MR. CHAIRMAN: I have finished it. You can ask the Minister for the Report and put a question.

Revised Estimates (1966-67) and Budget Estimates (1967-68) of Employees’ State Insurance Corporation and Related Papers

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Revised Estimates for the year 1966-67 and the Budget Estimates for the year 1967-68 of the Employees’ State Insurance Corporation, together with the Performance-cum-Programme Statement and the Business Type Budget of the Corporation. [Placed in Library-See No. LT-545/67].

Commissions under the Coal Mines Provident Fund and Bonus Schemes Act, 1948

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the Notifications of the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Rehabilitation) Notification G.S.R. No. 435-R/Amtd LXXXII, dated the 17th March, 1967, publishing the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Amendment Rules, 1967, under sub-section (3) of section 40 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 [Placed in Library. See No. LT-544/67].

The Defence of India (Amendment) Rules, 1967


Statement re West Asian Crisis—contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On June 8, 1967, Shri Surendra Pal Singh made a statement in regard to the situation in West Asia. We had a sufficient discussion on this matter. Any Member desiring to ask questions may do so.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Chairman, before I ask questions, I would like to know from the Minister whether he has to make any additional statement with regard to West Asia because new
developments have taken place. Before we put questions, let him make statement clarifying the latest position.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): Well, Sir, we have all read in the papers—I have not got any official information—that the UAR has accepted the cease-fire and that Syria has accepted the cease-fire. On the political side, that is the only further development that has taken place since the statement was made yesterday. We are all anxious that fighting in this region should stop, that peace should be restored and that the parties should come to some amicable settlement.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: I would like to know from the Minister whether, when the Secretary General decided to withdraw the UN EF from the Gaza Strip and the tension was mounting, the Government of India requested the Secretary General to evacuate the Indian Contingent from the Gaza Strip by air. This is my first question.

The second question is this. In this West Asian crisis, the Government of India, instead of taking the overall picture into consideration, has resulted in support of the actions of the UAR, they have given their un-stinted, unqualified, unthinking and undeserved support to the UAR in this respect without ascertaining the proper position in West Asia, and they have thus lost a splendid opportunity of taking an initiative in restoring peace in that part of the world. I would also like to know from the Minister—whether he has reconciled himself to the existence of Israel as an independent country and whether the security, and integrity of the States recognised by the United Nations and who are all members of the United Nations will be protected and that they will not lend support to the UAR and other Arab countries to extinguish Israel from the map of Asia.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Sir, it is better for me if I answer each question because otherwise it is very difficult for me to answer the questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Let me first, deal with the question of the evacuation of the Indian Contingent. Naturally, everyone in this House is most anxious about their safety and I hope we all universally condemn the brutal, callous, deliberate attack that was made on them by the Israeli Forces. That is the Report of the Secretary-General. We have not yet had a word of apology from Israel or any expression of regret as to what has happened.

Now, let me shortly state the history. We tried to evacuate them through air. We chartered two Air India planes. We were then told by the United Nations that they were arranging the programme, the Forces were under their control, they had a staggering programme and they would see to it that that programme was carried out. Their suggestion was that they should be evacuated by sea and not by air, and we were told that a ship should leave Bombay on the 8th June, which would pick up people from the place where they were.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): On the 19th; that was the date fixed.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Nineteenth; that was fixed for evacuation. In the meanwhile, you know what happened. Now, we have been in communication with the United Nations’ authorities for an immediate evacuation, and I should like to tell the House the latest situation from the report which I got
this morning. Now, it has been discovered that it is not possible to evacuate our Indian Contingent from the Port of Gaza because it has become unserviceable and therefore they are going to be evacuated from a nearby port, which is the port of Ashdod. And this is what the report says:—

"We have decided to use Ashdod as being the most practicable embarkation point under the circumstances. Accordingly, Swedish Contingent, Norwegian Hospital and almost half of Indian Contingent wiH embark by s.s. Thuleland before midnight tonight for departure, that is, 0.30 hrs., 9th June. Troops have been on the move for the past two hours. Our present plans are complete withdrawal of all Contingents less Yugoslav Contingent from Gaza by the 10th of June. In the light of Gaza Port being unserviceable, there is no other alternative but to have the troops sent to Ashdod."

