

know from the hon. Minister what exactly he means by saying that "appropriate action" has been taken?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: 'Appropriate action means that we have drawn the attention of H.M.G. of Nepal to the incidents that took place and we have been assured that necessary steps have been taken to see that such incidents will not occur in the future. May I appeal to the House, through you, Sir, that this is an internal matter and Nepal is a sovereign country, a friendly country and we should not make His Majesty's Government of Nepal feel that we are interfering in their internal affairs.

SHRI D. THENGARI: May I ask the hon. Minister if the Nepalese Government has conveyed to us information about any action taken by them against those who raised such slogans? And secondly, what was the general reaction of the Nepalese press towards these incidents?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I have already said that on our making the necessary representation, the Government of Nepal has assured us that they will take appropriate steps to see that such incidents do not occur again. We cannot expect anything more from a sovereign independent country.

SHRI D. THENGARI: And what about the reaction of the Nepalese newspapers regarding these incidents?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Newspapers where? Here?

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA: In Nepal.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Well, as far as we know, they have deplored that such things should happen, things which are contrary to diplomatic practice and convention as understood and accepted all over the world.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, the Minister of External Affairs said that this is an internal matter of Nepal. It is not an internal mat-

ter when anti-Indian feelings are roused and the Chinese are staling all sorts of nonsense about this country. It is no internal matter and it is but right that we should take up the matter with the Government of Nepal and say that such things should not be allowed. How does the hon. Minister say that it is an internal matter?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: To the extent that it is for the Nepalese Government to control such demonstrations of anti-Indian activities, and we have been assured that they will take appropriate action to see that such incidents do not occur again. To go beyond that would be interfering with a sovereign country.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: I would like to know from the Government whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to the formation of a so-called "Krantikar Dal", "Hindustan Krantikar Dal", in Nepal and whether the Government has made any enquiry—as to the possibility of the Chinese Embassy at Kathmandu trying to rake up such organisations there?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: That question does not arise strictly out of the main question, Sir. If the hon. Member will give me notice or write to me I will look into it.

ANTI-CHINA FEELINGS

*329. SHRI BHUPINDER SINGH: Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the growing anti-China feelings in almost all the countries situated on the periphery of China with the exception of Pakistan;

(b) if so, whether the Government of India propose to forge an anti-China block in collaboration with these countries mainly as a defensive measure; and

(c) whether they have taken any initiative in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): (a) Yes, sir.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

SHRI BHUPINDER SINGH: Sir, China's designs towards India are -not hidden from anybody. They are determined to create mischief on our borders. To defend our frontiers I have no doubt that the Government has taken various steps. But aggression against our country will have to be met with full military force of our own and of our allies, not by lofty principles of non-alignment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who are our allies?

SHRI BHUPINDER SINGH: So will it not be in our interest to take the initiative to forge a military bloc in South and Southeast Asia to defend these countries and also our own country, against Chinese aggression? What prevents the Government from taking advantage of the present climate to forge such a common defence pact?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Sir, our country has been always opposed, and rightly opposed, I suppose, to either entering into any military bloc or entering into any defence pact with other countries. I think that policy has been successful and the Government intends to continue it. That does not mean that we do not realise the threat from China. We propose to meet it and I think the better way to do that is to strengthen economically the Southeast Asian countries and we are doing it by various ways, by economic cooperation, by trade and commerce and so on, because we feel that if these countries are economically strong there will be less chance of subversion, from China.

