

Notice

on the Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure)—Preparation of Budget Estimates of Public Undertakings and Presentation of their Annual Reports and Accounts to Parliament.

- (ii) Tenth Report relating to action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Hundred and sixteenth Report of the Estimates Committee (Second Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Transport and Communications (Department of Transport)—Hindustan Shipyard Limited.

12.07½ hrs.

ADMINISTRATORS-GENERAL BILL

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to the office and duties of Administrator-General.

12.08 hrs.

RE: CALLING-ATTENTION-NOTICE

श्री भू० ना० मंडल (सहरसा): एक कार्गिंग अटेंशन मोशन कल में ने दिया था उस के बारे में इनफारमेशन की जरूरत थी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: मैंने आप से और दूसरे माननीय सदस्यों से कहा है कि जो कोई इनफारमेशन लेनी हो मुझ से आ कर लें। यहां न इस तरह शुरू करें।

श्री भू० ना० मंडल: उम के बारे में डिस्पोजल की कोई बात नहीं कही गई है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: मैं अभी आप को इतना दे दूंगा।

12.08½ hrs.

MOTION RE: COLOMBO CONFERENCE PROPOSALS—contd.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): May I make a submission? I had given notice of a privilege motion, and I have been told that the delivery of this motion to you was a little late. May I request you to suspend the relevant rule?

Mr. Speaker: I shall just look into it. If it was late, that is to be considered on the next day. Since there is no next day, I shall look into it and I can bring it up later in the day, if I think that it can be brought up.

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बागबंकी):

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा यह निवेदन है कि कल प्रधान मंत्री ने राज्य सभा में कहा कि लोक सभा ने ८ मितम्बर की अनुमति दे दी है। यह असत्य है और मैंने इस पर प्रिविलेज मोशन दिया था कि यह हाउस का अपमान है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: जो कुछ प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने वहां कहा हो उस का मुझे यहां नोटिस लेने की जरूरत नहीं। आज जो वह यहां कहने जा रहे हैं उस का नोटिस लिया जा सकता है।

Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar): On a point of order. The Prime Minister is equally responsible to this House and to the other House. The Prime Minister is the complete Prime Minister of this House and the other House.

Mr. Speaker: Under what rule or law is this point of order being raised? May I know that? Where is the violation of any particular rule?

Shri Priya Gupta: The Prime Minister is the complete Prime Minister of a Government comprising of this House and the other House.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक निवेदन है। आप ने अभी कहा कि प्रधान मंत्री ने राज्य सभा में जो बयान दिया उस का आप यहां नोटिस नहीं ले सकते। लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि प्रधान मंत्री अगर इस प्रकार का बयान राज्य सभा में नहीं कहीं बाहर भी दें, सदन में न दें, तो भी वह इस हाउस का कंटेम्प्ट है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्रार्डर, प्रार्डर। मैंने कहा है कि यही डिस्कशन है जो हम आज अभी ले रहे हैं और उसी पर अभी यहां बयान होना है इस वास्ते उस की बाबत अलहदा से कुछ नहीं किया जा सकता।

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have understood by parliamentary practice that when any Motion is talked out, it only means that Parliament is not committed to the policy or programme indicated by the motion just talked out. Therefore, we have abstained from tabling our amendments to this motion. But surprisingly enough, the Prime Minister seems to be definitely of the contrary impression that by talking out this motion and by the Government not moving to accept it, they would consider themselves as being authorised to proceed on the basis of the September 8 proposals as now being considered as approximating to the Colombo proposals. This seeks to pervert the well-understood parliamentary principle and practice.

In the light of this development, we must state categorically that the Parliament never gave its unanimous approval to the Prime Minister's cease-fire proposals on the basis of the 8th September 1962 line of occupation and that by the Resolution accepted by the House on the 14th November no approval was given to these proposals and that we do not consider ourselves bound by those proposals, nor are we now prepared to give, to quote the Prime Minister's own words, "the authority to carry on the policy Government have been pursuing in this matter".

So we would like to inform the Prime Minister in advance of his reply to day that we do not accept the Colombo proposals in principle nor his earlier date line of 8th September for cease-fire. (Interruptions).

An Hon. Member: This is extraordinary. How can he make a statement now? (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Of course, it was extraordinary. But I must take the blame. Advance notice of it had been given to me and the reason given was that instead of interfering with or interrupting the Prime Minister so often to make the same statement, he might be allowed to make a statement for one minute. I had allowed him under that circumstance. So if there is something odd, I am to blame, nobody else (Interruptions). He has concluded.

Shri Ranga: No, Sir. I have not concluded. I sat down when you rose to make some observations.

Also, we deem that it would be national humiliation and it would be harmful to accept the Colombo proposals.

Mr. Speaker: He has said all those things in his speech.

Shri Ranga: We therefore urge that they may be rejected by Government and Parliament. We are therefore obliged to support the amendment moved by Shri Ram Sewak Yadav.

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Members cannot stand up in this manner and speak:

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): I seek your guidance. Shri Ranga spoke yesterday every word of what he has said today. May I know how and in what way he is permitted to make another statement now.

Mr. Speaker: That I have said.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): I only want the Prime Minister, when he speaks, to make it very clear, as has been pointed out in this House, that so far as the September 8 position is concerned, Parliament is not committed to it". There is a difference of opinion. He seems to have made the statement because some amendment was negative and so this House also is committed to that proposition. We do not take it that way. It may be Government's stand. That is what I wanted to be made clear. Let him say that it may be the Government's stand. But Parliament is not committed to it. If it is taken as Parliament's verdict, we have to dissociate ourselves from it.

Mr. Speaker: They can do it by their Vote.

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: If hon. Members get up in this manner, we cannot conduct the proceedings.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: Let us hear the leader of the 'co-operation party.' (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Would we be able to conduct our business in this manner? It is not possible to do so if Members just stand up when they like and begin to speak.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): I make a submission that this is a very bad and wrong procedure, because if those who interrupt are given the opportunity to make such statements.... (*Interruptions*)

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): On a point of order.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): On a point of order.

An Hon. Member: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Not three points of order at a time.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: An explanation was given to the satisfaction of the House by you and we all felt satisfied after that. Now Mr. Gopalan is making a statement challenging the decision of the Speaker and this amounts to casting an aspersion on the Speaker.

Shri Hem Barua: I also rise on the same point of order. After you have explained the position that you allowed Mr. Ranga to make a statement, the Leader of the communist group stands up and says something which can be interpreted legitimately as an aspersion on the Chair. Naturally enough we are disturbed and perturbed by it.

Mr. Speaker: I am really thankful to the hon. Members for giving me that support. But I had not yet heard Mr. Gopalan what he had really wanted to say. I have explained and taken upon myself the responsibility so far as Mr. Ranga's statement was concerned, because my consent was taken in advance. I yet wanted to hear what Mr. Gopalan had to say. He had said that this is a bad precedent. So much I had heard, but I wanted to know what he had to say completely.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I am not casting any aspersion. This is the first time such a thing is happening. I have been here for the last so many years....

Mr. Speaker: I had given the explanation why it happened. Now I can be certainly sure that there would not be interruptions.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): Mr. Yadav has not given you that understanding.

Mr. Speaker: I am talking of Mr. Ranga now. The hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampore): Before you call upon

Proposals

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri.]

the Prime Minister, I should like to submit that the leader of the P.S.P. group has made a statement here....

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister would clarify that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I want the Prime Minister to clarify it; not the hon. Member.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: The Prime Minister, after all, is the leader of the Government.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. There is no necessity to clarify it now.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): By your leave....

Mr. Speaker: That has been brought to the notice of the Prime Minister and he would answer it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You told me that I might raise it here with your permission. It is reported in the Press....

Mr. Speaker: I am telling him that I have referred it to the Prime Minister and he would answer it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Then it is all right.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): **Mr. Speaker,** Sir, I crave your indulgence and the indulgence of this House to speak on the subject that we have been discussing for the last two days and try to do so objectively and dispassionately. I am afraid the beginning of today's debate has rather vitiated the atmosphere of objective consideration of any subject. However, I shall endeavour to try to be as calm and objective as possible and I trust that hon. Members will hear me and then, of course, it is open to them to decide as they wish.

In the course of the debate—I think day before yesterday—Shri Dhebar

asked a question: What exactly are we considering? It was a very relevant question, because the issues that were before us were confused, overlaid and covered up by all manner of other considerations and therefore were likely to be forgotten by hon. Members. I recognise, of course, that the immediate issues before us have a considerable background of history and we cannot separate that background from the present issue. I do not object to all the other matters coming up or being pointed out to us. Indeed, I myself would like it to be considered in that context.

So far as this background is concerned, I take it that in spite of many differences of opinion on many other subjects, there is no Member of this House who differs in his judgment of that background and our reaction to the Chinese aggression and invasion. So, if I do not refer to it at any length, it means that we take it for granted. This is common ground and we expressed that common ground in the solemn resolution that we passed in mid-November, and took a pledge. Now, we have not only to consider this background, but also the future as it might take shape. That future is of great concern to us in India. But it has relevance also to Asia and the world, as any conflict between India and China must necessarily have. We live in a rapidly changing world. We cannot, therefore, think in static terms. We have followed a policy of non-alignment and I believe in it fully. Now, I hope we shall continue to follow it. But even the old concept of non-alignment is slowly undergoing a change. On the one side, the Soviet Union and China are beginning to fall out. On the other side, there is some attempt at a closer approach between the United States and the Soviet Union. We cannot, at this stage, say much about it, but it does hold out some hope.

