Table a copy of the Eleventh Report of the Public Accounts Committee (1958-59) on the Appropriation Accounts (Posts and Telegraphs) 1955-56 and Audit Report, 1957— Part II.

MOTION FOR ELECTION TO NATIONAL SHIPPING BOARD AND PROGRAMME THEREFORE

THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI S. K. PATIL) : Sir, I beg to move:

"That in pursuance of clause (a) of sub-section (2) of section 4 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958, this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct, two members from among themselves to be members of the National Shipping Board."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Beneal): May I make a suggestion? I think the election we can avoid, if the Leader of the Party opposite will have consultation with us. We can by arrangement . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is all right. If it is all right, we shall do it. The ■question is:

"That in pursuance of clause (a) of sub-section (2) of section 4 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958, this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct, two members from among themselves to be members of the National Shipping Board."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have *to* inform the Members that the following dates have been fixed for receiving nominations and for holding election, if necessary, to the National Shipping Board.

I 1.	Number of members to be elected.	Two.
I 2.	Last date and time for receiving nominations.	19th December, 1958 (up to 3 P.M.).
j 3.	Last date and time for withdrawal of candidatur.	20th December, 1958 (up to 3 P.M).
1 4.	Date and time of election.	22nd December, 1958 (Between 3 P.M. and 5 P.M).
5.	Place of election.	Room No. 29' Ground Flcor» Parliament House. New Delhi
6.	Method of election.	Proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

MOTION REGARDING INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—continued.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU) : Mr. Chairman, in the course of the discussion yesterday there was a very large measure of agreement on our basic policy, but a number of rather relatively minor points were raised. I should like to deal with some of these matters and correct some obvious misapprehensions.

I am told that the hon. Member, Mr. Rajah, said something about 1,200 Indians being killed in the recent riots in Ceylon. It is not quite clear where ! Mr. Rajah gets his information from.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Sir, may I correct the Prime Minister? I said 200, not 1200.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I see. I am glad that he is gradually j approaching the correct figure. As a matter of fact, according to our information, two Indians were killed.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: No, Sir. Many people who fled from Ceylon have corroborated that statement to some Madras Ministers and also to people like us.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I maintain that Mr. Rajah is suffering

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] under some misapprehension, mixing up Indians with non-Indians, mixing up perhaps, the old Tamil inhabitants •f Ceylon with Indians. They may have gone from India two hundred years ago, but they are not normally referred to as Indians. Our definite information is, after much enquiry, that only two Indian nationals were killed in these riots. For the rest, the statement made by the Prime Minis ter of Ceylon was that the total number killed during the riots was 115 by mob violence and 44 as a result of police firing. This, according to him, included 12 Tamils who presumably are Ceylon Tamils, 10 killed by mob violence and 2 by the police firing, and one stateless person, and the nationality of 8 is not known. These very unfortunate riots, as the House will remember, had nothing to do with India. It was entirely an affair between parties or groups in Ceylon. It is true that some Indian nationals suffered chiefly because their shops were looted.

Then, Sir, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta referred in the course of his speech to some circular of the Home Ministry. In fact the matter came up before me some time ago. That circular was issued because it has become a habit of all kinds of organisations, good, bad or indifferent, to ask for the good wishes of Ministers, Governors and others, and as a normal course we are generous with our good wishes to anybody. But then, this assumes a political colour when it is published, let us say, that the President of India has aent his good wishes to an organisation which normally would not have been patted on the back by the Government—the President or the Governor or the Minister. So, a circular was issued to these persons, Ministers and Governors, that they might be careful about attending or responding in this way to such enquiries or messages- without finding out what they were, without referring the matter to us. As a matter of fact, this is the iarger significance of this question, because we have got several times into trouble on the international plane by thoughtless replies being sent, which involved the persons concerned, without their being aware of it, in complicated and embarrassing situations. That was the main object of that circular. It is not a question of preventing anybody from doing anything or discriminating.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mention names.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: As a matter of fact, some names are mentioned. Subsequently, some names that were mentioned were unmention-ed, if I may say so. They were removed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Which names were unmentioned?

