

I Mr. Chairman].
received from Shrimati Tara Ram-
chandra Sathe: —

"I reached Delhi on 20th May to attend the Session of the Rajya Sabha. Due to unforeseen domestic emergency, I was immediately called back to Poona. In view of the emergency which still prevails, I will be unable to 'attend the current Session of the Rajya Sabha and I will feel most grateful if leave of absence is granted to me."

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission' be granted to Shrimati Tara Sathe for remaining absent from aD meetings of the House during the curr>.t session?

(No hon. Member dissented.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER *RE* SITUATION IN WEST ASIA

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, may I express sincere regret for keeping this hon. House waiting yesterday for the statement on the West Asian crisis, which I was to have made by 5 P.M.? I am sorry for the inconvenience caused to you, Sir, and to hon. Members. However, I should like to assure the hon. House that this was due entirely to the fact that I had to remain in the other House to answer the points which arose out of the statement which I had made there. Even *go*, I had sent word to the Secretary in advance that I might be a little late. I believe that the Deputy Chairman was informed later by my colleague, Shri Gujral, who also informed the House accordingly

I hope hon. Members will show their usual understanding of the situation in which I was placed.

Nearly two weeks ago my colleague, the Minister of External Affairs, made a statement in this House giving Government's assessment of the explosive situation in West Asia and expressing our deep concern at the developments that were taking place there.

Since then our efforts in the Security Council, as well as outside, have been concentrated on counselling moderation and lessening of tension and preservation of peace in that area. Our Representative in the Security Council, in consultation with the non-permanent members of the Council and others, made earnest endeavours to formulate a resolution which might be acceptable to the Council. The resolution aimed at supporting the Secretary General's recommendations contained in his reports to the Council and earnestly appealing to all parties concerned to exercise restraint in order to avoid actions which might aggravate tension. Our Representative met with favourable response and it was hoped that in the next meeting of the Security Council significant progress would be made in this regard.

While these efforts were still continuing, news came on the morning of May 5 of an outbreak of hostilities between Israel and the UAR and other Arab countries. The Secretary-General of the United Nations made a report to the emergency meeting of the Security Council yesterday, in which he gave an account of various reports by the UNEF Commander and the UN Observers on the UN Truce Supervision Organisation and the Mixed Armistice Commissions, of attacks by Israeli aircraft on UAR and Syrian territory.

I do not wish to utter harsh words or use strong language. But on the basis of information available there can be no doubt that Israel has esca-

lated the situation into an armed conflict, which has now acquired the proportions of a full-scale war.

The world today faces a disastrous war in West Asia. The armed forces of Israel and those of UAR and other Arab countries are locked in combat and the situation becomes graver by the hour. If not stopped, this war is likely to expand into a much wider one, drawing into its vortex other countries and developing perhaps into a world war. World peace is in grave peril. Our own national interests are bound up with peace and stability in West Asia. I do not need to expand on this or to describe the horrors and consequences of such a war. It is our solemn duty as a Government as also that of hon. Members of Parliament to help in the restoration of peace in the present perilous situation. It is the bounden duty of all countries, large and small, to work towards this end.

In the Security Council we have been making earnest efforts for a cease-fire and withdrawal of all armed forces to the positions they occupied on June the 4th. We have just now received news that the security Council has unanimously adopted a simple resolution calling for as a first step a cease-fire. Evidently in view of the gravity of the situation a consensus emerged in the Council in favour of bringing about immediate cease-fire leaving other steps to be taken up later. This is a hopeful development. However, the resolution does not mean that troops are to withdraw to positions as on 4th June. Our representative in the Council has stated our position and this matter of withdrawal will necessarily have to be taken up in the Council without delay.

Hon. Members have no doubt learnt with deep resentment of the wanton Israeli artillery attack and subsequent strafings by Israeli aircraft resulting in death and injury of a number of personnel of the Indian UNEF Contingent in Gaza. These attacks were deliberate and without provocation

and in spite of the clear and unmistakable UN markings and identification of our Contingent. I addressed a message to the Secretary-General of the United Nations expressing our grief and indignation at these incidents and asking him to take effective steps to ensure the safety of our Contingent and their early evacuation from the area of hostilities. We have now learnt from our representative that the UN have alerted most of the shipping companies around the world to provide a ship immediately to withdraw our Contingent from the Gaza beach.

According to the latest reports in addition to the 5 killed and 10 injured earlier in two attacks, as a result of further shelling that took place, 3 more have been killed and 3 others injured bringing the total loss to 8 killed and 13 known to be injured so far. Government will naturally give adequate compensation to the families of the 8 soldiers who have lost their lives, and we shall make sure that the amount is not less than what they would have received had these men lost their lives in active combat. Meanwhile I am sending a sum of Rs. 40,000, that is, Rs. 5,000 per family, by way of immediate assistance to the bereaved families from the Prime Minister's National Relief Fund. There can be no justification for Israeli Armed Forces to have attacked our forces whose whereabouts, identification marking and intention to withdraw were clearly known to the Israeli authorities.

The Secretary-General in his message of condolence has stated: "It is a tragedy that these officers and men who came from India to serve the cause of peace in the Near East should, through no fault of their own, have lost their lives in a situation where they had no means of defending themselves and at a time when they were about to return to their home country". While conveying this message the Secretary-General has paid tribute to India's noble and generous contribution to peace-keeping operations in West Asia and else-

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi.]

where. I am sure the House will join me, Sir, in sending our sympathy and condolence to the bereaved families.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like the House to stand up for a minute as a mark of respect to the memory of those who have been killed.

(The Members stood in silence for one minute.)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: May I just make one brief clarification? I believe as I was reading my statement I said that the Secretary-General's report to the Security Council was on May 5th. Actually I meant June 5th.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Sir, many of us in this House will agree with some of the sentiments expressed by the Prime Minister. We all pay our tribute to the members of our Armed Forces who were engaged in a mission of peace and were attacked when they had no means of protecting themselves and lost their lives. An attack on defenceless people is 'jondemnable in the strongest terms. We would all like to pay our tribute to our representative in the UN, Mr. Parthasarathy, for the neutral stand that he has taken and the policy of trying to avoid war and to seek peace. But one is intrigued why the same policy was not followed by the Government here. The Government of India gave up its non-aligned policy and took a rather partisan stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Let us look at facts as they are. Is it not a fact that President Nasser vowed to obliterate the State of Israel which has come into existence, which the United Nations have approved of? Along with him all the Arab nations have joined, some at his call immediately, some have come to his aid. How does this augur for maintaining peace in the

world and why was it necessary for our Government here and the Minister of External Affairs here to take a partisan attitude in this matter? Why should we support a person, a State, who calls for the obliteration of a State that has come into existence under the auspices of the United Nations?

AN HON. MEMBER: They have not done so.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am sorry friends who do not seem to be well informed are disturbing me, but if people read the newspapers, they will know that it was the call of President Nasser that was the beginning of the provocation. If you provoke a man by saying we will finish you, what else do you expect? The best means of defence is attack. May I ask what did the Government of India do when India was attacked and when the Government of India failed to do that earlier, what was the result? When we trusted China we were a little alert from past experience, did we not fare better? too much, how did we suffer? When in this case I think our Government has taken a wrong stand, and because of our policy, misguided policy, we have not taken the right course; we did not give the right lead to the world for the maintenance of peace. I think the Prime-Minister owes an explanation to this country and to the Parliament for taking this stand, for giving up the stand that her respected father took, first asking for a cease-fire whenever there was a trouble, asking for removal of causes of irritation or the reasons why peace is disturbed.

"" SHRI* BPUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): What did he do in 1956 . . . SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: What did we get in return when we were attacked? We do not learn the lessons of history. We went to the aid of the Arabs at the time of the Suez crisis. When China attacked us, what did we get from the Arabs whom we went to their support? When Pakistan attacked us, what did we get from the same United

Arab Republic? Why was it necessary for us to go out of our way and make provocative statements of this type instead of pleading for restraint, for peace, and requesting President Nasser to desist from making such provocative statements such as obliterating a State that has come into being.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: President Nasser did not do it. Israel did it.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): No, no.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir, I would like to say that in this matter we should have taken the aid of other African countries. We should have called upon them to appeal for peace.

