

[Shri K. C. Pant]

17 hrs.

Shri Masani said that instead of an increase of Rs. 10 crores, the expenditure should be cut down by Rs. 10 crores, thus giving a saving of Rs. 20 crores. When the increase is only Rs. 50 lakhs, I do not know what scope is there for decreasing it by Rs. 20 crores. It has not gone up by Rs. 100 crores so that you can cut it down drastically; it has gone up only by Rs. 50 lakhs. Therefore, there is no scope for this kind of economy.

Then Shri Masani suggested cuts in defence expenditure and plan expenditure. He suggested Rs. 50 crores cut in defence and Rs. 80 crores saving by dropping Bokaro. Now, with all respect to him, Rs. 50 crores cut in defence expenditure is not going to come about unless this country takes a basically different attitude in the matter of foreign policy, in the matter of defence policy, in the matter of its assessment of its security needs and I dare say that if this matter is discussed further, most Members in this House, would agree that at this stage there is no justification for a basic shift in our policy, so far as our safeguarding our country's needs are concerned, because they deserve a certain priority. So far as the security needs of our country are concerned, I think very few people would agree with him that we should cut down the defence expenditure by Rs. 50 crores at this stage.

Then he suggested: why not drop Bokaro and soon and save Rs. 80 crores? The House would agree that while there is a running criticism of the fact that Government is going in for more and more of public sector steel plants, we have had to import steel from abroad, spending a large sum of money. This fact should not be forgotten. Now, if we do not go in for Bokaro, apart from other factors—it would not go into those other factors—it will lay us open to the charge of having lost sight of

वृत्त स्थिति (St.)

the lesson of coal, of cement, of so many other projects, in which because we did not keep up the momentum of growth there was a certain lag in production and it was pointed out to us that we should have foreseen it and that we should not have allowed the lag to occur. If we drop Bokaro, there will be a lag in production and the same members will criticise us later for this lag.

Then there was another criticism about the staff needs and proliferation in Government offices. I would like to say that in this matter also Government is conscious of the need to curtail any such proliferation. Among the steps that have been taken is the constitution of the staff inspection unit of the Ministry of Finance, which conducts works study in different Ministries, which in the course of 1966-67 has actually effected reasonably impressive economies.

Mr. Speaker: Will he take some more time?

Shri K. C. Pant: If you so desire, I will continue my speech later.

17.04 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS IN WEST ASIA SITUATION

Mr. Speaker: The External Affairs Minister.

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): Mr. Speaker, Sir, day before yesterday the Prime Minister. . .

श्री मधु सिन्घे (मुंबई) : वह क्या कर रहे हैं? मेरा ध्येय क्या का प्रश्न है।

Mr. Speaker: He is making a statement.

श्री मधु सिन्घे : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह इस के बारे में मेरे ध्यानकर्षण का नोटिस दिया था। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि उन नोटिसों को ही आप ने क्यों महत्वपूर्ण

किया और यह एकदम से खड़े होकर कैसे बयान देने लग गये ? वे विरोध नहीं करता यह बयान है लेकिन हमारे कॉलिंग अटेंशन नोटिसों के जवाब में बयान है ताकि स्पष्टीकरण मांगने का और मजाल पूछने का मौका हम लोगों को कॉलिंग अटेंशन नोटिसों देने वालों को मिले । उस दिन तो प्रधान मंत्री बड़ी गरमी में बोल रही थीं अपनी ताकत दिखा रही थीं, लेकिन आज वह क्यों नहीं आई ? आज चांगला साहब को क्यों सामने किया ? उस दिन तो बड़ी गरमी दिखालाई, आई हिम्मत की बात की और आज चांगल साहब को सामने कर दिया विरोधी दलों के । प्रधान मंत्री मायें, तीन घेर मार कर आई हैं, वह बरा बतलाये सदन को ।

Mr. Speaker: Before anyone of you gets up, may I say something? There were a number of call-attention notices, about 40 or 50 of them, on this issue and when the Minister said that he was going to make a statement, I thought that he should cover all the points made in those call-attention notices. All the call attention notices have been forwarded to him and he is making a comprehensive statement—I hope, he is making a comprehensive statement. Naturally, as the practice is, you can seek clarification or put a question.

श्री जयु सिन्धवे : उस में फर्क यह होता है कि चाप नेताओं को बुलायेंगे और इस में दूसरों को, पीछे वालों को सम्मन्वय हो जायेगा ।

Mr. Speaker: I cannot confine myself only to those who gave call-attention notices when he is making a statement. I would allow to the extent possible anybody, others also who have not given call-attention notice; I would like to give a chance to as large a number of people as possible.

श्री जयु सिन्धवे : चांगे वालों को भी बुलाइयेगा और पीछे वालों को भी बुलाइयेगा ।

Mr. Speaker: Yes, of course; anybody. But it does not mean that if all the 500 Members are going to put questions we are going to be here for two or three days for that. There is the restriction of time. I do not mind if we continue till 6 o'clock. I would allow it. If there is any other practical suggestion, I have absolutely no objection to accept it. But the statement must come. Hon. Members must know the information if it is a comprehensive statement or not or whether any Member has any doubt. I will not confine myself to the leaders now. Last time I did so because I wanted the party view and, therefore, I called only the leaders. A number of Members have given call-attention notice. Shri Nath Pai has given one; Shri Sondhi has given another and I will ask them to put a few questions. If there is any other good method, you may suggest and I am prepared to try. But let us do it in an orderly way. I appeal to the House that it should be done in an orderly way. I request your co-operation; that is all.