Our policy of non-alignment has won such favour in the outside world, not only among the so-called non-aligned countries, the newly independ-

ent countries of Africa and Asia, but even the major aligned countries like the United States and the Soviet Union have come to see some virtue in it and want it to be continued. It has surprised me, therefore, that just at this moment of our success in this policy, some people in India should doubt its worth. In any event, what I wish to lay stress on is the dynamic character of the world today. Any position that we take must keep this in view.

We have had to deal with, at first, the slow encroachments of China on Indian territory, which have lasted five or six years and then from September, 1962 aggression on a massive scale. We believe, and many other countries agree with us in this matter, that China, as constituted today, is an aggressive expansionist country, possibly with vast designs for the future. It believes in the inevitability of major wars. Thus, essentially it does not believe in peaceful co-existence between countries and it does not believe in the five principles of *Panchsheel*, which China and India laid down some seven or eight years ago and which had been accepted by a large number of countries.

The curious fact emerges that just when most other countries have come to this conclusion that peaceful co-existence is essential and war is no longer a desirable or a possible way of settling disputes between nations, China stands apart and follows a policy which is peculiar to her. China is a great nation with a great past. A great nation pursuing such aggressive policies necessarily becomes a danger and a menace to the other countries and to the world. It has been our misfortune that we have been victims of this aggression, but that very aggression has made not only us, but other countries also realise the nature of the problem that faces the world. I believe that even the Government of China has realised the danger of the course that it follows. Possibly also it has realis-

ed the wrong it has done to India and to itself by following this course. I am not referring to moral rights and wrongs, but to the practical consequences of the action. It must be obvious to China that they cannot compel us by military or other forceful means to surrender to them in any important matter. In spite of the aggressive actions that they have taken on India and the very intemperate language that they have used, it appears that they are beginning to realise that it is not good for them, as it is not for us and for Asia and the world, if our two countries be entangled in a war which may well last a long time and do tremendous injury. One thing is certain, and they must recognise it, that India as it is constituted today will not submit to any dishonour, whatever the consequences.

India has been devoted to peace, and in her long history, whatever we may have done within our own country, we have not invaded other countries. Our fault has been to submit to others' invasions in the past, but that time is past now, and a new India has arisen which cannot and will not submit to any aggression. We want to live peacefully and in freedom, and we do not wish to interfere with the freedom of others. We believe, whether others believe in them or not in the *Panchsheel* or the five principles, because that is the only civilised or even practical way of existence in the modern age. There is no other way except war and wholesale destruction, extermination. Therefore, we have to try to bring, in so far as we can, apparently two contradictory urges and principles—to promote peace and live in peace and freedom on the one hand, and on the other hand to resist any encroachment of our freedom and integrity with all our might. That is a difficult thing to do, but there is no reason why we should not endeavour to do it to the best of our ability. But it is clear that we cannot unilaterally pursue the path of peace if

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

aggression takes place against us, and our freedom, integrity and honour are threatened. Because we were so threatened, our nation responded in the only way that any self-respecting and freedom-loving nation can respond, and we were witnesses to a sight which was worth having even at the cost of the trouble we had on our frontier. Our people proved to themselves and to the world that freedom had brought a new spirit in them and that everything else was secondary to the preservation of their freedom and integrity.

On 14th November last we took a solemn pledge and by that we stand. Members have reminded me of this pledge, and they imagine that something is suggested that will go counter to that pledge. I would like to tell them that tomorrow, on our auspicious Republic Day, scores of millions of people all over India are going to repeat that pledge or a slightly modified form of it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Modified?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Slightly modified form of it. Naturally, the circumstances, the date has changed. Our whole community development movement, numerous blocks and community centres and panchayat ghars, all of them are going to meet tomorrow, I believe at 9 o'clock in the morning, in their respective places and take that pledge, modifying the words slightly to suit them; otherwise, the substance is the same.

Shri Maurya (Aligarh): Pledge is always pledge, there should be no modification.

Mr. Speaker: Without understanding what the modification is!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The modification has nothing to do with the

substance. Naturally, Parliament says one thing in one way, and the community centres say it in a different way.

That will be a noble demonstration of our people's will and determination. Would we have organised that if we wanted to by-pass the pledge? Let this be remembered and this argument of our proving false to our pledges not be raised again.

We have been told that Government is paralysed by fear and the military might of China, that we want to accept the Colombo proposals because we are frightened, and that it will be dishonourable for us to accept these proposals, and a breach of the pledges we have made. There have been heroics and hysterics and, what has been described by a foreign newspaper, a competition in patriotism, as if patriotism is to be measured by words and phrases and the strong statements that one makes. Patriotism is made of stronger stuff. It is to be judged by something more than the words we use, rather by the life we have led.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Exactly.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: By that life let us judge each one of us.

We have committed many mistakes, and no doubt will commit more....

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): That is the only thing we are sure of. We are quite sure of that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: but I have yet to know that we have succumbed to fear and have fashioned our policies on that basis. Long years ago, when we had the privilege of serving under the leadership of Gandhiji, we learnt one lesson: that

was to shed fear. There is little likelihood that we would forget that basic principle that he taught us. But fearlessness has to be married to wisdom.... (Interruptions) Otherwise it is reckless folly. It is to be governed by certain principles as well as a measure of intelligence and understanding of what the world is today. What have we been debating here during the last two or three days? It is the Colombo proposals. How do these come into being?

On the 20th of October last, the first massive invasion of India took place. Before that about six weeks ago, on the 8th September the Chinese forces had started coming from across the Thag La ridge in NEFA. On the 20th of October was this massive invasion. On the 24th of October the Chinese Government made their three-point proposals—that is, three or four days after this. Within two or three days we rejected these proposals as they were considered dishonourable for India and we could not possibly accept them. We had, therefore, to take a positive line and to make some positive proposals suited to the moment. Some people called it the 'peace offensive'. We had to meet that offensive, apart from any other positive line that we should take. It was then that we suggested that we would be prepared to talk to the Chinese if the situation as it existed before the latest invasion was restored—that is, what is called the 8th September line was restored. That was an ideal proposal for India as well as, I think for China. Neither of these countries could succeed in humiliating the other; each of them is too big and too conscious of its honour to submit to any humiliation.. (Interruptions).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या बहादुरी सिर्फ इन इंटरपोज में है ! अब जो उन का खयाल है, उस को आप सुनिये । आप ने अपनी तकरीरों में अपने खयालात का इजहार कर लिया है । अब आप उन की बात सुन लीजिए ।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : अध्यक्ष महोदय . . (Interruptions).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जायें । मैं उन को भी कह रहा हूँ कि वे भी बैठ जायें ।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : बहादुरी के बारे में मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ । मैं बहुत बहादुर नहीं हूँ । लेकिन मैं कायर भी नहीं हूँ, उस तरह से जिस तरह से ये लोग बोल रहे हैं ।

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : हमारी तरफ उंगलियाँ क्यों उठा

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Every one in his speech had made comments and the Prime Minister also can do that. Now, the hon. Members would kindly keep silent and listen to him.... (Interruptions.)

श्री बागड़ी : ये बहादुर बन

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जायें । मैं सभी मेम्बर साहिबान से कहता हूँ कि वे बैठ जायें ।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I proceed, Sir? I am not aware of having referred even indirectly or remotely to any hon. Member opposite, anywhere. I do not know why this extra-ordinary excitement should take place. I am talking slowly, calmly and dispassionately trying to analyse the position.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Please proceed.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am grateful to the hon. Member for permission to proceed.... (Interruptions.) This 8th September proposal was repeated by me many times in Parliament and outside, at meetings, on the radio and in the Press. It was definitely mentioned by me repeatedly in the course of my speech then. A substitute motion was proposed by Shri Ram Sevak Yadav for the particular purpose of the rejection of this proposal of the 8th September line.

Proposals

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

This substitute motion was rejected by a very large majority in the Lok Sabha. Subsequently a substantive motion was passed approving all the measures and policies adopted by Government. I shall read out these motions. The motion under discussion was:

"That the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China be taken into consideration".

In the course of my speech, I said:

"In answer to this it was stated that we could not proceed to any talks with them until at least this latest aggression was vacated and the status quo prior to the 8th September 1962 restored both in NEFA and Ladakh". This was the least we could do and that is the position we have consistently held during the last few months. Anxious for peace as we are, we suggested this minimum condition which might lead to a peaceful approach".

I referred to this again on two or three occasions in the course of the same speech. I would read further from that:

"What we had suggested is a simple and straightforward proposal, that of restoration of the status quo prior to the 8th September, 1962, when further aggression began".

Shri Ram Sevak Yadav proposed a substitute motion to this which ran as follows:

"This House having considered the border situation resulting from invasion of India by China, is of opinion that the policy of the Government of India to start negotiations on the condition of withdrawal by the Chinese aggressors to the line of control as on the 8th September, 1962 should be rejected, and no nego-

tiations should be undertaken till the Chinese aggressors withdraw to the Indian boundary as it existed on the 15th August, 1947".

