

(Shri Raghun Ramalah)

in Notification No. G.S.R. 535 in Gazette of India dated the 12th April, 1967. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-367/67].

REPORT OF PERMANENT INDUS COMMISSION

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri Iqbal Singh): On behalf of Dr. K. L. Rao, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Report of the Permanent Indus Commission for the year ended on 31st March, 1967. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-368/67].

ACCOUNTS OF THE ALL INDIA INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL SCIENCES

Shri Iqbal Singh: On behalf of Shri B. S. Murthy,

I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual statement of Accounts of the All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, for the year 1966-66, together with the Audit Report thereon, under sub-section (4) of section 18 of the All India Institute of Medical Sciences Act, 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-369/67].

14.04 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: SITUATION IN WEST ASIA

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): I do not know whether the House would like me to read the statement.

Some hon. Members: Yes, We have not got copies.

Shri M. L. Sondhi (New Delhi): It will take much time. We can ask questions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is only three pages, I am told. Let him read it.

Shri M. C. Chagla: The creation of Israel has given rise to tension between Israel and the Arab countries. From time to time, the tension has erupted into incidents of varying degrees of seriousness. After the aggression on the U.A.R. in 1966, a United Nations

Emergency Force (UNEF) was set up to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities between Egypt and Israel. The UNEF had contingents supplied by Brazil, Canada, Denmark, India, Norway, Sweden and Yugoslavia. Israel has all along refused to let the UNEF be stationed on or enter the Israeli side of the border. UNEF, therefore, operated only from the U.A.R. side with the consent of the U.A.R. Government.

In recent weeks serious tension has developed between Syria and Israel. The Israeli Prime Minister, Foreign Minister and Chief of Army Staff were quoted as saying that they would teach Syria a severe lesson and even march upto Damascus. At the same time, there were reports of Israeli troop concentrations near the Syrian border. The Syrians, apprehending an imminent attack from Israel, held urgent consultations with the United Arab Republic under the U.A.R.-Syrian Mutual Defence Agreement signed in November, 1966.

On May 18, a letter was received by U Thant from the U.A.R. Foreign Minister asking for the removal of UNEF entirely from U.A.R. territory and the Gaza strip. After again having consultations with the U.N. Advisory Committee on UNEF, the Secretary-General decided to terminate UNEF's presence as requested by the U.A.R.

The Government of India have always supported the UNEF's activities and believe that its presence on the Israeli-U.A.R. border has helped in maintaining peace in the area. We would however, like to state clearly that we appreciate the reasons which have impelled the U.A.R. to ask for the withdrawal of UNEF. When the UNEF was stationed in the U.A.R., it was with the consent of the U.A.R. Government and the UNEF could not continue to remain in U.A.R. territory without that Government's continuing consent. India could not be a party to any procedure which would make UNEF into an occupation force; nor

could the Government of India agree to UNEF's continued presence in U.A.R. in absence of latter's consent and in any case Indian troops could not remain part of UNEF without U.A.R.'s approval. This is also in keeping with customary international law, the U.N. General Assembly resolution on the subject and the understanding reached between the late Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, then U.N. Secretary-General, and the U.A.R. Government.

On the question of UNEF's removal I would like to refer to the reasons given by U Thant, United Nations Secretary-General, in his report dated May 18, 1967, to the U.N. General Assembly. U Thant has said:—

"(a) The United Nations Emergency Force was introduced into the territory of the United Arab Republic on the basis of an agreement reached in Cairo between the Secretary General of the United Nations and the President of Egypt and it, therefore, has seemed fully clear to me that since United Arab Republic consent was withdrawn, it was incumbent on the Secretary General to give orders for the withdrawal of the force. The consent of the host country is a basic principle which has applied to all United Nations peace-keeping operations.

(b) In practical fact, UNEF cannot remain or function without the continuing consent and cooperation of the host country.

(c) I have also been influenced by my deep concern to avoid any action which would either compromise or endanger the contingents which make up the force. The United Nations Emergency Force is, after all, a peace-keeping and not an enforcement operation.

(d) In the face of the request for the withdrawal of the force, there seemed to me to be no alternative course of action which could be taken by the Secretary General without putting in question the sovereign authority of the Government of the United

Arab Republic within its own territory".

The Government of India fully endorses the position taken by the U.N. Secretary General

I may here refer to the incident on May 18, 1967, regarding the plane carrying General Inderjit Rikhye, Commander of the UNEF. General Rikhye was flying inside the Gaza strip when two Israeli aircraft buzzed his plane, fired warning shots and tried to force the aircraft to enter Israeli territory over the Mediterranean. General Rikhye refused to be intimidated and proceeded to his destination. We consider this incident a highly provocative one. It is, however, understood that the Israeli authorities have conveyed their apologies in this connection to the U.N. authorities. The coolness and courage of this officer who belongs to our Armed Forces deserves commendation.

On May 18, 1967, the Prime Minister received a verbal message from President Nasser communicated through our Ambassador in Cairo. The message referred to the various statements recently made by the Israeli Prime Minister, Foreign Minister and the Chief of Army Staff, indicating that preparations were being made for an attack on Syria. The message indicated that the Israeli intention was to change the Government in Syria through pressure and even by invasion. In the circumstances, the UAR wanted to declare openly that it would come to Syria's help if the latter was attacked by Israel. The UAR had consequently taken necessary measures to deter the Israelis from any aggressive designs against Syria.

The message added that UAR was not interested in increasing tensions in the area, but considering their past experience, especially during the Suez crisis, they felt it necessary to take precautions against any possible Israeli attack on an Arab country.

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

A reply was sent to President Nasser's message through our Ambassador in Cairo on May 19, 1967. The reply expressed the deep concern of the Government of India at the dangerous situation which had developed and our anxiety at the nature of statements recently made by the Israeli leaders. The reply added that we shared with the UAR adherence to the principle that no country should interfere in the internal affairs of another country. We said that we fully appreciated the reasons why the UAR has had to institute precautionary measures. We expressed the hope that peace would be maintained and we noted with gratification that it was not the intention of the UAR to increase tension in the area but that the measures taken were in the interest of preparedness and precaution against a possible attack on an Arab country. This message reiterated the respect and regard which we have for President Nasser personally and for our friendship for the U.A.R.

On May 21, 1967, the U.N. Secretary-General flew to Cairo for discussions with the U.A.R. leaders.

News has been received of the U.A.R. decision to close the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping and to other shipping carrying strategic goods for Israel. So far as the Government of India are concerned, we have taken the position as far back as 1957 that the Gulf of Aqaba is an inland sea and that the entry to the Gulf lies within the territorial waters of UAR and Saudi Arabi. We adhere to this view.

I would like to impress on the House the gravity of the hour and the need to be exceedingly cautious in expressing views in a fast developing situation. The interests of West Asian countries, the interests of India and the interests of the world as a whole make it imperative that

there should be peace and stability in this entire area of West Asia. U Thant is on a delicate mission. He has the fullest support of the Government of India in his efforts to maintain peace.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Ranga.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): On a point of order, Sir. This is a statement made by the Minister of External Affairs. I want you to give serious thought to this new practice that is being followed here. The Prime Minister advises her colleagues and followers that they should try to take initiative in all matters, that the notices of Call Attention, Adjournment Motions etc. always come from the Opposition and why not from the Government side. This is a good advice. But this is not to be practised at the cost of the rights of this House. We gave notice of a Call Attention on this matter and that was disallowed. We raised the matter first. Now, in order to show how vigilant Government is, they want to destroy our rights and make statements suo motu. I am most concerned about it. On what authority my Call Attention notice is disallowed and Mr. Chagla thinks it proper for him to come and make a statement on the same subject. We took the first opportunity to raise it. Not only I but others also.....

Shri Mem Barua (Mangaldai): also did it.

Shri Nath Pai: Is this atterness to be practised, this initiative to be seized, at the cost of the rights of the House. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, you are our guardian No..... (Interruption).

I do agree that there is a right of the Government to make a statement on every matter of importance. This is the only thing you have taught

them. This is the initiative that you go on mumbling inabilities. I concede that Government has a right to make a statement *suo moto*. But here the question is different. On this specific matter, call attention notices were submitted to you. They were rejected peremptorily and now in order to make a semblance of alertness and initiative, the same statement is made. This is a very dangerous practice. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, you should tell the Government that this will not be allowed. If, on the same subject, a call attention notice is given, the call attention notice alone shall be given priority.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Shri M. C. Chagla rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let all the points of order be exhausted Mr. Son-dhi.

श्री म० सा० चौबी : मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कुछ आपकी धार से ऐसा होना चाहिये—इतने महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर, जब कि युद्ध होने का खतरा है, इतनी संकटकालीन स्थिति बनने जा रही है, हम क्या बजाक बोल रहे हैं। जहाँ हम यह उम्मीद रखते थे कि कम क्या कह रहा है, बमरीका क्या कह रहा है, फ्रान्स क्या कह रहा है, उन सब के बारे में यहाँ पर बर्बादी हो, वह कुछ भी नहीं हुआ, केवल एक बयान रखा गया है जिसमें बर्बादी की लड़ाई के जल्म पर और नजर चिड़का जा रहा है—यह क्या हालत है ?

