

**Mr. Speaker:** In view of the statement of the hon. Prime Minister I do not consider that it is a matter to which I should give my consent to move it as an adjournment motion.

#### RELATIONS WITH PAKISTAN

**Mr. Speaker:** I have received several notices of adjournment motions relating to "the grave menace to India's peace and security as evidenced by the warlike utterances of the Pakistan President, the hectic movements of Pakistan troops on India's borders and the incessant incursions into Indian territory by Pakistan Armymen and other nationals"; "the situation arising out of the reported mal-treatment and physical violence meted out to Shri K. C. Iyer, Accountant in the Office of the Assistant Indian High Commission, Dacca"; "the continued and increased Arms supply by the USA to Pakistan which in the context of the recent declarations of General Ayub Khan concerning Kashmir and the canal water dispute adds to the threat to the security of India" (Shri Dange). Shri Goray has given notice about "the hostile activities of Pakistani officials and Pakistani Army on our Eastern front." Similarly, there is one by Raja Mahendra Pratap saying that "the President Dictator of Pakistan said that he could go to war against India on Kashmir question." Then there is one by Shri Khadilkar regarding "aggression by Pakistani forces by entering forcibly into Indian territory."

**Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati):** My motion is about a definite matter.

**Mr. Speaker:** An instance has been given in his motion whereas the others relate to general matters. I have read it out. I would like to know what exactly the situation is.

**Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City—Central):** Sir, by raising the demand or requesting for this discussion, I do not wish to raise a hate campaign against Pakistan nor do I wish to raise

the question as to what form of Government they want to have for themselves. That is their affair. But, as the Prime Minister himself has already stated, the situation there is causing anxiety to us, first, because of the pronouncements of the Martial Law Administrator, though he has not stated that perhaps explicitly, and secondly, the greater supply of arms. It is very well known and already published in the press that the U.S. Secretary of Defence when we visited Karachi went to discuss the question of arms supply and a new pact of defence with Pakistan. Now, that arms supply may be directed against anybody else. But, surely, the immediate pronouncements have been against India. Therefore, such a build-up is bound to hit us first and anybody else. Therefore, my submission is that, if an adjournment motion is not so much to the taste of the Prime Minister, I should like to have a day set apart for discussion of this matter.

**Mr. Speaker:** And other relevant matters.

**Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura):** I may submit there will be danger...

**Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar):** I would like to know before the Prime Minister replies.....

**Mr. Speaker:** I have also read his motion to the House.

**Shri Khadilkar:**...on what grounds recognition was given to the new Pakistan Government after the two shifts in the Government, unless the Government has a firm assurance from the present Government that all the commitments and previous agreements will be honoured in the day to day administration.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** There is no question before us of recognition or non-recognition. We merely continue our dealings with those who are in charge of the destiny of Pakistan today. I have given much thought to it and I do not pretend to be able to

give a clear juristic interpretation of what has happened in Pakistan. We have adopted the simple practical way of dealing with those who are in authority and so far as I know, every other Government has done likewise.

I quite understand the anxiety and the concern of the Members of this House in connection with what has happened in Pakistan in recent weeks. I do not know, however, how that lends itself to an adjournment motion. It is my intention to make a statement before the House in the course of the next three or four days on a suitable day about these events, though I might also warn or submit to the House that what I have to say may not be anything novel. They know most of the facts. Nevertheless, I shall endeavour to make a statement before the House. If the House wishes to discuss the broad question—not these particular things—either as a general debate on foreign affairs or otherwise, we shall be willing. But, the question can hardly be considered this way as an adjournment motion.

So far as the case of Shri Iyer the accountant is concerned, it may be an individual case. But, individual cases, sometimes, are significant and important. We do consider this of significance and importance. I should not like to say much about it because we have been trying to make enquiries about it and we have addressed the Pakistan Government on the subject. *Prima facie*, it is a very objectionable thing that has happened.

