

aircraft over either country and the overall impression on my mind is that it is not unfavourable to us. If they ask for the exact figures, we can give the figures also.

About the Tashkent Declaration, I do not want to say anything. It is very much a foreign affairs matter, and at the appropriate time I would request the hon. member to address the question to the External Affairs Minister.

12.36 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Notification re : Management of Bengal Nagpur Cotton Mills etc.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN TRADE (SHRI RAM SEWAK CHOWDHARY) : I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1) A copy of Notification No. S. O. 4433 (English version) and S.O. 4434 (Hindi version) published in Gazette of India dated the 30th October, 1969, regarding management of the Bengal Nagpur Cotton Mills Limited, Rajnandgaon, under sub-section (2) of section 18A of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-2098/69*].
- (2) A copy of the Export of Froglegs (Inspection) Second Amendment Rules, 1969 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. S. O. 4537 in Gazette of India dated the 6th November, 1969, under sub-section (3) of section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-2099/69*].
- (3) A copy of the Textile Committee (Third Amendment) Rules, 1969, published in Notification No. G S R. 2172 in Gazette of India dated the 13th September, 1969, under sub-section (3) of section 22 of the Textiles Committee Act, 1963.

- (4) A copy of Corrigendum to the Annual Report on the working of the Cardamom Board for the year 1967-68, [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-2100/69*].

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Fifty-fifth Report

SHRI BHALJIBHAI PARMAR (Dohad) : I beg to present the Fifty-fifth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

12.37 hrs.

MATTER UNDER RULE 377

Shri Nehru's decision on India's Participation in religious Conference.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi) : I am grateful to you for permitting me to bring to the notice of this House a point, a very significant point, on what the External Affairs Minister, Mr. Dinesh Singh, stated on 17 November in the proceedings in this House on the motion for adjournment.

I have had a look at the communication which was received by you from the Minister. What the Minister says in this is contradicted by the common knowledge of most of the elder members of this House who know Mr. Nehru, and all those who have read his views in the various debates on external affairs which took place in this House are rather dismayed and amazed that the Minister should claim, and claim in the manner that he did in this House, that if religious conferences are held, then it would be in our interest if people from India participate in these religious conferences; and he said it in a manner that suggests that Pandit Nehru said this or thought this. It almost conveys, it does in fact convey, the impression that he is quoting from a document.

Further on he says that he is dealing with the subject in a manner which correctly reflects policy and does not mislead the House and he claims that the files concerned

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

are secret. With your permission, I would very briefly comment on this, because I think it is for this House to decide as it has inherited certain privileges from the House of Commons and has its own understanding of the issues.

I may reiterate that it is not a question of political arithmetic that I want to raise at this time. I am not interested in this question as to which faction of the Congress is interested or not. But the matter has a wider context in that it is the knowledge of this House, of senior members in the country, on the basis of records of Mr. Nehru, that he was categorically opposed to participation in religious conferences, because, in his view, such participation would undermine India's non-denominational constitutional system and, in fact, undermine India's capacity for a purposive diplomacy for a modern world order.

The Minister, in the manner in which he presented it to the House, has made a statement which is not merely inconsistent; it is not a mere irregularity, it goes to the heart of the matter because it contradicts our understanding and experience of Indian foreign policy for the last twenty years, and it also inflicts on us such a grave and such a cruel denial of our own knowledge and understanding of our country and of its first Foreign Minister.

So, I would request you, and I would again request the Minister, who happens to be in the House, not to stand on prestige, not to make an issue of it which I think is a false one because there have been examples in the House of the Commons of Mr. Eden and other Ministers who, when they made a mistake, would either correct the statement or come to the House with full facts.

It would be disrespectful to the memory of Mr. Nehru and disrespectful to this House because from what appears from the debate and from his submission to you, *prima facie* lot of mischief has been done to our understanding and to our very appreciation of the tenor of foreign affairs.

