SHRI DINESH SINGH: I am not standing on any formality about words. I refer to the substance also.

SHRI NATH PAI: I did not say that you made that statement. At that time you were handling Commerce; you were running the Ministry from behind.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: The hon Member says that we did not join him and some other Opposition Members in saying that arms given to Pakistan would only be used against us and they were a threat to the security of India. It surprises me because it is exactly what we have been saying privately and publicly. Government have made it abundantly clear to the Soviet Union and the United States and all the other countries that arms given to Pakistan are meant to be used only against India and they constituted a threat to India. If there was any doubt I should like to make it absolutely clear for the benefit of the hon. Member that there has been no different thinking on the part of the Government. What was said by the hon. Member, he tried to put words into my mouth or in the mouth of the Government was what the Soviet Union had told us. We told them that we did not agree with that assessment. That was totally wrong frem our point of view and we had conveyed it to the Soviet Union?

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): Can you disagree with the Soviet Union?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Sometimes it is possible.

SHRI NATH PAI: He left out the main point. He took the tail end of the question. First, there was the question about the steps that India was free to take. What are those steps? Regarding the talks, is there any change from the original resolve of the Government, namely, unless China first accepted the Colombo proposals no negotiations will be conducted with China. These are the two questions which has forgotton.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Sir, the first question was answered when I replied to the hon. Member, Shri K. L. Gupta, when he had asked a similar question. The second part of the hon. Member's question is

about China. He asked about China, and we have said on a number of occasions in this House, in the last session and even earlier, that we are willing to talk with China on any matter provided it is consistent with our self-respect and national interests.

SHRI RANGA; That part of his question has not been answered; whether it is not different from the earlier stand that they have been taking.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: No; it is not different.

SHRI NATH PAI: How?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Nath Pai, instead of directly replying to the query, he has indirectly covered it. That is my reading of it. Now.....

SHRI PILOO MODY: Sir, before you go on, I wish to say that the courts have stayed any further action on the nationalisation of Banks. I would like to know whether the Prime Minister is now going to nationalise the courts.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is not the stage where I can take note of it.

12.27 hrs.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Failure of Government to ensure Security to Public Travelling on Railways

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yesterday, after the statement was made, I had observed that I would discuss this matter afresh and give further thought to it. After discussion with the leaders of the Opposition, I have decided to permit him to ask leave. Mr. Hem Barua to ask to leave of the House.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai): Sir, I beg leave of the House to move an Adjournment Motion which is as follows:

"The most dismal failure of Government to ensure security to the travelling public as is evidenced by the recent train accident on the Allahabad-Gorakhpur line on June 21, 1969, to which I want to add another, namely, the accident of a ghastly nature which took place so far as the Asansol-Puri passenger is concerned, on 14th July, 1969".

I beg leave of the House to support me in this Adjournment Motion.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yes; I take it that leave is granted. We shall take it up at 4 O'clock.

12.28 hrs.

Re. Ordinance on Nationalisation of Banks

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): I want to know whether the Prime Minister is going to take over the courts.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): Does the Prime Minister know about the stay order?

श्री मघु िलमये (मुंगेर) श्री पीलु मोदी ने जो सवाल उठाया है, उसका क्या हुआ ? क्या सुप्रीम कोर्ट के स्टे आर्डर के बारे में कानून मंत्री कोई वक्तक्य देंगे ?

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House has taken notice of her statement yesterday, and I would like to ask the Government whether they would like to make any statement today.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF FINANCE, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY AND MINISTER OF PLANNING (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Yes; before the House rises for the day.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Before the House rises today, further information will be given.

SHRI PILOO MODY: At 6 O'clock or 2 O'Speaker?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Before the House rises at 6 O'clock.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : सर-कार को यह क्लेरिफाई करना चाहिए कि जो स्टे आउँर हुआ है, उसके इम्पलीकेशन्त्र क्या होंगे? डिपाजिटर्ज <mark>के मनी का क्याहोगा?</mark> लोगों <mark>के ल्लिए यह मामला एक बड़ा पजल ब्र्</mark>वन गया है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That will be made clear before the House adjourns.

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Sir, after the ordinance was issued, some people have gone to the Supreme Court and the various high courts. The same thing happened when the Essential Service (Maintenance) Ordinance was promulgated. We were overruled. Some of us went to the high courts, and some of us, Mr. Joshi and others, requested this House, and the Chair just to stay the consideration of anything contained in that particular Bill, but it was overruled by the Chair, by the Government. It is, therefore, surprising that this particular thing is being taken note of. Once an ordinance has been issued in the interests of the people, that is being challenged by the reactionary forces of this country. (Interruption).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: A pertinent point has been raised. I do not know what has happened in the Supreme Court. Mr. Mody and others have raised it, and the Government have said that before we rise this evening the Government will give information.

श्री मधुलिमये: शायद श्री बनर्जी समझते हैं कि यहां पर इस बारे में विचार करने पर रोक लगाई गई है। यह तो सुप्रीम कोर्टनहीं दे सकती है।

12 29 1 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE RE.
DELHI HIGH COURT NOTICES
AND SUMMONS TO MPs

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that on the 22nd June, 1969, the former Speaker, Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy, received a notice from the Assistant Registrar of the High Court of Delhi in the matter of Suit No. 228 of 1969: Shri Tej Kiran Jain and others, Plaintiffs, versus Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy. Speaker, Lok Sabha, and Sarvashri Narendra Kumar Salve, B. Shankaranand and S. M. Benerjee, Members of Lok Sabha, and Shri Y. B.