There is one further piece of news I would like to give. That is what the Secretary-General has done after we got in communication with him. The Secretary-General sent a direct telegram to the Premier of Israel last night, asking them that the ships must be allowed to pick up our troops by Friday night. The United Nations has been informed that three ships are lined up, a Swedish ship and two Yugoslav vessels. They are to reach the Gaza harbour by Saturday morning. One of the ships is already in the Gaza waters. This was the previous information that we had. But now we are told that the Gaza harbour is not serviceable and, therefore, our troops should be picked up from Ashdod. I hope there will be no further casualties.

I would also like to mention to the House with deep regret that the numbers of our casualties are larger than was reported in the statement. The latest figures are 11 killed, 24 injured and 7 missing. I hope the whole House wiH join with me in expressing our condolences to the families of the bereaved.

These brave men went there in the cause of peace, to preserve peace and I think the House will agree with me that it is terrible that they should have met with this fate when they were about to be repatriated home. We may differ as to our policy. But there can be no doubt and I hope that the whole House will be behind me in condemning Israel for this deliberate...

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): It should be on facts.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Yes, on facts. The facts are from the Secretary-General of the United Nations. I have got the reports here. (Interruptions). May I finish?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, here we stood up in silence for the great people who have been killed. Now three more people have been known to be killed. I hope you will ask the House to stand in silence.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I was saying that these reports are not from any partisan source. They are not reports from the U. A. R. or the Arab countries. I have got both the reports from the Secretary-General here. There can be no doubt that this contingent, which was in the Gaza strip, where the flag of the United Nations was flying, where there were proper markings, where there was no mistaking as to who these people were, they were first strafed and then artillery fire was directed against them. We may differ as to our policy with regard to Israel. But I am sure there will not be a dissenting voice in this House in condemning this action on the part of Israel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I ask you to stand up for a minute in silence as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased?

(Hon. Members then stood in silence for one minute).
SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: He has not answered my other question.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: There was the other question that I have to answer. The second question was whether the action that we took, or the decision that we took, has prevented us from taking an initiative for peace. My hon. friend has only got to read the statements made by our very able representative, Mr. Parthasarathy, in New York. What has he been doing?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: There was so much divergence between the statement of our representative and the statement that you have made here.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: There was no divergence. He was acting under our instructions. After all, an Ambassador has not got a policy of his own. An Ambassador carries out the policy of his Government.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: He has acted well.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: If he has acted well, the Government has acted well. He was acting under our instructions (Interruption by Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel) and not his own instructions, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Why do you not follow your own instructions? You observe neutrality here. Why do you take a partisan attitude?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He did not remain neutral there. He criticised Israel. He voiced the sentiments of the Government of India, of the people of India and he said that Israel was escalating the war. He also suggested that the cease-fire be linked up with withdrawal to the position as on June 4.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: May I say a word about neutrality of which my friend, Mr. Patel, is very fond? India has never been neutral. It does not believe in neutrality. It believes in non-alignment. Throughout our history we have passed judgements. We have stood up for causes. Look at our history. And if I am going to be asked today that India should fold up its tent and retire into isolation, I say that would be a bad day for our country.

Now, as regards the question of annihilation of Israel let me say this, President Nasser made it perfectly clear that he will not take the first step against Israel, that he will not start aggression. But he said if Israel started aggression, it will be a war to the finish, and I agree he used the words "Israel will be annihilated". But he made it perfectly clear—you can read all his statements—that he did not want to start the war, that he did not want to start the conflict . . .

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: What about his previous utterances?

SHRT DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: And what about his action?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: May I finish? As regards the existence of Israel, we have recognised Israel. We have a Consulate in Bombay. And there can be no question about our attitude as far as the existence of Israel is concerned.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir, a few days ago we had asked for information on this matter and the hon. Minister referred to some letters that he had received. I requested whether copies of those letters would be available to us. There is no answer. I have also followed up with a letter. There is no answer yet about the letter he is supposed to have received, the source of his information on the basis of which he says the aggression came from Israel.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN (Andhra Pradesh): It did come.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: That may be your opinion.
SHRI P. K. KUMARAN: It is a fact.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The position is this. The United Nations Peace Force was there and they were asked to go away. By whom? By the U.A.R. The Force of peace was asked to leave and leave Israel open to aggression. President Nasser vowed to exterminate, to eliminate this little State of Israel which has been standing up against the aggression. What did we do when Pakistan threatened? We took the offensive because offence is the best mode of defence. How can you blame Israel?

HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The only point is this, Sir, what the Congress policy. . . [The Minister of Defence (Sardar Swaran Singh) stood up in his seat] I am not yielding.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I am on a point of order.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am not yielding, Sir.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I am on a point of order. He must yield. My point of order is simple. How far is the hon. Member justified in distorting the Indian position? We never took the offensive. We were all the time on the defensive, and I want a very clear assurance that nothing will be said to tarnish our image and to misrepresent us.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir, the trouble with our Government is that they would not learn. They do not learn that when we tried to take the offensive, we failed; we could not reach Lahore, while the little Israel, when they took the offensive, they succeeded in making the enemy run for its life.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh) : Does he want us to learn from Israel? 892 RS—6.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I ask you to listen. I want silence to be maintained. I would give you an opportunity.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: If my friends here who are getting excited could only learn this thing from the country from which they take so many lessons, its attitude to the meaning of the word "non-alignment" if perhaps our Government had followed that line, we would not have been in these difficulties. Sir, I want to know from the Minister why the Government of India did not decide to airlift our Army personnel which was exposed to 1 P.M. such a risk there. It is a shame. Every time we are asked to get up and respect their memory. Certainly we respect them. The whole country has the greatest respect for our armed forces. But what has this Government reduced our armed forces to? Why should we wait for ships? Have we not got Air India? Have we not got our Air Force in this country? Is the Air Force reserved for only V. I. Ps. and for the use of Ministers if they want to go about in connection with elections? What about these army personnel? I charge this Government with utter neglect in looking after the safety of these personnel who were out on a mission of peace. They should have been airlifted from there when the situation became so serious. It is utter bankruptcy. There was some talk of charges and that the U.N. would not pay their charges for airlifting. Sir, is the Government of India haggling over this small matter of charges? They see crores and crores of rupees going down the drain. It does not bother them. The matter of charges could have been argued afterwards. Well, we make a large contribution to the U. N. Fund. We
could have made a deduction from it later on. But the first thing that was necessary was to secure the safety of the personnel who were isolated and who were exposed to risk by the action of the Government of India. The action of the Government of India may have been prompted by the U.N. and perhaps whether we were right in following the directions given by the U.N. in this matter, is a matter that can be argued. But certainly we were not right in exposing our men to grave risks of death in this manner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a discussion for 4 hours on this. I would request you to put your questions now.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: May I ask the hon. Minister whether he refused to see the Council of Israel, who he says represents his country here in Bombay, when he came to see him yesterday? May I know whether it is not a fact that the Secretary of the Department, Mr. Azim Hussain, also refused to see him and all correspondence with Israel is carried on through a third party, and that is why Government of India's information is so slow? They write to a third country from here and they write to Israel or the United Nations and we get that information here after two days. On the second day or the third day, we get second hand information, passed on to us as third-hand. And, therefore the House is not properly informed in this matter. Will the hon. Minister answer?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Yes, Sir. I wish Mr. Dahyabhai Patel's indignation was directed against the right country and the country that is to blame. He has not said one word—the House will notice—condemning Israel for what was done to our fellow countrymen. Now Sir, as regards Israeli aggression, here is a piece of evidence which Mr. Dahyabhai Patel will digest in his more sober moments. This is from 'The Indian Express' dated the 9th June, 1967:

"Israel has officially admitted that it fired the first shot in the Arab-Israel conflict, now in its fourth day.

Israel's Ambassador in London, Mr. Aharon Renez, in his talk at a meeting of British M.P.s of all political persuasions last night made no excuses for the Israeli offensive that plunged West Asia into a calamitous war.

He justified the Israeli offensive on the ground that, surrounded as Israel was then, offensive was the only way out for it."

Here is a confession, an admission.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is trying to justify that by our action against Pakistan.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I hope Mr. Dahyabhai Patel again in his leisure moments will read history and find out what happened in 1965.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I have read.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: It was only at the beginning that we took the offensive. It was only in the midst of the war, at a certain time.