The matter may or may not be sent to the Privileges Committee. I do not blame

you because your hands are tied by the rules which we have in this House. But it will be remembered by history. It was a grave violation of the elementary responsibility of democratic duty, committed by the treasury benches. They were not prepared to lay before the House all the facts; what the facts are, what were Mr. Nehru's views; they are the property of this nation. There is a whole Institute which works on his thoughts. I do not want to quote from May's Parliamentary Practice but there are relevant quotations which I can give.

This matter concerns not only Mr. Nehru but his close and trusted colleagues also, like Maulana Azad and others. If there are these written records why should we be unfair and say there is some struggle going on in the E. A. Ministry between the Minister and certain other officials. We do not know anything of this sort. We do not know anything of that sort. What we want is that the Minister should be prepared not to obstruct clear thinking by this House. He should be prepared to encourage Members to make up their mind. I therefore suggest that either you convene a conference of yourself, the Minister and the Opposition leaders. If you please, I am prepared to lend my assistance but I am not claiming for me any position in this. I am more interested in seeing that this matter is dealt with in a manner which does justice to the memory of Mr. Nehru and our academic understanding of the foreign policy.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Sondhi came to me with a request under direction No. 115. The only procedure was to send his request to the Minister and ascertain whether it was a quotation or not. If he had not used a quotation, he was quite privileged to do so, he can also put in the plea that it is a privileged document and would not be in the public interest to disclose it. He has come to me under rule 377. It is a borderline case under which a substantive matter cannot be raised. So far as the matter being referred to the Privileges Committee is concerned, I do not think I have any such rule under which I can send it to that committee. After all the Chair has to be guided by the rules and not always by what the hon. Members say, though sometimes it creates very difficult situations. If the hon. Minister wants to reply, he is welcome to reply.

THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS (SHRI DINESH SINGH) : Mr. Speaker, you had very kindly sent me a copy of the letter that the hon. Member has sent to you and had asked for my views; I had sent them to you. I got this intimation a short while ago that the hon. Member, Mr. Sondhi, would be raising this matter here. Mr. Sondhi has made a point about the secret document. I had said even on that day; it is in the record of the proceedings. I should like to say here that I am not in a position of privilege to give any quotation because it is a secret file; I have said that the papers were secret and I could not place them before the hon. Members. Mr. Sondhi has detached it out of context. He said as if it gave the impression that Mr. Nehru was anxious to send people to such conferences. That is not quite correct. If he goes through the records, he will see that I said that for a number of years we did not send any representatives; no one from India attended any of those conferences. If he was in doubt I shall be glad to read it out for his benefit.

SHRI M. L. SONDHİ : I am not in doubt. It appears that Nehru said or Nehru thought like that. Those are in quotation; it is clear that you were quoting words; that there is no mistake about it.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I had said that in 1955 it was felt that it would be in our interest not to prevent people from going to those conferences, that if people went to those conferences they would be able to reflect correctly the position of Muslims in India. But the people who went were not Governmental people. They were private people, and it is known that they have been going for a number of years, and the House has asked questions

SHRI M. L. SONDHİ : That is not the point, Sir, *(Interruptions)*

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I can understand the point.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Sondhi, please be patient. I am anxious that you may not go out of control.

SHRI M. L. SONDHİ : What the Minister said,—that question—does not arise.

I would beseech him not to look upon it from Mr. Nehru's political standpoint. Here is the opinion of the chief policy-maker...

MR. SPEAKER : I am not going to allow any debate whatsoever.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : The hon. Member has already delivered his speech. I think he should now show the courtesy of listening to what I have to say. This is not a matter of debate, as you have pointed out. He has made a statement and I should make my statement, and then it is for you to decide. It is not a question of entering into any debate or argument on this matter. It is provided in the rules.

MR. SPEAKER : No debate at all.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I have stated the position. I have also clarified the position about such conferences which were held in religious names but which dealt with political issues. I repeat that each conference should be considered on its merits and this is exactly what we have been doing.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : We made a departure this time by sending officials.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : The matter of sending our delegation to Rabat has been fully discussed in this House. I have nothing more to add on this subject.

SHRI M. L. SONDHİ : Please permit me to quote only one sentence.

