

12 Noon

## CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED DECISION OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT TO SELL ARMS TO SOUTH AFRICA

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the reported decision of the British Government to sell arms to South Africa and the reaction of the Government of India thereto.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, before you proceed further, I wonder if the House would agree that for Calling Attention motions there may be some time fixed. If the whole day is taken, that means waste of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, I am very grateful to Mr. Mahavir Tyagi for pointing this out in the House. I am very anxious myself and before the leaders of the various parties I have expressed my anxiety that Calling Attention motions should not take so much time as they have been doing. Now, we have adopted a certain formula, viz., one Member of each party out of the list shall be called first and later on the list might be revised and those whose names are not on the list might also be called, but when we shall stop should rest in the discretion of the Chair. If that is adopted and that is adhered to then alone we can control it.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश): श्रीमन्, मुझे इस संबंध में एक निवेदन करना है (Interruption) मैं श्री महावीर त्यागी की बात से बिल्कुल सहमत हूँ और आपने जो बात कही उस बात से भी मैं सहमत हूँ मगर मेरी मुसीबत जरा देख ली जाये। जिस दिन मैं इस सदन में आया, शुरु शुरु में मैंने आदरणीय माननीय स्वर्गीय डा० जाकिर हुसैन का ध्यान आकर्षित किया था कि राज्य सभा में एड्जर्नमेंट मोशन नहीं होना है, उन्होंने हमको वचन दिया था कि रूल कमेटी में आप बुलाये जायेंगे।

राज्य सभा में सेन्सर मोशन नहीं है, तो कान्फिडेन्स मोशन तो है ही नहीं...

श्री सभापति: ये बातें मालूम हैं।

श्री राजनारायण: तो डा० जाकिर हुसैन ने बीच की व्यवस्था निकाली। उन्होंने यह कहा कि हम कालिंग अटेंशन की परिधि ऐसी कर देंगे कि सभी परपज उसमें सात्व हो जायेंगे। इसलिये अब राज्य सभा का कालिंग अटेंशन केवल टेक्निकल कार्नेर में कालिंग अटेंशन नहीं रहता बल्कि वह एड्जर्नमेंट मोशन की भी शक्ल कही कही लेने की कोशिश करता है। एक कालिंग अटेंशन में 29 नाम आये तो कालिंग अटेंशन जिस महत्व का होगा उसके मुताबिक चर्चा होगी। इसलिये आप ऐसी व्यवस्था कर दें जिस किसी प्रश्न पर बहुत से नाम हों, उसके लिये एक दिन जनरल डिसकशन कर दें, वह कालिंग अटेंशन की तरह न लिया जाया करे...

श्री सभापति: आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री राजनारायण: तो आप मेरी डिफिकल्टी समझ गये।

श्री सभापति: मैं समझ गया। लेकिन हर एक केस को जनरल डिसकशन में नहीं लाया जा सकता है।

श्री राजनारायण: देखिये हम लोगों को कुछ जगह में काम करना है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rajnarain, I have listened to you. Now, I have called Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

श्री राजनारायण: आप कम से कम एड्जर्नमेंट मोशन रख दीजिये।

श्री ना० कृ० शंजवलकर (मध्य प्रदेश): इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा निवेदन है कि आज बराबर तीन दिन हो गये, आज चौथा दिन है। सदन के प्रारम्भ होने के दिन से जितने कालिंग अटेंशन नोटिस आए उनमें सीमाश्रय से मेरा नाम रहा लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से मुझे एक दफा भी अवसर नहीं मिला है कि मैं कुछ पूछ सकूँ। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जो प्रथा आपने...

श्री एस० डी० मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश) : आज सौभाग्य नहीं है।

श्री ना० कृ० गेजवलकर : उसमें तो नाम नहीं है लेकिन पता नहीं मुझे पुराजा जायेगा कि नहीं। आपने जो प्रक्रिया बतलाई है, मैंने बराबर कन भी निवेदन किया था, परमों भी किया था, कि जिन्हें लोगों का लिस्ट में नाम है उनको बोलने का हर हालत में अवसर दिया जाना चाहिये, अन्यथा यह बहुत बड़ी, गलत, चीज हो जायेगी। देखिये, इसमें मुझे आपत्ति नहीं है यदि आप दूसरों को भी अवसर दे लेकिन जो लोग अपना नाम दिये हैं उनको आप अवसर नहीं दें, यह बात तो मेरी समझ में किसी तरह नहीं आ रही है।

श्री सभापति : मगर मैं यह भी देखता हूँ एक ही पार्टी के अठ, दस नाम एकदम से आते हैं। तो औरों को भी मौका देना चाहिये इसको भी देखना पड़ता है।

SHRI A. P. JAIN (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, may I make a suggestion? Calling attention notices are of varying importance. There might be some very important calling attention notices which may require fuller discussion. I think it will not be fair to lay down any rigid rule.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Therefore I say leave it to my discretion.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: If the calling attention notice is of very high importance, in that case you might give time for discussion. You may convert it into a motion for discussion. On the other hand so far as the calling attention motions are concerned I think your opinion that they must be limited in point of time should be strictly adhered to, subject to the provision that if a calling attention notice is of grave importance it may be converted into a motion for discussion.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): Sir, may I bring to the notice of the House the system that prevails in Lok Sabha itself? Those who give such notices, their names are ballot-L/B(N)10RSS-6

ed and the first five names are printed on the calling attention notice. This principle of giving chance party-wise may do injustice to vigilant Members who give the notice. Let us take into consideration the very good practice that prevails in Lok Sabha. You can ballot the first five names.

(Interruption)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Sir. No, Sir. You yourself suggested a method. Now we are turning it into a discussion as to whether we should follow Lok Sabha or not.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Please give me a chance...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will consider all these matters and, if necessary, I will put it before the Business Advisory Committee and have their views, but let this discussion stop now.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, मैं इस ओर आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करता हूँ ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Sorry, no. The Minister.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): Mr. Chairman; the Government of India are greatly concerned about the British Government's declaration of intent to resume the sale of arms to South Africa. Government are in no doubt that the total effect of this shift in British policy will be to reinforce the racist regime in South Africa; instead of bringing stability, peace and security to the region, it will add to the existing tensions. Furthermore such a shift will affect the security and vital interests of a great number of countries in Africa and Asia, some of whom are also members of the Commonwealth. The proposed British decision would also be in utter disregard of the U.N. resolutions banning the sale of arms to South Africa.

In announcing their intention, the British Government invoked the so-called Simonstown Agreement concluded in 1955 which accorded Britain

certain facilities at the Simonstown naval base for the defence of the sea routes round South Africa. Britain and South Africa agreed to cooperate in defence of the sea routes through their 'respective maritime forces.' The British Home Secretary, Sir Alec Douglas Home, declared in the House of Commons on July 20, that: "It is our intention to give effect to the purpose of that agreement and we believe that as a consequence we should be ready to consider within that context applications for the export to South Africa of certain limited categories of arms, so long as they are for maritime defence directly related to the security of the sea routes".