(Interruption)

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: As my hon. friend pointed out, I am surprised and shocked that any Indian and certainly a Member of Parliament should say that we took the offensive against Pakistan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: He has distorted what I said.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I have argued this case in the Security Council and I know the facts. I am prepared to argue it out in five minutes now. Every action of ours was
defensive. It was only when the Army of Pakistan was marching towards Chhamb trying to cut our lifeline that we took action against Lahore, purely defensively.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: That is exactly what I said.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: That is not what Mr. Patel said . . . ( Interruption ) Now, Sir, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel said certain things which I have got to correct. As regards the source of information on aggression I got his letter yesterday. The draft is ready and it has given what the position is. Mr. Dahyabhai Patel wrote a letter to you asking for certain facts. That letter was forwarded to me and I have sent a reply to "the Chairman which contains two pages of the sources from which I deduced that Israeli leaders had made certain statements which were highly provocative. If Mr. Dahyabhai Patel will only take the trouble of seeing the Chairman, I am sure the Chairman will show him.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I asked four days ago.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Now, Mr. Patel has waxed eloquent about negligence of the Government in looking after the interests of our forces in UNEF and has also made capital out of the fact that UNEF was made to move out and, therefore, all this trouble arose. Does he know that when the United Nations passed a resolution for the establishment of the UNEF, Israel refused to have the UNEF on its territory and only U.A.R. agreed to have it? And it was not our action. The Secretary-General made it perfectly clear that when the U.A.R. withdrew its consent and its approval, the UNEF had no locus standi and it had to be withdrawn.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: What about the Government of India's moral responsibility to bring them here?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I am coming to that. You should know that I am on my legs now. "Now, as regards our responsibility, we have sent telegram after telegram to the United Nations suggesting an airlift, that every possible step should be taken to evacuate these forces as soon as possible. Now let us look at the position. We have a commander if his contingent, Gen. Rikhye, an extremely able Indian officer. He is in charge of this contingent. He is under the orders of the United Nations. He is a United Nations force. After all, there is such a thing as discipline in the military. We can make suggestions, but it is for the United Nations in consultation with the Commanding Officer, Gen. Rikhye, to make the necessary arrangements and as I said, every day we have been sending telegrams, making suggestions for airlift and ships to be made available and doing whatever could be done. How can we be blamed for negligence when we have taken every action. It was for the United Nations in consultation with Gen. Rikhye to on the way of evacuating those forces. The contingents of other countries also are there, which are equally in danger. It is not only our contingent which is there. Because we have placed the contingent at the disposal of the United Nations . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Is it not a fact that a certain contingent left by air?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Then question of economy. There was no question of economy at all.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Why doesn't he answer my question? Is it not a fact that a certain contingent left by air?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Canada did evacuate its contingent by air because the U.A.R. pointed out to the Canadians that in view of the Canadian attitude in the Security Council and elsewhere, the Canadian
in U.A.R. at that time were not welcome and, therefore, they advised them that they should immediately take them away. So that was a special case. The Swedes were there*, the Yugoslavs were there, the Brazilians were there and the Irish were there. So this is a wrong suggestion. And if I may add with all humility, in a situation where brave sons of India, who went there in the cause of peace, have lost their lives at the brutal hands of a callous Government, here are people who are out to find alibis for them and thus damage the morale of the people.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: About the last question, again Mr. Patel is wrong. He said that the consul of Israel came to see yesterday and the Secretary and the Minister did not see him. That is false. He was with him for half an hour and I am glad to say that the Secretary informed the consul in no unmistakable terms of our feelings with regard to what Israel has done.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Why do you not divulge all that he said? Did he not say anything about the person who died? Why do you not divulge that?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): On a point of order. Would the word 'false' become parliamentary if it is used by the Minister of External Affairs?