MR. CHAIRMAN: "Which name was unmentioned?" That is what he asks.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: For instance, I think, in the original list the Indo-China Friendship Association was there and I think there was *one* Indo-Czech Association too. If with all respect I may refer to these organisations, it has become a practice for half a dozen people in Delhi City suddenly to start an association and they begin to represent India and some other foreign nation. We would welcome organisations of friendship between India and other nations whatever they are. But it is a little difficult to accept that kind of association that is started with mixed intentions by some people. It is all a mere personal matter. And in that sense, and more specially, we have found that when some eminent dignitary is coming from abroad, from some other country, just before that a new organisation springs up to welcome him.

Then, Sir, in regard to the eastern border with Pakistan, I should like to make it clear that since Pakistan occupied Tukergram there has been no other Pakistani occupation of Indian

territory in the east. There have been | petty raids here and there and there have been the cases of those char lands about which I spoke yesterday. And may I say to the House that the border is very well defended? For j anyone to imagine that it is not de- i fended is not correct. And in order to get a balanced picture, it would be a good thing to read not only the Indian newspapers, but Pakistani newspapers on this subject also.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Was 1 the account given in the Pakistani j press correct?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: No, HO. I do *not* say it is correct. It is not all correct. Neither, if I may say so, is always the Indian account correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Acceptable . . .

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Yes. Because the Pakistani account is all] the time that the Pakistanis are the sufferers from the Indian raid. I think it is quite incorrect. But I am merely pointing out that the way these things are put out—this exaggeration or that — is not always deliberately done because you only see part of a picure of a local area. It is not that somebody deliberately seizes any ctiar island. It is very difficult to know what is happening.

Talking about this matter, we were asked about the recent so-called Nehru-Noon Agreement, as to how '. we are going to give effect to it and whether a constitutional change would he necessary or not. In so far as the proposals flowing from an intepret-ation of the Bagge Award are concerned, those are minor rectifications of the border and no legislation or constitutional amendment is necessary. In so far as the Cooch-Behar enclaves are concerned—the exchange of them —we have been advised that legis- ' lation by this Parliament is necessary —not constitutional amendment; but ! legislation by Parliament. We are taking care to get advice not from 1 one source only, but several highly ' legal sources, and they have agreed that legislation by Parliament is enough and it is the right course to adopt. We propose to take up this question, not in the present session, but in the next session; it may perhaps come up before this House and the other House.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: With regard t» Pakistan, what is the process by which they can implement this and see that it is preserved and kept up?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Where there is a question of their handing over some territory to us and our handing over some territory to them, well, whoever the authorities may be, they will have to be handed over. If they do not, they do not and we do not, and there the matter ends. It is obvious they have got—no doubt, there is functioning—a Government in Pakistan. It is not that Pakistan does not have a Government. Mr. Rajah may not approve of that Government. It is a different matter. That is a functioning Government and that Government undoubtedly will function in this matter if it wants to, and can function quite effectively.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM (Madras): Sir, the Pakistan Government has said that we have not fully accepted the recommendations of the Bagge Award. May I know the correct position?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: You mean whether India has not accepted? Yes. With Pakistan one particular matter is in dispute. They say that the Bagge Award has said something. We do not accept that interpretation. So it has really become a question of interpretation. And there i$_s$ another matter on which the Bagge Award expressed an opinion—it was about a matter which was not referred to them. It was what might be called an *obiter dictum,* for it was not referred to them and they expressed an opinion. But everything comes ultimately to a quest

ion of interpretation of what

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] was referred to them and what was | not. Now, when there was disagree- j ment between us on that issue, well,] how a disagreement like that is to be ! resolved? And I offered to the Prime ' Minister of Pakistan that the matter | should be referred to some tribunal. It is true that the Bagge Award was itself a tribunal and before that the Radcliff Award was a tribunal, but in spite of that some differences of interpretations remain. Well, let us define j precisely what the remaining matters ; are and ask a tribunal to decide. There is no other way except either by mutual agreement without a tribunal or by a tribunal or by a conflict with all the consequences. Obviously, we want to eliminate any idea of a 1 conflict.