**Shri Hem Barua:** There are other cases like that. The bags of two other employees of the Indian High Commission were ransacked on the Dacca Railway platform.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** If I may say so, there have been a number of cases, a variety of cases in the last two, three or four weeks, each one of them by itself not of very great importance, but nevertheless, taken together showing a certain trend which

is a matter of concern. So, I suggest, if you will be pleased to agree, that I might make a statement in regard to all the developments in Pakistan concerning us and after I have made the statement, it is for you and the House to decide how we should deal with it.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Just on a point of information, may I know whether in the meanwhile, we have tried to impress on the new regime in Pakistan about the sanctity of the Nehru-Noon Agreement and other Agreements that we have made with Pakistan in this connection?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The present Government of Pakistan has clearly stated, not to us, but generally, that they stand by all the agreements previously made. They have accepted that. We do not consider it necessary to ask them specifically whether they stand by this or not. First of all, we presume that the Government stands by its agreements. Secondly, they have made this general statement.

**Shri Goray (Poona):** I want to submit that a statement from the Prime Minister will not be enough because, some of us have been on the spot and we want to bring to the notice of the House the fears that are entertained by the people in the area and the acts of aggression that have taken place. Therefore, I submit that an opportunity should be given to the Members to submit their points of view and that can be followed by a statement from the Prime Minister.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad):** May I submit, Sir, that a discussion is necessary?

**Mr. Speaker:** I have heard in general.

**Raja Mahendra Pratap:** Will you allow me two minutes, Sir? I have something very important to say.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have allowed a number of hon. Members. The only question at this stage is, if I should

[Mr. Speaker.]

allow the adjournment motions. Having regard to the importance of this subject and the natural concern at the events evinced by the Members of the House and outside also, in view of the statement of the Prime Minister, he will make a statement in two or three days. Thereafter it is open to any hon. Member to say, let the matter be discussed, if he is not satisfied with a mere statement. The hon. Prime Minister has also said that either this matter may be taken up in the debate on Foreign affairs, which certainly will be taken up this session or a separate occasion or opportunity may be raised here. It will be taken advantage of for this purpose. We will consider this matter as soon as that statement is made.

**Raja Mahendra Pratap:** I have to say an important thing.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order, later.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** One word. From the wording of some of the motions of adjournment, it would appear that a somewhat exaggerated view is taken of what is supposed to be happening there. For instance, hectic movement of armies. I am not aware of hectic or even slow movement of armed forces there. We should take a balanced view. Again, there were headlines, I think, in today's papers or yesterday's papers, about some active aggression in Sylhet.....

**Shri Hem Barua:** Madanpur.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The hon. Member is right. So far as I know, there was undoubtedly aggression of about 10 or 20 yards or whatever it was. Some people came and sat there. They were told they would be pushed out and the same evening they walked away; they went back. So, these are petty things if you take each one by itself; it may be the folly of local persons or one of great importance. But, a succession of the petty things taken together does become a

bigger thing and that is what concerns us. As I said to you, I am not against this matter or any matter being discussed. But, I thought that I might put in a statement of the facts only before the House and after that, you may consider how to deal with it.

**Raja Mahendra Pratap:** May I make a statement, Sir, and then the Prime Minister may make a statement after hearing me. I have something very important to say. I say that Pakistan is in such a condition that any day Delhi may be bombed. The danger is there. I say that dictators are of this nature. Leader Hitler attacked Czechoslovakia, attacked Poland, attacked France and there is a danger. I say with my own experience that we can come to terms with Afghanistan and Iran. Afghan are Sunni Muslims. Iran is Shia Muslim; and if we can come to terms with them, then, in case Pakistan does something wrong to India. Afghanistan and Iran will consider that they are attacked. I am prepared to go to Kabul and Teheran and arrange such a treaty with Afghanistan and Iran.

**Mr. Speaker:** In view of the hon. Prime Minister's statement, let him make a statement first; thereafter we will consider the desirability of.....

**Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur):** May I suggest that a day may be fixed for the discussion, one whole day, after the hon. Prime Minister makes the statement?

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes, certainly I will consider that matter. In view of the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister.....

