

(ii) REPORTED MEETING BETWEEN SHEIKH
ABDULLAH AND THE CHINESE PRIME
MINISTER—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The External Affairs
Minister wanted time yesterday
to make the statement about Sheikh
Abdullah. Is he making it now?

The Minister of External Affairs
(Shri Swaran Singh): I would place
before the House...

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : बयान के
पहले मैं एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ ।
जिस आधार पर यह बयान दिया जा रहा है
उसके बाद से एक नई खबर छपी है और वह
यह है की शख़ अब्दुल्ला श्री चाऊ एन-लाई
से बातचीत कर चुके हैं । यह बयान उस
आधार पर दिया जा रहा है जब
बातचीत वह करने जा रहे थे

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सारी चीज आ
जाएगी ।

Shri Swaran Singh: In reply to the
calling-attention-notice regarding
Sheikh Abdullah's reported call at
Algiers on the Prime Minister of
China, Mr. Chou En-lai, I should like
to make the following statement.

Hon. Members have expressed their
anxiety to have some information re-
garding this matter, and this we have
been trying to gather ever since we
came to hear of the matter. Sheikh
Abdullah flew down to Algiers from
Paris, and after staying in Algiers for
a week or so, it appears that he pro-
poses to leave for Saudi Arabia to
perform the Haj with a brief stop-
over at Cairo. We also gather from
our Embassy in Algiers that Sheikh
Abdullah has been in contact with the

Algerian Foreign Office and has met
various Algerian personalities.

By a coincidence, our Foreign Sec-
retary happened to be in Algiers at
the time of Sheikh Abdullah's visit, to
attend the meeting of the Standing
Committee of the Afro-Asian Confer-
ence. As hon. Members are aware,
the Afro-Asian Conference is due to
meet at the end of June. The Foreign
Secretary is on his way back and is
due in New Delhi tonight or tomorrow
morning. We would like to have
first-hand information from him about
Sheikh Abdullah's activities in
Algiers . . . (Interruptions).

श्री बागड़ी : अपनी जिम्मेदारी
समझो । यह क्या क्या बता रहे हो ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जायें ।
नहीं सुनाते हैं ।

Shri Swaran Singh:..and whatever
information he gathered about his
talk with Mr. Chou En-lai I hope hon.
Members would agree that it would be
better....

Some hon. Members: No. Not at
all.

Shri Swaran Singh: I hope hon.
Members would agree that it would be
better if we were to make a report
to the House after we have had a talk
with the Foreign Secretary. I would
like to assure the House that after we
have considered the information avail-
able, Government would not hesitate
to take whatever action would be
merited by the nature of Sheikh
Abdullah's activities and the kind of
conversation he has indulged in.

I should only like to add that we
have instructed our Ambassador in
Algiers to make it abundantly clear
to Sheikh Abdullah that Government
consider that it would be most im-
proper if he were to visit China, for
reasons which should be obvious to
him and that if he should act contrary
to Government's wishes and advice,

[Shri Swaran Singh]

a serious view will be taken of his activities.

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of order....

श्री मधु लिमये : (मुंबेर) : मैं एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जाइये ।

Mr. Speaker: When is the Foreign Secretary expected here?

Shri Swaran Singh: Tonight, or tomorrow morning at the latest.

Mr. Speaker: What is the earliest time that the Government can make the statement after ascertaining from him?

Shri Swaran Singh: Monday.

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of order. We have a diplomatic mission in Algiers and that diplomatic mission was instructed to watch the movements of Sheikh Abdullah and report matters to us. Now, the newspapers have reported that Sheikh Abdullah has not only met Mr. Chou En-lai but that he proposes to go to Peking, in spite of what our Prime Minister said. I have an apprehension that he might set up an emigre government in Sinkiang under Chinese auspices.

Now, our Foreign Secretary, Shri C. S. Jha, was present there in Algiers when Sheikh Abdullah met Mr. Chou En-lai, and he knew everything about it, because Sheikh Abdullah met him also.

Mr. Speaker: He should come now to the point of order.

Shri Hem Barua: I will come to that.

This is the series of events. We have a diplomatic mission there and that

diplomatic mission has miserably failed to report to the Government. Secondly, we have had our Foreign Secretary present there during the meeting between Sheikh Abdullah and Mr. Chou En-lai, and he has also miserably failed to report to the Government.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Shri Raghunath Singh: Is it a speech or a point of order?

Shri Hem Barua: Yesterday you were pleased to say that you had called upon the Minister to make a statement within 48 hours. Yesterday when this matter had cropped up in the House, the Minister wanted some time to make a statement today. It was his own choice; we did not want that he should make a statement today. Now, today he comes and tells this House that he cannot make a statement unless and until the Foreign Secretary flies back to India.

The Foreign Secretary was there. He knew everything about it. How is it that he did not report to Government immediately about this meeting? It is a very serious matter. The Government have gone back upon their assurance and it is upto to you now to defend our rights when the Government are treating us in such a casual and off hand manner.

