the M/s. B. Patnaik Mines (P) Limited and others for the supply of Iron ore and Manganes ore.

PETITION RE. CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL

SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA (Jammu) : I beg to present a petition from Major-General (Retd.) U. C. Dubey and others, relating to the Constitution (Amendment) Bill, 1967, (*Amendment of the Eighth Schedule*).

11.48 HOURS

STATEMENT RE. CEMENT DISTRIBUTION REGULATION

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI RAGHUNATH REDDI) : On behalf of Shri F. A. Ahmed, I wish to make a statement on the decision of Government to regulate distribution of cement in the country . . .

SHRI N. DANDEKAR *rose*—

MR. SPEAKER : We do not allow a discussion now. Let him lay the statement on the Table.

SHRI RAGHUNATH REDDI : ..I beg to lay on the Table a statement on the decision of Government to regulate distribution of cement in the country. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-2193/67*].

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज इस सत्र का अन्तिम दिन है। इस विषय पर चर्चा करने या प्रश्न पूछने का अवसर कब मिलेगा ?

MR. SPEAKER : When once it is allowed, it has to be done again. The practice we have been following with respect to such statements is that after the statement is made, members may ask for time to discuss it. If immediately after it is made, questions are allowed, it will take much time without yielding corresponding results. We will not be able to get proper replies. One question is not going to clarify all matters. On one question today we have taken nearly 45 minutes. If we allow questions on this, it will take another 40 minutes without yielding any result. That is my difficulty. Therefore, we made a rule.

Let Members go through the statement. If necessary, we can have a discussion later on, next session.

SHRI N. DANDEKAR (Jamnagar) : That will mean that the mischief will be done and then we will have a debate over it.

MR. SPEAKER : He might write to the Minister. Or he might write to me and I will forward it to the Minister. Otherwise, we will take another 40 minutes on this.

11.50 HOURS

BANKING LAWS (AMENDMENT) BILL\*

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JAGANNATH PAHADIA) : On behalf of Shri Morarji Desai, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Banking Regulation Act, 1949, so as to provide for the extension of social control over banks and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, and also further to amend the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, and the State Bank of India Act, 1955.

MR. SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the

\*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary. Part II, section 2, dated 23-12-67.



Banking Regulation Act, 1949, so as to provide for the extension of social control over banks and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, and also further to amend the Reserve Bank of India, Act, 1934, and the State Bank of India Act 1955".

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I do not want to object to this Bill, but I want to say one thing...

MR. SPEAKER : Shri S. Kundu

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore) : I want to make this submission. I do not want that the nation should be fooled and cheated in the name of socialisation or in the name of this Bill. We demand complete nationalisation of the banks. I want to make this very clear. But the Bill that has come before us will only serve the interests of certain people. So far as the Government is concerned, it will further bureaucratise the entire banking industry and it will never serve the purpose for which the entire country demanded nationalisation of banks.

AN HON. MEMBER : Not entire country.

SHRI S. KUNDU : 99 per cent of the people of the country. During these years, out of the deposits, a huge proportion, 87 per cent, has gone as loans to big industrial houses. 49 per cent of the shares are held by 3 per cent of the shareholders. 36 per cent of the shares are held by one per cent of the shareholders—I am just giving you these figures to show the magnitude of the hold of big business on the banks. The directors, their relations, brothers, uncles and so on among themselves distribute the loans and interest to their own concerns.

This has actually helped the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few. Therefore, I would request Government to take back this Bill and bring forward a complete Bill nationalising the entire banking structure. That is the only solution.

If the Government by this Bill want to show to the country that they are in favour of nationalisation, it will only

be cheating and fooling the entire country, though we are demanding complete nationalisation.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE *rose*—

MR. SPEAKER : The rule is that if a motion for leave to introduce is objected to, the member opposing may make a brief statement and reply will be given by the Minister concerned. Then without further debate, the question has to be put. The rule is very clear. If all of you want to speak, it will become a debate.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I am not transgressing the rule.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour) : Only one second.

MR. SPEAKER : Everybody wants only one second.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : After all there has been a convention here.

MR. SPEAKER : Convention should replace rule ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Why should you be so rigid about the rules on the last day ?

On behalf of my group, I want to register my protest and say that the Congress has succumbed to the wishes of the big business houses. Now it is quite clear...

SHRI N. DANDEKAR (Jamnagar) : Is he opposing the Bill ?

MR. SPEAKER : Yes.

SHRI N. DANDEKAR : He has not said so.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : This is a prostitution of nationalisation.

I would only request you to convey our feelings to the hon. Deputy Prime Minister that he will not be able to end monopoly by keeping the banks in the hands of the sharks.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Banking Regulation Act, 1949, so as to provide for the extension of social control over banks and for matters

connected therewith or incidental thereto, and also further to amend the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, and the State Bank of India Act, 1955".

*The motion was adopted.*

SHRI JAGANNATH PAHADIA :  
I introduce the Bill.†

12.55 HOURS

#### CIVIL DEFENCE BILL\*

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN  
THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS  
(SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA):  
On behalf of Shri Y. B. Chavan, I beg  
to move for leave to introduce a Bill  
to make provision for civil defence and  
for matters connected therewith.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to make provision for civil defence and for matters connected therewith".

*The motion was adopted*

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :  
I introduce the Bill.

11.56 hrs.

#### COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES FOURTH REPORT

श्री श्रीचन्व गोयल (चण्डीगढ़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं चौथी लोक सभा की विशेषाधिकार समिति की चौथी रिपोर्ट पर यह विवाद उठाना चाहता हूँ। 4 जून को, जब कि देश की संसद् में हजारी रिपोर्ट के सम्बन्ध में विचार हो रहा था, हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स के एडीटर, श्री मूलगांवकर, ने "श्रीडज भाफ़ दि स्टार चेम्बर" के शीर्षक से एक लेख लिखा, जिस को पढ़ कर कोई भी व्यक्ति इस नतीजे पर पहुँचे बग़ैर नहीं रह सकता कि सम्पादक महोदय ने इस सदन की गरिमा को बड़ा

भारी घक्का लगाया है, इस सदन की तुलना स्टार चेम्बर से कर के इस को अपमानित किया है, इस की मान-हानि की है।

मैं नें इंगलैंड का इतिहास पढ़ा है। मैं स्टार चेम्बर नाम की कोर्ट की कुछ पृष्ठभूमि भ्राप की सेवा में रखना चाहता हूँ। चार्ल्स द्वितीय और चार्ल्स तृतीय के समय से इंगलैंड में स्टार चेम्बर नाम की एक कोर्ट थी, जिस की छत पर सितारे बने हुए थे। उस कोर्ट में जो सदस्य बैठते थे, वे केवल इधर-उधर की सुनी हुई भ्रफ़वाहों के भ्राघार पर, किसी बात का सबूत लिये बग़ैर, एक सम्मरी ढंन से लोगों की ट्रायल कर के उन को दंड देते थे और उन पर भ्रत्याचार करते थे। उन लोगों ने बड़े गैर-जिम्मेदार तरीके से व्यवहार करना शुरू किया था। उसी कारण उस समय राजा और संसद् के बीच में एक संघर्ष चला। उस संघर्ष में आखिर में संसद् की विजय हुई और उस ने उस स्टार चेम्बर की कोर्ट को दबाया।

स्टार चेम्बर की कोर्ट से इस संसद् की तुलना कर के सम्पादक महोदय ने यह कल्पना देने की कोशिश की है कि मानों भ्राज का यह हमारा सदन एक गैर-जिम्मेदार लोगों का सदन है, किसी बात की जांच-पड़ताल किये बग़ैर इस सदन में भीषण और गम्भीर आरोप लगाए जाते हैं। उस लेख में से कुछ उद्धरण पढ़ कर मैं यह सिद्ध करूंगा कि किस प्रकार सम्पादक महोदय ने भ्राज के इस जनतंत्र के प्रभुसत्ता-सम्पन्न सर्वोपरि सदन को लोगों की नज़रों में बेइज्जत करने का प्रयत्न किया है।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि किसी भी सम्पादक महोदय को अपने विचार रखने की स्वतंत्रता है।

परन्तु एक स्वतंत्र देश में जैसा कि कहा गया है कि किसी की भी भ्राजादी उस की नाक से परे नहीं चलती। एक व्यक्ति भ्रब दूसरे के ऊपर कीचड़ उछालता है या दूसरे के ऊपर इस तरह की नुक्ताचीनी करता है तो उसे यह भी देखना चाहिए कि क्या जिस लोकतं

\*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, section 2, dated 23-12-67.

†Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

## [श्री श्रीचन्द्र गोयल]

के तरीके को हमारे देश ने अपनाया है उस की मानहानि कर के और जिस संस्था को सारे देश ने ग्रहण किया है उस संस्था को घबका पहुंचा कर उस के प्रति अविश्वास पैदा कर के, लोगों के अन्दर इस जनतंत्र की पद्धति से उन को नफरत हो जाय इस प्रकार का वातावरण तो वह पैदा नहीं कर रहे हैं? अध्यक्ष महोदय, सम्पादक महोदय ने कहा है :

"The proposition has only to be put in this manner to recognise the absurdity of it, but this is precisely what it amounts to if we are to take with any seriousness the wild charges which have been flung in Parliament against the Birlas."

## 12 Hours

बिरलाज के बारे में चूँकि हजारी रिपोर्ट है और उस पर आप ने यह कहा कि अगले सत्र के पहले सप्ताह में उस पर आप विवाद इस सदन में लेंगे, इस कारण मैं उस के अंदर बिलकुल नहीं जाना चाहता। लेकिन मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आज जिस प्रकार से बिरला मनोवृत्ति है, आज जिस तरीके से कुछ लोग लाखों रुपये रोज की कमाई करते हैं उस के मुकाबिले में हमारे देश के अन्दर ऐसे भाई हैं कि जिनकी आय रुपये दो रुपये से अधिक नहीं, जिन की बुनियादी जरूरतें भी पूरी नहीं होतीं, इसलिए आज यदि सदन का कोई माननीय सदस्य इस बिरला मनोवृत्ति के विरुद्ध कोई आवाज संसद के अन्दर उठाता है, आज जो यह वर्तमान सिस्टम है उसके मुकाबिले पर समाजवाद का सिस्टम अपने देश में आये या लोगों की आय के अन्दर भेद कम से कम हो उस की आवाज उठाता है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हर एक माननीय सदस्य को इस बात का अधिकार है। कुछ लोगों के भाषणों से हमें मतभेद हो सकता है, कुछ लोग शायद उतनी जिम्मेदारी से बात सदन के अन्दर नहीं करते होंगे, उस से हमारा भी मतभेद हो सकता है लेकिन एक दो भाषणों से यह निष्कर्ष निकाल लेना या इस नतीजे पर

पहुँचना कि सारे का सारा जो सदन है वह गैर-जिम्मेदार लोगों का है और आज वह एक अत्याचार का साधन बन गया है, आज वह एक जुल्म व सितम का हथियार बन गया है, इस प्रकार की कल्पना सम्पादक महोदय ने जनता को दे कर इस सदन के साथ बड़ा भारी अन्याय किया है। सम्पादक आगे जा कर लिखते हैं :

"The question that now arises is how far can we go in allowing parliament to behave like some kind of a Star Chamber sitting in judgment of individuals and institutions... 55

इसमें तीन चार बातों की तरफ उन्होंने संकेत किया है और उन्होंने स्टार चैम्बर से जिस प्रकार तुलना की है..... (व्यवधान) अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि सम्पादक महोदय अपने अधिकार की सीमा से आगे बढ़ गए। मैं सम्पादक का अधिकार समझता हूँ कि वह उचित प्रकार की टिप्पणी किसी संसदीय प्रणाली के संबंध में कर सकते हैं लेकिन उन को यह अधिकार नहीं है कि इस सम्पूर्ण संसद को, पूरी लोक सभा को लोगों के सामने इस ढंग से पेश करें कि जिससे यह दिखाई दे कि इस संसद के सदस्य जिम्मेदारी से व्यवहार नहीं कर रहे हैं बल्कि वह कुछ लोगों को हानि पहुंचाने के लिए काम कर रहे हैं। इससे तो इनकार नहीं किया जा सकता कि यह सम्पादक महोदय उस समाचार पत्र से संबंध रखते हैं जिस के मालिक बिरला हैं इसलिये कुदरती तौर पर शायद उन को इस बात का दुख हुआ होगा लेकिन अध्यक्ष महोदय, अपनी जिम्मेदारी का उन को भी सबूत देना चाहिए था और जब इस सदन की विशेषाधिकार समिति ने उन को भ्रवसर दिया, सब से पहले उन को पत्र लिखा, इस लेख की तरफ उन का ध्यान दिलाया, उस के उत्तर में भी न उन्होंने किसी प्रकार की क्षमा याचना की न यह कहा कि मुझ से यह गलती हुई है बल्कि उन्होंने कहा कि जो कुछ मैंने किया है अपनी जिम्मेदारी को निभाने के लिए किया है तो विशेषाधिकार समिति के माननीय

सदस्य भी अपनी जिम्मेदारी निभा सकते हैं और जब उन की प्रत्यक्ष रूप में गवाही हुई, जब वह समिति के सामने पेश हुए और समिति के प्रति योग्य सदस्यों ने बार बार उन से प्रश्न पूछे तो उस समय भी उन्होंने किसी प्रकार की अपनी गलती को स्वीकार नहीं किया बल्कि उन्होंने यह कहा कि मैंने इस सदन के किसी भी विशेष अधिकार को भंग नहीं किया है। हालांकि बार बार हमारे माननीय सदस्य उन के ध्यान में यह चीज लाये कि चाहे आप का इरादा नहीं होगा, आप की नीयत नहीं होगी, लेकिन इस लेख को पढ़ कर हर एक व्यक्ति इस नतीजे पर पहुंचेगा कि जो इस सदन के सदस्य हैं वह गैर-जिम्मेदारी से व्यवहार करते हैं, तो भी उन्होंने अपनी इस गलती की क्षमा याचना नहीं की। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सदन ने बहुत बड़ा बड़प्पन का सबूत दिया है कि इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुंच कर कि सम्पादक महोदय ने विषाधिकारों की अवहेलना की है, विषाधिकारों को भंग किया है, उस के बावजूद भी उन को किसी प्रकार का दंड नहीं दिया। मैं यही इस समिति का बड़प्पन समझता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस को नजर-अन्दाज किया है। लेकिन आज इस विवाद के द्वारा मैं यह बात इस सदन के स्वरूप रखना चाहता हूँ कि जब इस देश ने लोकतंत्र की पद्धति को अपनाया है और जब इस लोक तंत्र में सम्मानित सदस्य भारत की सारी जनता के वयस्क मतों से चुन कर आते हैं तो उन के संबंध में अपने लेख द्वारा, अपने कुछ हितों की रक्षा के लिए या उस के जो अखबार के मालिक हैं केवल उनके हितों का विचार कर के सारे सदन के ऊपर जिस प्रकार कीचड़ उछाला गया है मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बहुत अनुचित बात है और इस से सदन की गरिमा को भी बड़ा भारी धक्का लगा है। इसलिये मैं निवेदन करता हूँ कि यह जो आवेदन है इस को यह सदन स्वीकार करे।

MR. SPEAKER : Before anything is done, I wish to say that according to the rules, the hon. Member is entitled

to move a motion. Now that the Committee has gone into it and made some recommendations, we may proceed with the next step without any further speeches. Mr. Goel has made a long speech and that is enough for the day. Mr. Khadilkar's motion is also coming.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Barmer) : Sir, is the Committee of Privileges superior to this House ?

MR. SPEAKER : It is a creature of this House. How can it be superior ? I am not here to answer which is bigger or which is more powerful. This House is supreme.

The question is :

"That the Fourth Report of the Committee of Privileges presented to the House on the 12th December, 1967, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted*

MR. SPEAKER : Now Shri Khadilkar.

SHRI KHADILKAR (Khed) : Sir, I move :

"That this House agrees with the Fourth Report of the Committee of Privileges presented to the House on the 12th December, 1967."

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That this House agrees with the Fourth Report of the Committee of Privileges presented to the House on the 12th December, 1967."

*The motion was adopted.*

12.11 HOURS

MOTION RE : INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER : The House will resume further discussion on the motion regarding the international situation. 2 hours remain. The PSP has not participated in the debate.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बिबेट का जवाब कौन देगा— न यहां पर प्राइम मिनिस्टर हैं और न डिप्टी प्राइम मिनिस्टर हैं।

**MR. SPEAKER :** The Prime Minister is not, going to give the final reply.

**SHRI M. R. MASANI (Rajkot) :** When is the Minister going to reply, Sir?

**MR. SPEAKER :** Today we are having lunch hour. The Minister will reply at 2.30. Now, Shri Nath Pai.

**SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not know if this debate was just an academic exercise or a serious effort on the part of Government. As I listened to the Prime Minister yesterday, I had an uneasy feeling that I was reading that annual document which the External Affairs Ministry presents to this House called the Annual Report of the Ministry of External Affairs. I felt that the same dosage of unadulterated drabness was once again being distributed to the House. The debate began with a whimper and it ended yesterday at least almost with a shriek.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to one serious aspect—the absence of the Prime Minister. The technical aspect of it has been dealt with by Mr. Masani yesterday and you have tried to mollify the feelings of the House. But there is a serious aspect as to who replies on behalf of Government. The House has allowed this change in the Ministry of External Affairs to go unnoticed. Neither Parliament nor the Press nor the country has taken cognizance of the fact that there has been a change in the Ministry of External Affairs. Originally we thought that the change of portfolio was a temporary one and other permanent arrangements would be made. Now we have this change which has been made very imperceptibly, but nonetheless it is a major change. It seems the Prime Minister is going to hold the portfolio. Who holds the portfolio of which department is absolutely the concern of the party in power, but so far as the absence of the Prime Minister today is concerned, I appreciate she has gone on a legitimate duty. But I would like to know, is the office of the External Affairs Ministry such a minor one that it can be attended to when one has

the leisure? I think the formulation of foreign policy, the assessment of the reaction of other countries to that policy and the adjustments necessary in the light of the dynamics of the international situation is a continuous process. It is not a process which can be attended to in a half-hearted manner. The External Affairs portfolio should not be made a part-time job. The Prime Minister has to look after the Centre-State relations. She has to look after the Atomic Energy Department; she has to look after Planning, not to mention the necessity of looking after the affairs of the Congress Party and the necessity of settling scores with Mr. Kamaraj or disciplining Mr. Patil. With all these worries and anxieties and pre-occupations of the Prime Minister, I would like to ask, is it fair to the portfolio, is it fair to Parliament and is it fair to the Prime Minister herself that she should be saddled with this responsibility. I have regard for the Prime Minister's undoubted talents and unchallenged charm. But even granting this, one has to raise this legitimate question, whether foreign affairs is such a minor thing that it can be relegated to a part-time job. I would like Government to clarify its position on this issue.

One gets an impression that Government regards external affairs mainly as a kind of a large-sized hospitality centre and travelling agency. The External Affairs Ministry today is becoming nothing more than a well established and fairly run hospitality centre-cum-travel agency looking after the arrangements of State dignitaries who come as the guests of India and, ultimately, it seems that for the conduct of foreign affairs the main pillars and props of India are not the experts in foreign affairs but, credit will have to be given by this country to them, the pilots of international airlines, who bring the distinguished guests, and the cooks and servants of the Rashtrapati Bhawan, because that is what foreign affairs is coming to.

When we have a look—I will not have the time to go into it in details—when we have a close look at the personnel who manage, I am reminded of

modern painting. I am sure, Sir, sometimes, when you find time, you too go and visit some of the modern exhibitions of modern paintings. Why do I say I am reminded of modern painting. When I look at the arrays and hordes of ambassadors, envoys, Joint Secretaries, Secretaries, Special Secretaries and Secretary General, as the modern painting is often rather bewildering to a common man so is the Ministry to me. It is a massive block. If you look at a modern painting. . . .

SHRI M. A. KHAN (Kasganj) : We have no Secretary General.

SHRI NATH PAI : I am taking a survey of the Ministry. Once you are quite right. I was talking of the Ministry, how it functions. If you do not have one today, tomorrow you may have. It depends upon who is the next aspirant. These are not permanent things. If the aspirant is sufficient important he can change the administrative rule and say that there should be a post of Secretary General created. If he is just, I do not say normal or ordinary man, a man more concerned with his duty and not designation, then of course we do not have it. I would like to point out why I am reminded of a modern painting. There is a massive centre block of dull grey drabness with occasional patches of bright features. In the same way, where the massive block is of mediocrity, grey and yellow, there are some bright people too in the Ministry.

How are ministerial appointments made, ambassadorial appointments made. I would not go into the details of that today. Since a reference was made and the Prime Minister has thrown a challenge asking us to give specific examples and then she will look into them, I know of two cases. You will be amazed to know that in one case the Ambassador decided, to accept a particular post, not because he was specially qualified to go and represent India in that country, not because he was familiar with the history and tradition of that country, but because his wife found the reception room in the ambassadorial, residence suitable for

holding receptions. After having a look at it they said : "we shall go as ambassadors to this country".

AN HON. MEMBER : Who was it ?

SHRI NATH PAI : *Hum Nahi kahenge.* I never mention names, but normally this House knows that this fact must be correct. In another case a certain ambassador went and had a look at five countries. Then he decided after talking to his wife. He said : "This seems to be the most spacious house." "Yes, darling let us stay here." He became the ambassador there. This is how it is normally happening. I am reproducing verbatim conversations. It is not the dedication of a man to his job, it is not the qualifications of a man for the job, it is not the missionary zeal of a man that enables him to be posted to these jobs. It is the policy of 'I scratch your back, you scratch my back' that is followed. This is the case in the higher echelons of the Ministry of External Affairs. When I say this, I am aware that there are some men dedicated, passionately dedicated, sincerely dedicated, to the pursuits of such a foreign policy as there is. And now I may say that there is not much of a foreign policy left today. Because, the government has persuaded itself that the drafting of some communiques, making some visits to some countries and receiving some guests, that is the sum total of a foreign policy. I must point out that the going on State visits, being well received, and then coming and receiving in return the Heads of other countries cannot make for the absence of a realistic, dynamic foreign policy which this country is entitled to.

We often flatter ourselves because of the courtesies that are shown to our guests and think we are making success. I will recall to this House a reference to the State visit made by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru when President Kennedy was still alive. Professor Schlesinger, in his monumental work on President Kennedy, points out—I would like people not to misunderstand, because Professor Schlesinger is a brilliant scholar of history and is a relentless critic of his own government too

[Shri Nath Pai]

as those who are familiar with his writings and his recent contributions to the *New York Times* must be aware of—referring to the Prime Minister's visit to the United States, that it was proclaimed as a triumph for diplomacy and statesmanship; the Indian radio and the press told the people, and the Parliament was persuaded into believing that it was an unadulterated triumph of Indian statesmanship and Indian diplomacy, this visit of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru; and what was the impression of the President at the receiving end? This was the most disastrous visit of all the State visits. The President had expected a lot from the Prime Minister of India. He was more or less a father figure for him. But, when the visit came, it was nothing but bitter disillusionment and disappointment. This is what happens very often, because when we make State visit we persuade ourselves into believing that we are succeeding in winning friends, we are succeeding in influencing countries in our direction. The reason is very simple. An essential modicum, an irreducible modicum of India's national interest in terms of security, in terms of our sphere of influence and in terms of our economic interest has never been defined by this government, and that is why we find ourselves content by making some communique. A smart stenographer can draft these communications. Cordial exchanges took place, mutual exchanges in very cordial and frank atmosphere, friendly exchanges—all these inanities are repeated in every communique. Every time a spokesman of India signs such a communique, he persuades himself into believing that he has signed a new page, written a new page in the history of India and mankind. Now, these platitudes and inanities, even if we produce them in mountains, they do not make one single line in the history of man. But, somehow or other, the Government of India and its draftsmen persuade themselves into believing that it does.

Now, having said something generally, I will try to draw the attention of the House to three specific issues before I

sit down. Of course, there is so much one can cover in a subject like this but I have no time. Our relations with the two super-powers leave much to be desired. The Government never tries of telling us that everything is all right. I think the relations with both the United States and the Soviet Union, whatever the appearance, leave much to be desired. In the case of one country the relations have reached the stage of cold stare and, in the case of the other country, the relations smack of suspicion of one another. Is this a very satisfactory state of affairs? If not, what shall we do? The reason why it is reduced to this state of affairs is very simple. There is never any frank dialogue with the United States. There is never any cordial dialogue with the USSR. We go, we are contented with the courtesies, inanities, platitudes and mutual compliments and we think we have done the job.

It is imperative, it is absolutely essential, it is necessary that when the statesmen and leaders of India go to the United States, and other countries they sit down with the leaders of those countries and in a candid manner define the areas of agreement, the areas where there is disagreement and limit the areas where there is likely to be conflict. I do not think that ever has a spokesman of India bothered to go into those essential aspects, the essential concomitants of a worthwhile foreign policy.

Therefore we find that we go like a pendulum from one end to the other end, either coldness or hostilities with the United States. I do think, there is an imperative necessity for going into a dialogue but the Government of India think that all that needs to be done has been done if we go and get some wheat, some aid, some assistance.

The same is true with the USSR. We think, if we get some equipment, particularly in terms of some arms which we badly need, all is all right with the USSR and Indian relations.

Sir, yesterday a reference was made in this House to the broadcasts from Radio Peace and Progress. I have kept silent though these broadcasts have been

going on for very long, nor do I want to go into details about it. But it is a very significant development if we know how the Soviet leaders try to make a projection of what they feel, not always in a direct manner but in an indirect manner. If one reads the monitored reports of what Radio Peace and Progress stands for, one begins to wonder if all is all right between New Delhi and Moscow, between South Block and the Kremlin.

I for one feel that it is far from being all right. The Soviet Union is beginning to equate Pakistan and India. Are we aware of this? Even the May Day slogans this year in the Moscow Parade and the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Revolution were: Long Live Friendship with India, Long Live Friendship with Pakistan. *Prima facie* what is wrong, you will ask. Very true. I do not want other nations, with whom we are not friendly, also to be unfriendly. That is not my demand. But the important point remains that the Soviet Union is showing a gradual tendency to equate India and Pakistan. Have the Government of India sat with the leaders of the Soviet Union and told them, "You are free as a sovereign nation to make friends with others but so far as Pakistan is concerned there is some irreducible minimum of India's interest."?

And, what is this? That is Kashmir, the delimitation of the borders and security of the border in the eastern region. Have we ever taken any guarantee like that? I wonder if we have ever dared to mention it to the leaders of the Soviet Union. If they draw conclusions and if they are sure that whatever they do, India will be okaying it after a minor perfunctory protest, will we be justified in blaming them?

Neither with the Soviet Union nor with the USA is there a meaningful dialogue on the basis of equality. Ultimately, foreign policy means mutuality and reciprocity of obligations. I do not think, we have tried to provide this basis.

In this regard I do not know why unfortunate souls seek this country for their asylum. Perhaps, they are tempted by the tradition of India's hospitality. They remember the hospitality of India but perhaps they are not familiar with the timidity of the present Government of India. I have in mind the young man who is wanting to seek refuge here. Since the matter, I am told, is being delicately handled, I do not want to prejudice it, but one thing this country will demand. If he may like to go to his country, he must not be prevented; if he likes to go back to his motherland, he should be free. If he wants to stay here, it must be made available to him. If he wants to go somewhere else, obstacles must not be put in his way under the garb of somebody being offended. We must not allow ourselves to disown our obligation of hospitality.

I am sorry that the Prime Minister is not here and, therefore, some of the things I wanted to say, I will be restrained and inhibited in saying because when I want to make criticism I like to make it in the face of the person concerned and she is not here today.

Apart from the necessity of putting our relations with the Soviet Union and the USA on a firm basis of mutual trust and friendship lifting it from the basis of our dependence, I would make a plea. Every time the Government comes and tells us that we get aid. There is a sycophantic undertone in the statement of the Government of India that we need some aid. I am one to acknowledge it readily from those countries who give it, but that should not make me subservient and appear as if I alone need friendship. I need it, but India has much to give too. When we take aid let us not be defiant, I agree, but let us not appear to be subservient as if we are the only people who need friendship. Friendship is a thing which we need; we need the friendship of these two countries but these countries too need the friendship of India and those countries who want the friendship of India will get it only on the basis of reciprocity.



[Shri Nath Pai]

I will now emphasize very briefly the necessity of giving more attention and taking more interest in South East Asia. Often, for the Government of India there is only West Asia. I do not know how a map is made only with the west without the east. Sometimes to the complete neglect of the east we are preoccupied with the west. I think, I have said about the west once and I do not want to repeat it, but I want to ask: Is our interest in South East Asia of such a marginal nature that spasmodically the Government of India will be taking interest and then again lapsing into its traditional indifference towards the countries of South East Asia?

Last year, Mr. Chagla made a good beginning, after he was goaded by the House, made a tour of the South-East Asian countries and he achieved limited but certain results. I do not know why he was eased out. I have no time to discuss that. But there is a mystery surrounding his going out. All kinds of explanations are made and given. The fact remains that Mr. Chagla who brought much sophistication and a little of culture to his task lost his job and, I think, he had self respect that, before he was thrown out, he resigned. But there is a mystery surrounding his going out, not familiar in a democracy. Somebody should try to remove it. Was it the cause that he disagreed on the language policy of the Government or were there some other causes? You, Sir, and I are entitled to know it.

Then, there is the question of South East Asia. These countries matter to us vitally. I am not going to propound a theory that there is a vacuum. But there is one thing that I would like the learned scholars of the External Affairs Ministry to do and that is to read what Prof. Marguntha has written in a recent article in the Foreign Affairs Journal of the United States:

"Any country which is powerful and strong, invariably, tends to interfere in the affairs of other countries."

Let us not go on persuading the world—the world will not believe it—that we

are so pious and good. Sometimes, non-interference is a reflection of political impotence. Here, I come to the basic problem. Our foreign policy is losing its credibility because of general instability in this country and almost our harrowing on the verge of economic instability. There is political instability and there is economic instability in this country. The world is becoming to be wondering. Where is India going?

The other day, I was distressed when Mr. Y. B. Chavan made an admission that money came to this country, not from one side, from both sides. Was that a matter to be told to the House with so much aplomb? What does it mean, that the people are beginning to interfere in the affairs of this country without fear of being challenged, without fear of being punished? The Home Minister ought to have said that we take a very grave view of it. There is non-alignment? Not only one side is trying to influence the electorate in this country but both sides are trying to influence the electorate in this country. So, what is there to be worried about? Both sides are trying to interfere and giving money. That was the reply given by the hon. Home Minister. It is alarming. That means, firstly, nobody is taking this country seriously and, secondly, an ominous inference is being drawn by super powers that India is beginning to crack. One side is trying to help one group and the other side is trying to help the other group. But the sinister meaning you should not escape and the leaders of the Government should not say, "It is all right. Both sides are involved in this. There is nothing to bother about." I think, there is a must to be worried about, there is a must to be concerned about. I would like to know: Would the United States be happy if it was established that Indian money was being poured into that country either to Rockefeller or Regan? What would be the reaction of the United States? (*Interruption*). I know it is impossible to do that. Would the Soviet Union be enthusiastic if it was known that we were trying to influence their elections to the Supreme Soviet? (*Interruption*). But according

to the Constitution, there are elections there. I do not want to comment on the internal affairs of other countries. The Soviet people are free to decide the form of Government they want just as I am free to decide the form of Government I want. I would like to know what would have been the reaction of these two super powers. I tell you, it would have led to a major crisis in our relations. Here is a Government which does not bother and worry about it.

I would like to point out two dangerous symptoms about this. India's sovereignty is, gradually, diminishing and already there is an indication of that. I am glad that with agony in your face, Sir, you are agreeing with me. This is the feeling of every patriot.

MR. SPEAKER : He may conclude now.

SHRI NATH PAI : I am concluding.

Sir, let us ponder over seriously. I am not happy in just castigating the Government. Let us try to evolve a policy worthy of the country. That is my final submission.

This is the non-proliferation treaty. I would once again warn the Government of being pressurised into signing this treaty, the draft treaty which we first saw in this House and Mr. Chagla denied it. I had submitted to the House that the treaty is a joint product of both Moscow and Washington and we should oppose it, not because it is a joint product but because it is patently discriminatory against this country and against other under-developed and developing countries. What an irony of fate! I have before me the famous speech of Mr. Gromyko of 14th February, 1947. You should know Mr. Gromyko was taking a stand which I am taking today for my country. When the Baruch Plan was presented to the United Nations by the Spokesman of the United States, the Plan was nothing different from the Joint Treaty now presented to India. The Baruch Plan and the so-called Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty are identical in their essence, though the terms, words, syn-

tax and grammar change here and there because the terminology changes. But the essence is the same. What happened? The Soviet Union, which was opposing tooth and nail the Baruch Plan, wants India to accept it because there is a major difference. I will tell you this. Logic tells us that any idea may be reduced to an absurdity, Mr. Gromyko says. This applies even to good thoughts and ideas. I want to tell the leaders of the Soviet Union that the Non-Proliferation Treaty is a good treaty, a good idea, but the way in which they are presenting it and are trying to twist the arm of India is not a good thing. If they succeed perhaps in twisting the arm of the Government because it is very susceptible to arm-twisting, the people will not allow their arms to be twisted. This is the warning that we want to give to the Government.

There is one redeeming feature. The stand which the hon. Defence Minister took in his speech made in the United Nations was a proper stand and he deserves credit and congratulations for that. There was also a speech made by India's representative at the U.N. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Conference in Geneva. Both are before me. I want them to stick and adhere to this policy. I want to quote one sentence from Mr. Gromyko. Let not those who are fighting today say, Russia wants it, America wants it. Russia did not want to sign it when it was against Russian interests. Why should India be compelled to sign? Because this Treaty is not just a Disarmament Treaty. This is not concerned with arms. A genuine *bona fide* effort to put an end to nuclear non-proliferation should be welcomed by us. There is going to be proliferation on the part of nuclear powers. But those who are unarmed are to be condemned to remain unarmed. Those countries which have nuclear arms are to develop them, produce them and go on amassing them, but those who do not have them, in the name of mankind, are to be condemned to this second-class citizenship in the world. India should refuse to be a vassal, to be a satellite. This is a new type of imperialism, the nuclear im-

[Shri Nath Pai]

perialism, in which the two partners are the Soviet Union and the United States, and this country will have to resist it. I trust such a valiant policy, such a worthwhile policy, such a realistic policy is the policy which, for long, this country has been demanding. We want to know when we could look forward to the dawn of such a policy.

श्री न० कु० सांघी (जोधपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारी विदेश नीति के बारे में यहाँ यह कहा गया है कि हिन्दुस्तान की कोई नीति ही नहीं है। वह किसी भी नीति पर चल नहीं रहा है। फिर चाहे वह अमरीका के प्रति हो या रूस के प्रति हो। लेकिन मैं दो देशों की बात न करके अपने पड़ोसी पाकिस्तान के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ और खासकर ताशकंद एग्रीमेंट जो हमने उसके साथ किया है, उसके बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। ताशकंद एग्रीमेंट करके हिन्दुस्तान ने यह आशा की थी कि इन दोनों देश के बीच शान्ति स्थापित होगी और पाकिस्तान हमारे साथ दोस्ती का हाथ आगे बढ़ायेगा। लेकिन वार्ता के बाद हमने देखा कि पाकिस्तान ने अभी तक अपने नापाक इरादे छोड़े नहीं हैं और अपने इरादों को वह तेजी के साथ और मजबूती के साथ आगे बढ़ाता जा रहा है। ताशकंद एग्रीमेंट के पीछे हमारा एक खास मकसद यह था कि दोनों के सम्बन्ध सामान्य होंगे और दोनों दोस्ती के साथ, शान्ति के साथ रहेंगे। लेकिन ऐसा नहीं हो सका है।

मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि ताशकंद एग्रीमेंट में हमने यह व्यवस्था की थी कि असम के जो नदी के रास्ते हैं, जो समुद्री रास्ते हैं वे एग्रीमेंट के बाद बातचीत द्वारा खुल सकेंगे और उन रास्तों से हमारे जहाज सामान तथा मुसाफिर आदि ले जा सकेंगे। लेकिन अभी तक ऐसा नहीं हो सका है। हमारे पास जो उनके जहाज थे उनको तो हमने वापिस कर दिया लेकिन हमारे जहाजों को उसने अभी तक वापिस नहीं किया है। हमारे जहाज अभी तक भी असम में गोहाटी ]

में पड़े हुए हैं। आज तक हम उनको समुद्र में नहीं ले जा सके हैं। ताशकंद एग्रीमेंट के बाद भी हम उनको नहीं ले जा सके हैं। ये हालात हिन्दुस्तान में आज भी बने हुये हैं। मैं आपका ध्यान राजस्थान की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ। ताशकंद एग्रीमेंट के बाद जहाँ पाकिस्तान का एट्च ब्रिगेड हैदराबाद सिंध में रखा हुआ था, वहाँ आज एक पूरा डिविजन है और राजस्थान बार्डर से चालीस मील दूर छोर में उस का डिविजनल हेड क्वार्टर बन गया है। यही नहीं वहाँ पर करीब एक दर्जन से ज्यादा हेलीपेड बनाए गए हैं और बहुत सी सड़कों का भी निर्माण किया गया है।

MR. SPEAKER : I want to remind you, Mr. Sanghi, this is a Foreign Affairs debate, it is not a debate on Defence.