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU (Uttar Pradesh) : South Africa you mean?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am afraid that the doctor's brain is working in another direction. So, he is forgetting his geography. He should concentrate on the loop and not dabble in all things. There is Ethiopia, there is Kenya, there is the Ivory Coast. If he looks at our own continent, he will find Ceylon, Nepal, Thailand and Japan. These are countries that stand for peace, and with their help we should have urged restraint, for restoring conditions for peace in the United Nations. Our Government's policy has failed badly in this. And the Prime Minister owes an explanation to this House and the people for taking up an attitude that was rather aggressive, that was rather likely to help to escalate the war, rather than to preserve peace.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I welcome the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister because I think a very correct position has been taken. We have for years and years expressed our solidarity with the Arab people who were victims of imperialism, whose countries were divided and torn to bits and who were victims of suppression and of imperialistic exploi-

tation. We have stood by them and they have stood by us. Let us not forget the origin of Israel. The territory of Israel was deliberately created, carved, out of the homeland of the Arab people in order to give a base to the imperialistic powers to manoeuvre and disrupt the growing unity of the Arab people and of the Arab nations. That was a deliberate manoeuvre on the part of the imperialist powers in order to split the growing strength and unity of the Arab people. Now, it was argued that the Jews should get a homeland, those Jewish people who were murdered by Hitler in Germany and in the whole of Europe, who were always treated as outcasts in all European countries, who were oppressed and suppressed and who were thrown out of their real homelands. The homeland of the Jews of Germany was Germany; the homeland of the Jews of England was England; the homeland of the Jews of France was France. But they were thrown out of their homelands; they were put at one place. An attempt has been made and is being made to convert them into imperialist tools in order to disrupt and weaken the unity of the Arab nations. Therefore, what has happened today is not accidental or fortuitous. A conspiracy was hatched, plans were prepared. The Israel State was armed to the teeth, just as Pakistan was armed to the teeth, by these very nations, these very imperialist forces in the name of fighting communism or something like that. Now, because the Arab nations are growing in strength or marching forward from stage to stage and are foiling the conspiracy of the imperialist powers, they have now chosen this opportunity to ask their puppet rulers of Israel to come out and attack the Arab nations, to create a war scene, create disturbances, create a conflagration, which will lead to a much bigger conflagration. Therefore, we, as a nation, stand by our pledges, stand by those brethren of the Arab nations who

[Shri Z. A. Ahmad.]

have stood by us in the past and we have to .

AN HON. MEMBER: When? Never.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD: And our national policy has been to support them, treat them as our brethren and to stand shoulder to shoulder *ith them against the imperialist conspiracy.

Therefore, I welcome the statement. Only I want to say that we should be more forthright in our condemnation of the Israeli rulers; not only the Israeli rulers but also the imperialist powers who are today behind these Israeli rulers. We should state it categorically to the so-called maritime powers. They call themselves maritime powers. I do not know how they call themselves so. They are pirates. We should condemn the pirates, the British and American pirates, and should stand firmly by our resolution, stand firmly by our national policy which, in this case, has been correctly applied.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भण्डारी (राजस्थान):

सभापति जी, भारत के जिन सैनिकों ने शान्ति स्थापना के कार्य में अपनी जान कुर्बान कर दी है, उनके प्रति हम भी अपनी सद्भावना प्रकट करते हैं। प्रधान मंत्री महोदया ने कल लोक-सभा में जो वक्तव्य दिया था जवाबों के बदले में, उसमें उन्होंने इस बात का उल्लेख किया था। मैं उसको यहां पर कोट कर रहा हूं जिसमें उन्होंने यह कहा है :

"India was willing to withdraw the Indian Contingent earlier but the United Nations expressed their inability to agree to evacuation by air."

इसमें से एक यह अर्थ निकलता है कि हमारे सैनिकों को हटाने की सारी जिम्मेदारी संयुक्त राष्ट्र-संघ पर थी और संयुक्त राष्ट्र-संघ की व्यवस्था के अभाव में ही उनको वहां से नहीं हटाया जा सका। आज के समाचार पत्र में, स्टेट्समैन को कोट करता हूं, यह यू० एन० एजेंसी की एक रिपोर्ट

है, जिस को पी० टी० आई० ने भेजी है, जिसमें यह कहा गया है कि :

"But the question of economy was raised and it was considered cheaper to get the troops to India by ship."

अब यह प्रश्न खड़ा होता है कि क्या हमने केवल कुछ थोड़े से अर्थ कंसिडरेशन के आधार पर ही अपने सैनिकों को वहां पर इस तरह की खतरनाक स्थिति पर मरने के लिए छोड़ा? आज जो आंकड़े प्रधान मंत्री महोदया ने दिये हैं, कल जितने आंकड़े दिये थे, आज उससे ज्यादा लोगों के मरने तथा घायल होने की खबर है। तो मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि इस सारे नेगजिलेंस के लिए उन सैनिकों को वहां से हटाने के लिए कौन व्यक्ति जिम्मेदार था? हमारे सैनिक इतने दिनों तक वहां पर क्यों रहे और अब भी क्या उनको वहां से हटाने के लिए केवल जहाजों का ही इस्तेमाल कर रहे हैं जिनको हम कमिशनड करना चाहते हैं? हम अपनी तरफ से उनको हवाई जहाजों के द्वारा सफलता यहां पर लाने का प्रयत्न क्यों नहीं कर रहे हैं? एक तो यह सवाल है।

दूसरा मेरा निवेदन यह है कि कल भी और पहले भी, इस तरह का बार बार समाचार मांगा गया है कि हम जो आरोप लगा रहे हैं इस सारे युद्ध को भड़काने की घटना का, उसका आधार क्या है? क्या इसका आधार काहिरा से प्राप्त होने वाले ही समाचार हैं? हम यह चाहते हैं कि जिन समाचारों के आधार पर लड़ाई को प्रारम्भ होने का इल्जाम है, या एकतरफा लगाये जा रहे हैं, उसके बारे में जानकारी सब को उपलब्ध कराई जाय। अभी भी इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था नहीं हो पाई है जिसके द्वारा एक निष्पक्ष रूप से सारी स्थिति को जानने का मौका मिल सके। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि

परिस्थित अभी भीषण नहीं हैं, वहां पर बिस्फोट बड़ा है, युद्ध की परिस्थिति बड़ी है और कोई ताज्जुब नहीं कि अगर इस लड़ाई की जल्द से जल्द रोकने की कोशिश नहीं की गई, तो यह एक बहुत बड़े विश्व-युद्ध में परिणित हो सकती है।

आज प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने बतलाया कि यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में जो प्रस्ताव पास हुआ है वह प्रस्ताव भी बिना इस झंझट में गये हुए कि किस ने सर्वप्रथम लड़ाई चलाई, कौन दोषी है, इन सब पर न जाकर, जो आज विश्व शान्ति के लिए मुख्य प्रश्न है, युद्ध रोकना और इसी बात को सामने रखकर वह प्रस्ताव पास हुआ है ताकि वहां पहले विराम हो जाय। मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या भारत इस मामले में यूनाइटेड नेशन्स का जो एक फोरम है हमारे सामने इस प्रकार के युद्धों को भड़कने से रोकने के लिए, उसी में अपने रोल को ज्यादा प्रभावी बना कर ही इस लड़ाई को रोकवाने में अदा करेगा जिस का सीधा प्रभाव हम पर भी पड़ता है? स्वेज के बन्द होने से वहां पर युद्ध होने से आज भारत को मिलने वाली अन्न की सहायता पर और भिन्न भिन्न प्रकार की सहायता पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ सकता है। और यह युद्ध का क्षेत्र हमारे इतना निकट है कि हमारे शत्रु देश जो हमारे पड़ोस में बंटे हैं, वे भी इसका नाजायज फायदा उठा कर भारत में इस युद्ध की परिस्थिति का लाभ उठा सकते हैं। इसलिये यह नितांत आवश्यक है कि यह युद्ध जल्दी से जल्दी समाप्त होना चाहिये। हम अगर इस युद्ध को प्रभावी ढंग से बन्द करवाने में कारगर हो सकते हैं तो तभी हो सकते हैं जब हमने जो अपना स्टैण्ड यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में लिया है निष्पक्ष रहने का, किसी पर आरोप न लगाने का उसी को हम यहां भी बराबर दोहराये और उस आधार पर मध्यस्थ बन कर इस सारी

शांति को स्थापित करने में हम अधिक से अधिक प्रभावी और कारगर कदम उठावें। मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या हम अरब देशों का पक्ष लेकर के इस युद्ध को रोकने में समर्थ हो सकेंगे और क्या इससे वहां पर शांति स्थापित करने में हमें ज्यादा कामयाबी हो सकेगी?