Mr. Speaker: At the utmost, the allegation can be that they have failed to keep the promise that he made yesterday. But what is it that I should do, and what is the decision I should give according to the rules? What is the point of order that I should decide? (*Interruptions*). I must first learn and try to understand the point of order so that I can answer it. What is the decision I have to give? (*Interruption*).

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं पहले से कह रहा था

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपको भी सुन लेता हूँ ।

श्री मधु लिमये : कभी हम को पहले आप मौका ही नहीं देते हैं । पहले हम खड़े होते हैं लेकिन मौका पहले नहीं मिलता है । यह बड़ा अन्याय होता है हमारे साथ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जाइये । इससे ज्यादा न कहिये ।

श्री मधु लिमये : ऐसा ही करेंगे आप । आपके लाड़ले हैं न ।

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Apart from the question of points of order, of which, of course, you can take a very technical view there are certain matters of propriety which also flow from Government's observance or non-observance of certain canons of conduct. On this occasion, Shri Barua has pointed out that you had laid down this 48-hour limit because you felt that when Members of Parliament called attention to a matter of very urgent public importance—and you also agreed that it was a matter of urgent public importance—it was for Government to come forward as quick as ever that was possible. In this case, it may be that you were right in giving Government another opportunity to consult their official.....

Mr. Speaker: I have not given that opportunity.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You have conceded that to Government.

Mr. Speaker: No. no. I have not said that. I only wanted to elicit facts, what do they want. I have not given them any time.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: My point is that since Government have offered to come back again on Monday—and that is what they have said in answer to your question—we might conceivably be expected to wait; but in the meantime, this House certainly has a right to know, because we are discussing affairs of Government during

this budget session, as to how our diplomatic apparatus works. The Minister has told us that the Foreign Secretary had been in Algiers for a couple of days or more. Our diplomatic representation is there, and an Indian national of the celebrity, and notoriety, of Sheikh Abdullah is in Algiers for more than a week, and he is hobnobbing with all kinds, and conditions, of people. I want to know how it is that the functioning of our diplomatic apparatus in Algiers, which is in telephonic communication with New Delhi, I am sure, is so bad that we have to wait upon the arrival of a particular official, however distinguished he may be, in order to get some idea as to what Government are doing in regard to a matter which is agitating the country.

This is a matter of such importance . . . (Interruptions).

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल आपने यह फरमाया था कि आप उन का बयान सुन लेंगे, उस के बाद देखेंगे कि इस में सरकार की कोई घोर असफलता हुई है या नहीं । आज तो उन का बयान आया है उससे बिल्कुल साफ हो जाता है कि वह बयान नहीं दे सकते हैं । इससे ज्यादा घोर असफलता सरकार की और क्या हो सकती है । इस सम्बन्ध में केवल नौ बातों में आपके सामने कहूंगा । एक एक वाक्य है, ज्यादा समय नहीं लूंगा ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नौ बातों ?

श्री मधु लिमये : क्योंकि मैंने असफलता के बारे में आपसे व्यवस्था चाही है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस वक्त असफलता का सवाल नहीं है । इस वक्त सवाल है प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर का । असफलता जो है वह तो बाद में देखी जायेगी ।

श्री मधु लिमये : उसी में से व्यवस्था का प्रश्न आयेगा ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं, जी नहीं । आपने जो व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाया उस के बारे में बतलाईये । असफलता की बात बाद में आयेगी ।

श्री मधु लिमये : आपने यह कहा था कि उन का बयान सुनने के बाद आप फैसला करेंगे कि असफलता हुई है या नहीं उनका जो बयान है उससे ज्यादा कोई और सबूत असफलता के लिए आवश्यक नहीं है । इसलिए मैं आप से अर्ज करूंगा कि हमारा जो स्थगन प्रस्ताव है, उसपर आप फैसला दे और इस के लिए आप आज ही समय नियत कर दें यदि इस समय नौ बात अर्ज नहीं करने देते ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस समय वह सवाल नहीं है । आप बतलाइये कि इस में कौन सा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है । क्या मैंने कोई फैसला दे दिया था कि वह असफलता नहीं है । आप खाड़े हो गये और मेरे ऊपर भी इल्जाम लगाया कि मैं पहले आप को वक्त नहीं देता । आप ने इतनी जोर से आवाजें दीं और कहा कि मैं दूसरों को पहले वक्त दे रहा हूँ । मैंने आप का प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर सुना तो वह यह था कि आप की राय में गवर्नमेंट की असफलता है । मैं अभी कोई फैसला नहीं दे रहा था ।

श्री मधु लिमये : यह बयान की असफलता है, यह मेरा निवेदन है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस में व्यवस्था की कौन सी बात है । क्या मैंने कुछ होल्ड किया है या नहीं ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न यह है कि स्थगन प्रस्ताव को लिया जाये ।

Shri Hem Barua: May I make a submission?

Mr. Speaker: No. Unless I identify a Member, no one shall speak. All should sit down.