SHRI M. C CHAGLA: Mr. Patel made a categorical statement. Of course, he knows more about the consuls than I do. He is ronstantly in touch with the Consuls but he made a statement—the record can be read—that neither I nor the Secretary concerned agreed to see the consul. That is a false statement and I repeat that it is a false statement because he was with the Secretary for some time. I do not use unparliamentary expressions.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I accept the Minister's statement. The Minister did not see him but the Secretary saw him.
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नें उन समय कहा था (Interruptions.) जब वह इजरायल का जमा हुआ था। तो मैं वह पृथ्वी चाहता हूँ मई के बाद होने के तीन दिन तक पहले संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की सेनाएँ का संमेलन के हरे के समय, हरे के मिसाल में दिखा है। सरकार ने घरी तक यह कहा है कि हमने अपनी सेनायें को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के मिसाल कर दिया है। यह हाल भरी तक हाल रही है कि उनकी इस बारे में कोई जिम्मेदार नहीं है।

इस तरह की बात मंदी में जो ने कहा कि हमने अपनी सेनायें को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के मिसाल कर दिया है।

Now it is the duty and responsibility of Samyukta Rashtra Sangh to see and send them back to India.

मैं समझा था कि यह किसी भी जिम्मेदार सरकार की तरफ से ऐसी साफ़क पर नहीं होती थी। उन्होंने जब इसे एक वाइल्ड ब्रांच का साफ़ करते हैं। मैं इस साफ़कों को नहीं मानता हूँ। मैं अपनी ब्राईल साफ़क और अन्य लोकीय संस्था को जीतने के बाद इसकी राय का हूँ कि सरकार ने ऐसा मानते हैं कि अपनी जिम्मेदारी को नहीं दिखाया है। इस सरकार को मई के प्रमुख इतिहास में मान्य होगा कि विदेशों की फ़ोर्सें मिश्र में हरे छोड़े गए हैं और अपने देश की जीत में सेना बहुमूल्य है। उन्होंने भी बहुमूल्य सेना का आदेश नहीं दिया है।

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON (Kerala): I would like to know whether he is against the existence of Israel?

SHRI RAJNARAIN: You will come to know.

तो मैं वह कहा था कि इस बारे में जब तक यह नहीं है कि जब इजरायल के अधिकार की नीति होती है, हम तत्कालीन नीति पूरा हो तो मैं उसके यह पृथ्वी खाना है कि तत्कालीन नीति में ब्रायल विदेशियों की नीति में किसके हैं? अपनी साफ़क प्राप्ति के बाद उनकी नीति में यह ब्रायल नहीं है? मैं इसके बाद की नीति नहीं मानता हूँ कि उन्हें यह ब्रायल नहीं है? मैं इसके बाद की नीति नहीं मानता हूँ कि उन्हें यह ब्रायल नहीं है?

विदेश की नीति का मतलब बताता है कि यह हमारा लाभ नहीं है? यह हमारा लाभ नहीं है? यह हमारा लाभ नहीं है? यह हमारा लाभ नहीं है?

ब्रायल नहीं है? यह हमारा लाभ नहीं है?
Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are getting away from the subject. I should say, you kindly put the questions relating to this matter. And, then there are so many others who would like to put questions. Kindly finish up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Rajnarain. You have put enough number of questions. Mr. Ansari.
SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Before Mr. Ansari, may I briefly answer the questions? I do not want to go into the history of the foundation of Israel. My hon. friend, Mr. Rajnarain, has quoted Dr. Lohia. I have also got a quotation of Gandhiji, what he said, what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said but, as I said we do no; want to go into the past.

SHRI F. AJNARAIN: If you do not go into the past, you will not know the present and you will not know the future.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I know tho past, I do not want to go into it, as I said, just now. If my hon. friend, Mr. Rajnarain, does not know the difference between non-alignment and neutrality, the only thing I can say is: I feel very sorry for him.

Now as regards the question of ceasefire, he has made a very extraordinary statement, "Why did we not advise the Arab States to carry out the Resolution?" The very fact that we voted for the Resolution—it was a unanimous Resolution—meant that we agreed with the other Members that there should be a cease-fire. What further advice could we give than a decision . . .