SHRI BHUPINDER SINGH: Sir, the small defenceless countries in Southeast Asia are an invitation to Chinese aggression. A big democratic India owes it to her to strengthen these countries to face Chinese aggression. In doing so India will be strengthening herself. But if India is hesitant in taking the initiative for having a pact with these countries, a defence pact against China, will it respond favourably if a Southeastern country takes initiative and invites India to join such a pact? What will be India's reaction to such a move?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: He has already given the reply.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: May I point out to the hon. Member a fact which he seems to have overlooked, that those Southeast Asian countries are strongly non-aligned? Apart from our being non-aligned, even these countries are non-aligned. They do not want to enter into any such pacts.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Malaysia?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, they are all non-aligned as we are. Therefore, as I suggested to the House, the only way to meet the Chinese aggression is to see that these countries are economically strong and we are doing our best to help them to become economically strong.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Is the hon. Minister not aware that there is a difference between non-alignment and a joint defence pact? If certain countries of Southeast Asia enter into a joint defence pact it will not be any contravention of non-alignment. So will the hon. Minister say what he means and how a policy of a joint defence pact come in the way of non-alignment? Why should these words be so cheaply quoted everywhere?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: They are not quoted cheaply. Once you enter a defence pact or join a military bloc, it is an end to your non-aligned policy. I have said it so often in this House that our policy of non-alignment has been the right policy and it is in our national interest and we intend to continue it. How can a country be non-aligned if it has a pact aimed against another country?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: As against a common enemy.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : श्रीमन्, यह बताने का कष्ट करें कि जब चीन के जितने भी पड़ोसी देश हैं उन सब को चीन का खतरा है और ये सारे देश चीन से संकट देख रहे हैं तो हिन्दुस्तान ही एक ऐसा बड़ा देश है जो कि इस विषय में कुछ कार्यवाही कर सकता है तो हिन्दुस्तान ने इन छोटे छोटे देशों को बुला कर एक संयुक्त डिफेंस योजना के लिये पहल क्यों नहीं की ?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: In the first place the simple answer is that none of these countries has asked India for any support militarily.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : आपने शुरुआत क्यों नहीं की ? बड़े देश होने की वजह से आपने इनिशियेटिव क्यों नहीं लिया कि आप इन छोटे छोटे देशों को बुला कर कहें कि उसके विरोध में एक पार्टी खड़ी करें ?

श्री एम० सी० चागला : देखिये, सब देश इक्वल हैं। हम इनिशियेटिव इस में ले रहे हैं कि जहाँ तक हम एकानामिकली सपोर्ट कर सकते हैं करें। एकानामिक कोआपरेशन हम देशों के साथ कर सकते हैं और करते हैं और हमारा यह ह्याल है कि एकानामिक कोआपरेशन से ये देश स्ट्रांग होंगे और चाइना के साथ खड़े रहने की ताकत रखेंगे।

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Is the hon. Minister aware that it is not only a

question of economic development but it is a question of making the people realise the expansionist role and the treacherous policy of China which is the real danger to democracy in the world and also to peace in the world and in that context may I know what efforts are being made by our Government to propagiate among these various countries the role that is being played by China? Is it not a fact that our machinery has not been able to go ahead in this direction of making the people of these various countries realise the role being played by China?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: My hon. friend, with all respect to him, is not right. We have done everything possible to impress upon friendly countries in South East Asia and elsewhere the danger, the threat and the menace that China poses and I assure my hon. friend that each of these countries is as conscious of the Chinese threat as we are.

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि एक तरफ तो वह कहती है कि ये जितने देश हैं वे सब खुद नानेलाइंड हैं जैसे हम हैं, तो अगर ये सब नानेलाइंड हैं तो फिर क्या वजह है कि ये जितने नानेलाइंड देश हैं जो कि चीन का खतरा महसूस करते हैं वे सब एक जगह बैठ कर के कामन स्ट्रेटेजी के बारे में बात न करें। मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार क्यों नहीं यह पहल करती है। मैं नहीं कहता कि डिफेंस पैक्ट बने, यों अगर बनायें तो बहुत ही अच्छा है, क्योंकि जब चीन हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण कर के बैठा है तो हम चाहे जो भी करें चीन के खिलाफ वह सही होगा। इसलिए इस से सरकार को घबड़ाना नहीं चाहिये लेकिन अगर डिफेंस पैक्ट नहीं भी बनाने हैं तो इस में क्या वजह है कि आप कुछ ऐसे देशों को इकट्ठा कर के कुछ बात-चीन करें, कुछ कामन स्ट्रेटेजी इवाल्व करें चीन के खिलाफ ? मैं चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की

