

House so far as this adjournment motion is concerned is that sentence, despite impressions to the contrary; our defence forces are not sufficient to safeguard our country. That is the only sentence so far as this adjournment motion is concerned. We are not at present concerned with the other parts of the statement because this is the definite matter that is brought before us in the adjournment motion.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): It is not defence forces; it was about equipment.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The actual words were:

“... defence forces inspite of impressions to the contrary are certainly insufficient for protection and security of country because they are badly equipped.”

This is what he said. I am not very happy about what he said there. Even what he said, I am not happy. But, it is clear that he was laying stress on the equipment and our desire to improve it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of clarification,

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central) The Prime Minister has not only by implication but very clearly admitted that it was not very happily put. And actually, if we read the whole transcript, which I am sure we would have the opportunity to do, then we shall find what the tenor of the interview was like.

I do not wish to discuss the merits, because you have not permitted us to do so as yet, but I do feel that since this matter has been bruited about and circulated all over the world, and from what the Prime Minister says, essentially and substantially there is hardly any difference between what the transcript says and what the PTI

reports, I do feel that your consent should be forthcoming, and if the House permits, we can have a discussion of this matter.

Mr. Speaker: Then, I shall ask the hon. Member to ask for the leave of the House.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: If there is no objection, I suppose...

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member must move the motion first, and ask for the leave of the House under rule 60.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg leave of the House to move my adjournment motion.

Shri Tyagi: I oppose this.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. Member leave of the House? I shall ask those hon. Members who are in favour of leave being granted to rise in their seats—

I find that only 45 Members have risen in their seats. As the requisite number under rule 60 is not there, leave is not granted.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In view of the attitude of the ruling party and some of its allies and their decision to withhold discussion on a matter of this description, I feel as a protest against this kind of procedure that we should walk out of the House.

12.15½ hrs.

[*Shri H. N. Mukerjee and some other hon. Members then left the House.*]

12 16 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO
MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC
IMPORTANCE

STATEMENT MADE BY INDIAN AMBASSADOR TO U.S.A. ABOUT INDIA'S DEFENCE FORCES

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Under rule 197, may I call the attention of the Prime Minister to the following matter of urgent public importance and request

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

that he may make a statement thereon:

"The statement reportedly made by the Indian Ambassador to the United States of America in the course of a television interview that 'Indian defence forces are, in fact, totally insufficient. . ."

—it was reported as 'totally' but the actual word used seems to be 'certainly'; so, there is a slight difference there—

...for the protection and security of India."

Mr. Speaker: The actual words that have been used have come before the House now. These words had not been correctly reported in the press. Has the hon. Prime Minister anything to say?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I have read it out earlier. I shall read it out again. The words were:

"Indian defence forces, in spite of impressions to contrary, are certainly insufficient for protection and security of country because they are badly equipped. We have never been able to equip them properly because we have been short of money. Now, India is a large country . . .".

These were the words.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of clarification. Apart from whether what the Ambassador is reported to have said in New York represents the true state of affairs or not with regard to our defence forces, is it not a fact that certain norms or rules of propriety in utterance and action have been set for our diplomats as for all diplomats the world over, and the Prime Minister himself has stated in the House often in the past that our Ambassadors and diplomats should be seen more and heard less? If so, may I know whether in this particular case, the Ambassador

has not over-stepped the bounds of propriety so set by Government for our Ambassadors and diplomats?

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister has already answered it. he has said that he is not very happy with that statement.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That is hardly the answer to my question. He has to answer this particular question whether norms and rules have been set, and whether the Ambassador has overstepped the bounds of propriety or not?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: About this particular statement, I accept that I am not happy at it. Certainly, I would not have said so; if I could not have said so, I do not like anyone else on our behalf to say so. But the hon. Member is right that in America a practice has grown; it is a local practice; and some ambassadors have adapted themselves to this practice. They say much more than in any other country in the world. They give television interviews. We do not have television interviews here. There, television interview is a well established thing. When one goes in for television interviews and Press interviews all the time the chances are that sometimes one goes beyond the limit. That has happened. There are several things in this matter which I would have wished to express differently. Very often leading questions are put to catch a person and words are put which are supposed to come from the person questioned . . . (Interruptions.)