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री : (बिजनौर) कल जिस समय ध्यान आकर्षण प्रस्ताव और कामरोको प्रस्ताव दोनों आप के सामने उपस्थित थे तो आप ने ध्यान आकर्षण प्रस्ताव पर सरकार को चौबीस घंटों के अन्दर वक्तव्य देने के लिए कहा था और कहा था कि तब फिर आप इस पर निर्णय लेंगे कि आया इस पर काम रोको प्रस्ताव आ सकता है अथवा नहीं । चौबीस घंटे बाद आज सरकार ने जो वक्तव्य दिया है उस वक्तव्य से न तो सदन को सन्तुष्टि है और न, मेरा अनुमान है, आप ही उस से सन्तुष्ट होंगे । इसी बीच में जो घटनायें घटी हैं वह यह कि शेख अब्दुल्ला

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप यह बतलाइये कि इस में व्यवस्था का कौन सा प्रश्न है ।

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री : मैंने व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं उठाया था ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यहाँ प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर उठाया गया । इस के सम्बन्ध में बाकी चर्चा तो चल नहीं रही है । जो भी मेम्बर साहबान खड़े हो रहे हैं वे इसी बात पर मेरे ऊपर इल्जाम लगा रहे हैं कि मैंने कहा था कि उन का बयान सुनकर फैसला दूंगा ।

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : अध्यक्ष महोदय ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप सब बैठ जायें । जितने साहब यहाँ बोले उन्होंने यही कहा कि कल गवर्नमेंट को वक्त दिया गया था और मैंने कहा था कि उन का बयान सुन कर मैं इस पर फैसला दूंगा कि आया असफलता हुई है या नहीं और मैं काम रोको प्रस्ताव की इजाजत दूँ या नहीं । आप ने गवर्नमेंट का बयान सुना । मुझ को आप फैसला ही नहीं देते । पहले ही सब कुछ हो गया । क्या मैंने कोई फैसला किया है, क्या मैंने कुछ कहा है कि मैं इस की इजाजत देता हूँ या नहीं ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :
समय का सवाल उठाया गया कि मंत्री
महोदय कब बयान देंगे ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब क्या मैं उन से
यह भी नहीं पूछ सकता कि वह क्या वक्त
मांगते हैं । यह तो मैं पूछ सकता हूँ ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : मौजूदा
परिस्थिति में जो बयान वह दे रहे थे उस का
प्रश्न नहीं उठता था । वह तो खुद कहते
हैं

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं यही तो उनसे
जानना चाहता था कि वह किस वक्त देंगे ।
अगर वह यह कहें कि वह चार बजे बयान देने
के लिए तैयार हैं तो यह अलहदा बात है
अगर वह कहें कि पांच दिन बाद
द देने के लिए तैयार हैं तो वह अलहदा
बात है । यह सवाल किस तरह से नहीं
उठता । इस को मुनकर क्या मुझे सोचना
नहीं है ।

Shri Hem Barua: May I put a
straight question to you?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मुझे कहने तो
दीजिये । जब मैंने अभी तक कोई फैसला
नहीं दिया तो मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता
कि व्यवस्था का प्रश्न कहाँ से उठ गया और
मेरे ऊपर इल्जाम लगाया गया कि मैं ने
उन को वक्त नहीं दे दिया । क्या मैं ने गवर्न-
मेंट की बात मान ली क्या मैं उनसे पूछ
भी नहीं सकता कि किस वक्त तक वह जल्दी
से जल्दी बयान दे सकते हैं । यही तो किया
था मैंने । और क्या किया है मैंने जिस पर यह
ऐतराज उठ गया, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं
आता ।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : यदि आप
फैसला देने से पहले मेरी बात सुन लें तो आप
को निर्णय देने में सहायता होनी ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जब मुझे सहायता
की जरूरत होगी तो मैं जरूर ले लूंगा ।
लेकिन जब एक को बुलाता हूँ तो दूसरे क्यों
उठ जाते हैं ।

Shri Hem Barua: My straight ques-
tion to you is this. Yesterday, the
hon. Prime Minister said that the
Government took a serious view of
Sheikh Abdullah's meeting Mr. Chou
En-Lai. The day before yesterday,
our Foreign Minister said that Gov-
ernment would take a serious view.
The progress so far is from 'would
take' to 'took' a serious view. Don't
you think that in this context we have
a legitimate right to know about the
reaction of the Government about the
steps that the Government have con-
templated to take against this orga-
nised conspiracy

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He
would sit down.

Shri Hem Barua: Don't you think
so, Sir?