The British Government have sought to justify their partial return to their former policy of supplying arms to South Africa on grounds of broad defence needs in relation to the security of the trade routes "which have grown in importance since the closure of the Suez Canal". But this strange strategic doctrine has no relation to existing realities. It conjures up a threat where none exists, and tries to cover up the fact that Britain will be arming the racist regime of South Africa. Truth is that South Africa is today Africa's only military power, well-equipped with sophisticated arms and defence equipment. With her disproportionately greater military strength, South Africa is a threat to her neighbours and not the other way round. As regards the distinction which the British Government have sought to make between arms and equipment for maritime defence and arms which would assist enforcement of the policy of apartheid, it cannot convince anyone. It is our belief that any accretion of military strength to South Africa can only strengthen her resolve to continue the policy of apartheid. It will also inevitably introduce a new element of tension and conflict, especially for the neighbouring African countries, and bring in great power rivalry and cold war into the Indian Ocean region.

The House is aware of our desire to see the Indian Ocean region remain an area of peace and tranquillity, free of great power conflict, mili-

tary and naval bases and other manifestations of a military presence. We cannot but view with grave concern any intention of the British Government to introduce tension into this region through a resumption of arms supply to South Africa.

The House is doubtless aware that the declaration of British intent to arm South Africa has caused widespread dismay and concern all over the world, and more specially among the Commonwealth countries in Africa and Asia. The Prime Minister has already sent a message in reply to the British Prime Minister's communication on the subject, conveying our serious concern and misgivings over British intention to arm South Africa.

The House is also aware of the efforts so far made by India in the United Nations and other multilateral and international forums to prohibit the supply of arms to South Africa. At the recently concluded debate in the Security Council the Permanent Representative of India drew attention to the obligation of the international community to observe and implement the United Nations Resolutions on arms embargo to South Africa. On 23rd July, 1970, the Security Council reiterated its earlier resolutions and called upon all states to ban the sale of arms to South Africa unconditionally and without reservations whatsoever. The House may be assured that Government will do its best to concert efforts with all like-minded countries, especially of Asia and Africa, to dissuade the British Government from resuming arms supply to South Africa in consonance with Britain's own obligations to the Commonwealth and the United Nations.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are somewhat disappointed by this statement. We expected that in view of the clear stand of the United Kingdom Government, the Government of India would concretely tell us the lines that it is going to pursue in regard to this matter for preventing the sale of arms by the United Kingdom Government to the South African racist regime. Instead, we have

been told about the concern which they have. Sir, the External Affairs Ministry should eschew its shock or expression of concern. It is a 'Concern Express Walla' Ministry because on every issue it only expresses its concern, it does not say what they are going to do. They say, they will do their best. What is the best that you are going to do? That is what Parliament should be told.

First of all, the matter is extremely serious and I do not see even a proper assessment of the seriousness of the situation.

As you know, in 1967 the Tories demanded the lifting of embargo on arms sales to South Africa. The Labour Government refused at that time. As soon as the Tories came to power, soon after the elections, they took a few steps. They decided that (i) the British forces would remain in Singapore; they will not be withdrawn from East of Suez; (ii) they decided that arms sale to the South Africa Government should be resumed; (iii) they decided also to normalise relations with the racist South Rhodesian regime, and (iv) there was a clear swing in the racist trends in the elections in the Conservative vote. No wonder Mr. Enoch Powell, the Fascist dictator, polled twice as many votes as he got on the earlier occasion...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should ask questions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, I am asking. Let me ask. What do you think you are? This question needs some explanation. I am seeking clarification, I will ask my question. This assessment is not there. It is stated as an isolated action. This is a drive against Afro-Asian countries, a part of the common strategy which they are already implementing. There is indication of it.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I must point out he threatened you and you smiled. This is submission to threats, and this is an insult to the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is not a controversial matter. Do not teach me how to put a question. You are in the Chair, I know. Somebody

L/B(N)10RSS—(a)

in the Chair does not mean that he understands things better. These are facts which I am entitled to bring to the notice of the House. How incompetent this Government is in certain matters should be brought out by facts. We are told that Mr. Heath sent a communication to the Prime Minister. We would like to have this communication laid on the Table of the House. We are reading about the communication in the newspapers, English and Indian press. You should tell what the main points in the communication are. The House is entitled to be supplied with a copy of it. I demand, Sir, the copies should be supplied.

Now, Sir, they have not mentioned another thing. Recently the Security Council discussed this matter of embargo. Do you know what Britain, France and the United States did? They abstained from voting. What does it mean? Three big powers out of five, permanent Members, have come to the conclusion that nothing should be done. As you know, France was not implementing even the earlier embargo. In this situation three powers have combined together to see that nothing is done. We should take serious note of it and of what our Permanent Representative is doing. That I should like to know... (*Time bell rings.*) Why are you ringing the Bell?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken seven minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I took seven minutes. You are threatening every time. All right, I am not going to sit down.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not a question of threatening anybody.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nobody can make me sit down.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have only pointed out that you have taken seven minutes. This morning the Chairman said that we should devise some method by which we can regulate our proceedings. This is not the way to conduct the proceedings in the House...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You better sit down. I am not going to sit down.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I cannot tolerate this. You have taken seven minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You do whatever you like. I am not going to yield. This discourtesy to the Members will not be tolerated.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have already told you that you have taken seven minutes to seek clarification.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And you have taken two minutes. You do not understand even a question...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know. You need not tell me about that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not at all.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should rather try to complete the question as early as possible.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have seen many Deputy Chairmen; they have come and gone. I have known many. You are not going to do this kind of thing to me.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Mysore): On a point of order, Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He can raise a point of order. I shall sit down. But this is very wrong. You should have told me that I could have only seven minutes.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: On a point of order, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: First Mr. Gurupadaswamy.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Sir, the matter has become rather serious. I do not object to a Member of this House putting questions seeking clarifications. I do not, Sir, mind a Member also taking a little longer time and putting questions in his own style to the treasury benches. But I object to some of the expressions made by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. And what has he said? You have

been standing and he has been persistently violating your direction. And he does not stop there. The most objectionable part of his expression is, he said that he has seen many Deputy Chairmen in the past.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is a statement of fact.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Let me formulate my point.

*(Interruptions)*

The most objectionable part is that the whole substance of his statement is that he does not care for the Chair, he is not bound by your ruling, and he does not take note of it. If this is the attitude of a very responsible Member, a leader of a party, I do not know how we can function. And the tragic part of it is, you seem to be helpless. You are presiding over the deliberations and you are helpless. A still more tragic thing is, we are equally helpless. We sit here witnessing a great drama of filibustering going on. I do not mind filibustering...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it a point of order?

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: I do not want to be bullied. *(Interruptions)*. I never get bullied. Why are you so upset?

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down, Mr. Gupta. I have called Mr. Gurupadaswamy.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is no point of order. Is this a point of order?

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: If that is so, I move that all the expressions made by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta casting aspersions on the Chair be removed from the record.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dharia.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am really sorry at the manner in which my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta for whom I have got regard, has behaved to-day. I do share the feeling of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and so far as the present question is concerned, the whole House, the whole country in unanimous on this point. The only point is, at the time of calling attention motion, the Members are entitled to seek some clarifications and a reasonable time should be given to them. But again it is the discretion of the Chair. When the Chair requests once, twice, thrice, I think the Member concerned should take proper note of it. Particularly when the Chairman is on his legs, it is the duty of every Member to sit down immediately. Instead of that, to say that I have seen many Deputy Chairmen is not proper. It may be a question of fact, but the way in which it was said was more disturbing. I have got great regard for Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I would appeal to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not want regard. Condemn me. I do not want this kind of courtesy.

You condemn me. You pass a resolution condemning me.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta cannot bully me that way.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You also cannot bully me. You condemn me. You can pass a resolution.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, when I am raising a point of order, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, if he likes, can give me a patient hearing and if he is not interested in hearing me, he can go out. But he cannot obstruct me like this. I am not going to be obstructed however loud his voice may be. He is not going to bully me...