प्रधान मंत्री के ध्यान में मैं एक बात और लाना चाहता हूं। भारत को अगर यह जिम्मेदारी पूरी करनी है तो भारत में एक स्वर से जिस बात को कहा जायेगा उसका ज्यादा महत्व होगा। मैं जानता हूं कि पार्टियां ने अपना एक दृष्टिकोण अपनाया है। मुझे अभी एक आवाज विरोधी पक्ष की तरफ से सुनने को मिली है। लेकिन मैं प्रधान मंत्री को यह बता देना चाहता हूं कि उन्होंने जो अरबों का पक्ष लिया है, इसमें देश का एकमत नहीं है। जब हम एक मत लेकर के यूनाइटेड नेशन्स के इस फोरम के अन्तर्गत निष्पक्ष मनोवृत्ति के आधार पर शान्ति को प्रस्थापित करने का प्रयत्न करेंगे तभी हम प्रभावी हो सकेंगे।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Consensus contains of Americans.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : अगर हम सब मिल कर के और सारे देश का जो एक कन्सन्स बन सकता है, शांति को प्रस्थापित करने में जो वास्तव में प्रभावी हो सकेगा, ऐसी एक राय हम इस मामले में ले करके चलेगे तो फिर हम एक प्रभावी पक्ष इसमें रख सकते हैं। उस यूनेनिमिटी के आधार पर, उस देश के एक जनरल कंसेंस के आधार पर हम अगर इसमें अपना दृष्टिकोण लेंगे तो आगे शांति प्रयत्नों में और इस लड़ाई को रोकवाने में हमें ज्यादा सफलता प्राप्त होगी।

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH (Uttar Pradesh); Sir, in view of the fact that Israel is a State recognised by the Government of India, may I know, Sir, if the hon. Prime Minister will make it clear that India will never be a party to the extermination of Israel? That is number one.

Secondly, according to information in possession of the hon. Prime Minister, it was Israel which started war.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Dahyabhai Patel has admitted it.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: I will not be guided by Mr. Dahyabhai Patel or even by the hon. Member. I want definite information. What is the basis or the source of information with the Prime Minister in support of her statement that it was Israel which escalated war? I would further suggest to the hon. Prime Minister to make further enquiry because, Sir, in my humble opinion India should adopt an attitude of strict neutrality between Israel and the Arab States. Whatever our sympathies might be either with the Arabs or with the Israelis, our attitude should be one of neutrality and active neutrality in order that India might be able to play an effective role in bringing about cease-fire or peace or successful mediation between the warring groups.

Thirdly, in view of the dislocation, caused in the Suez Canal area, will the hon. Prime Minister state, if she is not in a position to state here at the moment, that she will take effective steps to ensure that the supplies of foodgrains to this country are not disturbed as a result of the dislocation in the Suez Canal area?

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
श्रीमान्, मैं आपके द्वारा सदन के सम्मानित
सदस्यों से निवेदन करूंगा कि जब एक

अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समस्या जो एक विश्वव्यापी युद्ध के स्वरूप में भी बदल सकती है, उस पर विचार हो तो गंभीरता और मस्तिष्क के संतुलन के साथ होना चाहिये। हमारे कुछ मित्रों ने जो सवाल किया उस सवाल का जवाब तो प्रधान मंत्री देंगी ही। लेकिन आज सवाल है क्या? जो यह कहते हैं कि भारत सरकार की नीति तटस्थता की हो, सृजनात्मक हो, त्रिपटिव हो, कांस्ट्रक्टिव हो, किसी का पक्ष न लें, वे क्या अरब राष्ट्रों के विरोधी हैं। मैं उनमें से एक हूँ जो कहते हैं कि भारत सरकार की नीति तटस्थता की नीति होनी चाहिये, रचनात्मक और सृजनात्मक नीति होनी चाहिये। जो कि नहीं है। मैं यह कहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार ने यह गलती अपना कर और यह कह कर भूल की कि इसराइल ने युद्ध विभीषिका को भड़काने में पहल की। हमारे इस कथन की पुष्टि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की सीक्योरिटी कौंसिल ने भी कर दी है। आज 6 बज करके 35 मिनट का जब हम समाचार सुन रहे थे तो मुझे समाचार सुनाई पड़ा कि सर्वसम्मति से सीक्योरिटी कौंसिल ने सीजफायर का फैसला लिया है और इस फैसले पर आने के पूर्व अमरीकी और रूसी, दोनों पक्ष के वहां रहने वाले नेताओं और राजदूतों ने आपस में बैठकर के, विचार विनिमय के बाद और सोच समझ कर के ऐसा फैसला लिया। तो हम को ऐसा लगता है कि भारत सरकार ने जो नीति घोषित की थी वह जल्दी में और बचकानेपन में घोषित हो गई। हमारी तरफ एक कहावत है कि जिस का बैल था वह तो कहता था कि गरियार है और पड़ोसी यह कहता था कि बड़ा तेज चलता है। यही स्थिति हो गई भारत सरकार की।

हमारे मित्र नर
लोहिया को कोट करना चाहता हूँ।

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Why quote anybody?

श्री राजनारायण : जब इसराइल की स्थापना हुई थी तो डा० लोहिया ने, उस समय की सोशलिस्ट पार्टी ने कहा था :

"Israel is a dagger in the heart of Asia by the West."

डा० लोहिया ने कहा था कि इसरायल की स्थापना, इसरायल राष्ट्र का निर्माण एशिया की छाती में खंजर है जो कि पश्चिमी राष्ट्रों ने भोंका है। मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि जरा लोग उसको समझ लें। मैं फिर भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब ब्रिटेन ने स्वेज कनाल के ऊपर हमला किया तो मैं उस पार्टी का हूँ जिसने कहा था कि भारत को नासिर की इमदाद करनी चाहिए, नाविकों को भेजना चाहिए, सैनिकों से भी सहायता करनी चाहिए और हमने अंग्रेजों की भर्त्सना की थी, कड़े शब्दों में की थी। उस समय भारत की सरकार ने हमारी बात नहीं मानी। श्रीमन्, मैं यह भी सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को बताना चाहता हूँ कि उस समय के प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल जी नेहरू ने टीटो को एक पत्र लिखा था कि नासिर ने गलती की, त्रियोनी की सन्धि के समय जब हम लोग बैठे थे—नासिर, टीटो और जवाहरलाल नेहरू—उस समय उन्होंने बताया नहीं था कि स्वेज कनाल का राष्ट्रीयकरण करेंगे ऐसा करके उसने हमें फंसा दिया। 1949 का साल लोग याद करें जिस समय स्वेज कनाल के राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात सर्वप्रथम डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया ने कहा थी कि स्वेज कनाल का राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिए। मैंने अपनी स्थिति स्पष्ट कर दी। आज अगर अरब राष्ट्र पर कोई पश्चिमी राष्ट्र या दुनिया की कोई भी ताकत जबरदस्ती करती है तो हम उनमें से हैं जो अरब राष्ट्र की सहायता के लिए दौड़ेंगे, आज अगर इसरायल पर कोई हमला होता है तो इसरायल की सहायता के लिए भी दौड़ेंगे। इसको मद्देनजर रखते हुए देखा जाना चाहिए कि क्या हो रहा है। मैं, श्रीमन्, आपकी जानकारी के

लिए बताऊँ कि उस समय के प्रधान मंत्री जवाहरलाल जी नेहरू ने वह खत जो टीटो को लिखा था उसकी प्रतिलिपि डा० लोहिया को मिली, उन्होंने उसे अखबारों को दिया तो अखबारों को होम डिपार्टमेंट ने छापने से रोक दिया, फिर भी हिन्दू अखबार जो मद्रास से निकलता है उसमें वह छप गया। यह वह समय था जब स्वेज कनाल का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ था और ब्रिटेन का हमला हुआ और सोशलिस्ट पार्टी और डा० लोहिया ने ब्रिटेन की भर्त्सना की, तब डा० लोहिया का चित्र तमाम अरब राष्ट्रों में छा कर बंटा था (*Interruptions*) जरा सुन लीजिए। स्वतंत्रता प्राप्त होने के बाद द्वितीय विश्व युद्ध के बाद भारत पाकिस्तान का बंटवारा हो गया। मैं पाकिस्तान निर्माण का विरोधी रहा हूँ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजो (बिहार) : तटस्थ।