SHRI N. K. SANGHI : Sir, I was trying to draw your attention to the fact that Pakistan after signing the Tashkent Agreement has not honoured it, and this raises a fundamental issue. The Tashkent Agreement which we signed with hope of peace and progress has not been beneficial as far as India is concerned. The Tashkent Agreement has created terror and hostility right on our borders from one end to the other. I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that where there was previously only one Brigade at Hyderabad (Sind), Pakistan has now one full division at Chor. A dozen helipads have been constructed right on the borders of Rajasthan. They have created trenchways and roads. Sir, these roads, one can understand, have not been laid to make courtesy calls on India. In these conditions, it becomes necessary for us to give another thinking about Tashkent Agreement whether India is giving a proper dimension to the agreement that we have signed with Pakistan.

I would then draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Indus Rangers and Mujahids have been openly violating our borders. They have been uplifting our men and a number of cases have been reported and they have been accepted by the authorities also.

During the last six months more than a dozen such cases have happened and the Government has failed to recover these people. These people are still in Pakistan and their whereabouts are not known. Sir, our Government have not taken effective measures in bringing them back to our country.

Sir, these are grave conditions to which we have to give thought before we give effect to the Tashkent Declaration. It has been recently reported that Pakistan has built up a wall north of Khem Karan. All these activities of Pakistan naturally create a doubt in our mind whether our policy in regard to Tashkent Declaration has been beneficial to this country.

I would like to draw your attention to another area where we have good relations. With Burma, Ceylon and Nepal which are the other countries bordering India we have very good relations. We have very good relations with Afghanistan. Afghanistan has suffered at the hands of Pakistan. Recently Pakistan has been wooing Russia and has been having many trade agreements. For the first time you will see that mercantile goods have been allowed to go to Pakistan through Afghanistan. Sir, I think we will have to give another look at our relationship of forging stronger friendship with countries like Afghanistan.

Sir, there are other countries in West Asia like Kuwait. We have very good relations with them. We are having an export of about Rs. 100 crores and we have major petroleum deals with them. It is high time that we give more attention to these small countries. I would particularly suggest to the hon. Minister to appoint a High Commissioner in Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to draw your attention that India was chosen as the Chairman of the International Control Commission by the unanimous decision of all the major powers that got together in Geneva. But, after this escalation of war that has been going on in Viet Nam. I think it is very proper for us to give another thought whether there is any

purpose left for India to continue as the Chairman of the Control Commission. If we had not been able to help in stopping this war, if we had not been able to help in bringing peace, I think it is high time that we leave the chairmanship and let South Vietnam and North Vietnam and the powers themselves decide the matter between themselves.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House to West Asian crisis between Israel and the Arab countries. One thing has become very clear. The war between Israel and the West Asian States has been a holy war when we remember the fact that all the Arab countries, whether they belong to the left or right, whether they have joined the Eastern or Western Bloc, have united together in waging this war against Israel. India had taken active part in bringing peace in this region but failed in taking active lead in Vietnam and we should have taken more interest in bringing peace between North and South Vietnam.

Our foreign policy has been very much criticised and it has been said that the foreign policy of India is no foreign policy. I would like to draw the attention of the House to this fact that our foreign policy has now been tested amply. Even an important power like France has advocated our foreign policy. As you would recall, recently, France has removed herself from the NATO power bloc and further she has asked for the removal of the NATO headquarters from France. Recently, President De Gaulle has clearly advocated that he would not like to be aligned with the eastern or the western block but would advocate a policy of non-alignment, and non-interference, and whatever causes we are taking up, which is rightly done. From this also you will see that the policy which the Government has advocated all these years, namely, non-alignment and non-interference, peace with other countries and propagation of peace in the world has been advocated by an important power like France also.

One important question which arises and on which I would like to say some-

[Shri N. K. Sanghi]

thing is in regard to our relations with Kashmir. Kashmir is an integral part of our country, economically, legally and constitutionally it is an integral and indivisible part of India. Therefore, there does not arise any question of arbitration, mediation or plebiscite etc., as far as this question is concerned. But one thing that gives rise to some thinking in the minds of people is the special status that has been given to Kashmir. When we talk internationally, I would submit that this particular aspect has got to be looked into. We have to appreciate it ourselves that Kashmir is not yet on par with the other States of India in all respects. (*Interruption*)

MR. SPEAKER : I would request Members not to come to the Chair. When a Member is speaking, I am expected to hear his speech and not have any discussions with other Members near the Chair.

SHRI N. K. SANGHI : Our accepted foreign policy has braved the challenge of the times. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that possibly the fault lies in our foreign services and in our diplomats who are working abroad. They have failed to understand the urges and thoughts and aspirations of the people. They have failed to carry the message of friendship and good-will and our desires and thoughts to the other countries. Here, I would like to refer to the news item of *The Statesman* of the 20th instant, in which it has been stated that more than a dozen diplomats are presently away from their countries of posting, such as for instance important countries like China, Pakistan, Russia. In U.K. the envoy who has been posted has not yet taken charge. These are circumstances which are very bad, Government should take care to prevent such things and to see that our diplomacy works properly. I would say in conclusion that if only we could bring our foreign service personnel back to India after a certain period posted

abroad, so that they could understand the bearings, the working of the country and the thoughts and urges and aspirations of our people and then send them back, it would help in creating a better climate abroad.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : My hon. friend Shri Nath Pai has very aptly described the performance of our Prime Minister. All that I can add is that she indulged in generalities and did not answer the criticism that was made here whether by one group or by the other group. Rather, she said that the Opposition parties were divided. She failed to realise that the Opposition parties were completely united in condemning her foreign policy. However, divided they may have been among themselves, she forgot this fundamental unity that was there namely that both sides, the Communists as well as the non-Communists condemned her foreign policy.

I was once in a few countries in Europe, and every country that I visited told me that it was friendly to us. My reply was 'You must be friendly to us, because you are not our neighbours; it is only our neighbours about whom we have to think.'

Let us see how our policy, so far as our neighbours are concerned, has succeeded or failed. The tree is known by the fruit that it bears. First of all, I think that our foreign policy succeeded very eminently in bringing about the downfall of a buffer State of Tibet. Then, we went on fraternising with China, never knowing what its philosophy was and what it stood for. I do not want to repeat what has been already said several times. But our own former Rashtrapati Dr. Radhakrishnan was constrained to say when there was an invasion by China on our territory, that we had been negligent and credulous. The Prime Minister was talking of the division in the Opposition parties, but here was the Head of the State castigating the foreign policy and saying that we had been negligent and credulous, which means that we had been

gullible. Is that a successful foreign policy? There must have been something very wrong if the Head of the State had to castigate the Government's foreign policy. Even today, our representatives in China are ill-treated, and here we do nothing about it.

Foreign policy is concerned with mutuality. As regards internal policy, one may not do wrong because the other party has done some wrong. But in foreign policy there must be tit for tat; whatever they do unto us we should do unto them. For, in foreign politics it is not a question of non-violence and it is not a question of our being sadhus and sanyasis but it is a question of mutuality. Between China and India there is no mutuality and we do nothing about it.

It is a very old maxim of international politics that our enemy's enemy is our friend. There is Chiang Kai-shek's China; there is Formosa. We refuse to have anything to do with Formosa. Yesterday the Prime Minister said that we recognised Israel because it was in the UNO. Much more is Formosa in the UNO, and in fact, she is an original member. In spite of the enmity with Communist China we have nothing to do with Formosa. I cannot understand what this foreign policy is. The very elementary maxim of foreign policy has been forgotten.

Having said so much about China, let us come to our other neighbours. Take the case of Burma. We have peace with Burma and we are friendly with Burma. But what did Burma do? If packed off all our nationals who were established there for generations, without bag and baggage, and they drove them away. What did Ceylon do? Ceylon also did the same. It has obliged us to take people who have been established there for generations. It is just like the Americans telling the Irish people to go home, and the Irish Government accepting that and inviting them to return back. These things are not done. We do not know what our foreign policy is like. At least Jawaharlalji, when he was in charge of foreign

policy, went on postponing this question of Ceylon's demand; but one fine morning it was decided that we must get back all these people who for generations had been living there, who were the citizens of Ceylon. We consented to bring them back. I suppose we bring them back at our expense, and they must leave all that they have got there. This is not foreign policy. That is what I find hard to understand.

Then, we have the habit of being the peacemakers of the world. Yesterday, one Communist member, Mr. Ramamurti, was waxing eloquent. He is an orator, I cannot compete with him. Whatever happens in Vietnam, how are we concerned? Because we happen to be in some Commission, it does not mean that we are interested. Who are dying in Vietnam? Either the Vietnamese or the Americans. Do we love Americans more than the American authorities there? Do we love the Vietnamese more than the Vietnamese themselves? I can understand that you give an opinion once, that there should be a cease-fire and the *status quo* should be maintained, but not taking up cudgels on behalf of others. And when we take up cudgels, what do we do? We sing in one tune in America, in another tune in Russia and in a third tune here, because we have taken upon ourselves, a task which we cannot perform, which has nothing to do with us, with which we are not concerned. I do not say that the Americans are fighting in Vietnam the battle of democracy in South-east Asia or anything of that sort, but how do we come in this quarrel, I do not understand.

श्री अमृत नाहाटा (बाडमेर) : खिलाफत में क्यों घायले थे आप ?

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : What is he talking? I think that the Congress people have lost their balance. Where is the question of khilafat here? The question of khilafat here does not arise, because then we were helping our own countrymen, we were helping our Muslim brothers here.

Then, take Israel. I simply suggested that we might have a resolution here,

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

that our friendship with the Arab countries is well known, especially with UAR, but we only want that the parties go back to their original position. That would have been a very reasonable attitude for us to take, but we go out of our way and say that such and such a body of persons or such and such a nation is the aggressor. Only three or four days back the UNO appointed a committee of some 50 people or so to define the aggression; but we took upon ourselves to say that the Israelis the aggressors. How were the Jews aggressive? Because, I suppose they blocked for themselves the Gulf of Aqaba? Because they asked the international force to retire from the position they held. All these things were done by the Arabs and UAR was massing troops on the borders. The Jews were a shrewd people; they understood what was coming. I do not know even who drew the sword first or who fired the first shot. But whoever might have fired, the previous things that took place before shooting must be taken into consideration.

13 Hrs.

MR. SPEAKER: We are adjourning for lunch; is he concluding?

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: I am concluding. For us to go out of our way to say that Israel was the aggressor is beyond my power of comprehension. You were not there; we do not know. Hostile actions had taken place before the armed conflict began. Why should we take upon ourselves to give judgment in matters where we are not concerned? It is enough to say that the Arabs are our friends and we are friendly to them and that Israel must go to its original position. That was enough.

So, I say, Sir, that judged by results so far, where our interests are concerned, our foreign policy has failed.

One more thing, I would say. We are not concerned with Europe and America so much as with Asia. We must send there our best representatives, with their best wives if you would have it so. (*Interruption*) Mr. Nath Pai was saying that the ambassadors are sent because their wives want to go somewhere or

the other. I remember in this House our first Prime Minister had said that one has got to look to the wives of the ambassadors also because they are great assets. But since then wives have become even more important, because now we have the rule of women in India. You can select such ambassadors who have very attractive wives, very smart wives.

श्री रत्न राय (पुरी) : दादा, क्या वही मापदण्ड होना चाहिये ?

MR. SPEAKER: The time is up.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: If the time it up, I shall conclude now. I would suggest to the External Affairs Ministry that their best ambassadors must go to south-east Asia, and to west Asia and they might as well forget Europe and America. We are not concerned with their politics; they are not concerned with our politics; this habit of ours, thinking that America is our friend, that Soviet Russia is our friend should go. About Soviet Russia, I do not want to repeat what Mr. Nath Pai has said. I entirely agree with him that we were hugging to our breasts the idea that Soviet Union is our greatest friend and that it will help us in Kashmir and other questions. But the Tashkent agreement, I believe, was concluded under coercion. And who signed that treaty, that undertaking? The man who had said here several times that whatever we have occupied in Kashmir is our own territory and it will not be given up. Pressure from Russia made our last Prime Minister signed that agreement. That agreement has done no good. If we had only looked to the past, we would have seen that so many agreements have been arrived at with Pakistan, but none of them have been observed by Pakistan. This agreement also is violated by Pakistan. Yet, we are crying day and night "Tashkent spirit". It is not the Tashkent spirit, but the Tashkent spirits which have affected the brains of those . . .

SHRI NATH PAI: Mr. Swaran Singh is a teetotaler.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : I am glad he is a teetotalter, but there are many nowadays who are not teetotalters. Let them have liquor if they like, but not the Tashkent spirits.

13.06 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for lunch till Fourteen of the Clock*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after lunch at Fourteen of the Clock*

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

MOTION RE. INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—contd.

SOME HON. MEMBERS rose—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Prem Chand Verma—I would request hon. Members to confine their remarks to ten minutes so that I can accommodate more hon. Members.

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा (हमीरपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं वर्तमान अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति व उस के सम्बन्धों में जो प्रस्ताव माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने सदन के सामने रक्खा है मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ।

इससे पहले स्वतंत्र पार्टी, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी, प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी, जनसंघ और कुछ निर्दलीय सदस्यों ने इस विषय पर भाषण दिये हैं। मुझ से पहले श्री मसानी ने जो कुछ कहा उस में सब से अधिक जिक्र उन्होंने रूस की नोवोस्टी, न्यूज एजेंसी का किया है। मैं नहीं समझता कि उन्होंने अपनी सारी जो तकरीर थी; सारा जो भाषण था उस में उन्होंने जोर दिया। उन्होंने कहा कि भारत सरकार की मिनिस्ट्री आफ इनफोरमेशन एंड ब्राड-कास्टिंग के एक अफसर जिनका कि नाम श्री भारद्वाज बतलाया उन्होंने उस में एक बड़ा भारी अपराध किया है और उन के साथ एक वह समझौता किया है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप से कहना चाहूंगा कि अगर ऐसी कोई बात अमरीका या रूस कहते तो मैं मान लेता कि यह उस के मन का सही नक्शा है।

लेकिन माननीय सदस्य इस हाउस के एक आदरणीय सदस्य एक पोलिटिकल पार्टी के लीडर अगर यह बात कहते हैं तो यह एक अच्छी बात नहीं है क्योंकि इस सिलसिले में इनफोरमेशन और ब्रोडकास्टिंग मिनिस्ट्री के हमारे मंत्री महोदय यह बात पूरी तौर पर कह चुके हैं कि उस में न तो किसी अधिकारी का कसूर है न सरकार ने किसी ऐसी बात से कोई समझौता किया है जिससे कोई पोलिटिकल बात उस में साबित हो तो मैं यह कहूंगा कि उनका यह जो आरोप है वह निराधार है। दूसरी ओर श्री नाथ पाई ने भ्रमी कहा कि हमारा जो विदेश मंत्रालय है उसका काम जो है वह राष्ट्रपति भवन के कुक और इंडियन ऐयरलाइंस के पायलेट करते हैं। माननीय सदस्य की मैं बड़ी इज्जत करता हूँ लेकिन जहां उन्होंने यह भाषण दिया है उस भाषण से यह साफ जाहिर होता है कि वह निन्दा करना चाहते हैं सरकार की और केवल निन्दा के लिए वह निन्दा करना चाहते हैं। इस के अलावा उन के मन में उन की जो क्रिटिसिज्म है वह कंस्ट्रक्टिव नहीं है।

दूसरी ओर उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि प्रधान मंत्री का जो भाषण था वह नीरस था। मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती कि उसमें रस कैसे भरा जाता है? विदेश कार्यालय मंत्री एक हैं या दो हैं। प्रधान मंत्री में जो भाषण दिया वह नीति के बारे में था। वह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति के बारे में था। उसमें जो हालात वहां पर हैं वही तो उसमें कहे जा सकते हैं। उस में किसी ड्रामे या सिनेमा की बात तो कही नहीं जा सकती है। उस में रस नहीं भरा जा सकता है। उसी तरीके से मैं कहूंगा कि माननीय सदस्य में, उस भाषण को भी, उस पर क्रिटिसिज्म करने के लिए भी, जब उन को कोई शब्द नहीं मिला तो उन्होंने नीरस उस को कह दिया। मेरा ध्यान से इतना कहना है कि जो विरोधी सदस्य हैं वे एक ओर तो अमरीका और इंग्लैंड की बात करते हैं तो दूसरी ओर वह रूस व चीन की



### [श्री प्रेमचन्द वर्मा]

बात करते हैं। इस के अलावा वह किसी भी दृष्टि से किसी भी तरीके से किसी भी ढंग से हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति को नहीं देखते हैं। उन का खयाल यही रहता है कि रूस और चीन के इंटरैस्ट को यहां पर कैसे सुरक्षित रखा जाय। दूसरे उन का खयाल यह रहता है कि अमरीका और इंग्लैंड के इंटरैस्ट को किस तरीके से यहां पर सुरक्षित रखा जाय? मैं जानना चाहता हूं सदस्यों से कि जब यहां पर बड़े बड़े मसले आते हैं, बड़ी बड़ी बातें आती हैं तो उन पर तो वह कोई ध्यान नहीं देते हैं कोई बहुत तत्व नहीं होता है उस समय उन की बातों में लेकिन अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति पर विचार करने के लिए जिन सदस्यों ने और अन्य नेताओं ने जोर दिया कि यह सारा टाइम उस के लिए हो और अन्य तमाम कार्यों को पीछे करो तो उस के डिबेट में उन लोगों ने केवल नोवोस्टी का या अमरीका की कुछ बातों का जिक्र करने के अलावा और कोई ठोस सुझाव व विचार नहीं पेश किया है। एक ओर के माननीय सदस्य चाहते हैं कि इस ओर चीन की कठपुतली बन जाये और दूसरी ओर के कहते हैं कि अमरीका आदि पश्चिमी देशों की बन जाए। कुछ माननीय सदस्य जो यहां तक कहते हैं कि कुछ इलाका दे कर हम को चीन के साथ समझौता कर लेना चाहिये। वे यह भी कहते हैं कि रूस जैसे चाहता है हम काम करें और चीन के माओ और चाऊ के फोटो यहां लगा दिये जायें। यदि ऐसा किया जाय तभी हिन्दुस्तान की नीति सफल हों सकती है। कुछ माननीय सदस्य समझते हैं कि चीन को अपना रकबा दे कर, अपना इलाका दे कर देश का विभाजन करके चीन को खुश किया जाए और तब वे भी खुश होंगे और कहेंगे कि हमारी नीति ठीक है वर्ना नहीं है। जो माननीय सदस्य यह कहते हैं कि अमरीका और पश्चिमी देशों की यहां पर कालोनी बन जाए, उनकी यहां पर फेक्ट्रीज लग जाएं, बड़े बड़े कारखानें लग जायें और वे दीलत के जरिये से हमारी पोलिटिकल

पार्टीज के ऊपर असर रख कर सारे हिन्दुस्तान को फिर से एक नौ आवादी बना दें, तो यह कहां तक उचित है, इसको ध्याप सोच सकते हैं। यह जो दोनों का सोचने का तरीका है यह गलत तरीका है। जब भी कोई नीति तय की जाती है तो कुछ माननीय सदस्य कहते हैं कि यह अंधी पालिसी है, यह कानी पालिसी है यह लंगड़ी पालिसी है। जो माननीय सदस्य इस तरह की बातें कहते हैं मैं कहुंगा कि उनकी आंखों के शीशे पर रंग चढ़ा हुआ है। उनको चाहिये कि राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से वे पालिसीज जो हमारी हैं उन पर विचार करेंगे। जिन माननीय सदस्यों की आंख पर एक देश की तरफ का शीशा लगा हुआ है उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ का जो दूसरा शीशा है उसके ऊपर पानी फेर रखा है, इस वास्ते उन को एक ही तरफ से दिखाई देता है और दूसरी तरफ से दिखाई भी नहीं देता और वे देखना भी नहीं चाहते। वे चाहते यहीं हैं कि उनको रूस और चीन या फिर अमरीका और इंग्लैंड की बातें ही नजर आयें।

मैं समझता हूं कि किसी भी देश को अपनी विदेश नीति बनाते वक्त जहां अपने देश के हालात का ध्यान रखना पड़ता है वहां अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय हालात का भी ध्यान रखना पड़ता है। हिन्दुस्तान विकास के पथ पर आगे बढ़ रहा है। हमारे देश की सरहदों पर एक ओर चीन है तो दूसरी ओर पाकिस्तान है। एक लैफिटस्ट है और दूसरा राइटिस्ट। ये दोनों ही हमारे लिए एक समस्या हैं। हमारी विदेश नीति जो है इसको बनाते वक्त चीन और पाकिस्तान ये दो सब से बड़े फैक्टर हैं। इन का हमें ध्यान रखना पड़ता है। अगर हम अमरीका के साथ मिलते हैं, अगर उसकी गुटबन्दी में हम शामिल हो जाते हैं तो चीन जिस के साथ रूस भी है और सारे कम्युनिष्ट देश भी हैं वे सब के सब, यह सारा का सारा ब्लाक हमारे खिलाफ हो जाता है। फिर पाकिस्तान भी है। उसके साथ भी झगड़ा है। हम तो झगड़ा करना नहीं चाहते हैं लेकिन उसने झगड़ा पैदा कर रखा है। पाकि-

स्तान को अगर एक टुकड़ा भी हिन्दुस्तान का दिया जाता है तो हम में से कोई भी इसको बरदास्त करने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। एक इंच इलाका भी अपने देश का हम पाकिस्तान को नहीं दे सकते हैं। जिन सरहदों पर हमारे फौजी जवानों ने अपनी जानें गंवाई, पैटन टैंकों को अपने शरीर के जरिये से रोका, गोली चलने नहीं दी, हमारे बहादुरों ने अपनी जान पर खेल कर सीमाओं की रक्षा की, बरकी पर कब्जा किया, उनके साथ हम धोखा नहीं कर सकते हैं। हम अपने इलाके को पाकिस्तान को दे कर समझौता करना नहीं चाहते हैं। हम पाकिस्तान के साथ न अमरीका के दबाव में आकर और न इंग्लैंड के दबाव में आ कर और न ही किसी और देश के दबाव में आ कर समझौता करने को तैयार हैं।

हमारी नीति साफ है। न हम लैफ्ट हैं और न राइट। जो इस सदन के अन्दर राइट या लैफ्ट का नारा लगाते हैं वे हमारे देश का भला चाहने वालें नहीं हैं। जो इस तरह का नारा लगाते हैं उनका केवल एक ही इंटरेस्ट है। वह यह है कि विदेशों से पैसा उनको मिले और वे हिन्दुस्तान की बागडोर अपने हाथ में लेकर राज्य करें। राज्य क्षक्ति को हथियाने के लिए वे विदेश नीति को इस प्रकार से ढालने का नारा देते हैं।

भारत की विदेश नीति भारत के हालात के मुताबिक चलती है। जब कभी उस में लचक पैदा करने की जरूरत होती है तब उस में लचक पैदा की जाती है। जो यह कहते हैं कि भारत की विदेश नीति कोई नीति नहीं है उनको मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब भी अरब कंट्रीज में हालात खराब हुए, जब भी योरोपियन कंट्रीज के अन्दर हालात खराब हुए, वियतनाम का मसला आया भारत ने हमेशा शान्ति कायम रखने में एक महम रोल भवा किया।

इन शब्दों के साथ जो प्रस्ताव पेश किया गया है उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ और विदेश नीति की सराहना करता हूँ।

**SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY** (Cooch-Behar) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker. Sir, we have been told by the hon. Prime Minister, while initiating the debate on this motion, that foreign policy of our country is guided by our national interest. We have been further told that we were never neutral in matters of justice and freedom.

Looking to this aspect, I would like to mention what is our policy towards Pakistan. As a matter of fact, we have no policy towards Pakistan. While Pakistan has exhibited a very hostile attitude towards us, while Pakistan has started infiltration into our territory and has started training and giving arms to Naga and Mizo hostiles, we have a very soft corner towards Pakistan.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister to reply, categorically, certain basic questions. What is our stand about Pakistan? What is the stand of our Government towards Pakistan? We have seen that in a number of cases, our territories have been forcibly occupied by Pakistan. But we have not done anything so far. While Pakistan is training and aiding, directly, Naga and Mizo hostiles, we are doing nothing. I would like to ask : Can we not create a similar situation in East Pakistan? Cannot our Government do something so that this sort of subversive activities of Pakistan are stopped? But we have no answer to that.

Two years back, there was an upsurge in East Pakistan for national autonomy, provincial autonomy, and we did not give any help at the time of that national movement to attain their freedom, to have their sense of justice and their democratic right. This is our neutrality and sense of justice and freedom. While it is a fact that we have helped, in many countries of the world, many national movements, democratic movements, say, in Algeria, Indonesia, Spain and many other countries—even now, we are helping the African National Conference—we are so silent on the national movement in East Pakistan. This is a policy of appeasement that we are following. We say, it is neutrality;

[Shri G. K. Daschowdhury]

we say, it is non-alignment. We say something more; we use many other words. But all these policies are a failure and abortive.

What about our position of Indian enclaves? Thousands and thousands of Indian citizens are living in Indian enclaves. Only the other day, the hon. Minister of State for External Affairs Mr. B. R. Bhagat said about pitiable conditions of the Indian enclaves and he expressed his helplessness. He said, he could not do anything to protect the rights and the interests of Indian citizens in Indian enclaves. What a wonderful statement he made the other day on the floor of the House! With your permission, Sir, I would like to quote from *Patriot* of 5th December, 1967, as to what he said on the floor of the House:

"So far as the Indian enclaves in Pakistan are concerned, a overwhelming majority will have to come over to India."

We have our moral duties and obligations to protect our citizens there. But the Minister of External Affairs seems to be absolutely helpless. What has been suggested is that an overwhelming majority of our population will have to come to the mainland, that is, India. Side by side, if we look into what is Pakistan's policy regarding Pakistani enclaves surrounded by Indian territory? A brochure has been published by the Pakistan Foreign Office and has been distributed to all the MPs, wherein it has stated about the most insecure position of Pakistanis in the Dahagram enclave; it has stated that the Pakistanis there are feeling most insecure and all that. This is what the report says. But whenever thousands and thousands of Indians in the Indian enclaves in Pakistan are murdered, slendered and their houses are burnt, our External Affairs Ministry keeps mum; they never say anything for the protection of their rights. What is our policy and what is the policy of Pakistan? Time has come to change our foreign policy now, lest we should simply be helpless spectators of millions murdered in Pakistan.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I should like to warn this Government and the hon.

Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs who said the other day that an overwhelming majority of the Indian population would have to come over to India. May I ask the hon. Minister to give a categorical reply that when all those Indians in the Indian enclaves there, who are rendered homeless, come back, they would be made a new class of refugees and Government would take the full responsibility to rehabilitate them?

We have also seen the barren and abortive foreign policy of our country in other respects. As far as I can remember, many years back, Pandit Nehru gave an assurance; by saying that the Chittagong Hill district is a predominantly non-Muslim area and has mistakably gone to Pakistan and that he would take up the matter with the appropriate authorities through the international agencies and forums. I should also like to mention that about 6 to 8 police stations or *Thanas* of the Sylhet district, which have gone to East Pakistan after a Referendum in 1947, are predominantly non-Muslim areas, but because of certain doubtful interpretation of the Radcliffe Award, these areas alongwith many other areas have gone to East Pakistan. They should have come to the Indian Union. But we have not seen any attempt on the part of the External Affairs Ministry to raise those issues through international agencies and forums and to get those Indian territories annexed to the Indian Union. We have not done anything in this regard, which is practically a large territory. May I say one thing here, Sir? If Pakistan can raise the issue of Rann of Kutch through the International forum even after 18 years of the Partition, can we not raise these issues? These are both legally and politically our territories but our foreign policy is imbecile in the matter. Sir, you will find that Pakistan, even at the slightest pretext, raises such issues through international agencies. The other day we saw some reports that Pakistan was threatening to raise the Farakka Dam issue through an international agency unless our Government conceded to certain demands made by them. This is a disastrous foreign policy that we

are pursuing! We always try to appease them and in this policy of appeasement we are always the losers. It is regrettable that we very often forget that, by the policy of appeasement, we simply allow our aggressors to whet their knives at our cost and to use the same against us. Further we simply allow our aggressors to commit more and more aggression on our side.

Before Partition and after Partition it was said that the affairs of the minorities in Pakistan would be looked into. But we are not looking into those affairs. Those Hindu minorities in Pakistan are being murdered, butchered and plundered every day and many awful things have been happening; but we are keeping mum about this matter. Sir, is it not our duty to realise the fullest compensation of the properties and assets and interests left over by the Indian nationals in Pakistan. We have seen the same case here. In the case of West Pakistan displaced persons fullest compensation has been given to them, but, in the case of East Pakistan displaced persons this privilege has been denied. Sir, the Nehru-Liaquat pact has not been honoured by Pakistan and our Government also must disown it and should try to realise the fullest compensation from the Government of Pakistan and those monies should be paid to these displaced persons.

One thing more, Sir, I would like to mention in regard to our foreign policy. Many speakers have said so many things and I have weighed them very carefully. What is actually our foreign policy today? We have decided that we should have big missions in many countries. Sir, this one thing that I have come across—this is what has been published in the *Blitz* of the 6th December, 1967,—with your permission, Sir, read it out to the House:

"India's Ambassador to Washington, Mr. B. K. Nehru, who represents the present Government of India, has been using in his public speeches expressions like 'India-occupied Kashmir' and 'Pakistan-occupied Kashmir' or 'India-held Kashmir and Pakistan-held portions of Kashmir'."

This is very strange, Sir. Is our Ambassador there to make Pakistani propaganda? Is it not a fact that Kashmir's accession to India is both politically, constitutionally, and legally, a finality? If that be so, why is our Ambassador saying 'India-held Kashmir' and 'Pakistan-held Kashmir'. Will the External Affairs Ministry perform more "Bhudan Yajnas" by giving away Kashmir to Pakistan, like many other territories in Eastern India?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now please conclude.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY: Am I to sit down? I do not know if that is the policy that big people would get more time than what we are not getting.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You should conclude now.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY: Then, I sit down, Sir.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA: *rose*.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwash): He has not finished at all.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is no good. Purposely I called him. He sits at the back and there is no policy as such. He is a young man. I gave him 14 minutes. Now that is not fair. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI J. M. BISWAS (Bankaura): Can't you give him two minutes more?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I never said 'Please sit down'. I said, 'You please conclude', but he said 'I will sit down.'

श्री अमृत नाहाटा (बाङ्गुर): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कल की रात इस बरस की सब से लम्बी रात थी। कल से बड़े दिन शुरू हो रहे हैं। उनको क्रिसमिस कहा जाता है। पोप ने इस क्रिसमिस को समर्पित किया है विश्व-शान्ति के लिए। लेकिन हमें बड़ा दुख है इस बात का कि पोप ने इस वर्ष के जिस क्रिसमिस को विश्व-शान्ति के लिए समर्पित किया है, उस क्रिसमिस में वियतनाम में एक बहुत ही नृशंस और पाश्चविक आक्रमण चल रहा है और दुनियां की

### [श्री अमृत नाहाटा]

एक सब से बड़ी ताकत—अमरीकी साम्राज्यवाद—वहाँ की निरीह और स्वतंत्रता-प्रिय जनता को मौत के घाट उतारने पर आमादा है।

आज दुनियाँ की सारी स्वतंत्रता-प्रिय जनता वियतनाम की बहादुर जनता के प्रति नतमस्तक है, उसको अपनी श्रद्धा और अभिनन्दन देती है। अपने देश की आजादी के लिए वियतनाम का एक-एक नागरिक, बच्चा, औरत और जवान, बन्दूक ले कर खेतों में भी काम करता है और आक्रमणकारियों का मुकाबला भी करता है। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि वियतनाम युद्ध के सम्बन्ध में हमारी सरकार की नीति बिल्कुल सही है। सब से पहली बात यह है कि अमरीका की बमबारी बिना-शर्त बन्द की जानी चाहिए और उसके बाद जेनेवा सम्मेलन के आधार पर बातचीत की जानी चाहिए। जिस बातचीत में एन० एल० एफ० के मेम्बरों को भी शामिल किया जाना चाहिए। लेकिन उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं निवेदन करूँगा भारत सरकार से कि सही नीति प्रतिपादित करना काफी नहीं है। पोप पहलकदमी कर रहे हैं, यू० थांट पहलकदमी कर रहे हैं। सारी दुनिया आज भारतवर्ष की तरफ देख रही है कि आजादी का एक अलमबरदार था जो मुल्क वह आज वियतनाम के सवाल पर सही नीति प्रतिपादित करने के बाद भी चुप क्यों है ? भारत सरकार को चाहिए कि अपनी नीति को सही माने में अमल में लाने के लिए पहलकदमी करे और दुनिया में आवाज उठाए। मुझे अफसोस है आचार्य कृपालानी जी ने आज एक बहुत ही खतरनाक सिद्धांत यहाँ प्रतिपादित किया। उन्होंने कहा कि वियतनाम में अमेरिका के लोग मर रहे हैं या वियतनाम के लोग मर रहे हैं हमें इससे क्या ? मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, दक्षिणी अफ्रीका में काले लोगों पर जुल्म हो रहा है और गौरे लोग जुल्म कर रहे हैं हमें इससे क्या मतलब ?

स्पेन पर हिटलर ने हमला किया था और हमें क्या मतलब था कि पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू वहाँ जाते और स्पेन के साथ हमदर्दी जाहिर करते ? हमें क्या मतलब था कि चीन में कोटनीस को भेजते जो वहाँ शहीद हो गए वहाँ की आजादी के लिए ? दुनियाँ में कहीं भी किसी मुल्क पर जुल्म होगा, आक्रमण होगा, अगर किसी मुल्क की आजादी कुचली जायगी तो यह गांधी और जवाहर का देश अपनी आवाज बुलंद करेगा। हम चुप नहीं रह सकते। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ, ऊपर बादल गरज रहे थे और नीचे कमजोर दिल वाले नाथ पै उन गरजते हुए बादलों के साथ होड़ कर रहे थे लेकिन उनके मुँह से एक शब्द नहीं निकला वियतनाम की लड़ाई और उनकी हमदर्दी के बारे में...