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir,
I rise on a point of order. Yesterday
the hon. External Affairs Minister
wanted more time and you were
kind

Shri Hem Barua: Kind to them.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: . . . and you gave
them time to collect more information.
We heard the statement of the hon.
Minister of External Affairs. What-
ever possible information we could
gather from the newspapers is with
us. I am unable to believe that with
all the powers of the Government
machinery, they are unable to get in-
formation from those countries. My
point is that the Minister of External
Affairs or his colleagues in the Cab-
inet are deliberately and wilfully try-
ing to mislead this House and conceal
facts from the House. I am sorry to
use this expression that indirectly
they are trying to help the traitor to
go to China and set up his own Gov-
ernment.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Is it a speech or a question or a point of order or an insinuation?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My point of order is this. Is it open to the minister to do like this after due notice has been given and after the calling-attention notice had been admitted by you and an opportunity had already been given to the Minister, is it open to the hon. Minister to take protection and delay and try to conceal particular facts from this House, when everything has come out in the newspapers; I want to know whether he should not be held up for such things, for trying to mislead this House. It is high time that this Minister resigns....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He should resume his seat now.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My resumption will not help the Indian Government. I obey your orders, Sir; I resume my seat.

Mr. Speaker: Your continuing in this manner would help India? What should I do when your conduct is such? ... (Interruptions).

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय मेरा आप से सिर्फ एक निवेदन है कि इस तरीके से देश के अन्दर जो एक जहती है और देश की जनता का जो विश्वास है वह बुरी तरह से टूट रहा है। सभी लोग इधर उधर देशभक्ति की बात जरूर करने हैं, लेकिन शेख अब्दुल्ला का जेल से निकाला जाना, इस तरह की उसे शोहरत मिलना, उसके अपने को काश्मीरी मुसलिम लिखने के बावजूद भी उस को पासपोर्ट देना, 35 हजार रुपये देकर के उसे बाहर भेजना

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस पर तो इस समय बहस नहीं हो सकती है।

श्री बागड़ी : अलजीरिया से किसी तरीके से फ्रांस पहुंच जाना, किसी किस्म की कड़ी से जनता को गुमराह करना, इस के

बारे में देश के प्रधान मंत्री का सब से बड़ी कमी और साजिश हुई है, इस के ऊपर सदन को सोचना चाहिये।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am not going to allow this practice.

An hon. Member: Sir, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: In all that has been raised so far, there was not one point of order.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): Will you permit me to make one point—

Mr. Speaker: Simply under the guise of a point of order, I will not allow it. (Interruption). Order, order, Shall we continue to discuss a thing out of which nothing might come out? We should take some concrete step and try to proceed further.

Shri Alvares (Panjim): On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Has anything come out of those points of order that have been raised so far? Nothing.

Several hon. Members rose—

Shri Alvares: My point of order is—

Mr. Speaker: So many hon. Members are standing. Order, order.

Shri Alvares: My point of order is this. We do not make points of order frivolously.

Mr. Speaker: May I ask the hon. Member to give his judgment whether any of these things that have been raised earlier were points of order?

Shri Alvares: That is not for me to say, Sir. I would like to raise a point of order. I do not generally raise any points of order in the House.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Khadilkar. Is it a point of order?

Shri Khadilkar: No point of order. I am just mentioning that on the point

of order many submissions have been made because there was no point of order anywhere. The question is, before you give your decision whether, as has been said, some more time should be allowed to ascertain facts, or, as Members in the Opposition have said, whether the Government should come out immediately with a statement. My submission is, Sheikh Abdullah's utterances and movements have been highlighted by the foreign press and the press is interested in twisting what has happened. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : आप प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर को मौका ही नहीं दे रहे हैं, श्रीों को मौका दे रहे हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या है आप का प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर ।

श्री यशपालसिंह : मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि स्पीकर साहब का स्थान यहाँ हमारे लिए सर्वोच्च है । कल स्पीकर साहब ने भरे हाउस में फैसला दिया था कि वह कल फैसला देंगे, और वह फैसला स्पीकर साहब नहीं दे सकें हैं इसका कारण विदेश मंत्री हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप मुझे मौका भी दें, फैसला देने का, पहले ही शोर कर रहे हैं ।

Shri Alvares: May I be permitted to raise my point of order?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. He might also raise it.

Shri Alvares: My point does not arise from the admissibility or propriety or impropriety of not making a statement today. It arises from the text of the statement made by the Minister of External Affairs this morning. It is in regard to a contradiction of policy. Two days ago, the Prime Minister said that he would not permit Sheikh Abdullah....

Mr. Speaker: That is a different thing.

Shri Alvares: He has made a statement.

Shri Hari Vishnu Karoath (Hoshangabad): Sir, I would like to cite the rules. I would like to invite your attention to rule 197. I request you to pay very close attention to the wording of this rule. This is in regard to calling attention to matters of urgent public importance. The rule reads like this:

"A member may, with the previous permission of the Speaker, call the attention of a Minister to any matter of urgent public importance...."

Now comes the important wording—

"and the Minister may make a brief statement or ask for time to make a statement at a later hour or date."

If we examine the import of this wording, it means this. The hon. Minister did yesterday, after due deliberation—because you asked him to make a categorical statement,—say that he would make a statement today. This rule, in my humble judgment, does not permit or enable the Minister or the Government to go on asking for time. They have asked for time once. They cannot ask for time again. Once they asked, and it was given to them. But they cannot be given time on the second occasion. Only once, and not more, can they be given time. There is no rule under which you can go on permitting them more time.