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: He cannot bully me either.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: So I would appeal to my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, kindly to take into consideration the feeling of the House. The House has great regard for Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Members are interested

in knowing his views. On many occasions his views are certainly appreciated by this House. Even if sometimes his views are not appreciated, the whole House has great regard for Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. So he should kindly take into consideration the feeling of the House. Let there not be any sort of humiliation of the person who is occupying the Chair. It is highly objectionable. It is highly condemnable.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Have you finished? Then I can answer that point of order.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: My motion is there.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am very sorry for the way things are being conducted in this House. First of all, I must express my disagreement with the manner in which the Chair also conducts the proceedings. I must say that because whatever happens in this House is only a reaction of what comes from the Chair...

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana): And *vice versa*.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI: Therefore, first of all, I would like to appeal to you... (*Interruptions*). If they shout, they will have reaction from me also. That is why what I say is when there is something going on in this House, it is only a consequential reaction to what comes from the Chair. I am appealing to you that when somebody is making a submission or is trying to make out his point for getting a clarification, you give him enough time, let him present his point completely. But if you go on interrupting him in the middle, any Member would feel annoyed. Even when I am speaking, if you go on interrupting me in the middle saying, "Be done with it, be done with it." I definitely feel annoyed. That is why I am telling you, if you want that there should be orderly conduct in the House, then you should also exercise some patience. I do accept that some Members take an interminably long time in coming to their point, especially my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, or Mr. Rajnarayan. But then they have something to say

and we must also recognise that. When they want to say something, when they have something, important to say, they must be given an opportunity. Let us not be very petty in this matter.

Then, just because it happens to be Mr. Bhupesh Gupta who was involved today, I see so many Members getting up and saying, "No, we cannot tolerate this." I would like to ask how many Members have behaved in this manner during the last three days. There are ever so many Members. Why do you question only Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, why not others? I am only appealing to you, do not get excited. Let the Member complete his sentence. You can remind him saying that he has got only two minutes or three minutes and so on and that he should stop at that. But do not go on hammering, "No, no". It is a very irritating thing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now I can also join.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhandari.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now I can also join with others. I know that thing, I can answer them.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) : उपसभापति जी, हम एक विशस सॉकिल मे फंस गए हैं। सदस्यों के व्यवहार की चर्चा करते समय यह हमारा अधिकार है कि हम अध्यक्ष के व्यवहार को भी उसमें शामिल करें लेकिन अगर इन दोनों के बीच विवाद चलेगा तो इस समस्या का समधान कभी नहीं हो सकता। आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम इस परम्परा को निभाएं कि अध्यक्ष के आदेशों का यहां पालन होगा। अध्यक्ष ने आदेश समुचित विचार के बाद दिया है, उसमें और अधिक गुंजाइश है सुधार की या सदस्यों के विचारों के अभिव्यक्त करने के तरीके को ध्यान में रखकर अध्यक्ष को अपने निर्णय के सम्बन्ध में कुछ लचीलापन रखना चाहिए, यह सब चीजें ऐसी हैं जिन्हें अध्यक्ष की कुर्सी पर बैठने वाले व्यक्ति को विभिन्न पार्टियों के सदस्यों के साथ आपस में विचार करके तय

करना चाहिये, लेकिन मैं इस आधार पर अध्यक्ष के द्वारा दिए गए आदेशों की अवहेलना का समर्थन नहीं करता। आज स्पष्ट रूप से ऐसे वाक्यों का प्रयोग किया गया है उनमें अध्यक्ष के प्रति असम्मान प्रगट हुआ है और इस कारण से मैं श्री गुरुपाद-स्वामी के द्वारा रखे गए प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूं कि उन शब्दों को कार्यवाही में से निकाला जाना चाहिए।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, मैं बहुत धीरज के साथ इस समय सभी तर्क और वितर्क सुन रहा हूं। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि किस संसदीय प्रथा के मुताबिक यह कहना असंसदीय है कि हमने अन्य डिप्टी चैयरमैन को देखा है। मैं अपने मित्र मोहन धारिया जी की बहुत इज्जत करता हूं मगर यहां सदन की कार्यवाही निकाल कर देखी जाय, ऐसे अवसर आये हैं जब मोहन धारिया जी ने कहा है कि मैं नहीं बैठ सकता, मैं चैयर की आज्ञा नहीं मानूंगा और वे बराबर बोलते रहे हैं और चैयर कुछ बोला नहीं है। ऐसे अनेक अवसर आये हैं जबकि न चाहते हुये भी हमारे मित्र जो इतने संसदीय रहते हैं, हमारे वुजुर्ग श्री भंडारी साहब, उनको भी कभी कभी यह कहना पड़ता है कि चाहे मैं निकाल दिय जाऊं मगर मैं अपनी बात अवश्य कहूंगा। (*Interruption*) मैं शीलभद्र याजी की आज्ञा से कैसे देखूंगा, मैं अपनी आंख से देखूंगा। इसलिये हमेशा से मेरी मान्यता रही है कि चैयर और सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों का व्यवहार एक दूसरे के प्रति सना हुआ है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि कोई भी सम्मानित सदस्य जो पांच मिनट तक यथा बोल रहा हो अगर बीच में उसको दो या तीन बार टोका जाय तो उसकी धारा क्यों नहीं टूटेगी। उसकी धारा निश्चित टुट जायगी। इसलिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि इस मामले को ज्यादा बढ़ाया न जाय और श्री गुरुपादस्वामी जी ने जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने रखा है मैं यह चाहता हू कि मैं इस मनोस्थिति में रहूं कि मैं उनके प्रस्ताव का समर्थन कर सकू, लेकिन अगर वे यह कहें कि कोई बात असंसदीय न हो और

उसको भी इस सदन की कार्यवाही से निकाल दिया जाय तो मैं चेयर को यह अधिकार देने के लिये कतई तैयार नहीं हूँ। कभी भी मैंने इस राइट को कंसीड नहीं किया है, चेयर केवल कार्यवाही को नियंत्रित कर सकता है, रेगुलेट प्रोसीडिंस चेयर ने आज बड़ा ब्यापक अधिकार ले रखा है जो जनतंत्र की हत्या कर रहा है। जो चेयर को मनपसन्द न हो उन शक्तियों को भी निकालने को चेयर तैयार हो जाता है। इसलिए मैं आपसे निवेदन करूंगा और आपके जरिए अपने मित्र श्री गुरुपादस्वामी जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि वे अपने प्रस्ताव पर इंसिस्ट न करें। अगर कोई असंसदीय बात है तो उसको जरूर निकाल दें। लेकिन कोई संसदीय बात हो और वह किसी को रुचिकर न हो तो इसी की रुचि पर किसी बात को कार्यवाही से निवाला जाना अमर्यादित और असंसदीय हो जाता है। इसलिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि गुरुपादस्वामी जी अपने प्रस्ताव पर इस समय इंसिस्ट न करें, और यही कहें कि उसको आप देख लें और जो असंसदीय हो उसको निकाल दें।

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Let us come back to the Calling Attention Notice rather than continue like this.

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN** (Andhra Pradesh): May I request you to proceed with the subject?

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** All right.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH** (West Bengal): Let us close down the matter, Sir.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** That is why I am closing it down. Please sit down. As I said, this morning only the Chairman...