This substitute motion was voted upon in this House. The result of the division was: 13 in favour of the substitute motion and 288 against.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: We refrained from voting on that motion.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: By your leave, Sir, I want to raise a point of order. I would like to draw your attention and also the attention of the House to what the Prime Minister has consistently held and declared and stated in his speeches in Parliament and outside and in broadcasts, portions of which I will read out.

Mr. Speaker: Other speeches are not to be there. Only the debate that was held here was being referred to.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: My point of order is this. You have to give a ruling on that. He made it clear on every occasion that only the Government stands committed to this proposal. It is recorded there. I will read out one sentence.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order? He cannot read from the debate now.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Certainly if he can, so can I.

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister is on his legs.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The point of order relates to the statement that he has made.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The point of order in brief is this. He has said that the Parliament has endorsed the policy with regard to the

September 8 line. I do not contest that proposition. But, Sir, it would be wholly wrong to say that it was adopted unanimously, just as the Parliament adopted the 14th November resolution unanimously, with acclamation, happily, at your instance all standing. Parliament never endorsed it like that. That is all.

Mr. Speaker: He has raised no point of order, although he stood up on that pretext. I would request hon. Members to desist from this temptation when there is no point of order. At least senior Members should not stand up and interrupt when there is no point of order. (Interruption)

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The House never endorsed it unanimously.

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर यह है कि श्री राम सेवक यादव का जो अमेंडमेंट है उस के गलत मतलब निकाले जा रहे हैं। उन का जो अमेंडमेंट

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जाइये ।

श्री किशन पटनायक : मैं जो निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ, उस को कम्प्लीट कर लेने दीजिए । श्री राम सेवक यादव का यह अमेंडमेंट था कि १५ अगस्त, १९४७ की लाइन को माना जाये । उस को रिजक्ट करने का मतलब यह कैसे होता है कि ८ सितम्बर की लाइन को माना गया है ? आप इस के मतलब को साफ कर दें ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बस यही है आप का प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर ? आप ही बतलाईये कि इस में प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर कहाँ है ? मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह से खड़े हो जाना प्रीर प्रोसीडिंग्स को इंटरप्ट करना निहायत ना-बाजिब है । एक इंटरप्रिटेशन प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब दे रहे हैं और उस के लिए प्रोसीडिंग्स

पढ़ रहे हैं । दूसरे आदमी की राय इस से मुक्तलिफ हो सकती है, लेकिन इस प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर कैसे हो गया ?

Shri Priya Gupta: On a point of order. Only one hon. Member should be on his legs.

श्री किशन पटनायक : आप अपनी राय दे दीजिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस में मेरी राय की ज़रूरत नहीं है और न इस में कोई प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है । मैं मेम्बर साहबान से कहूँगा कि वह इस तरह के प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर न उठाये ।

Now the hon. Prime Minister may be allowed to proceed.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I had simply read out the wording of the substitute motion. It is for the hon. Members to say what it means. I shall read out the substitute motion again:

“This House... is of opinion that the policy of the Government of India to start negotiations on the condition of withdrawal by the Chinese aggressors to the line of control as on the 8th September, 1962, should be rejected and no negotiations should be undertaken till the Chinese aggressors withdraw to the Indian boundary as it existed on the 15th August, 1947.”

Subsequently, an amendment was proposed by Shri Vidya Charan Shukla that for the original motion the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House having considered the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China, approves of the measures and policy adopted by the Government to meet it.”

This was passed without voting apparently, but almost unanimously, though some did not agree. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He said, "almost unanimously".

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I definitely say that Acharya Ranga did not agree with it. Probably he will never agree on anything good. I am prepared to make an exception to Acharya Ranga in every proposition that I may make.

Shri Ranga: When I was agreeing with you I was a good man!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not a question of argument about words or things. It is beyond argument—what has been done by the House; that is the parliamentary practice and procedure. It is not normal—or can be followed by Government—to come every time to the House and take its opinion about a certain step that it might take. It places the general policy before the House and the House approves of it or disapproves of it or criticises it, and Government has to function accordingly. If the House disapproves of it naturally the Government have to change their policy. In this particular matter it was not necessary from the point of view of any Constitution or law for the Government to come to this hon. House and take—I am talking about the 10th December—their views about the 8th September line which was the proposal made by Government as a reaction to the proposal made by the Chinese previously. But we did come and we came after this matter had been repeated for two months, repeatedly by me and by the organs of public opinion. The House was particularly fully seized of this fact; this has been done; this has been said. I came here and stated, "this is our policy," and subsequently, after the substitute motion that Shri Ram Sewak Yadav proposed—it referred to something being rejected—a resolution was passed by the House that the House approves of the measures and policy adopted by Government. That is my understanding. How can there be any doubt in the least? One in a million, I say; there

can be no doubt about that. What is the effect of this? The effect of it is that the House, at that moment, approved of the proposal that we had made about the 8th September line. That is my submission. Others may disagree with it. Both negatively and positive it was cleared out. (Interruptions).

An Hon. Member: No, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am almost prepared to say that with the exception of Acharya Ranga the House approved of it. It is always open to the House, may I say, to disapprove of something it has approved previously, to change its mind. That is a different matter. I am not challenging the right of the House. I am merely saying as a matter of recorded fact in our proceedings that this fact was before the House; it was deliberately brought before the House in my speech, repeatedly, and in other public statements. Subsequently, the policy of the Government was reaffirmed by this House. There is no doubt about that. In that policy, at that time, this was the major thing, the other things having been previously agreed to. Therefore, I do submit that that particular matter, rightly or wrongly, was not only accepted by Government but this House also approved of it fully.

Even at the time when we were discussing this matter in the House, the conference convened by the Prime Minister of Ceylon was meeting. The Prime Minister of Ceylon had taken the initiative in regard to that in November—I forget the exact date. I think it was towards the last few days of November—in the third week probably—that she had taken the initiative, and she had suggested at first the 1st of December for that meeting. She did not ask us about it; we knew nothing about it till we were informed that she had convened it. Naturally she had asked the other countries; we could not come in the way. We, in a sense, welcomed her initiative, and then the date was changed to the 10th of December, so

Proposals

that actually on the day we were meeting here in the Lok Sabha, this conference was meeting in Colombo. Subsequently, they passed some resolutions, copies of which they gave us. But they made it clear that they wanted us to keep them confidential till a later stage, when they come to us. Some days later, again, the Prime Minister of Ceylon with some of her colleagues went to Peking to discuss these resolutions and later she came here. She was accompanied by two representatives of other countries: the Prime Minister of the United Arab Republic and the Minister of Justice of Ghana. First of all, we asked them to explain to us what exactly those resolutions meant and whether there was any doubt about the interpretation or not. It was obvious that some parts of the resolutions could be interpreted in more than one way. So we said that those should be cleared out. We asked them some questions and they gave us their explanations and amplifications in writing to be precise. Then we considered the original Colombo resolutions with their amplifications, and considering them we came to the conclusion that they fulfilled the essence of what we had asked for when we had put forward the proposal of 8th September line. Thereafter we told them as a Government that we accept them in principle but we would like to put them up before Parliament and take their reaction to them, and then we will let them have our final reply.

Now, I should like to add that the September proposal had nothing to do with any of the merits of the case or anything. The Colombo powers stated that they wanted to help in creating a situation which would enable the parties to discuss matters between themselves, to prepare the ground and to lessen tension. That was the position then, and that is what we are considering today.

When the representatives of the Colombo powers came here they told us—we had heard previously—that

the Government of China had given, what is called, a positive response to these proposals, whatever that might be. Subsequently, it appeared that that so-called positive response was limited and restricted in various important ways. I may mention one or two of those a little later to the House. Anyhow, it appeared that it was not in complete acceptance of the proposals as they were and as they were amplified by the representatives of the Colombo powers to us. So we told them that our acceptance in principle of these proposals meant our acceptance in principle, naturally, of those proposals as interpreted and amplified by them. We did not ask them to change the proposals or to alter them even though we might have wanted to do that; we wanted to keep them as a whole. Otherwise, we would have asked them to change their proposals, they would have gone back to Peking and would have possibly been asked to change the proposals in some other way. Anyhow, we did not discuss any change of the proposals, but we took the proposals as amplified by them, which we found, then and subsequently, was not the interpretation of the Chinese to these proposals.

So, now we will come to these proposals themselves because much has been said here in this House which has astonished me greatly. It is naturally open to any hon. Member to hold any opinion whether the proposal is good or bad, but to say something which has no basis and fact is, I submit, not justified. I should like hon. Members who criticise them and call them "disastrous to India politically, militarily and otherwise" to look at them again. I do submit that these proposals, not only in substance but essentially, carry out the main object of the 8th September proposal which we had made. I have dealt with the first part as to how far the 8th September proposal was justified or not. Having done that, when we got these proposals, obviously, what we had to do was not to argue with the Ceylon powers on the entire

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

position, the merits of the question and how China had done this and that, and we were against that—that is a different matter, we did talk about it informally—but so far as their proposals were concerned the only matter we could deal with them was to see how far their proposals fitted in with what we had said, with the 8th September line. Where they did not fit in it was for us to say so and reject them. If they did fit in, then automatically we had to accept them from that point of view.