Mr. Speaker: What is the remedy that he would suggest? If that is not made, if the statement is not made and the Minister asks for time, what is the remedy that he suggests? (*Interruption*). Order, order. These talks simply do not take us anywhere. Some useful purpose should be served by

[Mr. Speaker]

any interruption that is made. The Opposition Members have a responsibility as any others. They should realise their responsibilities as well. (Interruption). Order, order. The safest course for me then is this. There is a demand on the one side and there is opposition on the other. I will leave it to the House and ask for a vote.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: What should I do then, if I am not allowed to give my decision? That is the only course that I can adopt.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): I do not think that is the intention. My submission is about your last observation about your decision or ruling. The House wants you to give your ruling. That is the wish, both on this side and on the other side.

Mr. Speaker: He should realise that if I am not allowed to speak even and not allowed to give my decision, what is left for me to do. I should leave it to the House.

Shri Raghunath Singh: We will abide by your ruling, and we shall obey the Chair. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. When I am not allowed to speak, what should I do?

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): There are two things that I want to submit. Yesterday, there was a great uproar in the House on this question, and the Prime Minister made a statement, and the House became quiet. The House listened to the Prime Minister with rapt attention, and they thought that the same thing would be done today also. Since there is a lot of disturbance in the House, the Prime Minister should give some kind of reassurance to this House so that the House becomes quiet. (Interruption). Secondly, I do not think we should call for any vote. We would be guided by your ruling entirely.

You are the supreme master of this House and we do not want that your authority should be whittled down in any way.

Mr. Speaker: I am not being allowed to exercise my authority here.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): We await your ruling. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Nobody has awaited my ruling and I am not allowed to give my ruling.

Shri Daji (Indore): I only want to seek a clarification without apportioning any blame to anyone. I would like to know definitely whether this statement that was read out is all the information that has been received by the Government from the embassy at Algiers. That is very important.

Mr. Speaker: That is a different thing.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : मैं बड़ी नम्रता से आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि व्यवस्था देने से पूर्व या सदन का मत जानने से पूर्व, आप एक बात पर अवश्य विचार कर लें। कल आपने सरकार को समय दिया था कि वह 24 घंटे में जानकारी ले कर सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत करें, और उसके बाद आप व्यवस्था देंगे कि काम रोको प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार किया जाए अथवा नहीं।

विदेश मंत्री ने जो वक्तव्य दिया है वह इतना निराशापूर्ण है कि उससे कोई समाधान नहीं होता। उनको 24 घंटे के अन्दर अपने राजदूतावास से सारी जानकारी लेकर आज संसद को और संसद के द्वारा सारे देश को देनी चाहिए थी, लेकिन विदेश मंत्री ने आज ऐसा वक्तव्य दिया है कि मानों उनके पास कोई जानकारी नहीं है और वह चौराहे पर खड़े व्यक्ति की तरह कोई वक्तव्य दे रहे हैं। जब कि दूसरी और स्थिति यह है कि शेख अब्दुल्ला ने चाऊ एन लाई से अपनी मुलाकात के

सारे तथ्य दिए हैं कि इस मुलाकात में क्या क्या बातें हुई हैं, और यह भी कहा कि अबसर मिलने पर वह चीन अवश्य जाएंगे। दूसरे काहिरा में जो चीन का दूतावास है उसने स्पष्ट रूप से यह घोषणा की है कि वह शनिवार को काहिरा पहुंच रहे हैं जहां से वह हज करने को जाएंगे, जहां से वह पाकिस्तान जाएंगे, फिर पाकिस्तान से पीकिंग जाएंगे और फिर पीकिंग से पाकिस्तान आवेंगे।

इसी बीच दूसरा तथ्य यह भी सामने आया है कि नागा नेता फिजो भी इस बीच में च न जा रहे हैं। गृह मंत्री जी ने कुछ दिन पूर्व नागालैंड में जो उपद्रव हो रहे थे उनके सम्बन्ध में कहा था कि चीन नागा लोगों को गुरिल्ला ट्रेनिंग दे रहा है। ऐसी स्थिति में फिजो का चीन जाना, शेख अब्दुल्ला का चीन जाना, और चीन के विदेश मंत्री का नेपाल और पाकिस्तान जाना, इन तथ्यों के प्रकाश में आने के बाद भी अब तक भारत सरकार चुप बैठी है। क्या जो परिस्थिति सामने आ रही है उससे भारत के लिए खतरा पैदा नहीं हो रहा है और क्या ये प्रयास देश की अखंडता को खतरे में डालने के लिए नहीं किए जा रहे हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसी स्थिति में विदेश मंत्री का कोई वक्तव्य न देना राजनीतिक असावधानी है, और हम समझते हैं कि हमारा राजदूतावास भी वहां कोई कार्यवाही नहीं कर रहा है। विदेश मंत्रालय के जो सेक्रेटरी हैं उन्होंने भी विदेश मंत्री को पूरी जानकारी नहीं दी इस प्रकार वे भी अपनी जिम्मेवारी से हटे हैं। सरकार की इससे बड़ी विफलता और कोई नहीं हो सकती। इसलिए मेरा आपसे विनम्र अनुरोध है कि इस स्थगन प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करें और आज इस पर चर्चा अवश्य होनी चाहिए।

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): I feel that one important

piece of information is wanted from Government and perhaps that may have a very important bearing on this subject. The Afro-Asian conference is going to be held there and our Foreign Secretary is to attend that conference as a representative of this country. Now that he is coming back, I want to know whether he is being called back by Government for some specific purpose which has not been explained or he was scheduled to arrive here tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: What does this matter?

