

to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Report of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, for the year 1964-85. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-543/67].

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
श्रीमान, व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। मैं आप से जानना चाहता हूँ कि आप ने क्या खोजा है। सदा के सदस्यों की यह मांग थी कि माननीय मंत्री जी के पत्रों में जो स्पष्ट है उसको पढ़ें, उसके बारे में आपने कुछ कहा नहीं है कि सरकार पढ़ने जा रही है या नहीं पढ़ने जा रही है। मंत्री जी ने सदन को कह दिया that he has got BOIT information through reliable source; through the Central Government machinery

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].

NOTIFICATIONS 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 Labour and Employment), under section 7-A of the Coal, Mines Provident Fund and

Bonus Schemes Act, 1948. [Placed In Library. See No. LT-612/67 to 615167]

THE DISPLACED PERSONS (COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION) AMENDMENT RULES, 1967

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Rehabilitation) Notification G.S.R. No. 435-R/Amdt 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

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under section 41 of the Defence of India Act, 1962, a copy of the Ministry of Home Affairs Notification GSR. No. 81, dated the 25th May, 1967, publishing the Defence of India (Amendment) Rules, 1967. [Placed in library. See No. LT-549/67].

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

[Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy.]

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 unstinted, 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—we are all anxious to have peace restored in that part of the world—whether they have taken into consideration the statements made by Syria, the UAR and other Arab countries that their main aim is to annihilate Israel, 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 will 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 Yugoslave 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 will join with me in expressing our sympathies and 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?

SHRI 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 made 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.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: That is the trouble with our Government and, of course, our friends here.

(Some hon. Members stood up in their seats)

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

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

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 *A* cussion for li 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 3ay or (he 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 io 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 patt] 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. 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. RUTHNASWAMY: It was mil at the beginning that we 'ook t'ne offensive. It was only in the midst ul' tiie war, at a certain time . . .

(Interruption)

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I hav* 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 *<of* 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. This 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. Rikhi, 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 go 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?

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

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 constantly 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.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Rajnarain. You put questions for clarification.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, मैं अब फिर आपके जरिये अपने सम्मानित सदन के सदस्यों से अपील करता हूँ कि वे अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मसलों पर जरा धीरज के साथ लोगों की बात को सुनें। (Interruptions.) गम्भीरता के साथ सुनें।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Both national and international.

श्री राजनारायण : इमीडिएट एम और अल्टीमेट एम, यानी फौरी और दूरस्थ, इन दोनों पालिसियों में कोई एक रूपता होगी। एक सवाल तो मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ और मंत्री जी से चाहूँगा कि वे इसका जवाब देंगे। (Interruptions.) तत्काल लक्ष्य और दूरस्थ लक्ष्य, इमीडिएट एम और अल्टीमेट एम, यह हमारा क्या है, यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जरा दिमाग को परेशान करके इन दोनों पक्षों को समझ लिया जाय। यह न कोई एलीबाई है अमेरिका के और न रूस के एलीबाई हैं, तो क्या इससे विश्व में भारत की कोई आवाज बनी? यह मेरा निवेदन है और मैं यह जवाब चाहता हूँ, चाहे स्वर्ण सिंह जी दें या श्री चागला साहब दें।

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You say ally, not alibi.

श्री राजनारायण : उन्होंने एलीबाई कहा, इसलिए मैंने भी वही कह दिया। मेरा प्वाइन्ट यह है और मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब इसराइल बना था, तो अमेरिका और रूस दोनों ही इसराइल के बनने के हक में थे या नहीं? एक पार्टी उस समय हिन्दुस्तान में थी और वह सोशलिस्ट पार्टी थी, जिसने यह कहा था कि इसराइल एशिया की छाती में एक खंजर है और पश्चिमी देशों ने सांठ गांठ करके हँसिये मत और हँसने से आप समझ नहीं पायेंगे। न हम रूस की हिमायत करते हैं और न ही अमेरिका की हिमायत करते हैं। एक व्यक्ति

ने उस समय कहा था (Interruptions.) जब कि इजराइल का जन्म हुआ था। तो मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ मई के खत्म होने के तीन दिन पहले संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की सेनाओं का मिश्र से हटने का एलान हो गया था। सरकार ने अभी तक यह कहा है कि हमने अपनी सेनाओं को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के सिपुर्द कर दिया है। यह बात अभी तक सरकार कह रही है कि उसकी इस बारे में कोई जिम्मेदारी नहीं है। इस तरह की बात माननीय मंत्री जी ने कही कि हमने अपनी सेनाओं को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के सिपुर्द कर दी है। Now it is the duty and responsibility of Samyukt Rashtra Sangh to see and send them back to India.