**Shri Manay (Bombay City Central—Reserved—Sch. Castes):** I desire to seek a clarification of the reason given by you regarding my adjournment motion on the satyagraha in connection with the Bombay-Mysore border dispute.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am coming to that.

I do not give my consent to this adjournment motion in connection with matters relating to Pakistan in view of the statement that the hon. Prime Minister has made.

I have received a number of adjournment motions, one relating to the closure of the Banaras Hindu University, Lathi-charge etc.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** Yes.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have referred to it, though I have disallowed it. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh has already tabled a motion for a discussion of this matter—the closure and the consequent action that has been taken and I have admitted it as a No-Day-Yet-Named Motion, and I have requested the hon. Minister of Education to fix up a suitable date. I am sure all these matters will be discussed. All hon. Members will have an opportunity, and I will try to give an opportunity particularly to those who have tabled the adjournment motion, as far as possible.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** I want only to submit a word. Today, i.e., the 17th, was the date earlier fixed for reopening the University. Now we have got the information that the University is not opening. So, some 10,000 students. ....

**Mr. Speaker:** That is known.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** are not having their studies. So, it is a very important matter. It should be discussed early.

**Mr. Speaker:** We will try to fix up a date as early as possible. I have sent the notice to the hon. Minister of Education, and I am sure he will fix up a convenient day as quickly as possible. In view of that, it is not necessary for me ...

**Shri Vajpayee:** May I point out that if the discussion is delayed, the situation may deteriorate in the meantime?

**Mr. Speaker:** Very good. The hon. Minister.

**The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimali):** We may have a discussion at any time that you may decide

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall find out if it is possible to have a discussion this week

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** Tomorrow.

**Mr. Speaker:** Why not this afternoon? Hon. Members will not give me any discretion in this matter.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** Today is the 17th. After this some agitation will start.

**Mr. Speaker:** Very well. Nobody will start an agitation after a discussion in this House, and if still they start, they will thank themselves.

An Hon Member has tabled an adjournment motion relating to some satyagraha on account of the border disputes between Bombay and Mysore. Anybody starts any satyagraha anywhere relating to what he considers to be right or not right. I do not think this is the forum where I must take it up. Then anybody can start. It is open to anybody to feel aggrieved with respect to any solution arrived at. A solution was arrived at here by an Act of Parliament. Some persons may not agree to it. Very well, there are ways of demonstration, but every time a demonstration is made, it is not possible to discuss this matter here. There are a number of hon. Members here coming both from Mysore and the other place. If they want, let them table an amendment to the Act whereby the boundaries may be readjusted. There are constitutional remedies. I do not know how, merely because some people choose to take it into their heads to get up and offer satyagraha, I should allow an adjournment motion here. Therefore, in view of this, I am not going to allow the adjournment motion.

**Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur):** In view of what you have said, will you please allow me to make a very small statement?

I come from that city where the satyagraha is taking place.

You gave a constitutional ruling in the beginning by saying that what is happening there is a result of an Act of this Parliament. That, in the first place, brings us into the picture.

Secondly, the Zonal Council, we were assured, would be taking up the issue at the appropriate time. This was the assurance that was given to the people who are now agitating at the time the Bill was passed by this House. The people continued to pin their faith on this assurance, but it is the failure to act up to this promise that makes this Government burdened with the responsibility for the acts there.

It is a very salient feature which I should like to point out that the views which we are holding on this issue are identical with the views held by the Government of Bombay. The Chief Minister of Bombay has expressed himself in the same terms, in the same, identical language—the same, I respect it—as those who are agitating. The issue is very simple. Let us not go into the merits, I entirely submit to you.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am only on the point whether an adjournment motion will serve any purpose. Or, are we competent to take it up as an adjournment motion?