SHRI TRILOCHAN DUTTA (Jammu and Kashmir): Supposing our Parliament passes legislation that we transfer our territory to Pakistan and 1 later on Pakistan Government refuses to pass any legislation or take any consitutional step to transfer their territory to us by way of interchange, what would the position be?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: May I continue, Sir, for a little while? It is rather disturbing to have to sit down every two minutes. All these questions, if I may say so, that we give them our land and they do not give theirs, well, this kind of thing does not happen whatever the Government anywhere. There are certain things that do not happen and cannot happen. We are not interested in legislation being passed by the Pakistan Government. At the present moment a decree of the President is the legislation they pass. If the President says 'yes', that is the final legislation in Pakistan; nothing else is necessary, and if he says, 'yes', it has got to be done; and I have no doubt that if he says it has got to be done; the land in that area will be given to us. And all these things are done more or less simultaneously.

There is one thing I should like to say in case there is any misapprehension, as I think there is, because of something I had said in the other House. In these matters of borders, discussions were held even already, of course on numerous occasions, previous to the Prime Ministers, meeting, held at the Secretaries' level and various other levels, and all kinds of people have been consulted, and the revenue officials have been consulted about maps and other things. Revenue officials, of course, only come in about revenue matters, not about political matters, and advise us about that, and it "jvas after consulting all these people and getting a report from them that we considered it at the meeting of the Prime Ministers, and accepted something. We were responsible for accepting that. What I mean to say is this. Some people thought that I was laying all the burden of acceptance of this or any part of it on the revenue officials of Bengal which, of course, is not correct. They had nothing to do with it, except to advise us about certain revenue boundaries, according to them. Because there were certain rival maps and certain new maps, they advised us about certain boundaries of a district or a *thana* or a *pargana,* or whatever it is. The next stage was Secretaries and others considering the whole matter, and then, of course, the Prime Ministers. So, I want to absolve the revenue officials, wherever they be, of having taken any part in any decision

Now, Sir, some hon. Members asked about the Commonwealth Conference, as to why it should always be held in London. That point was raised in the Conference itself nearly two years ago when it was held, and it was proposed that it should be held at various places in the Commonwealth. So far as we were concerned, we were not only agreeable to it, but also we thought that it would be a good thing to have the venue changed from time to time. The proposal came not from us, but from another member of the Commonwealth. And

there it is. It was noted that this might be done. But as to whether it will be done or not, I do not know. It is a matter really not of high principle, but of convenience. There was a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Commonwealth countries held in Colombo some years ago. I would not venture to say anything in regard to Mr. Rajah's remarks about the Commonwealth, because I feel that I am totally incapable of creating- any impression in his mind, whatever I might say, on any issue. My difficulty is that Mr. Rajah refuses to come out of the twenties and the thirties of the century. We are approaching sixties presently, but he still lives in some bygone age, so far as his thinking in these matters is concerned.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: How does your attachment to the Commonwealth help our country? That is what I am unable to understand.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is not a question of helping our country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please go on.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Then ' Sir, Mr. Sinha enquired as to why we did not recognise the provisional Government of Algeria, and further, Sir, he wanted to know as to what progress had been made in regard to the economic resolution passed at. the Bandung Conference. We did not recognise the provisiona'l Government, because in our opinion it did not fulfil the normal tests of a provisional Government for the time being. Of course, all our sympathies were with it. We did not state that publicly or did not recognise it; we felt that that would be a brave gesture which had no particular meaning and no basis in real fact.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): May I know, Sir, what, according to the Prime Minister, are those normal tests?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The normal tests of a Government are that it should function as a Government; ! the normal tests of a Government are that it should function in a particular territory or a particular area. And there are also many other normal tests.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I know whether the free French Government was recognised at the time of the War, although it was functioning from London?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: We have not such a war started as yet. So there is some difference. In times of war very many things are done.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: There is actually a war going on between France and Algeria.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Wc are not talking of that war. We are talking of a world war. But the real test, so far as we are concerned, is as to how we can help the cause which we have at heart. We are, I hope, a responsible and a mature country whose voice counts, and such a country does not normally act as, perhaps, even I might at a public meeting, act. There are certain tests of a country's action. If it starts acting in the other way, then its voice has no great value. We have to approach other countries; we have relations with France; we have relations with the countries of North Africa. We have to consider all these matters and we have to think as to how we can help, in a certain process, achieving a certain objective. If, having said something very bravely, we can do nothing more about it, then we have not helped anybody.