**श्री नाथ पे :** आप शायद यहाँ नहीं थे। जब यह बमबारी शुरू हुई तो पहली मर्तबा हम ही ने भारत सरकार को कहा था कि इसका विरोध पूरे राष्ट्र की तरफ से होना चाहिए। एक बात को हजार दफा हम दोहराना नहीं चाहते, लेकिन जब यह बमबारी हुई तो उसके विरुद्ध हमने आप से पहले आवाज उठायी थी।

**श्री अमृत नाहाटा :** मैं इतिहास में नहीं जाना चाहता। मोहनजोदड़ो युग की बात हमें नहीं मालूम। मैं आज की बात करना चाहता हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, दूसरी बात मैं जो करना चाहता हूँ वह है जर्मनी के बारे में। भारत सरकार की नीति हमेशा यह रही है, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने यह कहा था कि दो जर्मनी वास्तविकताएँ हैं। एक जर्मनी से यानी पश्चिमी जर्मनी से हमारे कूटनीतिक संबंध स्थापित हैं, उस पश्चिमी जर्मनी से कि जिसके राष्ट्रपति ने कोयले की खानों में हवाई जहाज बनाने के कारखाने बना कर और सारे वार प्रिजनर्स से उसमें काम कराया और लाखों लोग वापस वहाँ से नहीं आये, उस पश्चिमी जर्मनी से जिसके चांसलर गोयवल्स के असिस्टेंट थे जिनका सिद्धांत था कि सौ दफा झूठ दोहराओ

तो वह सच हो जाता है, जो कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान को हम हथियार दे रहे हैं, हम क्या करें? उनका 30 प्रतिशत विदेशी व्यापार आज हमारे पड़ोसी दुश्मन चीन के साथ हो रहा है। कहते हैं हम क्या करें? उनका हवाई जहाज गिलगिट के ऊपर से उड़ता है, कहते हैं हम क्या करें? और उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, उन नक्शों में काश्मीर को स्वतंत्र बताया गया है। यहां प्रश्न उठाया गया। हमारी प्रधान मंत्री महोदया ने कहा कि यह तो पुराने नक्शे हैं। मैं यह नक्शे साथ लाया हूँ, उनके फोटो हैं, यह एक एटलस है, हरम एटलस जो म्यूनिख में, फ्रैंकफर्ट में, बर्लिन में और हैम्बर्ग में छपा है और इसमें काश्मीर को स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र बताया गया है। यह नक्शा 1963 का है, यह पुराना है। लेकिन उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मार्च 1967 का, यानी करीब 4 महीने पुराना यह नक्शा छपा है और वरसीज जर्नल वेस्ट जर्मनी में जिसमें काश्मीर स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र बताया गया है। यह अक्टूबर 1967 का डेढ़ महीने पहले का नक्शा छपा है इन्डो एशिया मैगजीन में जिसके अन्दर काश्मीर को स्वतंत्र बताया गया है। यह सारे सेमी गवर्नमेंट पब्लिकेशंस हैं, एटलस हैं जो वहाँ के स्कूलों में पढ़ाए जाते हैं जिसमें काश्मीर को स्वतंत्र बताया गया है। उस वेस्ट जर्मनी के साथ तो हमारे डिप्लोमैटिक रिलेशंस हैं। लेकिन जी० डी० आर० जर्मन डेमोक्रेटिक रिपब्लिक जिसका व्यापार हमारे साथ निरन्तर बढ़ रहा है, जो हमारे प्रति मैत्रीपूर्ण संबंध रखता है, जो काश्मीर के प्रश्न पर हमारा समर्थन करता है, उसके साथ हम डिप्लोमैटिक रिलेशंस नहीं स्थापित करते यह बह कर कि वह राष्ट्रसंघ का सदस्य नहीं है। राष्ट्रसंघ का सदस्य चीन भी नहीं है। यह कसीटी नहीं हो सकती किसी राष्ट्र के साथ कूटनीतिक संबंध स्थापित करने या न करने के लिए।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, तीसरी बात जो मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि आज जो वियतनाम में युद्ध हो रहा है उसके पीछे एक और बड़ी बात है। आज अमेरिका में

और रूस में हर रोज नये नये हथियार तैयार होते जा रहे हैं और पुराने हथियार आवसोलीट होते जा रहे हैं, पुराने पड़ते जा रहे हैं। अमेरिका में जगह नहीं है पुराने हथियारों को रखने के लिए। इसलिए कम से कम उनके गोडाउन्स का किराया भी बचाना चाहे तो वह चाहते हैं कि दूसरे देशों में वह हथियार इस्तेमाल किए जायें। इन देशों की, खास कर के अमेरिका की अर्थ-व्यवस्था मौत और युद्ध पर आधारित है। जब तक इस देश में निरस्त्रीकरण नहीं होगा, तब तक यह युद्ध चलते रहेंगे। भारतवर्ष ने आज तक हमेशा निरस्त्रीकरण के लिए पहलकदमी की है। आज मुझे अफसोस है कि दुनिया में हमारे देश का जो बिम्ब स्थापित होता जा रहा है वह धीरे-धीरे कमजोर होता जा रहा है इसलिए कि वह पहलकदमी हमारे हाथों से निकल रही है। मैं निवेदन करूंगा एक बार फिर हम निरस्त्रीकरण के लिए आवाज उठाएं और उसके लिए पूरी कोशिश करें। लेकिन उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मैं श्री नाथ पं की उस मांग का बिल्कुल समर्थन करता हूँ कि एक तरफ जहां हम निरस्त्रीकरण के लिए पहलकदमी करें दूसरी ओर हमें यह भी स्पष्ट कर देना चाहिए रूस और अमेरिका को कि हम एटामिक हथियार बनाएं, न बनाएं, सदियों तक न बनाएं, लेकिन वह हमारी मर्जी की बात है। उनके कहने से हम हस्ताक्षर करके हाथ कटा कर उनको नहीं देंगे। उस सन्धि पर हमें हस्ताक्षर करके नहीं देना चाहिए।

एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। जनसंघ की ओर से इस बार नहीं, पिछली बार मधोक ने और सौधी ने एक बात कही थी और वह खां अब्दुल गफ्फार खां के बारे में है। दो साल पहले हम लोग काबुल गए थे और श्री अब्दुल गफ्फार खां से मिले थे। हम लोग जितने थे, सब से वह गले लग कर मिले। हम में से एक एक के साथ वह गले मिले और उनको देख कर हमें आंसू बह आये। आज हम चाहते हैं कि श्री अब्दुल गफ्फार खां की भारत सरकार हर तरह से मदद करे। स्वास्थ्य ठीक करने के लिए।

### 【श्री अमृत नाहाटा】

नहीं बल्कि राजनैतिक कारणों से उन्हें भारतवर्ष बुलाया जाना चाहिए और उनकी मांग का समर्थन करना चाहिए। इसलिए नहीं कि हम पाकिस्तान के साथ इरीटेशन क्रियेट करना चाहते हैं। जनसंघ का एंटीट्यूड सिर्फ इतना है कि दलाई लामा को मान्यता दो, अब्दुल गफ्फार खां को बुलाओ, दरअसल यह टिट फार टैट की जो नीति है मैं उसका समर्थन नहीं करता, इरीटेशन क्रियेट करने की नीति का मैं समर्थन नहीं करता। लेकिन मेरिट पर देखा जाय, आन मेरिट्स हमारा यह फर्ज हो जाता है कि हम उनकी मदद करें। आज कहते हैं अब्दुल गफ्फार खां कि उनको भेड़ियों के हाथों में सौंप दिया गया है। आज महात्मा गांधी के वचन हमें याद करने होंगे और श्री अब्दुल गफ्फार खां के आन्दोलन का समर्थन करना होगा।

**श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) :** उपाध्यक्ष जी, अभी कुछ दिन पहले मुझे शांति निकेतन विश्वविद्यालय में जाने का अवसर मिला। यह बात उस समय की है कि जब हमारे पहले प्रधानमंत्री श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू का निघन हुए केवल एक ही वर्ष व्यतीत हुआ था। शांति निकेतन विश्वविद्यालय के अधिकाधिकारियों ने श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू के साथ पत्र-व्यवहार के चित्र बना कर दीवारों पर लगाए थे। एक पत्र उनका विशेष रूप से जो मुझे याद है आज तक। जिसकी चर्चा मैंने केवल इस सदन में नहीं, बल्कि वर्तमान प्रधानमंत्री की उपस्थिति में उस दिन भी की थी, जब श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू का जन्म दिन केन्द्रीय कक्ष में मनाया जा रहा था। उस पत्र में लिखा था— 23 दिसम्बर को जब शांति निकेतन विश्वविद्यालय का दीक्षांत समारोह था, उस समय एक दिन शनिवार को लोक सभा का अधिवेशन बड़ गया। श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने शांति निकेतन विश्वविद्यालय के अधिकारियों को लिखा क्योंकि लोक सभा का अधिवेशन एक दिन बड़ गया है इसलिए मैं 23 तारीख को नहीं आ सकूंगा। आप अपना कार्यक्रम कुछ

पीछे हटाएं। मैं यह बात विशेष रूप से इसलिए कहना चाहता हूँ कि पहले प्रधानमंत्री संसद को प्रमुखता देते थे अपेक्षाकृत और कार्यक्रमों के। लेकिन उन्हीं की पुत्री जो उनके उत्तराधिकारी के रूप में उस स्थान पर बैठी हुई हैं, उन्होंने आज विदेश मंत्रालय जैसी एक गंभीर बहस की अपेक्षा कर के उसी कार्यक्रम में सम्मिलित होना स्वीकार किया जहाँ उनके पिता जी ने इस आधार पर वहाँ जाने से इन्कार किया था। यह संसद की अबहेलना ही नहीं अपितु, उस परम्परा की अबहेलना भी है जो परम्परा और मार्ग उनके पिता जी ने प्रशस्त किया था।

उपाध्यक्ष जी विदेश नीति की सबसे बड़ी दुर्बलता इससे अधिक क्या होगी कि आज इतने दिनों के बाद भी सरकार का डाबांडोल मन श्री चागला के विदेश मंत्री पद से त्यागपत्र देने के बाद यह निर्णय नहीं कर पाया कि उस पद पर किस व्यक्ति को बिठाना है? मैं ने पहले संकेत के रूप में एक बार यहां कहा भी था कि प्रधानमंत्री के मन में जो विदेश मंत्री हैं परिस्थिति उनके अनुकूल नहीं जा रही है। लेकिन जो विदेश मंत्री होना चाहिए वह प्रधानमंत्री के मन का नहीं है। इस प्रकार की अनिश्चित परिस्थिति क्या हमारी विदेश नीति को आगे चल कर और दुर्बल नहीं बनाएगी? रक्षा नीति और कूट नीति यह दो इस प्रकार की नीतियां होती हैं जिनसे किसी देश का स्वाभिमान सुरक्षित रहता है। लेकिन इनकी अपेक्षा से भारत सरकार को आज कदम कदम पर दूसरे देशों में और अपने घर में भी अपमानित होना पड़ रहा है।

सबसे बड़ी चीज यह है कि हमारे पड़ोसी देशों के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध किस प्रकार के होने चाहियें। मैं भारत सरकार को इस बुद्धिमत्ता के लिये तो साधुवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि नेपाल में राजदूत के लिये उन्होंने श्री राज बहादुर की नियुक्ति की। सगता है सरकार अब धीरे-धीरे व्यावहारिक दृष्टिकोण पर आ रही है कि भारत को अपने पड़ोसी देशों

में किस प्रकार के जिम्मेदार और गम्भीर व्यक्तियों को राजदूत के रूप में भेजना चाहिये। एक छोटे-से नेपाल के साथ हुई भूल का अब तक कितना महंगा मूल्य देना पड़ा है मैं उस के विस्तार में नहीं जाना चाहता लेकिन इस प्रकार की भूलें हम अन्य पड़ोसी देशों के साथ न दोहराये। पड़ोसी देशों में राजदूतों की नियुक्ति करते समय हमें दूरदर्शिता का परिचय देना चाहिये, जैसा कि नेपाल के मामले में किया है।

अभी कुछ दिन पूर्व मुझे भारत के पड़ोसी देश अफगानिस्तान में जाने का अवसर मिला था। उस समय वहां पर हमारे जो राजदूत थे, उन की क्रियाशीलता या अक्रियाशीलता की मैं चर्चा यहां नहीं कर रहा हूं। लेकिन विदेश में जो हमारे राजदूत बन कर जाते हैं, केवल वे ही हमारे राजनीतिक प्रतिनिधि नहीं होते हैं। जो भारतीय वहां पर रहते हैं, वे भी हमारे राजनीतिक प्रतिनिधि का काम करते हैं। उन के साथ हमारे राजदूतों के सम्बन्ध बहुत घनिष्ठ होने चाहियें। देखा जाय तो वे ही हमारे स्थायी राजदूत हैं, जो वहां पर भारत के हितों को संरक्षण देते हैं। लेकिन उन के साथ हमारे राजदूतावासों का सम्पर्क न होना यह हमारी विदेश नीति की बहुत बड़ी दुर्बलता है। मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूं उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब देश स्वतन्त्र हुआ था और ईरान में हमारा सब से पहला राजदूतावास स्थापित हुआ था। उस समय ईरान में जितने भारतीय रहते थे, उन्होंने भारत सरकार को पत्र लिखा और उस पत्र में यह लिखा कि आप अपने राजदूतावास के लिये कोई भवन किराये पर न लें, भारत सरकार यहां पर अपना भवन बनाये। उसका भारत से एक नया पैसा मंगाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। हम भारतीय यहां पर सारा पैसा देंगे, जिससे भारतीय दूतावास का भवन तैयार हो सके। बीस साल बाद बिना सूद के हमारा पैसा हम को वापस कर दिया जाये। तेहरान में राजदूतावास बनाने के लिये वहां के भारतीयों ने इस प्रकार का

प्रस्ताव किया, लेकिन आज तक इस सरकार ने वहां के भारतीयों के उस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार नहीं किया। जितनी धनराशि में उस समय राजदूतावास का भवन तैयार हो सकता था, अब तक उस से 15 गुना किराये की शकल में यह सरकार दे चुकी है। दूसरे देशों में जो भारतीय रहते हैं, उन के साथ विदेश मंत्रालय का या हमारे राजदूतों का सम्पर्क न होना, यह हमारी विदेश नीति की कितनी बड़ी दुर्बलता है।

इसी प्रकार में प्रवासी भारतीयों के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूं। दो देश इस प्रकार के हैं जिनमें भारतीयों की संख्या अधिकांश मात्रा में है—मोरिशस और फिजी। फिजी के कुछ लोगों ने जिस समय श्री नेहरू प्रधान मंत्री और विदेश मंत्री थे, एक पत्र लिखा। प्रवासी भारतीयों के सम्बन्ध में भारत सरकार जितना 1947 से पहले, उनके हितों का संरक्षण करती थी, उस के बाद भारत सरकार की नीति वह नहीं रही। उन्होंने लिखा था कि हम दिल्ली में उनके प्रवासी भारतीय भवन अपने खर्च पर बनाना चाहते हैं। भारत सरकार हम को केवल भूमि दे दे। इससे केन्द्रीय सरकार और प्रवासी भारतीयों के बीच की शृंखला मजबूत हो जाय और उस में किसी प्रकार की दुर्बलता न आने पाये। श्री नेहरू ने देहरादून के सर्किट हाउस से अपनी मृत्यु के दो दिन पूर्व उन के पत्र का उत्तर दिया कि मुझे वह प्रस्ताव स्वीकार है, लेकिन आज तक भारत सरकार उस प्रस्ताव को कार्यान्वित नहीं कर सकी—क्या यह हमारी विदेश नीति है ?

इसके अतिरिक्त जब इन देशों से उच्च अधिकारी आते हैं तो उन्हें यथोचित आदर मिले। अभी कुछ दिन हुए मोरिशस के प्रधान मंत्री श्री रामगुलाम भारत आये। उनको उनके अनुरूप सम्मान न देना, क्योंकि वह भारतीय वंशज हैं, मैं इसको उचित नहीं समझता। अगर किसी अन्य देश का राष्ट्रपति आता है तो हमारे राष्ट्रपति उसका स्वागत करने के लिये



### [श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री]

जाते हैं। अगर किसी देश का प्रधान मंत्री आना है तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री उसको सम्मान देने के लिये जाते हैं। लेकिन इनके सम्मान के लिये उप-प्रधान मंत्री श्री मोरारजी भाई गये। मैं इसको भी बुरा नहीं समझता। लेकिन मैं यह अनुभव करता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री को वहाँ जाना चाहिये था। ये छोटी-छोटी बातें हैं, लेकिन दूसरे देशों में इनका बहुत बड़ा अर्थ लिया जाता है।

मैं एक बात अफगानिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में और कहना चाहता हूँ। कुछ दिन पहले हमारे उपराष्ट्रपति, जो इस समय राष्ट्रपति हैं, काबुल शहर में एक बाल रोग चिकित्सालय की नींव डाल कर आये थे। उनका कहना था कि भारत सरकार अपनी ओर से उन प्रकार का चिकित्सालय वहाँ बनायेगी। अब पाकिस्तानों वहाँ पर क्या काम करते हैं? धीरे धीरे वहाँ के नागरिकों के मनों को भारत के प्रति विषाक्त करने के लिये इस प्रकार का वातावरण बना रहे हैं कि देखो यह तो पत्थर ज्यों का त्यों पत्थर हो पड़ा है। लेकिन हमने जो सहयोग आपको दिया है, वह पूरा कर दिया है। इस लिये मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि या तो भारत सरकार इस प्रकार के निर्णय न ले। यदि लेता है तो शीघ्र उनको कार्यान्वित करे ताकि दूसरे देशों में उन बातों को लेकर हमारे विपरीत वातावरण तैयार न किया जा सके।

इसी प्रकार जैसा नहाटा जी ने कहा—खान बादशाह के मन में इस बात को लेकर इतना कष्ट है कि अफगानिस्तान की गवर्नमेंट तो खान बादशाह को पूरा समर्थन देता है लेकिन भारत सरकार से उनको वह समर्थन नहीं मिला, जिसकी वह अपेक्षा आरम्भ से रखते थे। खान बादशाह भारत से समर्थन लेना चाहते हैं। भारतीय स्वतन्त्रता संग्राम में उनका बहुत बड़ा योगदान रहा है। जब पठानों को मुक्ति आन्दोलन का हमने आश्वासन उन्हें दिया था, तो हमें अपने उस आश्वासन को पूरा करना चाहिये। यह राजनीतिक दृष्टि से भी उपयुक्त

है और कूटनीतिक दृष्टि से भी उपयुक्त है, और नैतिक दृष्टि से भी यह बात उपयुक्त है। इस पर हमें गम्भीरता से विचार करना चाहिये।

एक प्रश्न यह है—पश्चिमी एशिया का। पश्चिमी एशिया के सम्बन्ध में भारत सरकार की जो नीति है, मैं उस के विस्तार में तो नहीं जाऊंगा, लेकिन जहाँ तक इजराइल का सम्बन्ध है मेरी अपनी कुछ मान्यता है—अभी श्रीलंका जैसे छोटे देश को ईजिप्ट ने पत्र लिखा कि आपके हमारे साथ भी राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध हैं और इजराइल के साथ भी राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध हैं। उस छोटे-से देश ने जिसकी आबादी भारत से बहुत कम है, उत्तर दिया—आपको हमारे घरेलू मामलों में हस्तक्षेप करने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है। आपके साथ हमारी मित्रता है, इस का अर्थ यह नहीं है कि हम दूसरों के साथ मित्रता करें तो आपसे पूछ कर करें। यही बात मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ। हम को चाहिये था कि आज जितने भी देश अस्तित्व में हैं उनके साथ समान राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित करें। हमारी तटस्थ नीति की मांग भी यही है, लेकिन यदि किसी कारणवश आप अथवा अपनी दुर्बल नीति के कारण, जो दुर्भाग्य से अब तक चलती चली जा रही है, इजरायल को राजनीतिक मान्यता देने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं, तो कम से कम इस प्रकार के प्रगतिशील देशों के साथ शैक्षणिक सम्बन्ध ही स्थापित करें और सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित करें। पीछे राजस्थान सरकार ने इजरायल को लिखा था कि हमें अपनी मरुभूमि को शस्य-श्यामला बनाने के लिये आपके विशेषज्ञों की जरूरत है। उन्होंने उत्तर दिया कि हम विशेषज्ञ देने को तैयार हैं लेकिन जब राजस्थान सरकार ने केन्द्रीय सरकार से पूछा तो उन्होंने उस को स्वीकार नहीं किया, उस का विरोध किया। दूसरा देश अपने विशेषज्ञों को आपके घर भेजे, आपकी भूमि को हरा-भरा करने को तैयार है और आप उस के प्रस्ताव को ठुकराते हैं, यह कौनसी ब्यावहारिक नीति है ?

में अपने वक्तव्य को समाप्ति की ओर ले जाते हुए—दो बातें और कहना चाहता हूँ। एक बात—यह कि काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में प्रधान मंत्री ने यह कहा कि हम किसी के दबाव में आ कर काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में निर्णय नहीं ले रहे हैं लेकिन शेख अब्दुल्ला और मिर्जा अफजल बेग—इन का जो नया षड्यन्त्र प्रारम्भ होने जा रहा है इससे मैं सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी को सावधान कर देना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि वह रक्षा मंत्री के पद पर हैं और शायद आज वह विदेश मंत्री की ओर से भी इस विवाद का उत्तर देने जा रहे हैं। सरकार थोड़ा सावधान होकर चले, कई भूलें होने पर भी आपका व्यवहार उस के सुधार के अनुरूप नहीं हो रहा है। अन्तिम बात जिन देशों में भी में गया और वहाँ पर भारतीय दूतावासों को देखा सो दुख हुआ। और कुछ करो या न करो, कम से कम “भारतीय दूतावास” तो हिन्दी में लिखवाओ। जिन देशों में अंग्रेजी नहीं चलती है, वहाँ भी आपने अंग्रेजी भाषा में ‘भारतीय दूतावास’ लिखवाया हुआ है—इससे हम को कितना अपमानित होना पड़ता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह विदेश मंत्रालय को निर्देश दें कि हर जगह “भारतीय दूतावास” भारतीय भाषा में लिखा जाये जिससे कि कुछ स्वाभिमान जगे।

SHRI SEQUEIRA (Marmagoa): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, in today's world, one of three attributes seems to be necessary for a country to be a world power: economic might, military might or habitual belligerence. I submit that we in our country have none of these three. What then is our place in the world? We are a country which in terms of history is recently independent. We are a developing nation; we share with our friends in Asia, in Africa and in Latin America all the aspirations of nations; with a wide disparity of income among the people, we are making an effort to efface this difference. I submit that the object of our foreign policy in the councils of the world should be to take a place with them as equals and to play a major role in all common policies

that aid the process of development. Where and how is world wealth being created today? The majority of world trade is within the club of developed nations. The second largest quantum is the trade between developed nations and the developing nations. It is almost equal, but what does it consist of? The developing nations send to the developed nations raw materials and get in return finished products. The processing is being done in the developed nations. The jobs are being created, factories are being built and technology is being developed in those areas which need all these things less than we do. We must be able to arrest and reverse this process. There is not enough trade between the developing nations. We are having the UNCTAD conference and I am sure in this conference we shall try and project the view that we wish a greater amount of trade amongst ourselves, and there should be a flow of technology from developed nations to the developing nations, rather than merely finished products.

But is such a conference enough? This is the reversal of a process that has been there for centuries since colonial days. If we are to make this reversal of the process a success, it is necessary that we in India be in constant touch with all the developing nations and place before them our views and play a major role in the shaping and presentation of these views to the developed nations. Take Germany. Our trade with Germany is an adverse trade. Recently I read in the papers that we have come to an agreement with them and we are going to examine how we can close the gap. But a mere agreement to set up a committee is not enough. Besides our diplomatic initiative by our embassy there, it is necessary that we should have constantly delegations of all manner of people from this country who know something about exports, politicians who are able to influence the policies there, to go there and present the view that a safe world is only a contented world, that today we can achieve a contented world if all the countries get together and do something about it together. When we say a safe world is a contented

[Shri Sequeira]

world, let us not forget that in Bhutan, Sikkim and Nepal, it is our duty to contribute to the contentment of these neighbours who are economically not as strong as we are.

The projection of views in the world means ability to speak in languages other than our own, languages native to the country in which we are speaking. We in this country were fortunate enough to inherit three live teaching institutions of 3 live languages—English, French and Portuguese—English in most of the country, French in Pondicherry and Portuguese in Goa. But what have we done? With the short-sighted policy that whatever was colonial was bad, we are destroying the institutions that we have. This is another process we should reverse. We should maintain these institutions and strengthen them, so that our people can learn those languages and imbibe that culture to be able to go abroad and project our own very much Indian views.

The Prime Minister said yesterday that we do not miss many opportunities. I would give an example of one opportunity that we have not only lost, but which we had and which we have now almost lost.

You are aware, Sir, that when Goa was liberated this country earned the gratitude of almost all the freedom movements in Africa. These days we were very much in touch with them. What has happened to this advantage today? Are we in touch with these movements? Do we know what is happening to them. Having cleared foreign presence in this country, let us not forget there are still people in the world, many millions of them with an urge to be free and that we should be in constant touch with them. Wherever we are in a position to help them we should help and wherever we are not in a position to help them we should be able to recommend to our friends in the world that help should be given to them.

Non-alignment is perhaps not as important today when the super powers themselves are aligned. But the one

thing that I would like to submit in conclusion is that this country now should be fully aligned. It should align itself with the voices of those millions in the world who want peace, prosperity and progress. It should identify itself with the area in which it lives, it should find its own place and not seek to exceed it, it should define the area in which it can have influence, it should decide the priorities which it is going to apply to its policies and it should put all its efforts within these limited areas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Minister—

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA (Secunderabad) : Sir, allow me to put one question.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : All right. He may put his question.

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA : Sir, even though it was the chance of the Congress to speak you gave it to the Opposition. I want to protest about this differentiation being made in time allotment between the first among equals and the last among equals.

My question is this. Is the Minister aware that at a public meeting in Delhi a resolution was passed in favour of giving every assistance, diplomatic and otherwise, to Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan? This was sent to the Prime Minister, the Minister of External Affairs and others. I would like to know what action Government has taken on that. In this connection I would like to inform the Minister that this decision about partition and referendum was taken behind the back of both Mahatma Gandhi and Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan. On 26th September, 1947, Gandhiji said that if there was no other way of securing justice from Pakistan India should have to go to war against it. He said that war was not a joke, no one wanted war but he can never advise anyone to put up with injustice. On 17th November, 1947, Gandhiji informed Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan—that is after freedom—to come to India so that he could lead non-

cooperation movement from here, he said: "with me or otherwise". What that "otherwise" can be I do not know. He went so far to say, when he was asked: "You are a believer in ahimsa?", "I am a believer of ahimsa but my Government is not". That was the pledge of the Father of the Nation, which is dear not only to the Congress Party but the whole country, specially to Congress. May I know what steps Government of India has decided to take in giving help to Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan and his Pakhtoon Movement? If it is considered to be interference in the affairs of another country, I would like to know how you can allow interference in our country when Mizos and Nagas are being trained and armed by Pakistan and when every effort is made to attack India? I would like to have a definite answer. I am very sorry the Prime Minister is not here, but they had advance notice of the resolution of the public meeting.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Swaran Singh.

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore) : Sir, are you not going to give me an opportunity?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Your party spokesman has taken perhaps more than his time. I do not want to say how much time he has taken.

15 hrs.

SHRI S. KUNDU : Sir, I have given notice of amendments.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Usually, those who give notice of amendments are given opportunities. But it is not possible now.

SHRI S. KUNDU : I hope he will remember me when the amendments are taken up.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is not my intention to go into any great detail about the various points that have been urged. The Prime Minister in her two speeches yesterday had given the broad outlines and guidelines of our foreign policy on

essential matters, and in her intervention towards the end of the debate yesterday she tried to answer many of the points that had been raised yesterday. I would, therefore, like to confine myself to some of the points that have been raised in the debate today. I am very happy to find that even today, within a short period, as many as 9 hon. Members have participated in the debate, and they have raised many important issues, many important problems have been touched upon and their views have been put forward.

I would, first of all, like to touch upon some of the points raised by my esteemed colleague and friend, Shri Nath Pai. I fully agree with him on three points that he mentioned towards the end of his speech. These three points are: (1) our attitude on nuclear non-proliferation treaty, (2) use of foreign money inside our country for political purposes and (3) the political stability and economic difficulties of the country do present a picture abroad which is not to the liking of anyone of us and, therefore, the real strength of the country lies in having stability here and in improving our economic conditions.

I would only like to remind him, as he has in fact himself stated, that on non-proliferation treaty our position has been very fully clarified, not only in the various international gatherings including the United Nations, but also in our discussions with the representatives of the governments concerned. I need hardly re-state that Soviet Union, United States, France and United Kingdom, all these countries are fully aware of our attitude towards the non-proliferation treaty. We have said it very clearly, and I would like to make a very brief reference only to a part of our statement, the Government of India statement in the United Nations on this issue :

"A rational approach to the solution of this problem"

—that is, nuclear disarmament and disarmament generally—

"requires that all international instruments which seek to regulate and control nuclear weapons must assure

[Shri Swaran Singh]

that the possessors of those weapons must be denied that licence to continue increasing the instruments of their threat. Nuclear disarmament cannot be achieved by the preservation of exclusive rights, privileges and options as such to be retained by certain armed and powerful countries while measures are to be taken to limit the actions of the threatened and unarmed countries. It is for this reason that India has consistently emphasized that any international instrument which seeks to deal with this problem which would be acceptable and which would endure must ensure that both nuclear and non-nuclear weapon powers accept obligations not to proliferate. It must be recognised that these mutual obligations are complimentary and are two facets of the same problem."

We had occasion to point out to the international community that whereas we are very vitally interested in preventing horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons we are equally interested in preventing vertical proliferation. If, on the one hand, the nuclear arsenal of the Big Powers continues to increase and they continue to add to their nuclear holdings by stepping up the production of nuclear weapons . . . (*Interruption*)

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi) : What is vertical and horizontal proliferation ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am glad, Raja Sahib is showing some interest in this. I tried to explain the second sentence. Horizontal proliferation is that more countries start manufacturing nuclear weapons and vertical proliferation is that the same countries go on adding to their nuclear arsenal.

Whereas the nuclear powers are trying to keep the option to them of vertical proliferation, that is, increasing their own nuclear holdings, they are preventing the other countries from developing nuclear weapons. We have always urged in the international community that this state of affairs is, to say the least, not fair and that this thinking must be reversed. In view of this clear policy.

there is no scope for any criticism of Government policy in this respect.

With regard to the percolation of foreign money to influence one way or the other political events in this country, it is something which cannot be too strongly condemned. I felt surprised when Shri Nath Pai regarded the statement of my colleague, the Home Minister, somewhat lightly. We do not treat this matter in that spirit. We attach the highest importance to keeping our independence and our line and course of action being absolutely free from any foreign influence, whether it is money or any other influence. I cannot state the Government's stand in this respect more clearly.

There are several other points raised by Shri Nath Pai and I would like to refer to one or two of them. I think that his criticism of State visits was not quite fair. If the total outcome of a State visit is only the issuing of a joint communique, which Shri Nath Pai dismissed as a very ordinary routine affair and which could perhaps be handled by an expert or a trained stenographer, then perhaps his criticism may have some force. But it cannot be unknown to him—I am sure, it is not unknown to this hon. House and to the country—that the visits of Indian leaders abroad as also the visits of foreign dignitaries to this country are useful and very important for a variety of reasons, the most important being that here is an opportunity to exchange views at the highest level on very important issues. I would like to remind the hon. House of what the Prime Minister said yesterday, namely, that all these talks and discussions which take place at diplomatic level cannot be divulged. The communique is only on those points upon which some public attitude has to be taken, either of some agreement or of some difference of opinion. That is the normal accepted pattern all over the world. There are many other matters which are discussed in the course of these visits and which are of the highest importance because this gives an opportunity to put across our viewpoint in front of the visiting foreign dignitary

and also to put across our viewpoint when our Prime Minister, Foreign Minister or other ministers visit other countries.

**SHRI S. KUNDU :** The hon. Minister will remember that what Shri Nath Pai meant was that even when we go for food agreement we take such a huge contingent of officers that it appears that we have gone to give food and not to bring food.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** I would like to say very clearly on this issue that it is again an unfair assessment, namely, that any visit abroad by Indian ministers is only to beg for foreign aid or to ask for food. We experienced unprecedented difficulties in the matter of food and even now we are facing some economic difficulties. We welcome help from whatever quarter it comes. But it will be absolutely wrong for anybody to imagine as if all our foreign policy and all our postures are, in any way, revolving around this basic or central thing, namely, food or economic aid. If it comes, we welcome that and we are in need of it for our economic development, particularly, in the basic sectors of our economy. I would like to reiterate our debt of gratitude that we owe to many industrialised and developed countries, like U.S.A., U.K., France, West Germany, Soviet Union and several others who have helped us in giving economic aid in vital sectors of our economy. But let us not be misunderstood on this issue. Our postures, our attitudes, in the international field on basic political and burning issues have never been influenced by anything extraneous and will never be so influenced in future. There is no use trying to project that our postures and our attitudes are, in any way, circumscribed or influenced by these matters.

It should not be forgotten that the aid-giving also, in a large majority of cases, is the result of an assessment of the national interest, even of the aid giving countries. In this context, our young colleague from Goa made some admirable suggestions in the economic

field. It is not as if it is only by way of charity that the developed countries are extending aid for the economic development of the under-developed countries. It is rectification of an act of injustice in the economic field spread over centuries together and that, to a small measure, is now being straightened and it is as much in their interest as it is in the interest of the developing countries. Poverty is indivisible and, if peace and progress has to be maintained, the widening gulf between the rich and the poor countries has to be bridged and it is as much in the interest of the developing countries for a variety of reasons, not only moral but the questions of peace and war, the question of maintenance of economy at a particular level, all these factors, are important and it is on an overall assessment of these factors that the aid-giving countries have come forward to help the under-developed countries. In fact, they are not doing enough in this respect and it has been our endeavour to highlight this in the United Nations and in the Economic and Social Councils, and also a great deal of concentrated effort will have to be put in by us at the time of the UNCTAD Conference. These are important economic issues that face the world. Our own attitude on these issues is well known. I would like to state again, clearly, that our political postures and our attitudes have never been deflected by the fact that we are receiving economic aid or food aid from any country.

Another matter that was mentioned was our state of relationship with the United States of America and the Soviet Union. More than one hon. Member has referred to it. It is important because these two countries are powerful countries, economically and politically, and they hold a great deal of concentrated power in their hands. Our relations, both with the Soviet Union and with the United States of America, are friendly and there is appreciation of our view point even when there is some difference of opinion on important international issues between us and any of these countries. It is true that the international scene is changing. If there

[Shri Swaran Singh]

is less of tension now or less of the atmosphere of cold war, we should be happy rather than that we should feel perturbed over it. We have, after all, been working in the international forums and amongst the international communities for lowering tensions between the power blocs, between the defence blocs, as they were described. And if a new situation is developing where these tensions are being lowered, I do not see why there should be any feeling of consternation; on the other hand, there should be happiness over that. We, by the size of our country, by our geo-political situation, by the pursuit of correct policies, internally and externally, will continue to have a position of importance in all these changing situations which might be witnessed by us . . .

**SHRI M. L. SONDHAI** (New Delhi) : Are you happy about the Soviet and American military aid to Pakistan ?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH** : I think, this was a question which could admit of only one reply. How can India be happy if Pakistan receives military aid from Soviet Union or from United States or, in fact, from many other countries ? This was a question which was hardly of any importance, and I would also like to say that, according to the information in our possession Soviet Union has not given any aid so far to Pakistan; it has not even sold anything of a military character or any military hardware to Pakistan.

**SHRI M. R. MASANI** : Helicopters.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH** : Helicopter has been discussed more than once. Helicopter is on OGL and any country can purchase it. You can purchase it. Anybody else can purchase it. In this connection I would like to say this, which is quite interesting. I did not want to say that, but because he picked up this 'Helicopter', I would say this. I have not seen Mr. Masani very often mentioning the heavy military and which was given to Pakistan by way of gift; I have not seen him condemning strongly the military armament and military equipment that have been gifted

by the United States of America to Pakistan. But the helicopter, which is on OGL as I said earlier, is always put forward as if they want to put the Government on the defensive in our relationship with the Soviet Union. I cannot approve of this attitude from one side or the other, trying to highlight only those points which might be in consonance with the pet theories which they want to propound, and they forget altogether the other spectrum of either help or association that might be existing between us and those countries. This is a lop-sided presentation and we should resist the temptation of indulging in this.

On South-East Asia more than one hon. Member has laid stress—several members from both the sides of the House. We in Government attach the highest importance to development of close and friendliest of relations with all the countries of South-East Asia. I am glad that Mr. Nath Pai has in a belated manner mentioned with approval the work done by Mr. Chagla. Mr. Nath Pai was prominent with his brick-bats when Mr. Chagla held the fort, but I am glad that, at any rate, when he is no longer there, he is giving bouquets . . .

**SHRI NATH PAI** : Bouquets !

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH** : I am very happy about it because all of us valued very greatly the contribution that Mr. Chagla had made in regard to our foreign policy.

**SHRI NATH PAI** : Is that why he was removed ? You said, you valued his contribution so much.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH** : I would not like him to take any credit that his brick-bats can remove a Minister. It has not come to that bad.

South-East Asia is a region in which several countries are included and our relations with almost all of them are quite friendly and we have taken a decision that we should give even greater importance to our relations with the countries in South-East Asia. We intend to improve our relations, economic rela-



tions, cultural relations and political relations with this region and we want to strengthen them so that this region which is in our neighbourhood prospers and all the progressive forces and forces of unity, independence and sovereignty there are strengthened, because the real strength of South East Asia lies in strengthening the forces of independence as a result of which all these countries feel that they have a pride in their own culture, in their own existence and in their own independent line of action.

The strength of this region does not lie, as some countries at one time thought, in having some sort of defence pacts and the like, but really it lies in developing the independence, the strength and the honour and dignity of these countries. It is in this spirit that we view the problems of South-east Asia.

I need hardly bring back to the minds of hon. Members the situation that exists in South-East Asia today. Indonesia has passed through a very difficult period. There is a new government there. They are doing their best not only to improve their relations with other countries in South-east Asia but also are grappling hard in the matter of improving their internal economy. The best of our wishes go to them for the success of the task upon which they have embarked. It is a colossal task, and we have assured our friends in Indonesia that we are prepared to participate in that venture of theirs upon which they have embarked for strengthening their economy and for improving the conditions in their country. Our relations with that country are today very much different from what they were before the present regime came into power, although even at that time we were careful always to keep the real objective before us namely that Indonesia is a large country in the South-east Asian region, and the people of Indonesia and India have common bonds of history and of culture, and they being neighbours, there should be abiding friendship between the people of Indonesia and the people of India.