स्वर्गीय प० नेहरू जब जिन्दा थे, 1950-57 की बात है, उस समय ऐसी व्यवस्था थी—आप उस समय का रिकार्ड पढ़िये . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is his point of order?

श्री म० सा० चौबी : आप काल एंटेनस की तरफ ध्यान क्यों नहीं देते, आप

याद कीजिये 1956-57 में क्या हुआ था। क्या पंडित नेहरू का नाम भी मूल गये हैं? उन्होंने कहा था कि जो वेस्ट एशिया में हुआ था . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is his point of order. I now call Mr. Madhu Limaye.

श्री मधु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस में मबाल बिलकुल सीधा है। इस सदन की परिपाटी है, अध्यक्ष का निर्णय है कि अगर सदस्यों के द्वारा पहले नोटिस दिया जाता है, तो उस को ध्यान आकर्षण के रूप में ही लेना चाहिये। मैं आप को यह निर्णय खोज निकाल कर देने के लिये तैयार हूँ। पिछली लोक सभा में अध्यक्ष का निर्णय है कि अगर नोटिस पहले आया है तो ध्यान आकर्षण के रूप में ही उसको लिया जाय। छागला साहब का जो यह बयान है, इस को ध्यान आकर्षण के रूप में लिया जाय, जिन्होंने पहले नोटिस दिया है, है, उनके नाम में इस को लिखा जाय, और जिन्होंने अपना नाम नोटिस पर दिया है उन को मबाल पूछने की इजाजत दी जाय।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Umanath.

श्री प्रकाशवीर सास्त्री (हापुड) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं भी वही बात कह रहा हूँ, आप लोक सभा के कार्यालय से पूछिये . . . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will give him an opportunity. Mr. Umanath is on his legs.

श्री प्रकाशवीर सास्त्री : मैं उसी बात को कह रहा हूँ, आप लोक सभा के आफिस से पूछिये—अगर सर्वनेमेंट की धार से पहले सूचना आई है, तब तो सर्वनेमेंट बलव्य दे सकती है, धन्यवा यदि ध्यान आकर्षण या कम रोको पहले आया है, तो पहले उस को लिया जाय।

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): I fully support the point of order raised by my hon. friend, Mr. Nath Pai. We, from our group, on the very first day had given two call attention notices, one on the West Asian situation and the other on firing on the plane.. (Interruptions).

Shri Ranshir Singh (Rohtak): Is he corroborating his point of order?

श्री उमथ लियने (पुदुक्कोट्टा) : आप प्रत्यक्ष नहीं हैं, वे प्रत्यक्ष की अनुमति से बड़े हैं, आप बीच में क्यों बोलते हैं? यह आपकी बड़ी बुराई साबित है।

Shri Ranshir Singh: What is he?

Shri Umanath: What are you? Who are you to interfere? Sit down. The House is going on in a cool way. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, you are here. He has not asked for your permission.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is he supporting Mr. Nath Pai's point of order? He may continue.

Shri Umanath: As I was saying, the other call attention notice was specifically with regard to firing by the Israeli plane on the plane which carried Maj. Gen. Rikhy who has gone from our country. I was informed that these two call attention notices were rejected. I was under the impression that the Lok Sabha Secretariat considered these two issues as not of public importance, as unimportant. On the one side, you hold that the two issues are not of public importance, but on the other side, you allow a suo motu statement by the Minister considering that to be of public importance. You allow the Minister on the assessment that it is of public importance, but when we give notices you reject them as not of public importance. What is this procedure? We want a reply from the Lok Sabha Secretariat and yourself straightway because this is a matter on which you have got the discretion.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kangur): May I say something?...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does he want to add something to the point of order?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Yes, I want to add something.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): May I make a submission?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Sri S. M. Banerjee may please resume his seat.

The Prime Minister would like to clarify the position.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Whom have you called, the Prime Minister or myself?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let the Prime Minister clarify the position.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I just want to clarify the position. I am sorry I do not know which came first. That is certainly a question which the Secretariat of the Lok Sabha or the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker can clarify. All I want to say is that there was some discussion on the statement which I had made to the Congress Party and in replying to that Shri M. C. Chagla promised to make a statement; there was a demand that there should be a statement, as far as I know, and it was in reply to that that Shri M. C. Chagla said that he would make a statement on Thursday.

श्री उमथ लियने : प्रधानमन्त्री के रूप में हम ने पहले कहा था।

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I want to make it clear that if the call-attention-notice or adjournment motion or whatever other notice it might be had come first, we have no objection to its being taken up first.

श्री उमथ लियने : हाँ, जी हाँ :

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** When we had tabled the calling-attention notice on the shooting on the plane of Gen. Rikhye, I got a reply from the Lok Sabha Secretariat that that was under consideration. We had tabled that and it was under consideration. We do not know the circumstances under which it was summarily rejected. I would request that that should not be done in future.

**Shri Bal Raj Madhok:** (South Delhi): May I submit.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I think the matter has been sufficiently discussed.

**Shri Nath Pai:** What is your ruling on my point of order?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let the hon. Minister reply to the point, and then I shall give my ruling.

As the Prime Minister has already explained, when the question was raised regarding some sort of statement made before the party, there was a statement that Government would clarify their position soon.

श्री मधु लिमये : पार्टी से हमको क्या मतलब है ? उनकी पार्टी जहन्नुम में जाये, हमें तो सदन से मतलब है ।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** When calling-attention notices were received, it was within the discretion of the Speaker to admit or not to admit them; Government are offering to make a statement on a particular subject and there are calling-attention notices also on the same subject; it is within the discretion of the Speaker to give priority to the Ministers' statement.

**Shri Bal Raj Madhok:** It was only when we had come to know that our calling-attention-notices had not been accepted that we raised this matter. I had raised the question on the very first day; then, I had raised the question about my calling-attention-notice 368 (Ai) LS—9.

yesterday also. Yesterday, I had also written a letter to the Speaker in which I had pointed out that the situation was serious and I had requested him that some time should be given for a discussion of this matter. Again, that was rejected. And now, the hon. Minister has come forward with a statement.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** This is the practice that has been followed so far.

**Shri M. L. Sondhi:** What happened in 1956 is very relevant.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If hon. Members want a change in procedure, there are other methods. Simultaneously, two calling-attention-notice might be received. In such cases, what I would suggest is this; if hon. Members want to change the procedure, there are other courses upon to them. I would suggest that questions may be put now.

**Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta** (Delhi Sadar): You must find out which was received first.

**Shri S. S. Kothari** (Mandsaur): My calling-attention-notice on the entry of the U. K. into the ECM had been accepted, but later on, I found that the hon. Minister made a statement on it. What is the justification for it?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is a different thing, altogether. Now, on the statement made by the hon. Minister, I shall allow some questions.

**Shri S. S. Kothari:** Yesterday I had received intimation that my calling-attention-notice on the entry of the United Kingdom into the ECM had been accepted, but then I found that the hon. Minister made a statement *suo motu*.

**Shri Nath Pai:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, you did not satisfy me on my point of order. The facts as you have narrated are not the facts. On Monday

[Shri Nath Pai]

when we praised it, there was no reference to the Party and what happened there. What we tried to ask was what happened to our call-attention notice on a most explosive situation. Then Shri Chagla said 'I hope to make a statement on Thursday'. This was the first time the House was told that he was intending to make a statement. It was in that context that we raised this point. If you require four days to make a statement on such a vital issue, how is it that your Prime Minister and senior leader already thought it proper to make a statement on the same subject elsewhere. We were not concerned with what happened in the Congress Party. That is their absolute right to do what they like. What we said was: when he took four days to make a statement on this matter and we had tabled the call-attention notice, there is evidence to establish that the call-attention notice came first. That being so, there is no question of discretion in you. The rule is absolutely well-established, that first it must be admitted.

I am pleading for the rights of Members. I have nothing against Shri Chagla. But let us follow the established procedure of the House and not in a cavalier manner abandon it, as is likely to happen if we say that there is the question of discretion.

I welcome the Prime Minister's statement. The only thing that remains is to find out the facts as to which came first. On the evidence available, I still submit that we gave notice first. In priority, in chronological sequence, our notice came before the intention of the Minister was made known.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Ranga.

Shri M. L. Senzhi: Are you going to stifle debate on this important issue?

Shri M. C. Chagla: This is an important question of procedure. I received as many as 2<sup>n</sup> to 30 call-

attention notices on the same subject, on different aspects of the situation. Under the rules, you can take up only one call-attention notice a day. So I thought it would be better if I made a comprehensive statement rather than have these 10 or 15 motions calling attention, spread over 10 or 15 days. I am the last person to try to deprive this House of its rights. But I thought it was better to deal with all aspects of the matter in a comprehensive statement rather than deal with some aspects only. There was a question about the shooting of the 'plane of Gen. Rikhye'. As I said, I received about 20 notices. So I informed the Speaker that I would make a general statement.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The position has been made clear.

Shri Nath Pai: Still no ruling? What is the ruling?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: My ruling is this. There were several call-attention notices received. Instead of....