मैं समझता हूँ कि यह किसी भी जिम्मेदार सरकार की तरफ से ऐसी सफाई पेश नहीं होनी चाहिये जैसे एक कातिल अपनी सफाई पेश करता है। मैं इस सफाई को नहीं मानता हूँ। मैं अब अभी श्री चागला साहब और श्री स्वर्ण सिंह जी को सुनने के बाद इस पक्की राय का हूँ कि सरकार ने इस मामले में अपनी जिम्मेदारी को नहीं निभाया है। इस सरकार को मई के आखिरी हफ्ते में मालूम हो गया कि सिक्योरिटी फोर्स मिश्र से हटने वाली हैं और अपने देश की जो सेना वहाँ गई है उसको भी वहाँ से हटना है। मगर इस सरकार को इतनी अकल नहीं है कि वहाँ पर जिस तरह का वातावरण उस समय था उसने लड़ाई छिड़ सकती थी और हमारे सैनिक शंशक में आ सकते थे। इसलिए मैं सरकार को इसके लिए दोषी ठहराता हूँ। मैं यहाँ पर इजराइल को भी दोष देना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि वहाँ पर हमारे कुछ सैनिक मारे गये। जब अमेरिका के सैनिक मारे गये थे इजराइल ने अमेरिका से क्षमा मांगी। उसने अमेरिका से कहा कि गलती से जो सैनिक तुम्हारे मारे गये हैं, उसके लिए हमें खेद है। इसी तरह से वह हमारे सैनिकों के मारे जाने पर भी खेद प्रकट कर सकता था मगर उसने नहीं किया और इसलिए वह अपराधी है। मेरे खयाल में उनको हमसे

क्षमा मांगनी चाहिये थी क्योंकि हमारे सिपाही उनकी गोली से मरे हैं।

मैं यहाँ पर श्री जेड ए० अहमद साहब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब इजराइल की स्थापना हुई थी तो क्या वहाँ पर रूस उसकी स्थापना में नहीं था। रूस और अमेरिका दोनों ही इजराइल के निर्माण में सहयोगी रहे हैं। तो मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब इजराइल की स्थापना हुई थी, उस समय कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने कोई आवाज उठाई थी? सिवाय सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के, और डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया ने कहा था कि इजराइल की स्थापना करके एशिया की छाती में एक खंजर रख दिया गया 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 यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि श्री चागला साहब ने बहुत अच्छी बात कही कि हम बिन लगाव की नीति वाले हैं, हम तटस्थ नीति वाले हैं तो मैं उनसे यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि तटस्थ नीति में और बिनलगाव की नीति में क्या फर्क है? अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय पैमाने पर शायद उसको न मैं समझ पाऊंगा और न वे खुद ही समझ पावेंगे। बिन लगाव की नीति का मतलब क्या होता है? क्या हमारा लगाव न रूस से है और न अमेरिका से है? मगर एक मौके पर सरकार ने हिम्मत क्यों नहीं की? जब संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल में सर्वसम्मति से यह फैसला लिया था कि तत्काल युद्ध बंद हो, तो अरब राष्ट्रों ने युद्ध बंद करने का एलान क्यों नहीं किया? यह हमारा सवाल है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि अगर सरकार बिनलगाव नीति वाली होगी, तो सरकार को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में सर्वसम्मति से जो प्रस्ताव रूस के इनीशियेटिव पर पास हुआ था कि युद्ध फौरन बंद करो, तब भारत सरकार ने अरब राष्ट्रों के

[श्री राजनारायण]