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर): मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि विदेश मंत्री के लिए एक बयान देने के वास्ते कोई खास जानकारी की इस वक्त जरूरत नहीं है क्योंकि शेख अब्दुल्ला ने चाऊ एन लाई से किस भाषा में बातचीत की है या क्या क्या बातचीत की है वह ज्यादा जरूरी नहीं है जितना कि यह जानना कि शेख अब्दुल्ला विदेश में किस प्रकार का काम कर रहे हैं और शेख अब्दुल्ला जिस प्रकार का काम कर रहे हैं उसके प्रति सरकार का क्या रुख है, क्या नीति है उस पर बयान देने की जरूरत है। अपनी नीति, अपना रुख अगर यह जल्दी हाउस को नहीं बतलाते हैं तो उससे यह नतीजा लग सकता है कि यह सरकार निश्चय ही नहीं कर पा रही है, कोई बात तय ही नहीं कर पा रही है...

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): I am a little confounded about the business we are discussing. Thrice or more than that, you wanted to give your ruling, but you have not given it. On the other hand, you are allowing members to discuss the admissibility of the adjournment motion that has been moved. If you do not give the ruling, I take it that you are allowing us to discuss the admissibility of the motion. On that, I would like to point out

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri]

certain great lapses on the part of Government.

The other fact which has not been stated is in this matter the whole functioning of the Foreign Office and the Foreign Office secretariat is involved. Only three days back, there was the news that our Ambassador to the United States, our Acting High Commissioner in Great Britain, our Ambassador in Paris and another fourth Ambassador had come away from their stations, taking advantage of a free flight in the Air India. At the very time when in Paris Mr. Sheikh Abdullah was having confabulations with certain objectionable people and when he went from Paris to Algiers, all our Heads of Missions were absent. So, there is a grave doubt in our minds that the Foreign Office is functioning absolutely inefficiently and irresponsibly. These things must be discussed in this House.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): I want to draw your attention to rule 364, Sir; either you decide and give your ruling by yourself or let the House decide this issue.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund): On a point of order, Sir. Under rule 58(v), you are precluded from admitting any adjournment motion on this subject, which has been discussed in the House on an earlier occasion in the same session. So, this adjournment motion is not admissible according to that rule.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): You were pleased to ask the External Affairs Minister whether he wanted more time. You have left it to our decision. But it is a very narrow issue. We would like to abide by your decision and not to make it a party issue. It is a grave matter and the External Affairs Minister wants a little more time. The issues are very grave. We have not yet settled down in Algeria in the sense that our Embassy has not been fully estab-

lished. This is the first time and they have lots of difficulties. There are no two opinions about Sheikh Abdullah. If you want to hang him, you can hang him on Monday afternoon, so that the Minister will have time to make a statement before the House.

Shri Shinkre (Marmagoa): Let us sit tomorrow, Sir, so that Government may make a statement tomorrow.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri has already observed that this is rather confounding and confusing as to what we are supposed to decide now, and what you are supposed to decide also. If it is an adjournment motion, we have to take one attitude. If it is only a calling attention notice, I am conscious of the rule read out by Mr. Kamath. It is true that under that rule Government cannot be given any time when it comes to make a statement. They have already made a statement. All that they want to say now is, in addition to this information if some more information comes to our notice and to our possession, we would be able to give it to the House on Monday. I have been trying my best to see some light out of this discussion we are having. What is the point we want to make? Whatever information is in their possession, they have given to us.

Some hon. Members: No.

Shri Ranga: If we are dissatisfied with the total quantity of information that they have gained so far, then we have to pursue some other procedure. If we think that they are concealing something which is already within their knowledge, then we have to give the benefit of doubt to the Government.

श्री रघु लिमये : आपको विरोधी दल की ओर से बोलना चाहिये । आप सरकारी दल के हक में क्यों बोल रहे हैं ?

Shri Ranga: It is no good contradicting each other. While all my friends were on their feet, I did not raise my voice. I want to be heard. If I do not happen to agree with my friends, that does not mean that I should not have the right to express myself here.

If they have some information which it is feared that they are not willing to share with the House, there is a justification provided by the Government themselves that their Secretary is coming over here and they would like to get information from him and make sure of the correctness of whatever information they have, which they are supposed not to have given to us, and obtain additional information also; and, thereafter place all the information that would come within their knowledge to their satisfaction as being correct, before the House. That is all that Government have asked for. I do not see any reason why the House should not give them this opportunity of placing before the House full and properly vetted information after having got it from the most authentic source—the Foreign Secretary—who is not available today and who would be available soon. (Interruptions).