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Times should avoid such interviews.

Mr. Speaker: Order. order. Shri Hem Barua may put one question.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Times without number, our Prime Minister has been saying, very rightly, that we are capable of defending our frontiers but here comes an ambassador who makes a statement that goes counter to our national policy . . . (Interruptions.) I do not say that he

is to be removed in midstream but I want to know whether the Government are ready to administer an admonition to him, if not to recall him?

Mr. Speaker: That could not be replied at this time. Has Shri D. C. Sharma got any question?

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur) No, Sir.

REMARKS MADE BY INDIAN AMBASSADOR
TO U.S.A. ABOUT MINISTER OF DEFENCE

Mr. Speaker: There is a calling attention notice by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Sir, under rule 197, I beg to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

"The following remarks made by Shri B.K. Nehru, Indian Ambassador in USA about the Minister of Defence"

I am quoting:

"Mr. Menon is not popular in this country and that many things he does and in fact the manner in which he often speaks at the United Nations irritates the American people. We are aware of that and I suppose that is one of the reasons for the Senate Committee being trifle displeased with us."

Mr. Speaker: It has been read out. Does he want to put any particular question?

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: From what has been said, it is clear that he made this statement. I would like to know whether there is any rule which prohibits our ambassador or any officer, however highplaced he may, expressing such views and casting such aspersions against a member of our Government. If there is such rule, what action is going to be taken against him?

Mr. Speaker: Probably this mistake is due to the fact that the hon. Mem-

ber has not yet read the statement laid by the hon. Prime Minister. The hon. Prime Minister may again give the context to the hon. Member.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): It is totally indiscreet.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I shall read out the context; certainly it depends upon the question. The question put was:

"In announcing cut Fulbright said this that there was strong feeling among members on Committee that attitude of Krishna Menon who is India's Defence Minister especially his un-co-operative attitude in United Nations and otherwise perhaps influenced cut. Now do you think that this is true and do you think that Committee by this action will induce Krishna Menon to change his ways?"

Now, that was the question. The answer of the Ambassador was:

"You know that is very difficult question to answer. You ask me as Indian Ambassador—I know very well that Krishna Menon is not popular in this country and manner in which he often speaks at United Nations irritates American people. Yes, we are aware of that. And I suppose this is one of reasons for Senate Committee being trifle displeased with us. But as regard our policies in United Nations I wish people would be little more specific what they complain about . . ."

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He should have refused or declined to answer that question.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If this question were put to me, I would have dealt with it differently. I do not wholly like the way he dealt with it. It is not very well to repeat what the question has said about Shri Krishna Menon being popular or not. It is difficult to judge one's popularity.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

And popularity among what group and what sect? But he was dealing with that question and said that policies were national policies which were pursued and that it was wrong and improper for the American Government to think that they could affect our policies by pressures of this type.

Shri Tyagi: It is very obviously indiscreet of a Government servant to speak about a Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Do the signatories to this notice want to put any questions?

Pandit D. N. Tiwary (Gopalganj): There is no doubt that the statement made by Shri B. K. Nehru was very indiscreet. May I know whether Government is going to take any steps or ask him for his explanation?

Mr. Speaker: That would be for the Government to decide; they cannot disclose it just now.

Shri J. P. Jyotishi (Sagar): Has any Government servant a right to make such a public statement?

Mr. Speaker: That has been answered.

FIRE IN SADAR BAZAR IN DELHI

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): Sir, under rule 197, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

"Fire in Sadar Bazar area in Delhi on 28-5-1962 which destroyed several houses, shops and goats and rendered a large number of persons homeless."

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): Sir, there were two fires and I am making a statement in respect of each of them.