फौरन युद्ध बंद न करने के ऐलान के लिए भर्त्सना क्यों नहीं की ? इसराइल ने कहा कि युद्ध बंद करने के लिए तैयार हैं बशर्ते दूसरा भी करे। आप कहेंगे कि इसकी सफाई हो सकती है और सरकार कह सकती है कि वह अपने हमले का गेन करना चाहता था, तो मैं सरकार से यह पूछता चाहता हूँ कि जब पाकिस्तान ने हमारे ऊपर हमला किया था। पाकिस्तान ने जब कंजरकोट पर हमला करके उसके किले को ले लिया था, तो सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य इस बात को समझें कि हमने सीज फायर किया था, हमने लड़ाई बंदी की थी और इसके लिए तीन आदमियों की एक कमेटी बनी थी, स्वीडन, यूगोस्लाविया और ईरान और ये त.नों फैसला करेंगे कि 3500 हजार वर्ग मील भूमि किस की है, जिसको पाकिस्तान कहता है हमारी है और भारत कहता है हमारी है।

मगर बन्द हो गई लड़ाई और लड़ाई बन्द होने के बाद एक ट्रिब्यूनल बैठा और ट्रिब्यूनल उस पर फैसला ले रहा है।

दूसरी एक बात, जो कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव के मानने वाले हैं, उनसे कहन चाहता हूँ कि वे कहेंगे कि एक पार्टी है सोशलिस्ट पार्टी, जिसने कोलम्बो रिजोल्यूशन की भर्त्सना की थी, जब पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी ने लोक सभा और राज्य सभा में पेश किया था। श्री रामसेवक यादव ने अपने प्रस्ताव द्वारा . . .

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.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार का क्या विभाग था कि जब हमारी जमीन को पाकिस्तान दबा ले तो लड़ाई बन्द हो जाय, ट्रिब्यूनल बन जायगा,

जब हमारी जमीन को चीन दबा ले तो लड़ाई बन्द हो जाय, ट्रिब्यूनल बन जायगा, वही प्रस्ताव मान लिया जायगा, बैठ करके फैसला हो जायगा, तो यही सलाह अरब राष्ट्रों को दे दी होती कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र में जब रूस के इनिशिएटिव पर सर्वसम्मति से युद्ध बन्दी का फैसला हो गया, तो तुम को उसे मान लेना चाहिये, उसके बाद चाहे तुम लोगों का झगडा हो जाय तो, उसको तुम देखते और समझते कि क्या करें। मैं इसके उदाहरण में कह रहा हूँ कि यहां पर पहले भारत की सरकार जब अपने राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा का सवाल आता है, तो यह गोल हो जात है। भारत में जब कोई विदेशी हमला होता है तो यह गोल हो जाती है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आज इस सरकार ने इसराइल को जिस तत्परता से एग््रेसर ऐलान करने में तत्काल दिखाई है, उसी तत्परता से यह पाकिस्तान और चीन को एग््रेसर ऐलान करवाते में तत्काल दिखाती। क्या कभी अरब राष्ट्रों ने पाकिस्तान को एग््रेसर ऐलान किया, क्या कभी रूस ने पाकिस्तान को एग््रेसर ऐलान किया। रूस ने बराबर यही कहा है कि पाकिस्तान को हम उसी नुस्ते नजर से देखेंगे, जिस नुस्ते नजर से हम हिन्दुस्तान को देखते हैं।

(Interruptions.)

हमारा सवाल यह है कि माननीय मंत्री जी क्या इस सत्य और तथ्य को समझेंगे कि कमजोर का सत्य ताकतवर के झूठ से भी ज्यादा कमजोर होता है। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि नानेलाइनमेट, बिनलगाव की नीति के चार नेता थे, श्री नेहरू जी, श्री नासिर जी, सुकर्ण साहब और टीटो साहब। नेहरू जी का मामला समाप्त हो गया, सुकर्ण साहब का मामला समाप्त हो गया, नासिर साहब का भी मामला समाप्त हो रहा है, टीटो बेचारा बैठा है, देखिये, क्या होता है। तो सरकार मेरी बातों का सफाई के साथ उत्तर दे।

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 not 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 the 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

श्री राजनारायण : हम कहते हैं कि
भर्त्सना क्यों नहीं की ?