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : माननीय सदस्य के दल ने ही शेख अब्दुल्ला की वकालत की थी और उनको छोड़ा था ।

Shri Ranga: If, on the other hand, we want the Government to give a decision, this is not the proper occasion. It is for the Government to take a decision on whatever information they would be getting, and they would be getting it only later on. Therefore, I am in favour of giving the time that Government have asked for.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo Indians): *Prima facie*, what Acharya Ranga stated would be the best course, because apparently Government may be required to take definite, drastic action. My only concern

is this, and I think this will have to supersede all other consideration. If Government ask for time till Monday—let them not until then take any definite urgent action—they should let us know today whether they will be disabled by Monday from taking action to prevent Sheikh Abdullah from going to Peking. I do not know whether it is not possible—I know some thing about the passport rules because I have as a counsel dealt with a lot of passport forgery cases—but can't Government today with the information at their disposal come to the conclusion that Sheikh Abdullah must not be allowed to continue further his anti-national activities? Can't we immediately impound his passport? Do we have to wait till Monday for taking further action? Can't we say today that we will impound his passport? Perhaps, our High Commissioner could do that... (Interruption). that... (Interruptions).

Shri Hem Barua: His passport should be cancelled before he enters any other country.

श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा : श्रीमन, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है :

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): We are feeling that the Government is playing with the House. Let there be a definite assurance that the passport of Sheikh Abdullah will be cancelled and that appropriate action would be taken against him later on for treason and that, if necessary, extradition proceedings would be taken against him if he does not choose to come back to India. If we can get that assurance, we have no objection to grant one or two days' time. But no further playing with the House, no further slurring over the issue

श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा : श्रीमन, मेरा कड़ना यह है कि आपने अभी विदेश मंत्री * से पूछा कि वह जब वक्तव्य देंगे और उन्होंने कहा कि वह सोमवार को वक्तव्य

[श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा]

देंगे। यह ठीक है। वह सोमवार को वक्तव्य दें या मंगलवार को दें। लेकिन क्या प्रधान मंत्री सदन को और देश को यह आश्वासन देंगे कि शेख अब्दुल्ला जो भारतीय नागरिक होते हुए भी विदेश में बगावत का बिगुल बजा रहा है और देश-विरोधी हरकतें कर रहा है, उसको हिन्दुस्तान में आते ही गिरफ्तार कर लिया जायेगा?

Mr. Speaker: Now could I say something?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Let the Leader of the House give a lead.

Shri Hem Barua: He should make his position clear.

Mr. Speaker: We have already spent 55 minutes on this.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Sir, press reports which have appeared in our newspapers are most disconcerting and there is no doubt about it that we take a very serious view of this development.

श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा : यह तो कल ही कह दिया था। (Interruptions).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या यह भी कोई कायदा है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर को कहा जाये कि वह बोलें और अगर वह बोलने के लिए खड़े हों, तो उनको बोलने न दिया जाये? ऐसा तो कभी किसी हाउस में नहीं हुआ है। (Interruptions). मैं माननीय सदस्यों से कहूंगा कि वह इस तरह प्रोसीडिंग्ज को बन्द न करें।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर इस तरह बीच में टोका-टाकी होती है, तो इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि प्रधान मंत्री को बोलने नहीं दिया जा रहा है

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसका और क्या मतलब है?

श्री रामसेवक यादव : वह तो कल से ही सीरियस व्यू ले रहे हैं, लेकिन हो क्या रहा है? (Interruptions).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं आपोजीशन से कहूंगा कि क्या हाउस का काम चलाने के लिए यह कायदा है। एक घंटा हमने पहले ही जाया कर दिया है।

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : सभी आपोजीशन नहीं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं सभी आपोजीशन से नहीं, लेकिन आपोजीशन के जो मेम्बर ऐसा कर रहे हैं, उनसे कह रहा हूँ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : समय बच सकता है, अगर ठीक ढंग से चला जाये।

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : हम प्रधान मंत्री को सुनना चाहते हैं।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: We have positively to take some action in this matter, but it would be definitely advisable—of course, what has appeared in the newspaper seems to be correct—rather, it is essential that Government should further confirm it before any positive action is taken, and a day or two is not going to matter much.

Shri Hem Barua: He will be in Peking by then.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: So far as his going to Peking is concerned, as we have said, in so far as we are concerned, we will not permit it; and if he, of his own, goes to Peking, he will have to suffer the consequences.

श्री बागड़ी : क्या सफर करेगा? (Interruptions).