Some hon. Members rose—

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): May I make one request in this connection? When the Speaker is on his legs, can we not exercise some discipline on ourselves? If we do that, it will lead to a very great discipline. We should not interrupt the Speaker when he is on his legs.

Shri Dul Raj Madhok (South Delhi): A number of times call-attention notices are given on matters of urgent public importance but we feel that they are summarily rejected. That creates a very bad impression. I think much of the trouble that comes in the House is because people feel that for some very important issues which should be discussed or

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

brought to the notice of the House no opportunity is given. Now the hon. Minister feels that something needs to be said. You have said that people have given call-attention notices and other things. These are important questions and you should have accepted them. Then, this trouble would not have come. In future this should be kept in mind.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister's statement will cover all the call-attention notices. Suppose, I had admitted one call-attention notice, then the statement would only take note of that. I wanted a comprehensive statement taking into consideration all the call-attention notices that have been given. Then, if it is a call-attention, only those people whose names are put there will have a chance to ask questions. Now the leaders of parties and back benchers also will have a chance. Do you want to deprive them of the chance? It serves the same purpose; the only thing is that a few more people will get a chance to ask questions.

श्री प्रकाश चंद शर्मा (हापुड़) :
 मैं यही कहना चाहता था कि आप ने इसी घासन से एक शब्दवा दी थी कि घासना-
 कर्षण प्रस्ताव का नोटिस पहले अगर आवेगा
 तो वह लिया जायगा और सर्वमैंट की सूचना
 अगर पहले आवेगी तो उस को पहले माना
 जायगा और ले लिया जायगा। मेरा कहना है
 कि जब इस तरह की एक शब्दवा आप दे
 चुके हैं, एक परम्परा बन चुकी है तो वह
 परम्परा अगर घास भी जारी रहे तो
 खरका होगा।

Mr. Speaker: That is not the practice. Normally, call-attention notices are there but if they are making a comprehensive statement the Speaker need not admit the call-attention notice.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Sir, I am not at all anxious to make a statement. I am in the hands of the House. If they will rather have a call-attention notice tomorrow, I have no objection.

Mr. Speaker: That has been decided already.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Mr. Speaker, Sir, day before yesterday, the Prime Minister made a statement in the House on the West Asian crisis. Since then, there have been some further developments, which I would like to report to the House. The Prime Minister mentioned that in our endeavours towards restoration of peace, we were making earnest efforts for a ceasefire and withdrawal of all armed forces to the position they occupied on June 4.

On June 6, the Security Council unanimously adopted a simple ceasefire resolution as a first step. Evidently, in view of the gravity of the situation, a consensus emerged in the Council in favour of bringing about immediate ceasefire, leaving other steps to be taken later. But as no ceasefire took place as a result of this resolution, at the request of the Soviet Union, an emergency meeting of the Security Council was called yesterday at which another resolution was unanimously adopted, demanding of the Governments concerned a ceasefire effective from 1:30 A.M. (IST) today. While firm information from the U.N. about the response to this resolution is awaited, Government of India earnestly hopes that all concerned will have already agreed to ceasefire.

Our Representative, while giving support to the resolution, stated that the ceasefire should be regarded only a first step, although a most important first step. He added that India, along with some other members of the Council, would have preferred a resolution which along with ceasefire called upon the Governments

concerned for a withdrawal of all armed forces to positions prior to the outbreak of hostilities. Such a linking of the ceasefire with the withdrawal of forces would have been in accord with the practice which the Security Council had evolved in the past, based on the sound principle that the aggressor should not be permitted by the international community to enjoy the fruits of aggression. This was a most important tenet in the interest of peace and indeed the only basis on which lasting peace can be built in the troubled area of West Asia. This question of withdrawal, therefore, will have to be taken up further after cease-fire has been accepted by all concerned.

The Prime Minister, in her statement to the House, had also referred to the wanton Israeli attacks on the Indian contingent with UNEF in Gaza. She had mentioned that she had sent a message to the U.N. Secretary-General asking for effective steps to ensure the safety for our contingent and their early evacuation from the area of hostilities. The Prime Minister received a reply on June 7th from the Secretary-General in which he expressed his shock at the death of Indian personnel with UNEF and wounding of others. He assured our Prime Minister that he and the Commander of UNEF are taking every possible step to ensure the safety of Indian and other contingents and are making all possible efforts to provide for their earliest evacuation from the area. He had added that it was a tragedy that these losses should have been suffered by the members of the Indian contingent when their operational functions had already ceased and when they were awaiting repatriation to their country. The Secretary-General addressed a formal protest to the Government of Israel regarding "the tragic and unnecessary loss of life among the UNEF personnel" and asked the Government of Israel to "take urgent measures to ensure that there is no recurrence of such incidents". I should also say

that when our Representative addressed the Council yesterday, he asked for an unqualified guarantee for the safety and security of the UNEF personnel still in the area of the conflict.

According to the latest reports available, nine were killed, 20 wounded and 19 are said to be missing. The House would like to know that the Government of India has lodged a strong protest with the Government of Israel regarding attacks on Indian personnel. In this protest we have condemned the utter disregard by the Israeli authorities of the immunity which the U.N. personnel engaged in peace-keeping operations enjoy. Our protest further demands that while the U.N. is making arrangements for the evacuation of our personnel, further barbarous attacks on Indian personnel of UNEF should cease forthwith.

The Government of India has also demanded that the Israeli Government pays adequate compensation to the families of the deceased and the wounded. Finally, the Government of India has reserved its right to take such further action in the matter as it may deem necessary according to international law and practice.