About the economic resolution at Bandung, the economic resolution consisted of two parts, I think. One was in regard to bilateral trade agree-| ments, and the other was to consider [1] by correspondence etc. in what matters we can act jointly. We have had some bilateral agreements. Our Government tried very hard and repeatedly addressed the Bandung countries on this issue, but very few

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] replied. We went on addressing them. Two or three replied rather vaguely, the others did not. reply at all. The fact of the matter is, when we discussed this matter at Bandung, everyone was anxious that there should be this economic co-operation. But everyone realised that it was not a particularly easy thing for economic co-operation over this wide area, because the economic problems and interests were completely different. Yes, between two or three countries, maybe in South East Asia, the interests were more in common—over a geographical area. But over the whole of Asia and Africa, to consider some kind of an economic unit, which could have something in common, it became difficult. Personally, I think it is desirable and necessary for us to begin, even though at first in a small way, these economic common efforts. I agree with the general principal and I am sure that this will grow and we should work towards that end. But at the present moment it is a little difficult to think of that from a practical point of view. We have been thinking for some months past as to how to come to grips with this problem. We have discussed it and we have been corresponding with other countries. But as the House knows, so many odd political developments have taken place in these countries of Asia and Africa and that idea of coming together to discuss these problems quitely and calmly has not taken shape yet.

Then Sir, about Pondicherry, I was asked if we had raised this matter with the Government of General De Gaulle. We have informally mentioned it on several occasions and we have been told, again on the informal level, that they are well seized of it, that they like to give effect to it as soon as possible. Again, France has been a country where there have been considerable changes—elections, plebiscite and all that, and apart from reminding them from time to time and pressing them to take action, we can do nothing more now. But hon. I Members might remember that in fact I we do possess Pondicherry. We are there and nobody else is there. Although we are anxious that this legal transfer should take place, in fact, the transfer has taken place factually, and it does not make very much difference if the legal thing is delayed. It does make a little difference, of course. For instance, Pondicherry cannot be represented in this Parliament. That is certainly so and there are other things too, and we would like it to be done. But this does not affect the people of Pondicherry too much.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But there is that difference.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have just received a note. I will correct it. I said that two persons, two Indian nationals, were killed in the Ceylon' riots. The subsequent information says that the number killed were three.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Another fifty per cent.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member is perfectly correct.

I referred at some length to the friction that has started or the possibility of conflict between the growing African nations, the African personality and the continued rigidity of the South African Government and to some extent of the adjoining areas too. As the hon. Members know, seventy countries voted for the Apartheid Resolution including the United States of America; the absentees were Dominican Republic, Finland, Netherlands and Spain. The countries that voted against were the United Kingdom, Australia, Portugal, France and Belgium. That is to say, some countries of the Commonwealth like Canada and New Zealand voted for it while Australia and the United Kingdom voted against it.