Shri Nath Pai: Were they received prior to the announcement of his intention to make a statement?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Presumably yes. They were in the process of being looked into and put on the order paper according to rules. In between, Government decided to make a comprehensive statement taking into consideration the call-attention notices in which certain points were raised. By this I think the rights of the House are in no way curtailed. (Interruptions).

Shri M. L. Senzhi: It is not a comprehensive statement; it is a caricature of a comprehensive statement. Can you give us any evidence in it showing that the gravity of the situation is realised? As I said, in 1966 there was a very dangerous situation. We can go back and look up the records of that time.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** All right. Prof. Ranga.

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur):** I have been trying to catch your eye so many times before. Now I want to catch your eye.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I will call him later.

**Shri Ranga (Srikakulam):** The hon. Minister wanted us to be very cautious, very judicious in dealing with this very important matter. But I fear the Government have not been sufficiently cautious or judicious, judging from the way in which they have rushed to express their opinion approving of what UAR wanted to do, was going to do and has been doing. UAR is not directly involved. It was Syria which was directly involved. UAR was only bound to help Syria through a treaty. Just because of our over-anxiety to please UAR, there was no justification for Government to have done what they have done. If it was right for the UAR to have remained neutral, uncommitted, when China invaded us and we got into terrible trouble and when the other imbroglia was also imposed upon us by Pakistan's invasion of India, how is it not right for us to have stayed our hands, to have kept silent for some time at least, until the clouds had cleared and U Thant was able to use his good offices and show some way out of this impasse that has arisen in that particular troubled area? I do not know why our Government wishes to rush in where angels fear to tread. This is not the first time, but they do not seem to become any the wiser. All our warnings seem to be falling on deaf ears. Has the hon. Minister considered the implications of the blanket approval given to one party in this dispute? And this approval has been given on the basis of some statement they made in 1957. This Government claims to be a progressive one, but it is a tradition-bound Government. Over ten years it goes on remembering what it said, what assurance it had given, and in

pursuance of that assurance, now suddenly it has woken up to give this new assurance again of supporting them without considering how the blanket approval given to one party in this dispute may boomerang against us. How can they be sure that it cannot, in another context, endanger our country's interests in future? Does the hon. Minister not realise that the cause of peace would be much better served by adopting an attitude of neutrality, as they had gone on two occasions, crucial occasions, in our disputes, rather than one of encouraging and inciting one party to attack the other? I am using the word "attack" advisedly, because of the latest threat held out in regard to the Gulf of Aqaba, and all that it connotes. As my hon. friend, Prof. Sondhi has rightly said, all other countries are taking a certain stand. It would have been within his rights, and his duties, to have warned us about what they are doing, and in that context what we propose to do, but he kept silent about it. In the face of UAR maintaining neutrality during the Sino-Indian dispute and also the Indo-Pak dispute, how is it not possible for us to maintain the same neutrality, especially when it will promote the cause of peace?

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** I may assure the House that whatever action we have taken is in the interests of the cause of peace.

**Shri M. L. Sondhi:** You are a war monger, that is what I say.

**Shri Hardayal Devgun (East Delhi):** You are supporting aggression.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** I have never heard India being accused of war-mongering.

**Shri Bal Raj Madhak:** This is what your action amounts to. India is not a war monger, but you are making India a war monger.

**An hon. Member:** You have attacked our country.

**Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli):** India is not a war monger. India has rightly done its duty. This is not war mongering. You are war mongering.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta (Alipore):** We cannot forget what Israel did in 1956. (Interruptions).

**Shri M. L. Sondhi:** I will quote from the Soviet press very clearly. (Interruptions).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He has put a question. Let him reply. There will be ample opportunities for questions and answers.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** Will the House show me the indulgence of hearing me and then they can approve or criticise my action. For ten years India has made the greatest contribution to the UN Emergency Force. We are proud of it. The UNEF has kept the peace between the U.A.R. and Israel; our contribution, as I said, had been the greatest. The Force had been commanded by a very gallant officer, Gen. Rikhy about whom I have already spoken. Why did we take this action? India's position is quite clear. As soon as the U.A.R. withdrew its consent to the stationing of UNEF on its territory, the UNEF had no locus standi at all. It would be like an occupation force and we could not be a party to it.

Coming to the Gulf of Aqaba, President Nasser has made it perfectly clear in his message to the Prime Minister and from all that we have heard it is clear that every action that he is taking is a preventive action and a precautionary action.

**Shri M. L. Sondhi:** What is the width of the Gulf? What is the length of it?..... (Interruptions).

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North East):** What does he mean by these interruptions? They are like those of an agent of the American Lobby.... (Interruptions).

**श्री जयलाल बिहारी बाबू (बनारस):** श्री ही० ना० मुकर्जी ने मेरी पार्टी के सदस्य श्री सोनी के बारे में जो कुछ कहा है वह अन-पार्लियामेंटरी है। वह किसी को अमेरिकन लाबीस्ट नहीं कह सकते।

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** He says: War-monger. Is India a war-monger?.... (Interruptions).

**श्री जयलाल बिहारी बाबू:** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर मेरी पार्टी का कोई सदस्य श्री मुकर्जी के लिये कहे कि वह रक्षियन लाबीस्ट हैं तो क्या यह उन्हें पसन्द आयेगा ?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** In the past such accusations were made by those who did not agree ideologically on the floor of the House.

**Shri A. B. Vajpayee:** There is difference of opinion. If the hon. Foreign Minister is interrupted, it is for you to check the hon. Member and not for any other hon. Member to impute motives.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I will appeal to all hon. Members again. So far as Mr. Sondhi is concerned, more than ten times I requested him to resume his seat and not to interrupt like this. If in spite of all this, he does like this, is it not exasperating to other Members?

**Shri Bal Raj Madhok:** A number of times things happen in this House which one may not like. Interruptions are allowed.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** But there is a limit.

**Shri Bal Raj Madhok:** If somebody says that some Member is an agent of the American Lobby and imputes motives, it vitiates the atmosphere. We can say that he is a Russian Lobbyist or Chinese Lobbyist. Such re-primandations will vitiate the atmosphere and therefore, I appeal to you

to expunge the words that he had spoken.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am a Member of this House for ten years. Such allegations were hurled against each other and I was myself not excepted when I spoke on foreign policy. I do not think these words are to be expunged from the records.

14.40 hrs.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त : यह सवाल ऐसा है जिस में दो राये हो सकती हैं। जो स्टेटमेंट सदन में दिया गया है उसके बारे में भी दो राये होने की गुंजाइश है। इतना ही नहीं अपोजिशन के अन्दर भी दो राय हो सकती हैं, प्रो० मुखर्जी की एक राय हो सकती और हमारी दूसरी राय हो सकती है। डेमोक्रेसी में अपनी राय रखने का हर एक को हक हासिल है। कुछ वेग हो सकते हैं जहाँ पर डेमोक्रेसी नहीं है और जहाँ पर कोई दूसरी राय रख ही नहीं सकता है। प्रो० मुखर्जी को मान्य है कि हिन्दुस्तान में डेमोक्रेसी है। इसलिए हमें यह हक है कि हम प्रो० मुखर्जी से डिफर करें। अगर कोई धायबी कहता है कि जो राय किसी के द्वारा व्यक्त की जा रही है उस से बार बढ़ेगी तो उसको बैसा कहने का पूरा हक हासिल है। प्रो० मुखर्जी जैसे वैलेंस और सीरियस पार्लियामेंटेरियन के लिए बीच में चढ़े हो कर यह कहना कि कोई धायबी अपनी लीची का एजेंट है, क्या ठीक है और मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह खुद ही सोच ले क्या उनको इस तरह की बात कहना शोभा देता है . . . .

Shri J. M. Biswas (Bankaura): This was placed before the Deputy-Speaker and he gave a ruling.

श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त : मैं खतम कर रहा हूँ। अगर कहीं कोई कंवर कोई हमारा कंवर करता है तो सीकर का फर्ज है कि

उसे रोक दे और इस काम में हम भी स्वीकर की सहायता करेंगे। लेकिन इस तरह से इतिनुएन्स लगाना और किसी को इंटेंस और मोटिव को डाउट करना प्रो० मुखर्जी जैसे पार्लियामेंटेरियन को शोभा नहीं देता है और इसकी हम उन से धामा भी नहीं करते थे। मैं उन से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि अपने इन शब्दों को वह वापिस ले लें।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have heard hon. Members. At 3.30 we will have to adjourn to enable the Finance Minister and the Cabinet to present the budget. There are two subjects now, and we are now discussing a very important subject. The Minister of External Affairs has made a statement and each one of the hon. Members can express his views. Not that a view expressed by one Member is accepted by the whole House. It is not possible in a democracy, and in a democracy we have to tolerate the opinion of every Member, whether you like it or not or agree with it or not. Therefore, I hope the House would allow the Minister to proceed. I think the Minister of External Affairs was replying to Prof. Ranga's question. I will allow the Members to put their questions and shall try to accommodate the leaders of the parties.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I fully understand and appreciate the difference of opinion among the Members of the Opposition, but I want all of us to be agreed on one thing, and I hope there will be complete unanimity on that, namely, India has always stood for peace; India has always resisted aggression; I want to assure this House that in the action that we have taken, we have tried to avoid war. We have tried to maintain peace and we have tried to avoid war. We have tried to maintain peace and we have tried to bring about a normal situation.