श्री राजनारायण : मैंने श्रीमन्, आप से पहले ही निवेदन किया था कि जब अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय विषयों पर चर्चा हो तो मस्तिष्क का संतुलन रहे, इसमें तनुकमिजाजी नहीं होनी चाहिए। मैं आपको बताऊँ कि जब हमारे श्रेष्ठ आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव जी कांग्रेस वर्किंग कमटी से आए जहाँ रचनात्मक, सृजनात्मक तटस्थता की नीति की हिमायत हुई थी तो लखनऊ की सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के कार्यालय में उनको आमंत्रित किया, हम लोगों ने कहा कि यह गलत नीति अस्तित्व की गई, सोशलिस्ट पार्टी को डटकर हिम्मत से आगे आना चाहिए था और भारत के बंटवारे का विरोध करना चाहिए था। उस समय हम पाकिस्तान के विरोधी थे। जो आज यह कहते हैं कि भारत सरकार की अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति सक्रिय तटस्थता की हो, पाकिस्तान को भारत हड़प ले, पाकिस्तान पर भारत हमला कर दे, हमला करके ले लेंगे तो हमारे मित्र लोग क्या कहेंगे जो कहते हैं कि यदि इसरायल को आक्रामक नहीं बहेंगे, विश्व युद्ध को भड़काने में पहल लेने वाला नहीं

[श्री राज नारायण]

कहेंगे तो कहीं हम अरब के शत्रु न माने जायें। मैंने उस दिमाग को, उस जाल को काटने के लिए इतनी भूमिका दी। इसलिए मैं आज आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार की नीति से अपना मतभेद प्रगट करते हुए, संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ ने जो फैसला लिया सीज़-फायर का वह फैसला अपनी जगह पर सही मानता हूँ। इसी के साथ एक कदम और आगे जाना चाहता हूँ कि इससे पहले भारत की ओर से जो प्रस्ताव रखा गया था हम उसको भी अच्छा प्रस्ताव कहते हैं कि 4 जून तक की स्थिति पर लौट आएं। मगर भारत के प्रधान मंत्री ने कह दिया कि इजरायल ने पहल की। क्या यह समस्या के समाधान का सही रास्ता है? एक तरफ तो हम कहते हैं कि हम विश्व शान्ति के प्रतीक हैं, विश्व शान्ति चाहते हैं तो फिर विश्व शान्ति चाहने वाला व्यक्ति या सरकार दो टकराने वाली ताकतों में से एक ताकत को पहल करने वाली कह कर समझौते की बात चलाएगी तो उसकी बात कौन सुनेगा। आपने इजरायल को दोषी बना दिया। इसलिए भारत सरकार को एहतियात बरतना चाहिए था। इस सम्बन्ध में भारत की सरकार ने जो बचकानापन दिखाया है मैं उसके खिलाफ हूँ, इस तरह के दिमाग और इस तरह की बात का सख्त विरोधी हूँ। हम नहीं जानते भारत की सरकार हमारे भारत राष्ट्र को कहाँ कहाँ घसीट ले जाकर फेंक देना चाहती है।

एक निवेदन और करना चाहता हूँ। अगर भारत की सरकार को कुछ कहना है तो (*Interruptions*) भारत की सरकार को आगे बढ़ कर कहना चाहिए। उस से सभी की समस्या का समाधान हो जायगा। क्यों न इजरायल और अरब का महासंघ बने, क्यों न भारत और पाकिस्तान का महासंघ बने? हम चाहते हैं कि हमारी

सृजनात्मक, रचनात्मक सक्रिय तटस्थता की नीति होनी चाहिए। भारत की ऐसी पाजिटिव इंडिपेन्डेंट विदेश नीति होनी चाहिए जो न रूस की पिछलगू हो और जो न अमरीका और ब्रिटेन की पिछलगू हो। हम चाहते हैं कि भारत राष्ट्र एक शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र हो, उसकी तटस्थता की नीति शक्तिशाली नीति हो, जो बारी-बारी से न ब्रिटेन और अमरीका की गुलामी करें और न एशिया की गुलामी करे बल्कि स्वतंत्र रूप से सक्रिय रूप से अपनी तटस्थता की नीति को लागू करने के लिए आगे बढ़ता रहे।

SHRI A. D. MANI: I join the Prime Minister and others in offering our sympathies to the Indian troops who have suffered grievous losses as a result of Israeli aggression. I would like to say that on technicalities. Israel is an aggressor in this present conflict. But in condemning Israel, I would have taken into account the totality of circumstances which exist in West Asia. Here is a small country hemmed in on all sides by States which want to destroy that country ...

(Interruption)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not at all. Israel has been armed by the Americans.

SHRI A. D. MANI: ... which want to destroy the territorial identity of that State and destroy the people who have made remarkable contributions to human civilisation, who have produced Nobel Laureates by the number, any number of Nobel Laureates ...

(Interruption)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Americans who are using the people there as pawns in their game ...

(Interruption)

SHRI A. D. MANI: I want the Prime Minister to recall the dreadful days of September 1965 ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You cannot mislead.

SHRI A. D. MANI: We took the decision to cross the international boundary and march into Sialkot and Lahore which produced a very strong and prejudiced reaction in the U.N. circles. Why did we do it? Because we felt that offence was the best form of defence

SOMETHON. MEMBERS: No
(Interruption)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You must allow him to speak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On what basis

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Hon. Mr. Mani has every right to express his opinion about the West Asian conflict. But Mr. Mani has no right to represent history in a wrong way to malign the whole country, the whole nation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA-. In a vulgar, crude way

(Interruption)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mani. do not raise questions which will lead to controversy. You state your views.

1 P.M.

श्री राजनारायण : आन ए प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर । मैं पुनः आपके द्वारा सदन के सदस्यों से विनम्रता से अपील करूंगा कि किसी भी सदस्य को सदन के बाहर बोलने का अधिकार हमारे संविधान में सुरक्षित है, सदन में बोलने का अधिकार तो है ही ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would like Shri Rajnarain to be

श्री राजनारायण : प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर जरा सुनिये । इसका मतलब ही है कि अगर हमारे दिमाग में कोई बात गलत है
877 RSD—5.

दूसरों की दृष्टि से तो उसको बोलने की गारंटी हमको संविधान में है, अगर सही बोलते हैं तो उसमें गारंटी की कोई बाध नहीं है । गारंटी का मतलब ही है कि He can talk something illegal. He can talk nonsense. He can talk all things.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are not questioning his right, but if h* utters such arrant nonsense, we should be allowed to repudiate it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mani, try to avoid controversies and state your point. I want silence to be maintained. Simply state your suggestions.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Sir, recently the Supreme Court has held that Fundamental Rights are inviolable and cannot be amended by Parliament. But, unfortunately, I am not having the fundamental right to express my views on a matter ...

(Interruption)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be brief.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am very brief, Sir, but they are not allowing me to be brief. Sir, I am not a pro-Israeli; I am not.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Can you deny that Israel and America have their base in Asia?

SHRI A. D. MANI: Israel has got a right to live and

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to request hon. Members again to hear him. They have their right to reply to him when they speak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I accept your ruling and I am sure you will call me.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I want the Prime Minister to give us her views on the two Resolutions which are now

West Asia

[Shri A. D. Mani.] before the Security Council. There is one Resolution sponsored by the United States. I do not like the United States; I am anti- United States. You must be very happy when I say this. Now the U.S. Resolution wants Israel to withdraw to the 1949 lines, which means that Israel will lose some territory. But India, our representative there, has tabled a Resolution asking the contesting parties to return to their pre-June 4 positions. This means that we accept that the Gulf of Aqaba is an internal waterway. Sir, I would like the Prime Minister to bear in mind that we have got the strait of Talai-mannar. If, suppose, somebody in Ceylon says that it is an internal waterway of Ceylon, would the House accept the position? The Dardanelles strait falls within one mile of the territorial waters of Turkey. Yet it is an international waterway. And by accepting the Gulf of Aqaba as an internal waterway . . . (Interruptions)

There is no tolerance in this House. You talk about Fundamental Rights.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): They don't believe in democracy; it is funny.