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: May I finish, please? What further advice could we give than that contained in the Resolution passed by the highest international tribunal we have got in the world?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Did you exert any pressure on the U.A.R. to accept a cease-fire?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: What pressure? What greater pressure can there be than a Resolution of the Security Council, to which we were a party? If we had not voted for it, then the criticism would be justified, as why we did not vote for it. But it was a unanimous Resolution to which we were a party.
A contributing factor to the casualties suffered from artillery fire was the proximity of the United Arab Republic military positions to the camps concerned.
SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: May I answer the last question first because it is very important? The reason why we have taken up the attitude that both, the force, must go back to the position that they occupied on 4th June is this. In our opinion—and I am sure the House will agree with me—if aggression is committed, the aggressor should not be permitted to keep the benefits of aggression. Now, there is no doubt that . . .

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: What about the Gulf of Aqaba?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I will deal with Aqaba also presently. There is no doubt now and I have read the statement of the Israeli Ambassador himself that the first shot was fired by Israel against the Arab countries.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: After the blockade.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I will come to the blockade. As for the Gulf of Aqaba, I have stated in my statement that since, 1957 our position is that this is an internal waterway, a coastal sea of Egypt. Right or wrong, that has been our attitude. But let us see what has happened. How is it that Israel got this, right of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba? It was after the Suez crisis. It is common ground that
(Shri M. C. Chagla,) before 1965, no Israeli ship was permitted to pass through the Strait of Tiran and to pass Aqaba to the Port of Eilah. It was after the Suez crisis that Israel got this benefit as a result of that aggression. Therefore, that aggression was not vacated at all. President Nasser . . .

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: Why don't you go back to the year 1949?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I do not know whether Israel was better off in 1949.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: How will Israel exist? We have taken the position that Israel should exist.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: But has she to exist by the fruits of aggression? She has other ports on the Mediterranean. That can hardly be an argument. Now, may I point out that till 1956—many hon. Members do not realise it—before 1956, the Strait of Tiran was not open to Israeli ships, it was only after the Suez aggression, and there can be no doubt today that the historical fact is that there was collusion between the United Kingdom, France and Israel to commit this aggression which is known as the Suez crisis.

With regard to the other point made by Mr. Bhandari, that the Prime Minister's policy was actuated by repercussions in Pakistan, let me say that that is absolutely untrue. This country does not formulate its foreign policy by considering what the reaction of a particular country might be.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: But this is what she said.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: As the External Affairs Minister and before too, I know that whatever India does Pakistan will be hostile to it. So we are not worried about what Pakistan thinks about our action. Do not forget that in 1956 Pakistan did not support the Arab world on the Suez crisis. We stood by the Arab world and today history has proved that we were right and what was done there was a gross injustice to the Arab people.

Now, my hon. friend asks what are the reasons for the Israeli attack. We are not considering the reasons now. We are considering . . .

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: I also asked whether you have received any information about Gen. Rikh-ye's report.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Yes, quite right. I shall deal with that. Now, Gen. Rikh-ye is an international civil servant. He is not under our control. He does not report to the External Affairs Ministry or to the Defence Ministry presided over by my colleague here. His contact is only with the United Nations and the Secretary-General. We cannot issue orders to him. He has no obligation to report to us. Therefore, as I explained in answer to Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, it was entirely between Gen. Rikh-ye and the Secretary-General. The most that we could do was to make suggestion to the Secretary-General through our Permanent Representative! there and say, "Please do something to evacuate our people as soon as possible."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: First of all, I should like to ask a small question and that is whether the hon. Minister is aware that the Israeli Consulate people having done their job in Bombay have now landed in Delhi and are contacting the press, politicians and even some people in the Government with a view to getting the stand of India with regard to his crisis in West Asia modified in favour of Israel, America and Britain?

Secondly, do I understand that the Government still stands by the statement of May 25 which the Minister of External Affairs made giving the Government's assessment of the situation in West Asia and also enunciating the stand of the Government? I ask this question because there is a concerted effort on the part of certain political
forces—some well-guided, others misguided—to influence the Government in a wrong direction, accompanied by pressure from the West. Therefore it is very, very essential because I think the 25th May statement is one of the very good statements made on external affairs, on foreign affairs, by the Government in recent years.