(*Interruptions*)

**THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE** (SHRI K. K. SHAH): For a minute, may I request the House, before the Calling Attention Notice is taken up, that some time is fixed, half an hour... (*Interruptions*)... half an hour, according to the importance of the matter. According to the importance of the Calling Attention Notice, some time may be fixed.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** No time limit.

(*Interruptions*)

**श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर :** आन ए प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि जो सदन के नेता हैं वे अभी उधर से आ रहे हैं और यह सारी चर्चा पहले चल चुकी है। तो क्या नये सिंगे में फिर इसको शुरू किया जायगा ?

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Just a minute. The Chairman this morning had expressed his concern about the time that is consumed during the Calling Attention discussion. Yesterday, for one matter we have spent the time of this House, about three hours... (*Interruption*)... Just a minute. For Calling Attention Notice, normally, I think it was the procedure that only half an hour could be utilised. For Calling Attention Notice, we have gone from half an hour to 45 minutes; all right, from 45 minutes to one hour, if that is an important matter. (*Interruptions*). Therefore, what happens? Yesterday, in one hour only two or three persons could ask clarifications. So, what is the procedure by which we are supposed to ask clarifications? I think if you honestly make out your point... (*Interruptions*)—please listen: one question should not take more than one minute or at the most two minutes.

**SHRI A. D. MANI** (Madhya Pradesh): Three minutes, Sir.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Yesterday we spent one hour for three questions. It means that every Member had taken about 8 to 10 minutes. Now, Shri Godey Murahari said that the Chair is ringing the bell or interrupting the Member. Just now I said 'five or six minutes'. I told Shri Bhupesh Gupta, 'it is only five or six minutes'. Shri Godey Murahari said, "There is not enough time."... (*Interruption*). Please sit down.

**SHRI GODEY MURAHARI** (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, there is a lot of difference between saying 'it is only 5 minutes' and keeping quiet. But if you go on saying "Be done with it, be done with it", then?



MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. After five minutes, it is pointed out that the time is over. For asking clarification two or three minutes are enough. At the end of seven minutes he was told—"you have taken seven minutes"—two minutes were not enough for winding up for Shri Bhupesh Gupta? You have said that I am only ringing the bell and interrupting the Member. After five minutes, I told the Member, "Two minutes more."

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI: That will be natural reaction . . .

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have no objection if it is the desire of the House that we should allow the Hon. Members of the House the whole day for the Calling Attention Notice for which I am prepared to sit in the Chair and to hear the long speeches of Shri Bhupesh Gupta, Shri Rajnarain, Shri Godey Murahari and all other Members. So far as I am concerned, I have to sit here. But it is a matter of concern for the government to see how the business is finished. It is not my business. Therefore, I seek the co-operation of the whole House. Let there be some procedure. My point is that if we can restrict the time of the hon. Members, we can allow more hon. Members to speak and ask questions. He said he was putting his name. During the last three days he could not ask any clarification. Why? Yesterday, we spent three hours. Only one person from each party could get a chance. So we have to overcome these difficulties. . . . *(Interruptions)*. Only I want the co-operation of the Members and if you do not want to cooperate, as I have continue. . . . *(Interruptions)* So far as the Calling Attention Motion is concerned, there is no necessity for that and I would appeal to the hon. Members that they should use proper language and they should not use derogatory language while addressing the Chair. It is highly improper.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): With great respect and humility I wish to draw your attention to one thing. . . . *(Interruptions)*. . . . You said that Members need only one minute to seek

clarification. I entirely agree with you, Sir. There were times. But days have so changed now and the Ministers do not come out with correct answers and clarifications. . . . *(Interruptions)*. With great respect and humility I say you are only admonishing the Members. Why don't you pull up the Ministers to cooperate with the Members? Only then the House will be satisfied.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, since I have been the subject-matter of controversy, I want to make my position very clear. Sir, It was not my intention at all to personally cast any reflection or insult you in any manner. Sir, I am prepared to follow the rule. If you say "One minute for each Member" I can assure you that I shall follow that, provided everybody follows it.

श्री राजनारायण : आज आप ज्यादा टाइम मत लीजिए, बोलिए अपनी बात ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I suggest you better make up your mind how much time you want to give to each Member and we shall keep that in our minds.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, the Chairman has said this morning that he will consult the Leaders of the various Parties about this matter, how much time should be taken.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मेरा एक प्वाइन्ट आफ ऑर्डर यह है कि जब आप चेयर पर हैं तो बार बार आप चेयरमैन को यहां रेफर मत किया करिये । जब आप चेयर पर हैं तो आप यहां की प्रोसीडिंग्स को रेगुलेट करेंगे । चेयर ने क्या कहा यह ज़रूर ब्रह्म आर्येंगे तो देखेंगे ।

श्री उप सभापति : अच्छा, आप बैठिये ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, if any reasonable time is fixed, everybody will obey. We heard in fact in the other House there was a suggestion about a revolution bell. I think you should fix a hammer bell on the ministerial benches and on our benches and if we exceed the time, that bell should work.

Now, Sir my suggestion is that the Government should have called a meeting of the Commonwealth countries which are against this action of the British Government and they should have condemned such action on the part of the British Government. I think 20 countries have already expressed themselves against this proposal of the British Government to sell arms to South Africa. They should jointly issue a declaration condemning this action and our people in the UNO and also in the Security Council should seek condemnation by these bodies of this action on the part of the British Government. Also, Sir, like the Kenyan Foreign Minister we should tell the British Government that if they proceed with this kind of strategy and plan of selling arms to South Africa, they are only encouraging apartheid. After all we have got one million people living in South Africa. We should declare here and now that the Commonwealth ends and it is dissolved. If the Kenyan Foreign Minister can say this, why can't we do it? That is why I say that the Government of India should behave in this manner. I think this kind of mere expression of our concern will not do. Moreover, Sir, it is only a hypocritical expression of concern and they are not at all moved by it. I hope certain bold action in this matter will be taken against the British Government. The Tories have been running racial riots in England itself. For meeting such a situation a much bolder action is called for and that is the immediate withdrawal from the Commonwealth; that is the supreme task of the hour.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: As this question relates to the intended supply of arms by British to South Africa I would have been accused of not adhering to the rule of relevancy, if I had given the Government's assessment on the British Government's policy about their position with regard to the East of Suez or Rhodesia, although on both these matters the Gov't's position is well known and there should be no doubt on that score. In the last part of Shri Bhupesh Gupta's speech he has made two or three suggestions. He has asked about the Government's

views. So far as the copy of the letter which our Prime Minister has written to Prime Minister Heath is concerned, I would only point out...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Their letter also.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I would plead with him to have a look at the proceedings of the British Parliament. Prime Minister Heath was asked to produce a copy of his letter to the Commonwealth Prime Ministers and Heads of Governments and also their replies. He said that there is a convention that these are not made public although extracts of these have appeared in the newspapers. Some extracts have appeared. This was one of the points urged.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The British Parliament's practice is, in such cases the communications are placed in the form of White Papers and the Indian Government have done it in regard to our correspondence with China. Why cannot you do it in this case?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: In the case of China, the situation was different. In those matters you will agree that even if you have to release the correspondence, you have to get the agreement of the other party but about the substance of the letter, I would like to inform the hon. House in very unmistakable terms that our Prime Minister has taken a very strong line in this connection. She has said:

"Any accretion of military strength to South Africa can only strengthen her resolve to continue the policy of apartheid which all civilised Governments of the world abhor and condemn."