SHRI A. D. MANI: My main point is this. The dispute is that the Gulf of Aqaba must be treated as an international waterway, and unless it is treated as such, there is no likelihood of peace returning to this war-torn part of the world. I am not suggesting that the U.A.R. should give up its territorial rights, but Israel must have the right to live, and I want this Government to give us its view in the matter.

شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق (جموں اور کشمیر): سر - میں وزیر اعظم کو ان کے بیان پر مبارکباد پیش کرتا ہوں - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ان کے بیان سے

دنیا میں جو ہندوستان کا احترام تھا وہ آج پچھلے بیس سال کے مقابلے میں بے حد زیادہ ہو گیا ہے - غیر جانبداری کے معنی بالکل بزدلی نہیں ہیں - بلکہ غیر جانبداری کے معنی یہ ہیں کہ ہم حقیقت کو حقیقت کہیں؟ سچ کو سچ کہیں اور غلط کو غلط کہیں . . .

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद : एग्जैवर को एग्जैवर कहें ।

شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق : . . . اور حملہ آور کو حملہ آور کہیں اور جس پر حملہ ہوا ہے اس کے ساتھ ہمدردی کا اظہار کریں - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ حکومت ہندوستان کے وزیر اعظم نے اس فرض کو نہایت خوبصورتی سے سرانجام دیا ہے لیکن جہاں تک مسئلہ ملی کا تعلق ہے میں ایک بات ان سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ انہوں نے ایک ایسی بات کہی ہے جس کا واقعات اور تاریخ سے قطعی تعلق نہیں ہے اور جس کو امریکہ ہندوستان کے خلاف استعمال کرے گا کہ ہندوستان نے اپنے بچپان کے لئے لاہور اور سیالکوٹ پر حملہ کیا - یہ حقیقت نہیں ہے بلکہ یہ بالکل جھوٹ ہے - میں مسئلہ ملی سے ایک ہندوستانی کی حیثیت سے یہ درخواست کروں گا کہ وہ اپنے انداز کو واپس لیں ورنہ ان کے استہزاء کو

آج ہندوستان اور غیر جانبدار ملکوں
کے جو دشمن ہیں وہ ہندوستان کے
خلاف استعمال کریں گے۔

مسٹر چورمین : میں آپ سے
یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس
میں شک نہیں کہ عرب اگر ہم پر
حملہ ہوا تو انکے نہیں آئیں گے لیکن
جاں تک عرب اور یہودیوں کا تعلق
ہے یہ بات واضح رہنی چاہیئے کہ
یہ کوئی اسلام اور یہودیوں کی جنگ
نہیں ہے یہ جنگ ہے عرب نیٹولزم
اور اسرائیل اور امپیریلسٹ پاورس کی۔
اور وزارت خارجہ ایکسٹرنل افئرس
میں اس بات میں ناکام رہی ہے
دنیا کہ بتانے میں کہ ہندوستان عرب
نیٹولزم کی حمایت کرتا ہے۔ شوشانم
کی حمایت کرتا ہے اور امپیریلسٹ کے
خلاف ہے۔ وہ سازش کے خلاف ہے
چاہے وہ کسی بھی ملک کی طرف
سے ہو۔ ہماری پالیسی یہ ہے، ہماری
نہی یہ ہے۔ آج صدر ایوب جو اپنے کو
مسلمان کہتے ہیں اور کہتے ہیں کہ
پاکستان اسلامی ملک ہے۔ لیکن

Today Sadar Ayub is non-committal
because America has not committed
herself against this side or against
that side. But we are a free coun-
try, but Pakistan has proved that she
is working under the U.S.A., under
the policy of U.S. President.

श्री ह्यातुल्ला अन्सारी (उत्तर प्रदेश):
उर्दू में बोलते थे, उर्दू में बोलिये।

شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق : صدر
ایوب نے یہ کہا کہ صاحب ہم تو
جہاد کریں گے، ہم اپنے والفتیوس
بھائیوں کے۔ ہم اپنی فوج بھجائیے۔
لیکن کل جب عرب پر، کل جب
قاہرہ پر، جب بیت المقدس پر جو
کہ مسلمانوں کے لئے نہایت ہی
مہم جگہ ہے، بیت المقدس کے
کے بعد مسلمانوں نے لئے سب سے
اہم جگہ ہے اس پر حملہ ہوا تو آج
صدر ایوب اپنے آپ کو کمت نہیں کر
سکتے۔ کہیں؟ اس لئے کہ آگے ان
کو دیکھنا ہے لیکن ہندوستان نے اپنے
کو کمت کہا ہے کہ اسرائیل حملہ آور
ہے اور انہوں نے عرب پر حملہ کیا
ہے۔ ہماری عربوں سے ہمدردی اس
لئے نہیں کہ چانڈیز انگریزوں پر
انہوں نے ہمارا ساتھ دیا یا نہیں دیا
شویف انسان شرافت کا سودا نہیں
کرتا ہے۔ ہم دنیا میں شرافت
امن اور مصمت کو زندہ رکھنا چاہتے
ہیں اور اس کو ہر قیمت پر رکھنا
چاہتے ہیں۔

میں وزیر اعظم سے یہ بھی جاننا
چاہتا ہوں کہ کیا یہ حقیقت نہیں
ہے کہ ابھی چار پانچ دن پہلے وہ

[شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق]

نام میں ایک روسی جہاز پر امریکن بمباروں نے بم گرایا۔ کیا یہ حقیقت نہیں ہے کہ کشمیر کے مسئلہ کو بھی امریکہ نے اسی طرح اقوام متحدہ میں پیش کیا۔ دنیا کے سامنے پیش کیا جس طرح سے اسرائیل کے مسئلہ کو بھی پیش کیا جاتا ہے؟ کیا یہ نہیں کہا جاتا ہے کہ پاکستان ایک چھوٹا ملک ہے ہندوستان بہت بڑا ملک ہے، ہندوستان پاکستان کو کھانا چاہتا ہے اور آج اس چھڑ کو اس رنگ میں پیش کیا جا رہا ہے کہ "عرب بڑا ملک ہے اسرائیل چھوٹا ملک ہے" اس کو کھانا چاہتا ہے، یہ بالکل غلط ہے۔ ہندوستان پاکستان کو کھانا نہیں چاہتا۔ عرب ملک اسرائیل کے بارے میں اپنی علیحدہ پالیسی رکھتے ہیں لیکن چونکہ یہ قہراً بیانی نے کہا ہے۔ صدر ناصر نے یہ کہا کہ یہودیوں کا ہوم لینڈ ہے، یہ آخر کی بات ہے اس سے پہلے انہوں نے اشتعال دلایا گیا کہ اشتعال دلایا گیا۔ کیا جان بوجھ کر اسرائیل نے ہندوستان کے سپاہیوں کو قتل نہیں کیا ان پر گولیاں نہیں چلائیں؟ کیا ان کو یہ معلوم نہیں تھا کہ ہندوستان قومی طور پر عرب ممالک کے ساتھ نہیں ہے تو ہم کو یہ "دیکھنا ہے کہ اور ان تمام باتوں باوجود ہمیں اس سازش کو اس

امریکن سازش کو اس انگلیزوں کی سازش کو بھی ناکام کرنا ہے۔ اور اس کے لئے میں ہندوستان کے وزیر اعظم کو ان کی بھاری پر، ان کی جوت پر ان کی دانشمندی پر، ان کی حوصلہ مندی پر مبارکباد دیتا ہوں۔

†[شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق (جम्मہ اور کشمیر) : سر، میں بھاری براجم کو ان کے بیان پر مبارکباد پیش کرتا ہوں۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ان کے بیان سے دنیا میں جو ہندوستان کا عقیدہ تھا وہ آج پچھلے بیس سال کے مقابلے میں بہت زیادہ ہو گیا ہے۔ غیر جانبداری کے ماننے بیکول بوجھدلی نہیں ہیں۔ بلکہ غیر جانبداری کے ماننے یہ ہیں کہ ہم حقیقت کو حقیقت کہیں، سچ کو سچ کہیں اور غلط کو غلط کہیں۔

شری بے ڈی۔ اے۔ احمد : اسپیکر کو اسپیکر کہیں۔

شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق : اور ہملا-آبر کو ہملا-آبر کہیں اور جس پر ہملا دھڑا ہے اس کے ساتھ ہم دہریہ کا ڈھنگ کریں۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ حکومت ہندوستان کے بھاری براجم نے اس فوج کو نہایت خوب-سختی سے سر-انجام دیا ہے لیکن جہاں تک میسٹر مین کا تعلق ہے، میں ایک بات ان سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ انہوں نے ایک ایسی بات کہی ہے جس کا واقعات اور تاریخ سے کتہہ تعلق نہیں ہے اور جس کو امریکا ہندوستان کے خلاف استعمال کرے گا کہ ہندوستان نے اپنے بچاؤ کے لیے لاہور اور سیکٹر 47 پر ہمارا کیا۔ یہ حقیقت نہیں ہے، بلکہ یہ بیکول سچ ہے۔ میں میسٹر مین سے ایک ہندوستانی کی تہذیب سے یہ درخواست کرے گا کہ وہ اپنے اہلکار کو واپس لے کر ان کے سٹیٹمنٹ کو آج ہندوستان

[] Hindi transliteration.