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.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (*Addressing Shri P. N. Sapru*) No speech, you may put questions. I do not want to allow speeches; we are already very late.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): President Nasser was not very happy with all this; it is Syria.,

श्री हयानुल्ला अन्सारी (उत्तर प्रदेश):

मिस्टर चेयरमैन, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से सिर्फ दो सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। एक तो यह है कि क्या उन्होंने इस बात पर ध्यान दिया है कि जो थ्योरी मि० जिन्ना की थी यानी टू नेशन थ्योरी, बिल्कुल उसी थ्योरी पर जियानिस्ट बना है, इजराइल बना है। दूसरे, क्या उन्होंने इस बात पर ध्यान दिया है कि जो लो० आज इजराइल को सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं, वे जो हमारा काश्मीर पर क्लेम है, उसको लूज कर रहे हैं। ये दोनों बातें अलग-अलग नहीं हैं, बिल्कुल जुड़ी हुई हैं। अमेरिका का जो एक ज्यू है, जो जियानिस्ट का मेम्बर है, वह अमरीकी भी है, लेकिन साथ-साथ अपने को यह भी समझता है कि वह इसरायल का शहरी है, इजराइल का सिटीजन है। इंग्लैंड का जो ज्यू है और जो जियानिस्ट का मेम्बर है, वह यू० के० का भी रहने वाला है और वह अपने को इजराइल का भी शहरी समझता है। बिल्कुल यही थ्योरी मि० जिन्ना ने यहां इंडिया में ऐडवांस की थी और वह थ्योरी आज भी पाकिस्तानी ऐडवांस कर रहे हैं। वे यह कहते हैं कि काश्मीर का रहने वाला मुसलमान चूंकि मुसलमान है, इसलिये वह पाकिस्तानी है और चूंकि उसकी वहां पर मेजरिटी है, इसलिये काश्मीर पाकिस्तान में मिल जाना चाहिये। जियानिस्ट बना है रिलीजन के ऊपर, यह बात नहीं है कि जो जियानिस्ट कोई खास नेशन के हों, उनके लिये इजराइल हो, बल्कि अमरीका के हों, ब्रिटिश हों, जो भी हों, सब इजराइल के शहरी हैं। जो ज्यूज नहीं हैं, उनके लिये यह नहीं है इजराइल में। तो यह रिलीजन के ऊपर बेस की हुई नेशनलिटी है और

[श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी]

वही थ्योरी है जो मि० जिन्ना ने ऐडवांस की थी। आज उसी थ्योरी पर क्लेम है पाकिस्तान का काश्मीर पर और वह कहता है कि चूंकि काश्मीर के रहने वाले मेजरिटी में मुसलमान हैं, इसलिये सबके सब पाकिस्तानी हैं, और सबको आकर के पाकिस्तान में मिल जाना चाहिए। आज डाह्याभाई पटेल जी कह रहे हैं कि जियानिस्ट बिलकुल सही है, बिलकुल जायज़ है। क्या इससे हम अपना क्लेम लूज़ नहीं कर रहे हैं? कल हमसे यू० एन० ओ० कहेगा कि तुम यह कह रहे थे कि जियानिस्ट मूवमेंट करेक्ट है और हर जू जियानिस्ट है और वह इजराइली बन सकता है, चाहे वह इंडिया में रहता हो, चाहे वह अमरीका में रहता हो, चाहे वह एशिया में रहता हो, चाहे फ्रांस में रहता हो और उसी बिना पर आज पाकिस्तान काश्मीर के लिये कहता है कि वहां मुसलमान हैं, इसलिये उनको आकर के पाकिस्तान में मिल जाना चाहिये, तो क्या जवाब देंगे डाह्याभाई पटेल साहब। एक ही थ्योरी दोनों की है। जो क्लेम आज कर रहा है जियानिस्ट अमेरिका का रहने वाला या इंग्लैंड का रहने वाला इजराइल के ऊपर, बिलकुल वही क्लेम पाकिस्तान का है काश्मीर के ऊपर। तो जो जियानिस्ट को सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं वे समझ लें कि वे अपना क्लेम काश्मीर के ऊपर लूज़ कर रहे हैं और वे मि० जिन्ना की थ्योरी को सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं। बहुत अफसोस की बात है कि जो कल ज़बान से कहते थे कि वे मि० जिन्ना के खिलाफ हैं, वही आज खड़े होकर के इजराइल के मामले में मि० जिन्ना को सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं। तो टू नेशन थ्योरी को आप ज़िन्दा कर रहे हैं जो आज खत्म हो गई है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhandari now. I shall go by parties and see that every party is given a chance.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान):
सभापति जी, मैं विदेश मंत्री के साथ