In regard to Cyprus, I should like to say that the position there for a long time past has been an extraordinarily distressing one, and a compli-

cated one, as all problems become complicated if they are not dealt with early enough. It is a triangular position there. There are the other people of Cyprus. There is the United Kingdom and there are the Greeks and the Turks. Cyprus itself has got a population of 85 per cent. Greeks and 15 per cent. Turks. At the present moment, it almost, appears as if the problem is not capable of being solved if you want something by agreement as obviously there should be. We took up the attitude in the recent debates in the General Assembly that the Assembly should declare itself in favour of the independence of Cyprus—that independence may be within the Commonwealth or whatever it may be but it should be real freedom of Cyprus—and should declare itself against "a partition of Cyprus. Cyprus is a small island with a relatively small population and we felt that to partition Cyprus would be a calamity. Apart from being a small island, the Greek and the Turkish population is spread out in almost every village and with some experience of partition, we thought that this would be a most unhappy way of trying to solve the problem. It could not be solved that way.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: "We know it to our cost.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: As a matter of fact, the British representative there has himself said that the British Government did not like the idea of partition at all but somehow they did not like that, put there in the Resolution. Ultimately, it was not put in there and they decided to have talks. I hope the talks will lead to something because it is a tragedy that in this small and very beautiful island this kind of a conflict should continue and people should go about murdering each other.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Pradesh): What is the attitude of Turkey towards this?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The Turkish attitude is that they do not agree to any kind of independence, self-government for Cyprus, which put, the Turkish minority under the Greek majority. Either there should be partition or things should continue as they are, broadly speaking.

The hon. Dr. Kunzru, referring to the new developments in Pakistan, referred to the article by Mr. Gaitskell, the Leader of the Opposition in the British House of Commons. That article, as he quoted, was very much to the point as representing the views of Mr. Gaitskell or the Labour Party. I must say that. Mr. Gaitskell said that the very basis of Commonwealth association was parliamentary government, democracy. Well, that is so but, as a matter of fact, in the final analysis, the basis of the Commonwealth association is two or more countries being prepared to talk to each other. The moment they do not want to talk to each other on that basis, that association ceases. It is undoubtedly a new development and I cannot say anything because there are no rules to the effect as to who should be in the Commonwealth or . not. There are countries in the Commonwealth with which we completely disagree like South Africa. On the other hand, you must remember that the Commonwealth has now got some new countries like Ghana representing an entirely new outlooK ana a very important outlook, the African personality. It may have Malaya and Nigeria. This element is growing there and the question will arise and does arise as to how these desperate elements, having their completely different forms of Government, fit in in such an association. I referred to Guinea the other day. Guinea, as the House perhaps knows, has become a member of the United Nations. The question has arisen about Ghana and Guinea combining together in some type of association or federation. How that would affect the Commonwealth again, whether that means Guinea also coming in the Commonwealth or not, I do not know.