और गैरजानबदार मुल्कों के जो दुश्मन हैं वे हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल करेंगे।

मिस्टर चैयरमैन, मैं आपसे यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इसमें शक नहीं कि अरब अगर हम पर हमला हुआ तो आगे नहीं आएंगे लेकिन जहाँ तक अरब और यहूदियों का ताल्लुक है यह बात वास्तव होनी चाहिए कि यह कोई इस्लाम और यहूदियों की जंग नहीं है, यह जंग है अरब नेशनलिज्म, इजराइल और इम्पीरियलिस्ट पावर्स की। और बजायते खारजा, एक्सटर्नल अफयर्स मिनिस्ट्री इस बात में नाकाम रही है दुनिया को बताने में कि हिन्दुस्तान अरब नेशनलिज्म की हिमायत करता है, सोशलिज्म की हिमायत करता है और इम्पीरियलिज्म के खिलाफ है, वे साजिश के खिलाफ है, चाहे वह किसी भी मुल्क की तरफ से हो। हमारी पालिसी यह है, हमारी नीति यह है। आज सदर अयूब, जो अपने को मुसलमान कहते हैं और कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान इस्लामी मुल्क है लेकिन today Sadar Ayub is non-committal because America has not committed herself against this side or against that side. But we are a free country, but Pakistan has proved that she is working under the U.S.A., under the policy of U.S. President.

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्तारी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
उर्दू में बोलते थे, उर्दू में बोलिये।

श्री ए० एम० तारिक : सदर अयूब यह कहा कि साहब हम तो जहाद करेंगे, न अपने बालेटियस भेजेंगे, हम अपनी फौज भेजेंगे, लेकिन कल जब अरब पर, कल जब काहिरा पर, जब बैत-उलमकदस पर जो कि मुसलमानों के लिए निहायत ही मुतबर्क जगह है, बैत उलमुकदस कावा के बाद मुसलमानों के लिए सब से ग्रहम जगह है उस पर हमला हुआ तो आज सदर अयूब अपने आप को कमिट नहीं कर सकते, क्यों?

इस लिए कि आगे उनको देना है जेकि हिन्दुस्तान ने अपने आप को कमिट किया है कि इजराइल हमलाआवर है और उन्होंने अरब पर हमला किया है। हमरी अरबों से हमदर्दी इसलिए नहीं कि ना गीज एग्जेशन पर उन्होंने हमारा साथ दिया या नहीं दिया। शरीफ इस्तान शराफत का मौला नहीं करता है। हम दुनिया में शराफत, अमन और मुरुब्वत को जिन्दा रखना चाहते और उसको हर कीमत पर रखना चाहते हैं।

मैं वजीरेआजम से यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह इकीकत नहीं है कि अभी चार पांच दिन पहले वियतनाम में एक जहाज पर अमेरिकन बमार्शों ने बम गिराया। क्या यह इकीकत नहीं है कि काश्मीर के मामले को भी अमेरिका ने इसी तरह अकताम मुतहरा में पेश किया, दुनिया के सामने पेश किया, जिस तरह से इजराइल के मामले को पेश किया जाता है? क्या यह नहीं कहा जाता है कि पाकिस्तान एक छोटा मुल्क है, हिन्दुस्तान बहुत बड़ा मुल्क है, हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान को खाना चाहता है और आज इन चीज को इस रंग में पेश किया जा रहा है कि अरब बड़ा मुल्क है, इजराइल छोटा मुल्क है उसको, खाना चाहता है, यह बिल्कुल गलत है? हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान को खाना नहीं चाहता। अरब मुल्क इजराइल के बारे में अपनी अलहदा पालिसी रखत है, लेकिन जैसा कि डा.आभाई ने कहा है सर नासिर ने यह कहा कि यहूदियों का होमलैण्ड है, यह आखिर की बात है, इससे पहले उन्हें बड़ा इलातेआल दिलाया गया। हमको इलातेआल दिलाया गया। क्या जान बूझ कर इजराइल ने हिन्दुस्तान के सिपाहियों को कल नहीं किया, ठा पर गोलियां नहीं चलाई, क्या इसको माफ़ा नहीं? श्री कि हिन्दुस्तान सीवी तें पर अरब मुमालिक के साथ नहीं है? हमको यह देखना है और उत तमाम बातों के नामजूर हमें इस साजिश को, इन

[श्री ए० एम० टारिक]

अमेरिकन साजिश को, इस घंटे की साजिश को, भी नाकाम करना है। और इसके लिए हिन्दुस्तान के वज्जीरेआजम को उनकी बहादुरी पर, उनकी ज़ुरत पर, उनकी दानशमन्दी पर, उनकी होसलामन्दी पर मुशारिकवाद देता हूँ।]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the Republican Party, Mr. Khobaragade. I am trying to see that every party is given the chance.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Sir, I would like to have a clarification from the Chair. If it is only representation by parties, then only one spokesman from each party should be allowed to speak. If you make it a free for all, I would like my party to get the chance. Now if each one of them will get the chance, it will continue for five hours.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It niny continue for two days. I have no objection. The position with regard to clarification is not on party basis.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am not satisfied with some of the statements made by the hon. Prime Minister. She has tried to apportion blame on the issue of the war. She had blamed Israel for escalating the present war. Our main concern in this conflict should be our own vital national interests, and in this conflict our vital national interests are involved. If this conflict continued and there is no cease-fire, then it will affect our economy and all our developmental plans. We have to import foodgrains from the Western countries and we have to get cotton from the UAR. We have got to get petrol also from these areas. If this war continued for a pretty long time, then our economy which is already in a topsyturvy condition will be further ruined. * AH our developmental plans will also be mined. Therefore our prime coneera ia this matter

shsould have been to see how to safe-j guard our interests in this war-troubled area. The first thing is to have I a cease-fire in this Middle East area. I But by taking a partisan role, by adopting a partisan attitude, we have mortgaged our independent position and we have abandoned our peacemaking role. Therefore it will be very difficult for us to secure approval of the belligerent nations to the cease-fire proposals.

We always believe in peaceful coexistence and, therefore, we should also see that Israel also exists along with the Arab nations. Israel was created not only by the Western powers—Britain and the United States of America—as has been claimed jr> this House—but Russia was also responsible for creating Israel. Russia supported the creation of Israel in the United Nations.

AN HON. MEMBER: Russia co-sponsored the proposal.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Yes, Russia co-sponsored it. And also the very next day of Israel's existence Russia recognised her. Russia changed her policy only in 1956. Therefore, now it is the responsibility of all peace-loving nations to see that Israel exists. Mr. Tariq said that India also does not want *o destroy Pakistan. That is the proclaimed policy of the Government also and almost all the people of this country. Except some individuals and a few parties who claim that they want to destroy Pakistan, the view of the vast majority of our people, about 80 to 90 per cent of our people is that they want to see Pakistan exist. They also want to see Pakistan prosper and nourish. On the contrary what do we notice on the part of the Arab nations? They want to destroy Israel. If that is the attitude of the Ar?b naions then 'it will be very difficult to maintain peace in that area. We should not have taken sides. We should not have taken a partisan attitude. As a matter of fact, it is

very difficult even to say who is responsible for this escalation. No doubt there may be some information with the Prime Minister which she has received to show who is responsible for escalating this war. May I ask the hon. Prime Minister to tell us Who is responsible for precipitating this crisis? In my opinion, Sir, two factors are responsible for creating this crisis. The first factor is the withdrawal of the U.N. Emergency Force. Since the Arab nations claim sovereignty, they do not like any other troops, Indian or other foreign troops, even if they belong to the U.N., to be on their soil; they can insist on withdrawal of such troops. But I should like to ask this question at this stage. Why did they choose his particular moment to ask for the withdrawal of the U.N. Emergency Force from Arab soil? Why was it not done earlier in the past? Why did they do so at this particular juncture? The second factor that has led to this crisis, according to my humble opinion is the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba. These are the two factors, namely, the withdrawal of the U.N. Emergency Force and the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba. These are responsible for precipitating the crisis in the Middle East.