So we came to the conclusion that essentially they did fit in with the 8th September line. It is true that their approach to this was slightly different and, therefore, we had simply put a straightforward suggestion that the 8th September position should be restored. They did not approach that that way, but in the result they arrived at something which was essentially the restoration of the 8th September line. In some small matters it did not yield that result, in other matters it did yield results much better than what we had said.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Let us have more details of those small matters and other matters.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: For instance, I will mention one or two matters in the Ladakh area which is the important area from this point of view. In the middle sector nothing has happened and nothing is happening because the old position prior to 8th September has remained and, according to these proposals, will continue to remain till it is changed. In the NEFA the Chinese have retired or are supposed to retire completely.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): That is not the correct position. Sir, this is a very important thing. Nowhere have the Colombo proposals stipulated the withdrawal of the Chinese forces from Dhola and Longju, and the pity of it is that they were no-

where there in any of these areas prior to 8th September.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member must have patience. The hon. Prime Minister was coming to those things.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I would beg of the hon. Members to learn the habit of listening quietly.

Shri Hem Barua: I have listened. I only say that the word "completely" should not be there.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He will come to that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, we are developing some parliamentary conventions. Before I have finished a sentence the hon. Member interrupts me. The course of interruptions here on the basis of points of order is a remarkable invention in the history of parliaments.

Shri Hem Barua: I did not do that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not saying that.

Shri Priya Gupta: Conventions are changed with the prospects changed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member must resume his seat now.

Shri Hem Barua: The Prime Minister should not be allowed to throw omnibus abuse against us.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We can reciprocate, but we do not want to do it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Prime Minister should not, I entirely agree with the hon. Member, be allowed to throw abuse omnibus or any other bus.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You set an example yourself.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I entirely agree. If what I said, that people

should not interrupt before I have finished what I have to say, before I have finished a sentence or even half a sentence, or that points of order are raised here in a remarkable way, is an abuse, I do not know the meaning of language then.

What I said was that in NEFA, according to the Colombo proposals, we are supposed to go all over except in two points which have been reserved for further discussion. No decision has been made according to these proposals about them. They are: a little territory near the Dhola Ridge and Longju. No decision has been made about these two matters.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What about Thagla Ridge?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as Longju is concerned, according to these proposals and according to our September statement, no decision is necessary because when we have said that they go back to the 8th September line, well, Longju will remain with the 8th September line now and later. The question does not arise. I do not want to go into its history as to how Longju is there and then say that they should withdraw or we should withdraw, whether that is right or wrong and so on. That is another matter. But, according to the 8th September line, it is not affected. Dhola is affected, undoubtedly.

Shri Hem Barua: Longju is also affected.

13 hrs.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Anyhow, Longju and Dhola are matters open to discussion and further consideration. So far as we are concerned, we have made it perfectly clear that Dhola and Longju....

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Since Dhola and Longju are matters for discussion in the future, we should not comment about them one way or the other.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We are not commenting. We have made the position clear and the Colombo Powers have made the position clear on this point. About Longju, as I have stated, there is no question. We have stated it repeatedly. I would beg of the House to remember that we have to consider, we are considering it from the point of view of the 8th September line, not on merits. According to the 8th September line, Longju is a frontier village, half with us and half with them. Dhola post is also an important area. Our position was, and is, that Dhola and all the area on this side of the post should be completely vacated, and that remains so. So that, if you accept the position which I have stated, no question arises in NEFA.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Thag La Ridge.

Mr. Speaker: Thag La Ridge is the name of that place and Dhola was the post.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We know that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The present position is, as I have said yesterday, the Chinese have withdrawn throughout NEFA, except in a small area near the Thag La Ridge which has not been decided yet and which is supposed to be discussed by us further, and by the Colombo Powers we have been assured that we can occupy all those territories.

Coming to Ladakh, which is perhaps the area which has been exercising the hon. Members' minds most, may I say that I was a little surprised to learn from the hon. Member, the leader of the Praja Socialist Party, that he doubted the fact that they had advanced only twenty kilometres. I do not know how he measures and from what place he measures.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I asked whether by their withdrawal of 20 kilometres back from the line of

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

actual control they will reach the 8th September line. That is to say, have they advanced only 20 kilometre from that date?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is very difficult to measure these distances, because it depends upon where you measure them from. Because, it is not a straight line, as the hon. Member knows. There are 40 or so of our posts and 40 or so of their posts, all mixed up. Where does one measure from? As a matter of fact, the Chinese advance in the Ladakh area was, by and large, much less than 20 kilometres. Normally, it was about 10, 12 or 8 kilometres.

Shri Hem Barua: Question. We have grave doubts.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In one or two places, specially in the south it was probably a little more than 20 kilometres. But that too would depend on how you measure, from what place. Anyhow, what we have to consider was how far it fitted in with the 8th September line, to which we were committed. Now, the 8th September line, if it is reproduced completely, would mean that all our posts and all the Chinese posts in that area would remain, because they were there before the 8th September; they are not new Chinese posts. Our posts had, of course, been liquidated meanwhile by this aggressive action. So that, it meant our going back to those posts and the Chinese keeping their posts, 40 posts or so, in that area, and keeping them in a very dominating position, disadvantageous to us. Now, compared to that, the proposals that have been made by the Colombo Powers are that all these strong posts of the Chinese, which counted very much against us, should be withdrawn—we are not there at the present moment—and that there should be some civil posts of the Chinese and some civil posts by us in that area but not together. There is no question of

dual posts or dual partnership; they will be separate posts by agreement. I do not understand how the withdrawal by the Chinese of their military posts, leaving behind a few civil posts, would amount to partnership with the Chinese to control an area. How does it give them any right to that area? They are there. The whole question is their withdrawal, and how much withdrawal for the purpose of some other step that we might take. On the question of merits, are we opposed to their withdrawal? Should we say: you remain there? Or should we say: you should not remain there? I do not understand this argument.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: How can they withdraw and still be there?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They will withdraw all their military posts. There will be civil posts, as much number as we may agree upon, on the basis of parity and equality. Of course, a difficulty may arise if there is a question of administration and all that. No such question arises there. That area would be a demilitarised area with no military which means the Chinese military withdrawing; not ours, because ours is not there.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We are vacating and giving them peaceful possession.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry. My mind does not work as acutely as that of the hon. Members opposite. It is a common mind, but it is a practical mind which sees facts.

Anyhow, I do submit to this House that the Colombo proposals in regard to that area in Ladakh is better, definitely better, from any point of view.

Shri Hem Barua: No, no.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): No, no. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Kishan Pattnayak: It is unpatriotic to say like that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Hon. Members can have their own opinion. But is the hon. Prime Minister debarred from giving his own opinion?

Shri Hem Barua: What about the 2,000 sq. miles which we have lost in that area....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He can have his own opinion and approach to this problem. Here we have to listen to the speech. Why should the hon. Member get impatient? (*Interruptions*).

Shri Bagri: Sir, on a point of order.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: How can there be a point of order when I am speaking?

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मान ए प्वा 'ट आफ़ आर्डर । मेरा कहना यह है कि वैसे तो प्रधान मंत्री महोदय, हाउस का मान होना चाहिए, यह बात बहुत कहते हैं लेकिन क्रायदा, कानून क्या यह इजाजत देता है कि जब अध्यक्ष महोदय खड़े हों तब भी प्राइम मिनिस्टर स्तम्भ की तरह खड़े रहते हैं लेकिन उस के मुकाबले यदि कोई दूसरा मेम्बर खड़ा होता है तो उस को कहा जाता है कि यह हाउस के क्रायदे, कानून के खिलाफ है । मैं इस पर रूलिंग चाहता हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं कह चुका हूँ कि जब अध्यक्ष खड़े हों तब कोई मेम्बर खड़ा नहीं हो सकता । अब कोई मेम्बर में मिनिस्टर भी शामिल है यह कौन नहीं जानता ।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is no good, Sir, my repeating some of these arguments because it seems to be as clear as daylight. From the military or political or from any point of view it is an advantage to us to have this

corridor for the time being—all this is for the time being that nobody gives up anything—under the Colombo proposals, as said there, than for us to have a lot of military outposts....

An Hon. Member: Civil outposts.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I did not go into that deeply—than to have our military outposts mixed up with their military outposts and making it very difficult. That is the advice we have been given by non-civil people also. If the hon. Members have some different viewpoint, it is open to them to have it. I cannot help it. I cannot help them to see sometimes the obvious.

Shri Hem Barua: That is not the 8th September proposal. It was for unconditional withdrawal.... (*Interruption*). He is misleading.

Mr. Speaker: Now he should listen.

Shri Hem Barua: We want to be enlightened.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am trying to enlighten you.

Shri Hem Barua: That is not the 8th September proposal. It was that they must withdraw completely unconditionally.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The 8th September proposal was to restore the position as it was on the 8th September.

Shri Kishan Pattnayak: Did the corridor exist on the 8th September?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: To restore that position means having the Chinese strongposts in this area with vast armies round about them and our posts also mixed up. That was it. That was not an advantageous position. Suppose, they say, "We give you what you want", we have to accept it because we have asked for that.