जो अपने सैनिक इजराइल में मारे गये, उनके प्रति सहानुभूति प्रगट करता हूँ और इस बात को दोहराता हूँ कि हमको इसकी क्षति पूर्ति के लिये पूरा जोर लगाना चाहिये। लेकिन मैं एक बात इसके साथ पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सेनाएं यूनाइटेड नेशंस के अधिकार में गई थीं, लेकिन जनरल रिखी का हमारे साथ कोई सम्बन्ध रहा कि नहीं रहा और क्या जो आक्रमण हमारी सेनाओं पर हुआ है, जनरल रिखी की तरफ से हमारे विदेश मंत्री को इस सारे आक्रमण का कोई समाचार मिला या नहीं मिला?

आज 'हिंदुस्तान टाइम्स' में ऊथांत को जनरल रिखी से जो रिपोर्ट मिली है, उसको उद्धृत किया गया है। मैं कोट करता हूँ जो जनरल रिखी ने कहा है:—

"A contributing factor to the casualties suffered from artillery fire was the proximity of the United Arab Republic military positions to the camps concerned."

सेक्रेटरी जनरल ऊथांत को जो रिपोर्ट मिली है जनरल रिखी की तरफ से यह उसका उद्धरण किया है, यह आज के अखबारों में छपी है। मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या जनरल रिखी की तरफ से हमको भी कोई कम्यूनिकेशन मिली है या नहीं मिली है? अगर मिली है तो इस घटना के बारे में उन्होंने कुछ जानकारी दी है या नहीं दी है कि जहां पर हमारा इंडियन कन्टिजेंट ठहरा हुआ था, वहां पर यू० ए० आर० फोर्सेज की तोपें लगी हुई थीं, इसकी कुछ जानकारी उन्होंने दी है या नहीं दी है? इस रिपोर्ट में इस बात की भी सम्भावना बताई गई गई है कि:—

There are unconfirmed reports, here to suggest that UAR military convoys also were moving on the same road at that time."

तो यह ज्यादा अच्छा होगा यदि इन सारी बातों को समझने के लिये—अब भी चाहे देरी ही क्यों न हो गई हो—अपने सैनिक कमान्डर से जो भी रिपोर्ट मिली है इस घटना के बारे में उसकी जानकारी हमें दी जाये, क्योंकि मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर जनरल रिखी का इन्टरव्यू भी इस सारे आक्रमण के लिये कुछ और कारण बताने वाला हो सकता है, तो फिर हमने जो एक आफ-हैंड कह दिया उसपर फिर विचार करना पड़ सकता है। मुझे दुःख है कि हमारे सैनिकों का वहाँ बलिदान हुआ, लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहूँगा कि इस काइसिस में हमने जो एटीट्यूड लिया है, क्या यह एटीट्यूड हमारे सैनिक वहाँ मर गये उसके रिएक्शन से पैदा हुआ है या हमने ओवरऑल सिचुएशन का एनेलेसिस करने के बाद कोई कन्सीडर्ड ओपोनियन बनाई है इन सारे सवाल पर यह बहुत बड़ा सवाल है। उस घटना की निन्दा करते हुये मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सारे सवाल पर हमारा एटीट्यूड अधिक कन्सीडरेट होना चाहिये था। एक दूसरा विचार किया जा रहा है कि हमारे देश ने जो एटीट्यूट लिया और जिसके बारे में कहा गया है कि The Prime Minister's confession is that New Delhi's attitude has been dictated by a desire to answer Pakistani propaganda. अगर यह सारा एटीट्यूड हमारे सैनिकों पर हमला हुआ या पाकिस्तान के एटीट्यूड के रिएक्शन के रूप में हमने बनाया है। तो मेरा केवल यही निवेदन है विदेश विभाग के मंत्री महोदय से कि वे इस सम्बन्ध में सारी स्थिति को स्पष्ट करें। सारा जो विचार, हिन्दुस्तान की नीति बनी है वह केवल क्या तात्कालिक रिएक्शनों के कारण है? अगर ऐसा है तो निश्चित रूप से इससे बढ़ कर दुःख की बात और हमारे देश की स्थिति खराब करने वाली बात दूसरी नहीं हो सकती है।