The question of immediate withdrawal of our contingent continues to cause us concern. As the House is aware, the United Nations is responsible for all arrangements for the repatriation and replacement of the Indian contingent as of all other contingents constituting UNEF as has been done during the last ten years and the cost borne by the United Nations. When the Secretary-General decided to withdraw UNEF from Gaza, we immediately got in touch with him and in accordance with a programme of phased withdrawals of various contingents, an Indian ship was to leave on 8th June and repatriate the Indian contingent consisting of over 1,100 persons along with 400 tons of cargo on 19th June. India was willing for an earlier withdrawal, if necessary, by air but the

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

United Nations did not favour such an arrangement. In the meantime, suddenly hostilities broke out with unfortunate consequences to our personnel. Since then, our Representative has been constantly in touch with the Secretary-General who informed us that shipping companies around the world have been alerted to provide a ship immediately to withdraw the contingent from the Gaza beach to the nearest point of safety, namely, Cyprus, from where they could be brought to India by air or by sea, as may be practicable. In the meantime, we are holding our ship in readiness to sail, should it be required. The Secretary-General has also been requested today to make further efforts to arrange for evacuation of the Indian contingent by air from Gaza. The House may rest assured that the Government of India, through the United Nations, will continue to do every thing possible to ensure the safety of our personnel and to have them evacuated at the earliest possible opportunity.

I would like to mention one other matter. A number of Arab countries have broken off diplomatic relations with the United Kingdom and the United States. From among those who have taken this action, the U.A.R. and Iraqi Governments have asked India to look after their interests in the United States, and the Syrian Government their interests in the United Kingdom. We have agreed to do so.

Shri Ranga (Srikakulam): It is a good news that at long last the Security Council was able to decide unanimously—and it can decide only that way—in favour of ceasefire. The old grandmother of the world has commanded that much of energy. We are glad to achieve this much. But it is very sad indeed that one of the two parties to the struggle—U.A.R., I suppose, if I have heard the hon. Minister correctly—has so far failed to agree to the ceasefire, accept

it and implement it. I hope the Government of India would use their influence with U.A.R. to pursue them to accept it without any more delay.

But the Defence Minister as well as the Foreign Minister owe an explanation to the country as to why they failed to demand the emergent evacuation of our troops soon after U. Thant had decided to withdraw the Emergency Force from there. I learn that every other country has succeeded—or many other countries have succeeded—in withdrawing their own contingents. Whether that information is correct or not, the Defence Minister should have been alert enough to offer the services of our own Air Force in order to get those people out of that troubled spot. Now, at long last, they are going to do something in that direction.

Shri Pileo Mody (Godhra): A ship has been kept ready.

Shri Ranga: A ship has been kept ready. It has not yet gone out.

If anybody is responsible for the loss of those eight precious lives, it is not only those combatants who were responsible—we were told that they were Israelis—but also the United Nations and U Thant on the one side and our own Defence Minister who would have to be held responsible at least in part. Then, I would like to sound a note of warning. It is good that our representative at the UN has pleaded for cease-fire. But it would have been much better, and it would be certainly much better for him not to try to take too much of an initiative on the lines of their past experience here in order to leave some more authority and some more scope for the UN and their wonderful emergency force and their observers to play their ineffective role which has led to this present mess in the world.

Mr. Speaker: Before I call Shri Bal Raj Modhok, I would request that only certain questions may be put and clarifications may be asked for. That was the intention. Even if it is a calling-attention-notice, only questions can be asked and clarifications sought.

श्री बल राज मोडहो : बोड़ा सा, कुछ तो कहने की इजाजत देने न।

Mr. Speaker: I am suggesting this so that a larger number of Members could get opportunities. If each one of the Members begins to make a small speech, then we would not have enough time. The opinions of Members are known already. I have already given a chance to hon. Members belonging to all parties to express their opinion on the issue. Now, may I request that only questions may be asked and clarifications sought so that other Members also may have a chance?

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): While welcoming your suggestion, may I say that the difficulty in which we are being placed is this? We had given a notice after Shri M. C. Chagla had made his first statement on this vital issue that a debate should take place. But now we are reduced to this position of asking only a simple question . . .

Mr. Speaker: That is a different thing altogether.

Shri Nath Pai: Why should we be balked of our right to discuss an important matter? You do not allow us to have the motion admitted and have a debate on this.

Mr. Speaker: Even if the calling-attention-notice is there, the hon. Member could only ask a question.

Shri Nath Pai: I have said that I shall fully abide by your decision; I am not going to flout it. But I must express to you my deep disappointment and even resentment that on

a vital issue on which we are feeling so much exercised and disappointed and even angry at the way things are being done in our name, you are refusing us a debate but you are permitting us to ask only one simple question each. There are so many aspects that we want to bring out.

The matter is not that easy as asking 'Would you give consent to marry me or not?' We want a thousand things to be brought out to express our disappointment.

Mr. Speaker: Even if his calling-attention notice had been admitted, Shri Nath Pai would agree with me that it is only a question that he would be allowed to ask. Assuming that I had admitted Shri Nath Pai's notice, he would have got opportunity only to ask a question.

Shri Nath Pai: I am asking for a debate.

Mr. Speaker: If he is asking for a debate, that is a different thing altogether.

Shri Nath Pai: I had given notice of the motion on the 25th itself.

Mr. Speaker: I know that he has given a notice. If Government could find time for it, that is a different thing. I am only talking of the calling-attention-notice, which is within my purview.

Shri Teneti Viswanatham (Visakhapatnam): They must find time.

Mr. Speaker: Even if it is a calling attention-notice, the hon. Member would only get an opportunity to ask a question to seek clarification.