श्री बागड़ी : क्या उन चौकियों के नाम मेंशन किये गये हैं या नहीं ?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Even if that is granted, this certainly is not the restoration of the 8th September position.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: 7th September position, that is, pre-8th September.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have said so. It is not a restoration there; it is better than a restoration.

Some Hon. Members: How?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Please allow him to explain that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is why the Chinese do not accept that. (Interruption).

An Hon. Member: They want more.

Dr. B. N. Singh (Hazaribagh): Because they do not accept it, it is better?

श्री बागड़ी : स्पीकर साहब,

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर । क्या इस तरह से हम उनमें कोई काम चल सकेगा ?

श्री बागड़ी : यह तो आप प्राइम मिनिस्टर से पूछिए । प्राइम मिनिस्टर खुद ऐसे हालात पैदा कर रहे हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जब प्राइम मिनिस्टर यहां पर बोलेंगे, तो वह अपनी राय, अपने खयाल और गवर्नमेंट का एटीट्यूड रखेंगे । अगर आप उनको नहीं सुनना चाहते, तो क्या मैं उनको बन्द कर दूँ ? यह उनका खयाल है और अगर आप उससे एग्री नहीं करते हैं और वह आपकी मुझफिकित में न भी हो, तो उनको सुनना तो पड़ेगा । जब वक्त आयेगा, तो इसका फैसला यह हाउस ही देगा ।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So, the question is that these Colombo proposals in so far as they refer to Ladakh do not mean any kind of a division or acceptance of any division directly or indirectly. It is a temporary arrangement which, if it is not agreed to, would simply mean that they could remain in control there till other developments take place.

Now, I want to make one point clear, to which the hon. Member Shri Kamath referred before I began speaking and some other hon. Member referred, to what I said in the Rajya Sabha. I think, I have said that the practice is for the Government to keep the House and Parliament informed fully. It is not necessary for Government to come and take a vote on every step that it takes. About most of the things Government has to take a step in a particular position. Suppose, there is a war on. Now, during war the Generals take steps without even referring to Government. Sometimes they refer to Government in important matters where they can; but they cannot afford to do it. So, in all these matters Government can take steps if they are in line with the general policy outlined.

In this matter, as I have ventured to point out, our general policy has been brought before the House and has been approved by the House repeatedly. Therefore, within that line, whether that particular step is approved or not, if it is within the line of that policy, Government takes that step. I need not have, by any constitutional convention, brought this matter up necessarily to the House. But I did not think that that was right for me specially when the House was going to meet. So, I brought it up and I am glad that I brought it up. 1

Now, having brought it up, what are we to do? I did not think it necessary then, to begin with, to bring a substantive motion for the approval of this because I thought that this was

Proposals

included in the general lines of policy approval which have been given by this House to me. Further, I thought that if I place the whole position. . . .

Shri Nath Pai: That is not quite true. You made sure even of your supporters.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know what the hon. Member feels. If the House agrees, I am prepared to put it forward here and now.
(*Interruption*).

Some Hon. Members: Yes, yes. . .
(*Interruption*).

Shri Ranga: You have got majority, anyhow. We do not question that. . .
(*Interruption*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am prepared. I did not bring it for two reasons. One was, as I have said, that I did not think it necessary and I did not wish to create precedents for the future that every matter is voted upon by Parliament. It is not a good precedent. It is not followed by other Parliaments.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy rose—

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Please let me go on. Please let me finish a sentence or two.

Secondly, because the Chinese had not given their final reply, I thought it on the whole desirable for this matter to be left by the House to the Government to pursue within the lines of the general policy. But, if there is any doubt in any people's mind that this is not a correct course, I would suggest to you and to the House to permit me to move an amendment here and now and to have it this way or that way. . . . (*Interruption*).

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: You should have had courage enough to bring forward a positive motion instead of saying now that you want to move an amendment. . . (*Interruption*).

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Parliament can pass anything by majority. We do not contest that position at all. By a majority you can pass anything. . . . (*Interruption*).

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: What I want to point out is that when it was said that there will be no approval of a Resolution, we took it for granted that the policy accepted in this House on the 14th November is accepted. Now, the hon. Prime Minister says that there is no question of an approval motion because of the adoption of that amendment on the 10th December which, he now interprets, also accepts this. That was not our understanding.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry, the hon. Member thought that because it could not have been that. Any intelligent approach would show that it could not be that. How could I put this up? Leave out Parliament for a moment. Government is committed to a certain line of action and Government, naturally, pursues it unless it is told not to do so by Parliament. It has to; Government cannot remain in the air in matters of this kind. We have said that. First of all, I showed that so far as Parliament is concerned they have also given their approval to the 8th September line as a matter of policy. Then comes the question of interpretation as to how far the 8th September line has been carried out by the Colombo proposals. That is the sole question that we have to consider as Government and we have told them that we accept these in principle. We thought, we should accept them. Of course, our acceptance does not bring this about wholly because this is a matter concerning China also. China has thus far not accepted it. I do not know what it will do. But we cannot remain in the air. We have to inform the Prime Minister of Ceylon what our position is. As I told you, I shall inform her. Therefore what the hon. Member opposite said, namely, that I have not brought forward a substantive resolution because of the November thing, I do not at all

Proposals

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

understand. How can that help us at all at the present moment? Of course, we hold to the 8th November thing and, of course, I am going to repeat it tomorrow from a hundred thousand platforms in India. That is a different thing. But in this matter we have to say something. We have to say 'Yes' or 'No' and therefore it is for the House to tell us to say "Yes" or "No".

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: What is all this? How should this be recorded, may I know?

Shri Ranga: He has got that reply also.

Mr. Speaker: He is arguing his case and when there are shouts of 'No', there are shouts of 'Yes' also. But I am asking all the hon. Members and not one side only. . . .(Interruption).

Shri Ranga: You should not be upset.

Mr. Speaker: Why should I not be? If the proceedings are not peaceful, I have got to regulate them.

Shri Ranga: When they said 'Yes', we said 'No'.

Shri Nath Pai: I do not want to interrupt, but he was not aware of the developments. I claim the attention of the hon. Prime Minister. After he summoned us to meet him, it was clearly understood, on the assurance given by no less a person than the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs who should bear this out to avoid all misunderstanding in the House, that the Government will not seek a positive vote and it is expected that we will not move an amendment to reject it. That was the position given us to understand and that re-

mains. No wrong inferences should be drawn. That is our expectation.

I hope that I am correctly quoting him.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In view of the fact that there is this difference of opinion, I submit that the difference of opinion should be set aside and the vote be taken now, if you like, on a substantive motion. If the House permits me, I shall move it. . . .

Shri Priya Gupta: You should have brought it forward earlier.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know that it is unusual for me to suggest it at this late stage. But if the House agrees and you agree, I am perfectly willing. That is all that I wish to say. I do not wish to press it. But one thing is perfectly clear.

The hon. Member Shri Nath Pai has certainly, according to me, misunderstood what I may have said or the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs may have said. He said that we shall not bring it up because in the normal course it was not necessary to bring it up. Government follow a certain policy, and if that policy is explained, if the House broadly accepts it that is enough. . . .

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनल) : अध्यक्ष
महोदय . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बंद नइये,
आप की प्रार्थना मुन ली जएगी ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मेरी एक प्रार्थना
तो मुन लीजिये ।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Therefore, the position necessarily is that I have to send some precise answer to the Colombo Powers and to the Prime Minister of Ceylon today or tomorrow as to where we stand. I cannot tell them that we have not made up our

mind. It is absurd. As a matter of fact, we have already told them that we accept them in principle. And it is the proposition of Government that we should tell them definitely and precisely that we are prepared to accept these Colombo proposals subject to the amplifications and elucidations. Whether they will come into effect or not depends on the other party accepting them. For the moment, they have not accepted them. Well, if they do not accept them, they do not come into effect; that is a different matter. But I have to choose; there is no help for it; I have to choose this way or that way. If there is any doubt in any hon. Members' minds, I propose to resolve that doubt by suggesting to you and to the House to permit me even at this stage to put forward a specific motion....

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: No body questions your right as a Government.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Your majority is there.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मेरी प्रार्थना सुन लीजिये । आप के कहने के मुताबिक मैं पहले बैठ गया था । अब तो सुन लीजिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जाइये । मैं आप की प्रार्थना सुन लूंगा ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : आप कह तो बैठ जाता हूँ । लेकिन मेरी बात अवश्य सुन ली जायें ।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member opposite says that he does not challenge my right to give the Government's reaction to it to the Colombo Powers. Then, will the hon. Member at a later stage, some other day,.....