I should also like to know whether the Government is taking all possible steps to see that the doctrine that the aggressor must not enjoy the fruits of aggression is being implemented so that the cease-fire would not end; is a cease-fire if it came, but would certainly mean the complete evacuation by the Israeli aggressor from the territories they have occupied. I ask this question because in today's paper we find that the Israeli military officers and politicians are saying that they are going to stay put in Jerusalem and other places. There is every reason to think that backed by the United States and Britain, they will remain there and also in other parts, like Aqaba and so on. I should also like to point out that the Americans in the United Nations and elsewhere in New York are saying that their war has been won or something like that. In fact, they say, 'we are on the winning side'. That is to say, they are so identified with Israel that with very military success—temporary—which Israel has gained, the Americans are saying that their side is winning. Has the hon. Minister taken due note of such statements made by them?

I should also like to know whether our Representative at the United Nations has been given proper instructions that this cease-fire must be treated only as a first step and that other steps must immediately follow, leading to the withdrawal of the forces to the positions as on June 4. That was a very sound decision taken by the Government. Does the Government stand by that decision and what instructions have they given to our Representative at the United Nations? The other day Mr. Dahyabhai Patel congratulated Mr. Parthasarathy under the assumption that Mr. Parthasarthy was saying something which suits Mr. Dahyabhai Patel.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I still maintain that his stand was better and more logical than what Mr. Chagla says.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Today I think he will not congratulate Mr. Parthasarthy because between the time he showered his encomiums on Mr. Parthasarthy and now, Mr. Parthasarthy has again spoken in the United Nations Security Council and he has said rather more strongly all that Mr. Chagla has said.

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA (Madhya Pradesh): Under the direction of Mr. Chagla.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then both should be congratulated. Mr. Parthasarthy has won his congratulations and Mr. Chagla should get that now. Why—poor chap—are you all the time attacking him? If you congratulate Mr. Parthasarthy then you should congratulate the man who is directing Mr. Parthasarthy to do such things. That is only fair.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Not directing; mis-directing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore F say this. The point now is that terrific pressure is being built by the West and their lobby is active in our country; the Israelis also are active. They want India to take up a position when Israel would be in a position to enjoy the fruits of aggression. Nothing would be more dishonourable, nothing would be more calamitous, nothing would be more criminal, nothing would be more shameful than to permit the Israeli aggressor to remain in a state of aggression and continue that aggression under the cover of a cease-fire. Let us be very, very clear about it. Everybody has said that. Therefore I would like a categorical assurance; I am sure Mr. Chagla will give that assurance because that is in line with his policy. For once after many years, Mr. Chairman, we find
ourselves in general agreement with their policy about the Arabis indeed all freedom-loving people in the world will be in agreement with this policy which brings honour and prestige to our country. As an Indian I feel proud that we are standing by the Arab people, that the days of Lawrence have passed and a new dawn is coming up there. Therefore it is very, very important.

I shall also like to have another assurance. I want to know whether the Government is aware that in this country the monopoly Press is being briefed day and night in order to write in favour of Israel and against the Arabs and bring disgrace to our position. If it is so, what is the guarantee we have to counter such propaganda? May I have an assurance from the hon. Minister that the Government of India will instruct at least the All India Radio to intensify its broadcasts in order to make our position known to the whole world? It is very, very important. Therefore it is very essential that India's position should be stated and stated in different languages, especially in Arab languages, so that the people know what we stand for here.

Finally, I would like to know one thing. And here the Government is silent. I can understand their difficulty; that is the P. L. 480 problem. The real culprit, the real criminal, the masters of Israel are the United Kingdom. You read the speeches of the British Government spokesmen, of Mr. Wilson and other people and read also the speeches of the American spokesmen. It is quite clear they had prepared to strike before it was too late because they had realised that the Islamic Pact and Arab Pact and that kind of things had divided the Arab nations and there was a fiasco and before the Arabs were better armed they wanted to smash them. That was the criminal part of it. Is it not a fact that the Israeli Prime Minister made a statement that the aim of Israel was to march to Damascus? If anybody in this context had announced a declaration of war it was Israel and the aim was declared to be to march to Damascus and to destroy Damascus.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Both sides have done that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, not both sides. President Nasser had never said that. Only after that President Nasser started operations in that region. Therefore you cannot say that. I am surprised that an officer of the Ministry met that Israeli representative who came here, whose hand is dripping with the blood of our Indian soldiers. Do I have an assurance that these people would be asked to quit this country? This Consulate is a source of intrigue, interference, political pressure and downright bribery. I would like to know how we are going to stop this political bribery which is going on after the cold-blooded murders of our Indian brethren who were in soldiers' uniform on an international peace mission. All these things he should clarify.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am only allowing one more Member, Mr. Niren Ghosh, to speak. After that the Minister will reply.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Sir, you have not given anybody a chance from this side.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Sir, may I... .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You would like to reply to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Yes; I will answer in two minutes.