Shri Bal Raj Modhok: While endorsing every word that Shri Nath pai has said, I would like to say that today we all feel sorry about the loss of lives of our gallant soldiers there. But may I know from the hon. Minister whether he was not aware that a war was going to break out? I knew it and I had told him that as

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

the things appeared, the ring was being closed against Israel, and Israel would be less than human if it did not fight for its existence and, therefore, it had to do that. It was known to everybody that a war was going to break out. It was also known that our troops were at a place behind which the gun placements of the Egyptians were there. If our soldiers are behind the gun placements, then naturally it is to be expected that our soldiers would suffer if bullets would hit those gun placements. If we are sorry and we are angry at those people who dropped the bullets, I think we must be equally angry at and we must be equally opposed to what has happened, and condemn those people of our own Government who failed to take steps in time to evacuate our soldiers from there, and, therefore, they cannot be exonerated of this blame, of the murder of our soldiers there.

Secondly, it is said that our representative at the UN while endorsing the resolution that there should be a ceasefire, has again repeated that both sides must go back to the June 4 position when the hostilities started. I want to make it very clear that hostilities did not start on June 4. The hostilities started on the day that UAR decided to blockade the Gulf of Aqaba, and, therefore, when we want the forces to go back, they must go back to places where they existed before the hostilities broke out. The Gulf of Aqaba must be opened, and Sharmel-Sheikh, which is the place or the fortification from which the UAR guns were trained and directed against the ships which were moving into the Gulf of Aqaba should not be given back to UAR lest UAR should be able to blockade that international waterways once again. These two things must be kept clear in our minds.

Shri Hem Barua (Mangaldai): It has been reported that our boys in the UNIFIL are bottled up in Gasa. I

can tell you this that unless our boys are safely evacuated from that area and they reach the shores of India, there would not be peace in the mind of any Member or of any man in the country.

Shri Raaga: That is right.

Shri Hem Barua: Whatever that may be, it has been reported that our ship could not go there because of the danger inherent in the situation. It has also been reported that it is impossible for civil aircraft to reach that place, again because of the dangers inherent in the situation. In that context, may I know what urgent steps Government propose to take to take back or evacuate our boys from that war-torn area in West Asia?

Secondly, may I know this? The air outside this Chamber in the Central Hall is agog with a news that a coup has taken place in Egypt and President Nasser has been removed from office. If so, may I know whether Government have the latest information with them because there is conflicting news about it and we all like to be enlightened by Shri Chaglia on this particular point also?

An hon. Member: If it is true, announce an asylum to him.

श्री शचु लिजवे : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस वक्त बैसे तो पश्चिम एशिया के सभी लोगों के प्रति लेकिन विशेषकर अरबों के प्रति, अपनी सहानुभूति प्रकट में करना चाहता हूँ। इसका कारण यह है कि उनके नेतृत्व के बन्द और साहस की धति के कारण आज उनके ऊपर यह बोझ धाई है। साथ-साथ सब लोग सोचते हैं कि यहाँ के लोग उनके विरुद्ध हैं। लेकिन अगर मेरी आवाज और इन लोगों की आवाज वहाँ तक पहुँचेंगी तो आपकी मार्फत मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि बुखारा, चापनूची और संकुचित स्वार्थ की उनकी जो कल्पना है उसके बन्द में आकर जो इस्तराफ बातें इस सरकार के हाथ कहीं गई हैं उन बातों के अरबों का कोई हित नहीं

हुआ है। हम लोग जो बात करते थे वह धरवों के हित की भी बात थी और इजराइली लोगों के भी। और इजराइली लोगों से मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे लोग भी जो धरव नेतृत्व ने गलती की, वह न कर बैठें और धरवों में घा कर कोई काम न करें। युद्ध बन्दो तो हो जायेगी। वे इजिप्ट पर कब्जा नहीं करना चाहते और न कर सकते हैं। इसलिए युद्ध बन्दो धाज नहीं तो कल और कल नहीं तो परसों हो जायेगी। लेकिन जो समस्याएँ हैं उनका हल कैसे निकलेगा? यह सवाल हमारे सामने है।

ध्राज भी हम बारह लाख धरव शरणार्थी संबलान में, जार्डन में और गाजा के इलाके में पड़े हुए हैं। उनकी समस्या जब तक हल नहीं होती है, पश्चिम एशिया में शान्ति नहीं होने वाली है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र मंच ने फिलस्तीन के बारे में बटवारे के धाधार पर योजना बनाई थी। ध्राज एक नकल मुझ को मिली। उसके दो तीन जूमले में पढ़ना चाहता हूँ। देशों की नाइने के क्या नतीजे होते हैं? ध्राशा एक की जाती है और नतीजे दूसरे होते हैं। इस में क्या लिखा है, देखिये :

"The partition solution provides that finality which is the most urgent need in the situation. Every other proposed solution would tend to induce the two parties to seek modification in their favour by means of persistent pressure. The grant of independence to both states, however, would remove the basis for such a pressure".