Burma is also experiencing at the present moment many economic difficulties. Also, there are tensions that Burma is now experiencing from certain quarters. We value very greatly the independence and friendship of a neighbouring country Burma. There have been several exchanges of visits between the heads of governments of the two countries, and it has always been a great pleasure to welcome the chairman Mr. Ne Win in our country, and the Government and the people of Burma also have been greatly pleased by the visits of the heads of our Government to Burma. Our relations are very close, very cordial, and we are working in mutual interest and in a spirit of mutual help.

As the Prime Minister has mentioned, the Governor-General of Ceylon paid us a visit. Our Prime Minister went to Ceylon and paid a visit to that country. These are very important links and we should greatly value them.

Coming to the other countries in South-east, Asia, for instance, countries like Thailand, Philippines, Singapore, Malaysia etc. we have got very excellent economic and cultural relations. Also, there is constant exchange of views on important issues. Then, our relations with Australia and New Zealand are also good. The visit of our Deputy Prime Minister to Japan was also very successful. All these things show that we attach the highest importance to our relationship with our neighbouring countries in the South-east Asian region.

In the West Asian region also, our position today is such that we can say with a great deal of confidence that our relations with all the Arab countries are excellent. There are as many as 10 Arab countries in the North of African and the west of Asia and our relations with them are excellent. Our trade relations, political relations, cultural relations etc. are in a very excellent form, and there is a great deal of appreciation of the just stand that India took in the Arab-Israel conflict when we saw the situation in the correct perspective and raised our voice in unmistakable terms



[Shri Swaran Singh]

in favour of justice and against aggression and thus kept the banner aloft . . .

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : . . . of national humiliation.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : . . . of national honour. If some people think that to connive at a country grabbing the fruits of aggression would redound to the honour of the country, then I submit that they have still to know the meaning of the word 'honour'. Perhaps, my hon. friend has forgotten all that he has learnt in the foreign service.

AN HON. MEMBER : He has no sense of shame.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Here is a case where even today we have got areas in Arab countries under Israel possession, areas which are admittedly in Arab countries. Even the friends of Shri M. L. Sondhi admit that they are Arab countries, as for example, Sinai . . . .

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : I have Arab friends also, in Saudi Arabia, for instance.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I thought that he had written them off. Otherwise he could not have used that expression.

I would like to say that here is the case where even now Israel is in occupation of territories which are admittedly Arab territories, and some of their leaders in a flamboyant manner say that they are not going to vacate those territories. Can there be a more flagrant case of aggression, in fact, not only aggression, but gloating over aggression. And here are our friends like Shri M. L. Sondhi who say that to raise our voice in favour of vacating the aggression and depriving the Israelis of their going ahead with the enjoyment of the fruits of aggression is a matter of national humiliation; it is amazing that he should use such a word as humiliation. It is humiliating to think in those terms.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : I Challenge him to fight an election on this issue anywhere, in Jullundur, for instance. There are countries that think that our country has been purchased by the Arab countries.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am very glad that Shri M. L. Sondhi who also comes from Jullundur which is his home town reminds me of fighting an election in Jullundur. I have fought six elections in Jullundur, and the only election that Shri M. L. Sondhi has fought is in Delhi. Therefore, I think he does not know Jullundur. Of course, we are proud of him because he was a bright student of Khalsa College there but he has now fallen in bad company and so he has been progressively forgetting the good things that we had taught him. But I think he had retired himself a little because I was going to give him a compliment for the speech that he delivered yesterday.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) : Shri Swaran Singh has been a Minister for nearly thirty years, whereas Shri M. L. Sondhi is not even thirty years old.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I wish to compliment Shri M. L. Sondhi because he had tried to salvage some of the positions which the Jan Sangh had progressively lost by adopting a very reactionary policy in the international sphere. Yesterday he did make an attempt, though it was a feeble attempt; I could see, the stresses and strains on him from Shri Bal Raj Madhok on the one side, from Shri Shrichand Goel on the other and from Shri A. B. Vajpayee on the third side. So, he did try to do some rope-dancing and some tight rope-dancing at that.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : I thank him for taking so much interest in the Jan Sangh. If he continues that effort, I shall be delighted because he might possibly be able to bring a certain measure of realism in the otherwise highly retrograde and highly reactionary policies of the Jan Sangh. This is just by the way and I am sorry for this interlude.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN : He is creating groupism in the Jan Sangh.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The groups are already there . . .

AN HON. MEMBER : Groupism is the monopoly of the Congress alone.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : . . . and I cannot forget to take notice of them. If he does not want me to take notice of them, I would not because the hon. Member will find out for himself what their position is.

Sir, coming back to the Arab-Israel position, the Government of India's representative in the Security Council did a great deal in bringing realism to the whole situation. I am very happy to recall it, because I was at one stage despondent as to whether the Security Council would be able to arrive at an consensus about a resolution, but, ultimately I am happy that a near-unanimous resolution was adopted by the Security Council which has laid down certain fundamental principles which should be the basis for bringing permanent and lasting peace in West Asia and we should bless the efforts of the United Nations representative who is at the present moment engaged in very serious and delicate talks with Israel on the one side and the Arab countries on the other. And let us hope that his efforts will result in restoring normalcy in this region.

I would like to make one position quite clear. We have always been in favour of safeguarding the sovereignty and integrity of all countries in that region and in this is included Israel. It is wrong to suggest that we have adopted policies which are in any way anti-Israel, in fact anti any country. We are interested in preserving the sovereignty and integrity of every country in this region and we are also interested in the use of the international water-ways.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Do you remember Tibet ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Sir, we are also interested in presenting the

right of navigation in the international water-ways for all shipping. Sir, this is a vital route for our economy and we are very much interested in re-opening the Suez Canal.

SHRI NATH PAI : For Israel also?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I want Mr. Nath Pai to study that clause in the resolution to which we are a party in which we have said . . . . .

SHRI NATH PAI : Whose resolution is it ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : This was a joint resolution moved by many countries.

SHRI NATH PAI : That is our point. Who moved it ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I think, the British representative.

SHRI NATH PAI : It was not India's resolution. India's resolution could not have come because of your partisan attitude. Anyway, there is a resolution, I agree.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : You cannot take credit for that.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I was trying to inform the House about the developments there. I am not taking any credit for this that we did it.

SHRI NATH PAI : You were.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I take the credit that we toed a line and we actually pursued a policy which ultimately resulted in creation of a consensus.

Somehow or other, there are certain friends in our country who would like to give all the credit when it is a British resolution or a Soviet Union resolution or a United States resolution, but they would never like to consider our own contribution which would help them. I will be content with differing with them.

Mr. Masani's face absolutely became bright when I recalled that it was the British representative, Lord Caradon's resolution which was approved.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMIKANTTAM-MA (Khammam) : We are only sorry for you.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I can say, I wish them well. I hope that the pressure of public opinion and the opinions expressed strongly in this House will continue to instil in their minds a greater regard and love for the representatives of their own country and they would not always be looking round to representatives of other countries.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Public opinion is not with you on West Asia. You are hopelessly isolated.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : We know the public opinion on West Asia.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Not quite.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : We know India is essentially secular and we have always opposed forces of aggression and have always been in favour of restoration of areas which might be in the possession of an aggressor. This is the public opinion and merely because there are some friends like Mr. Masani with powerful lobbies and merely because....

SHRI M. L. SONDHY : Please remember Tibet.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : From the desert you go the plateau. I will come to the plateau also. Rest assured I will not leave that.

It is wrong to say, and it is an injustice to the Indian people, wedded as they are to secularism and to the support of progressive forces, that they are in this respect with Israel and not with the Arabs.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : They are neutral, they are objective.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : That is the greatest disservice that is being done, because the good that the Government wants to achieve is sought to be belittled and clouded by expressions of opinion of this nature which I strongly repudiate. Otherwise, so far as the West Asian situation is concerned.....

SHRI NATH PAI : You were diverted by Mr. Masani. You were making a very important statement which was a new line of thinking for us. Would you kindly tell us more about it. You said this Government stands by the right of all nations to use international waterways. Do we understand that even Israel is included when you say all nations?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The words of the resolution are quite clear.

SHRI M. L. SONDHY : Why not give a direct answer?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I know how to give a direct answer, and also to give an indirect answer.

SHRI NATH PAI : You specialise in it, that is our worry.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I had something to do with the formulation and evaluation of some of these principles which are incorporated in the Security Council resolution, and there is now a concensus that the international waterways should be open for innocent navigation, for normal trade, to all countries. It is quite another consideration, to which I did not want to refer at this stage, because I do not want to prejudice the ultimate success of the negotiations that might be undertaken by the U.N. representative, namely what other conditions could be superimposed which could be based either on national security or defence or other matters, they are matters of detail. So, I would not like at this stage to say anything more on that. The words of the resolution and the principle that is incorporated in one of the clause is quite clear, and I would suggest that that may be studied carefully. I am not saying anything new. All these points, sovereignty and integrity of all States, the use of international waterways, restoration to position before the aggression took place, these are all incorporated in the resolution which has been approved even by those countries for whom Mr. Masani has a better word than India. All these countries have approved that resolution.

I would like now to say a few words about the policy on Tibet. It happened to be here when Mr. Sondhi was making his speech, and I was very much intrigued to notice that he thought that I was anti-Tibet, a little more anti-Tibet, and that perhaps Mr. Chagla was a little more pro-Tibet. It is amazing that the assessment should be based on these considerations. Mr. Sondhi or his other colleagues in the Jana Sangh may be anti-many countries, because unfortunately some of their programmes are negative. And here was a young friend from East Pakistan who was describing our policy towards Pakistan....

B. K. DASCHOWDHURY : I am not from East Pakistan, I am from West Bengal.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It was a slip of the tongue, it will not be there on the record, I will correct it (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER : Colossal ignorance.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : There are many friends who came from West Pakistan and they are now in West Bengal. Anyhow, this was a slip of the tongue on my part, and I am very grateful to Mr. Gupta to remind the House of it and ridicule it, because that is the level to which he goes.

Mr. Sondhi and several other friends, I will not name them, are somehow or other in the grip of a phobia of anti-something. Either their approach is anti-China or anti-Tibet or pro-Tibet or anti-Pakistan or pro-Pakistan. That is not the attitude of the Government of India. None of us is either pro-Tibet or anti-Tibet. We see the situation in its proper perspective. Here is a country which is our neighbour. And people talk lightly about the treaties entered into and the declarations entered into and suddenly, if it is inconvenient to them, they say, "you scrap this; you cancel this; you repudiate this treaty." It was my friend from Cooch-Bihar who said that the Nehru-Liaquat Pact should be scrapped

It was said that the Tashkent Declaration is quite useless, "You forget about it."

AN HON. MEMBER : It is correct.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : If such a thing is correct, then it is a highly irresponsible thing and no government can be credible if they are going to scrap the treaties entered into, merely because it is inconvenient or it is uncomfortable. (*Interruption*). That is a spirit which we should eschew. I say in all seriousness, not as a point of argument.

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : You are evading Tibet.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am coming to that. Because there is a treaty, because you are erroneously adopting a policy, we should forget the terms of the treaty ! Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I say this in all seriousness. This is a light-hearted manner which is shown when they say that the agreements that we entered into with other countries, whether it is the Nehru-Liaquat Pact or our agreement on borders or the Tashkent Declaration.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Or the Privy purse ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Internal matters, we shall discuss when we discuss the internal matters.

AN HON. MEMBER : It is a breach of privilege.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Internal economic matters and our attitude towards them are separate matters. What is Mr. Masani's argument ? Does he mean that I should dishonour all the agreements we entered into with others outside, and honour only all the agreements entered into inside ?

SHRI M. R. MASANI : All.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am not going to do it. Inside the country, this Parliament is sovereign, and any economic issue is a matter which can be finally and firmly and unalterably decided by Parliament, if Parliament, in its wisdom, one day decides to do away

[Shri Swaran Singh]

with private property, or nationalise banks or remove the privy purse, it is the prerogative of Parliament. There is no question of agreement or non-agreement in these matters, because the Constitution is supreme and Parliament is supreme. You can take any decision you like. But I would like to remind the hon. House that this Parliament has to honour the international agreements. I would beg of the hon. Members, even those who disagree with the Government, not to lightly challenge the concluded treaties and agreements, and they should not urge that these should be got over.

SHRI NATH PAI : I agree.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : You agree, but there are several others who do not. That is my difficulty. I have to see in many directions. If you are the only man whom I have to satisfy then I will finish the thing in a short while. But there is a wide spectrum and some one wants to pull in one direction and some others in the other direction.

SHRI NATH PAI : You are looking for loopholes in order to evade the issue. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Minister is saying that the treaties that India has entered into with other countries should not be disregarded. I agree. We subscribe to it. But let him answer this question : was there a stipulation on the part of India in the treaty we entered into with China in 1954 to see that the personality, the entity and the freedom of the people of Tibet is destroyed? I would like to know the clause in which we have agreed to that.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : This is not a new point. This has been discussed several times.

SHRI NATH PAI : Is it?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Yes. I can quote chapter and verse when this point was gone into in the course of the debates. I myself have handled it more than once here. Our treaty with China on Tibet is quite clear : we have

accepted certain Chinese position in relation to Tibet.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Shame.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : He is shouting, "shame." What I am saying is—

SHRI RANJIT SINGH (Khalilabad) : *Sabash*.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Even if it is *sabash*, I will be sorry. Even if the *sabash* is from Mr. Sondhi or Mr. Masani, I will be sorry because it means that I have done something which is incorrect.

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : Sir, you are getting allergic to me. Mr. Ranjit Singh said *sabash*.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am in a rather difficult position to choose between the two. I have been in charge of External Affairs and Mr. Sondhi has been in the foreign service. Now I am Defence Minister and Mr. Ranjit Singh has been in the Army. I have to keep a balance between the two.

Coming to the treaty with China on Tibet, we had taken a certain attitude with regard to Tibet after taking into consideration everything — historical background, documents, etc., and even the McMahon line on the eastern side of our border; there were talks with Tibetans. I do not want to go into all these details. All those matters are known to the House. If there has been a conflict later on, to get away from that treaty is a suggestion which is most fantastic. Even if any particular clause of that treaty has not been actually adopted by any country, whether that entitles us to smash that treaty, to obliterate it . . . (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There should be no more interruptions.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I want to make it clear that notwithstanding all these pressures that are mounted from time to time our policy on Tibet continues to be what it was. We cannot recognise Dalai Lama as the head of an emigre government, because

there is no such government. This matter has been clarified more than once.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : The public opinion in the Congress Party is in favour of Tibet. You are against Tibet. (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You were not a member then; this issue was discussed threadbare since 1958.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar) : The Chair is not expected to reply, Sir. It is for the minister to reply.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Again and again I requested Mr. Sondhi not to interrupt. You will have to resume your seat.

श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे आप बोलने दीजिये। मुझे आप से शिकायत है। यह आप का काम है कि वह मिनिस्टर का काम है ? आपको मेरी बात सुननी पड़ेगी।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर।

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Mr. Swaran Singh has a vendetta against Tibet. He is anti-Tibet. The Dalai Lama is not safe as long as Mr. Swaran Singh is there. The Dalai Lama is a prisoner in India. Mr. Chagla was pro-Tibet . . . (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This matter was discussed umpteen times. Mr. Gupta, please resume your seat. Nothing will go on record now. (*Interruptions*).\*\*

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is better to know our mind and to know our policy clearly. Any amount of confusion or any amount of lack of appreciation is not good. There can be a difference of opinion, but there should be no misapprehension about a particular policy that we pursue. We have our differences with China. China is in illegal occupation of our territory. They are mounting pressures on us in a variety of

ways. Collusion between China and Pakistan is there. All these factors are known to us and to the country. But let our judgment, let our attitude not be clouded on issues about which there is no scope for confusion. If we get confused on every issue, then we are not serving the country, we are not serving the national interest.

Take this question of recognition of Formosa. The Prime Minister explained this matter. It is surprising that it was again raised here. The essential point there is that the Government in Formosa claims that they are the rightful and the only Government of the whole of China including the vast mainland of China. It will be fantastic if we are to accept that claim. It is on account of this fact that they are in the United Nations, in fact they are represented in the Security Council, that they make this claim. But will it be realistic for us. And, on this most sensitive issue that affects us daily—I think it will do some good to my friends from Jan Sangh if they know this—the border question, the position of the Formosan Government is precisely the same as that of the Peking Government.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Not, it is not true.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Not at all, it is false.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Shri Gupta is not yet a representative of the Formosan Government. He is an hon. Member of this House.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Are you their representative ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I have talked with their Foreign Minister as Foreign Minister and I know their views. I say this in all solemnity that the only difference they make is this. It is in their published books.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : No. That is not correct.

\*\*Not recorded

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** It is amazing that friends from the Swatantra Party and Jan Sangh are trying to defend the Formosan attitude on this issue. The important question for us to remember is, irrespective of their stand, I repeat, that their stand on this Sino-Indian border dispute is the same. The Formosan view is the same. They also claim the same area which the Peking Government is claiming. At any rate, here is a Government which claims to say that their writ runs over the whole of China. Whether we are at peace or in conflict or exchange of arms—it is with the Chinese army—how can we ignore hard reality of fact, hard reality of geography, hard reality of positions at the border. It is amazing that those people who ask us to recognise Formosa as the legitimate Government of the whole of China . . .

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA :** Only for Formosa.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** That they do not say, that they are only in Formosa. Shri Gupta does not know the Formosan mind on this issue. I am very sorry. I cannot go to their help.

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA :** I know your mind.

**SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli) :** Recognise the Government of Formosa and the Chinese army may withdraw from our border. That possibility is there. Why don't you try that?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** I will commend the observation of an important Member of the Opposition to another Member of the Opposition. That is all that I can say. I will be glad if both of them were to combine, and whether it is Formosa or . . .

**SHRI NATH PAI :** We can pay you in the same coin. You recommend your view, to the Deputy Leader of the Congress Party, on Tibet as the view of the Defence Minister of Government.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** I am very glad that Shri Nath Pai is in a somewhat lighter mood now, because he had become very tense at one stage. I want to say this in clear terms that our position with regard to Formosa and our position on Tibet remains the same, because raising these issues does not help us. In fact, it embarrasses us in the international community. A great deal of harm is done by doing that. The opposition has not clearly understood all these issues.

There were several other unimportant matters, unimportant in the sense that they were not policy matters, and it is not my intention to go into any great detail about them. But I would like to say one or two things about Pakistan.

I was greatly disturbed when I found the hon. Member from Cooch Behar saying that there was unrest in East Pakistan and that was the time when India should have helped the process of insurgency, or whatever it was, in East Pakistan. I would appeal to this hon. House to view this thing in its proper perspective, and it will be a very dangerous principle for us to adopt that we should interfere in the internal affairs of another country. We tell others "what business has Pakistan to give arms to Mizos or Nagas?". Every day we take it up with the Government of Pakistan and we say that it is a very wrong policy that they are pursuing. When we claim that this is a wrong policy, can you suggest that we have to pursue a similar wrong policy when it deals with Pakistan territory? It will be very wrong for us to view this matter in that perspective. Pakistan is our neighbour. We do have an unfortunate state of relationship with Pakistan. Yet, as our Prime Minister has stated more than once, it is the desire of the Government of India, and I hope also of the people of India, that the two countries should live in peace, in friendship as good neighbours.

**AN HON. MEMBER :** Not at any cost.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** That is the desirable objective to have. To get

irritated over things that we do not like and to suggest doing in another country something which we do not like to be done in our country by another country, it is not a great virtue; in fact, it is a wrong approach. We should not give up our basic policy and principles in this respect. We have to pursue our basic policy, because that is the only correct policy in international affairs, not to interfere in the internal affairs of another country. We should not interfere in the internal affairs of Pakistan. Their relations with East Pakistan is a matter entirely for them to decide. What measure of autonomy East Pakistan or West Pakistan gets, it is entirely a matter for them to decide just as in relation to Nagaland, Maharashtra, Punjab or Haryana, whatever re-organisation we make is entirely for us, for this Parliament, to decide. How will we react if there is any interference in our affairs by a foreign power? So, what we expect others to do unto us, we should do to others. So, there cannot be any justification for suggesting that we should interfere in these matters. In fact, these are the voices which are exploited against India; these are the voices which are used against India. India is always projected in this light, that India has not reconciled herself to the fact of partition and it still continues to have some sort of lurking desire in its mind to undo this partition. So, this is a wrong policy, a bad policy from our national point of view. It comes in the way of development of good-neighbourliness between India and Pakistan. We should not do that.

A great deal has been said about enclaves. I want to make the position quite clear. We entered into a solemn agreement with Pakistan to exchange the enclaves. We stand by that agreement and we will honour that agreement, whatever happens. In fact, the Parliament amended this Constitution and has ratified the agreement on enclaves. It is unfortunate that the matter has been prolonged. Some litigation is still going on, unfortunately, in the High Court of Calcutta. After this sovereign Parliament, as the amender of

the Constitution, has ratified that agreement, it does not lie in the mouth of any hon. Member, however irritated he might be, to suggest that we should do away with all those agreements and that we should look at the whole thing *de novo*.

16 Hrs.

It is a very, very dangerous approach and I would beg of hon. Members not to slip into this temptation with a view to scoring the deal in a limited manner. You will be harming the interests of the country in the long run . . . (Interruption). In these international affairs if we give up sanity, if we give up the sanctity of agreements and if we are carried away by the moment, ultimately we have to pay a bigger price.

In this short time, Sir, I have tried to cover most of the points. I oppose all the substitute motions that have been moved except the one moved by my hon. friend, Shri Chintamani Panigrahi.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to substitute motion No. 13 which he approves of. It says :—

“This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto approves the same.”

Is he asking the House to approve of the international situation, involving the occupation of Indian territory by China and Pakistan and of Arab territory by Israel? Are you approving of the international situation also?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I think, Shri Masani has been carried away by dialectics. The international situation has been discussed. There is no clause artifying any particular attitude of the Government of India. This is the normal form in which approval is given to the policy of the Government of India.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There is something which I would call vagueness in it. Will you correct it?



**SHRI P. K. DEO :** How can it be corrected at this stage ?

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** We approve the policy. That is the main question. He will take the leave of the House to amend it.

**SHRI M. R. MASANI :** When the time comes.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Yes This is not the normal formula; there is a slight need for amendment. We will do it with the approval of the House.

Now, there are substitute motions by Saravashri Sequeira, Masani, Goel, Bharati, Kundu, Shastri and Shiva Chandra Jha. Shall I put all of them together to the vote of the House ?

**SHRI M. R. MASANI :** No, Sir. We are pressing our substitute motions Nos. 2 and 4 to a vote.

**SHRI S. KUNDU :** I am also pressing my substitute motion, No. 10, to a vote.

**SHRI SHRI CHAND GOEL (Chandigarh) :** We want our substitute motion to be put separately.

**SHRI M. R. MASANI :** It is the same as No. 2.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** It is more or less covered by Shri Masani's. Only the wording is slightly different.

**SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA :** (Madhubani) : I want my substitute motion to be put separately.

**SHRI B. K. DAS CHOWDHURY :** My substitute motion, No. 1, should also be put separately.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Now, I will first put the disapproval motions to the vote of the House. The first one is by Shri Masani.

The question is :

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :—

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, disapproves of the policies pursued by the Government in recent months." (2)

*The Lok Sabha divided :*

Division No. 33]

[16.10 Hrs.

## AYES

Amat, Shri D.  
 Amersey, Shri M.  
 Amin, Shri Ramchandra J.  
 Behera, Shri Baidhar  
 Bharat Singh, Shri  
 Bharti, Shri Maharaj Singh  
 Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri  
 Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri  
 Dandeker, Shri N.  
 Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.  
 Deb, Shri D. N.  
 Deo, Shri K. P. Singh  
 Deo, Shri P. K.  
 Dhrangadhra, Shri Sriraj Meghrajji  
 Goel, Shri Shri Chand  
 Gowd, Shri Gadilingana  
 Guha, Shri Samar  
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal  
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand  
 Khan, Shri H. Ajmal

Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali  
 Koushik, Shri K. M.  
 Kundu, Shri S.  
 Kunte, Shri Dattatraya  
 Kushwah, Shri Y. S.  
 Lakkappa, Shri K.  
 Mahato, Shri Bhajahari  
 Maiti, Shri S. N.  
 Majhi, Shri M.  
 Masani, Shri M. R.  
 Misra, Shri Srinibas  
 Mohamed Imam, Shri J.  
 Mohan Swarup, Shri  
 Muthusami, Shri C.  
 Naik, Shri G. C.  
 Naik, Shri R. V.  
 Onkar Singh, Shri  
 Parmar, Shri D. R.  
 Puri, Dr. Surya Prakash  
 Ranjit Singh, Shri

Rao, Shri V. Narasimha  
 Ray, Shri Rabi  
 Samanta, Shri S. C.  
 Sen, Shri Deven  
 Sharda Nand, Shri  
 Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir

Shastri, Shri Raghuvir Singh  
 Shivappa, Shri N.  
 Singh, Shri J. B.  
 Sondhi, Shri M. L.  
 Thakur, Shri P. R.

## NOES

Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram  
 Arumugam, Shri R. S.  
 Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri  
 Babunath Singh, Shri  
 Bajpai, Shri Shashibhushan  
 Barupal, Shri P. L.  
 Baswant, Shri  
 Bhakt Darshan, Shri  
 Bhargava, Shri B. N.  
 Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.  
 Bholu Nath, Shri  
 Brahma, Shri Rupnath  
 Buta Singh, Shri  
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.  
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna  
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri  
 Chatterji, Shri Krishna Kumar  
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh  
 Chavan, Shri D. R.  
 Chavan, Shri Y. B.  
 Choudhury, Shri J. K.  
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas  
 Dass, Shri C.  
 Deoghare, Shri N. R.  
 Deshmukh, Shri B. D.  
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.  
 Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.  
 Dinesh Singh, Shri  
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar  
 Ering, Shri D.  
 Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri  
 Ganesh, Shri K. R.  
 Gautam, Shri C. D.  
 Gavit, Shri Tukaram  
 Ghosh, Shri Bimalkanti  
 Ghosh, Shri P. K.  
 Ghosh, Shri Parimal  
 Girja Kumari, Shrimati  
 Gowda, Shri M. H.\*  
 Gupta, Shri Lakhan Lal  
 Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan  
 Hari Krishna, Shri  
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.  
 Hem Raj, Shri  
 Himatsingka, Shri

Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas  
 Jagjiwan Ram, Shri  
 Jamir, Shri S. C.  
 Kahandole, Shri Z. M.  
 Kamble, Shri  
 Kamala Kumari, Shrimati  
 Karan Singh, Dr.  
 Kasture, Shri A. S.  
 Katham, Shri B. N.  
 Kavade, Shri B. R.  
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.  
 Khan, Shri M. A.  
 Kinder Lal, Shri  
 Kotoki Shri Liladhar  
 Krishnan Shri G. Y.  
 Kureel Shri B. N.  
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati  
 Lalit Sen, Shri  
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati  
 Maharaj Singh, Shri  
 Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh  
 Malimariyappa, Shri  
 Mandal, Dr. P.  
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad  
 Mane, Shri Shankarrao  
 Manikya Bahadur, Shri  
 Masuriya Din, Shri  
 Mehta, Shri Asoka  
 Mehta, Shri P. M.  
 Melkote, Dr.  
 Menon, Shri Govinda  
 Minimata Agam Dass Guru, Smt.  
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali  
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti  
 Mishra, Shri G. S.  
 Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati  
 Mohsin, Shri  
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri  
 Murti, Shri M. S.  
 Naghnoor, Shri M. N.  
 Oraon, Shri Kartik  
 Padmavati Devi, Shrimati  
 Pandey, Shri K. N.  
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath  
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani

\*Wrongly voted for 'NOES'

Pant, Shri K. C.  
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai  
 Partap Singh, Shri  
 Parthasarathy, Shri  
 Patil, Shri Anantrao  
 Patil, Shri C. A.  
 Patil, Shri S. B.  
 Patil, Shri S. D.  
 Patil, Shri T. A.  
 Pramanik, Shri J. N.  
 Radhabai, Shrimati B.  
 Raj Deo Singh, Shri  
 Ram Kishan, Shri  
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.  
 Ram Swarup, Shri  
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri  
 Randhir Singh, Shri  
 Rao, Shri K. Narayana  
 Rao, Shri Thirumala  
 Reddi, Shri G. S.  
 Reddy, Shri P. Antony  
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila  
 Roy, Shrimati Uma  
 Saha, Dr. S. K.  
 Saigal, Shri A. S.  
 Sanghi, Shri N. K.  
 Sanji Rupji, Shri  
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.  
 Sapre, Shrimati Tara  
 Sarma, Shri A. T.

Savitri Shayam, Shrimati  
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.  
 Sayyad Ali, Shri  
 Sen, Shri Dwaipayan  
 Sen, Shri P. G.  
 Sethuramae, Shri N.  
 Shambhu Nath, Shri  
 Sharma, Shri M. R.  
 Shastri, Shri B. N.  
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand  
 Sheo Narain, Shri  
 Sher Singh, Shri  
 Sheth, Shri T. M.  
 Shinkree, Shri  
 Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri  
 Singh, Shri D. N.  
 Singh, Shri D. V.  
 Snatak, Shri Nar Deo  
 Supakar, Shri Sradhakar  
 Sursingh, Shri  
 Swaran Singh, Shri  
 Uikey, Shri M. G.  
 Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra  
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.  
 Verma, Shri Balgovind  
 Verma, Shri Prem Chand  
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri  
 Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra  
 Yadab, Shri N. P.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The \*result of the Division is :

|      |        |
|------|--------|
| Ayes | 51     |
| Noes | .. 149 |

*The motion was negated*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, I put Amendments Nos. 7 and 8 together to the vote of the House.

*The substitute motions Nos. 7 & 8 were put and negated.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will now put Mr. Kundu's amendment to the vote of the House, Amendment No. 10.

SHRI S. KUNDU : Please read it out, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :—

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, is of the opinion that the Government has failed to—

- (a) project the right image of India abroad by not pursuing a correct non-aligned policy in the international sphere;
- (b) evolve a correct policy towards the Afro-Asian countries." (10)

*The motion was negated*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will now put Mr. Shiv Kumar Shastri's amendment to the vote of the House, Amendment No. 11.

\*The following Members also recorded their votes :—

Ayes—Sarvashri Nath Pai, Arjan Singh Bhadoria, M. H. Gowda, S. S. Kothari and Bansh Narain Singh.  
 Noes—Shrimati Ganga Devi.

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री (बाघपत्त) :  
इसे पढ़ दिया जाय ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :—

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :—

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, disapproves of the foreign policy of the Government because the Government has failed to protect the interests of India in the West Asia and the South-East Asia."(11)

*The motion was negatived*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will now put Mr. Shiva Chandra Jha's amendment to the vote of the House, Amendment No. 12,

The question is :

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :—

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, is of the opinion that the Government of India has failed to—

- (a) give up its pusillanimous policy in voicing for the cause of democracy and socialism, wherever they are endangered; and
- (b) speak for the revival of the democratic Government in Nepal and the release of Shri B. P. Koirala." (12).

Division No. 34]

[16. 19 Hrs.

## AYES

Amat, Shri D.  
Amersy, Shri M.  
Amin, Shri Ramchandra J.  
Bansh Narain Singh, Shri  
Behera, Shri Baidhar  
Bharat Singh, Shri  
Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri  
Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri

*The motion was negatived*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now I will put Mr. B. K. Daschowdhury's amendment to the vote of the House, Amendment No. 1. This is a long one. The hon. Member himself may read it out.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY : It is not necessary to read it out. You may put it to the vote of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I now put Amendment No. 1 to the vote of the House.

*The substitute motion No. 1 was put and negatived*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I will now put Amendment No. 4—Mr. Masani's Amendment—to the vote of the House.

The question is :

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :—

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, is of the view that the recent agreement between the Press Information Bureau of the Indian Government and the Soviet news and feature agency *Novosti* should be revoked and a thorough enquiry made into the circumstances leading to the signing of this agreement." (4)

*The Lok Sabha divided :*

Dandeker, Shri N.  
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.  
Deo, Shri K. P. Singh  
Deo, Shri P. K.  
Deo, Shri R. R. Singh  
Goel, Shri Shri Chand  
Gowd, Shri Gadilingana  
Gowda, Shri M. H.

Guha, Shri Samar  
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal  
 Imam, Shri J. M.  
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand  
 Khan, Shri H. Ajmal  
 Koushik, Shri K. M.  
 Kunte, Shri Dattatraya  
 Kushwah, Shri Y. S.  
 Maiti, Shri S. N.  
 Majhi, Shri M.  
 Masani, Shri M. R.  
 Meghrajji, Shri  
 Misra, Shri Srinibas  
 Muthusami, Shri C.  
 Naik, Shri G. C.  
 Naik, Shri R. V.

Onkar Singh, Shri  
 Parmar, Shri D. R.  
 Puri, Dr. Surya Prakash  
 Ramani, Shri K.  
 Ranjit Singh, Shri  
 Rao, Shri V. Narasimha  
 Samanta, Shri S. C.  
 Sequeira, Shri  
 Sharda Nand, Shri  
 Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir  
 Shastri, Shri Raghuvir Singh  
 Shivappa, Shri N.  
 Singh, Shri J. B.  
 Sondhi, Shri M. L.  
 Thakur, Shri P. R.  
 Viswanathan, Shri G.

## NOES

Adichan, Shri P. C.  
 Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram  
 Arumugam, Shri R. S.  
 Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri  
 Babunath Singh, Shri  
 Bajpai, Shri Shashibhushan  
 Barua, Shri R.  
 Barupal, Shri P. L.  
 Baswant, Shri  
 Bhakt Darshan, Shri  
 Bhargava, Shri B. N.  
 Bhattacharya, Shri C. K.  
 Bhola Nath, Shri  
 Birua, Shri Kolai  
 Brahma, Shri Rupnath  
 Buta Singh, Shri  
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.  
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna  
 Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri  
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri  
 Chatterji, Shri Krishna Kumar  
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh  
 Chavan, Shri D. R.  
 Chavan, Shri Y. B.  
 Choudhury, Shri J. K.  
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas  
 Dass, Shri C.  
 Deoghare, Shri N. R.  
 Deshmukh, Shri B. D.  
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.  
 Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.  
 Diesh Singh, Shri  
 Ering, Shri D.  
 Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri  
 Ganesh, Shri K. R.  
 Gautam, Shri C. D.  
 Govit, Shri Tukaram  
 Ghosh, Shri Bimalkanti

Ghosh, Shri P. K.  
 Ghosh, Shri Parimal  
 Girja Kumari, Shrimati  
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit  
 Gupta, Shri Lakhan Lal  
 Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan  
 Hari Krishna, Shri  
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.  
 Hem Raj, Shri  
 Himatsingka, Shri  
 Jadhav, Shri Tulsidas  
 Jagiwan Ram, Shri  
 Jamir, Shri S. C.  
 Kahandole, Shri Z. M.  
 Kamble, Shri  
 Kamala Kumari, Shrimati  
 Karan Singh, Dr.  
 Kasture, Shri A. S.  
 Katham, Shri B. N.  
 Kavade, Shri B. R.  
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.  
 Khan, Shri Latafat Ali  
 Khan, Shri M. A.  
 Kinder Lal, Shri  
 Kotoki, Shri Liladhar  
 Krishnan, Shri G. Y.  
 Kureel, Shri B. N.  
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati  
 Lalit Sen, Shri  
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati  
 Maharaj Singh, Shri  
 Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh  
 Malimariyappa, Shri  
 Mandal, Dr. P.  
 Mane, Shri Shankarrao  
 Manikya Bahadur, Shri  
 Marandi, Shri  
 Masuria Din, Shri

|                                   |                            |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Mehta, Shri Asoka                 | Roy, Shrimati Uma          |
| Mehta, Shri P. M.                 | Saha, Dr. S. K.            |
| Melkote, Dr.                      | Saigal, Shri A. S.         |
| Menon, Shri Govinda               | Sambhali, Shri Ishaq       |
| Minimata, Shrimati Agam Dass Guru | Sanghi, Shri N. K.         |
| Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali             | Sanjit Rupji, Shri         |
| Mishra, Shri Bibhuti              | Sankata Prasad, Dr.        |
| Mishra, Shri G. S.                | Sapre, Shrimati Tara       |
| Mohsin, Shri                      | Sarma, Shri A. T.          |
| Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati           | Savitri Shyam, Shrimati    |
| Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri           | Sayeed, Shri P. M.         |
| Murthi, Shri B. S.                | Sayyad Ali, Shri           |
| Nageshwar, Shri                   | Sen, Shri Dwaipayan        |
| Naghoor, Shri M. N.               | Sen, Shri P. G.            |
| Nair, Shri Vasudevan              | Sethuramae, Shri N.        |
| Narayanan, Shri                   | Shambhu Nath, Shri         |
| Oraon, Shri Kartik                | Sharma, Shri M. R.         |
| Padmavati Devi, Shrimati          | Sharma, Shri Ram Avtar     |
| Pandey, Shri K. N.                | Shastri, Shri B. N.        |
| Pandey, Shri Sarjoo               | Shastri, Shri R.           |
| Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath          | Shastri, Shri Ramanand     |
| Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani        | Sheo Narain, Shri          |
| Pant, Shri K. C.                  | Sher Singh, Shri           |
| Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai           | Sheth, Shri T. M.          |
| Partap Singh, Shri                | Shinkre, Shri              |
| Parthasarathy, Shri               | Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri |
| Patil, Shri A. V.                 | Siddeshwar Prasad, Shri    |
| Pital, Shri C. A.                 | Singh, Shri D. N.          |
| Patil, Shri N. R.                 | Singh, Shri D. V.          |
| Patil, Shri S. B.                 | Snatak, Shri Nar Deo       |
| Patil, Shri S. D.                 | Supakar, Shri Sradhakar    |
| Patil, Shri T. A.                 | Sursingh, Shri             |
| Pramanik, Shri J. N.              | Swaran Singh, Shri         |
| Radhabai, Shrimati B              | Tiwary, Shri K. N.         |
| Raj Deo Singh, Shri               | Uikey, Shri M. G.          |
| Ram Kishan, Shri                  | Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra    |
| Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.             | Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.   |
| Ram Swarup, Shri                  | Verma, Shri Balgovind      |
| Randhir Singh, Shri               | Verma, Shri Prem Chand     |
| Reddi, Shri G. S.                 | Virbhadra Singh, Shri      |
| Reddy, Shri P. Antony             | Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra  |
| Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila         | Yadab, Shri N. P.          |

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The result\* of the Division is : Ayes : 48; Noes : 160.