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इज्जतों आदमी मरवा दिये गये हैं . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं ने आप से कहा है कि मैं आप की प्रार्थना सुनूंगा । मगर अब आप बैठ जाइये ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : तीन बार तो आप के कहने से मैं बैठ गया हूँ । अब तो मेरी प्रार्थना सुन लीजिये । अभी तक आप ने सुनी नहीं है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं ने कहा है कि मैं सुन लूंगा ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मेरा अनुशासन देखिए । आप के कहने के अनुसार मैं तीन बार बैठ चुका हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कहिये, आप क्या कहना चाहते हैं ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार की पालिसी इस तरह से रोज कैसे बदलती रहती है ? कल तो वह कह रहे थे कि चीन जब तक हमारा इलाका खाली नहीं कर देता, तब तक उस के साथ बात नहीं करेंगे । आज आप क्या कह रहे हैं ? आज आप क्या कर रहे हैं ? आप उन को ईमानदार बता रहे हैं और कह रहे हैं कि बड़े सज्जन हैं । क्या उन की नीयत ठीक हो गई है, क्या वे पहले जैसे भाई हो गए हैं या कुछ और ज्यादा हो गए हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप की बात सुन ली है । आपने तर्करीर करनी थी, वह कर ली है ।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I leave myself in your hands and the hands of the House, because I have to take some action, and not merely deliver a speech here, and I have expressed to the House what the intention of Government is very clearly, and we think we are right; it may be that some hon. Members think that we are not right. Now, there are two ways of dealing with this matter. One of them is the very clear way of putting it to the vote. As a matter of fact, it is going to be put to the vote in a slightly indirect way by Shri Ram Sewak Yadav's amendment, which is a negative one, and which seeks a

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

disapproval of this. If that is rejected, certain consequences flow, but I am prepared to accept those consequences. But, if not, and if the House wants a clear direction, I am prepared to have a direct vote on it. It is immaterial. But the fact is that I want the House to realise it. I do not want to be said that I did something behind the back of the House, or which the House not accept. That must be made perfectly clear.

It is Government's intention to convey a final answer to this matter to the Prime Minister of Ceylon, approving in toto the Colombo proposals as amplified and explained by them. I would naturally add that the fact of giving effect to them will only come when the other party has fully approved of them. I think that is the position on which I propose to act, and I cannot act if the House does not approve of it; naturally, I cannot act, and I would not act, if the House does not approve of it, but nobody should be left in any doubt about it.

May I add that in spite of all this argument that we have had these two or three days, this business of the 8th September line and the Colombo proposals is a temporary thing for a temporary objective?

As I said earlier, the whole question of our conflict with China is a very much deeper one, and it may carry us on for years, whatever may happen in between. I do not say that the actual war will go on for years, but the conflict will go on and the menace will be there. Therefore, we have to prepare and strengthen ourselves to the best of our ability; whatever happens, we have to strengthen ourselves.

Some people imagine that because of these Colombo proposals being accepted or acted upon we shall slow down or slacken. That would be utterly wrong. That is certainly not the view of Government, or, I take it, of anybody in this House. We

must strengthen ourselves, because it is inevitable that we should build up our strength, not only get such help as we are getting—and we are grateful to the countries who are giving us that help—but the real thing is to build up our strength in India, build up our industry, build up everything that goes to strengthen our nation in war and in peace. That is urgent and important.

The hon. Member Shri Frank Anthony in his eloquent, and if I may say so, rather flamboyant language referred to something; he said that in two hundred years, something was going to happen, not in my life-time, not in his life-time, and all kinds of things would flow from it. I am glad that he thinks of the future also sometimes and what the consequences of our action might be. For, as I said at the beginning, the world is not a static world, it is a changing world; it may well be that the present face of the world may change completely; it may well be that what is talked about now about one-world State may arise; it may well be that frontiers may cease to exist except for some administrative purposes; all kinds of things may happen. We are too much wedded to a static view of the past even to consider the present. In this changing dynamic present, the main point is that we must never submit to coercion or military pressure.

Now, I do not know what the Chinese objections are, all of them, but I shall mention one or two to you, their objections to the Colombo proposals. One is that they do not want us in that Ladakh area, that corridor as it is called, to put up any kind of military or civil posts. That is an important matter. And China wants to put up her own posts there, civilian posts, not military posts. That is one important matter. The second, I believe, relates to . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What was the pre-September 8 position with regard to that point? I think we had more.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We had 40, and they had 40 or 50; I do not exactly know. There is a vast number of posts there. You will see that it is difficult to explain what a post is, because a post is either a fairly strong fortified post or just half a dozen men sitting there with a flag, more to prevent others from capturing that place than for anything else. It is not a sign of strength, but a sign of visible sovereignty of a nation.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: A symbol.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So, in regard to all these posts, they do not want us; like Acharya Ranga they also object to what is called dual control; they both agree.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Let them also go back. Let them also not come in there.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is a major point of difference between China and the Colombo Powers, and certainly we cannot accept the Chinese approach to it.

There is another. I imagine that is in NEFA about what they call the Che Dong Ridge which we call the Thagla Ridge. These are two major matters. There may be some others. They have not told us about them because we are not dealing directly with them. They are dealing with Colombo. We do not know. We happened to know these because those were mentioned to us. There may be others.

We are not prepared—prepared as we are to accept the Colombo proposals in their totality with their explanations—we are not prepared to have any amendments or changes or variations made in them because the Chinese do not like them.

There are one or two points which I may mention which are not directly connected with this. Shri Kamath made some statement about emigre governments of Bhutan and Sikkim

set up in Tibet. We have no information on the subject. When the Bhutan Prime Minister was here, he was asked and he also said so. I do not think there is the slightest truth in it. The Chinese Government has angrily denied this.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May we know what was said by Shri Kamath? He has not spoken at all. (Interruption).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Then there was another—I do not know which Member said so—that Chinese troops were pressing on Burma and that Burmese troops were co-operating with Chinese troops. Somebody mentioned this. This has been very forcefully denied by the Burmese Government. I do not think there is the slightest truth in it.

Now, may I say a word about some criticism that have been made of the Colombo powers and other countries, certain non-aligned countries. Nobody considers these countries as strong militarily. Somebody asked: are they going to enforce their decision? Of course, they are not supposed to enforce any decision. They can only proceed as mediators suggesting something. I would beg of the House to remember when they criticise, as they often do, and often with justice—I will admit it—our publicity etc., that all our publicity is ruined by some such remarks made in this House. If, for instance, contemptuous remarks are made about these countries, any of the Colombo Powers, these go there and they say this was said in our Parliament. That has a worse effect than all the propaganda that can be made by China against us. I want the House to remember that one has to speak rather carefully about other countries, specially other countries which are friendly to us. May be they do not agree with us.

Now, much is said about their not separately condemning the Chinese as aggressors. First of all, it is difficult for them to do so. Whatever views they may have held, once they start

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

acting in a mediatory role, it is difficult for them to move about condemning one party with which they are dealing. They can retire and then condemn certainly.

I would remind the House about one country, the United Arab Republic, which has done more than any other country to support us. Their Cabinet has passed a resolution supporting us. I do not remember the words they have used, but in dealing with the situation they have been very strongly in our favour. When Mr. Ali Sabry, their Prime Minister, comes here, he is attacked by our press, asked to say that China is an aggressor—attacked in the sense that he is cross-examined. Here is a man coming as a mediator. He has to behave with some decency towards the parties concerned. It is very unfortunate that he was treated that way.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Is it right to say they 'attacked' him. He was asked questions.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member is right. By 'attacked' I mean he was cross-examined.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That is not improper in a democratic country. The Press only asked questions.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not challenging their right. What I am saying is that you have to bear the consequences which flow in many countries which are very friendly to us.

Take another, Burma, for instance, I might mention, was deeply grieved at the charges made against her in this House. Some questions are asked about Burmese troops co-operating with China. They are very annoyed at that, and they protested.

Then there is some not very reputable paper, a weekly, which also gave some extraordinary stories about Burma.

Shri Hem Barua: Is it Blitz?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, it is the *Current*, if he wants to know.

Shri Hem Barua: They are the same, two faces of the same thing.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We had actually a protest from the Burmese Government about it, asking why we did not go about formally denying this kind of thing, repudiating it. We pointed out that it is difficult to go on repudiating every deviation from fact that occurs in Indian newspapers, for that would be to long a process and would be giving further publicity to something that has been said by a not very widely circulated paper.

Then yesterday or the day before—I forget—an hon. Member quoted something from the *Anand Bazar Patrika*. I was deeply grieved about it. I had heard about it before, because that was a very contemptuous personal reference to Mrs. Bandaranaike, the Prime Minister of Ceylon. I was also included in it, but leave me out, it does not matter what is said about me. But it was very improper for any person to have said that about not only the Prime Minister of a country but of a country very friendly to us, a country with whom we have close dealings, a country which is trying, according to its lights, to serve the cause of peace.

Shri Priya Gupta: That is a personal opinion.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not a question of merits. I am merely saying, if we want friendship in the world, we have to restrain ourselves. We cannot go out and condemn other countries and then expect them to stand up for us.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : श्रीर भी दे देंगे जो रहा सहा है ।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru I would just repeat one thing more which I have said previously. We have been attacked and we are, and may be, at war with China. That, I hope, will not affect our fundamental approach in the world and in India to solving problems by peaceful means, because the world is too dangerous. Hon. Members must have seen what happened in the Cuba affair where it was touch and go—within 24 hours 200 millions might die from nuclear bombs. It is a terrible thing to think that such a thing might happen by a slight mistake. Fortunately, wisdom came in the way and stopped it. We have neither nuclear bombs, nor do we intend possessing them. Nevertheless, we have always to think of these possible consequences of what may happen. So that we have to join, as I said, our firm determination and preparation to resist to the best of our ability, always with an attempt, where possible and where it is honourable to us, to adopt peaceful methods to settle any problem.