At about 2:10 A.M. on the 28th May (on the night of 27th and 28th May) a fire broke out in the huts situated at Idgah Road in Motia Khan, Police Station Sadar Bazar. On receipt of information at the Police Station all the available force was immediately rushed to the spot for rescue work. Fire Brigade which reached the spot immediately took about an hour to bring the fire under control, which was completely extinguished by about 5.30 A.M.

The exact cause of fire is still under investigation. Since the fire started late in the night no person in the vicinity appears to have noticed as to how and where it started. The fire spread quickly in the affected area as the same consisted of thatched huts. Though there was no loss of human life yet there was considerable damage to property which is estimated at about Rs. 72,000. 15 shops mostly of *Kabaris* (dealing in second-hand motor parts), *sirkies* and chick makers, coal and *bhoosa* dealers were affected by fire. Two purely residential and two shop-cum-residential huts were also burnt. Five families residing in these huts lost most of their domestic belongings. One enclosure where cattle were being kept also caught fire and as a result 128 sheep kept there were burnt to death.

Relief work is being undertaken in the affected area by various authorities including the Delhi Red Cross and the Home Guards. In order to provide immediate relief to the fire affected families, the District Magistrate has sanctioned a grant of Rs. 25 to each affected family.

Now, I come to the next one. At about 11.08 A.M. on 28th May, 1962, some huts in Nabi Karim graveyard in police station Paharganj caught fire. The fire spread rapidly. 30 thatched residential huts were affected by this fire including 23 huts which were completely burnt and seven which were demolished in order to prevent the spreading of fire. The families living in these huts have been re-

dered homeless. The Fire Brigade reached the place of occurrence immediately and it took about one and a half hours to extinguish the fire completely.

No person is reported to have been injured although the loss of property is estimated at about Rs. 16,000.

The cause of fire could not be known. Such fires are usually caused in summer months due to slight, negligence on the part of the individuals residing in the area and the fire spreads fast due to fast wind and heat, particularly when there is some combustible material nearby.

In order to provide immediate relief to the affected families, the District Magistrate, Delhi, has sanctioned an amount of Rs. 500 as gratuitous relief. The Delhi Red Cross and other organisations are undertaking relief work in the affected area.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: What rehabilitation facilities are proposed to be provided to those who have lost their properties and who have been rendered homeless? May I also know whether the Government considers the sanction of Rs. 500 an adequate sanction for the purposes of rehabilitation of so many people?

Shri Datar: Government have called for an immediate report in this respect and more relief will be provided for, as soon as the exact nature of the fire and the reasons are known. Rs. 500 is only to start with.

12 32 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

THE COMPANIES (APPEAL TO THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES, AND

THE COMPANIES (CENTRAL GOVERNMENT'S) GENERAL RULES AND FORMS (AMENDMENT) RULES, 1962

The Minister of Industry in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry (Shri Kanungo): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (3) of section 642 of the Companies Act, 1956:—

(i) The Companies (Appeal to the Central Government) (Amendment) Rules, 1962 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 651 dated the 12th May, 1962. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-152/62].

(ii) The Companies (Central Government's) General Rules and Forms (Amendment) Rules, 1962 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 653 dated the 12th May, 1962 [Placed in Library. See No. LT-153/62].

12.32 hrs.

*DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—contd.

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion of the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. Four hours have already been taken, and there is only one hour left. Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (विजनीर): अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल जहाँ से मैं ने अपने भाषण को आरम्भ किया था उस में इस मन्त्रालय के भ्रष्टार्थ मन्त्रों डा० केमकर के सम्बन्ध में मैंने यह निवेदन किया था कि जो परम्पराएँ पिछले वर्षों में उन्होंने आकाशवाणी से सम्बन्धित विभागों के लिए डाली थी उन परम्पराओं में किसी प्रकार का कोई परिवर्तन नहीं आना चाहिए उन परम्पराओं को और अधिक प्रोत्साहन मिलना चाहिए। आज भी मैं उसी से सम्बन्धित दों, तीन प्राव-

*Mover with the recommendation of the President.