*The motion was negatived*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I shall now put Mr. Sequirra's substitute motion No. 9.

*The substitute motion No. 9 was put and negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now substitute motion No. 13 of Mr. Chintamani Panigrahi. There is an amendment to it.

SHRI P. K. DEO : Sir, there is always a procedure to give amendments.

\*The following Members also recorded their votes : —

Ayes—Sarvashri Nath Pai, Kiruttinan, S. S. Kothari, and D. N. Deb.

Noes—Shri Ramshekhar Prasad Singh.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It was given already.

SHRI P. K. DEO : Sir, can an amendment be given to another amendment, and if so, under what rule ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If a certain amendment is not clear, then with the permission of the House a verbal change can be made to provide a clearer enunciation. Beyond that there is nothing in this.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH) : My amendment is that in the substitute motion No. 13, at the end, for the word 'same' substitute 'policy of the Government of India.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am explaining what it is. To make it clearer, he has proposed an amendment to substitute 'same' by 'policy of the Government of India'. I will now put Dr. Ram Subhag Singh's amendment to vote.

The question is :

"That in substitute motion No. 13, at the end, for the word 'same', substitute 'policy of the Government of India'."

Those in favour will please say 'Aye'.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS 'Aye'.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Those against will please say 'No'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : 'No'.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The 'Ayes' have it, the 'Ayes' have it; the amendment to the substitute motion is adopted.

I shall now put substitute motion No. 13, as amended, to the vote of the House.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : Sir, we are unable to understand what you have been talking to Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The first question was that there was a verbal amendment for which the approval of the House was taken. That is all. But by mistake somebody shouted 'No'. That is all. Beyond that nothing.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : It was not a mistake.

SHRI N. DANDEKER : We deliberately said 'No'.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now I shall put the substitute motion moved by Shri Panigrahi with this verbal amendment...

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : For the word 'same', the words 'policy of the Government of India' are to be put in.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am putting the substantive motion as now verbally amended to the vote of the House.

SHRI NATH PAI : If the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs wants to talk to you, even he must stand. What is this dialogue between the two of you? This is very disorderly.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of the policy of the Government of India".

(13 as amended)

*The Lok Sabha divided :*

DIVISION No. 35]

[16.27 Hrs.

## AYES

- Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram  
 Arumugam, Shri R. S.  
 Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri  
 Babunath Singh, Shri  
 Bajpai, Shri Shashibhushan  
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata  
 Barupal, Shri P. L.  
 Baswant, Shri  
 Bhakt Darshan, Shri  
 Bhargava, Shri B. N.  
 Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.  
 Bholu Nath, Shri  
 Brahma, Shri Rupnath  
 Buta Singh, Shri  
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.  
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna  
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri  
 Chatterji, Shri Krishna Kumar  
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh  
 Chavan, Shri D. R.  
 Chavan, Shri Y. B.  
 Choudhury, Shri J. K.  
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas  
 Dass, Shri C.  
 Deoghare, Shri N. R.  
 Deshmukh, Shri B. D.  
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.  
 Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.  
 Dinesh Singh, Shri  
 Ering, Shri D.  
 Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri  
 Ganesh, Shri K. R.  
 Gautam, Shri C. D.  
 Gavit, Shri Tukaram  
 Ghosh, Shri P. K.  
 Ghosh, Shri Parimal  
 Girja Kumari, Shrimati  
 Gupta, Shri Lakhna Lal  
 Hari Krishna, Shri  
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.  
 Hem Raj, Shri  
 Himatsingka, Shri  
 Jadhav, Shri Tulsidas  
 Jagiwan Ram, Shri  
 Jamir, Shri S. C.  
 Kahandole, Shri Z. M.  
 Kamble, Shri  
 Kamala Kumari, Shrimati  
 Karan Singh, Dr.  
 Karni Singh, Dr.  
 Kasture, Shri A. S.  
 Katham, Shri B. N.  
 Kavade, Shri B. R.  
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.  
 Khan, Shri M. A.  
 Kinder Lal, Shri  
 Kotoki, Shri Liladhar  
 Krishnan, Shri G. Y.  
 Kureel, Shri B. N.  
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati  
 Lalit Sen, Shri  
 Laskar, Shri N. R.  
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati  
 Maharaj Singh, Shri  
 Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh  
 Malimariyappa, Shri  
 Mandal, Dr. P.  
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad  
 Mane, Shri Shankarrao  
 Marandi, Shri  
 Masuria Din, Shri  
 Mehta, Shri Asoka  
 Mehta, Shri P. M.  
 Melkote, Dr.  
 Menon, Shri Govinda  
 Minimata, Shrimati Agam Das Guru  
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali  
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti  
 Mishra, Shri G. S.  
 Mohsin, Shri  
 Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati  
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri  
 Murti, Shri M. S.  
 Nageshwar, Shri  
 Naghnoor, Shri M. N.  
 Nahata, Shri Amrit  
 Oraon, Shri Kartik  
 Padmavati Devi, Shrimati  
 Pandey, Shri K. N.  
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath  
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani  
 Pant, Shri K. C.  
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai  
 Partap Singh, Shri  
 Parthasarathy, Shri  
 Patil, Shri A. V.  
 Patil, Shri C. A.  
 Patil, Shri Deorao  
 Patil, Shri S. B.  
 Patil, Shri S. D.  
 Patil, Shri T. A.  
 Pramanik, Shri J. N.  
 Radhabai, Shrimati B.



Raj Deo Singh, Shri  
 Rajani Gandha, Kumari  
 Rajasekharan, Shri  
 Ram Kishan, Shri  
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.  
 Ram Swarup, Shri  
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri  
 Randhir Singh, Shri  
 Rao, Shri K. Narayana  
 Reddi, Shri G. S.  
 Reddy, Shri P. Antony  
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila  
 Roy, Shrimati Uma  
 Saha, Dr. S. K.  
 Saigal, Shri A. S.  
 Sanghi, Shri N. K.  
 Sanjit Rupji, Shri  
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.  
 Sapre, Shrimati Tara  
 Sarma, Shri A. T.  
 Savitri Shyam, Shrimati  
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.  
 Sayyad Ali, Shri  
 Sen, Shri Dwaipayana  
 Sen, Shri P. G.  
 Sethuramae, Shri N.  
 Shah, Shri Manabendra

Shambhu Nath, Shri  
 Shankaranand, Shri  
 Sharma, Shri M. R.  
 Shastri, Shri B. N.  
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand  
 Sheo Narain, Shri  
 Sher Singh, Shri  
 Sheth, Shri T. M.  
 Shinkre, Shri  
 Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri  
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan  
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri  
 Singh, Shri D. N.  
 Singh, Shri D. V.  
 Snatak, Shri Nar Deo  
 Supakar, Shri Sradhakar  
 Sursingh, Shri  
 Swaran Singh, Shri  
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.  
 Uikey, Shri M. G.  
 Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra  
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.  
 Verma, Shri Balgovind  
 Verma, Shri Prem Chand  
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri  
 Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra  
 Yadab, Shri N. P.

## NOES

Adichan, Shri P. C.  
 Amat, Shri D.  
 Amersey, Shri M.  
 Amin, Shri Ramchandra J.  
 Bansh Narain Singh, Shri  
 Behera, Shri Baidhar  
 Bharat Singh, Shri  
 Bharti, Shri Maharaj Singh  
 Birua, Shri Kolai  
 Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri  
 Brij Raj Singh—Kotah, Shri  
 Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri  
 Dandeker, Shri N.  
 Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.  
 Deo, Shri K. P. Singh  
 Deo, Shri P. K.  
 Deo, Shri R. R. Singh  
 Dhirendranath, Shri  
 Goel, Shri Shri Chand  
 Gowd, Shri Gadilingana  
 Guha, Shri Samar  
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit  
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal  
 Jha, Shri S. C.  
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand  
 Khan, Shri H. Ajmal  
 Khan, Shri Latafat Ali

Kirutinan, Shri  
 Koushik, Shri K. M.  
 Kunte, Shri Dattatraya  
 Kushwah, Shri Y. S.  
 Lakkappa, Shri K.  
 Maiti, Shri S. N.  
 Majhi, Shri M.  
 Manikya Bahadur, Shri\*  
 Masani, Shri M. R.  
 Meghrajji, Shri  
 Misra, Shri Srinibas  
 Mohamed Imam, Shri  
 Mohan Swarup, Shri  
 Muthusami, Shri C.  
 Naidu, Shri Ramabadra  
 Naik, Shri G. C.  
 Naik, Shri R. V.  
 Nair, Shri Vasudevan  
 Nath Pai, Shri  
 Onkar Singh, Shri  
 Pandey, Shri Sarjoo  
 Parmar, Shri D. R.  
 Patil, Shri N. R.  
 Puri, Dr. Surya Prakash  
 Ranjit Singh, Shri  
 Rao, Shri V. Narasimha  
 Ray, Shri Rabi

\*Wrongly voted for 'NOES'.

Samanta, Shri S. C.  
Sambhali, Shri Ishaq  
Sequeira, Shri  
Sharda Nand, Shri  
Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir  
Shastri, Shri R.  
Shastri, Shri Raghuvir Singh

Shivappa, Shri N.  
Singh, Shri J. B.  
Sivasankaran, Shri  
Sondhi, Shri M. L.  
Thakur, Shri Gunanand  
Thakur, Shri P. R.  
Umanath, Shri  
Viswanathan, Shri G.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The result of the Division is : Ayes 156; Noes 69.

*The motion was adopted*

16.26 hrs.

#### HARYANA STATE LEGISLATURE (DELEGATION OF POWERS) BILL

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY) : On behalf of Shri Y. B. Chavan, I beg to move :

"That the Bill to confer on the President the powers of the Legislature of the State of Haryana to make laws, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration".

श्री ए० ए० बाबूपाल (गंगानगर) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं हिन्दी भाषी हूँ लेकिन मुझे यह अंग्रेजी की डायरी दी गई है . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We have taken a different decision. He might take up the matter with the Minister concerned, not at this juncture.

SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY : On the 31st of last month, the President issued a Proclamation in relation to the State of Haryana under art. 356 of the Constitution dissolving the Assembly of the State. The two Houses of Parliament approved the Proclamation. Under the Proclamation, Parliament is vested

with the powers of the legislature of the State of Haryana. Now, Parliament has to enact certain laws in regard to the State. This has become very much necessary now as some of the ordinances issued by the Governor are pending and enactments have to be made by Parliament. This has to be done within 6 weeks of the summoning of Parliament.

The ordinances in question are very important. They go to augment the resources of the State. Let me mention some of them : The Haryana Land Revenue (Additional Surcharge) Ordinance, 1967, which was published in the Gazette of India dated 15 July 1967 is expected to bring in 50 per cent more income from land revenue; similarly the Punjab Urban Immovable Tax (Haryana Amendment) Ordinance, 1967 and the Indian Stamp (Haryana Amendment) Ordinance, 1967 and several other ordinances will bring in substantial additional revenue to the State Government.

Sub-Clause (a) of cl. 1 of art. 357 confers on the President the powers of the Legislature of the State of Haryana to enact laws under the authority of Parliament. This is not the first time that such enactments have had to be brought before this House. This was done in the past when Proclamations were issued with regard to the Punjab in 1951 and 1956, PEPSU in 1953, Andhra Pradesh in 1956, Travancore-Cochin in 1956, Kerala in 1959, 1964 and 1965 and Orissa in 1961.

\*The following Members also recorded their votes :—

Ayes—Sarvashri Manikya Bahadur and Bimalkanti Ghosh.

Noes—Sarvashri M. H. Gowda, C. K. Chakrapani and S. S. Kothari

[Shri K. S. Ramaswamy]

This Bill provides for the constitution of a consultative committee consisting of all the members from the Haryana State. It will consist of the 30 to be nominated from this House and 15 to be nominated from the other House.

The President has to consult the Committee before enacting any Act, whenever it is practicable to do so. After these pieces of legislation are enacted, they will be placed before the Houses of Parliament for their approval subject to any modifications or alterations made by the two Houses. The time fixed is 30 days instead of 7, which was the usual time given before. I think this power is very much necessary to be conferred on the President, and I hope the House will approve of the same.

I move that the Bill be taken for consideration.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That the Bill to confer on the President the powers of the Legislature of the State of Haryana to make laws, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

We have three hours. For clause by clause we shall reserve one hour.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi) : Half an hour.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA) : The whole thing can be done in two hours.

SHRI P. K. DEO : This Bill which is assuming legislative powers on behalf of the Haryana Legislative Assembly and delegating the powers to the President under article 357(1)(a) raises very many fundamental issues as to how far the President is justified in issuing a proclamation under article 356, how far the President is justified

in accepting the report of the Governor that a situation has arisen in which the Government of that State cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of India, and how far this House is competent to delegate the legislative powers of the Haryana Legislative Assembly to the President.

The Constitution draws a sharp distinction between Part VI and Part XVIII. Part VI mainly deals with State matters like the judiciary, legislature and executive. Part XVIII deals with emergency powers. And so long as Part VI is in effective operation, so long as the various authorities under Part VI continue to exist and function, there is absolutely no room for taking any action under Part XVIII, i.e. Central intervention. The Haryana Governor acted on hypothesis and assumptions—on if and buts. He drew conclusion on wrong premises.

16.32 HRS.

[SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARYYA in the Chair].

How had there been a breakdown in the Constitution? If you peruse the Governor's report, the Governor says, and I quote :

"With an effective strength of 78 of the Assembly, with a three vacancies, the ruling party has 40 members."

He says this in one breath, and in the other breath he says that there has been breakdown of the constitutional machinery. I would like to know which provision of the Constitution has been infringed, in which part of the constitutional machinery there has been breakdown.

Shri Rao Birendra Singh was still enjoying the majority in the House. He was still continuing as Chief Minister. One fine morning he was no more the Chief Minister. The only parallel in history you will find is during the time of Charles I who used to play ducks and drakes with Parliament. Rao

Birendra Singh should have been asked to test the strength of his party in the Legislative Assembly. Instead of doing that, various pleas were given. The Governor has clearly stated in his report that when the Chief Minister said that the calling of the Assembly could be postponed till after a by-election, he agreed with him. So, even though the Governor felt that the Assembly should have been called, he arrogated to himself the power of the Assembly to pass a judgment that the Rao Ministry had lost its majority.

A writ has been admitted in the High Court, and the order of the President has been challenged. I do not know how far we are justified in discussing the matter which is *sub judice*. The convention in this House is that all *sub judice* matter is taboo. So, if we pass any opinion, that is likely to prejudice the finding in the High Court. So, I want your guidance in this regard.

Coming to the appointment of Governors, we find that those who are defeated and discredited politicians are appointed as Governors, that inconvenient and unwanted colleagues have been shunted to the Governor's posts, that these gentlemen are not answerable to the people and that unlike the President, they cannot be impeached. Under these circumstances they subject themselves to the whims and fancies of the Home Ministry here. They act in a partisan way. They have no other go. The Governor's report is a long thesis on defections and the moral values of public life but before the ink of the report dried, we came across several defections. It reminds me as if the pot is calling the kettle black. Large scale defections were witnessed in various States and those defectors were not only rewarded with fishes and loaves but with Chief Ministerships also. Subsequent events have proved that. Before 1967 nobody bothered or questioned about the Centre's choice of these constitutional heads, but in the fourth General Election we saw the heads of stalwarts, the heads of Chief Ministers, the heads of Provincial Congress Committees Chiefs and the heads of the

AICC chief and the Central Cabinet Ministers being rolled on the ground. We saw that by the emergence of the non-Congress governments in various States, the federal structure of the Constitution came under an acid test. We thought that the federal structure of the Constitution will actually come into operation, but we were completely belied. Instead of bowing down to the verdict of the people, instead of reconciling ourselves to this position, our power hungry gentlemen on the other side started intriguing and seducing the defectors. This is not a new phenomenon. This is an old game which is being practised since 1957, and it started in my State of Orissa.

As you know, the MLAs were purchased by exploiting their ignorance and poverty, by luring them away with promises and even when the Assembly was in session, the MLAs in the Opposition were clamped behind the bars including myself who went as a spectator; it was in 1958 I am grateful when all Members of the Opposition recorded a protest in this House by staging a walk-out. All these defectors were made Ministers. One glaring example is that of Ram Prasad Mishra. What happened? He was completely routed in the elections; he was hounded out from public life. This thing is again going to happen to the Congress in Haryana, I am sure.

So far as Haryana is concerned, this game of defectors could not succeed. Shri Rao Birendra Singh seems to be a pastmaster in this game of defections. He paid back the Congress in their own coin. That is why the institution of Governors was used to topple down the Ministry there even though it had a majority. We passed a resolution the other day in the General Council of the Swatantra Party expressing great concern at the way in which the institution of Governors is being misused by toppling down legally and constitutionally established governments and by installing minority governments. Even in your own State, West Bengal, Sir, we condemned that ministry; how a ministry with the party of 17 defectors could function in a State like West

[Shri P. K. Deo]

Bengal where public opinion is so much enlightened. Mr. Dandekar, yesterday, condemned the way in which the government has been foisted in West Bengal.

So far as working of the institution of Governors is concerned, I beg to submit that they do not follow any prescribed standard. Different standards are being followed in dealing with the various governments. In Haryana, Governor's report was a thesis on the immorality of defections; sermons were given to the defectors, and the Governor abrogated to himself the power of the Assembly and dismissed the Government. In Madhya Pradesh, the Assembly was in session; it was discussing the budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI P. K. DEO : At least 20 minutes.

The Assembly was prorogued by the Governor on the advice of the Chief Minister who did not have a majority at that time. Mr. Chavan, while supporting the action of the Governor, stated in this House that Mr. Mishra still continued to be Chief Minister then, and asked, if he wanted some time to negotiate with the defectors and to have a talk with his old colleagues, what was wrong in that? In M.P. the sitting Assembly was prorogued and in West Bengal the assembly was insisted to be called upon. So far as calling the Assembly in West Bengal is concerned, I quite appreciate that the strength of the Government should be decided in the Assembly and sooner the Assembly is called in West Bengal, the better it will be.

In Rajasthan, the Chief Minister resigned one day before the Assembly was scheduled to meet. He did not have the courage to face the Assembly. Even though a majority of MLAs paraded before the President expressing their allegiance to the Swatantra Party leader there, no alternative government was allowed to be formed there. On the other hand, a few days afterwards, when Shri Sukhadia was able to collect

a few more defectors and have a majority, he was asked to form the Government. About West Bengal I express my pity to Dr. P. C. Ghosh. As Rajaji rightly pointed out, he has become a sacrificial goat. I cannot understand how in Punjab, a defector could be rewarded with Chief Ministership. He has a strength of only 17. As Rajaji pointed out, it is really sharing power without any responsibility. That is what the Congress has been doing there. The Congress is behind the puppet enjoying all the power, without sharing the responsibility. Mr. Gurnam Singh was first called to form a ministry. He wanted one day's time. He said, by Sunday evening he would come back from Delhi after consultations with the Prime Minister. But by the time he returned, somebody else was installed as Chief Minister and the oath was administered, lest the defectors might have melted away.

In this connection, I would like to draw attention to a very nice convention in this House regarding recognition of parties. When a few individuals formed a party in this House, Speaker did not recognise them as a party. Direction No. 121 by the Speaker clearly says :

"An association of members who propose to form a Parliamentary Party—

- (a) shall have announced at the time of the general elections a distinct ideology and programme of parliamentary work on which they have been returned to the House;
- (b) shall have an organisation both inside and outside the House."

I sincerely wish that from this Chair a direction should go to various Governors about the criteria for recognising parties. So many mushroom parties like the Soshit Dal, the Janta Party in Punjab and the PDF in West Bengal are there which have absolutely no common programme and no organisation inside or outside the House. It is an association of convenience, an association of expediency, an association of

immorality. There should be an end to it.

There might be a temporary rejoicing in the Congress ranks, but what a precedent and what convention we are going to leave for the posterity! By this we are completely demoralising public life. People are losing faith in elections and the right to change the Government through the ballot, which has acted as a safety valve to let out the grievances of the people. I draw attention to the writing on the wall and give a note of warning that by this turmoil the entire edifice of our democratic structure is going to be toppled down.

I would draw attention to the various incidents taking place throughout the world and caution them that if their intention is not to pave the way for dictatorship or forcing the hands of the people to take to unconstitutional measures, they should put an end to this game. Haryana is a very bad precedent. By this way, we are murdering democracy and the Home Minister has acted as the hangman. As the reaction to their wrong actions when the entire country has been burning this gentleman have been playing fiddle like Nero sitting in their ivory tower here.

I must say that this Proclamation and this Bill are not even worth the paper on which they are printed. So far as Haryana is concerned, it is definitely a punishment which is given to the people of Haryana because they did not vote the way the Ruling Party liked. It is a challenge which has been thrown to the people of Haryana. I fully realise that, gallant and democratic as they are, the people of Haryana will take up the challenge and in the mid-term elections they will completely wipe out the Congress from Haryana.

Lastly, Sir, I beg to submit that this Bill is immoral, illegal and unjustifiable. I oppose this Bill.

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब को धन्यावाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने हाउस में यह बिल पेश किया है।

हरियाणा की आबादी 75—80 लाख है। उनकी यह जबर्दस्त मांग थी कि जो बेउसूले आदमी हैं, जो किसी तरह से सियासी तौर पर पावर में आ गए थे उन से उनका पीछा छुड़ाया जाए। हरियाणा के आदमी अपने देश में ही नहीं बल्कि बाहर के देशों में भी मशहूर हैं। हमारे हरियाणा के बँलों तक को विक्टोरिया क्रॉस मिला हुआ है बहादुरी में। हमारे यहां के आदमियों के नाम से चीनी कांपते हैं, पाकिस्तानी कांपते हैं और किसान भी जोकि हिन्दुस्तान का ही नहीं बल्कि दुनिया का बेहतरीन और मेहनती किसान है, उनके नाम पर इन बेउसूले आदमियों ने धब्बा लगाया। अगर आप हमारे किसानों को सुविधा दें तो मैं आपको बता सकता हूँ कि वे इतना पैदा करके दे सकते हैं कि आपकी जो आवश्यकतायें हैं वे पूरी हो जाएं। वहां पर जमीन सोना उगलती है।

मेरे दोस्त ने कई बातें कही हैं। उन्होंने कहा है कि बड़ी ज्यादाती हुई है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे ज़रा अपने दिल पर हाथ रख कर इन बातों को कहें। हरियाणा ने तो अपना नाम ही डिबो दिया। यह एक ऐसा इलाका है जहां के सिपाही बहादुर हैं, किसान बहादुर हैं। इस इलाके ने वीर पैदा किये हैं। चालीस हजार आदमी अकेले हरियाणा के नेताजी सुभाष चन्द्र बोस के झंडे के नीचे कुर्बान हो गए। 1857 के गद्दर में ये हरियाणा के आदमी ही थे, जिन्होंने बगावत का झंडा बुलन्द किया था और अंग्रेजों से टक्कर ली थी। चीन की लड़ाई में अकेले हरियाणा के ब्रिगेड ने, हरियाणा के फौजियों ने चीनी फौजों को चुगल और लड़ाख में आने नहीं दिया। इन सब का नाम हमारे इन बेउसूले लोगों ने डबो दिया। इस तरह के एम० एल० ए० और मिनिस्टर और चीफ मिनिस्टर वहां बने। इस पर मुझे बड़ी शर्म आती है। उनका नाम अगर जबान पर आ जाए तो जबान गन्दी हो जाती है। यह सारा आवा का आवा ही खराब हो गया है। छः महीने

[श्री रणधीर सिंह]

से काम नहीं चलेगा। छः महोने के बाद फिर आप एक्सटेंशन लेने के लिए आयें और कम से कम दो साल तक राष्ट्रपति का शासन वहां जारी रखें। यह सिलसिला ही खराब हो गया है। ये जो टर्न कोट हैं, जो धोखे बाज आदमी हैं, ये किसी न किसी तरीके से फिर से ताकत में आना चाहते हैं। परसों मैंने जिफ्र किया था और आज फिर करना चाहता हूँ कि हरियाणा ही बदनाम नहीं होता है सारा देश बदनाम होता है। जहां पर आदमी बीस बीस और तीस तीस हजार में बिकते हैं और उस तरह से बिकते हों जिस तरह से डंगर बिकते हैं तो देश बदनाम नहीं होगा तो और क्या होगा हमारे यहां पंद्रह पंद्रह और बीस बीस दिन के बाद डंगरों के मेले लगते हैं, लोग वहां पर डंगर लाते हैं और वे डंगर नीलामी पर चढ़ते हैं। उसी तरह से यहां आदमी नीलामी पर चढ़ते थे, वे डंगरों की तरह बिकते थे। उन आदमियों को खत्म करना है। उनको सियासी तौर पर खत्म करना है। उनको आने नहीं देना है। मेरे भाई कहते हैं कि वहां पर कांग्रेस आ नहीं सकेगी। लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि वहां पर अपोजीशन का नामोनिशान मिट जाएगा। छः महीने के बाद आप देख लेना। क्या होता है। आपको पता चल जाएगा।

बहुत शोर सुनते थे पहलू में दिल का।

जब काटा तो कतरा-ए-खून निकला।

अपोजीशन वाले पता नहीं क्या क्या कहा करते थे। कहते थे राम राज्य लायेंगे। कांग्रेस तो ला नहीं सकी, यह मैं जानता हूँ। लेकिन इन्होंने तो रावण राज ला कर रख दिया। 6 महीने में आप देख लेना ये जाकर जलसा तो कर दें। अगर कांग्रेस राज चाहती तो कांग्रेस की अकसरियत थी। राव वीरेन्द्र सिंह की हकूमत को तोड़ कर कांग्रेस का राज बड़े आराम से हो सकता था। लेकिन मैं शाबाश देता हूँ अपने नौजवान होम मिनिस्टर श्री शुक्ल, को दूसरे मिनिस्टर साहबान को

और कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट को कि उन्होंने हरियाणा में कांग्रेस का राज लाने की कोशिश नहीं की। हम वहां पर कांग्रेस का राज ला सकते थे, लेकिन हम ने ऐसा नहीं किया। आपोजीशन पार्टी कहती हैं कि वे हकूमत चलाने के काबिल नहीं हैं, इस लिये जैसे हरियाणा में राष्ट्रपति का राज लागू किया गया है, उसी तरह वैस्ट बंगाल, पंजाब, यू० पी० और बिहार में भी राष्ट्रपति का राज लागू किया जाये। वे खुद अपने जुर्म का इकबाल करती हैं और कहती हैं कि उन को सजा दी जाये।

लेकिन मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि कहीं हरियाणा के लोग यह न सोचें कि आसमान से गिरा और खजूर में अटका। उन्होंने एक रावणों से तो हमारा पीछा छुड़ाया है, लेकिन वह अब हमें दूसरे रावणों, इन बड़े बड़े आई० सी० एस० अफसरों के रहमो-कर्म पर न छोड़ दें। ये जो छः महीने मिले हैं, इस अरसे में वह हमारी जनता की कुछ सेवा करें। हमारे मिनिस्टर साहबान सिर्फ अपनी कोठियों में ही न बैठे रहें। होम मिनिस्टर साहब हमारे प्रदेश के चीफ मिनिस्टर की तरह हों। वह चौधरी शेर सिंह, एग््रीकल्चर मिनिस्टर और नहरों के मिनिस्टर को साथ ले कर हमारी जनता की बहवूदी के लिए कुछ काम करें। हमारी जमीन सोना उगलने वाली जमीन है, लेकिन हमारी दो-तिहाई जमीन वाटर-लार्गिंग या पानी न मिलने की वजह से खत्म हो गई है।

जैस कि मैं ने अभी कहा है, हमारे लोगों के लिए आसमान से गिरा, खजूर में अटका वाली बात नहीं होनी चाहिए। कहीं ऐसा न हो कि हम लोगों को आई० सी० एस० अफसरों के हाथों में डाल दिया जाये। हम राव वीरेन्द्र सिंह से तो छूट गए हैं। लेकिन ये बड़े बड़े अफसर लोगों से बात नहीं करते हैं। ये कालर और टाई वाले, ये अंग्रेजी बोलने वाले, कहीं इन छः महीनों में हरियाणा के शरीब किसानों को मार न दें। मिनिस्टर-साहब इन छः महीनों में हमारे किसानों के

लिए वह काम करें, जो राव वीरेन्द्र सिंह मिनिस्ट्री ने नहीं किया। होम मिनिस्ट्री दूसरी मिनिस्ट्रीज मिल कर यह काम करें।

वहां के टीचर्स ने हड़ताल कर रखी है। वे लोग अपनी तन्ख्वाह के लिए एक महीने से लड़ रहे हैं। राव वीरेन्द्र सिंह ने उन का हाल नहीं पूछा। उन के पहले बखीर ने भी उन का हाल नहीं पूछा था। मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब और चौधरी शेरसिंह से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे गरीब आदमी के लिए नर्म दिल रखें और उन के जख्मों पर फोहा रखें। उन टीचर्स ने दर्जन बच्चे पैदा कर रखे हैं। वे लोग सौ, डेढ़ सौ रुपयों से कैसे अपना गुजारा कर सकते हैं? अगर हमारे टीचर्स को तन्ख्वाह नहीं मिलेगी, तो वे क्या पढ़ायेंगे और बच्चों का कैरिक्टर क्या बनायेंगे? अगर हमारे बच्चे नहीं पढ़ेंगे, तो देश का भविष्य क्या होगा?

वहां के सर्वाइडनेट सर्विसज के लाख के करीब लोगों ने भी बिगुल बजा दिया है। यहां पर तो सरकार ने गजेन्द्रगढ़कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के मुताबिक अपने मुलाजिमों को भत्ता बगैरह दे दिया। लेकिन मिनिस्टर साहब उन गरीबों का भी ख्याल करें। वह उन लोगों की फेडरेशन से बात करें और उन की तन्ख्वाह बढ़ायें।

अब मैं एक ऐसी समस्या की तरफ मिनिस्टर साहब का ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ, जिस ने हरियाणा के किसान, मजदूर, ब्राह्मण और हरिजन, सब को परेशान कर रखा है। मनु महाराज से ले कर आज तक, हजारों साल तक, उन के जो दस्तूर रिवाज, ख्यालात और वे आफ्र थिंकिंग रहे हैं, उन के साथ कांग्रेस सरकार ने खिलवाड़ किया है। वह हमारे लोगों की बात सुनती नहीं है। हमारे कानून मंत्री अपने दिमाग पर जोर नहीं डालते हैं, यह मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है। यह सिर्फ मेरी आवाज नहीं है, बल्कि हरियाणा के अस्सी लाख लोगों और सारे हिन्दुस्तान के दस-पंद्रह करोड़ लोगों की आवाज है। यह

कोई छोटी बात नहीं है, यह बड़ी सीरियस बात है। इस लिए इस को मन्त्रालय में न उड़ा दिया जाये। हरियाणा के लोग हम से, और अपोजीशन के मेम्बर्सों से भी, कहते हैं कि हम लोग यह आवाज यहां पर उठावें।

जैसा कि आप जानते हैं, शुमाली हिन्दुस्तान कस्टम से गवर्न होता है। वह कस्टम यह है कि लड़कों को अपने बाप की जायदाद में हिस्सा मिलता है और लड़की को अपने फ़ादर-इन-ला और अपने हसबैंड की जायदाद में से हिस्सा मिलता है। ऐसा क्यों होता है? इस की वजह यह है कि हमारे वहां दस पंद्रह मील दूर, गोट से बाहर, लड़की की शादी करते हैं। अगर लड़की का खाविन्द गांव में आ जाये, तो उस को हम बड़ी भारी तीहान ममन्नते हैं। आप जानते हैं कि दुनिया में किसी छोटी से छोटी रूम पर हमला करने से इनकलाब हुए हैं। हमारे इलाके के लोग इस बात को बहुत महसूस करते हैं। सरकार उन पर चाहे जितने टैक्स लगा दे, वे उस को महसूस नहीं करते हैं। लेकिन जब वह उन के रूम, ख्यालात, वे आफ्र थिंकिंग, कस्टम्ज और प्रैक्टिसज में इन्टरफ़ीयर करती है, तो वे बहुत नाराज होते हैं। हमारे आदमी बड़े सरकश हैं। अगर उन पर कोई ज्यादाती होती है, तो वे अकड़ जाते हैं। वह आर्यसमाजी इलाका है। सिर्फ मेरे हलके से हैदराबाद के सत्याग्रह में साठ हजार आदमी चले गए। इसी तरह हिन्दी सत्याग्रह में दस पंद्रह हजार आदमी चले गए। मैं सरकार को बार्न करना चाहता हूँ कि कहीं इसी मामले को ले कर हरियाणा में कांग्रेस का सफ़ाया न हो जाये।

इस बारे में हम ने दसियों दफ़ा कहा है। राव वीरेन्द्र सिंह मिनिस्ट्री ने भी रेडोल्यूशन पास कर के भेजा है। मैं ने भी यह सवाल उठाया है, लेकिन सरकार ने कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया है। हम अपनी लड़कियों पर जितना खर्च करते हैं, उतना कोई नहीं करता है। लेकिन हमारे यहां यह सिस्टम है कि लड़के को सारी उम्मीद अपने वासदेन के पास रहना



[श्री रणधीर सिंह]

पड़ता है और लड़की को अपने इन लाज के पास। इस सूरत में क्या लड़की अपनी हसबेंड को ले कर प्रापर्टी का हिस्सा लेने के लिए अपने बालदेन के पास जायेगी? हमारे यहां पर्दे का रिवाज है। अगर जवाहरलाल भी या गांधीजी भी कहें कि पर्दे को छोड़ दो, तो हमारे लोग नहीं मानेंगे। हम लोग अपनी रस्मों, अपने करेक्टर और अवलाक पर पलते हैं। मैं बहनों के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ, लेकिन जो रिवाज, जो कस्टम, जो वे आफ थिंकिंग बन गया है, उस को न मनु महाराज तोड़ सके और न दूसरे कानून वाले।

हरियाणा में यह एक बर्निंग टापिक बना हुआ है। हमारे यहां के लोग हम को और हर एक पार्टी को कहते हैं कि यह काम करा दो। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब इस मामले पर हमदर्दानी तरीके से शोर करेंगे। वह मालूम करें कि क्या यह लाखों करोड़ों लोगों की आवाज नहीं है। वह एक कानून ला कर यह बेंज करें कि पैयरंट्स की प्रापर्टी लड़के के नाम रहे और लड़की को इन-लाज की प्रापर्टी में हिस्सा मिले।

हमारी स्टेट छोटी सी है, लेकिन अगर उस को डेवेलप किया जाये, तो वह बहुत बड़ी बन सकती है। अगर हुकूमत की तरफ से मदद दी जाये, तो हमारी जमीन सोना उपलेगी। जिस तरह का इलाका लायलपुर का है, हमारे यहां हिसार, महेन्द्रगढ़ और गुड़गांव का इलाका भी उसी तरह का है। हमारे यहां कोई बड़ा दरिया नहीं है; हमारे इलाके में छोटे छोटे रिव्यूल्टस हैं। सरकार माकंडा, घग्घर और साहवी नदी को टेम और ट्रेन करे। यह काम सिर्फ पांच दस करोड़ से हो जायेगा। अगर वह हरियाणा को पानी मुहैया करने के लिए थोड़ा सा रुपया लगाये, तो उस को अमरीका से एक दाना भी नहीं मंगाना पड़ेगा। हमारे किसान बहुत मेहनती हैं और बहुत वेल-टुंड हैं। आप उन के मकान, उन की हीलिडंज और उन के गांवों को देखिए। वे इतने मेहनती हैं कि अगर

उन को पानी और बिजली दी जाए, तो वे इस मुल्क को अनाज के मामले में सिल्के-साफ़िगेट बना देंगे। इस लिए मिनिस्टर साहब डा० राव के हाथ मजबूत करें, ताकि वह हरियाणा के लोगों के कुछ काम कर सकें।

17 hrs.