जो धंदाजा था उससे बिल्कुल विपरीत बात हुई। इसलिए उस वकत हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने कहा था कि फिलस्तीन को खंडित करने से कोई समस्या हल नहीं होगी। ध्राज भी मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि शरणार्थियों का जो बलता है, जार्डन और इजराइल दोनों में न केवल सह-अस्तित्व बल्कि दोनों में अब तक कोई महासंघ या संघ नहीं बनता है उस तक हल नहीं हुआ। मेरे पास समय नहीं है लेकिन

मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि बहुत सारे इजराइली तथा धरव लोगों के जो समझदार तबके हैं उनमें चर्चा है और वे ऐसा मानते हैं कि सब से पहले जार्डन और इजराइल का कोई ढोला ढाला महासंघ बने, जिस से यह शरणार्थियों का सवाल भी हल हो जायेगा और सह-अस्तित्व का सवाल भी हल हो जायेगा। यह हिन्दुस्तान की पुरानी नीति से मेल खाता है। हमें उम् के लिए कोशिश करनी चाहिए न कि एकतरफा बात करनी चाहिए। ध्राज में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि धरव कोई देश कम की मदद के धाधार पर या अमरीका की सहायता के धाधार पर धर धरव करे कि हम यह काम करेंगे, वह काम करेंगे, वह तो कोई नतीजा नहीं निकलने वाला है। जो पिछड़ी हुई धरव-व्यवस्था है, उस पर 200 करोड़ रुपये धाधनिक हथियार खरीदने के ये खर्च कर के कोई भी ताकत पैदा नहीं की जा सकती है। इस लिए ये जो व्यापक समस्याएँ हैं, सरकार उन को हल करने के लिए कोशिश करे। लेकिन सरकार के एकतरफा व्यवहार से ध्राज हम लोगों का पश्चिमी एशिया में कोई नैतिक अधिकाय नहीं रहा है। इस लिए मैं ध्राज श्री चागला और प्रधान मंत्री से यह उमीद करना हूँ कि वे अपनी गलती को स्वीकारे और सही रास्ते पर ध्रावे और हम लोगों ने 1947-48 में अच्छा काम शुरू किया था, जिसे की सरकार ने बीच में छोड़ दिया, उमी को लेकर ध्रागे बढ़ने की कोशिश करे।

श्री बलबल सिंह (देहरादून) : मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री महादेव इनने सवालों का जवाब एक-साथ नहीं दे सकेंगे, इस लिए हर एक सवाल के बाद उस का जवाब दे दिया जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : हमारे पास टाइम ध्राघ चंटा है और धची दस पंद्रह सदस्यों ने सवाल पूछने हैं।

श्री व० ड० शर्मा (अमृतसर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अभी तक आप की आंख नहीं पकड़ सका, हूँ, इस लिए आप बरा मुझ से आंख मिलाइये ।

Mr. Speaker: Those who try to be humorous with the Speaker will not catch his eye, I tell you here and now. Your humour need no be exhibited here.

श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं विदेश मंत्री महोदय से तीन बातें पूछना चाहता हूँ ।

धरमों और इस्त्रायल के झगड़े के बाद क्या भारत सरकार को यह सबक मिला है कि इस प्रकार के अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रश्नों पर, किन से विश्व-युद्ध की ज्वाला प्रकट सकती है, बड़ी संतुलित भाषा का प्रयोग करना चाहिए और उन के बारे में अपने विचार प्रकट करने में या वक्तव्य देने में कोई बहुत सीधता नहीं दिखानी चाहिए ?

धरमों और इस्त्रायल के झगड़े के बाद समाचारपत्रों में कुछ ऐसे समाचार छपे हैं कि भारत सरकार अपने दो विधेयार मिनिस्ट्रों को सुरक्षा परिषद या संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में भेज रही है । उन मिनिस्ट्रों के नाम भी निकले हैं कि वे वाणिज्य मंत्री और रक्षा मंत्री हैं, जब कि ऐसी परिस्थितियों का वायित्व विदेश मंत्रालय पर होता है । क्या भारत सचमुच इस प्रकार का कोई जटपटा निर्णय लेने जा रही है कि विदेश मंत्री को छोड़ कर रक्षा मंत्री और वाणिज्य मंत्री को सुरक्षा परिषद में भेजा जाये; यदि हाँ, तो क्यों ?

जिन देशों ने अमरीका के साथ अपने द्वैतीतिक सम्बन्ध तोड़ लिये हैं, समाचारपत्रों में कहा है कि भारत सरकार उन के हितों की रक्षा का वायित्व अपने ऊपर लेनी । क्या मंत्री महोदय प्रकाश शर्मा ने कि क्या इस

प्रकार की कोई बातचीत हुई है, यदि हाँ, तो इस बारे में क्या निर्णय लिया गया है ?

श्री महापाल सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जिन सदस्यों ने बार बार कांसिग एटेंशन नोटिस दिये हैं, उनको भी मौका दिया जाना चाहिए ।

Shri M. L. Sondhi (New Delhi): My question relates to the diplomatic stale of the Foreign Minister, and I crave your indulgence to explain the context in which I am asking the question.

The Soviet Union, which is our great neighbour, has in this issue carefully avoided military confrontation and assumed that its commitment to international peace is built on sound foundations. Countries like Nepal, Rumania, Japan and Iran have all shown us that they are cautious and careful in their attitude, a point which was laboured here by the leader of the DMK Party. So, arising from the behaviour of the Government of India in this crisis, these are my questions or sub-questions: whether it was desirable for the Government of India to prevent or rather to fail to bring its influence to bear on direct discussion between the two parties to the conflict; further, whether the Government of India failed to obtain first-hand information particularly in the case of Israel, and learning from this mistake, whether they will now announce, or immediately announce, the despatch of an Ambassador to Israel; whether the sense of independent assessment which Mr. Nehru tried to achieve, and which we hope any further development of our diplomacy in this country would try to achieve, would be based upon a realistic understanding of the rights of this country and the requirements of world peace; in particular whether it is in our interest that the Suez Canal should remain open, whether it is in our interest that a country like Israel should trade more with Afro-Asian countries through the Gulf of Aqaba rather than what is

suggested or imputed or inferred from the propaganda which the Government of India has indulged in. I have been listening to the external broadcasts of the All India Radio. If that has been approved by the hon. Foreign Minister as I know from my experience that they are approved by the E.A. Ministry, it seems that India functions as the fourteenth Arab State and that is to our great regret. . . . (Interruptions.)