मेरा एक निवेदन और है और वह यह है कि युद्ध विराम के बाद हम चाहते हैं कि

दोनों पक्ष 4 जून की पोजीशन पर चले जायें—मैं मानता हूँ कि फ्रूट्स आफ एग्जेशन नहीं मिलना चाहिये—लेकिन अकाबा की खाड़ी की जो नाकेबन्दी की थी, क्या यू० ए० आर० उसका लाभ उठा सकेगा, इसको वे फ्रूट्स आफ एग्जेशन में शामिल करना चाहते हैं या नहीं? अगर सेनाएं 4 जून की स्थिति पर वापस जायें, अपने इलाके में वापस जायें—जो आवश्यक है—तो क्या विदेश मंत्री महोदय, सैनिकों के पुरानी पोजीशन पर जाते समय अकाबा की खाड़ी के ब्लाकेड को भी हटवाने का प्रयत्न करेंगे या नहीं करेंगे?

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 forces, 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 wiH 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 wa_s collusion between the United Kingdom, France and Israel to commit this aggression which is knows 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 Pakistan₁ 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 th_e External Affairs Minister and before too, I know that whatever India does Pakistan wiH 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 ara 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. Rikhye 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. Rikhey 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 smal] question and that i_s 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 i_s 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 this 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 territory 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 were 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 every 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. Parthasarathy 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. Parthasarathy because between the time he showered his encomiums on Mr. Parthasarathy and now, Mr. Parthasarathy 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. Parthasarathy 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. Parthasarathy then you should congratulate the man who is directing Mr. Parthasarathy to do such things. That is only fair.

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

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore I 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

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

ourselves in general agreement with their policy about the Arabs 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. I say this thing, because all the papers go abroad. 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 like 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 ceasefire 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 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 he 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.

श्री राजनारायण : इजराइल का फायदा क्या है भारतवर्ष को रंजीदा करने में। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि भारतवर्ष की सेना पर बम गिरा कर मारने से इजराइल को पूछनाँ गन क्या है ?

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.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): The hon. Minister, Mr. Chagla has said that the UNEF was not there on the Israeli side, because Israel did not allow it. Now, I want to know from the Minister what was the intention of Israel in not allowing UNEF on their side of the border. Is it because they had the ulterior motives of preparing for aggression against the Arab world? That is one thing. Secondly, UAR has made a definite charge that the US and UK gave cover to the Israeli forces, when they took the first offensive and struck at the UAR air force, literally destroyed it, so that they could advance. If so, what is the opinion of the Government, whether this charge is true or not and, if true, may I know whether this matter would be brought before the Security Council? My third question is this. The present borders of Israel are not the borders when Israel was created. The hon. Minister has said that these borders stand as the fruits of aggression committed in 1955 or 1956. If that be so and if UAR presses that they should vacate the aggression which they committed in 1956 along with the other Western powers, may I know whether the Government of India would support UAR in its stand? Where do we stand, if this demand is made? My Party and we also say that the Government should clarify their position on this matter, whether Israel should not be debarred from gaining the fruits of aggression they gained in 1956. My fourth question is this. It is reported in the press that our Ambassador in US was called and he was advised that India should restrain UAR. In a sense it means that UAR does not resist Israeli aggression. May I know whether it is a fact that the United States Government told our Ambassador some time ago, a week or so back, and it was reported in the press that through him they tried to advise our country to restrain UAR; not restrain Israel, the aggressor, but the aggressed. They were asked to put pressure on UAR. Is it a fact or not? May I know the present position, whether the United States Govern-

[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 o'f 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 columnist 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