अब तीन-चार महीने में इलेक्शन आ रहे हैं। अगर सरकार ने कुछ कर के दिखा दिया, तो वहां के लोग कहेंगे कि यह सरकार अच्छी और राव बीरेन्द्रसिंह की सरकार बुरी, लेकिन अगर इस सरकार ने कुछ नहीं किया, तो वे कहेंगे कि राव बीरेन्द्र सिंह की सरकार अच्छी और यह बुरी है। मैं सरकार और कांग्रेस पार्टी का उपलची नहीं हूँ। मैं अपने आदमियों की बात जरूर कहूंगा। मैं तो चाहता हूँ कि हरियाणा में छः महीने के बजाये दो साल तक राष्ट्रपति का राज कायम रखा जाये। यह बात सिर्फ मैं ही नहीं कहता हूँ, बल्कि श्री श्रीराम शर्मा, जो वहां पर बजीर रह चुके हैं और चौधरी लहरीसिंह, जो जनसंघ की तरफ से यहां पर एम० पी० थे, ने भी यही राय जाहिर की है। और वह कहते हैं कि छः महीने का टाइम है। हमारे तो कुंभकर्ण की तरह आदमी हैं। सो जाते हैं तो सो जाते हैं, जाग जाते हैं तो जाग जाते हैं। आज यह आदमी जाग गए हैं और उन्होंने तय कर लिया है कि निकम्मे आदमियों को खत्म करना है। जिन की दोहाई दे रहे थे हमारे दोस्त कि बहुत अच्छे आदमी हैं उन को अब वह आने नहीं देंगे बीरेन्द्र सिंह को और दूसरे आदमियों को जो बिके हैं और और डगरों की तरह से उन को आने नहीं देंगे। यह सिख लो प्राप। अच्छे आदमियों को लायेंगे। जिन्होंने हरयाने का नाम बबनाम किया है, जिन्होंने ग्रन्डर आ कर तिजारत की है एम० एल० ए० के नाम की, मेम्बरी के नाम की, उन को अब हरयाने का आदमी नहीं आने देगा। लेकिन यह बात जरूर कहते हैं कि पांच छः महीने यह मिले हैं, भगवान करेगा तो साल दो साल और मिलेगा, उस में हमारे हरयाने के लिए प्राप कुछ अच्छे काम कर दीजिए। और हम को खुशी है कि

यह हमारी पार्लियामेंट जो है वह हरयाने की असेम्बली भी है। मिनिस्टर साहब ने ४५ ब्रादमी जो लिए हैं उन में ६ तो हमारे भाई हैं, ७ कांग्रेस के और २ अपोजीशन के और ५ राज्य सभा के १४ तो यह हैं इन को लगाओ काम में आप। हम करेंगे अपन हरयाने में काम। हमें काम दो। दो हमारे भाई अपोजीशन के एम० पी० हैं और सात हम कांग्रेस के हैं। हमें आप काम दो। यह न हो कि हमें आप उन अफसरों के कदमों में रखो जिन से जा कर हम यह कहें कि जनाब मेरा यह काम कर दो। डी० सी० या चीफ इंजीनियर या फाइनेशियल कमिश्नर के पास हमें न जाना पड़े यह कहने के लिये कि हमारा यह काम कर दो। हम खुददार ब्रादमी हैं, यह बात नहीं मानेंगे। एक एम० पी० भुकेगा डी० सी० के सामने? आप हमारे मालिक हैं, हम आप के सेवक हैं। आप हम से काम लो। हमारे साथ आप हरयाने में चलो। यह नहीं कि जैसे इस बिल में दे रखा है कि दो महीने में या एक महीने में मीटिंग बुला लेंगे। जहां शुक्ला साहब होंगे, मुझे उम्मीद है कि इन्साफ होगा और सही बता होगी। शानदार ब्रादमी हैं और बड़ी हिम्मत के ब्रादमी हैं। क्या कमी है मेरे वजीर में? शानदार मिनिस्टर हमें मिला है। और अब तो आप हरयाने के चीफ मिनिस्टर बन गए हो, अब अपना तगड़ापन हमें दिखाओ। जहां चौहान साहब हों, और आप हों वहां क्या कमी हो सकती है? हफ्ते दो हफ्ते में आप मीटिंग बुलाया करो सारे एम० पी० की और हम से पूछा करो कि क्या तकलीफ है? पानी की क्या तकलीफ है, खाने की क्या तकलीफ है, तालीम की क्या तकलीफ है? वाकई यही बात है कि नाम ही नाम है हरयाने का। असल में वहां का ब्रादमी बड़ी मुसीबत से दिन बीताता है। हरिजन भाई हैं, वह भूखों मरते हैं। हरिजन मिनिस्टर को आप एक दफा वहां भेजो। वह जा कर उन की हालत वहां देख कर आये। अशोक मेहता साहब को भेजो। अब चूंकि आप डाइरेक्टली गवर्न

करेंगे हरयाने को तो लम्बे लम्बे दौरे बम्बई और कलकत्ते के छोड़ दीजिए। नखदीक के दौरे करो। शेर सिंह जी को भी साथ जो, हम सारे एम० पी० को साथ लो और चल कर देखो। निहायत बेहतरीन किसान हैं, बेहतरीन जमीन है, फर्टिलिटी स्टेड्ड आफ लिविंग, ब्रादमी साफ सुधरे, उंगर सुधरे, स्त्रियां सुधरीं, एक दफा चल कर आप देखो तो। आप थोड़ा वहां कुछ कर के दिखाओ और अगर आपने कुछ नहीं किया तो वह यही कहेंगे कि यह तो खाली बात ही बात करते हैं, कुछ करना घरना इनको नहीं है।

यह ४५ ब्रादमियों की जो कमेटी है इसको आप हफ्ते-हफ्ते बुलाया करो। और ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव इन्स्ट्रक्शंस जारी करो वहां की गवर्नमेंट को कि यह जो एम० पी० हैं यह अगर वहां कहीं जाना चाहें तो ले जा कर दिखाएं, लोगों की तकलीफें जिस में वह देख सकें। उनको आप कहें कि एम० पी० मौके पर जाते हैं तो उनको कोआपरेशन दें, उन को जगह-जगह ले जायें ताकि लोगों की बात को हम सुनें। दूसरे मेरे भाई जो ४५ में से ३० और एम० पी० हैं अगर वह मौका देखना चाहें, वह आये तो वह ३० एम० पी० भी वैसे ही हैं। जैसे हरयाना विधान सभा के मेंबर। उसी तरह से वह सारे के सारे जायें। उनको वहां भी सरकार पूरा कोआपरेशन दे। ट्रांसपोर्ट उन को दे सारी सहूलियत दे। इन छः महीनों में मैं यह चाहूंगा कि आप पुलिस के रहम पर और बड़े-बड़े अफसरान के रहम पर उनको मत छोड़िए। अगर यह बात उनके दिमाग पर आ गई तो वह यही समझेंगे कि इस राष्ट्र-पति राज से तो वीरेन्द्र सिंह ही अच्छा था। और अगर वीरेन्द्र सिंह से अच्छा काम किया, वहां जा कर गरीबों से पूछा कि तुम्हारी क्या तकलीफ है, मास्टर्स से पूछा, हरिजनों से पूछा तो मैं सिफारिश करूंगा कि छः महीने के बजाये आप दो साल इसे करो। इस हरयाने की सफाई करो। हरयाने में एक गन्ध

आ गई है जो सारे देश को खराब करेगी। हरयाने का नाम इन लोगों ने बदनाम किया है और सारे हिन्दुस्तान का नाम बदनाम किया है, इसलिए इस की अच्छी तरह से सफाई करो। मैं चाहूंगा कि आप इसमें ज्यादा से ज्यादा इन्टरेस्ट लो। इन शब्दों के साथ चेयरमैन साहब, मैं आप का शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ कि आप ने मुझे मौका दिया।

श्री श्रीचन्द्र गोयल (चण्डीगढ़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, चौधरी रणधीर सिंह एक काबिल वकील होते हुए भी जब भी कभी कोई बिल आये या और किसी सम्बन्ध में हो, उन्होंने हमेशा एक ही वीन से एक ही सुर बजाना सीखा है। उनके भाषण में ऐसा नहीं पता लगता है कि वह राष्ट्रपति के भाषण पर बोल रहे हैं या बजट पर बोल रहे हैं या किसी बिल पर बोल रहे हैं या किसी और मसले पर बोल रहे हैं। हरयाना के संबंध में बोलते हुए खास तौर पर अपने बजोरों की तारीफ करना, भाट और डोम की तरह उनकी चाटुकारी करना, बस यही एक तरीका उन्होंने अपनाया है। यही बातें वह हमेशा करते हैं। कोई तथ्यों के आधार पर, दलीलों की बुनियाद पर अपना केस सदन के सामने रखने का कष्ट कभी नहीं करते। उन्होंने इस बात का भी विचार नहीं किया कि जिस बिल पर हम इस वक्त विचार कर रहे हैं उस का कहां तक स्कोप है, कितनी उस की मर्यादा है, क्या उस का अर्थ है...

श्री कमल नयन बजाज (वर्धा) : आप भी बिल पर बोल रहे हैं या रणधीर सिंह पर बोल रहे हैं ?

श्री श्रीचन्द्र गोयल : जहां तक इस बिल का संबंध है इस बिल के ऊपर मुझे तीन एतराज हैं। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि दो-चार रोज हुए एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में मंत्री महोदय ने यह कहा है, हमारे विधि मंत्री ने कि हरयाना में मई के अन्दर हम चुनाव कराने जा रहे हैं। उसके लिए मतदादाओं की सूची बना रहे हैं। अधिकारी उस काम के लिए नियुक्त हो गए

हैं। लेकिन आज रणधीर सिंह के द्वारा यह जो सुर यहां पर भलापा जा रहा है उस से मुझे नीयत में कुछ फर्क नजर आता है कि शायद मई के महीने में चुनाव कराने का विचार नहीं रखते। कारण क्या है ? एक तरफ हमारे रणधीर सिंह जी कहते हैं कि हरयाना का आदमी बड़ा समझदार है, जो दल-बदल करने वाले हैं उन को कभी समर्थन नहीं देगा, निकाल बाहर करेगा, यह दलील अगर सच है तो यह क्यों नहीं कहते कि जनता का फतवा हासिल करो ? उस के लिए कह रहे हैं कि जरा चलिए हरयाना में कुछ सरमाया लगा दीजिए, पांच दस करोड़ रुपया खर्च कर दीजिए और जो आज तक पद्धति रही है, यहां पर जो कांग्रेस का बोट हासिल करने का तरीका रहा है कि लोगों को डिस्क्रिशनरी ग्रान्ट बांट कर के बोट हासिल करते रहे हैं जिसमें इनके हरयाना के सवास्थ्य मंत्री का चुवाव हाईकोर्ट ने रद्द किया है... (व्यवधान)... श्रीमती श्रीम प्रभा जिन के संबंध में हाईकोर्ट ने लिखा कि उन्होंने डिस्क्रिशनरी ग्रान्ट का मतदाताओं का मत हासिल करने के लिये दुरुपयोग किया है, इसलिए उनको 6 साल के लिए डिस्क्वालीफाई कर दिया...

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : That is a pending case before the Supreme Court. So, he cannot speak about that. It is *sub judice*.

SHRI A. S. SAIGAL (Bilaspur) : On a point of order. When a case is pending before the Court, how can the hon. Member talk about it ?

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai) : How does he know ? The Chair has no records of that.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : The hon. members know about it.

श्री श्रीचन्द्र गोयल : मेरे भाइयों को चिढ़ लगती है, दुःख लगता है कि इनके माननीय मंत्रियों के संबंध में हाई कोर्ट ने इस प्रकार का निर्णय क्यों दे दिया ? इनको चिढ़ लगती है लेकिन मैं तो जो कुछ निर्णय आया है वही सदन के सामने रख रहा हूँ। सब अखबारों के अंदर

यह प्रकाशित हुआ है। मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि आज इस प्रकार की जो यह स्थिति है, उसका कारण यह है कि जनता का विश्वास हासिल करना, जनता की सेवा करना, जनता में काम कर के, 'मतदान में उनका समर्थन लेना, यह शायद हमारे कांग्रेस मित्रों ने सबक नहीं सीखा। वह पुराने ढर्रे पर चलना चाहते हैं कि कुछ सरमाया लगाया, कांग्रेस की तरफ से कुछ फंड्स वहां पर लगाया, और लोगों को इस प्रकार लालच दे कर उनका मत हासिल कर लिया। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि छः महीने के अन्दर अगर मई में चुनाव कराना चाहते हैं तो कहां जरूरत थी इस कानून को लाने की? और फिर कानून किस शकल में लाया जा रहा है? आप जानते हैं राष्ट्रपति को जो कानून बनाने के अधिकार संविधान में दिए हैं वह बहुत मर्यादित अवस्था तक हैं। आखिर कानून बनाने का जो अधिकार है, वह इस संसद के पास है, राष्ट्रपति विशेष परिस्थितियों के अन्दर कानून बनाते हैं, लेकिन आज यहां तो लेजिस्लेचर-विद-इन-लैजिस्लेचर पद्धति की जा रही है। किया यह जा रहा है कि उसमें 30 लोक सभा के सदस्य होंगे और 15 राज्य सभा के सदस्य होंगे और इन 45 सदस्यों का एक सब-लैजिस्लेचर बनेगा, जो हरियाणा के सम्बन्ध में, अगर राष्ट्रपति उनका मशविरा लेना चाहें, तो राय देंगे और उसको लेकर फिर राष्ट्रपति कानून बना सकते हैं। चौधरी साहब समझते हैं कि 45 प्रादमियों की जो समिति बनी है यह शायद हरियाणा के लिए कोई डबलपमेन्ट बोर्ड बना है, विकास बोर्ड बना है, लेकिन वहां पर लोगों की क्या तकलीफें हैं, हरिजनों की क्या तकलीफ है—उन्होंने इस प्रकार उसके स्कोप को नहीं समझा। उसको कहां तक अस्तियारात होंगे—उस तक उन्होंने अपने दिमाग को दौड़ाने की कोशिश नहीं की।

मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि यह जो डेलिगेटिव लैजिस्लेशन का प्रस्ताव है—संसद

को हटा कर किसी व्यक्ति को कानून बनाने का अधिकार देना—दुनिया में किसी भी जनतन्त्रीय देश में इसको पसन्द नहीं किया है। दुनिया भर की हाईकोर्टों और सुप्रीम कोर्टों के फैसले इस बात की गवाही देते हैं, इस बात का सुबूत है कि केवल मर्यादित हालात में, केवल किसी विशेष परिस्थिति में राष्ट्रपति को कानून बनाने का अधिकार होना चाहिए।

हरियाणा के बारे में मेरे बहुत से भाईयों ने दलीलें दीं—उन्होंने इस बात का राग भलापा कि वहां के लोग बेइमान हो गए थे, हरियाणा को उन्होंने बदनाम कर दिया था—लेकिन आखिर इसका कोई वैधानिक तरीका है। राज्यपाल महोदय ने अपनी रिपोर्ट दी है, उसमें उन्होंने लिखा है कि बहुमत राब बीरेन्द्र सिंह के साथ था, बहुमत एक दल के साथ होते हुए भी उनके द्वारा वहां की विधान सभा को भंग करना, वहां पर राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करना—यह जनतन्त्र की हत्या है और मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि इन के द्वारा जो दलीलें दी गई हैं—चूंकि हरियाणा में बहुत बड़ी मात्रा में दल-बदल हो रहे थे, इसलिए हम नें हरियाणा में राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू किया है। एक तरफ दल-बदल को नापसन्द करते हैं, बीमारी का इलाज करने जा रहे हैं, लेकिन उससे अगले रोज पंजाब में जो 16 प्रादमियों का दल है, जिसके १६ के 16 सदस्य मन्त्री बन गए और जब उनको उपाध्यक्ष का चुनाव कराने की जरूरत पड़ी तो कांग्रेस को अपना व्यक्ति उधार देना पड़ा, उनके पास कोई सदस्य नहीं बचा, जिसको उपाध्यक्ष के पद पर नियुक्त किया जा सके। जहां पर यह स्थिति हो—इस प्रकार का दल कि जिसका कोई विधान नहीं, कोई कार्यक्रम नहीं, कोई नीति नहीं, जिसकी कोई जिन्दगी नहीं, एक दिन पहले दल बना और अगले दिन उनको राजगद्दी पर बैठा दिया। मेरे कांग्रेस के भाई चोर दरवाजे से इस प्रकार दल-बदल करनेवालों का समर्थन करते हैं, उनकी पीठ थपथपाते हैं।

[श्री श्रीचन्द गोयल]

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप मई के अन्दर चुनाव करायें। आज चौधरी साहब कह रहे थे कि वहाँ पर कोई जल्सा नहीं कर सकता, जल्सों का उन को पता नहीं है, हम रात-दिन जल्से करते हैं। हम कहते हैं कि चुनाव कराइयें, लेकिन साथ ही साथ सरकार ने घोषणा कर दी है कि वहाँ की नगर-पालिकाओं के चुनाव भी मार्च में होंगे। ऐसी स्थिति में मुझे सन्देह दिखाई दे रहा है कि ये मई में वहाँ पर चुनाव कराने जा रहे हैं। क्योंकि अगर मई में चुनाव कराना होता, तो ये नगरपालिकाओं के चुनाव के लिए मार्च की तारीख तय नहीं करते। इसलिए मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आपको अपनी बात पर अडिग रहना चाहिए। हरियाणा के अन्दर मई में चुनाव करें, वहाँ की जनता अपना फतवा देगी, अगर कांग्रेस बहुमत प्राप्त करती है तो कांग्रेस शासन करेगी, यदि दूसरे दल बहुमत प्राप्त करते हैं तो दूसरे दल वहाँ पर शासन करेंगे। लेकिन यह नहीं हो सकता कि जब तक स्थिति ठीक नहीं होती, तब तक हम अपना घर नहीं सम्भालते, जब तक हमारे अन्दर जो फूट है, उसको ठीक नहीं करते, तब तक उसको टाला जाए, दो साल तक उस को बढ़ा दिया जाए, यह अप्रजातान्त्रिक तरीका है।

हरियाणा के गवर्नर ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में इस बात को कहा है कि हरियाणा के कांग्रेसी भाइयों ने विरोधी दल का काम जिस प्रकार से करना चाहिए था, उस प्रकार से नहीं किया, पंजाब के गवर्नर ने भी यही रिपोर्ट दी है, आप इस बात से शिक्षा क्यों नहीं लेते और अपने सदस्यों को क्यों नहीं कहते कि वे विरोधी दल के अन्दर बैठकर अपने कर्तव्यों का पालन करना सीखें। दिल्ली के अन्दर जो नगर-निगम बना है, जो मैट्रोपालिटन कान्सिल बनी है—आजकल उसकी भी चर्चा चलाई जा रही है। हालांकि दिल्ली की जनता न स्पष्टतया बहुमत जनसंघ के पक्ष में दिया है, वहाँ पर दो

पार्टियों के मेल की भी जरूरत नहीं पड़ी। उसको भी भंग करने की चर्चा आज कल चल रही है, क्योंकि मेरे भाई ताकत के भूखे हैं, जिन्होंने केवल सत्ता में रहना सीखा है, जिन्होंने विरोधी दल में बैठ कर अपने कर्तव्यों को निभाना आज तक नहीं सीखा। मैं उनको आज तम्बीह करना चाहूँगा कि दिल्ली के अन्दर अगर उन्होंने इस प्रकार का कोई कदम उठाया . . . . .

सभापति महोदय : इस वक्त दिल्ली की बात तो नहीं हो रही है।

श्री श्रीचन्द गोयल : ये लोग उसके बारे में सोच रहे हैं, यहाँ के नगर निगम को भंग करने के बारे में इन्होंने विचार किया है। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जैसे बंगाल इन से नहीं संभला है, उससे भी ज्यादा महंगा सौदा इनको दिल्ली में पड़ेगा, अगर इन्होंने नगर निगम को भंग करने का कोई निश्चय किया। बजाए इसके कि जनतन्त्र की दूमरों को शिक्षा दें, पहले अन्तर्मुख हो कर विचार करें और सचमुच जनतन्त्र को पनपता हुआ, फलता फूलता हुआ देखना चाहते हैं तो पहले उसके प्रारम्भिक सबक को सीखें तथा उस पर आचरण करना भी इनको सीखना होगा।

श्री शशिमूषण बाजपेयी (खारगोन) : चेयरमैन साहब, हरियाणा दिल्ली के पड़ोस में हमेशा नुकसान उठाता आया है। जब सम्मिलित पंजाब में था, उस जमाने में हरियाणा बहुत दबा रहा—आर्थिक तौर पर और औद्योगिक तौर पर। सामाजिक तौर पर हरियाणा में एक चेतना आई—स्वामी दयानन्द जी के द्वारा, सारा हरियाणा आर्य-समाजी हो गया, हरियाणा में बड़े-बड़े महात्मा आर्य समाज के पैदा हुए, उन्होंने बहुत प्रयत्न किया कि हरियाणा का सामाजिक उत्थान हो, लेकिन आज हरियाणा अलग है, पंजाब से जिन बजूहात से अलग हुआ, वे ज्यादा सराहनीय नहीं हैं।

सभापति महोदय, हरियाणा में आर्थिक तौर पर इतना पिछड़ापन है कि हरियाणा

आनेवाले 50 सालों तक केन्द्र से सहायता न्यता रहेगा, इसलिए कि हरियाणा इतना छोटा यूनिट है कि जब उस का पंजाब के साथ विभाजन हुआ, उस वक्त यह नहीं सोचा गया कि हरियाणा किस तरह आर्थिक तौर पर आगे बढ़ेगा। कुछ भावनाओं पर, कुछ अन्दरूनी तौर पर यह सब चीजें बनीं—बड़े आन्दोलन के बाद। सभापति महोदय, जिन हालात में यह मन्त्री मंडल आया, वह हरियाणा की कितनी सेवा कर सकता था, कितनी इस के पास सत्ता थी, कितना इस के पास फाइनेन्स था, इस को भी हमें सोचना होगा। आज जो बिल हमारे सामने आया है, इस में इस में हमें खास तौर से एक बात ध्यान में रखनी होगी कि हरियाणा अपने पैरों पर खड़ा हो सके और इस के लिए उस को अधिक से अधिक सहायता देनी होगी।

जहां तक टैक्सेज का सवाल है, हरियाणा के लोग ज्यादा टैक्सेज नहीं दे सकते। यह बहुत गरीब इलाका है। हरियाणा के लोग बहुत बहादुर हैं—इसमें कोई शक नहीं, लेकिन आज भी वहां हरिजनों को फौज में भरती नहीं होने दिया जाता। वहां की जो जाट रेजिमेन्ट है, उस में हरिजनों को अभी तक भरती नहीं होने दिया जाता—यह मुनासिब बात नहीं है।

पहले यह होता रहा है कि हरियाणा से लोग जालन्धर जाते थे और वह सिक्ख लाइट इन्फैंट्री में भरती हो जाते थे यह कह कर कि वह सिक्ख हो रहे हैं बाद में चाहे सिक्ख न बनें लेकिन वैसा कह कर हो जाते थे। हरियाणा का विकास सब से बड़ी बात वहां जो यह फौज में नौकरी करते हैं जो बाहर से पैसा आता है इस से सम्बन्धित है। वहां के हरिजनों को ज्यादा से ज्यादा मौका मिलना चाहिए। सामाजिक तौर पर पिछड़े होने की वजह से दहिये, गठवाड़िये, भरतपुरिये यह जाटों की बिदाररियां हैं। आज हरिजनों को बहुत नुक्सान है। आज भी हरियाणा में कुओं पर हरिजन पानी नहीं भर सकते हैं। इस के लिए कानन जरूर है लेकिन आर्यसमाज की इतनी

तरक्की के बावजूद भी हरियाणा में यह आज एक पिछड़ापन है उस को दूर करना है अगर हरियाणा को तरक्की करनी है। एक छोटा सा इलाका है। वहां सब कीमों को मिला कर हरियाणा को बनाना होगा नहीं तो बना पायेंगे। हरियाणा के लोग जब वहां के व्यापारी कलकत्ते जाते हैं तो वहां अपने को मारवाड़ी कहते हैं। कम से कम कलकत्ते में हरियाणा के व्यापारियों का 200-300 करोड़ रूपया लगा हुआ है। बेरी, झज्जर के लोग जब वहां जाते हैं कलकत्ते में तो अपने को मारवाड़ी कहते हैं। जब यहां आते हैं तो अपने को पंजाबी कहते हैं। अभी तक उन का ध्यान हरियाणा की तरक्की की तरफ नहीं हुआ। हरियाणा के लोगों में राजनीतिक चेतना भी रही है और सन् 42 के खाद्य आन्दोलन में वहां हरिजन सब से ज्यादा तादाद में जेल में गए हैं। अगर इस देश के किसी जिले से सब से अधिक लोग जेल में गए हैं तो इस रोहतक जिले से लोग जेल में गए हैं। सारी मुलतान जेल भरी हुई थी। हरिजन भी वहां के बहादुर हैं, जाट भी बहादुर हैं और वहां पर जो तत्व हैं उन को आगेंनाइख किया जाए तो हरियाणा एक शानदार स्टेट इस देश में बन सकता है।

आज में एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं। स्वामी स्वतन्त्रतानन्द के दीनानगर पंजाब के दयानन्द मठ में मैं उन के साथ में रहा। मैं ने उन को कहा कि स्वामी जी आप पैदा तो हुए हैं हरियाणा में, यह 6-7 फुट आप का कद है आप यहां दीनानगर में क्यों मठ बनाये हुए हैं? उन्होंने मुझ से कहा कि यह पंजाब में एक वैंट है जो जाटों की है। माणस रेस है। कहां रोहतक और कहां दीनानगर गुरुदासपुर के इलाक़े में उन्होंने मठ बनाया लेकिन आज वह पंजाब बंट गया और वह जाटों में विभाजन आया। पाकिस्तान के किनारे पर एक बहादुर स्टेट को, मजबूत स्टेट होना चाहिए था लेकिन जो कुछ भी हुआ, आज तो देर हो गयी

इस बात को लेकिन एक बात में आज कहे देता हूँ कि 10 साल में, 15 साल में, 20 साल में यह पंजाब फिर एक हो और फिर आग भड़केगी क्योंकि उस को कोई विभाजित नहीं करता। स्वामी स्वतन्त्रतानन्द की बात मुझे याद है वह जरूर पूरी होगी।

जहां यह कहा गया कि फरवरी में चुनाव यह हो में उस से पूर्णतया सहमत हूँ, चुनाव बहुत जल्द होना चाहिए। हरियाणा के लोगों के मन में राजनैतिक चेतना है। पिछली बार कुछ भावना भड़का कर हिन्दी के नाम पर लोकतंत्र के हिन्दी के सब से बड़े जो नेता ये हिन्दी आन्दोलन के वह हमारे यहां के एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर हैं। आधे लाख आदमी हिन्दी के लिए हरियाणा जेल में लेकर गये। वह आज हमारे मिनिस्टर हैं। वह हिन्दी के नाम पर गाय के नाम पर और दूसरी चीजों के ऊपर वहां लोगों से वोट लेने की जो बात हुई है इस इलैक्शन में आर्थिक तरक्की के लिए जो पार्टी प्रोग्राम देयी वह आ सकेगी और आज जितना हरियाणा के लोगों को यह अहसास हो रहा है कि पंजाब के बंटने के बाद भी आज वह तरक्की नहीं कर पाये तो आज वह यह सीधी-सादी बात सामने रखते हैं। जो आर्थिक तरक्की का प्लान उन के सामने लायेगी उस को हम वोट देंगे। यह आज मौका है जनता के सामने कि यह जो चुनाव है इसे जल्दी लाना है, ज्यादा देर गवर्नर रुल नहीं रखना चाहिए। मैं इस बात से सहमत हूँ। मैं सिर्फ इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो बिल आया है उस को मैं सपोर्ट करता हूँ।

श्री महाराज सिंह भारती (मेरठ) : सभापति महोदय, हरियाणा एक छोटा-सा प्रदेश है। उस बेचारे का न तो कोई पावर हाउस है और न कोई उस में बांध है। वह अपनी बिजली और सिंचाई दोनों के लिए अपने चारों तरफ़ के सूबों की तरफ़ देखता है। मैं चाहूंगा कि जिस तरीके से एक नेशनल ग्रिड बनाने की बात चल रही है, जो थोड़ा-सा टाइम एलैक्शन से पहले दो, चार दिन

का, दिल्ली की सरकार को मिला है, उस में उन का जो बिजली वाला ग्रिड है वह आस-पास के सब प्रदेशों से मिल कर, चूँकि उन का वहां कोई पावर हाउस नहीं है, बिजली का इंतज़ाम कर दिया जाय। साथ में जो उन का बजट अब पेश होने वाला है अगले सेशन में, 57 करोड़ के लगभग बतलाया गया है, मैं चाहूंगा कि उस बजट में 1 करोड़ रुपया किसानों के लिए भी रक्खा जाय जिस बांध के साथ हरियाणा की जिदगी नत्थी है, उस की सिंचाई नत्थी है। हरियाणा के लिये कैसे उस की आर्थिक प्रगति हो, कहां से पानी आये, कहां से बिजली आये, जब तक वह जिम्मेदारी वह सरकार उठा रही है तब तक उसे उस जिम्मेदारी को पूरे तरीके से निभाना चाहिए।

श्रीमान्, जल्दी में इसलिए करवाना चाहता हूँ कि जिस दिन चुनाव होगा और उस के बाद उस का नतीजा आयेगा तो बहुत-से लोग कपड़े फाड़ेंगे क्योंकि इस देश में एक बढ़िया राजनीति चली है कि किसी सिद्धांत हीन पार्टी को जिदा नहीं रहना चाहिए। जनता समझ गयी है और इसलिए उस-ने कांग्रेस को हराओ और देश बचाओ का नारा लगाया। इंग्लैंड में जिस तरीके से लिबरल पार्टी एक शानदार पार्टी थी लेकिन सिद्धांतहीन होने के नाते जब वहां की जनता बालिया डूई तो उस के बाद वह अपोजीशन पार्टी नहीं बन पाई, बिलकुल उसी तरीके से इस देश के अन्दर पूंजीवाद और समाजवादी शक्तियों में लड़ाई होगी तो यह बीच में कांग्रेस जैसी सिद्धांतहीन, लिबरल पार्टियों जैसी पार्टियां लिक्विडेट हो जायेंगी। उन का कोई ताल्लुक नहीं रहेगा और इतिहास में महत्त्व यह लिख दिया जायेगा कि वह बड़े अच्छे थे वाक़ी जैसा मैं ने कहा एलैक्शन का नतीजा आने के बाद लोग अपने कपड़े फाड़ेंगे। उस के बाद यही लोग कहेंगे कि चूँकि अब की बार हमारी वहां सरकार नहीं बनी है इसलिए वहां के लिए अब केन्द्र से कम सहायता दी जाय। जितनी जल्दी यह काम हो जाय रणधीर सिंह

उतना ही अच्छा है नहीं तो तुम भी पछताओगे और हम भी पछताएंगे ।

एक बात की तरफ़ में ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ और वह यह कि हरियाणा बहुत छोटा प्रदेश है। केवल 9 एम० पीज० वाला यह हरियाणा प्रान्त है जोकि इतना छोटा है और इस के मुकाबले जब मैं अपने सूबे को देखता हूँ, उत्तरप्रदेश को, वह हमारा प्रदेश 80-85 एम० पीज० वाला इतना बड़ा सूबा है कि जिसका इंतज़ाम कभी हो ही नहीं सकेगा। अब चूँकि कोई भावना तो हमारे पास है नहीं, हम भाषा का नारा लगायें कोई नारा लगायें, हम 80-85 एम० पीज० को एक जमह बंधा ही रहना पड़ेगा। सवा, सवा लाख वोटर हैं एक, एक क्षेत्र में। हरियाणा में 80 एम० एल० एज० हैं। अगर हरियाणा थोड़ा उत्तर प्रदेश में मिला दिया जाय तो उन की संख्या घट कर 40 रह जायेगी। हमारे हिसाब से जो छूट जायेंगे उतने से हरियाणा कभी एकोनामिकल नहीं हो सकेगा। कभी चल नहीं सकेगा। श्री रणधीर सिंह ने और दूसरे लोगों ने जान-बूझ कर यह नहीं कहना चाहा। हरियाणा के लोग नहीं चाहते कि वह अकेले रह जायें। वह किस के साथ मिलना चाहते हैं। उस की चर्चा वह नहीं करना चाहते थे कि वह मिलना चाहते हैं तो उस काम में केन्द्रीय सरकार को क्रदम उठाना चाहिए। जहाँ तक मेरे कहने का सवाल है कि उन्हें किस के साथ मिलना चाहिए तो जो उन के खरीददार हैं माल के उस के साथ मिल जायें तो कहीं ज्यादा अच्छा है। राजस्थान के साथ मिल कर क्या करेंगे? हरियाणा का कोई व्यक्ति राजस्थान के साथ मिलना नहीं चाहता। अरे भाई, हरियाणा वाला तो जिस को अपनी सग्गी बेचता है, जिसको वह अपना दूध बेचता है और जिस को वह अपनी लेबर बेचता है और जिसके कि साथ उस का सम्बन्ध जुड़ा हुआ है उस से वह मिलना चाहेगा। उस दिल्ली के साथ आप मिलाइये।

दिल्ली के साथ मिलाने से नतीजा निकलेगा और फिर खरीददार और पैदावार करने वाले दोनों एक हो जायेंगे। फिर यह सवाल पैदा नहीं होगा कि कल को दूध मिलेगा या नहीं और मिलेगा तो वह कैसा मिलेगा? एक दिल्ली के ऊपर मीरेल जिम्मेदारी आजायेगी और दोनों मिल कर एक आर्थिक इकाई हो जायेंगे। जहाँ तक मेरठ का सवाल है अगर मेरठ को दिल्ली में मिलाना चाहें तो वह इस के लिए 100 फीसदी तैयार है लेकिन अलग नहीं और विशाल हरियाणा में जोड़ कर दिल्ली हरियाणा के साथ हम नहीं मिलना चाहेंगे। दिल्ली के साथ हम मिलने को तैयार हैं, हरियाणा मिले या न मिले। उत्तर प्रदेश का मेरठ का इलाका तो दिल्ली के साथ मिलने के लिए तैयार है लेकिन हमें तो कोई मिलावेगा नहीं। हम तो जैसे फंसे हुए हैं, फंसे हुए हैं लेकिन हरियाणा की विशेष परिस्थिति को देखते हुए...