She also said:

"It is our considered view that the total effect of this new approach to the South African questions will be to reinforce the racist regimes in Rhodesia and South Africa. Instead of bringing stability, peace and security in the region, it will add to the existing tensions" and things to that effect.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** What has Health said in justification of that?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** That I have covered in my statement. If you study the statement I have given, the elements of their stand are there. What are we doing in the UN? Our Permanent Representative and our Delegation there have made very strong statements on this point in the forum of the UN and they have actually been published. They are published documents. If the Members are interested, we can get copies of those statements and place them on the Table of the House. The third point raised is about a meeting of the Commonwealth countries to be convened and that...

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** to condemn...

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** You cannot say that the meeting is to condemn. The meeting will decide what it wants to do.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** The agenda may say 'for condemnation'.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** How can the agenda contain this wording? You cannot say this is being convened to condemn. There is no use of convening it if you are to say: 'This is the resolution and we want you to approve it'. I would submit that in any case in Lusaka, in about a month from now, the non-aligned countries, including a large number of Commonwealth countries, are attending the conference, this matter being an important one, is bound to come up. I do not think any separate meeting of the Commonwealth countries in this respect is needed. We are in touch with the other Commonwealth countries through their representatives here and through our High Commissioners in those countries and we are co-ordinating action in this respect. About the last suggestion that we should straightway say that the Commonwealth should be dissolved, I think it is too drastic a thing to be expected in the course of a Calling Attention Notice.

**SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY** (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to know from the

Foreign Minister about this that the British Prime Minister, Mr. Heath, in justifying the decision of his Government to supply arms to South Africa, has said that it will be for the maritime defence of South Africa and her trade, and then also that it will be for external use. Now, Sir, that is what the United States of America said when they supplied arms to Pakistan, which were later on used against us. And that is what the USSR is now saying, that the arms supplies that they are making to Pakistan will not be used against India. But the fact is that these countries have always used them in their own interests against their enemies. Similarly, in this case the UK decision to supply arms will strengthen to sustain the racist regime in South Africa, and it will not promote the accord existing among the different races in other countries. In view of this decision, is it not desirable—even the Labour Government in Britain failed to implement the majority decision of the United Nations that the racist regime in Rhodesia should be liquidated; now this Conservative Government has decided to supply arms to South Africa—is it not desirable then that we should take more positive action instead of sending just protest notes? And the more positive action lies in our deciding to withdraw from the Commonwealth. Is it also not a fact that some of the Commonwealth countries, who have expressed their resentment against this decision, have taken the stand to withdraw from the Commonwealth? And why should not the Government of India take the lead in coordinating the activities of all the Commonwealth countries who are opposed to this decision?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** I agree with the first part of the statement that the excuses put forward by the British Government in justification of their intention to supply arms are not valid. We have not accepted them and that is what I have said in my Statement. About the more positive action that he has suggested, this, to my mind, at the present moment at any rate, is negative action, and this is a matter about which we need not take a

view in haste. We should continue our pressure in conjunction with other Commonwealth countries and other non-aligned countries to impress upon the British Government the inadvisability of going ahead with their intentions.

**श्री सुन्दर सिंह मंडारी :** श्रीमन्, सरकार की तरफ से यह कहना कि अंग्रेजों ने हथियारों को देने के लिये जो कारण दिये हैं उसको सरकार उचित नहीं मानती और इसमें से साफ जाहिर होता है कि रंग-भेद की नीति को बढ़ावा देने के लिये इन हथियारों का इस्तेमाल होगा—इस बात की मुझे खुशी है कि उन्होंने सरकारों की तरफ से केवल कही हुई बातों पर भरोसा न कर के असलियत पर कुछ जाने का प्रयत्न किया है, अच्छा हो कि यही कर के साथ सम्बन्ध रखने वाली बातों के सम्बन्ध में अपनी नीतियां बनाने पर भी लागू हों और पड़ौस में जो हो रहा है उसके लिये विदेशी सरकारों के जो एक्सप्लेनेशन दिये गये हैं उन पर विश्वास करके उनकी फेस-वैल्यू पर ही ध्यान देने की जो आदत है उस आदत को यहां भी छोड़े जैसा कि इस मामले में छोड़ने की कोशिश की है। लेकिन क्या यह बात सच है कि इन हथियारों को कर अंग्रेज इंडियन ओशन में अपनी मिलिटरी पोजीशंस को कांसेलिडेट करने का भी प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं जैसा कि उसने सिंगापुर से हटने के निर्णय को बदलने का फैसला कर लिया अगर ऐसा है तो हम राष्ट्र-मंडलीय देशों का समर्थन इस बात के लिये प्राप्त करें कि इंग्लैंड अफ्रीकी देशों को हथियार देने के अपने इरादे को छोड़े। यह एक बात है। उसके साथ साथ यह जो घेरा घीरे-धीरे हिन्द महासागर पर बढ़ रहा है, और जिसका प्रभाव विभिन्न प्रकार से हमें प्राप्त हुआ, इंग्लैंड भी जिसमें जुड़ गया, रूस के बारे में भी इस प्रकार से प्रमाण हमें मिला जबकि मारिशस में भी उसने अपने आग को इस्टैबलिश करके धीरे धीरे एक मिलिटरी बेस, एक नैवल बेस बनाने का उसने प्रयत्न किया। आस्ट्रेलिया भी काकबनी की तरफ बढ़ रहा है अपने अड्डे बना कर। कम से कम

मलेशिया में इस बात की चिन्ता है। तो क्या भारत सरकार इस नये डेवलपमेंट के आधार पर हिन्द महासागर में अपनी स्थिति अधिक जटिल न बने इसके लिये भी कोई व्यावहारिक पग उठायेगी नम्बर एक।

और नम्बर दूसरा, जैसा कि श्री डगलस ह्यूम ने भी कहा है, अखबारों में जो उनका रिएक्शन है उसको मैं कोट करता हूं, उन्होंने कामनवेल्थ के बारे में कहा :

“Britain valued the association but insisted on being treated as a member able to decide in its own interest.”

यानी इंग्लैंड भी—क्योंकि सारे कामनवेल्थ देशों ने इस आर्म सप्लाय का विरोध किया है उन्होंने इसमें से यह रास्ता निकाला कि एसोसियेशन तो हम चाहते हैं लेकिन हम अपने इंटरेस्ट में अपनी नीती बनाने का अधिकार सुरक्षित रखना चाहते हैं। तो क्या इस रिएक्शन के आधार पर भी भारत सरकार इस कामनवेल्थ की आवश्यकता, इसकी उपादेयता के सम्बन्ध में पुनर्विचार करेगी।

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** It is a little difficult for me to answer because he did not put any specific question. So far as the general situation in the Indian Ocean area is concerned we have clarified our position more than once. We are totally opposed to the establishment of any military bases; we are opposed to the military presence of any country, particularly of the big powers, in the Indian Ocean area because we want this area to remain an ocean of peace rather than of tension and conflict. And from whatever source it comes we are totally opposed to the induction of any military presence or establishment of bases of any type there.