Look at the Gulf of Aqaba. We have been told that we took up a particular attitude in 1967. I have looked into all the aspects and I think it is a mistake

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

view that we took. Even from the point of view of international law, if necessary, I am prepared to satisfy the House on that. But I would not go into it now. But what does President Nasser say? He says that arms are being supplied to Israel. That raises the risk of war. "I only want to prevent Israeli ships and ships carrying strategic material to Israel from entering the gulf." He has not stopped this gulf to all shipping. Is not a country which is threatened by aggression entitled to say that? Are we wrong in saying that we support President Nasser to that extent? It is his territorial water. Under the law, he is perfectly entitled to say that "in the interests of my security I close this gulf."

My hon. friend asked me about the width of this gulf. It is nine miles. On the one side is UAR and on the other side is Saudi Arabia. Even applying the principle of territorial waters, which is 12 miles for each country, the width is only nine miles between the two countries in this case. UAR says "I am threatened; Syria which is my friend and my ally is threatened. Syria, an Arab country, is threatened. Only in order to prevent aggression, I am doing this. I do not want to attack anyone." Is it wrong then to say that we support President Nasser who is fighting for peace to be maintained in this region?

Therefore, I would appeal to the House, whatever view is expressed, let us not defame our own country. We have never been a warmonger. I feel hurt when any hon. Member says about India that India is a warmongering country. That is not our tradition. That is not our policy. That is not our history.

Shri Banga: He has the genius to side-track issues. He has not answered my question. He has only delivered a homily. Is it not his duty to answer my question?

श्री बांगः सिद्धरी सवालकी : क्या यह सच नहीं है कि भारत के इजरायल के प्रतिपक्ष

को स्वीकार किया है? क्या यह सच नहीं है कि हमने इजरायल के प्रतिपक्ष को मान्यता दी है। उसके साथ हमारे वृत्तीयिक सम्बन्ध नहीं हैं लेकिन एक स्वतन्त्र देश के रूप में हमने उसके प्रतिपक्ष को माना है। जब यह बात है तो मैं विवेक मंती से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस वक्तव्य के पहले वाक्य में क्या लिखा गया है? मैं उद्धृत करता हूँ :

"The creation of Israel has given rise to tension between Israel and the Arab countries."

क्या इसका अर्थ यह नहीं है कि जब तक इजरायल रहेगा तब तक अरब देशों के साथ उसका तनाव रहेगा और तनाव तब खत्म होगा जब इजरायल को दुनिया के नक्शे से मिटा दिया जाएगा? अभी विवेक मंती अग्ररीका की यात्रा पर गए थे। अरब मेरी जानकारी सही है तो उन्होंने यह बात कहा की थी और उनसे पहले स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री श्री नेहरू ने भी यह बात कही थी कि अब इजरायल एक तथ्य है, उस तथ्य से इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता। एक और विवेक मंती बड़े "कांसस" होने की बात कर रहे हैं और इस मामले में हमें "कांसस" होना भी चाहिये लेकिन मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह वाक्य कि श्री किमोनन प्राक इजरायल हैं अब निबन्ध राष्ट्रक दू टैकन, क्या यह अरब देशों को इस बात के लिए उत्तेजना देना नहीं है कि वे इजरायल के प्रतिपक्ष को मानने से इन्कार करते रहे और जब तक इजरायल कायम है उस क्षेत्र में तनाव पैदा करें ?

मुझे कुछ है कि यह वक्तव्य जर्मनों के खिलाफ है। वर्तमान परिस्थिति क्यों पैदा हुई? क्या यह सच नहीं है कि जीरिया के कर्नालेज बलि के और इजरायल के क्षेत्र में घुस कर हमने कब्रों के? इसके

क्या उपाय उपलब्ध नहीं हुआ ? सारे मामले के बारे में राज फैले के पहले क्या भारत सरकार का यह कर्तव्य नहीं था कि अपना एक विशेष दूत काहिरा और तेरबनीय भेजती, दोनों पक्षों की बात सुनी, शांति कायम करने वाले का काम भवा करती, और किसी पक्ष का समर्थन न करती ? भारत सुरक्षा परिषद् का सदस्य है । उस क्षेत्र में शान्ति कायम रखने की हमारे ऊपर भी जिम्मेवारी है । एक ओर तो हम ऊ बात का समर्थन कर रहे हैं और दूसरी ओर एक पक्ष का प्रस्ताव समर्थन कर रहे हैं । यह क्या बहुपक्षित्व के सिद्धान्त के अनुकूल है ? क्या यह स्वतन्त्र विदेश नीति का उपहास नहीं है ?

मैं चाहता हूँ कि मेरी दोनों बातों का जवाब दिया जाए । क्या भारत इजराइल के अस्तित्व को स्वीकार करता है ? क्या यह सच नहीं है कि सीरिया से जाने वाले कमांडोज ने यह तनाव पैदा किया ?

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** The existence of Israel is a fact of life. What I have stated is equally a fact of life.

**Shri Nath Pal:** The question is whether we accept it or not.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** We have accepted it.

**Shri Nath Pal:** We want a categorical reply. You say it is a fact of life. The question is whether we accept it or not.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** Mr. Vajpayee was not asking me about that. (Interruptions).

**Shri Nath Pal:** He has asked about it.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** I am answering Mr. Vajpayee's question.

**Shri Nath Pal:** The question is not private property. You answer the whole House.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** The statement "The creation of Israel has given rise to tension between Israel and the Arab countries" is also a fact of life.

**Shri M. L. Sondhi:** It is an irresponsible statement (Interruptions).

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** If we go back into the past and see the history of the creation of Israel, the tension between Arabs and Israelis has continued and continues till today because of the existence and the creation of Israel. This is true. What I have said is absolutely a fact.

As regards the second question, as regards Syrian commandos, fortunately, I have a statement here from the Secretary General of the United Nations which I will read out to the House, which will completely disprove what Shri Vajpayee has been suggesting, that Syria instigated these commandos to attack Israel. This is what the Secretary General says—this was in his report on the 19th May, 1967 to the Security Council—

"Although allegations are often made, to the best of my knowledge there is no verified information about the organisation, central direction and originating source of these acts which have accrued intermittently in the vicinity of Israel's lines with Jordan and Lebanon."

So the Secretary General has not been in a position to come to any conclusion that Syria or any Arab country is behind these commando raids about which complaint has been made. As against that, we have the statements made against Syria.

**Shri Bal Raj Madhok:** What about the statement made by the Secretary General on the 13th May in which he stated that Syria is sending saboteurs into Israel? Quote that statement also.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** I am quoting a later statement. I have not got the statement of 13th May.

Shri H. N. Mankarjee: In view of the peculiarly intransigent attitude of Israel which, as the Foreign Minister has noted, is a creation of certain circumstances and acts only at the dictation and with the patronage and open support of certain powers like the United States of America and bandwagoned behind them the United Kingdom, may I know if, particularly, in view of the very cowardly attack on General Rikhy's plane, our Government is making it plain that we shall not be bamboozled by any kind of pressure in changing those aspects of our foreign policy in relation to West Asia which are categorically imperative of what ought to be done by a country in our position, and whether we are making it clear to President Nasser that we are very definitely with him and UAR in regard to this matter? Reading between the lines, I sensed a certain sense of hesitancy and when I read the report of the Prime Minister addressing her party meeting and then this report being delayed in this House, I could feel that possibly pressures were being put on our country by our donors, lenders and those people who are supporters in whatever efforts we try to make for our economic and other kinds of development. I want a categorical assurance in regard to this matter, which appertains to categorical imperatives of our foreign policy, that not even with Shri Ranga's pleading that we should change in this particular hour, we are not going to yield to any kind of pressure coming from any neo-colonialist source.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I give the assurance to this House that in our foreign policy we are neither bamboozled nor pressurised by any power. Our foreign policy is an independent policy arrived at in the interest of our country.

श्री मधु निखरे : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय मंत्री जी ने अपने बयान के अन्तिम अनुच्छेद में कहा है :-

"I would like to impress on the House the gravity of the hour and the need to be exceedingly cautious in expressing views in a fast developing situation."

लेकिन दूसरों के लिए उन्होंने जो हिदायत दी है, उस पर वह कुछ अपने बयान में नहीं बले। उन्होंने जो तीन वाक्य ऐसे कहे हैं, जो बिल्कुल एकतरफा वाक्य कहे जा सकते हैं। जैसे, उन्होंने अपने बयान के अन्तिम अनुच्छेद में कहा है :

"The Israeli Prime Minister, Foreign Minister and Chief of Army Staff were quoted as saying that they would teach Syria a severe lesson and even march upto Damascus."