Shri H. N. Mankerjee: It is necessary for us also to express ourselves because certain things have been said, and to put the record straight our point of view has to be presented. I am very glad that the Government of India has persisted in its efforts and that in the implementation of the resolution regarding the cease fire, there is a further decision, as far as the operative part of the cease fire is concerned, to secure the withdrawal of forces to the line that was held on the 4th of June. I say this because, the categorical imperatives of India's foreign policy demand our defending the Arab world in its hour of danger and I am happy if, as pointed out by my friend from the other side, we behaved as the 14th Arab State it is a good job if the Arab World thinks of us as their own brethren in their time of need. I am ashamed to see, Sir, in this House that the temporary triumph won by the Israelite forces which was propped up by the bayonets and aircraft carriers of the USA and the U.K. with which the U.A.R. has broken off relations. (Interruptions.) (Time Bell rung) Other people have said all kinds of things and you heard them patiently.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay Central—South): The United States armaments should not excite anybody, least of all you, Sir.

Shri H. N. Mankerjee (Calcutta North East): I am pointing out the fact that in a country which swears by the name of Gandhiji, the temporary military triumph as it appears

to be of Israel is leading some of the Members of Parliament to suggest that we change our basic foreign policy, that we recognise Israel, that we send our ambassador there while the fact of the matter is, as the Government has already said in a statement, that Israel is the creation of imperialist interests and it is in the interest of our own country that in the Middle-East. . . . (Time Bell rung).

Shri Inderajit Gupta (Alipore): Why are you ringing the Bell? I object to this. Why are you showing your impatience by ringing the Bell?

Mr. Speaker: I rang the Bell while Mr. Sondhi was speaking; I rang the Bell while Mr. Limaye was speaking. You object to this now, as if I must take orders even for this? (Interruptions.)

Shri H. N. Mankerjee: You will forgive me; I am constrained to remark that certain observations particularly by certain people are permitted a kind of latitude while because we behave in a civilised, decent and democratic manner in this House, we are put into this difficulty. The position has got to be straightened as far as the record of parliamentary discussion is concerned.

Suggestions have been made that we change the basis of our foreign policy, that we recognise Israel, that we cease to be friend the Arab countries. That is something of a trap into which I hope and trust the Government will not fall. I say this because it is a fact of history that in the Middle-east, strategically the most valuable area in the world—these are not my words but the words of the American ex-President. Eisenhower—it is the historic role of imperialism to control that part of the world and if in fighting the menace of imperialist control of the most strategically valuable part of the world the Arab people for the time being suffer a great deal, our sympathies go out to the Arabs. I have been ashamed to hear that even

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

where our own people have died, some of our Members have hesitated to condemn those who openly and aggressively took steps in order to bring about the massacre of so many of our people. (*Interruption*), and they are trying to put the Government on the carpet, while the Government have said before, that it was on account of the fact that the Arabs trusted us; they did not trust the Canadians, and we were told to remain last of all, and our brave, gallant men in the United Nations expeditionary force remained there, and our people went there, but these people talk (*Interruption*).

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Please sit down.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Every day of my present parliamentary life, this is the kind of thing they say; they say all kinds of things, these people whose propinquity in this House I detest.... (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Therefore, we are happy that the Government is sticking to its position. I hope it does stick to this position in a principled manner, and I am happy that the Government is trying to persuade the Security Council to see to it that operatively speaking, the 4th June line is adhered to when the cease fire is implemented. I am hoping that the basic factors of our foreign policy are adhered to by the Government. We are not going to be intimidated and bamboozled by the fact of the temporary Israeli triumph which has been the result of the aircraft carriers of the United States and the American-trained aeroplane pilots who have come from all over the world in order to fight with the Israeli force.

These are the things which I wish to say. I wish to say. I would not normally have said this, because I

I have a sense of parliamentary propriety and I have a sense of the gravity of the international situation; but since many things have been said from here to there, other things have also to be said in order to put the record straight.

Mr. Speaker: I think all points of view have been put forward.

Shri Nath Pal: Not at all.

Mr. Speaker: At least, in future, will we be satisfied with questions only? I say so, because a large number of Members can than put questions. It is already 20 minutes to six (*Interruption*). I would call all of you. I would like to give opportunity to Members; if only Members; confine themselves to put questions, they will get a chance.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha (Barh): We would also like to be given a chance.

Shri Ranjit Singh (Khalilabad): My submission is that you are looking only to the interests of the front Benches; not on this side.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Sondhi is in your Bench; in the front Benches. From your party, I have called already two Members. (*Interruption*). These remarks, I resent very much, when I have done justice. I have called your leader, from the your Bench. All four of you are getting up every time. They are in your Bench. I have already called Mr. Sondhi. Four of you are getting up. The whole House is there; it is not only the front Benches. I called Mr. Sondhi from your Bench.

An hon. Member: Please see this side also.

Mr. Speaker: I know; I will look at both sides. I am aware that everybody wants to have a chance. When I come to one side, let them have a

chance, and then I will come to the other side. Mr. Nath Pai.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Speaker, Sir, perhaps now you will agree with me (Interruption)—you will see the cogency of my argument when I have pleaded with you repeatedly for the admission of a proper motion. What is happening is this: when a Member puts a question, that leads to misunderstanding. Anything that is said leads itself to be misinterpreted, and then we are reduced to a spectacle that the slightest dissent is denounced as almost a treason. The essence of democracy is that dissent is tolerated and those who are at the helm of affairs are not the wholesale monopolists of patriotism for this country. A systematic campaign is being waged, Mr. Speaker, and the All-India Radio is being used to slander, malign, misrepresent those, who because of their patriotism have the guts for challenging Mr. Chagla's handling of this affair.