**Shri Nath Pai:** If you had given me a minute, I would have concluded.

All the demands pertain to a request to this Government to accept a principle which the Congress Party had upheld before the nation for more than 30 years, since 1922, that this issue should be amicably settled on the basis of the principle of a single contiguous unit of a village. It is this appeal that is being made repeatedly

to this Government, and on this issue the people have been most patient, most peaceful. The Government has turned a deaf ear to this, and the Government always waits till there is a paroxysm of popular rage, and then we are told that the people are misbehaving. I say the people there are contributing to democracy by their action. If we do not want an Ayub Khan in India to develop, I plead and submit that the only way of doing it is by seeing that the people's wishes are respected and their initiative is not killed and not by turning a deaf ear to their demand.

**Mr. Speaker:** At this stage, I am not concerned with the general discussion. If I allow the adjournment motion, discussion may go on, but so far I have not been convinced that this is a matter for an adjournment motion here. If they want, let the hon. Members table a resolution and take their chance. There are a number of ways in which this can be discussed. If it was said that this matter would be considered by the Zonal Council and it has not been followed, it is to be raised not by an adjournment motion here. They can impress upon the Government that they should follow it if any assurance has been given. Even if an assurance has not been given, if it is the opinion of the House that a particular course has to be adopted, it should be done.

In view of this, I am not called upon to give my consent.

**Shri Manay:** I was seeking clarification from you on the reason given by you.

**Mr. Speaker:** The reason is that this is not a subject matter of an adjournment motion, trying to upset the boundaries which have been already accepted by Parliament. If each Bill that is passed by Parliament is to be upset by some persons taking the law into their own hands or offering satyagraha or other demonstration, there will not be any end to this kind of adjournment motion. No Act of Parliament will be safe. Under the circumstances, as a matter of principle,

I am not going to allow adjournment motions relating to matters intended or calculated to get rid of Acts of Parliament.

**Shri Manay:** Would you allow me one minute?

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not going to allow.

**Shri Manay:** You say that it relates to a continuing matter. I wanted clarification on that point only.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have now said that this is not a matter on which an adjournment motion can be allowed in this House to upset an Act of Parliament.

This disposes of all the adjournment motions.

12.28 hrs.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

##### AMENDMENT TO WORKING JOURNALISTS (FIXATIONS OF RATES OF WAGES) RULES

**The Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri Nanda):** I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. G.S.R. 946, dated the 10th October, 1958 making certain amendment to the Working Journalists (Fixation of Rates of Wages) Rules, 1958. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-980/58]

##### NOTIFICATION TO BE ISSUED UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri):** I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (2) of section 620 of the Companies Act, 1956, a copy of draft Notification proposed to be issued under sub-section (1) of Section 620 of the said Act. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-981/58.]

##### REPORT OF AGRICULTURAL ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

**The Minister of Co-operation (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh):** On behalf of Shri A. P. Jain, I beg to lay on the Table

a copy of the Report of the Agricultural Administration Committee. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-982/58.]

##### HIMACHAL PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (CONSTITUTION AND PROCEEDINGS) VALIDATION ORDINANCE

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):** I beg to lay on the Table, under provisions of article 123(2)(a) of the Constitution, a copy of the Himachal Pradesh Legislative Assembly (Constitution and Proceedings) Validation Ordinance, 1958 (No. 7 of 1958). [Placed in Library. See No. LT-983/58.]

##### AMENDMENT TO TEA RULES

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo):** I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 49 of the Tea Act, 1953, a copy of Notification No. G.S.R. 799, dated the 13th September, 1958, making certain further amendment to the Tea Rules, 1954. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-984/58.]

##### AMENDMENT TO COFFEE RULES

**Shri Kanungo:** I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 48 of the Coffee Act, 1942, a copy of Notification No. G.S.R. 1024, dated the 1st November, 1958, making certain further amendments to the Coffee Rules, 1955. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-985/58]

##### AMENDMENT TO KHADI AND VILLAGE INDUSTRIES COMMISSION RULES

**The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah):** I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 26 of the Khadi and Village Industries Commission Act, 1956, a copy of Notification No. G.S.R. 1002, dated the 25th October, 1958, making certain further amendment to the Khadi and Village Industries Commission Rules, 1957. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-986/58.]