लेकिन इस के साथ-साथ नास्ति साहब ने पचासों बका कहा है कि इस्रायल के अस्तित्व को खत्म करना हमारा उद्देश्य है। अगर मंत्री जी अपने बयान में दोनों पक्षों के कथनों को रखते, तो उचित होता। मैं यह भी बता दूँ कि इस्रायल ने जो काम 1956 में किया, उस का हम ने सख्त विरोध किया था और स्वेच नहरे के राष्ट्रीकरण का अगर किसी ने सब से ज्यादा समर्थन किया, तो हमारे दल ने किया था। इन लिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री जी अमेरिका की साबी बर्ररह की बात छेड़ कर बेरे प्रश्न को न टालें।

मंत्री जी ने अपने बयान में वह भी कहा है :

"The reply expressed the deep concern of the Government of India at the dangerous situation which had developed and our anxiety at the nature of statements recently made by the Israeli leaders."

यहूदी नेताओं के बयानों के बारे में तो भारत सरकार चिन्ता व्यक्त करती है और हमें बत कर दूँ। ए० आर० के बयान के बारे में वह क्या कहती है ?

"We expressed the hope that peace would be maintained and we noted with gratification that it was not the intention of the U.A.R. to increase tension in the area....."

मू० ए० धार० के बयान के बारे में भारत सरकार को वैदिकिकेसन है, संतोष है। इस के बावजूद मंत्री भी सदन को यह हिदायत देते हैं कि इस स्थिति के बारे में अपनी राय प्रकट करने में "एकसौद्वितीय का मत" रहना चाहिए। बाहरे! संयम और सावधानता!

इस सरकार ने जो निरपेक्षता की नीति चलाई, उस का क्या नतीजा हुआ? निरपेक्षता की नीति मानने वाले देशों में के एक देश पर हमला होता है। और किन के द्वारा? किसी निरपेक्ष देश के द्वारा नहीं, बल्कि राष्ट्र-गुटों के साथ जुड़े हुए देशों के द्वारा, चीन और पाकिस्तान के द्वारा हमला होता है, जो धमकी गूट के साथ या दूसरे गूट के साथ जुड़े हुए देश हैं। तब ये निरपेक्ष देश क्या रबैया अपनाते हैं? वे आक्रामक निरपेक्ष देश का साथ नहीं देते हैं। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि वे धमकी गूट का साथ दें या इस के खड़े का साथ दें। लेकिन जब हिन्दुस्तान पर, जो कि निरपेक्षता की नीति चला रहा है, हमला होता है, तो तथा-कथित निरपेक्षता की नीति चमाने वाले सभी देश उस की मदद नहीं करते हैं। यह हमारी विदेश-नीति का नतीजा है!

न कहना चाहता हूँ कि दोस्ती कभी एक-तरफा नहीं हुआ करती है। जब हमारे राष्ट्र पर हमला होता है, जब हमारे ऊपर संकट आता है, तो जो देश हमारे दोस्त कहलाते हैं, जो हमारी तरह निरपेक्षता की नीति पर चलते हैं, उनका कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि वे हमारी मदद करें। क्या भारत सरकार में नासिर साहब की यह बात कही है? उनको यह बताने का बड़ी मौका था कि एक-तरफा

दोस्ती नहीं हुआ करती है, 1962 में जब हमारा देश खतरे में था, जब 1965 में पाकिस्तान ने हम पर हमला किया, तो उनको भी इसी तरह हमारा साथ देना चाहिये था। यह मौका था कि भारत सरकार नासिर साहब को कहती कि उन्होंने प्रकटपूर, 1962 में क्या किया, निरपेक्ष नीति को चलाने वाले एक देश पर हमला होता है और यह उसका साथ नहीं देते हैं। जब 1962 में हम पर संकट आया, तो नासिर साहब वे और अन्य निरपेक्ष देशों ने क्या किया? वे कोसम्बो बोम्बना बना कर मध्यस्थता करने के लिए आए! पाकिस्तान के आक्रमण के बरत भी यही हुआ।

मंत्री जी के बक्तव्य का पहला वाक्य यह है कि इसरायल के अस्तित्व से तनाव की स्थिति उत्पन्न हुई। मैं मानता हूँ कि मजहब के आघार पर किसी राज्य का गठन करना बड़ी खतरनाक बात है। लेकिन इस के साथ साथ उन को कहना चाहिए था कि पाकिस्तान का निर्माण भी मजहब के आघार पर हुआ और उस से भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच में तनाव की स्थिति पैदा हुई।

इस लिए अगर दुनिया में तनाव का अन्त करना है और पूर्वी जर्मनी तथा पश्चिमी जर्मनी, इसरायल और अरब देशों, भारत और पाकिस्तान, उत्तर कोरिया और दक्षिण कोरिया के पारस्परिक झगड़ों को खत्म करना है, तो उस का एक ही रास्ता है, जो हमारे देश ने 1946 और 1948 में अपनाया था। क्या आप नहीं जानते हैं कि भारत ने—और मुझे याद है कि यूगोस्लाविया ने भी—यह सुझाव रखा था कि यहूदियों और अरब देशों का एक महासंघ बने, बटनारा न हो? इस नीति में परिवर्तन करने की क्या आवश्यकता हुई? भारत सरकार आज भी इस बतिका पर क्यों नहीं बंदी रहती है कि

[श्री मधु लिमये]

बहुतियों और मरुत देशों, भारत और पाकिस्तान, उत्तर कोरिया और दक्षिण कोरिया, पूर्वी जर्मनी और पश्चिमी जर्मनी के झगड़े संघ-राज्य के आघार पर तय किये जायें और किसी भी हालत में धर्म के आघार पर, मजहब के आघार पर, बंध के आघार पर स्वतंत्र सार्वभौम राज्यों का निर्माण नहीं हो।

निरपेक्षता की नीति का यह मतलब नहीं है कि पचास करोड़ का देश चार पांच करोड़ वाले देश के आगे हमेशा झुके और उन की खुशामद करे। हमें छोटे देशों का जबर साथ देना चाहिए। लेकिन कभी भी इस का मतलब नहीं है कि एकतरफा दोस्ती रहे। अध्यक्ष महोदय, अन्तिम वाक्य मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमेशा अमरीकी लाबी की बात चलती है, रूसी लाबी की बात चलती है, चीनी लाबी की बात चलती है, क्या इन सदन के अन्दर ऐसे लोग नहीं हैं जो हिन्दुस्तानी लाबी के सदस्य बनने में अपने ऊपर गर्व करते हैं और फरार करते हैं? इन चीजों का मंत्री जी जवाब दें।

15 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: Every one of us here is an Indian. Let us not accuse each other of American lobby or Russian lobby. All of us are elected by Indian people. We represent Indian people and we represent India.

श्री मधु लिमये: यह थापना साहब को कहने दें अध्यक्ष महोदय, थाप तो कहते ही हैं।

Shri M. C. Chagla: Mr. Limaye has accused me of taking sides with U.A.R. and not being objective and impartial. May I draw his attention to the fact that the passages quoted

from the statement must be read in their own context. President Nasser sent a verbal message to our Prime Minister and our Prime Minister was sending a reply to President Nasser. If those passages are read in that context, it will be perfectly clear that our Prime Minister was urging upon President Nasser to use his moderating influence and to see that peace was maintained.

With regard to the question of non-alignment—of course, this is not a debate on foreign policy—I do not see how the attitude that we have taken up detracts from our principle of non-alignment. I think, it emphasizes non-alignment. Let us not forget that. My friend, Mr. Madhu Limaye, said something with which I entirely agree, which is that religion should not be equated with nationalism. This is exactly what Egypt stands for. (Interruptions). President Nasser has emphatically opposed Islamic Summit, Islamic Pact, and he has said over and over again that as far as Egyptian policy is concerned. (Interruptions).

श्री मधु लिमये: माफ कीजिए, क्या कभी नासिर साहब ने ऐसा बयान दिया है कि:

"The aggression of Pakistan has given rise to tension between India and Pakistan".

क्या कभी इस तरह का बयान नासिर साहब ने दिया है? .....

श्री हरदयाल देवगुण: यह नासिर साहब की कितान मेरे पास है.....

Mr. Speaker: I now call Mr. Umanath.

श्री हरदयाल देवगुण: अध्यक्ष महोदय, व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है.....

Mr. Speaker: He may please resume his seat.

श्री एम. कलेश्वर सोबित्त (कन्नड़): :  
विषय साहब का कथन ठीक दिखाना है।

बाप ही जोषिए बिबदे काहव ने जो कहा उस का जबाब आ गया ?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Limaye's question was a general question about policy matters, about Pakistan, Korea, Germany and all that. I do not think any Foreign Minister can answer such a wide question on international politics offhand. It will be difficult.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वह जबाब दे रहे थे . . . . .

जी हरदयाल देवनन : अध्यक्ष महोदय, व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है . . . . .