Shri Mukerjee is quite right; he has said that this country shall not be stampeded into changing the basic posture by the threat of anybody. It is equally to be remembered by all concerned that those of us who feel that our basic interests have been harmed, and the image of India has been distorted by the opportunistic and pusillanimous policy pursued by Mr. Chagla, shall not be deterred by this campaign of vilification.

Mr. Speaker: the colossal bungling by the Government of this delicate, explosive situation, will go down in the annals of free India, in the history of free India, as a piece of monumental ineptitude, of incredible abdication of its sense of self-respect and judgment and unimaginable disregard for our own self-respect and enlightened self-interest. One is appalled that in the process, we have not served the cause of Arab friends, as we ought to have and as we could have if we had acted judiciously. Will Mr. Chagla agree? We have not furthered

the cause of peace. Our greatest contribution as a free country was, often we hurt ourselves, but we stood by peace, to serve the cause of peace. This was perhaps the greatest glory of India since independence. Even that image has been distorted by our fear complex. There is again talk of somebody being friend of Arabs and others being the enemy of the Arabs. It was this Government which had a perverse fear of the French fascists and which refused to recognise the Government of the Republic of Algeria. It was this Government which compelled the Ambassador of free Algeria to go on a Moroccan passport.

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj (Wardah): On a point of order, Sir. (Interruptions). How is it relevant?

Shri Nath Pai: I am not yielding. I want to point out that it was in this House that we had pleaded times without number. Somebody attacks us of being anti-Arab. I had to expel Mr. Guy Mollet, the young socialist, because of their attitude to the Algerian problem. One day I had to go to the Prime Minister and Mr. Tyabji to point out this incredible, fantastic humiliation of the Arab fighters for freedom that the Government of India, South Block, refused to give a passport to the representative of free fighting Algeria, when Algeria was recognised by 34 nations, including the non-aligned. Why? Again and again the charge has been flung at us that we are anti-Arab. Our concern was not Israel or Arabs. Our concern was the damage to the image of India, the picture of India as an opportunistic country. We moved a correct resolution. Here is the latest example of our pusillanimity. I stand by that resolution that both the parties should withdraw to the 4th June position. You fought for it. But the moment the Russians and Americans closed, you do not have the guts, the honesty, the courage, to stand by your resolution. Your whole policy is to be shaped for you by somebody

[Shri Nath Pail]

else. I would have demanded that my resolution is correct and fair to the Arabs and Israel. There were other points about Aqaba and unnecessary withdrawal of the forces Nasser was quite right in demanding it as a free and sovereign country. Our generation understands Nasser better. He has always stood for the superiority and supremacy of his country. He has refused to bow down. All these are worthy of compliment. But why did the Government of India not firmly stand by its resolution, which it was trying to move? Why did it not plead for it? I know unanimity was necessary. We could have at least said that since our resolution was not being accepted, we will abstain. Will Mr. Chagla answer this? Is this not damaging the image of India, the cause of peace and the Arab cause?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mody. He may put a question.

Shri Pillee Mody: Sir, I have never asked a question of anybody who cannot or will not reply one. We have heard today something about the categorical imperative of our foreign policy being to support the Arab nations. I have never heard such utter nonsense. There is only one categorical imperative of our foreign policy and that is our own self-interest. The self-interest of our country demands that there should be peace, and that the Suez Canal should be open. Other nations have taken sides on this issue and have either supported Israel or the Arabs. But when it came to a time for action, they all remained neutral in the interests of peace. But what did our Government do? When the time came, they could not restrain themselves from playing to the gallery. They could not restrain themselves and they went out of their way, against the entire House and sense of the House—and I claim that they went against even the majority of their own party—to support the Arab cause on this issue.

I have only one submission to make. Already you find that the Arabs were shouting fire and brimstone. This Government I charge have added to that fire and added to that conflict.

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: Sir, the Government has already said for Nasser, "We are one with you". In pursuance of that, will the hon. Minister be able to tell us whether he would involve India in any direct involvement?

श्री बसवण लिहू : मैं निर्फ यह बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब भारत को बिजय की ज़रूरत थी, तब इन लोगों ने विश्वमार्ति का नारा लगाया और जब हिमालय की रक्षा की आवश्यकता थी, तब इन लोगों ने पंचशील का नारा लगाया। जब हिमालय की रक्षा के लिये सिपाही नहीं हैं तो क्या ज़रूरत थी कि हम अपने सिपाहियों को राष्ट्र संघ की फौज में भेजते और अपने सिपाहियों को कटवाते। मन्ने मारनों में ये लोग कालि हैं, हरयारे हैं, जिन्होंने देश के जवानों को कटवाया।

दूसरी बात में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेसी मेम्बरों को सबाल पृछने का मोका न दिया जाय, क्योंकि उन्होंने ही निश्च कर यह तबाही करने की पानिसा बनाई थी, ये सब उस साखिज में मिले हुए थे।

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): Sir, I just want to ask one simple question as to why it was necessary for us to keep on waiting for the U.N. to evacuate our men in view of the danger that we were well aware of. Could not we have evacuated our men ourselves with our own aeroplanes and charge the U.N. for that? I am sure the U.N. would have agreed to pay. If they did not pay, after all, we pay a certain amount to the U.N. every year and we could have deducted it out of that and saved our men in that fashion.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Sir, I want to ask only two things from Shri Chagla.

Shri Hem Barus: Sir why two ladies at a time?

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I do not know why that is causing so much anxiety to him.