श्री अमृत नाहाटा (वाड़मेर) : दिल्ली का आधा दूध बीकानेर से आता है।

श्री महाराज सिंह भारती : बीकानेर को भी दिल्ली में मिला लो, क्यों झगड़ा कर रहे हो। ऐसा भी अगर हो जाए तो मुझ से ज्यादा खुश कोई दूसरा नहीं होगा। जिन्दगी भर एक सूबे को अपाहिज की शकल में न रखा जाए। आखिर कब तक आप उसको चम्मच से दूध पिलाते रहेंगे और उसको जिन्दा रखेंगे। बहुत बड़ा पाप हो जाएगा। सुन्दर लोगों को अपाहिज बना कर न रखो। लोक सभा की यह बदकिस्मती है कि हरियाणा की उस पर जिम्मेदारी धा पड़ी है। मैं खुश नहीं हूँ। बहुमत की सरकार को तोड़ने के बाद राष्ट्रपति को सलाह देने के लिए उस कमेटी में हम जायें यह शर्म की बात है। इसका जवाब हरियाणा वाले देंगे उस वक्त उन्हें मौका मिलेगा। तब वे बता देंगे कि क्या ठीक है और क्या ठीक नहीं है। जब तक जिम्मेदारी हमारे ऊपर है तब तक हमारा फर्ज है कि ऐसा सूबा जिस के अन्दर पावर हाउस नहीं



है, बांध नहीं है, जिस के लिए पीने का पानी बाहर से आएगा, बिजली बाहर से आएगी कच्चा माल बाहर से, लोहा बाहर से, सारी चीजें बाहर से आयेंगी उसको हम ठीक हालत में लायें। उस सूबे में थोड़ी-बहुत जगमगाहट दिखाई देती है तो वह उस सूबे की जगमगाहट नहीं है जैसे गाजियाबाद की जगमगाहट उत्तर प्रदेश की जगमगाहट नहीं है वह दिल्ली की जगमगाहट है उसी तरह से उसकी जगमगाहट अपनी नहीं है दिल्ली की जगमगाहट है। फरीदाबाद का जो इलाका दिल्ली के साथ लगा हुआ है उसकी जगमगाहट को देख कर आप यह न समझें कि यह हरियाणा की जगमगाहट है बल्कि वह दिल्ली की जगमगाहट है। अगर आपने हरियाणा की जगमगाहट को देखना हो तो हिसार में जा कर देखो। लोग सभा को महसूस करना चाहिये कि वह सूबा किस कद्र हमारी मदद की ज़रूरत महसूस करता है और उसकी मदद हमको करनी चाहिये। जो थोड़ा-सा समय मिला है उसमें हमें साबित करना चाहिये कि हरियाणा के विकास के लिए हम सब लोग बड़े चिन्तित हैं और सही मानों में हम उनकी मदद करें। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि जो डैम वाली बात मैंने कही है उसके लिए अगले बजट में रुपया रखा जाएगा और अड़ोस-पड़ोस के सूबों की जो ग्रिड है उस ग्रिड को दो तीन महीनों में हम चारों तरफ से मिला देंगे।

**SHRI D. C. SHARMA (Gurdaspur):**  
Sir, my first duty is to pay my humble tribute to Mr. B. N. Chakravarty, the Governor of Haryana, who thought boldly, acted boldly and executed his plan boldly. It is because, whatever you might say of Haryana or any other State of India, Haryana had become notorious for having become a mockery of democracy. Democracy had become there, if I may be permitted to say so, a saleable commodity. Democracy had become there a commodity which was out for sale. I have never seen democracy in such a worst form as I saw in Haryana during the last so many

months. As a democrat, hang my head down in shame when I contemplate what was happening in Haryana during those days. It is, therefore, that I offer my congratulations to the Governor of Haryana for acting boldly and for saving Indian democracy.

My second point is this. Haryana has produced great men. Who says that Haryana is a backward area? If anybody says that to me, I would say to him that he does not know the history of Haryana. Haryana produced Sir Chotu Ram; if he had been alive, India would not have been divided. Haryana produced Sir Manoharlal who was the Finance Minister of Punjab at one time. Haryana produced Shri Shadilal, who was the Chief Justice of the Punjab High Court. Haryana produced Lala R. Lajpat Rai, our great leader. Haryana produced Shri Chajju Ram, a big industrialist, in whose memory a college has been started in Hissar now. Haryana produced Dr. Gopichand Bhargava, who was Chief Minister of the United Punjab. Haryana produced Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, whom I look upon as my political guru. My political guru got nothing out of this Government and I am also not going to get anything from this Government. So, Haryana has produced great men.

Who can deny that the Haryana farmer is one of the best farmers in India? Who can deny that Haryana warriors and soldiers have been the guardians of India's unity, security and national defence?

But sometimes great things fall into unworthy hands. Those unworthy hands do not understand Haryana. My friend, Shri Shashi Bhushan was talking about Harijans. Sir, Haryana is the paradise of casteism. There are jats and even among jats there are sub-castes. No jat will go to another jat who does not belong to his *gotra*. There are *vaisyas*, who are good businessmen. Then there are some impoverished brahmins like me. Then there are the underdogs of this country, the Harijans. When shall we be able to have an amalgamation of these four communities in

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

Haryana? When shall the jats, the vaisyas, the brahmins and the harijans walk hand in hand? That is my problem.

My hon. friend opposite was saying that the days of the Congress are over. He has just come here by a freak of fate and he should not make such prophesies. To make prophesies is the function of a brahmin. Sir, Congress is the only bridge between the rich and the poor. The moment you destroy this bridge, the rich will live in their palaces and the poor will live in their huts and hovels. Therefore, it is necessary that the Congress party should be preserved and allowed to function in this country, as long as this country does not attain a sizeable per capita income.

My friend said, it will take 50 years for Haryana to develop. I repudiate this suggestion. Haryana will come into its own as long as it gets good government, good ministers, good people to run it. Haryana is not devoid of talent or of administrative skill.

Sir, I forgot to pay my compliment to Swarni Swatantra Nandji Maharaj. He belongs to my constituency. I do not know how this intruder happened to go there. I do not know how he gate-crashed into that Mat. That Dayanand Mat is my Mat. It belongs to me, it belongs to my constituency. But what can I do? Shri Sashi Bhushan will go anywhere. He can even take possession of my house if he likes. Nobody can withstand him.

Therefore, I say that Haryana should be made safe for democracy, safe for good government, safe for economic development. As my hon. friend said, all those schemes should be undertaken which are necessary for the economic improvement of this State.

Some people say that Haryana and Punjab will become one. Do not live in this kind of wishful thinking. Some others will say that Pakistan and India will become one. Are we to believe it? Do you mean to say that a State which has been established once will

ever agree to be merged with another State? No. Haryana will go on as long as India goes on, and I will be very happy if it goes on. But I want it to live in a state of economic self-sufficiency.

My hon. friend over there said, do not do something to Delhi. What has Delhi get to do with Haryana. When my friend, Shri Randhir Singh was saying something about Delhi, he said do not touch Delhi, as if he is the master of Delhi.

SHRI SRICHAND GOEL: People have voted in our favour. Do not forget that. They have rejected you.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA: 30 lakhs of people are the masters of Delhi and not Shri Sri Chand Goel who represents only 30,000 people. Therefore, I say that Delhi has nothing to do with it. He was asking, why do you have a committee of 45 persons. My hon. friend is very new to this House and he has come from a pocket constituency. He does not know. If he had studied Patiala, Pepsu etc., he would have known (Interruption).

I submit, Sir, this is the pattern which we have been following in some other States where we established the President's Rule. We have always constituted a representative committee of people so that they can act as an advisory committee to the Government.

It is only for six months. I do not say, as my friend suggested, that it should go on for two years. Then let there be elections after six months and let us see what happens. I am sure Haryana will definitely choose the Congress.

17.45 hrs.

#### MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report the following messages received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:—

- (i) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and

Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1967, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 21st December, 1967, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."

- (ii) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1967, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 21st December, 1967, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."
- (iii) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Manipur Appropriation Bill, 1967, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 21st December, 1967, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."
- (iv) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Haryana Appropriation Bill, 1967, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 21st December, 1967, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this

House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."

- (v) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill, 1967, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 21st December, 1967, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."
- (vi) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 22nd December, 1967, agreed without any amendment to the Official Languages (Amendment) Bill, 1967, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 16th December, 1967."

17.47 hrs.

HARYANA STATE LEGISLATURE  
(DELEGATION OF POWERS) BILL  
—Contd.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwash) : Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the speeches from the Congress benches and some members from the opposition. While my hon. friend Shri Shrichand Goel of the Jan Sangh ably argued why this power should not be delegated to the President, I am sorry to note that no Congress member advanced any argument, at least any convincing argument, in favour of passing this Bill.

One of the previous speakers here spoke about the merger of Haryana either with UP or Delhi. I am not going to enter into that controversy. It is the will of the people and it should be

[Shri G. Viswanathan]

left to the people of Haryana to decide whether they will remain separately or they will merge with some other State.

Nobody will welcome President's Rule in any State, because President's Rule is the complete negation of democracy.

**SHRI KAMALNAYAN BAJAJ :** It is not against democracy. It is provided in the Constitution.

**SHRI AMRIT NAHATA :** You wanted President's Rule in Bengal yesterday ?

**SHRI RANDHIR SINGH :** But yesterday is not today.

**SHRI G. VISWANATHAN :** Where the Assembly is dissolved, the peoples' verdict is also dissolved. It is the case generally, but I take Haryana as a special case. I shed no tears over the dismissal of the Rao Birendra Singh Ministry. My hon. friend, Shri Randhir Singh spoke about the valiant soldiers and heroic farmers. I congratulate them. But, at the same time, according to Professor Sharma, Haryana has become notorious. It has not only become notorious, it has become the motherland of defectors and the birthplace of turncoats. For that we have to condemn, not the people but the elected representatives of Haryana. They have made the whole of democracy a mockery.

For that what is the remedy ? Is it the passing of the Bill ? Is the passing of the Bill going to remedy the situation in Haryana ? Certainly not. Even Shri Chakravarty, the Governor of Haryana, has suggested that President's Rule shall be "for a spell of a brief period" to quote his own words. So, the mid-term poll should be there as soon as possible, as early as possible. If the Congress benches are going to agree to the suggestion of the Governor, that there should be mid-term election as early as possible, what is the necessity of this Bill ? If there is going to be election very soon, then there is no necessity for this Bill.

The Bill provides for consultative or advisory committees. We know how the advisory committee is going to function. We have the experience of an advisory committee in Kerala. The Law Minister knows that much better. It was not at all functioning well. It was not at all effective in its working. It was often complained in this House that nobody took serious notice of the consultative committee on Kerala and the decisions of that committee were not implemented by the bureaucrats. Even though Shri Randhir Singh happens to be a Congress member, I agree with him when he speaks at length of the feelings of the people there. The people of Haryana should not be left at the mercy of the bureaucrats. Election should be held as early as possible and there must be an elected government in Haryana.

This Bill says :

"Provided that before enacting any such Act the President shall, whenever he considers it practicable to do so, consult the Committee."

The President may not think it practicable and may not consult it at all. They have put the word "shall" but after putting the word "shall" they have said, "whenever he considers it practicable". These words should be deleted. The President must be obliged to consult the Committee and it must be made mandatory. So, I request the Minister, even if this Bill is passed, that they must delete the words "whenever he considers it practicable to do so", so that the President will be obliged to consult the Committee before enacting any Act.

Here, the Swatantra and the Jana Sangh on the one side and the Congress on the other challenge each other. I have no axe to grind in Haryana. We do not have branches of the DMK in Haryana. So, I am neutral as far as Haryana is concerned. But both of them are anxious to fight the election. That I can understand. So, let us have a trial of strength; let us face the battle

of the ballot as early as possible. Even the Congress people are agreed on that point. So, the whole House is agreeable to an election as early as possible and there is no necessity for this Bill at all. That is my opinion.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Sheo Narain,

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli) : Today being the last day much time should be given to Shri Sheo Narain.

श्री शिवनारायण (बस्ती) : सभापति महोदय, हरियाणा वह स्थान है, जिसने हम को गीता दी, जो भगवान कृष्ण की तपोभूमि रहा है। मैं आज गोयल साहब और चौधरी रणधीर सिंह से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अपने पुराने इतिहास को मत भूलो, अपने बाप-दादाओं की कमाई को मत भूलो, लेकिन मैं शशि भूषण का अनुगृहीत हूँ—वहाँ हरिजनों के साथ अभी भी जुल्मो-सितम हो रहा है। लेकिन सभापति महोदय, हम आशावान हैं, निराशावान नहीं हैं। मैं इस सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ और हरियाणा की जनता से अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ पर जल्द से जल्द चुनाव हों और जितने डिफ़रेंस हैं उनको अच्छा सबक सिखाया जाय, चाहे वे कांग्रेसवाले हों या नान-कांग्रेसवाले हों। मैं वहाँ की जनता से कहना चाहता हूँ कि उनमें से किसी को असेम्बली में रिटर्न न करो, तभी हरियाणा की जबरदस्त इज्जत होगी।

मैं वहाँ के गवर्नर को जरूर धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि जिसने अपने अधिकार का सही मायनों में, सही ढंग से इस्तेमाल किया—आयारामों और गयारामों को उसने चेक किया—उसके लिये मैं उसको बधाई देना चाहता हूँ। मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब से भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपकी नजर हरियाणा पर होनी चाहिये—यह हिन्दुस्तान के सन 1967 के इलेक्शन का टैस्ट है—हम तो 20 साल में जाकर करप्ट हुए लेकिन ये लोग तो 6 महीने में ही करप्ट हो

गये, 6 महीने में ही इतर-बितर हो गये। गोयल साहब जरा ठण्डे दिल से सोचो, क्यों दिल्ली के साथ खिलवाड़ कर रहे हो, आज जहाँ जाओ—रिक्शावाले, मोटरवाले कहते हैं—हाय, हाय, तोबा तोबा। मैं उन शब्दों का इस्तेमाल नहीं करना चाहता हूँ, जिनका वे लोग इस्तेमाल करते हैं।

प्रो० शेर सिंह साहब यहाँ बैठे हैं, आप एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर हैं, मैं आपसे अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि जरा वहाँ के टीचर्स का ध्यान करो। आप भी टीचर रहे हैं और मैं भी टीचर रहा हूँ, आपको उनके साथ हमदर्दी होनी चाहिये। उन अध्यापकों की मांगों को इग्नोर करके, तुम हरियाणा में कृष्ण पैदा नहीं कर सकते, तुम उस गीता के पंडित पैदा नहीं कर सकते, अगर उनको सुखी नहीं बनाया, अगर उनको खाना, कपड़ा और रहने को मकान नहीं दिया। तुमको भी गुरु द्रोणाचार्य हरियाणा में मिल सकते हैं, यदि इन अध्यापकों की कठिनाइयों को दूर करो। इस लिये मैं प्रोफेसर साहब से अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि आप इस तरह विशेष रूप से ध्यान दें।

मैं चौधरी रणधीर सिंह की तरह से कमजोर नहीं हूँ। मैं ओपन चैलेन्ज देता हूँ—गोयल साहब को, कल हो जायें चुनाव हरियाणा में, हम आपको हरायेंगे.....

श्री श्रीबन्ध गोयल : हमें आपका चैलेन्ज मन्जूर है, आप हरियाणा में चुनाव तो कराओ।

श्री शिवनारायण : हरियाणा की जनता इन आयारामों और गयारामों को छोटने की तैयारी कर रही है। जैसा मेरे मित्र ने कहा—वहाँ की जनता दुखी है, वहाँ का किसान दुखी है—मैं सरकार से अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि इन आई० सी० एस० वालों से निजात दिलाओ, इस साहबी ठाठ ने ही हमारी कबर खोदी है। सारे देश में इन लोगों ने बड़ी तैयारी की थी—जनसंघ

से मिल गये, कम्प्यूनिस्टों से मिल गये, सरकारों को बदलने की कोशिश की। मुझ से एक अफसर ने कहा—तेरा राज कब लौटनेवाला है उत्तर प्रदेश में। मैंने कहा।—अच्छा काका, तुम ने तो हमारे खिलाफ़ खूब ठप्पा लगवाया था, अब भोगो बेटे। मैं अपने मेरठवाले जवान मित्र से कहना चाहता हूँ कि 26 पेज की मेरी स्पीच थी और हमारे कमला पति जी की स्पीच थी, उन्होंने कहा था कि हम सत्तू खा कर रहेंगे लेकिन उत्तर प्रदेश को बंटने नहीं देंगे। मैंने कहा था कि जब तक पं० पंत जिन्दा हैं, हमारा सूबा बंट नहीं सकता.....

एक माननीय सदस्य : श्री चरण सिंह बांटना चाहते हैं.....

श्री शिवनारायण : चरण सिंह क्या है, दुई कौड़ी के, पता चल जायगा। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि 45 मेम्बरों की जो यह समिति बनाई जा रही है—इसका बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण स्थान है। गोयल साहब, जरा इसके कांस्टीचूशनल प्वाइन्ट को समझो। मैं भी ला का स्टूडेंट हूँ, जरा खिलवाड़ न कीजिये। इससे बढ़िया काम गवर्नमेन्ट क्या कर सकती है। फिलहाल सलाह देने के लिये 30 लोक सभा के और 15 राज्य सभा के सदस्यों की यह जो कमेटी बनाई जा रही है, ये सारे जनता द्वारा चुने हुए प्रतिनिधि हैं और क्रीम आफ़ बी सोसायटी हैं, बैस्ट जीनियस हैं—उनसे गवर्नमेन्ट ने सलाह लेना शुरू किया है। जिस किस्म की हुल्लड़बाजी ये लोग करते हैं, कम से कम वैसी हुल्लड़बाजी तो नहीं होगी।

सभापति महोदय, डा० ईश्वरी प्रसाद मेरे प्रोफेसर थे। उन्होंने कहा कि तुम बड़े भाग्यवान हो, जो तुम पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर चुने गये हो, तुम जनता के चुने हुए प्रतिनिधि हो। इस लिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिन 45 आदमियों को सरकार ने नोमिनेट किया है, यह कोई अनुचित बात

नहीं है, यह बहुत मुनासिब है और इसमें होम मिनिस्टर साहब की सिन्सीयरिटी दिखाई देती है। उन्होंने एक को डिप्टेटर नहीं बनाया है, सिर्फ़ गवर्नर के ही हाथ में शासन नहीं दिया है। कौन कहता है कि तुम डिस्ट्रिक्ट मैजिस्ट्रेट के यहां हाथ जोड़े खड़े रहो, इन 45 मेम्बरों या होम मिनिस्टर साहब को अपनी दिक्कत बताओ। हरियाणा के किसानों के साथ मेरी पूरी हमदर्दी है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार उनके लिये पानी का प्रबन्ध करे, उन को खाना, कपड़ा और मकान दे, उनको पैदावार की हर तरह की सुविधायें दे। आज हम विदेशों में भीख मांगने जाते हैं, बाउल ले कर अमरीका जाते हैं, रूस जाते हैं, लेकिन मैं सरकार से अपील करना चाहता हूँ:—

पानी राखो पात्र में, बिन पानी सब चून, पानी गये न ऊबरे, मोती मानस, चून। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि वहां पर खेती के लिये उचित प्रबन्ध करो, हरियाणा को हर प्रकार की सुविधा दो, क्योंकि वह हमारा प्रोटैक्टर है।

जिस दिन यहां पर हरियाणा और पंजाब के विभाजन का फैसला हुआ था—उस दिन यह समझा गया था कि यह एक अच्छा डिजिज़न हुआ है, लेकिन एक छोटा काम हुआ, अच्छा काम नहीं हुआ। मैं हरियाणा और पंजाब दोनों से अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि दोनों गले मिल कर एक हो जाओ, ताकि 9-9 एम्पीज का सूबा न रहे। अगर बड़े रहोगे तो बड़े काम कर पाओगे, लेकिन छोटे रहोगे तो छोटे ही काम कर पाओगे, जिसका नमूना अभी देखने को मिला। राव वीरेन्द्र सिंह बिलकुल फेल्योर चीफ़ मिनिस्टर रहे, वह वहां की गवर्नमेन्ट को ठीक तरह से नहीं चला सके। मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करते हुए हरियाणा की जनता से अपील करता हूँ कि अगले चुनाव में इनमें से एक भी न लौटने पावे।

श्री रामाबतार शास्त्री (पटना) : सभा-पति महोदय, मैं आपके सम्मुख हरियाणा के सम्बन्ध में कानून बनाने का जो अधिका-र राष्ट्रपति को सौंपने का बिल पेश है, उसका विरोध करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। यों तो आप जानते हैं कि हरियाणा समेत सम्पूर्ण भारतवर्ष पर पिछले लगभग 20 वर्षों से, 15 अगस्त, 1947 से लेकर 1967 के मार्च-अप्रैल के प्रारम्भ तक पूरे हिन्दुस्तान में कांग्रेस सरकार की इजारे-दारी रही, कांग्रेस का एक-छत्र राज्य रहा और उस एक क्षत्र राज्य रहने के बावजूद 20 वर्षों में हरियाणा समेत तमाम जगहों में कांग्रेस की हुकूमतों ने हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर किसानों को जमीन देने के बजाय, मजदूरों की दिक्कतों को दूर करने के बजाय, हिन्दुस्तान को आत्मनिर्भर बनाने के बजाय, हिन्दुस्तान में जनतन्त्र की जड़ें मजबूत करने के बजाय, जनता पर हमला किया, गोलियाँ चलाई। किसानों को दबाया, मजदूरों को दबाया। इन का काला इतिहास, काला कारनामा 20 वर्ष तक जनता बड़े सब्र के साथ देखती रही। लेकिन 1967 का जब चुनाव आया तो उन्होंने देखा कि उन्होंने जो लम्बे-लम्बे वायदे किये थे, जम्बी-लम्बी बातें कही थीं कि वह बाघ मारेंगे, वह सिंह मारेंगे, उनके तमाम वायदे झूठे निकले। उन्होंने जनता को दबाया और हिन्दुस्तान में पूंजीवाद को विकसित किया। उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान में जनतंत्र को कमजोर किया इस बात को जनता ने अपने अनुभव से सीखा और उस चुनाव को आधार बना कर 1967 के चुनाव में हरियाणा समेत 9 सूबों में से कांग्रेसी राज्य का खात्मा किया, कांग्रेस की इजारेदारी को खत्म किया, कांग्रेस के एकछत्र राज्य को खत्म किया।

18 hrs.

1957-58 में पूरे हिन्दुस्तान में कांग्रेस का एकछत्र राज्य था, कांग्रेस की शासन व्य-

वस्था यहां पर थी। उस समय केवल एक केरल राज्य ने उनके अन्दर सुराख किया। उनकी इजारेदारी को तोड़ने की कोशिश की। लेकिन उन कांग्रेसी शासकों ने जो जनतंत्र का दम भरते हैं लेकिन दिन रात उसका विरोध करते हैं, उस सरकार को तमाम प्रतिगामी और देशविरोधी शक्तियों से एकता करके खत्म किया। लेकिन 1967 आखिर 1967 ही है। इसलिए सन् 57 की बात 1967 में नहीं चल सकती। सन् 1967 में हिन्दुस्तान के 9 सूबों में कांग्रेस विरोधी सरकारें बनीं, बंगाल के अन्दर, केरल के अन्दर, हरियाणा के अन्दर पंजाब के अन्दर, बिहार के अन्दर और उत्तर प्रदेश के अन्दर, इन तमाम क्षेत्रों में, इन तमाम राज्यों में गैर कांग्रेसी सरकारें बनीं। आप जानते हैं सभापति महोदय कि पिछले चुनाव में कांग्रेस को केवल 36 फ्रीसदी वोट मिले, 64 फ्रीसदी वोट कांग्रेस विरोधी शक्तियों को मिले और उन्हीं लोगों ने मिल कर इन 9 सूबों में संयुक्त गैर कांग्रेसी सरकारों की स्थापना की। यह दुःख की बात है कि 36 फ्रीसदी वोट पाने वाली कांग्रेस आज हमारे देश के सीने पर बैठी हुई है और जबरदस्ती बैठ कर हिन्दुस्तान में जनतंत्र को दफना रही है, जनतंत्र को खत्म कर रही है। यह स्थिति आज बनी है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब 9 सूबों में गैर कांग्रेसी सरकारें बनीं, केरल के अन्दर, बंगाल के अन्दर, बिहार के अन्दर और उत्तर प्रदेश आदि के अन्दर और पूंजीपतियों पर, सरमायेदारों पर, जमींदारों पर और जमीन मालिकों पर जब चोट पड़ने लगी तो उन लोगों ने गुहार मचाया, हल्ला मचाया। कांग्रेसी आकाशों को आवाज दी कि आइये हमें बचाइये, हमारी रक्षा कीजिये वरना हम खत्म हो जायेंगे। उसी समय से इन लोगों ने जो जनतंत्र विरोधी हैं, जो जनतंत्र को दफनाना चाहते हैं और देश के अन्दर फासिस्ट ताकतों को बढ़ावा देना चाहते हैं। गैर कांग्रेसी सरकारों को

तोड़ने की चाल अपनाई, नीति अपनाई और उसके परिणामस्वरूप हरियाणा की सरकार को उलटा गया जबकि वहाँ गैर-कांग्रेसी सरकार बनाने वालों का बहुमत था। बंगाल में क्या किया गया ? आप का सूबा है, आप जानते हैं कि आज वहाँ क्या और किस तरीके से अत्याचार चल रहा है। पंजाब में क्या हुआ आप जानते हैं। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कल हमारे इस सदन के अन्दर गृह-कार्य मंत्री ने यह बतलाया था, कि अगर बंगाल के लोग विरोधी दल के लोग असेम्बली बुलाने का तैयार हो जायें तो हम उनके साथ सहयोग करेंगे। लेकिन यह तो नहीं होना चाहिये कि वहाँ के लिए एक नीति रखें और हरियाणा के लिए दूसरी नीति रखें। हरियाणा में क्या बात थी ? हरियाणा के अन्दर राव वीरेन्द्र सिंह के मंत्रिमंडल को बहुमत प्राप्त था। तो यह आपको कैसे मालूम हो गया कि उनका बहुमत नहीं रहा ? आचाराम और गयाराम के आधार पर आपने इस तरीके से एक ऐसी नीति अपनाई। आपका फर्ज था कि आप पहले वहाँ असेम्बली को बुलाते। अगर आप ईमानदार हैं तो बंगाल में जो बात आप करना चाहते हैं अभी हरियाणा में भी वही कीजिये। पुरानी असेम्बली बुलाइये और उसमें अपनी ताकत की अजमाइश कीजिये। कि आपकी ताकत है या गैर कांग्रेसी सरकार की ताकत है ? यह आप करना नहीं चाहते और आपका स्वार्थ यही है कि वहाँ की सरकार को खत्म करके राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करो। बंगाल के अन्दर आपकी नीति वह नहीं है और आपने दल-बदल करने वालों को मिला करके वहाँ के अंग्रेज मालिकों की हिफाजत में अंग्रेजी पूंजीपतियों की हिफाजत के लिये बड़े बड़े लोगों की हिफाजत के लिए वहाँ की सरकार को नहीं चाहते थे। संयुक्त मोर्चे की सरकार को, अजय मुखर्जी की सरकार को आप नहीं चाहते थे। इसीलिये आप ने वहाँ 16-17 की तादाद में रहने वाले आचाराम और गयाराम लोगों की सरकार बनाई।

वहाँ क्या स्टैंडर्ड है ? हरियाणा में एक है, बंगाल में दूसरा और पंजाब में तीसरा है। पंजाब में भी आपने क्या किया ? अगर आप जनतंत्र के प्रेमी हैं तो आपकी नीति सब जगह एक होनी चाहिये। इन पूंजीपतियों की हिफाजत के लिए, हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर पूंजीवाद के विकास के लिये, जनता के आन्दोलनों को कुचलने के लिये, किसानों को बेजमान रखने के लिये आप तरह-तरह की नीतियाँ अपना रहे हैं। बिहार में आप क्या कर रहे हैं ? मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज आप अलग-अलग जगहों के लिए अलग-अलग नीतियाँ अपना रहे हैं, हरियाणा में दूसरी, बंगाल में तीसरी, पंजाब में चौथी और बिहार में पाँचवीं।

बिहार में क्या स्थिति है ? आप जानते हैं कि बिहार में आपने शोषित दल के नाम से एक ऐसा दल पैदा करवाया। आप सीधे नहीं आ सकते थे शासन में। जनता आपको नहीं पसन्द करती। जनता आपसे घृणा करती है, जनता आपसे नफरत करती है। कांग्रेस का नाम सुन कर के उसका दिमाग नाराज हो जाता है। क्रोध से जनता पागल हो उठती है। इसलिये अपने शोषित दल को शिखंडी बना कर और उस शिखंडी को आगे चढ़ा कर अब आप अपनी सरकार वहाँ भी कायम करना चाहते हैं और वहाँ इस तरीके की नीति अपना कर के वहाँ की सरकार को फिर उलटना चाहते हैं। लेकिन केरल में आपको कोई शिखंडी नहीं मिल सकता। केरल की जनता बहुत आगे है। केरल की महान जनता, बहादुर जनता, चेतना वाली जनता, जिसकी बगल चेतना आगे स्तर पर बढ़ी हुई है वहाँ, आप यह काम नहीं कर सकते लेकिन जहाँ बहुत पिछड़ापन है, जहाँ राजनैतिक चेतना कम है, वहाँ इस तरीके की बात आप कर रहे हैं। इसलिये मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर जनतंत्र के आप प्रेमी हैं, जनतंत्र को बचाना चाहते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान को फासिज्म



की मोद में नहीं ठकेलना चाहते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर हमारी महान सभ्यता, संस्कृति को, किसानों को और मजदूरों को आगे बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तो आपका यह फर्ज है कि आप जितने गैर जनतांत्रिक तरीके अपना रहे हैं उनको खत्म कीजिये। हरियाणा में भी वही कीजिये। वहाँ की जनता को मौका दीजिये। वहाँ की असेम्बली को मौका दीजिये।

वहाँ कैसी शासन व्यवस्था होगी; आपको पसन्द न हो लेकिन वहाँ जनता तय करे इसलिये फौरन वहाँ चुनाव करवायें और फैसला हो जाय कि किसके साथ जनता है मैं अपने भाई शिव नारायण जी से भी यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आइये, आन्दोलन कीजिये, चुनाव जल्दी हो। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का विरोध करता हूँ।

**श्री भोलानाथ (अलवर) :** सभापति, महोदय, हरियाणा का जिक्र कल से शुरू हुआ है। हरियाणा, राजस्थान के बोरडर पर राजस्थान की सीमा पर, राजस्थान के बहुत से हिस्सों में घुसा हुआ है। इसलिये राजस्थान के लोग भी जो हरियाणा में गतिविधि चलती है या राजस्थान में जो गतिविधि चलती है उसको हरियाणा वाले बराबर पूरी दिलचस्पी से देखते हैं और उनकी दिलचस्पी केवल इस बात में नहीं है कि वहाँ का राजनीतिक वातावरण क्या रहता है बल्कि इस बात में भी दिलचस्पी है कि वहाँ के विकास का कार्य किस प्रकार से चलता है ?

कल साहिबी नदी का जिक्र आया था। यह कहा गया है कि राजस्थान और खास तौर से अलवर जिला जो हरियाणा से मिलता है और गुड़गांव का बहुत सा हिस्सा मिलता है, उसका पानी हरियाणा में आता है और फिर हरियाणा से दिल्ली में आता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसी बात नहीं होनी चाहिये कि राजस्थान वाले भी दुःख पायें, हरि-

याणा वाले भी पायें और सारा विकास का काम जो चलना चाहिये वह रुक जाए और राष्ट्रपति के शासन का जो समय है वह बेकार चला जाए। प्रजातंत्र का जो इन्स्टीट्यूशन है उसके द्वारा समय-समय पर जनता के प्रिवेंसिस को, जनता की शिकायतों को, जनता के अभाव अभियोगों को आप के सम्मुख जनता के चुने हुए प्रतिनिधियों द्वारा रखा जाता है। अगर उससे कोई महसूस रहे तो विकास का जो समय गुजरता है वह गुजरता ही चला जाएगा। यह बहुत आवश्यक है कि राष्ट्रपति के आदेशों के अनुसार जो सलाहकार समिति बनाई जा रही है उसका हम पूरा समर्थन करें।

दस मास तक राव वीरेन्द्र सिंह की हकूमत रही। सारा हिन्दुस्तान जानता है और मैं भी हरियाणा का पड़ोसी होने के नाते जानता हूँ कि किस तरह से वह हकूमत रही है। आया राम और गया राम की बात तो सब जानते हैं। लेकिन ज्यों ही उन्होंने शासन सम्भाला राव साहब ट्रकों को ले आते थे और स्कूलों का जो फर्नीचर होता था उसको उनमें भर कर ले जाते थे और उन स्कूलों को वह बन्द करवा देते थे। जहाँ पहले निहास सिंह जी ने स्कूल खोले और हम से मिल कर के बात करके खोले उन स्कूलों को बन्द करने के लिये राव वीरेन्द्र सिंह ट्रकों अपने साथ ले जाते थे और उनका फर्नीचर तक उठा लाते थे और स्कूलों को उन्होंने बन्द करवा दिया। सरपंचों ने इस तरह के स्कूलों के नाम हम लोगों के सामने रखे हैं और उन्होंने कहा है कि कैसी यह सरकार है, दिल्ली की सरकार के नजदीक ही हरियाणा लगता है लेकिन फिर भी दिल्ली की सरकार इतने जुल्म और ज्यादतियों होने दे रही है। आपस में अगर पोलिटिकल डिफ्रेंसिस है, राजनीतिक मतभेद हैं तो इसका अर्थ यह नहीं है कि विकास के कामों को रोक दिया जाय। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इसकी ओर ध्यान दें।

कज हमारी डा० के० एल० राव साहब से बात हुई थी। दिल्ली में सरप्लस बिजली है और उस सरप्लस बिजली को अलवर होते हुए राजस्थान में जयपुर तक बढ़ाने की बात थी। लेकिन राव साहब राव बीरेन्द्र सिंह से इतने डरे हुए थे कि यह जो सरप्लस बिजली है यह दिल्ली के अंदर बेकार थी लेकिन उनकी हिम्मत नहीं होती थी कि यहां से हाई टेंशन लाइज को हरियाणा के क्षेत्र में से होकर राजस्थान तक पहुंचाने के लिए उनसे कहें। हाई टेंशन लाइज को बिछा देने के लिए न हरियाणा के पास इंतजाम है और न हरियाणा की सरकार उसको समर्थन देती है और इस कारण से राजस्थान सरकार सुस्ती की तरफ जा रही थी। राजस्थान जो न केवल मवेशियों के कारण प्रसिद्ध है, दूध के कारण भी मशहूर है, बैलों और सांड़ों के लिए भी मशहूर है, वहां पर अगर बिजली पहुंच जाती है तो बहुत से कुओं को बिजली मिल सकती थी और सिंचाई की व्यवस्था हो जाने से पैदावार बढ़ सकती थी। लेकिन वहां पर बिजली का इंतजाम नहीं हो पा रहा है। हरियाणा का विकास न होने के कारण राजस्थान के ऊपर भी बहुत बुरा उसका असर पड़ा। हाई टेंशन लाइज को न बिछाने के लिए कई तरह के बहाने किये गये। कहा गया कि हाई टेंशन के खम्भे इसलिये नहीं गाड़े जा रहे हैं कि नदियों के बहाव को रोकने में हरियाणा असमर्थ है, हाई टेंशन लाइज के खम्भे गाड़े गए तो बहुत भारी खर्चा आएगा और शायद लाइन टूट जाएगी। इस तरह के बहानों से सारे विकास के कामों को रोका गया। इसका असर राजस्थान पर भी पड़ा।

विकास के कार्यों को पूरा करने के लिये बहुत आवश्यक है कि हम एक यह समिति बनायें जो बराबर वहां के विकास कार्यों की देखरेख करे जब तक कि वहां चुनाव नहीं हो जाते हैं। राष्ट्रपति शासन में विकास कार्यों को रोक कर प्रजा को दंड नहीं दिया जाना

चाहिये। आया राम और गया राम को आप सजा दें। जो डिफैक्टुजं थे उनको आप सजा दें। एम० एल० एज० को जो अपने-अपने घरों में बैठ गए हैं उनको आप सजा दें। लेकिन विकास के कार्यों में आप किसी तरह की बाधा उपस्थित न होने दें। राष्ट्रपति के पास शक्ति आई है। गवर्नर बैठे हुए हैं। उनके साथ एडवाइजर लगे हुए हैं। उनका कर्तव्य है कि हरियाणा के विकास के लिए सक्रिय कदम उठाएं। आपसी लड़ाई के कारण स्कूल जैसी चीजें भी बंद हो गई थीं। उनकी तरफ आप ध्यान दें। विकास के कार्यों को जो श्रम आपके हाथ में आ गए हैं आप तेज करें।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का हादिक समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA (Cut-tack) : While opposing this motion, I will first of all make a reference to the circumstances under which this Bill has been introduced and is now under consideration. The Proclamation promulgated by the President was on the report of the Governor. It has been contended by some members here that the President found on a report from the Governor that there was a breakdown of the constitutional machinery. What was the report? It was that 40 members were supporting the Ministry in a House of 73. So it had the support of the majority. Still it was found that the allegiance of the members was very suspicious. On a suspicion of defection, the Legislature was dissolved and the Ministry dismissed. This brings in a new factor into our constitutional set-up. The position in West Bengal is different. There the constitutional machinery has come to a standstill by some ruling of the Speaker, by something that has happened there. The legal brains of the country are now being exercised in finding out whether there is a way out or not. But in Haryana on a suspicion of defection, the Legislature has been dissolved. Can suspicion be an element in this affair? Suspicion of whom? Of the Governor.