Mr. Speaker: Will he please sit down? I know that he has a book and he wants to point out something. This side also must have a chance. I will call a few of them on this side also.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वह जबाब दे रहे थे, देते देते बन्द कर दिया ।

Mr. Speaker: If he has any answer to give, I have no objection.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I would answer that question with the greatest pleasure on the proper occasion. It does not arise out of the question that we are discussing now.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : एक हक होती है जिस के बाव बाप को हस्तक्षेप करना चाहिए । यहाँ पर एक सीधा सादा सवाल जाति और जो कुछ विवेक मंत्री जी ने कहा है उती के हित में पूछा गया कि जो टूटे हुए इलाके हैं इनको जोड़ने के लिए संघ का विचार क्या वह सरकार रखती है ? इस से कहीं कोई तनाव बढ़ता नहीं । तनाव बढ़ाने की कोशिश है । हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान का ही भातया भाड़ा है । तो क्या उस विचार को जो स्वयं विवेक मंत्री जब वह नहीं थे, लेकिन वह अपना चुके हैं, वह अपने हक के को चुपके इस प्रश्न पर थे, तो उसकी जयजय हो, जैसे ही जो अपने वह

दे निकाब दो कि संघ के विचार को हम हम टूटे हुए देशों के मामलों के बारे में अपनाते हैं ।

Shri Umasath (Pudukkottai): It is a strange spectacle, though a logical one, that advocates of alignment so far have suddenly become advocates of non-alignment when this issue has come up. We have always been very clear as far as this issue is concerned. Between forces of war, whether directly through certain powers or as instruments of certain powers, and forces of peace and nationalism and independence, there can be no non-alignment and no neutrality. That has been our consistent position.

With regard to this particular question now, whatever hesitant positions might have been taken, as contained in the statement by the Government of India, as the days go by and as time goes by, Government should not try to slide back or weaken from that position. On the other hand, those positions must be made firmer and firmer. Whether the pressure be foreign or internal, the present position must be further strengthened.

In this context, I would like to ask this question. In the recent long talks that the Secretary-General of the U.N., U Thant was having with President Nasser, U Thant was trying to persuade President Nasser, as reported in the press, that he must agree to the stationing of U.N. troops in the Gulf of Aqaba or whatever it is. It is reported that Maj. Gen. Rikhye was assisting U Thant during the discussions on this specific proposal. I would like to know from the Government whether Maj. Gen. Rikhye is a military commander representing the Gaza Strips and whether in this political proposal . . .

Shrimati Tarkashwari Saha (Berk): He is working under the U.N. He is not answerable to the Government of India.

**Shri Umanath:** I know that he is working under the U.N. I am asking this question of the hon. Minister. Why should she interrupt? I would like to know when Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha has been appointed the general constable of this House.

**Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:** Since when has Shri Umanath been appointed as the general conscience-keeper of this House and also of the U.N.? He is not the conscience-keeper of the U.N. or of this House.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order, Shri Umanath may address the Chair.

**Shri Umanath:** I have been very disciplined and I have been trying to put my question, but she has been trying to interrupt me. Anyhow, I shall be chivalrous now.

**Maj. Gen. Rikhye** is there to carry out certain military tasks given to him by the United Nations. But these negotiations are political, and the proposal also is a political one, because it has been proposed that troops must be permitted to be stationed there. My question is whether Government have considered this aspect namely whether the participation of Maj. Gen. Rikhye in such negotiations or assistance by him, as reported in the press, will not lead to misunderstandings among the Arab countries, especially the U.A.R. May I know whether this question has been taken into consideration and what Government propose to do about it?

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** Gen. Rikhye is an international civil servant. He is on deputation to the United Nations. Obviously, he is an officer in whom U Thant has great confidence. U Thant had asked him to accompany him in his conversations with President Nasser. He had given no instructions to him and it is not on our advice that he had accompanied U Thant in his discussions with President Nasser.

**Shri Nath Pai and Shri Hem Barua** rose—

**Mr. Speaker:** One of you.

**Shri Hem Barua:** We both have given notice.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is a different matter. A number of others also have given notice. But all are not called. Let one of them ask a question. The Deputy Leader of the P.S.F.

**Shri Nath Pai:** On Monday I raised an objection to the fact that the Prime Minister had made a statement on this very explosive situation, and then I welcomed the fact that Shri Chagla wanted to have some time so that he could handle this very delicate subject with sufficient caution. I recant my objection to the Prime Minister's statement because her impromptu statement was more balanced and cautious than this sheet that has been submitted to us. It pains me greatly to say that I do not see Shri Chagla's hand in this . . . (Interruptions). Will she put a stop to this habit? (Interruptions).

**Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:** He should have been better informed as to who has drafted it. Let him brief us about it also. (Interruptions). What is this underground tunnel with the Treasury Benches?

**Shrimati Lakshminakshamma (Khammam):** He may be asked not to talk across the Table.

**Mr. speaker:** He should not talk across the Table.

**Shri Nath Pai:** The lady has had nothing to do with what Shri Chagla did as Chief Justice. I as a student of law know the touch and imprint of his language. I think this wretched document has been drafted by some section officer. If Shri Chagla wants to own authorship of it, he is free to do so.

I would like to draw your attention to what is stated in this wretched

thing. As I said, he is free to own it as his. But I will say what I feel about it. That is what I am here for. Let me deal with both the *modus operandi* on this very vital issue and also what we have to say.

Mr. Speaker, I would like them to very carefully—even now, it is not too late—reflect on the statement that has originated from Moscow, how carefully that statement is couched. The Soviet Union have made it abundantly clear that their first and foremost concern is the preservation of peace. They have, of course, indicated their general support for the Arab cause. No one can deny them that right. Similarly, when you indicate that you are supporting the Arab cause as friends, nobody would object. But there is nothing like that abiding concern for prevention of break-out of hostilities and for preservation of peace in this; instead, there are general inanities. Let me now examine how the cause of peace is being furthered in this document. I have marked those paragraphs:

“... We said that we fully appreciated the reasons why the U.A.R. has had to institute precautionary measures...”

This is the *modus operandi*; this is what we say in an explosive situation where the prospects of war or peace depend on what we do as much as on what anybody else does.

Then look at this paragraph: where it is said that Mr. Nasser conveyed ‘verbally’ his anxiety. He is free as a friend to do that. But Mr. Chagla reiterated the allegation against the other side. Did we hear what the other side had to say? Do we know what the other side has to say? No.

Out of fear, we have failed to exercise the sovereign right of India of having a diplomatic mission that every sovereign country in the world has. Let some country be our friend. Let us call all countries our friends...

Mr. Speaker: Will he put the question?

Shri Nath Pai: I have given notice for a debate on this also.

Mr. Speaker: I know. But let him ask his question now.

Shri Nath Pai: They will get tit for tat. I am not used to be brow-beaten... I would like to ask... (Interruptions).

I would not take notice of such gross vulgarities.

I would like to ask Mr. Chagla if it is not part of our policy to remain friendly with all nations; with some we are more friendly, I agree with you, but here are you adhering to that?

Secondly, did you take the precaution, before levelling charges against a nation with whom you do not have diplomatic relations, of finding out their side of the case? Is it being non-aligned, is it furthering the cause of peace? I think we ought to have done something like the U.S.S.R. which has made its stand abundantly clear. I was extremely impressed by that statement. I do not know if he carefully studied it. First and foremost, the U.S.S.R. says that the breaking out of hostilities in that area will be against the interests of all. We could have at least done that. You have thrown your complete weight on one side. You should have indicated support, I agree, I have no objection, but I should like to know...

Mr. Speaker: What is the question?

Shri Nath Pai: The question is this. Did he exercise the sovereign right of India to find out the case of the other side? Was it fair of India to identify itself at this critical juncture with one side? While reiterating our friendship, we ought to have advised caution. All that Mr. Chagla does is to go on reiterating what was told verbally by Mr. Nasser. Perhaps the Prime Minister can reply.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I take full responsibility for the statement. My friend says he knows my language because he had appeared before me

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

when I was a Judge. May I say that when Mr. Nath Pai used to appear before me, he was a very well behaved lawyer.

Shri Hem Barua: I think he is better behaved now.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am sorry to find a general deterioration in his language. His language used to be polite, courteous, considerate.

Shri Hem Barua: He is more polite now.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Something has happened. A time comes in a man's life when deterioration sets in. It may be in your language or anything else. I used to admire Mr. Nath Pai's language. I have great regard for him. May I request him to keep some control over his language, and not follow the example of some other members in this House. (Interruptions).

श्री मधु लिसवै : बड़ी बिना हो रयी है भापको ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am very glad indeed that Mr. Nath Pai has referred to the Soviet communique. I have got it here. I will read only one paragraph:

"During the course of the last few weeks a situation is developing in the Middle East which is causing anxiety from the point of view of peace and international security. After the armed attack of Israeli forces on the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic on April 7 this year, the ruling circles of Israel are continuing to increase the atmosphere of military psychosis in the country. Leading statesmen, amongst them the Minister of Foreign Affairs Eban, have openly called for the conduction of broad "punitive" operations of Israel against Syria and inflicting on the latter a "decisive blow". The Defence and Foreign Affairs

Commission of Knesset (Parliament) by its decision of May ninth has empowered the Government to conduct military operations against Syria. The Israeli forces which are brought near the borders of Syria have been kept in a state of Military preparedness. Military mobilisation has been ordered in the country.

It is absolutely clear that Israel could not have acted in this manner if there had not been a practical and indirect encouragement of its stand on the part of certain imperialist circles who are trying to impose colonial tyranny on the Arab land."

So, this is exactly what . . .