MR. SPEAKER : Please stand by your commitment; no debate.

SHRI M. L. SONDHİ : One second, Sir. He says there will be no departure in our policy, as laid down by Pandit Nehru. Now, he agrees with Mr. Ranga. What is this? He should be consistent.

MR. SPEAKER : No argument.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) : Please meet him in his room.

SHRI M. L. SONDHİ : Sir, let this matter be not taken in such a frivolous manner. What is this frivolity? I am trying to help him. Do not be frivolous.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : I love you.

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : Let there be a little seriousness. It is this sort of quality which brings about indiscipline in this House: it is this light-heartedness. He is a fine fellow to meet in the playground; but not here where he brings down the temper of this House. Let him tell the Minister to be forth right.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : I am so sorry.

MR. SPEAKER : Do not take the privilege of interrupting every Member when he is speaking. Please do not do that.

12.49 hrs.

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Ninth Report

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara) : Sir I beg to move :

“ That this House do agree with the Ninth Report of the Committee of Privileges laid on the Table of the House on the 19th November, 1969.”

I do not think it needs any explanation; the report has been circulated.

MR. SPEAKER : Yes. The question is :

“ That this House do agree with the Ninth Report of the Committee of Privileges laid on the Table of the House on the 19th November, 1969.”

The motion was adopted.

12 50 hrs.

MOTOR VEHICLES (AMENDMENT) BILL—(Contd.)

श्री श्रीम प्रकाश श्यामी (मुरादाबाद) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कल कह रहा था कि मोटर

व्हीकल एक्ट में सबसे बड़ी विशेष धारा पर-
मिट के बारे में है और परमिट देने के सम्बन्ध
में जितनी घांघली चल रही है, जितना भ्रष्टा-
चार चल रहा है और उसके कारण जनता को
जितना कष्ट पहुँच रहा है, उतना सरकार की
किसी अन्य व्यवस्था से नहीं। जैसा कि मैंने
कल कहा था, बाजार में एक एक लाख रुपये
का परमिट बिक रहा है। इसके मानी यह है
कि परमिट लेने वाले ज्यादा हैं और गाड़ियां
कम हैं। इस स्थिति में यह समझ में नहीं
आता है कि सरकार परमिट देने में हिचकिचाती
क्यों है? इसका एक ही कारण मालूम होता
है कि सरकार के कर्मचारी भ्रष्टाचार चाहते
हैं। उनके पाकेट गर्म होनी रहें, इसी कारण से
उन्होंने इस प्रणाली को दूषित बना रखा है।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस भ्रष्टाचार को दूर
किया जाये और जनता को राहत मिले। इसके
लिए मेरा मुभाव है कि सरकार के पास पर-
मिट के लिए जितने भी प्रार्थना पत्र अयों और
सरकार जितने प्रार्थना पत्रों को प्रमाणित कर
दे, उन सभी को परमिट मिल जाना चाहिए,
ताकि वे किसी भी रूट पर बम चला सकें।
1920 तक यही व्यवस्था थी, लेकिन बीच में
पड़्यन्त्र चला और जान बूझ कर भ्रष्टाचार
उत्पन्न करने के लिए उसमें परिवर्तन कर दिया
गया।

यह दलील दी जा सकती है कि अगर एक
ही रूट पर ज्यादा बसें हो जायेंगी, तो लाम
नहीं होगा, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि लाम
और हार्निंग के बारे में निर्णय करना परमिट
लेने वालों का काम है। जहाँ लाम नहीं होगा
वहाँ कोई व्यक्ति परमिट नहीं लेगा। परमिट
लेने वाले मोच लेंगे कि अमुक रूट पर लाम
होगा या नहीं। अगर किसी रूट पर बसों आदि
की संख्या बढ़ जायेगी, तो यात्रियों को लाम
होगा, उन्हें किराया भी कम देना पड़ेगा और
वे आराम से यात्रा करेंगे ओवरलोडिंग समाप्त
हो जायेगा। इस तरह ज्यादा लोगों को काम
मिल सकता है।