सरकार इस के बारे में साफ नीति बनाये, उनको बुलाकर कुछ कामन स्ट्रेटेजी बनाने की बात करें। मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि आप इस में कुछ पहल करेंगे या नहीं ?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I assure my hon. friend that we have constant discussions. We have informed all these countries and they are themselves conscious of the fact of Chinese expansionism, Chinese imperialism, Chinese attempt at subverting countries on her periphery. But when you talk of a pact, first of all it requires two to make a pact and there is no South East Asian country which wants to give up its independence or its non-alignment, apart from the fact that we ourselves feel that it is not in the interests of peace and in the larger interests of the country to join in pacts and to give up our traditional policy.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Since the hon. Minister has been talking so much about non-alignment, may I know in what context of world forces was the policy of non-alignment developed? Did it not mean non-alignment between two Power blocs which covered the whole world? Today it is 17 years thereafter and Power blocs have broken up. There are nations like China which . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Where have they broken up?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Not in the Peace Conference at least. In reality they have broken up but not in the mind of my hon. friend. The Warsaw Pact is broken up; Rumania is out of it. NATO is broken up; France is out of it.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: The Warsaw Pact exists.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: On paper. They all exist on paper. The Power blocs have broken. Now it is a period when non-alignment means this much that we are not aligned against Russia with the U.S.A. and

we are not aligned with Russia against the U.S.A. Non-alignment today only means non-alignment *visa-vis* Russia on one side and U.S.A. on the other or the few countries led by them. Has not the age of regional pacts which are permitted by the United Nations dawned? Are not the Arab nations aligned with each other to defend themselves against Israel and other invaders?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are making a speech.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Therefore my point is in the new context of world affairs non-alignment does not prevent us from having, if not a pact, at least a firm understanding with nations of a regional character, nations which are threatened by Chinese expansionism.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: When non-alignment was propounded by India I agree that it was a different context from what it is today. It was followed then in the sense that we did not align ourselves with either of the two major blocs. Today it is true that there is a detente between the two Powers and non-alignment has taken a different complexion but I do say that non-alignment has as much validity today in the changed circumstances of the world as it had when it was propounded by us soon after our independence because today more and more countries are realising the importance of non-alignment. Non-alignment today means the right of a country to remain independent of any bloc, to come to independent decisions, not to feel itself shackled by the fact that it belongs to a particular alliance and it has got to do what the alliance requires and not have the right to be independent in its foreign policy or in the judgments it might make.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: May I know if the Government is aware of the fact that China has made territorial claims only against two countries, India and the Soviet Union and no*

against any of the small countries of South East Asia which some Members have in view? In view of the fact that China 'has made i territorial .claims only against the Soviet Union and India, may I know what steps the Government is taking to enter into a mutual defence treaty with the Soviet Union?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I do not think this calls for an answer. I taave given the answer that we have *no* intention of entering into any defence treaty with any country.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: The Chinese by their own actions have already estranged the South East Asian countries and this is a very psychological moment convenient for us to meet other friends in a conference and have a propaganda offensive against China. May I know from the hon. Minister whether the External Affairs Ministry is prepared to take initiative in this direction to have a conference in India?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: We have no objection whatsoever to have friendly talks with South East Asian countries or any other country. In fact we are carrying on friendly conversations. With regard to the second part of the question, the South East Asian countries are as much aware of what is happening near their frontiers as we are because today China has changed its policy. At one time she propounded the theory that she believed in peaceful co-existence with South East Asian countries and that India alone was her enemy. But today the whole policy is changed if you look at what is happening in Burma and what is happening in other South East Asian countries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Question Hour is over. I am sorry the time is up.

12 NOON

CHAIRMAN'S RULING REGARDING THE SCOPE AND DURATION OF THE QUESTION HOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to make the position clear regarding the scope and purpose of the Question Hour, in view of what happened yesterday. I feel strongly that the duration of the Question Hour should not normally be extended either for purposes of continuing the discussion sought by non-official Members • or for the Government for keeping the records straight. The Ministers have, no doubt, the right to come to the House and with the consent of the Chairman, make pronouncement on official statement or clarification or to rebut a charge levelled against them. This may be done during the sitting of the House even if the original charge is made during the Question Hour.

Similarly, the non-official Members have means of seeking further discussion on issues which they think have not been adequately raised during Question Hour.

Hon. Members are aware that no matter which is not on the Order Paper can be taken up in the House without the consent of the Chairman. This rule applies both to private Members and the Treasury Bench.

There have, however, been occasions when I have shown latitude for all sections of the House to raise matters or make statements treating them as exceptional cases. I gave permission yesterday to the Minister of Transport and Shipping to make a statement before the House rose for the day. This was made clear by the Deputy Chairman, when objection was raised in the House to the Minister making a statement. In such circumstances, I should have expected that the Members would hear the Minister without any interruption. Hon. Members should agree with me