श्री नाथ पाई : भापने पूरा पढ़ा नहीं, जैसे भापको भादन है। कहते हैं मेरी उदाहण सगार है।

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am prepared to read the whole of it.

Shri Ranga: We do not have so much time to waste now.

Shri M. C. Chagla: My hon. friend is accusing me for not showing concern for peace. The Prime Minister has shown her concern for peace in the statement quite clearly. Even in her plea to President Nasser, she has shown her concern for peace. I do not want to read it again but if one thing is clear from these statements, it is our abiding concern for peace. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Shri D. C. Sharma.

Shri Hem Barua: I wrote to you and I also submitted a call attention notice to you.

Mr. Speaker: Every Member has equal rights in this House; this side also has its rights. If one hour is given to that side, at least ten minutes must be given to this side.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Are you going back on your promise? How can you bypass the right of a Member?

**Mr. Speaker:** I have called Shri D. C. Sharma. Please sit down. I will come to you now.

**Shri Hem Barua:** I wrote to you this morning.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is no monopoly among the three or four of you.

**Shri Hem Barua:** What is this monopoly? Do not use this foul language.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I want to submit very respectfully that it is not only the Opposition Members who send you call attention notices about Israel and other things and about Gen. Rikhy's condition but also the Congress Members. You wanted that before the call attention notices were discussed on the floor of the House, there would be more substance in the debate if the Foreign Minister were to make a statement first and questions could come later on.

**Mr. Speaker:** Please come to your question.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I know there are some hon. Members who are always in the habit of denigrating the statements that are made by some Ministers that they had been written by some section officers. I think this tendency should be curbed. There is so much solicitude for peace in the statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** Please put your question.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Sir, you have given so much time to those people. President Nasser has said that he has taken preventive action only and that he has no intention of having any aggression against Israel or any other country. May I know from the Foreign Minister if he would keep the situation under his watch from day to day and come to this House after three

or four days to report that the preventive action has not developed into a shooting war or some other kind of bellicosity. He should come to the House to make a statement on the subject because the statement says that the situation is explosive.

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** All that I can say is, it is the hope and prayer of everybody that this preventive action should not lead to war. We will certainly do whatever we can to prevent violence breaking out.

Some hon. Members rose—

**Mr. Speaker:** There are three Members who wrote to me about this. Mr. Sharma had also written. Then, Mr. Barua had written, Shri Madhok also had written. I now call Shri Madhok to put his question.

**Shri Nambiar:** I do not want to write a letter, but I want to get a chance.

**Mr. Speaker:** I wanted to call the other hon. Member because he wrote to me.

**Shri Nambiar:** I must get a chance. If he has a right, I too have a right.

श्री मधु लिखते: अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप के इस स्थान पर पहुँचने के पहले उपाध्यक्ष महोदय कुर्सी पर बैठे थे और उस वक्त यह बात छिड़ गयी कि इस को ध्यानकर्षण के रूप में लिया जाय या इन के बयान के रूप में लिया जाय। अब बयान के रूप में लिया जाता है तो उस में विकलत होती है। बिन्होंने पहले मोटिस दिया है उन्हें मौका नहीं मिलता है इसलिए मेरी आप से विनती है कि इस पर केवल तीन, चार ही लोगों को नहीं बल्कि कम से कम 10-12 लोगों को मौका दिया जाये।

**Shri Raj Raj Madhok:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister has been talking in the statement about the friendship

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

of UAR and India. I will now read out to you the statement made by the editor of *Al Jamuria*, the official organ of the Government of Egypt, when he was leading a delegation in Dacca. He said on the 3rd May this year as follows:

"मुल्हदा अरब जम्हूरिया के बर्हिन्दे कम्बीर के तनाजे में बही जइबात रखते हैं जो आप फिलस्तीन के तिलसिले में रखते हैं। सन् 1965 की सितम्बर की जंग में आप यकीन रखें कि हमारे जइबात आपके साथ थे।

उन्होंने आपे कहा कि मुझे यह देख कर बड़ी दुःखी होती है कि सदर अय्यूब की कयादत में आपका मुल्क बड़ी तेज रफ्तारी से तरकी कर रहा है।"

He said two things: first, we have the same views about your disputes with India as you have with regard to us in regard to Palestine. Secondly, he said: in the war of 1965, the people of Egypt were entirely with you. This is the statement made by this editor of *Al Jamuria*, a leading newspaper and the official newspaper of Egypt, in Dacca when he was in the official delegation there. May I know how the Government of India can say that UAR is a friendly country? I say UAR is not a friendly country. At the most, our relations with it are the same as with Israel. Therefore, if both of them are unfriendly or equally friendly or equally indifferent, why should we take sides?

Secondly, the Minister said that in 1957, when the question of the Aqaba gulf came, Mr. Menon made a statement that we stand for the rights of the UAR and Saudi Arabia, that both of them have legal rights in these territorial waters. But the same year, there was a resolution in the General Assembly of the United Nations in which we said that freedom will be given to all ships, ships of all countries including those of Israel and other

countries, to pass through the Gulf of Aqaba and that no restriction will be put on them. That resolution which was passed by the General Assembly in the United Nations was voted by us. May I know whether, what Mr. Menon in his discretion or in his pleasure might have said, is binding on us? Or, is not the vote that we gave in the United Nations resolution about freedom of access to all ships including ships of Israel to pass through the Gulf of Aqaba binding? The Minister said that because this forms part of UAR's territorial waters, "the UAR President said that if any ship comes we will attack it;" Is it not a clear provocation to war, and we are supporting that. May I know how he reconciles these two statements?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Personally, I have not seen the newspaper to which my hon. friend refers.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: It is a leading paper, *Paabaaan*, of Pakistan; not India.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I accept it. But we know enough about the press in our own country to be able to say that everything that appears in a newspaper does not represent the policy of the Government.

Shri A. B. Vajpayee: It is a reflection.

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is not right to say that what appeared in that paper is the official policy of the Egyptian Government. As regards the UN Resolution, I have looked for it practically for 2 hours this morning, but I have not been able to come across any UN Resolution to the effect mentioned by my friend, Shri Madhok. There is no UN Resolution which has laid down that this is an open seaway through which all ships can pass. If he will draw my attention to it, I will accept it. I have made some search in whatever time I had and I have not been able to come across any resolution passed by the UN. But the three powers—USA, France and UK—did

issue a statement about the Aqaba canal. But as far as the UN is concerned, there is no resolution to that effect. I speak subject to correction. If my hon. friend will correct me, I will accept it.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is now 3.30 and we have to adjourn. But a number of chits are coming and I do not know how I can help. We will spend another 5 minutes on this. I will call 2 or 3 more members to put questions. Shri Hem Barua.

**Shri M. R. Krishna (Peddapalli):** You call only those who frighten you always.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is said: any question from this side supports the policy of the Government; it is the opposition that wants a chance to oppose the policy. Anyway, I do not agree with that view and I have told Prof. Ranga also about that.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Somehow or other, we have taken UAR's friendship towards India for granted. I want the friendship of our country with all the nations of the world, including the Arab world, to grow from strength to strength. I agree with Mr. Chaglia that our country is not war-mongering and we stand for peace. In the context of this conflict, we find that the different interested nations of the world are ganging up either on this side or that side of the warring faction. What pains me is this that the Prime Minister immediately came forward with a statement in a party meeting offering India's support to UAR. That is not the way of serving the cause of peace. She got banner headlines in the UAR Press saying "India supports UAR". In spite of the fact that President Nasser is a good friend of ours and we want that friendship to grow, may I know whether the attention of the minister is drawn to the slanderous attack published in the UAR newspapers about India saying that in India, the dogs are stouter than human beings, be-

cause they feed on the human carcasses of children and other beings and at the same time, India is a Hindu country, which oppresses the Muslim minority? The press in UAR belongs to the State. May I know from the Prime Minister, particularly, if she is going to request President Nasser to find out if Mr. Nasser is potent enough to stop this sort of canard against India, which vitiate the relation between the two countries, which we want to grow from strength to strength?

**Shri M. C. Chaglia:** I have seen the quotations referred to by my hon. friend and I must confess I was very deeply distressed on reading it. I sincerely hope and I am sure it does not represent the official view of the Egyptian Government. Even so, we will make due representations through proper channels drawing the attention of the Egyptian Government to these articles which have appeared and which have shocked and hurt the Indian people.

**Shri R. K. Sinha (Faizabad):** Sir, at the time of the Indo-Pakistan aggression I was in UAR as a journalist.

**Mr. Speaker:** Please do not go into the background.

**Shri R. K. Sinha:** You have allowed long speeches and harangues. At least let me put my question.

I have written in the UAR press in the midst of Indo-Pakistan aggression supporting our view. In the UAR I have found friendship for the Indian political opinion and the Indian stand. UAR, as I have found, is a socialist and secular country. I was present at the time when an attempt was being made to murder President Nasser by the Muslim Brotherhood. This Muslim Brotherhood was in alliance with Pakistan. When things are pointed out in a vitiated pattern, I want to put a question to our Foreign Minister. Is he conscious of the fact that Israel was created as part of the pattern of partition of people's countries in the world? As India was partitioned, as Sudan was partitioned and Egypt was

[Shri R. K. Sinha]

partitioned, in the same fashion Israel was torn from the body and flesh of the Arab world. Has the Foreign Minister carefully kept in view the fact that UAR is today facing a continuation of the situation arising out of the Suez Canal aggression in which imperialistic power and Israel tried to invade UAR? Has the Foreign Minister taken into consideration that UAR is the only country which is fighting against Muslim communal infiltration which we are fighting in another form in India? Has he also kept in view that UAR is a non-aligned country, a socialist oriented country and one of our best allies in the Arab world? Has he also taken into consideration that in the last Summit of the Arab powers it was President Nasser and Nasser alone who defended the Indian Government's point of view and a pro-Pakistan resolution was defeated? These points of friendship our friends in the Opposition want to forget. Has the hon. Minister taken note of it?