I want to assure this House and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that the policy enunciated by this Government in the statement made on the 25th May stands. There is no change in the policy because that policy is based on our national interests and the cause of what we consider to be justice and right.
As regards the question whether Israel would be allowed to keep Jerusalem and other places, whatever the future may be, our Representative has made it clear in supporting the cease-fire resolution—the hon. Member may read his speech—that we stand by the attitude that we have taken that the two forces should withdraw to the positions occupied by them on the 4th of June.

As regards the activities of the Consul for Israel, he has been told in no unmistakable terms that it is not for a Consul to attack or criticise Government policy. Even an Ambassador is not permitted to do so, much less a Consul, who really looks after consular activities and is not supposed to indulge in political activities.

Sir, there is one thing I should like to say. My friend, Mr. Bhandari, is not here. There was a statement in The Hindustan Times' to which he referred and said there was some slant in the report made by General Rikhey about the Israeli attack on our contingent. I have got the report of General Rikhey, which was sent to the Secretary-General, and I want to assure this House that from this report it is perfectly clear that the attack was by the Israeli forces. It was deliberate, it was callous, it was calculated. There was no question of any mistake. *(Interruptions)* Let me finish.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: After I have finished this, I cannot enter into the motives of people *(Interruption)* Israel knows that she has taken up an anti-Indian attitude and you can draw your own conclusion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Consul met the management.
Calling Attention to a matter of urgent

[Shri Niren Ghosh.] ment have expressed any opinion? Is it in the know of the Government of India that the Israeli position is to stay put in the territories now gained as a result of aggression? Formally or informally or through any other source, do the Government of India know about the intention of the Government of the United States? My last question is, since our armed personnel have been deliberately killed, may I know whether the Israeli Consul would be asked to wind up? I demand that we should sever our consular relations with Israel.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Chinese Embassy is still in India.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: My friend has asked me why did not Israel agree to the stationing of UN-EF on Israeli territory. We’ll, there are many resolutions of the United Nations which Israel has not accepted and this is one of those. Even with regard to partition the fact today is that the partition plan, which was drawn up by the United Nations, gave to Israel fifty per cent of Palestine. Today, as a matter of fact, she is occupying 80 per cent, but I do not want to go into the history of that. I can give a catalogue. For the edification of my friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, how many resolutions of the United Nations have not been carried out or accepted or honoured by Israel?

Now, Sir, as regards the question whether the United States and the United Kingdom gave cover to Israeli forces, I can only tell the House that both the United States and the United Kingdom have officially denied that any cover was given by them or that they took any part in the hostilities between Israel and the Arab States. I cannot disclose to this House what talks took place between diplomats in the United Nations. Some question was put to me whether the American Ambassador told something to Mr. Parthasarathy. Obviously the House will understand that the representatives meet from time to time. Their various discussions may be reported to us, but that is not a matter which can be divulged to this House.

DR. ANUP SINGH: May I draw the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the column in 'The Statesman' of today wherein the episode that we are discussing has been characterised as infamous. I would like just to submit that every correspondent has the right to choose the language according to his taste and knowledge and he could have said that the statement was partisan, inappropriate, rash, uncritical, etc. Now, English is not my mother-tongue, nor that of the correspondent, but the word 'infamous' has the connotation of moral depravity. Jalianwala was an infamous act. Genocide is infamous, but to refer to a statement made by the Minister of External Affairs as infamous— whether the choice was deliberate or inadvertent—I think is most unfortunate, unwanted and uncalled for.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I think that is a matter which the Press Council may take notice.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Sir, I read that column and I was myself surprised at the use of that expression. I thought that particular correspondent was a master of the English language, but after reading that I doubt whether he really understood the implications of the word he was using. I wish he had consulted an English dictionary before he used that word.

2 P.M.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): With your permission, Sir, I rise to announce that Government Business in the