Sir, we hear that the United Nations Security Council has passed a resolution unanimously asking for a cease-fire. I do not know whether this cease-fire, will be accepted by the belligerent nations, because this morning we have heard various things from the radio. We have also heard about the attitude of the Arab nations. They have suspended their diplomatic relations with the Western countries, I mean the United Kingdom and the United States of America. Not only that they have also put a block to the passage of ships through the Suez Canal. I do not know whether these two steps would be conducive to the maintaining of peace in that area. It should have been the prime concern of our Government to persuade the Arab nations. They should have been told that first of all they should accept this cease-fire

and then we should all have worked for the peaceful existence of Israel and the Arab nations. Only in this way can we safeguard our national interests?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you may ask your questions for getting clarification.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Please give us also a chance, Sir.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Mr. Chairman, Sir,

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I would like to make it quite clear, Sir,

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Sir, this side also should be given a chance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have asked Mr. Gupta to put his questions. He should not make a speech. He wanted to put certain questions for clarification.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: What about us?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not afraid of the Swatantra Party, Sir. You may allow them. I shall be grateful if you allow them. You can take two minutes from my time and allow Mr. Rathnaswamy, I am quite willing.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA (West Bengal): What about us?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let Mr. Gupta go on. I shall see about the rest.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: First of all I must say that I am a little surprised—and I should like to know whether the Prime Minister and the Government share my surprise—that some people here should have spoken in the manner in which they did, demanding almost a support of Israel. Is it not a fact that this is the third time that Israel launched an attack against the Arab nations? First it was in 1948, the second time in 1956 and

Lbhri Ehupesh Gupta.]

now a third time. Is it not a fact, Sir, I should like to know from the Prime Minister, whether she is aware of the fact—I am asking the question—hat all these years the United States of America and Britain and also West Germany have lavishly armed Israel with a view to utilising her, with a view to using her as a pawn against Arab nationalism and this thing now is also part of the same game? Is it not a fact, I would like to know from the Prime Minister, that in this period again, Mr. Harold Wilson in the House of Commons spoke and appealed to the so-called maritime nations to gang up for an attack? Is it not also a fact, I would like to know from the Prime Minister, that the Sixth Fleet has moved into the Mediterranean Sea with aircraft carriers which are now being used to provide air umbrella to the Israeli forces to attack Egypt, Jordan and other countries? Is it also not a fact—I do not know why it was not mentioned, I think it should be mentioned now—that attacks based on the U.S. aircraft are already going on, that these aircrafts are participating in a big way in this 'I' attack against the UAR and other countries? Sir, I also want to know whether it is not a fact that the Israelis have deliberately killed not only the Indians but they have deliberately launched an attack now because they realised and their masters, America and Britain, have realised that the so-called Islamic Pact had come to an end, that the Arab nations were getting together and were consolidating their position and the situation was such that it would be impossible to launch upon any such trouble. Therefore, according to our information, on the orders and at the instigation of the United States and Britain the whole thing has been initiated in order to curb and suppress Arab nationalism. This is the nature of the matter. I am surprised that hon. Members should ask the Government to be neutral. What is the neutrality between

a war of aggression and a war of defence?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, kindly put your question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir. The question is whether Prime Minister takes the position now that there should be neutrality between a war of peace and a war of aggression? Is there to be neutrality between a war of colonialism and a war of national liberation? That is what I would like to know. If Prime Minister is to be accused I also make the accusation that she has been erring on the side of moderation. It is not escalation, it is the starting of a war by Israel and it is deliberately escalating it. But she wants to be moderate. She may be moderate, if she likes, but in such matters, Sir, I am not a man of moderate temperament. Then about consensus, why shouldn't there be a consensus of that kind? Consensus is meant to vindicate our position in the world . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Put the question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, is not consensus meant for vindicating our anti-colonialism and our anti-imperialism and projecting to the world especially when . . .

(Interruption) SHRI

LOKANATH MISRA: Sir, this is all repetition of the same things. We listen to it every day.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why, I listen to you every day.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: the turn is mine. I must be allowed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let Arab have his turn before the Israeli's turn comes.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: Sir, in a point of order. After the Prime Minister makes a statement it is the right of Members to put a question

by way of explanation, not for making speeches. But speeches have been allowed. I appeal to this House, through you, Sir, let there be a thorough debate. Let time be allotted for a thorough debate about India's . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, have you finished?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am finishing. Is the Prime Minister, aware that the Israeli Consulate in Bombay is being used to carry on propaganda which is contrary to our national position in this matter?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That motion already admitted for a debate, and therefore I would ask the Prime Minister to reply on that motion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want to know whether the Government has considered the advisability of closing down that Consulate in view of what they are doing here.

SHRI LOKANATH MTSRA: Sir, I am on a point of order. I had anticipated this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, you must keep your promise, namely, of not making a speech.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Therefore I have brought it to your notice that if you give Mr. Bhupesh Gupta a chance you will have to give a chance to us also.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you finished, Mr. Gupta?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How can I finish, if I am disturbed like this? Regarding the procedure in the House it is for you to decide. As far as I am concerned, I shall never ask you not to give them a chance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not the question now. The understanding was that you will only put questions for clarification. I do not want you to make a speech. That is all I want now.

SHRI LOKANATH MTSRA: But, Sir, he has made a speech. I do not understand this. He has already made a speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You CBH also make a speech.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Where is the time? It is already 1.20.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why are you agitated? I am not an Arab.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not Israeli either.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please keep your promise that you will only ask questions and this will be the last question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I have done my job because the Swa-tantra friends are angry and that is the hallmark of my success. This is the last question before I sit down. In view of the fact that the Israelis have killed our people under conditions which the Prime Minister has described as cold-blooded, pre-planned murder, is it not proper to consider, if only on this ground, the question of closing down the Israeli Consulate—we have not got full diplomatic relations—in Bombay and may I know whether the matter is under consideration? And I do not expect that the Prime Minister will not submit to pressure but come out with a bold and forthright statement calling the aggressor aggressor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lokanath Misra. Put only questions.

SHRI LOKANATH MTSRA: But why do you restrict me? You have not restricted him.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: If you tolerate Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, why not tolerate others too?

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right; go ahead.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You give them a chance; I know they will fail. You will see that they will not be able to make it.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: An attempt has been made . . .

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): Sir, on a point of order. According to Rule 251, a statement may be made by a Minister on a matter of public importance with the consent of the Chairman but no question shall be asked at the time the statement is made. The practice of the House is to demand some clarification but not to put questions. When the rule is specifically there, how can we put questions?

(Interruptions)

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: An attempt has been made to make a point that Israel is the creation of the imperialists and even my Communist friend, Comrade Z. A. Ahmad has said that it is an attempt of the imperialists that the Israel Government and the State of Israel should continue to exist. May I ask the Prime Minister to kindly enlighten the hon. Member that it was also the USSR who was a co-sponsor and may I ask whether Dr. Z. A. Ahmad considers the USSR to be imperialist?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If you want . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISHRA: If there is a dialogue I am capable of it. Anybody on the other side may or may not be but I am at least capable of it.

The second question is this. We have a joint venture for manufacturing HF-24, a kind of aeroplane, in the UAR. Now the U.A.R. Government and the Indian Government have put in their investments and -----

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: At least the Indian technicians are there and I would like to know categorically from the Prime Minister, in case this war continues, whether she would allow Indian technicians to be used by the UAR against Israel because it involves India also directly in the war. I would like to have categorical replies to these two questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jagat Narain; put only questions please.

श्री जगत नारायण (हरियाणा) : मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदया से दो सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने यह कहा कि इजराइल अग्रसर है और उसने हमला किया है। सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल में जो रिजोल्यूशन पास हुआ है और उससे पीस न हो, तो फिर हिन्दुस्तान यू० ए० आर० की मदद के लिए आयेगा या नहीं आयेगा? क्या वह वहाँ पर अपनी फौज भेजेगा, मेडिकल मिशन भेजेगा क्या करेगा? इस बारे में मैं कैटेगोरिकली यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की पालिसी क्या है?