Shri M. C. Chagla: My hon. friend has expressed my views in a better language than I can do.

Mr. Speaker: That is the charge of the Opposition.

Shri R. Sinha: They all got up and expressed their view.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister himself has said that you have expressed his views. Therefore, it is a compliment to you. It has also strengthened the view of the Opposition that Members on this side only express the view of the Government.

Shri N. Dandekar (Jamnagar): May I ask the Minister of External Affairs whether the Government of India endeavoured to find out from the Government of Israel what they had to say on the whole subject, and if the Government of India did not attempt to find this out why not?

Shri M. C. Chagla: The facts as established on the record from the report of U Thant....

Shri N. Dandekar: That is no answer.

Shri M. C. Chagla: We have made no enquiries.

Shri N. Dandekar: Will you do it now?

Shri M. C. Chagla: That is a suggestion for action and we will consider it.

Shri N. Dandekar: Why was it not done?

Mr. Speaker: He is considering it.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Now, I will allow another five minutes. We have to adjourn and meet again at 5.00 for the Budget.

श्री मधु सिन्हा : कल के स्पर्शन के मामले का क्या हुआ ?

कम्प्लेक्स : कल मैंने ।

Shri M. L. Sondhi: May I request the hon. Minister for External Affairs to kindly take into account the importance of certain views which were expressed here that there is an impression that Israel is over-dependent upon the United States of America for its security and needs? Indeed, it is said that Israel is a stooge of the United States of America. Let us take realistically what is the reason for that. The reason is....

Mr. Speaker: Don't go into these things. You put a question.

Shri M. L. Sondhi: Would the hon. Minister examine the possibilities that exist for weaning away Israel from its dependence on the United States by assuring Israel of an Afro-Asian personality? The strait of

Tiran is the way through which it carries on trade with Afro-Asia. This trade, even in 1958, amounted to the equivalent of 10 million dollars. It is much more now. In fact, the Minister has not considered the possibilities that there are of encouraging Israel to change its personality and to come closer to Asia. Indeed, the founders of Israel were people who were in very close touch with the radical movements of the world and even now it is a fact that they address Soviets as comrades and Histadrut is a labour organisation of international renown. May I, therefore, request the Minister for External Affairs to kindly consider the possibility of making an on-the-spot examination of these issues and not depend upon certain hearsay in this matter? My question is: Will the Government of India be prepared to take steps to recognise Israel on condition that Israel establishes an independent personality free of American control?

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** We have already recognised Israel. There is no question of not recognising Israel. We have no diplomatic relations. There is a Consul in Bombay; we have recognised Israel.

**डा० राज मनोहर लोहिया:** मैं कोशिश यही करूंगा कि ज्यादा धर्म बात न हो. इसलिए चांगला माहब से आज मैं ज्यादा बिनती के रूप में ही कुछ बहूंगा।

हमारी जो नीति धरम और इजराईल के सम्बन्ध में है, उनके चार तत्व हैं। एक यह है कि धरम राज्यों से प्रेम, हमारे धरम जातिकों से प्रेम, तीसरे यहूदी जाति से प्रेम और चौथे, इजराईल राज्य के धर्मिन्त्व का स्वीकार। मैंने आपको कर्क चार का बताना दिया है। इन चार तत्वों को साथ लेकर धरम आप चलेंगे तो यहूदी नीति चला पाएंगे। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि आपने इन चार तत्वों में से कुछ को कम कर दिया है। इस पर आप बरा ध्यान रखें।

इजराईल के लोग कुछ गुन्मा जरूर हूँ होंगे। मैंने खुद भी कुछ पांच छः मान पहलने उनको गुन्मा करने का मौका दिया था। लेकिन आज उनसे एक धरम करना चाहूंगा कि चाहे झकावा की खाड़ी को बन्द कर दें। नाबिग माहब धीर यह काम धरम है वा बुरा, इस बहम में इस बकल मैं नहीं पहना चाहता। लेकिन नेमाबीव एक जगह है जहाँ से वे अपना मार्ग मामान अमरीका से, इंग्लिन्डन से, रम से, ममी जगह से ले जा सकते हैं, यह का भी सामान। इसलिए आप एक जग मेरी बिनती को भी याद रखना कि इजराईल को गुन्मा जाने के लिए आपने काफी मौका दिया है लेकिन फिर भी हमारे कुछ ऐसे लोग हैं, हमारे जैसे इस देश में लोग हैं जो न तो अमरीका के साथ हैं, न रूस के साथ हैं और जो हिन्दुस्तान की अपनी नीति हो, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति . . . . .

**अध्यक्ष महोदय:** आपका मवान हो गया है।

**Shri M. C. Chagla:** I will certainly bear in mind what the hon. Member has said.

**डा० राज मनोहर लोहिया:** यह धरम बात है, यह तो आप हमेशा ही कहते हैं।

**Mr. Speaker:** He has promised to bear in mind.

**डा० राज मनोहर लोहिया:** आपने मुझे बीच में ही रोक दिया था। मेरा मवान भी पूरा नहीं हुआ। मेजर जनरल रिम्बी जिनकी यहां इनती गारोफ की गई है उन्होंने अपना एक बात मुझे लिखा है कि हिन्दुस्तान के सिपाहियों को जो बहा नैनाल हैं पहले प० एन० की तरफ से पचास रुपये रोज की तनकाह दी जाती थी और फिर बाद में फिर चार रुपये दी गई और यह इनके मवान से हुआ है।

**Mr. Speaker:** He may not bring in that now.

श्री भोलेन्द्र झा (जयनगर) : किन कारणों से वहाँ पर तनाव बढ़ रहा है और उसका कुछ जिक्र यहाँ माननीय सदस्यों ने किया है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इसका यह कारण नहीं है कि धमरीकी शास्तास्त्रियों से लैस होकर इसरायल आक्रमणकारी भाव ले रहा है? क्या वही पैटन टैंक, वही जेट विमान नहीं हैं जिनकी बजह से हमारे देश पर आक्रमण हुआ था? क्या उन्हीं पैटन टैंकस और इन्हीं जेट्स की बजह से वियतनाम में संघर्ष नहीं हो रहा है? क्या यही वहाँ पर भी तनाव की स्थिति पैदा करने के कारण नहीं है? क्या मंत्री महोदय भारत सरकार की ओर से यह रुख लेंगे कि विदेशी हथियारों के अट्टे संगार में कहीं न बनाये जायें, न इसरायल में, न पाकिस्तान में, न कहीं और ताकि दुनिया में शांति बनी रहे? क्या यही रुख इसरायल के बारे में धार्य लने जा रहे हैं या नहीं?

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing to answer.

श्री भोलेन्द्र झा : जवाब दिनवाइये, अष्टाक्ष महोदय।

Mr. Speaker: He has no answer.  
Mr. Nambiar.

Shri Nambiar: In view of the fact...

श्री र.बाबुलाल शर्मा (पटना) : हम लोगों को भी सबाल वृद्धन का मौका दिया जाना चाहिये। कुछ का धार्य देने है, कुछ का नहीं देने है। यह कौन सा नाँव है...

Mr. Speaker: I am really sorry for the back-benchers. The leaders of their parties are taking away the time. (Interruptions).

श्री र.बाबुलाल शर्मा : हमें भी मौका मिलना चाहिये...

Mr. Speaker: The leaders of parties are taking away the time. The back-

benchers should ask the leaders of their parties. I cannot be responsible for that.

Shri Nambiar: In view of the fact that there are big powers behind Israel who are interested in creating tension in West Asian region and in the Mediterranean by sending warships and armaments to this region, is it not our duty to defend peace in this region in our own interest by naming the powers who are disturbing peace and standing by the victims of threat of war and thus restore peace by putting our full might on the side of those who want to live in peace?

Mr. Speaker: The House stands adjourned till 5 P.M.

15.50 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Seventeen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled at Seventeen Hours of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

#### GENERAL BUDGET, 1967-68

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Finance Minister. (Applause).

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): They are glad at the coming taxes?

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Has there been a leakage of the budget?

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): Sir, on the 20th of March this year, I presented to this Honourable House an interim Budget for the year 1967-68. In presenting that Budget, I had occasion to remark that a number of difficult and even conflicting considerations had to be taken into account in framing the Budget for the current year. There was not enough time in the last session of Parliament either for Honourable Members or for the Government to review the situation fully. It was against this general