The Governor is a creature of the Home Ministry. There is no doubt about it.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA : No.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : On that the President takes a decision. The decision taken by the President is that of the Home Ministry here. So on a suspicion by the Home Ministry that there will be defections, or to put it in another way, there is defection potential, dissolution of the Haryana Assembly is ordered. May I ask : is the defection potential everywhere in all these Assemblies and here in this House also any the less ? Can the President or the Home Ministry say that the defection potential in such and such Assembly having become greater, therefore it will be dissolved ? That brings in a subjective element which cannot be verified by anybody. So my submission is that the dissolution of the Assembly was not based on correct constitutional principles.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA : Report of the Governor.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : I will come to that.

The condition of Haryana has to be seen to find out under what circumstances this bit of legislation is being introduced. In Haryana, there are contending parties. Legislators have been crossing the floor five times and six times. A new party has now started functioning there. Election is in the offing. So the parties must be trying to get hold of something, or some office, to get advantage to cut other parties down to size. Under these circumstances, powers have been assumed by the President under art. 356. Under the Constitution, the power of making laws for the State has been assumed by him on behalf of Parliament. This legislation has been introduced to delegate that power to the President under art. 356.

This raises the question : are the Government very sincere in their profession that election will be held soon ?

If that is so, if election is going to be held, I am not concerned with whatever be the result. Of course, the hon. Member, Prof. Sharma, said that the Congress should be preserved. Let the Congress come, let the Jan Sangh come; let any party come. But is the election going to be held soon ? If that is so, is there any necessity for bringing this Legislation ? It appears, there is a suspicion at least, that the Government intends to put off the mid-term election in Haryana for a long time. However, when there is a declaration, some arrangement has to be made. Either Parliament should pass legislation for Haryana or the power has to be delegated to the President.

I will not refer to the heroic deeds of the past and the present soldiers of Haryana, the glory of the farmers of Haryana, its bullocks and bulls, its production, but I will refer certainly to Mr. Sharma's statement that Haryana has produced great men. On this particular occasion, as has been agreed by everybody, Haryana did not return great men, it returned some persons who crossed the floor and betrayed the faith placed in them by the electors. With all my respect to the people of Haryana, I am sorry that the persons elected by them made the Government there unstable.

What are the temptations now ? Both sides are attempting to be in power. We have seen the attempts in Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Bengal, Bihar and U.P. Constant attempt is going on. If the power is given to the President, the Home Minister will exercise it. Being party men, when the temptation is so great, even if they do not interfere, they are liable to be accused of having interfered in the elections or manoeuvring in the State. Do the people who man the Home Ministry feel strong enough to check this temptation ?

An example of this temptation has been evident in this House, when an hon. member said that the Congress must be preserved. Others here say that the Congress must be preserved in cold storage or in a museum. With these

[Shri Srinibas Misra]

two contrary views regarding the Congress, will the Ministers who man the Home Ministry be able to check their temptation to interfere, manoeuvre here and there, spend money for supporting a particular party? That is the question? I would appeal that they should not take upon themselves this responsibility indirectly. They should leave to Parliament if any business is to be transacted.

There has been a reference to Mr. Goel. He is a new member. I am also a new member. Let it not be said that new members are unimportant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Leave it to Mr. Goel himself.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA: I have given an amendment to this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will come later.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA: If the Government wants to take power because it is necessary for transacting business with respect to Haryana, I would request them not to take powers under List III, because that will create an anomalous situation so far as President's powers are concerned. I will speak on that while moving the amendment.

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री (बागपत) : सभापति महोदय, जब इस सदन में हरियाणा में राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करने के सम्बन्ध में चर्चा हुई थी, उस दिन भी मैंने कहा था और आज मैं उसको दोहराता हूँ कि चाहे वैधानिक बारीकियों का कुछ भी अर्थ लगाया जाये, चाहे राजनीतिक पक्ष कुछ भी कहें, लेकिन अगर जनता की दृष्टि से देखा जाए और यदि जनता की बात पूछी जाये, तो हरियाणा में राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करना जैसे जनता की मांग को पूरा करना है।

18.25 Hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair] मैं समझता हूँ कि जो राजनीतिक भ्रष्टाचार हरियाणा में चल रहा था, इसके अतिरिक्त

उसका और कोई इलाज नहीं था। हरियाणा में जो कुछ हो रहा था, वह डेमोक्रेसी के नाम पर एक कलंक था। अगर कोई राक्षस देवता का वेश बना कर आ जाये और हम से कहा जाये कि उसको प्रणाम करो, तो हमें सोचना पड़ेगा कि हम उस राक्षस को देवता कैसे समझ लें। मैं समझता हूँ कि हरियाणा में यही हो रहा था।

अगर वहाँ पर एसेम्बली भी बुलाई जाती, जैसाकि आमतौर से कहा जाता है, तो वहाँ पर ऐसी स्थिति उत्पन्न हो जाती कि उसमें शाम को एक निश्चय होता और दूसरी सुबह उस निश्चय को बदल दिया जाता, क्योंकि जो सदस्य शाम को एक तरफ़ वोट देते, वे दूसरी सुबह दूसरी तरफ़ वोट देते और फिर छः महीने के लिए छुट्टी हो जाती। इसलिए एसेम्बली बुलाना कोई इलाज नहीं था।

मैं इस बात से सहमत हूँ कि गव वीरेन्द्रसिंह जिस रास्ते पर चल रहे थे, उसकी जितनी भी निन्दा की जाये, वह थोड़ी है। परन्तु मैं कांग्रेसी सदस्यों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर वे अपने गरेवान में मुँह डाल कर देखें, तो वे इस परिणाम पर पहुंचेंगे कि राव वीरेन्द्रसिंह मिनिस्ट्री की आलोचना करना उन्हें शोभा नहीं देता है। राव वीरेन्द्रसिंह तो संयुक्त मोर्चे के चीफ़ मिनिस्टर थे, लेकिन उन से पहले कांग्रेस के चीफ़ मिनिस्टर के क्या कारनामे रहे? आज कांग्रेसी सदस्यों में यह हिम्मत होनी चाहिए कि अगर वे राव वीरेन्द्रसिंह की बुराई करें, तो उसके साथ ही वे भगवतदयाल के कामों को भी देखें। अगर केन्द्रीय सरकार और कांग्रेस पार्टी यह चाहती है कि हरियाणा में जो बुरा और भ्रष्टाचारी शासन था, उसके स्थान पर एक शुद्ध, ईमानदार और कुशल व्यवस्था कायम की जाये, तो एक कमीशन बिठाया जाये, जो वहाँ के राजनीतिक भ्रष्टाचार और बेईमानी के बारे में जांच करे और हरियाणा में जितने भी बेईमान हों, चाहे वे कांग्रेसी पार्टी के हों और चाहे विरोधी पार्टियों के,

उनको जनता के सामने खड़ा करे। वहां पर स्थिति यह है कि अगर एक ने पचास लाख कमाया है, तो दूसरे ने एक करोड़ कमाया है। अगर केन्द्रीय सरकार चाहती है कि वह हरियाणा की जनता के लिए जो नई व्यवस्था कर रही है, जनता उसको उचित और अच्छी समझे, तो वह अपने कार्य से जनता के दिमाग पर यह प्रभाव डाले कि जो एक बुरा निजाम था, उसको बदल कर अब एक अच्छा निजाम आ रहा है।

हरियाणा की पवित्रता के सम्बन्ध में सभी सदस्यों ने कहा है, लेकिन कांग्रेसी शासन के माथे से इस पाप का कलंक नहीं हट सकता है कि भगवतदयाल मंत्रिमंडल ने वहां पर सब से पहले शराब खोली। अकेला यह कार्य ही हरियाणा के कांग्रेसी मंत्रिमंडल की निन्दा के लिए पर्याप्त है। क्या हरियाणा की पवित्र भूमि और पवित्र संस्कार वाले लोगों को भ्रष्टाचारी बनाने के लिए इससे बुरी और कोई हरकत हो सकती है? मैं समझता हूँ कि कांग्रेसी वेंचिज इस अकेली बात का कोई जबाब या स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दे सकते हैं।

हरियाणा की जनता को हमेशा जितना अन्याय और दुर्व्यवहार केन्द्र से मिला है, उतना और किसी से नहीं मिला है। इस लिए आज जबकि केन्द्र के हाथ में वहां की सत्ता आई है, तो हरियाणा के लोगों में सन्देश बढ़ रहे हैं। उदाहरण के लिए आप चण्डीगढ़ के प्रश्न को ले लीजिए। उसके बारे में सरकार ने एक कमीशन बिठाया। उस कमीशन ने अपना फ्रैंसला कर दिया, लेकिन अब सरकार मध्यस्थता की बात कर रही है। मध्यस्थता का क्या प्रश्न है? जब उसने एक कमीशन बिठाया और उसने अपना फ्रैंसला दे दिया, तो फिर वह बार-बार उस प्रश्न को क्यों ओपन करती है? अगर चण्डीगढ़ दूसरी तरफ़ चला जाता, तो केन्द्रीय सरकार की कुछ कहने की हिम्मत न होती। आज हरियाणा की जनता को कमजोर समझ कर मध्यस्थता की बात की जाती है। प्रधान मंत्री हों या कोई भी हों, कोई मध्यस्थ क्यों

बनाया जाये? आज मैं केन्द्र सरकार के मंत्रियों से यह आश्वासन चाहता हूँ कि वे स्पष्ट रूप से यह घोषणा करें कि जब तक हरियाणा में राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू रहेगा और जब तक वहां पर कोई जन-प्रतिनिधि सरकार स्थापित नहीं होगी तब तक चण्डीगढ़ के बारे में फ्रैंसला नहीं किया जायेगा और अगर कोई फ्रैंसला होगा, तो वह शाह कमीशन का फ्रैंसला रहेगा।

**श्री कमलनयन बजाज :** माननीय सदस्य की यह मांग वाजिब है।

**श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री :** सरकार की यह जो नीति है कि वह कमीशन बिठाती है और फिर उस कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को उलट देती है और मनमाने ढंग से काम करना चाहती है, उस से देश में कांग्रेस की साख़ खत्म हो गई है। आज महाजन कमीशन की क्या छीछालेदार हो रही है। अगर सरकार कोई कमीशन बिठाती है और वह कमीशन जनता की राय ले कर और समस्या के सब एस्पेक्ट्स को देख कर कोई रिपोर्ट देता है, तो सरकार में उस रिपोर्ट को कार्यान्वित करने की हिम्मत होनी चाहिये। सरकार को आगे के लिए फ्रैंला करना होगा कि या तो वह कोई कमीशन न बिठाए और अगर बिठाए, तो उस की बात पर अमल करे। उस को मनमाने ढंग से काम करने की नीति पर नहीं चलना चाहिए।

आज चण्डीगढ़ विश्वविद्यालय की छीछालेदार हो रही है। आज कहा जाता है कि उसमें हरियाणा का इतना भाग होना चाहिए, पंजाब का इतना भाग होना चाहिए और हिमाचल प्रदेश का इतना भाग होना चाहिए।

जब आपने चण्डीगढ़ को यूनियन टैरीटरी घोषित किया है तो चण्डीगढ़ विश्वविद्यालय को यूनियन का विश्वविद्यालय रखिए। आप क्यों एक बने बनाए विश्वविद्यालय की जो कि एक शिखा की सीट है उसकी क्यों छीछालेदार कर रहे हैं? इसलिए उसके सम्बन्ध

## [श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री]

में भी आपको यह घोषणा करनी चाहिए कि वह केन्द्र का विश्वविद्यालय रहेगा।

दूसरी बात में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अब जबकि आप जन-प्रतिनिधियों की तथाकथित सरकार को खत्म कर के अपने आप सारे अधिकार ले रहे हैं तो आपको इस प्रकार कार्य करना होगा कि हरयाणे की जनता को यह मालूम पड़े कि जन-प्रतिनिधियों की सरकार वहाँ काम कर रही है। तानाशाही से आपको वहाँ काम नहीं करना है। जैसा मैंने कहा हरयाणा को नई बातों में बड़ा दुर्व्यवहार मिलता रहा है। जैसे सविसेज की बात है, हरयाणा के लोग जब अलग होना चाहते थे तो उनकी सब से बड़ी वेदना यह थी कि हमारे लोगों को सविसेज नहीं मिलती। जब विभाजन हुआ तो विभाजन में भी बाहर से ही लोग वहाँ आये हैं और आज भी मुझे मालूम हुआ है कि पी० सी० एस० से कुछ लोग आई० सी० एस० बनाए जा रहे हैं, उसमें शायद हरयाणे का कोई आदमी नहीं है। यहाँ केन्द्रीय मिनिस्ट्रीज में भी जबकि और सब प्रान्तों के लोग हैं हरयाणा का कोई नहीं है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ आप हरयाणा से क्यों नहीं लेते ?

एक बात अंत में मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ जिसका सम्बन्ध मेरे अपने क्षेत्र से भी है कि हरयाणा की सिंचाई का जहाँ तक सम्बन्ध है भाखरा का बहुत थोड़ा पानी हरयाणा में आता है। ज्यादातर सिंचाई यमुना की नहरों से होती है। यमुना की नहरों में पानी बहुत कम हो गया है उसके लिए किसान बांध एक बहुत बड़ा बांध बनने वाला है। अब जबकि केन्द्र के हाथ में यह बात आई है तो मैं यह कहूँगा कि किसान बांध की योजना को तीव्र करना चाहिए। हरयाणा की जनता यह देखना चाहती है कि उसकी नहरों में ज्यादा से ज्यादा पानी हो जाय। अगर यह किसान बांध जल्दी से जल्दी पूरा हो जाय तो हरयाणे की जनता यह समझेगी कि केन्द्रीय

सरकार ने उसके लिए कुछ अच्छा काम किया है। हम आशा करते हैं कि आज जब केन्द्र के हाथ में यह शासन आया है तो जनता में विश्वास पैदा होगा, जनता में व्यवस्था की भावना पैदा होगी और शांति और सात्वना की भावना जो मिली है, उसकी वृद्धि होगी।

SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY : Sir, in the course of the spirited discussion, I heard three kinds of speeches. One is with regard to the circumstances that led to the proclamation of President's rule. The other is the implementation part of this Bill, what the committee should do. The third is about the provisions of the Bill itself.

I need not repeat what has been said about the circumstances leading to the proclamation. As Mr. Randhir Singh and Mr. Sharma said, Haryana has produced brilliant people like Lala Lajpat Rai and others. All glory to them. Now they have got an opportunity, when the committee is formed, to contribute their rite.

Shri Shashi Bhushan referred to the social and economic backwardness of the Harijans. Mr. Bharati mentioned about water shortage and felt the need for a dam there. The development of Haryana can take place no doubt better when the Assembly is there, but during the short period when this committee meets. I am sure the hon. members will definitely make their contribution directly for the improvement of Haryana. I only wish that in their anxiety to do this they may not wish for the prolongation of this rule. When I say this I also include the Members of the Opposition.

Coming to the Bill, Sir, hon. Members, Shri Goel, Shri Viswanathan and Shri Misra asked why there should be this Bill and why there should be a committee. As explained in my opening speech, there are certain ordinances which are going to contribute more to the revenue of Haryana and they have to be enacted in Parliament. Parliament, as you know, has no time to pass these legislations. So we felt the need for this committee. This committee is going to consider all of them and place

them before Parliament. Hon. Members can then suggest amendments and make their suggestions at that time. That is why we have come forward with this Bill.

Hon. Member, Shri Viswanathan referred to the proviso to sub-clause (2) of clause 3. He said that the President should consult the Consultative Committee at all times and asked why there should be the words "whenever he considers it practicable to do so". This is only to provide for any contingency. Hon. Members come from different places. Suppose there is no quorum, what are we to do? There may be immediate necessity to have a legislation. This is only an emergency power. We have got the word 'shall' which is mandatory and President shall definitely consult this committee whenever it is not impracticable. This Consultative Committee is a miniature parliament where different shades of opinion are represented.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : It will be Haryana Assembly.

SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY : Really speaking it will be so. When all Members of Haryana are there it will be a miniature assembly with more consultative powers. I hope that all sections of the House agree with me that such a Bill is necessary. I commend my motion.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : I requested the hon. Minister to say something about the teachers who are on strike. Two lakh people are involved.

SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY : You are a member of the committee and you raise it there.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Member has put it before the House. It will be taken note of by the committee. The question is :

"That the Bill to confer on the President the powers of the Legislature of the State of Haryana to make laws, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The House will now take the Bill clause by clause. There are no amendments to clause 2. The question is :

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 2 was added to the Bill.*

*Clause 3 (Conferment on the President of the power of the State Legislature to make laws)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There are some amendments to clause 3.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : Sir, I beg to move :

Page 2, line 2,—

after "laws" insert—

"except with respect to matters enumerated in List III of the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution of India" (5)

Page 2,—

for lines 20 to 22,—*Substitute :*

"(3) Every Act enacted by the President under sub-section (2) shall be laid before each House of Parliament within a week from the date of the enactment if the Parliament is in session, and within a week from the date of the first sitting of the Parliament after the enactment if the Parliament is not in session at the time of the enactment." (6).

By my amendments I have tried to restrict the delegation of powers to matters referred to in List III of the Seventh Schedule. Why? Because, under article 254, whenever the State Legislature passes an Act, if it is inconsistent with any Act passed by Parliament, it will not be operative to the extent of its conflict. But, if the Act of the State Legislature gets previous permission from the President, it will operate in that limited field. So, here when the President passes an Act as President's Act, which comes into conflict with an

[Shri Srinibas Misra]

Act of Parliament, if the President has given previous permission for the passing of the Act, then that Act will operate in Haryana as against the Act of this Parliament. This raises the question of impropriety and inconsistency because, in the peculiar circumstances in Haryana, List III, in respect of which this power will be exercised, refers to such things as "Preventive detention for reasons connected with the security of a State, the maintenance of public order, or the maintenance of supplies and services essential to the community; persons subjected to such detention". It is very likely—I have nothing to speak about the Ministers who are carrying out this, but there will be a reasonable suspicion—that these functions can be exercised by the Ministers to oppress the opposition parties who are fighting against the ruling party here. There is a possibility. Why should the Minister take that burden, that odium of having exercised the powers, the powers which the President took over after a proclamation under article 356? Why should they take the responsibility? So, I would request them not to press for it. After all, these are meant to cover a short period. Very soon there will be elections. If matters connected with List III, if they reserve them to be passed by Parliament, they will at least save that odium, because it is also improper in the sense the same person will give the permission and pass the other Act by giving his assent. It is improper.

The party which is in power, which was in power there previously, it is an old party, and that old party still hankers after power, like any other political party. It is natural. But that hankering is so great in the old party. Sir, I hope you will remember the words :

वृद्धस्य अनपत्यस्य विघ्नवायाम् बहुव्रुत :

It is so great that they are liable to commit this error. They are also liable to criticism by the public of misuse of power. So, I would request them not to press for subjects enumerated in List III.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO (Bobbli) : I want to say something on the point raised by Shri Srinibas Misra.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : His point is valid only for the brief six weeks when Parliament will not be in session. Because, once Parliament is in session everything will come before Parliament.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO : Shri Misra has raised quite an interesting constitutional point. Under article 254(2), according to his contention, a law made by the State can also prevail in the concurrent field over the law made by Parliament, provided it had been reserved for the President and the assent of the President has been obtained. In this particular case, there is an anachronism in the sense that it is essentially a Presidential Act with the result that, according to what Shri Misra has stated, it looks as though the Presidential Act under the delegated powers, if such an Act comes into conflict with any Parliamentary Act, it would appear that the State Act (the Presidential Act in this case) would prevail over the Parliamentary Act. This is his contention. I submit that such a situation may not arise. If he reads carefully article 254(2), only when a law has been passed by the State Legislature—that is very important to note, that a Bill has been passed by the State Legislature—and if such a Bill has been reserved for President's consent and if the President under such circumstances has given his assent, then such a State Act would prevail over the Parliamentary Act. In the present circumstances such a situation would not arise. Therefore, the apprehension expressed by Shri Misra appears to be unfounded.

Then, with your permission, Sir, here I would like to add a few observations with reference to the present clause before the House. We are delegating *carte blanche* all the powers which have been conferred on Parliament to the President. It is not a small matter that we should take very lightly. It is an important matter. Of course, the Constitution has provided for the delega-



tion of these powers by Parliament to the President.

If you carefully look into the scheme of the constitutional provisions, under the emergency powers first the President confers these powers on the Parliament through the Proclamation. It is the Proclamation that gives the power to Parliament to enact laws in respect of the State List. Now, by this Act we are throwing the shuttlecock or the ball again to the President. This is what is called *renvoi*, a reference back. I do not mind it; has been provided in the Constitution but in doing that what is the safeguard which has been reserved in this Bill; what is the nature of the conditions which have been provided in the Bill? The simple condition is that a committee consisting of so-and-so may be constituted. There is no compulsion on the part of the President to refer each and every Act to the committee.

I draw your attention to the parenthetical clause which says :—

“whenever he considers it practicable to do so”.

About the subject of satisfaction I have no grievance. Of course, there may be some very innocuous Acts which may require the consultation with the committee, but there may be very important matters also which may require consultation. An innovation has been brought about in this particular Bill. Hitherto in legislative drafting we came across with the wording, “considers it necessary”, but in this particular Bill we see the word “practicable”.

What is the significance of the word “practicable”? What is the importance of this? A Bill may be very important but it may not be practicable according to the opinion of the President to consult the committee. Therefore I am quite unhappy about the use of the word “practicable”. I would rather recommend that instead of the word “practicable” the word “necessary” should be substituted.

Then, the committee contemplated in this Bill is only for consultation pur-

poses. As the hon. Minister has rightly and correctly said, this committee is a miniature Parliament. In referring to this committee in this particular Bill we should not stop merely at consultation. I rather wish that it should be with the concurrence of the committee. That is more important than mere consultation. Therefore I will submit that the concurrence of the committee instead of the consultation with the committee should be there.

One more word. About modifications by Parliament, we should not stop with modification alone. Here again, there is a departure from the normal process of delegated legislation. Why should we stop short with modification? Why can power be not given to Parliament to repeal the Act, even may be a Presidential Act? Therefore I submit that here again we should add that Parliament should have the power to repeal a particular Act referred to it, Presidential Act also, and not merely confine itself to modification.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : Article 357 says :—

“Where by a Proclamation issued under clause (1) of Article 356, it has been declared that the powers of the Legislature of the State shall be exercisable by or under the authority of Parliament”.

Therefore, whatever is passed by the Legislature and by the President is an Act of Legislature.

SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY : I have already explained why this proviso, namely, “whenever he considers it practicable to do so”, is adopted here.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : Expound “practicable”.

SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY : It is only a contingency provision. And, when all the Acts passed will be placed before Parliament, Parliament can definitely have its say. So, there is no question of bypassing Parliament any time. With regard to the other point about the powers, I want to say that the State Legislature powers are defined in Arti-

[Shri K. S. Ramaswamy]

clause 246 of the Constitution in respect of the Concurrent List as follows :

"(2) Notwithstanding anything in clause (3), Parliament, and, subject to clause (1), the Legislature of any State also, have power to make laws with respect to any of the matters enumerated in List III in the Seventh Schedule (in this Constitution referred to as the 'Concurrent List')."

The delegation to the President proposed in the Bill is only in connection with powers of the State Legislature. There should be no apprehension that the powers of the Parliament itself of enacting laws under List III of the Seventh Schedule would also be exercisable by the President by virtue of this delegation by the Parliament. There is also no point in restricting the delegation merely to List II since the full exercise of the functions of the State Government may from time to time require legislation on the subjects in List III.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I shall now put Amendments Nos. 5 and 6 moved by Shri Srinibas Mishra to the vote of the House.

*Amendments Nos. 5 and 6 were put and negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That Clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 3 was added to the Bill.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill*

SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY : I move :

"That the Bill be passed."

SHRI S. C. SAMANTA (Tamluk) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I lodge my

protest against the procedure that has been adopted by the Home Ministry as regards this Bill. In the order paper, we find Mr. Y. B. Chavan was to pilot this Bill. But he is absent. The Minister of State who came here also disappeared. Then, it has fallen on the shoulders of the Deputy Minister to pilot the Bill. It may be said that the Deputy Minister is a Minister and he can do so. I admit it. But a prior permission of the Speaker should be taken. Though you kindly allowed him to pilot the Bill, he did not say, "On behalf of Mr. Y. B. Chavan, I am piloting the Bill." So, this is a bad procedure and I lodge my protest against it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Usually, that formality is observed and I take it that is observed.

SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY : I moved it on behalf of Mr. Y. B. Chavan.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

18.54 HRS.

#### MONOPOLIES AND RESTRICTIVE TRADE PRACTICES BILL

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The House will now take up the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Bill.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Sir, I rise on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Let the Minister first move the motion.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI RAGHUNATH REDDY) : Sir, on behalf of Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, I beg to move:

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha that the House do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of economic power



[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

ed anything—Dr. Hazari's Report or the Monopoly Commission's Report.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Member has risen on a point of order regarding the Bill. What he says now is outside its purview. If he has any specific point of order to raise, say, some sort of an irregular procedure so far as the introduction of this Bill is concerned, I will permit him. Otherwise, I will not. Here we are not concerned with Dr. Hazari's Report. This is only an excuse for a speech. He may first quote the rule under which he is raising the point of order.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : My submission is . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Banerjee, let us follow the procedure. Let us adjourn the House in a good humour. Please co-operate.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I will quote the rule, Sir. Rule 376 of the Rules of Procedure and Article 117 of the Constitution. The business before the House is the motion made by the hon. Minister, Shri Raghunath Reddy, that this particular Bill be referred to the Select Committee after associating some of the members of the House. With this particular Bill we have received Bulletin Part II, *i.e.*, the President's recommendation under Article 117 of the Constitution of India in respect of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Bill, 1967.

May I first invite your attention to article 110 of the Constitution? Article 110 says :

"For the purposes of this Chapter, a Bill shall be deemed to be a Money Bill if it contains only provisions dealing with all or any of the following matters, namely . . ."

You know it well, Sir. Therefore, I do not want to waste the time of the House by reading out the whole thing.

Then I invite your attention to article 117(1) of the Constitution. Article 117(1) says :

"A Bill or amendment making provision for any of the matters speci-

fied in sub-clauses (a) to (f) of clause (1) of article 110 shall not be introduced or moved except on the recommendation of the President and a Bill making such provision shall not be introduced in the Council of States . . ."

Normally, the practice is that such an important thing which is supposed to be a Money Bill and which is a Money Bill should not have been introduced in the Council of States, *i.e.* Rajya Sabha.

Now, coming to the Bill it is mentioned there that :

"The President has, in pursuance of clause (3) of Article 117 of the Constitution of India, recommended the consideration of the Bill by the Rajya Sabha."

But it has not been explained to us, this House, why so far as Monopolies Bill is concerned, why as far as Dr. Hazari's Report is concerned, or anything concerned with Birlas, that was never introduced in this House. I want an explanation from the hon. Minister. Let him explain why in this particular case this provision was not followed. They say this is the recommendation and when the recommendation of the President was cited for Rajya Sabha, as far as Lok Sabha is concerned, Lok Sabha was alive to the problem and they got it immediately before the Bill was introduced. I only want the Minister to answer this point.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will not agree with this proposition. You have pointed out Art. 110 and Art. 117 and your contention is that a Money Bill or amendment to a Money Bill which is supposed to be a Money Bill should have come before this House without going to the other House.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Absolutely.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That is your contention. On that point I am prepared to listen. Why Dr. Hazari's Report was not brought forward here—that has nothing to do with this.

19 Hrs.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE :** I have thrown up many points. You may kindly choose them.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** I think on this point—if it is a Money Bill or an amendment to Money Bill, whether it can be placed first in the Council of States or it should have come before this House—the Minister may clarify.

**SHRI GADILINGANA GOWD (Kurnool) :** I am a Member of the Business Advisory Committee. There it was unanimously decided that it should not be discussed and the Bill should be sent to Joint Select Committee.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** I am specifically limiting this discussion to the point of order. He has mentioned two articles of the Constitution. So on that point if you have got to say anything, I am prepared to listen.

**SHRI RAGHUNATH REDDI :** Though I am not able to immediately recollect the necessary provisions of the Constitution in terms of the language used in the Constitution read by Mr. Banerjee, if I consult my memory, as far as my knowledge of Constitution is concerned, the articles specifically use the expression 'charge' and the Monopoly Bill contains 'defray'. The expression used is 'defray' and unless the money which is to be paid to the Monopolies Commission or other officers in the Monopolies Commission Bill is to be charged in terms of Sec. 117, it does not become a Money Bill. Otherwise, as long it is 'defrayed' it is not Money Bill. I hope you will accept my contention.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE** *rose*—

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** Please listen to me.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE :** One sentence, Sir. If the hon. Minister can convince us on this point by telling us that the Rajya Sabha is supposed to be the 'House of Lords' and the Bill with regard to big business houses should be discussed there first, I can understand. After all this is the House of

common people. My point is whether this is a Money Bill or not.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** Therefore, you have drawn the attention of the Chair and this House to this specific point whether under Art. 110 it is not a Money Bill. There are several provisos in that Article and you have not pinpointed. So far as these clause are concerned, unfortunately, it does not attract any one of the clauses for me to strike it down as a Money Bill.

**SHRI AMRIT NAHATA :** I have a submission, Sir.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** No discussion please. If you want to say anything on the point of order, I can listen.

**SHRI AMRIT NAHATA :** Yes, Sir. The decision that was taken in the Business Advisory Committee does not hold good any more. I want to show it. I had the privilege of attending the Business Advisory Committee. Sir, It was decided that this Bill shall be referred to the Joint Select Committee without any discussion. I agree to that. Previously, 8 hours had been provided for this Bill along with the Hazare report. But we were told that the session of the House could not be extended beyond Saturday, because the Prime Minister and the Deputy Minister would not be here. Therefore, our proposal to continue the session to the 26th and the 27th instant in order to discuss this Bill and the Hazare Report was rejected. Now, Rajya Sabha has decided. . . .

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER** We have nothing to do with that.

**SHRI AMRIT NAHATA :** . . . to hold their sittings on the 26th and the 27th also. If Rajya Sabha can sit without the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister being here, why can this House also not sit on the 26th and the 27th instant? So, I move a motion . .

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** I have followed his point.

**SHRI AMRIT NAHATA :** I have a right to move a motion for that purpose.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I entirely agree that this House is sovereign and whatever decisions are taken at the Business Advisory Committee are only the decisions of the committee, until they are approved by this House. But once the approval and concurrence of the House is given, they become the order of the House.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA : But the conditions have changed . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : That does not apply here. I am not concerned with what the other House has decided. At least for my part, I do not feel myself called upon to change the order, which has the concurrence of the House. Now, I shall put the main motion to vote.

SHRI A. S. SAIGAL (Bilaspur) : I oppose the motion . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Amrit Nahata cannot move his motion now. We have already adopted the report of the Business Advisory Committee, and it is now binding on the House to accept it, and we have already accepted it.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) : I agree with my hon. friend Shri A. S. Saigal.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha that the House do join the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of economic power to the common detriment, for the control of monopolies, for the prohibition of monopolistic and restrictive trade practices and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, made in the motion adopted by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 21st November, 1967 and communicated to this House on the 23rd November, 1967 and resolves that the following thirty members of Lok Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee, namely: Shri G. M.

Bakshi, Shri B. Bhagavati, Shri Onkar Lal Bohra, Shri Valmiki Choudhury, Shri Bharat Singh Chowhan, Shri S. R. Damani, Shri C. Dass, Shri C. C. Desai, Mahant Digvijai Nath, Shri K. R. Ganesh, Shri Bimalkanti Ghosh, Shri Indrajit Gupta, Shri Hem Barua, Shri Prabhu Dayal Himmatsingka, Shri M. N. Nagnhoor, Chaudhary Nitiraj Singh, Shrimati Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, Shri Anantrao Patil, Shri S. R. Rane, Shri Rabi Ray, Shri G. S. Reddi, Shri A. S. Saigal, Shri S. C. Samanta, Shri V. Sambasivam, Shrimati Savitri Shyam, Shri Era Sezhiyan, Shri Ramshankar Prasad Singh, Shri Krishna Dev Tripathi, Shri R. Umanath, Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed."

*The motion was adopted.*

19.08 Hrs.

BIHAR AND UTTAR PRADESH  
 (ALTERATION OF BOUNDARIES)  
 BILL

गृह कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री विद्याचरण शुक्ल) : मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि :

"बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश के राज्यों की सीमाओं के परिवर्तन और तत्संबन्ध विषयों का उपबन्ध करने वाले विधेयक पर विचार किया जाये।"

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विधेयक पर ज्यादा कुछ कहने की जरूरत नहीं है। मुझे विश्वास है कि माननीय सदस्य इस बात से सहमत होंगे कि जो एक समझौता दो राज्य सरकारों में हुआ है, उस को पूरी तरह से माना जाये और हम उस को कानूनी रूप दें।

SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARYYA (Raiganj) : Could we not pass this Bill in the same manner as we had disposed of the previous Bill ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No. No time has been allotted for this Bill. Therefore, we are free to debate it for so long as we like to sit today; or else, we can have this postponed to the next session. So far as I am concerned, I shall not restrict the discussion here,

because I have already got before me a list containing several names.

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** We have started it already, and let us go on with it.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** But there must be some time-limit. I am not going to sit indefinitely today. We may sit for another 15 to 20 minutes only.

**SHRI GADILINGANA GOWD (Kurnool) :** On a point of order. I submit that this matter came up before the Business Advisory Committee the other day and it was decided that this should be considered in the next session, and, therefore, no time was allotted for this Bill.

**THE MINISTER OF LAW (SHRI GOVINDA MENON) :** Suppose we have this in the next session ?

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** We may sit for another 10 or 15 minutes more, but not longer.

Even assuming that we sit throughout the night and pass it, is the Rajya Sabha going to pass it ?

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** Yes, it is going to pass it, because it is sitting for two more days.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** I do not think that they are sitting for two more days for the purpose of passing this Bill.

I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs whether it was decided at the Business Advisory Committee that this might be postponed to the next session. Shri Gadilinga Gowd was also present there, and this is what he says.

**श्री रविराय (पुरी) :** जब यह बिल बिजिनेस एडवाइसरी कमेटी में नहीं आया है, तो इसको कैसे पास कराया जा सकता है ?

**THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH) :** I am not opposing them. But it was decided that time permitting this Bill would be taken up.

**SHRI GADILINGA GOWD :** It is not fair to the House to expect it to sit longer now. We have been away from our constituencies for nearly a month and a half and we would like to go back as soon as possible.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** I would like to get the firm opinion of the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs on this point. Two hon. Members who were present there have stated what had happened. This is a fairly long Bill, and I have got with me a list of at least fifteen Members who want to speak. Everybody is interested in this, and so we cannot rush through. It would not be fair to the House to do so, and I agree with the hon. Member who has raised this point.

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** May I say something ? This Bill had been circulated to hon. Members already and it has already been on the agenda for several days now, and it has been in the hands of hon. Members for several days.

**श्री रविराय :** किसी ने इस बिल को पढ़ा नहीं है ।

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** This is not a controversial Bill. I am sure hon. Members must have read it.

**SHRI GADILINGANA GOWD :** If we were to sit for longer hours today, then we could have taken some more time on the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Bill.

There was a gentlemen's agreement at the Business Advisory Committee and that should not be broken now.

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** This is a non-controversial Bill. There is no controversy at all. This is a simple Bill. If I may be allowed to explain it to the House...

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi): It should be discussed. After all, it is the tax-payers' money. What is the harm, if we sit till mid-night?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Can we really do justice to this measure at this House ?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: I think we can do it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I do not feel that we can do it.

It is now already 7.15 p.m. Even if we were to take 45 minutes on the general discussion, it is not possible to have clause-by-clause consideration and to put the clauses to vote without a debate. I am not prepared to hurry through this Bill.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: There is no question of hurrying through. The House may take its own time. The Business Advisory Committee had decided that time permitting this Bill would come up before the House. The Bill is before the House

now, and since you have called me, I have already moved the motion. I am now in the midst of my speech. I do not think that this is the time to say that I should stop here and the Bill should go over to the next session. I think there would be enough time for this Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is true that the hon. Minister has started making the motion. But serious objection has been taken to that. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs what Government's intention is...

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : It may be postponed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : So, there shall be no more discussion on this Bill now.

The House will now stand adjourned *sine die*.

19.15 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned sine die.*