दूसरी बात मैं उनसे यह पूछना चाहता हूँ, जो हमारे टेक्नीशियन्स आज ईराक और मिश्र में हैं उनकी सेफ्टी के लिए हिन्दुस्तान ने क्या इंतजाम किया है जब कि हमारी फौज के 8 आदमी मारे गये हैं। उनकी सेफ्टी के लिए गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया क्या कर रही है, उनको वापस बुलाने के लिए क्या इंतजाम कर रही है और उनकी सेफ्टी का वहाँ पर कोई इंतजाम हो रहा है या नहीं, ये बातें मैं जानना चाहता हूँ?

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: May I know, since the Houses of Parliament are in session and we are vitally interested in this, whether the Prime Minister will think it advisable to

ueoai^e *m* me *Houses* of Parliament before committing the nation to either side and before taking any view? Secondly, has the cease-fire resolution of the Security Council been accepted by the warring countries? If it is not so, what role our Government wants to play in effecting peace between the two countries? My third question is, what are the names of those Indian soldiers killed in the conflict and their ranks?

DR. ANUP SINGH: I have three questions to ask the Prime Minister. (1) It has been suggested by the critics of the statement that whereas the "stand taken by our representative in the Security Council is correct and they seem to subscribe to it, the Government of India here has taken a different stand. Is it or is it not true that everything that our representative has done in New York represents the stand and opinion of the Government of India?

(2) Is it or is it not true that non-alignment does not necessarily or does not mean neutrality? Non-alignment simply means our right to judge each and every issue on its merit. Is it not a fact that we have done exactly the same thing on this occasion?

The last question is with reference to the resolution we have sponsored. Will the Prime Minister be good enough to tell us whether or not we are going to pursue it any further because if we do not do it and allow the Israelis to reap the benefit of aggression, then it will simply mean putting a premium on aggression and anyone can march or take initiative and if he is allowed to retain it, with impunity, I think we will be setting a very bad precedent?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The Prime Minister has expressed a certain amount of happiness at the Security Council Resolution which very inadequately deals with the situation because it merely calls for a mere cease-fire and thus may enable Israel

to have the fruits of aggression. The Resolution of the Security Council is very inadequate. In 1986 also Israel was the aggressor. The world condemned the aggression.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Put questions for clarification.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: But somehow Israel was allowed to retain in 1956 the fruits of aggression. The correct approach in the matter is that the two sides should be asked by the U.N. to go back to their 1949 positions. May I know if the Prime Minister will instruct our representative in the U.N. to take up this matter and see that the U.N. takes an attitude which denies Israel all gains of aggression whether it is the aggression of 1840 or 1956 or 1967?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Prime Minister to reply.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa): We are neglected.

SHRI AWADESHWAR PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): All of us are neglected.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I allowed Mr. Sen Gupta. The Prime Minister.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The debate has revealed unanimity on our Resolution that the conflagration in West Asia should be extinguished as soon as possible. Our own efforts have all along been directed towards achieving this. One hon. Member has talked of consensus but the entire House has witnessed the consensus which now exists between the Opposition Members themselves! They seem to be so pleased with their newfound toy of Opposition unity that this is used on all occasions even, to try for a consensus of diametrically opposite views.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: But no such unity exists.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no party politics.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I am not sitting down.

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): This arrogance is not going to last long.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly hear.
(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: That is not the point. The question raised was of consensus of opinion on this particular matter. The Congress is united in this policy. It is the opposition which is divided. There are bound to be differences on such an important matter. Some hon. Members have resented the fact that we have talked about "escalation" of the conflict. But that is a fact which just cannot be bypassed. An hon. Member from this side has already said that at no time has non-align-ment meant neutrality or sitting on the fence and waiting for others to make up our mind. We have always made up our own minds in the interests of justice, in the interests of peace and we shall continue to do so. We have, as a matter of fact, on this issue given the most careful consideration and we have been moderate as well as cautious. May I draw your attention, Sir, and the attention of the House that in fact two Members have gone a step further than I have in my statement. They are hon. Members Dahyabhai Patel and I thank A. D. Mani. I did not talk about who started the war. It is they who named the country that started the war— I hope the House will note this. The same Members who complained that at the time of the fighting on our borders, certain countries did not name the aggressor, are to-day—the same people and the same parties—accusing us of trying to judge between the two countries. Let them take whatever line they like. It is not my concern—and it has nothing

to do with me—but let them be a little logical. It has been argued that by making such a statement we have in some mysterious way weakened our capacity to play a conciliatory role. With all due respect, I must say that this is a ridiculous proposition!. Our past experience of the last 30 years has demonstrated our capacity to render useful service in the case of peace and in each case we took a very definite, positive position. This has not prevented India from playing the historic role that we played in Indonesia, in Korea, in Indo-China, in the Suez crisis and in the Congo. We are at an objective presentation of the facts of the situation can help in the restoration of peace in the present perilous situation.

Some question was asked about past aggression. I think the House knows that the U.N. has twice condemned Israel for aggression.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Israel has been condemned for aggression many times by the U.N.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I would like to make it clear that we are not against any people. Our sympathies are always with the oppressed, those who have had to undergo suffering but what has caused the suffering of the Jewish people? Who has driven them out of Europe where they were distributed in many countries? The people who are now the people of Israel, belong to many countries. Why did they have to go out to find a new homeland? It was because of the bigotry and intolerance of the majority communities of those nations. I sincerely hope because sometimes we do hear similar narrow-views in our own country—that we will be very careful about these matters. The Government of India's view has always been one of tolerance. Not only the Government but I think our whole culture and history have pointed to that way.

श्री राजनारायण: सहजसता और
मुक्ति, दोनों का अन्वेषण है।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: One hon. Member has made the point about the evacuation of the U.N. contingent. I do not know what he was trying to prove. I do not know whether he was trying to find an alibi for a totally indefensible attack again by Israel.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: Was it only because of economy?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: This is entirely incorrect and I am told that my colleague, the Defence Minister, has just now contradicted that statement. When the UNEF was in Gaza, Israel knew it. They knew the position. They knew that this contingent was awaiting evacuation. To attack and kill these missionaries of peace was cruel and wanton. There is absolutely no justification for this act. The United Nations Emergency Force consists of about 3,400 people and the Indian contingent is about a thousand. Contingents of other countries are also there and the suggestion that we have been negligent is as unworthy as it is irresponsible.

The approved U.N. schedule provided for the repatriation of the Indian contingent is on the 19th June by sea. It was but natural for the Government of India, in the interests of an orderly withdrawal of the various contingents by the U.N., to agree to the schedule and mode of repatriation decided by the United Nations. Naturally we could not dream that Israel, knowing the entire situation, would act in the way it did. I am surprised that although hon. Members have expressed a little sympathy for the bereaved families, they have dealt with this matter so lightly as not even to condemn this action taken by Israel.

As regards the food ships there will perhaps be some delay and I am sure the House will be glad to know that an Indian food ship coming from the U.S.A. was allowed to pass through the Suez Canal. I do not think there is any other point. All the important points have been covered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.30.

The House then adjourned for lunch at forty-two minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock. The VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair.

THE PASSPORTS BILL, 1967—contd.

श्री निरंजन बर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) :
श्रीमान् उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, पासपोर्ट बिल के बारे में कल मैंने अपने विचार प्रकट किये थे उनके सन्दर्भ में आगे श्रीमान् की सेवा में और भी कुछ तथ्य में रखना चाहता हूँ जिससे यह प्रतीति प्रकट हो जायेगा कि जासन अपने हाथ में अधिक से अधिक सत्ता रखना चाहती है। जासन की इच्छा ऐसी नहीं है कि वह उन व्यक्तियों के हाथ में कुछ सत्ता दे जो कि बाहर जाना चाहते हैं या बाहर से लौट कर आना चाहते हैं। उन पर संकुल लगाने के लिये साधारणतः एक उदार नाति बरती जानी चाहिये थी लेकिन वह उदार नीति नहीं बरती गई, जैसा कि धारा 24 की उपधारा 2 (बी) से मान्य पड़ता है, उसमें यह है :—

"the classes of persons to whom passports and travel documents referred to respectively in sub-section (1) and sub-section (2) of section 4 may be issued;"