In this connection, I had said previously about the suggestion I had made about the International Court of Justice or arbitration or some such thing. It is no good my placing this matter before the House at this stage, because the question has not arisen. But I do mention it to the House because it may bear it in mind. If it arises, I shall come to the House to take its advice in the matter.

I may say concisely what I have said. The question that arises today is a very limited question, which is not a question which will last 200 years, as **Shri Anthony** said that it might or its effects might.

Shri Frank Anthony: It might last longer.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But it is a question as to how to bring about the Chinese withdrawal to a certain extent in order to be able to deal with this matter in a manner which may lead to results or not—possibly not—but, the fact that a course of action

does not lead to results should not deter us from going into it, provided it does not do any harm or injury. I think both from the political and the diplomatic point of view—I am not referring to military matters; hon. Members opposite seem to be experts in it—this is desirable. Our rejecting this would be harmful to us, harmful diplomatically and from every point of view. Not only those countries which have made these proposals, but other countries, big and small, will think that we are acting wrongly and will not support us, as they have done and as they might do in the future. We are grateful for their support, of course, and we want their support. But it will not be quite right for us to ask for support if we do not do two things.

One is, we should shoulder our own burden. We shall have to shoulder it; we are shouldering it and we are going to shoulder it, because there will be no respect for us if we are not prepared to meet up to the challenge ourselves. We want all the help we can get; we are grateful to those who give it. Secondly, we must not take all the time a belligerent attitude. It must be all right in the context of India today. A belligerent attitude is usually taken by weak nations, not by strong nations. Strong people, when necessary, take strong actions and prepare for it. But merely taking up a belligerent attitudes without the necessary strength does not impress anybody.

Therefore, I submit that the attitude that the Government has taken and intends to take in this matter is correct and I am sure that the House will give its support to it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: About the reported Chinese Government's demand for the release and repatriation of the Chinese detenus and internees in India and the Government's reaction to it, you said that you had referred it to the Prime Minister and he would answer it in the course of his speech. You told me so at the outset.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, Sir. The Chinese Government have said that they are going to send one or two ships to take back the Chinese civilians who have been interned here. We have said that all those who hold the Chinese People's Republic passports can go back to China and we will not come in their way—we are talking about civilians at the present moment—unless there is any civil or criminal case pending against them. That is to say, we are not going to force any person to go back. We are leaving it to the choice of the person concerned, whether he wants to go to China or not.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Is it not the Government's policy to demand the release of our prisoners of war in Chinese custody before we agree to release the Chinese detenus?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: These are not prisoners of war; these are civilians.

श्री बागड़ी : एक मामूली सी बात में कहना चाहता हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं, बहुत हो चुका ।

श्री बागड़ी : मैं एक छोटा सा क्लेरिफिकेशन चाहता था । जो हिन्दुस्तान के फौजी चाहना के पास हैं उन की रिहाई के बारे में क्या कुछ बनेगा और क्या कुछ फैसला हुआ है ।

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put Shri Ram Sewak Yadav's substitute motion to the vote of the House.

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री : (विजनौर) : मैं आप से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस समय १ बज कर ४५ मिनट हो चुके हैं । अगर आप उचित समझ तो ढाई बजे के बाद इस को ले लें । स बीच में हम देश के नाम पर थोड़ा इन्हें समझा भी लेंगे और उन को अपना संशोधन वापस लेने के लिए राजी करने का प्रयत्न कर लें ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जैसा शास्त्री जी ने कहा, उस के मुताबिक जो प्रैक्टिस हम ने एडाप्ट कर रखी है वह यही है । लेकिन अगर हाउस और सभी पार्टियाँ चाहती हैं कि इसी वक्त इस को ले लिया जाये तो इस को इस वक्त लेने में कोई हर्ज नहीं है ।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : इसी वक्त हो जाय ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ठीक है, बाद में फिर आप सब लोगों को इकट्ठा होना पड़ेगा ।

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the proposals of the Conference of six non-aligned Nations held at Colombo between the 10th and 12th of December, 1962, with the clarifications given by the Delegations of Ceylon, U.A.R. and Ghana in the meetings with the Prime Minister of India and his colleagues on the 12th and 13th of January, 1963 laid on the Table of the House on the 21st January, 1963, is of the opinion that the proposals are not in keeping with the honour, sovereignty and integrity of India."

The Lok Sabha divided.

Mr. Speaker: Some Members do not appear to have voted properly. Will they kindly stand up?

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I find there are six "Noes" to be added: three "Ayes" to be added and one to be taken out.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): We cannot take out.

Mr. Speaker: We can. So long as the present rules stand, certainly a Member can correct it because they were made before we started this. That is exactly the position. Therefore, I have to do it in accordance with that.

AYES

Division No. 2]

[13.53 hrs.

Anthony, Shri Frank
Bade, Shri
Bagri, Shri
Barrow, Shri
Barua, Shri Hem
Barua, Shri R.
Basant Kunwari, Shrimati
Bateahwar Singh, Shri
Berwa Kotah, Shri
Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri
Brij Raj Singh, Shri
Buta Singh, Shri
Chaudhary, Shri Y.S.
Deo, Shri P.K.
Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
Geystri Devi, Shrimati
Ghoah, Shri P.K.
Gulaban, Shri
Gupta, Shri Priya

Himanatsinhji, Shri
Kachhavaia, Shri
Kakkar, Shri Gauri Shanker
Kamath, Shri Hari Viahnu
Kapur Singh, Shri
Kishing, Shri Rishang
Kesar Lal, Shri
Lahari Singh, Shri
Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
Mandal, Shri B.N.
Narandi, Shri
Mate, Shri
Maurya, Shri
Mehta, Shri Jaahvant
Mohan Swarup, Shri
Muzaffar Hussain, Shri
Nath Pai, Shri
Onkar Singh, Shri
Paradhi, Shri
Patnayak, Shri Kisben

Rajyalaxmi, Shrimati
Rameshwaranand, Shri
Ranga, Shri
Reddy, Shri Narasimha
Singh, Dr. B. N.
Singh, Shri A.P.
Singh, Shri Y.D.
Singh, Shri Y.N.
Singhvi, Dr. L.M.
Solanki, Shri
Soy, Shri H.C.
Swamy, Shri M.V.
Tan Singh, Shri
Trivedi, Shri U.M.
Utiya, Shri
Verma, Shri S.L.
Vijaya Raie, Shrimati
Vishram Prasad, Shri
Yadav, Shri Ram Sewak
Yashpal Singh, Shri

NOES

Abdul Rashid, Bakahi
Abdul Wahid, Shri T.
Achal Singh, Shri
Achuthan, Shri
Akkamma Devi, Shrimati
Alegassan, Shri
Alva, Shri A.S.
Alva, Shri Joachim
Arunachalam, Shri
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Babunath Singh, Shri
Bajaj, Shri Kamalanya
Bakliwal, Shri
Bal Krishna Singh, Shri
Balmiki, Shri
Banerjee, Shri S.M.
Barkataki, Shrimati Renuka
Barrow, Shri
Barupal, Shri P.L.
Basappa, Shri
Bastimari, Shri
Baswant, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B.R.
Bhagvan, Shri
Bhakti Darshan, Shri
Bhanja Deo, Shri L.N.
Bhargava, Shri M. B.
Bhatkar, Shri
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
Bhattacharya, Shri Dinen
Bhawani, Shri Lakshmu
Birendra Bahadur Shri
Blet, Shri J. B. S.
Borooah, Shri P. G.
Brahm Prakash, Shri
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri

Brij Basi Lal, Shri
Chakravartty, Shrimati Renu
Chakraverti, Shri P. R.
Chandak, Shri
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
Chandriki, Shri
Chattar Singh, Shri
Chatterjee, Shri H. P.
Chaturvedi, Shri S. N.
Chaudhary, Shri C.L.
Chaudhuri, Shri D. S.
Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar
Chaudhuri, Shrimati Kamala
Chavan, Shri D. R.
Chavda, Shrimati
Chettiar, Shri Ramanathan
Chuni Lal, Shri
Daffe, Shri
Daji, Shri
Das, Dr. M. M.
Das, Shri B. K.
Das, Shri N. T.
Das, Shri Sudhansu
Dasappa, Shri
Dass, Shri G
Desai, Shri Morarji
Deshmukh, Dr. P. S.
Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
Deshmukh, Shri Shivaji Rao S.
Deshpande, Shri
Dheber, Shri U. N.
Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri
Dighe, S.
Dinesh Singh, Shri
Dwivedi, Shri M. L.
Elayaperum, Shri

Elias, Shri Mohammad
Ering, Shri D.
Gaekwad, Shri Patehsinhrao
Gahmari, Shri
Gaitonde, Dr.
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
Ganapati Ram, Shri
Gandhi, Shri V. B.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Goni, Shri Abdu Ghanu
Gopalan, Shri A. K.
Govind Das Dr.
Guha, Shri A. C.
Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Gupta, Shri Kanahi Ram
Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan
Hajarnavis, Shri
Hansda, Shri Subodh
Haq, Shri M. M.
Harvani, Shri Ansar
Hazarika, Shri J. N.
Heda, Shri
Hem Raj, Shri
Himataingka, Shri
Hukam Singh, Sardar
Iqbal Singh, Shri
Jadhav, Shri M.L.
Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas
Jagjivan Ram, Shri
Jain, Shri A.P.
Jamir, Shri S.G.
Jamunadevi, Shrimati
Jedhe, Shri
Jena, Shri
Joshi, Shri A. C.
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra

Proposals

- Jyotishi, Shri J. P.
 Kabir, Shri Humayun
 Kadadi, Shri
 Kairolkar, Shri
 Kamble, Shri
 Kanungo, Shri
 Kappen, Shri
 Kar, Shri Parbhat
 Karuthiruman, Shri
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.
 Khadilkar, Shri
 Khan, Shri Osman Ali
 Khan, Shri Shah Nawaz
 Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand
 Khanna, Shri P. K.
 Kindar Lal, Shri
 Kisan Veer, Shri
 Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
 Kriahna, Shri M. R.
 Kriahnamachari, Shri T. T.
 Kumaran, Shri M. K.
 Kunhan, Shri P.
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Lakhan Das, Shri
 Lakshminanthamma, Shrimati
 Laskar, Shri N. R.
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
 Lonikar, Shri
 Mahadeo Prasad, Shri
 Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
 Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
 Mahishi, Shrimati Sarojini
 Maimoona Sultan, Shrimati
 Malsichami, Shri
 Malaviya, Shri K. D.
 Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
 Malliah, Shri U. S.
 Mallick, Shri
 Manan, Shri
 Mandal, Dr. P.
 Mandal, Shri J.
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
 Maniyangadan, Shri
 Mantri, Shri
 Marutiah, Shri
 Maruriya Din, Shri
 Matcharaju, Shri
 Mathur, Shri Harish Chandra
 Mehdi, Shri S. A.
 Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari
 Mehta, Shri J. R.
 Melkote, Dr.
 Menon, Shri P. G.
 Minimata, Shri
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
 Mishra, Shri Bibhut
 Mishra, Shri Bibudhendra
 Mishra, Shri M. P.
 Misra, Dr. U.
 Misra, Shri Mahesh Dutta
 Misra, Shri Shyam Dhar
 Mohiuddin, Shri
 Mohsin, Shri
 Morarka, Shri
 More, Shri K. L.
 More, Shri S. S.
 Mukane, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
 Murli, Manohar, Shri
 Murmu, Shri Sarkar
 Murthy, Shri B. S.
 Murti, Shri M. S.
 Musafir, Shri G. S.
 Muthiah Shri
 Naik, Shri D. J.
 Naik, Shri Maheshwar
 Nair, Shri N. Sreekanth
 Nallakoya, Shri
 Nanda, Shri
 Naskar, Shri P. S.
 Nayak, Shri Mohan
 Nayar, Dr. Suahla
 Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal
 Niranjana Lal, Shri
 Oza, Shri
 Paliwal, Shri
 Pande, Shri K. N.
 Pandey, Shri R. S.
 Pandey, Shri Sarjoo
 Pandey, Shri Vishwanath
 Panna Lal, Shri
 Paramasivan, Shri
 Parsabar, Shri
 Patel, Shri Chhotubhai
 Patel, Shri Man Singh P.
 Patel, Shri N. N.
 Patel, Shri P. R.
 Patel, Shri Rajeshwar
 Patil, Shri D. S.
 Patil, Shri J. S.
 Patil, Shri M. B.
 Patil, Shri S. B.
 Patil, Shri T. A.
 Patil, Shri V. T.
 Patil, Shri Vasantao
 Patnaik, Shri B. C.
 Pattabhi Raman, Shri C. R.
 Pillai, Shri Nataraja
 Pottakkat, Shri
 Prabhakar, Shri Naval
 Pratap Singh, Shri
 Puri, Shri D. D.
 Raghavan, Shri A. V.
 Raghunath Singh, Shri
 Raghuramaiah, Shri
 Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai
 Raja, Shri C. R.
 Raju, Dr. D. S.
 Raju, Shri D. B.
 Ram, Shri T.
 Ram Sewak, Shri
 Ram Subhag, Singh, Dr.
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramaswamy, Shri S. V.
 Ramasamy, Shri V. K.
 Ramdhani Das, Shri
 Rampure, Shri M.
 Rananjai Singh, Shri
 Rane, Shri
 Ranjit Singh, Shri
 Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Rao, Shri Hanmanth
 Rao, Shri Jagannatha
 Rao, Shri Kriahnamoorthy
 Rao, Shri Muthyal
 Rao, Shri Rajagopala
 Rao, Shri Rampathi
 Rao, Shri Thirumala
 Rattan Lal, Shri
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Rawandale, Shri
 Ray, Shrimati Renuka
 Reddi, Dr. B. Gopale
 Reddi, Shri R. N.
 Reddiar, Shri
 Reddy, Shri K. C.
 Reddy, Shri Narayan
 Reddy, Shri Ramakrishna
 Reddy, Shrimati Yasboda
 Roy, Dr. Saradiah
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Saha, Dr. S. K.
 Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
 Saigal, Shri A. S.
 Saraf, Shri Sham Lal
 Satma, Shri A. T.
 Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati
 Satyanarayana, Shri
 Scindia, Shrimati Vijaya Raju
 Sen, Dr. Ranen
 Sen Shri P. G.
 Shah, Shri Manabendra
 Shah, Shri Manubhai
 Shah, Shrimati Jayaben
 Sham Nath, Shri
 Shankaraiya, Shri
 Sharma, Shri A. P.
 Sharma, Shri D. C.
 Sharma, Shri K. C.
 Shashi Ranjan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Lal Bahadur
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand
 Sheo Narain, Shri
 Shinde, Shri
 Shivananjappa, Shri
 Shree Narayan Das, Shri
 Shrimali, Dr. K. L.
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
 Siddanjanappa, Shri
 Siddiah, Shri
 Sidheshwar Prasad, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri J. B.
 Singh, Shri K. K.
 Singh, Shri R. P.
 Singh, Shri S. T.
 Singha, Shri G. K.
 Sinha, Shri B. P.

Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
 Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
 Sinhasan Singh, Shri
 Sonavane, Shri
 Srinivasan, Dr. P.
 Subbaraman, Shri C.
 Subramanian, Shri C.
 Subramanyam, Shri T.
 Sumat Prasad, Shri
 Sunder Lal, Shri
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
 Swamy, Shri M. N.
 Swamy, Shri M. P.
 Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi
 Swaran Singh, Shri
 Swell, Shri

Thevar, Shri U. M.
 Thevar, Shri V.
 Thomas, Shri A. M.
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Tiwary, Shri R. S.
 Tombi, Shri
 Tripathi, Shri Krishna Deo
 Tuls Ram, Shri
 Tyagi, Shri
 Uikey, Shri
 Ulaka, Shri
 Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Dutt
 Vaishya, Shri M. B.
 Valvi, Shri
 Varma, Shri M. L.

Varma, Shri Ravindra
 Veerabasappa, Shri
 Veerappa, Shri
 Venkatasubhaiah, Shri P.
 Verma, Shri Balgovind
 Verma, Shri K. K.
 Vidyalankar, Shri A. N.
 Vimla Devi, Shrimati
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri
 Vyas, Shri Radhelal
 Wadiwa, Shri
 Wasnik, Shri Balkrishna
 Yadab, Shri N. P.
 Yadav, Shri Ram Harkh
 Yadava, Shri B. P.
 Yajnik, Shri

Mr. Speaker: The result of the division is: Ayes: 57 plus 3 minus 1, i.e., 59; Noes: 349.

Ayes: 59; Noes: 349

The motion was negatived.

श्री किशन पटनायक : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस राय के बारे में

अध्यक्ष महोदय : राय के बारे में मैं अब नहीं सुन सकता।

स्वामी जी यहां पर खड़े हो कर बात कर रहे हैं।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अगर आप मुझे नहीं देखना चाहते तो मैं चला जाता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जाते जाते भी बे बोलते जा रहे हैं।

13.55 hrs.

DELHI RENT CONTROL (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shrimati Chandrasekhar): On behalf of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to amend the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir....

Mr. Speaker: I am no longer the Deputy-Speaker.

Shrimati Chandrasekhar: I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Rent Control was first introduced in New Delhi by the New Delhi House Rent Control Order, 1939. This was applicable only to the New Delhi area. Then the Delhi Rent Control Order, 1944 was passed which made Rent Control applicable to the whole of Old Delhi area also and this was superseded by the Delhi, Ajmer, Marwar Rent Control Act of 1947. This was later replaced by the Delhi Ajmer Rent Control Act, 1952.

The Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958 which now governs the landlord tenant relationship is a comprehensive one and supersedes all the previous orders and enactments. This Act applies to all private premises but does not apply to premises belonging to Government vide section 3. This is in accordance with the provisions contained in the previous enactments.

13.56 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

A very large number of buildings in the urban area of Delhi are built on Government leasehold lands. The provisions of the enactments of Rent Control, right from 1939 in the case of New Delhi and from 1944 in the case of other areas were applicable to these premises built on Government leasehold lands, thereby giving

*Noes—the names of three members could not be recorded.