Mr. Speaker: In between the Opposition and the Congress Benches on this side I thought it would be better to call two ladies from the centre.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Sir, when the Government of India knew that the whole of Gaza Strip is virtually an area of battle and Israeli forces were moving forward and also that they had taken the entire area in their possession, why were the Indian soldiers not evacuated from Gaza city or near about that area to some safer place in that area itself because Gaza was a pinpointed area of battle? May I also know whether and how they are in touch with the Israeli Government, because that area is at the present under Israeli occupation and our soldiers there are blockaded as if they are living in an island? May I know how the Government of India propose to bring them out from that area which is under occupation of Israel? I would like to ask the Foreign Minister whether he had been in touch with the Israeli Government as to how they would help and assist in evacuating these soldiers? The unanimous resolution of the Security Council, of which India is also a party calls for all nations to come to an unconditional cease-fire. Now, some countries have agreed to cease-fire, while some other countries have not agreed to cease-fire. I would like to know whether the Government of India has been able to influence the thinking of those Arab countries—I do not know about Israel; I would not expect the Government of India to have any talks with the Israeli Government—to pave the way for the cease-fire uncondi-

tional cease-fire which is the unanimous resolution of the Security Council. I would also like to know what has been the response so far of those Arab countries about this unconditional cease-fire.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi (Bhubaneswar): It is shocking that 9 Indian soldiers were killed and still more shocking to learn that in our country there are some people who could justify the killing of these 9 soldiers by the Israelis and it is still more shocking to hear the voice of support to Israeli aggression....
(Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The question is addressed to the Minister and not to the opposition.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Out of the 1,100 army personnel stationed in Gaza, how many have been evacuated and what efforts are being made to evacuate the rest in one or two days?

Shri D. C. Sharma: (Gurdaspur): Has the Government of India adumbrated any plan to evacuate those brave Indians from the Gaza strip where on account of the irony of history they have been murdered though they went there to keep peace? Secondly, I agree with the hon. Foreign Minister that our friendship with Arab countries will stand as it is. It is indissoluble and permanent. But I want to ask him whether he is going to do any re-thinking about our relations with Israel though I know that according to their thinking an aggressor is not a very friendly person, all the same, I would like to know whether we are going to do some-re-thinking on this point. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand one point. Our Foreign Minister goes for the non-proliferation treaty and Shri L. K. Jha and Shri C. S. Jha follow him. Now also he is the Foreign Minister of this country. I am reading in the papers that one Commerce Minister is going to UN to plead our cause. I

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

also hear that our ex-Foreign Minister, who has been moving from one Ministry to another Ministry, and is now occupying the Defence Ministry, is also going there. May I know if it is the policy of this Government not to stand by our Foreign Minister, who has given such a splendid account of himself during his term of office, who has done much better than any interim Foreign Minister? Of course, Jawaharlal Nehru was a class by himself. He was unique. . . (interruptions).

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): May I know from the Minister whether there is any change in the policy that was announced by the Minister two days back and, if so, what is the reason for it?

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Now I want a direction from the House. Should I give opportunity to the forty and odd hon. Members who are on their legs? That is not possible. So, I will ask the Minister to reply. . . . (interruptions). If hon. Members do not want hear the reply, I will adjourn the House. I want to call the Minister but if hon. Members make my position helpless I will have to adjourn the House. I have no other alternative. . . (interruptions).

18 hrs.

श्री हुकम चन्द कश्यप (उज्जैन) :
 आपके बचन दिया था कि जिन्होंने कोल
 बर्टेकन नोटिस दिये हैं उन सबको मवाल
 पूर्ण का मौका दूंगा तो आप उससे फिर क्यों
 रहे हैं ?

Shri Beker Ali Mirza (Secunderabad): What about this side?

Mr. Speaker: If Members do not want to hear him, I cannot help it. I have called upon the Minister to speak. If Members like to hear him, I would request them to be a little calm. After all points have been made and they should be answered.

Shri Kachwal has got a right to get up on every subject; from atomic science to akhbar ha has a right. If it is the desire of the House that another 40 Members must be heard I will do so. But I do not think that Members are ready for that. If the Members are ready to hear them and light thrown by other Members, I have no objection. But I do not think the House is ready to do that. Now, the Minister.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Mr. Speaker, may I give my answer while replying to the last question put to me by Shri Gopalan. His question was: Is there any change in policy? My emphatic answer is that there is no change in our policy.

श्री मधु सिन्घे : आप हमेशा इन्फैटिक
 रहने हैं . . . (अवधान)

Shri M. C. Chagla: I did not interrupt; may I have your courtesy?

The policy was enunciated in a statement by me and repeated in the statement made by the Prime Minister. We stand by that policy. That policy is based on national interest and justice. . . (interruption).

Some hon. Members: No.

Shri M. C. Chagla: My friend, Shri Piloo Mody said that the whole House was against his policy. Probably, judging by his own weight. . . (interruption).

Shri Piloo Mody: Overwhelmingly.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I make bold to say that not only in this House, not only in the other House but in the country by and large the people are behind the policy.

Some hon. Members: No.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: There is a challenge. Speak anywhere in the country and let us see what the people want. That is my challenge. . . . (interruption).

Shri S. A. Dange and several hon.
Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: The House stands
adjourned till 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

12.05 hrs

श्री मधु लिजवे क्या बाने साहब बिदेस
मंती बन गये ह ? मुझे पता नहीं थीमती
इंदिरा गांधी ने कब उन्हें बिदेस मंती बना
लिया है . . . (अपमान)

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
Eleven of the Clock on Friday, June
9, 1967|12 Jyaishta, 1969 (Saha).