श्री रामसेवक यादव : सरकार क्या करेगी? सरकार के हाथ में यह नहीं है।

श्री बागड़ी : सरकार ने जो गलती और गुनाह किये हैं, उनके बारे में प्रधान मंत्री का क्या कहना है? उसने ही शेख अब्दुल्ला को बाहर पहुंचाया है।

श्री मधु लिमये : प्रधान मंत्री एक ही बात कर सकते हैं—इस्तीफा देना। सबसे बढ़िया काम यही होगा।

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : माननीय सदस्य अभी अविश्वास प्रस्ताव ला चुके हैं और उस का नतीजा भी उन्होंने देख लिया है। उन को यह बात कहने का कोई हक नहीं है कोई अधिकार नहीं है।

श्री मधु लिमये उधर 357 लोग जो बैठे हैं।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : न हटने का नतीजा भी देख लिया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य हाउस की प्रोसीडिंग्स को आवस्ट्रकट कर रहे हैं। अगर वह इसी तरह चलेंगे, तो मैं एक्शन लूंगा। हाउस को अपनी रेपुटेशन का ख्याल रखना चाहिए। इस तरह से इस हाउस की कार्यवाही और डेमोक्रेसी नहीं चल सकती है।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : शेख की जगह पूरी करने के लिए हम लोग हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मुझे इस से मतलब नहीं है। मैं ने तो हाउस का काम चलाना है। अगर माननीय सदस्य कार्यवाही को आवस्ट्रकट करेंगे, तो मैं उसको नहीं चलने दूंगा।

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह आवस्ट्रकशन नहीं है। हम अपनी बात कह रहे हैं और प्रधान मंत्री जी भी उस का जबाब दे रहे हैं। उन्होंने कहा "आप का उस्ताद" क्या ये प्रधान मंत्री के शब्द हैं? उस्ताद कौन होता है? हाउस में सब

बराबर हैं। उस्ताद तो वह है, जिन्होंने शेख अब्दुल्ला को बाहर भेज दिया।

Shri Kapur Singh: Let him make his statement. Let us hear him.

Mr. Speaker: But there are others who obstruct him. They do not seem to want to hear him. If this attitude continues, I will have to take strong action against those who do not allow him to proceed with his speech.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Let us not be deprived of our right to hear him.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I was telling the House that in case Sheikh Abdullah decides not to come to India and do as he wishes, visit different countries, of course, it will be up to him to do whatever he likes; but here we will have to take positive action against him and what that action should be, as I said, it will be advisable that we take a couple of days and then come to a final decision. I have no doubt that we share the feelings of the hon. Members. We fully realise what the hon. Members have said, its importance and its implications. Its implications are very serious and Government will definitely take a decision in the light of the seriousness of the implications involved.

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय,

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें।

श्री बागड़ी : यह सारे देश की आवाज है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने आप से कहा है कि आप बैठ जायें।

Mr. Speaker: Now the greatest concern of the hon. Members is that some further harm might not be caused during these two days we are

[Mr. Speaker]

granting and whether there might be something done by him which, if the Government takes action just now, could be avoided. That is the point that Government has to consider. The fear or apprehension of the hon. Members is, if we take time to take any decision whether during these two days he might do something else which could be prevented if we take action immediately, just now. That is the anxiety of the hon. Members.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: A suggestion was made that his passport could be impounded.

Mr. Speaker: That is for the Government to decide because it is the Government which administers. I am not asking the Government to say what action they are going to take. I do not want the Government to disclose that. It is not necessary that they should disclose what action they intend to take. I am not insisting on that. I do not want that. But they should consider, should give full consideration to this aspect as to whether this delay or waiting on their part to hear the Foreign Secretary and then, afterwards, to take some action might not come in the way of any other thing or might not just encourage Mr. Abdullah to do further harm to this country during these two days which we might take in further discussion.

13.00 hrs.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: As far as I can see, during the next two days I do not think Sheikh Abdullah will be able to do anything further which would harm the interests of our country. But, as I said, in spite of the passport, he is entirely free to do whatever he likes, but he has also to realise that he must suffer the consequences . . . (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Now, no further discussion on that. So far as the adjournment motion is concerned, unless I know the facts, I cannot

admit it simply on reliance of the newspapers which may even be correct. No discussion can take place merely on that. They might be a useful guide, they might give us information; but the facts are to be known and, therefore, so far as that is concerned, if the Government wants time, I am inclined to give them time up to Monday. But, again, I repeat my request and that warning that they should take proper precaution to see that nothing further is done during these two days so that our country might suffer . . . (*Interruption*).

13.01 hrs.

PRESIDENT'S ASSENT TO BILLS

Secretary: Sir, I lay on the Table following six Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament during the current Session and assented to by the Vice-President discharging the functions of the President since a report was last made to the House on the 22nd March, 1965:

- (1) The Appropriation (Railways) Bill, 1965.
- (2) The Appropriation (Railways) No. 2 Bill, 1965.
- (3) The Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1965.
- (4) The Industries (Development and Regulation) Amendment Bill, 1965.
- (5) The Kerala Appropriation Bill, 1965.
- (6) The Kerala Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1965.

13.01½ hrs.

RESIGNATION BY MEMBER

(SHRI AJIT PRASAD JAIN)

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that Shri Ajit Prasad Jain, an