About the second question he says whether we should not review the utility of the Commonwealth. This is a matter which should be and is under constant review and if we find that this association of Commonwealth countries—it is no longer

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

British Commonwealth; it is an association of countries where the Asian and African countries are in a large majority . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Is it Subzi Mandi Commonwealth or what?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** It is neither Calcutta nor Subzi Mandi. It is a Commonwealth of free independent countries and the next Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference as you know is going to be held in Singapore. The next Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference if it takes place at all will take place in Singapore.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal):** That is one of the themes that you are propagating.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Who is the Head of the Commonwealth?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Not Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

The utility of continuing this association is a matter which is constantly under review. We feel that at the present moment with a preponderance of members from among the African and Asian countries who have recently become independent, it is a forum which if properly utilised could yield useful results both in the economic as well as in the political fields. If at any moment we find that there is no utility for it, we would certainly be fully prepared to say good bye but we should not do that in a huff.

Then he referred to the presence of the British in Singapore. I do not know what really is the implication of what the hon. Member has said because I had an impression that he and his party were in the past in favour of the continuance of the British presence in that area and they said that this withdrawal is likely to cause a vacuum which is a matter of concern, a theory which we have totally rejected.

**SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI:** We only warned about the situation which is developing by the

withdrawal of the British. We have never supported that the British should remain there.

1 P.M.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** I am glad that his opinion, at any rate, in this respect coincides with ours . . .

**SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI:** I do not know how you have been so ignorant.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** If you read the speeches of your party you will not get this impression. I never make a statement casually, Mr. Bhandari. Be rest assured and I am happy that you want to change it. In fact, in several matters . . .

**SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI:** I am happy that intelligence has dawned on you.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Now, if Malaysia or Singapore or any other country, for their defence, want to enter into a mutual agreement, then you may like it or you may not like it, but that is a different matter.

**SHRI C. D. PANDE:** They are wiser than you are.

**SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal):** It has been admitted that the proposed sale of arms by the United Kingdom to South Africa would constitute a grave threat to the independent States of Africa which are neighbours of South Africa. May I know from the hon. Minister why the Government has not mentioned the likely effect of this arms supply to South Africa? The arms supply to South Africa is likely to be used by the Rhodesian Government and other Governments to suppress and subdue the people's movement in certain other African countries who are fighting against the White regime and fighting for their emancipation. If the Government of India is committed to helping morally and materially those people who are fighting against the White domination and for their independence, why has not the statement condemned it and said something about their attempt to help those people who are fighting

against the White domination in other countries? These arms are also likely to be used in Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique to subdue the people's movement there. My second question is this. Why does not the Government make a categorical declaration now that if the United Kingdom does not comply with the request or does not properly respond to the feelings expressed by India as well as by the Afro-Asian countries, the Government of India will decline the invitation to attend the next meeting of the Commonwealth countries?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** About the first question, whether such arms are actually passed on to the racist regime in Rhodesia or not, the fact that the military power of South Africa gets augmented is in itself a direct help, direct encouragement and direct support to Rhodesia and for this reason alone we would be totally opposed to any such move, to supply arms to South Africa. In reply to the second question, I would like to say that the next Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, if at all it takes place, will be in Singapore and the invitation will be by the Prime Minister of Singapore. Whether it would be wise for us to decline such an invitation is a matter which should not be lightly commented upon. Singapore is a friendly country with whom we have the best of relations. Moreover, it is bad tactics to say what you want to do after ten steps at the very beginning. It is just not done.

**SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra):** Sir, I am particularly interested to know from the Foreign Minister—I have gone through the statement—I really wanted to find out what positive action Government wants to take. They have stated they have taken some positive steps like going to the United Nations where, as my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has stated, three out of the five abstained from voting. What is the use of the Security Council resolution banning arms supply to those African countries? Particularly I draw his attention and the Foreign Minister must be also aware of this.

I say in this move the feeling is developing in the United Kingdom about strengthening the racist movements, particularly against Asians and Indians, whatever it is. Why is the Government of India taking such a low posture and making a weak assessment of this type of thinking which is dangerous to Asian interests, Indian interests, interests generally on this side? So, Sir, it is not only to that extent the sending of expressions of regret and all those things will not do anything, but at the outset the minimum the Government of India can do is to see that this racist movement due to Enoch Powell or whoever he is is not strengthened. The Conservatives have repaid their voters by declaring their decision of sending arms to South Africa. So I wanted to know from the Government this, that they must denounce this type of action at the highest authority. Secondly, the danger of enforcement of the policy of apartheid is there. Lastly, the Asian and African heads of countries should call a meeting to decide on some positive steps. Further, I do not suggest that the Prime Minister should not go to the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference but by going there sufficient strength must be mustered to show to the United Kingdom that the interests of the Commonwealth countries will not be sacrificed by such actions of the United Kingdom Government.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** I have noted his views and I greatly value them.

**SHRI A. D. MANI:** I want to refer very briefly to three points for clarification. My hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta raised a question about the United Nations in respect of this issue. May I ask the Minister whether he would instruct our delegation to raise also the issue of the Simonstown Agreement in the U.N. General Assembly because even in the United States there is a good deal of scepticism about Britain being involved in the Simonstown Agreement and their defending the Cape route. Even Britain's western allies do not believe in the desirability of the agreement, and they are

[Shri A. D. Mani]

not bound by the agreement. We are also interested in the Indian Ocean area. We should raise the matter of this agreement and the general opposition of all Asian countries to any kind of big military power bloc emerging in the Indian Ocean area.

The second point is, the British Government has acted in defiance of a U.N. resolution. We are a Commonwealth country. Can we not ask Britain as a Commonwealth country what are the kinds of arms she is supplying to South Africa? The plea offered by the Heath Government is that they are supplying maritime weapons.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Aircraft, helicopters . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: We have got a right to ask them what is the kind of weapons they are supplying to South Africa and what steps they are taking to see that they are not used against the African population. The British Government may well say "this is a matter which concerns us", but this concerns also the Commonwealth.

The third point is, I quite agree with the hon. Minister that we cannot decide the question of India's continuance in the Commonwealth in a calling attention motion. Apart from this, the Minister is aware that India is subjected to humiliation, that Indian immigrants are asked to move in restricted areas . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It cannot be decided in a calling attention motion or in an unstarred question.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Indians are being kicked out of Great Britain. In the face of this humiliation that we are facing, I only want the Minister to tell us and clarify by saying that we shall keep an open mind on the question of walking out of the Commonwealth if the need arises.

This is necessary because everybody thinks that we are hanging on to the coat-tails of Mr. Heath or Mr. Douglas Home. We want that impression to be dispelled.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: On the first issue, I do not know why we should depend upon the American attitude which in this case is also critical of the British move. Our objection is much more fundamental. Here is a racist regime wedded to a policy of Apartheid; we are opposed to it and we need not go into the interpretation of the terms of the Simonstown Agreement; we are opposed to any supply of arms even if the agreement enjoins some responsibility on them. After all, the Labour Government were not supplying arms. Therefore this is not a legal matter. It is a political issue. We should say that we are totally opposed to it, agreement or no agreement.

Then on the second issue that there is a United Nations embargo, that we are a member of the Commonwealth and that we should ask the United Kingdom to give us information about the supply of arms; we are not interested in that information at all. We are opposed to the supplying of any arms. Do you have an open mind in this? If they convince you that particular types of arms are not going to be used against others, will you accept it? So, this argument, entering into this type of query, weakens our stand which should be forthright that we are opposed to it, instead of entering into any argument with them.

About the general question as to whether we should or we should not continue in the Commonwealth, I have already expressed my views.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY (Tamil Nadu): As the Government and the country are aware, recently a Resolution was passed in the Security Council whereby they have condemned the United Kingdom for having violated . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, Mr. Mani always monopolises on every point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you want, I will give you a chance.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY: Recently, the Security Council has passed a Resolution condemning the violation of this embargo which was there for over 10½ years . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is PL-480.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY: Let me be heard. What is this?