There is, I forget, an hon. Member who protested about our President

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] going to some military function in Indonesia to address some military | academy. I have been completely unable to find out what justification there was for that report in the *Hindustan* Times, yesterday. As I said 1 then, I just could not conceive of it, that our President should go to hold a closed session with the military advisers of President Soekarno, which our President does not do even with the Indian Army, much less with the Indonesian Army. I could not make out. I think probably there was some misapprehension. We, in fact, enquired about this matter by telegram, but what I find, as far as I can make out, is this. The President went to Bandung. He was scheduled to visit that building where the Asian-African Conference was held. And then he went to a place, he was to visit a certain place, a certain building of the Military Academy—as an academy, as a building. It is possible that he may have said a few words of greeting there. But there was no question of any conference with the military leaders there or any consultation.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: The press report said that he issued a warning. If it is greeting, then it is all right.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Now, Dr. Ray referred to it. I enquired something about Goa. Well, in Goa, on the conditions there we had recently a brief report from the Secretary of the Egyptian Embassy here. The House will remember that Egypt represents us *vis-a-vis* Portugal. The Secretary was good enough to go there and give us a report about the conditions there. We have not received the full report yet—we are waiting for it; at any rate, I have not seen it—but the brief report did not exhibit a very satisfactory state of affairs. Some improvement, I believe, had been made and some time ago some people had been released too. But there are a few Indians and a fairly large number of Goans in prison still. On the other hand, at the same time the House will remember that there is a case going on in the Hague Court, the World Court, in regard to Daman and Diu. That case has become a very complicated one, because it has involved looking into documents of hundreds of years which mostly are in old Marathi, which few persons can read now, look into them, translate them and all that. Maybe most of them are not relevant at all. But one has to go through the whole lot.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Can they determine our sovereignty with regard to foreign troops being allowed to go through our territory? Is that question fundamental or not?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: What is the question?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Our sovereignty is being impugned. They demand a right to the passage of their troops through our country. Is this sovereignty to be determined by the Hague Court? That is the point I want to know.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I would not like to answer that question now. We have certain views about that. It is obvious that nobody can tell us to do something which is opposed to our sovereignty, and ; nobody can tell us to allow foreign troops to come in our soil, no country can tell us that. But the question is not that simple. There are other aspects of it, and therefore I would rather not say anything at this stage.

Finally, I would like to refer to these Geneva Conferences. One of them has not made any progress so far as I know, but the other one is making a slow, but on the whole satisfactory, progress. That is the one in regard to nuclear tests being stopped. Three articles have been agreed to. I have not seen the third I article in detail, but the first two I .articles themselves indicate fairly considerable progress. But all this is 1 subject to the whole treaty being I agreed to. These partial agreements will only be valid if the whole treaty s finally agreed to.

I believe, Sir, so far as I can remember, I have referred to most of the points raised in the debate. I should like to express my deep gratitude to the House for the way they have dealt with this motion of mine.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I would like to draw the Prime Minister's attention to a telegram which we have received from Mr. Sadiq, President of the Democratic National Conference. In this telegram he complains to the effect that some workers of the Democratic National Conference have been waylaid and robbed by the "Peace Brigades" who have been assisted by the police again. Then again, he goes on to say that similar incidents have created a very great sense of uncertainty and deep feelings amongst the people of Kashmir. I suppose the Prime Minister has got a telegram like this, because it seems that it has been sent to many people. I would like to know from the Prime Minister, since he has not said anything on the Kashmir issue, whether he is going to consider these complaints that are coming from Srinagar from time to time. It affects some vital matters.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The telegram the hon. Member refers to is apparently about some internal fracas or something that happened there. It is true that I received a telegram or a copy of it, and I forwarded it to the Kashmir Government to enquire what happened.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My point is— here the telegram says, just in this portion, "how long have we to pay the price of humiliation and dishonour . . ."

(.Interruptions.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. It is not a question of foreign affairs. It is an internal matter. He has sent it to the Kashmir Government. So, in a foreign affairs debate it does not come.

SHRI D. A. M^{T}RZA (Madras): It is a State subject. It is a law and order question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mirza, it is quite all right.

The question is:

"That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely: —

'and having considered the same, this House approves the said policy.'"

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration, and having considered the same, this House approves the said policy."

The motion was adopted.

THE PARLIAMENT (PREVENTION OF DISQUALIFICATION) BILL, 1958—*continued*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does anybody want to speak on this Bill?

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND (Uttar Pradesh): I would like to speak, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Here I have got the name of Mr. Samuel first.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this Bill has a vital and significant implication. It relates directly to the functioning of democracy in our country. Therefore, as I read the Bill and listened to the speech of the hon. Deputy Law Minister, I experienced a strange impact on my mind— both good and bad, I must confess— of the play and interplay of the various forces in the functioning of democracy in our country. Vith democracy in shambles and almost prostrate before military dictatorships all around us—in Thailand, Burma, Pakistan, Iraq, Sudan and Egypt and even to some extent, in Indonesia, with military alliances or military aid backing some of them—our young child of democracy becomes dearer