Recently, a Resolution has been passed by the Security Council condemning the United Kingdom for having violated this embargo which was in existence for over 10½ years. They have also passed a Resolution that African countries and other countries must also adopt measures whereby they can see that this is implemented well. From our side, what is the line that you are going to think of to see that this measure is carried out? The Commonwealth Conference is to be very shortly convened and the Prime Minister is going there. Though we cannot refuse the invitation can we not at any rate move in the matter and express our censure or resentment as regards this and pass a resolution saying that what they have done is only creating further tension so far as the Apartheid Policy is concerned? Being a member of the Commonwealth, we have got every right to do it. If it is not allowed, let us call such of those like-minded people to come to Delhi and we can express our concern and condemn the United Kingdom Government for having violated this embargo.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I do not know what I am supposed to answer, Sir. He is more or less repeating what I have said in my statement. No new point has been urged.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY: How are you going to act in pursuance of the Security Council Resolution. I would like to know whether the Prime Minister would pass a Resolution in the coming Commonwealth Conference expressing our regret at the United Kingdom violating certain principles whereby we can condemn their attitude?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: We have not waited for the Commonwealth Conference to clarify our attitude. We are here and now saying that this action of theirs is condemnable.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Crissa): And we have no other friends or supporters.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why don't you say that it has committed a crime against mankind?

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS (Assam): In fact I was very much disappointed. The basic question he has not replied at all. It is all very good to say that we feel concerned. We go to the United Nations and express our concern. But nothing will happen at the United Nations. It is absolutely useless. We wrote letters to the British Prime Minister. He also replied to us. The Government has admitted that the explanation given by the British Government for the proposed supply of arms to South Africa cannot be accepted as valid. That is only a cover for strengthening the racist regime in South Africa against the interests of the coloured people. Now, this a direct attack, if I have understood correctly on the very basic foreign policy of the Government of India as a whole. What do you propose to do about it? Simply writing letters and expressing opinions, is that sufficient? A very basic question has been asked by everybody . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Ordinary letters will now go Express Delivery.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: . . . about our stay in the Commonwealth. The honourable Foreign Minister has frequently said something which is nothing but an evasion of this question. I want to ask a concrete question. What are the factors that stand in the way of the Government of India for not indicating in the clearest possible terms to the British Prime Minister that if they supply arms to South Africa, if they do not listen to our advice, then we will walk out of the Commonwealth? What are the factors standing in the way of our Government telling the



[Shri Bipinpal Das]

British Government in that language?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I cannot accept this language. I do not agree with him. Let him remain disappointed. That is all that I can say.

श्री राजनारायण : हमको कोई प्रश्न करना नहीं है । मैं आपके द्वारा यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो सदन का समय इतना नष्ट किया गया है उसमें हम बहुत दुःखी और चिन्तित हैं । मुझे तो इस सम्बन्ध में केवल कुछ अपनी राय का इजहार करना है कि हम 15 अगस्त 1947 से ...

श्री उपसभापति : आपको सवाल नहीं करना है तो आप बैठ जाइये ।

श्री राजनारायण : 15 अगस्त 1947 से हम इस राय के हैं कि भारत को कामनवेल्थ छोड़ देना चाहिये और कांग्रेस से अलग होने का कारण भी हमारा यही रहा है । हमारे मित्र श्री विपिनपाल दास जी ने जो प्रश्न पूछा है और उसके जबाब में मंत्री जी ने जो यह कहा कि हम इस बात से एग्री नहीं करते हैं, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वे इस मामले में सीरियस नहीं हैं । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आज भारत सरकार में यह हिम्मत है कि वह यह कहे कि जब टोरी गवर्नमेंट की सरकार वहाँ पर आ गई है तो वह लेबर गवर्नमेंट की नीतियों को बदलेगी और दक्षिण आफ्रिका का जो सवाल है वह उलट देगी और रोडेशिया की सरकार को हथियार सप्लाई करेगी । इस तरह से जो टोरी सरकार रंग भेद की सुप्रीमैसी की नीति पर चलेगी तो उसके विरोध में यह सरकार स्वतः यहाँ पर कामनवेल्थ और अन्य राष्ट्रों को बुलाये और फिर यह सरकार कहे कि हम आज ब्रिटिश सरकार की इस नीति के घोर विरोधी हैं और उसकी घोर भर्त्सना करते हैं । क्या इस सरकार में इस तरह के कार्य करने की हिम्मत है कि जो सरकार काले गोरे के रंग भेद को इस जगत में पुनः पैदा कर रही है उसके खिलाफ कोई इस तरह की कार्यवाही करे ।

हम यह जानते हैं कि जब जब टोरी सरकार आयेगी तब वह लेबर गवर्नमेंट के फण्डामेंटल और मूल पालिसियों को बदलेगी । हम इस चीज को अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि इंग्लैण्ड इस तरह की बात करेगा । परन्तु मुझे तो यह प्रश्न करना है कि भारत की हिजड़ी सरकार इस संबंध में क्या कर रही है । भारत में आज जो यह हिजड़ी सरकार है, नयुन्सक सरकार है ...

श्री उपसभापति : अच्छे शब्द इस्तेमाल करें ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : हिजड़ी क्या हुआ ?

श्री राजनारायण : नयुन्सक ।

श्री महावीर त्यागो : यहाँ कोई मेम्बर नयुन्सक नहीं है ।

श्री राजनारायण : तो मेरा कहना यह है कि यहाँ पर हमारे सम्मानित सदस्यों ने ब्रिटिश सरकार की पालिसी के बारे में जो कुछ कहा है वह सब व्यर्थ है । यह बात तो हमको मान लेनी चाहिये कि वह इस तरह की बात करेगी ही, अगर वह नहीं करती है तो अपने कर्तव्य से विहीन हो जाती है । भारत सरकार जो यह कहती है कि हम रंग भेद की नीति को नहीं मानते हैं, हम तो मानव को एक मानते हैं, सब को समान अधिकार होने चाहिये, उपनिवेशवाद खत्म होना चाहिये, तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि उपनिवेशवाद के प्रति भारत सरकार की यही नीति है ।

मैं इस पक्ष में हूँ कि इस सदन की राय जाहिर की जाय कि यह सदन भारत की सरकार को आदेश देता है कि ब्रिटिश सरकार ने जो अब तक की नीति में परिवर्तन किया है और दक्षिण अफ्रीका को हथियार भेजकर जो रंग भेद की नीति को चलाने की साजिश की है उसके विरुद्ध वह सक्रिय और ठोस कदम उठाये और कामनवेल्थ से अपना नाता-रिश्ता तोड़े । अगर यह प्रस्ताव सदन कर सकता है तो सदन को करना चाहिए । क्या सरकार हमारे इस प्रस्ताव को मानेगी ?

**श्री महावीर त्यागी :** जो लफ्ज 'नपुंसक' इन्होंने कहा है इसको एक्सपंज कर देना चाहिए क्योंकि हाउस में जितने मेम्बर हैं सब शादीशुदा हैं, बच्चे वाले हैं, उनको नपुंसक कहना बिल्कुल गलत है।

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Sir, the hon. Member started by saying that he wanted to express an opinion and he did not want to ask any questions. But towards the end he asked a question to which I have already replied and I have nothing more to add.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** I would like to know if the U.K. can claim that it would sell arms to South Africa in its own interest—whether it is in its own interest or not, it is a different matter; that is what the Minister says—is it not in the interest of India to claim the right to sell arms to the overwhelming majority in South Africa which is struggling against this Fascist regime?

**THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI S. N. MISHRA):** India is so overwhelmed with arms that it can sell them to others?

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** I understand that they have got five hundred or six hundred crores of military hardware from the Soviet Union alone. What are you going to do with this? At least you can help them.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA:** Why don't you ask China to do it?

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** So, in the interest of Rhodesians and the South African people, as well as in our own interest, why should you not claim this right to sell arms to them? Secondly, I would like to know whether he would consider the question of raising this issue in the United Nations to condemn those countries which are members of the U.N. and which have violated U.N. agreements on banning of trade with, or selling of arms to South Africa. Have you moved any such thing? If not, why not? What are you doing? You are not even doing that. Thirdly, he waxed eloquent that it is no longer a British Commonwealth. Nobody would

believe this. If a free vote is taken in this House or in the other House, or even if a referendum is taken in the country, the vote would be for quitting the Commonwealth. Have you the courage to do it? You are tied to the apron-strings of so many countries—U.K., U.S.A. and others—against our national interest.

So, when the U.K. is deliberately violating this agreement, is violating the resolution of the U.N. you are only expressing concern. You are expressing concern for South Africa, as far as I understand, for the last five to ten years. You have only expressed concern and have done nothing else. So at least now would you consider, in view of all those things, the question of quitting this damned Commonwealth?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** I hope Shrimati Nandini Satpathy will not be made the Minister in charge of expressing concern.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Sometimes I express happiness.

Sir, the first question that he has asked is why we should not claim the right to sell arms to the freedom fighters in Mozambique, Angola or South Africa. I ask: From whom have we to claim that right? As a sovereign country if you decide that it is in your national interest to sell arms to someone, how can anybody object? It is quite another thing whether you actually sell arms or not. So there is no question of claiming any right from anyone. You should not put it as if it a right to be claimed from somebody. It is the sovereign right of any country to sell arms to whomsoever it wants.

Then the second question he has asked is: Why we are not taking the line in the U.N. that those who are contravening the embargo on supplies to Rhodesia, should be condemned. This is precisely our attitude. We have ourselves raised our voice exactly in those terms in the United Nations.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** Have you moved any resolution?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** Yes, yes. We have co-sponsored a resolution. Mr. Niren Ghosh generally is a well-read person, but probably he is not keeping himself informed about the U.N. Persons of his way of thinking have, of late, lost interest in the U.N. That is my feeling; otherwise, he would not have put this question.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** What is the date of that resolution?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** That has been adopted by the Security Council of the United Nations.

And his third question is one which I have already answered and I cannot add anything to what I have said already.

**SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa):** Sir, on 22nd July in the House of Commons the Foreign Secretary, Alec Douglas Home, when he was giving a battering, said,

"We have told Mr. Volster that it is our intention to sell arms under the Simonstown Agreement, but we have taken no final decision."

But when it was again pursued he said,

"The decision at the end of the day must be the decision of the British Government and nobody can make it for us."

So I want to ask the Minister what the content of the letter is, whether after making the decision that they will supply arms to South Africa, they have asked us for our opinion or whether they are going to give any weight to our opinion. What is the content of that letter? Are you prepared to lay a copy of that letter on the Table of the House?

My second question is this. We are told that during the discussion in the House of Commons it was announced that sixteen nations of the Commonwealth had already informed the British Government about their reaction. Can you enlighten us if you consulted other Commonwealth Nations? Which are the countries which have objected to the supply of arms to South Africa?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** With regard to the first question I would say that in the communication sent to our Prime Minister, the British Prime Minister had not said that they had already taken a decision. In fact they said this is their intention and they asked for our reaction, and we have conveyed that to them.

With regard to his second question, all the African countries in the Commonwealth have opposed it. Even Canada has opposed it. We have opposed it. If the honourable Member is interested, I will give him a complete list of such countries.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Twenty out of twenty-nine members.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:** I will give a complete list.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Shri Shejwalkar.

**SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR:** I am not going to put any question. I want to lodge my protest. I have been submitting in the last three days . . .

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** I am now giving you a chance.

**SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR:** Those people whose names do not appear in the list have been given chances . . .

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** You represent a different political group.

**SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR:** I do not want to put any question. But I want to lodge my protest.

**SHRI KRISHAN KANT:** May I know from the hon. Minister whether the conference of Commonwealth countries which you want to have in Lusaka will be an informal conference or a formal conference? The hon. Minister said that at the Lusaka non-aligned conference, many countries belonging to the Commonwealth will also be present and you will have talks with them. May I know whether it will be an informal talk or formal talk and will

they come to any conclusion as to what they are going to do at the next Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference? As Shri Niren Ghosh said, many African national movements are asking for arms from India because they have come to the conclusion that non-violent struggle is not going to help them. Are the Government of India prepared to supply them arms?

श्री राजनारायण : कभी आपने कोई मवमेंट किया है ? ऐसा हथ्ता करके बेवकूफी की बात करते हैं ।

**SARDAR SVARAN SINGH:** With regard to the first question, my expectation is that the non-aligned conference as a whole will also take up this matter and it is hoped that a resolution strongly disapproving or condemning the proposed action will be passed. There, we will fully associate ourselves with that move.

The second question does not arise out of the present Calling Attention motion.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

**ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS (1968-69) OF THE INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE, CALCUTTA AND OTHER PAPERS**

**THE MINISTER OF STATE (SHRIMATI NANDINI SATPATHY):** Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Thirty seventh Annual Report and Accounts of the Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta, for the year 1968-69, together with the Auditors' Report thereon. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-3691/70.]

**NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE NAVY ACT, 1957**

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI NARENDRA SINGH MAHIDA):** Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under section 185 of the Navy Act, 1957, a copy each of the following

L/B(N)10SRS-7(a)

Notifications (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Defence:—

(i) Notification S.R.O. No. 40, dated the 6th January, 1967, together with a statement giving reasons for the delay in laying the Notification on the Table.

(ii) Notification S.R.O. No. 22, dated the 1st January, 1968, together with a statement giving reasons for the delay in laying the Notification on the Table.

(iii) Notification S.R.O. No. 217, dated the 24th June, 1968, together with a statement giving reasons for the delay in laying the Notification on the Table.

(iv) Notification S.R.O. No. 159, dated the 9th February, 1969, together with a statement giving reasons for the delay in laying the Notification on the Table.

(v) Notification S.R.O. No. 161, dated the 1st May, 1969, together with a statement giving reasons for the delay in laying the Notification on the Table.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-3784/70 for (i) to (v).]

(vi) Notification S.R.O. No. 199, dated the 10th December, 1969, publishing the Naval Ceremonial Conditions of Service and Miscellaneous (Second Amendment) Regulation, 1970.

(vii) Notification S.R.O. No. 229, dated the 3rd March, 1970, publishing the Naval Ceremonial Conditions of Service and Miscellaneous (Fourth Amendment) Regulations, 1970.

(viii) Notification S.R.O. No. 209, dated the 18th March, 1970, publishing the Naval Ceremonial Conditions of Service and Miscellaneous (5th Amendment) Regulations, 1970.

(ix) Notification S.R.O. No. 201/70, dated the 2nd May, 1970, publishing the Naval Ceremonial Conditions of Service and Miscellaneous (Amendment) Regulations, 1970.