

सिंह जी रेल मंत्री थे, उन्होंने वहाँ जाकर कुछ कहा था, लेकिन उनके जाने के बाद जब पुनाचा साहब धीरे, तो उनकी बात को उलट दिया गया। यह रेलवे बोर्ड एक सर्वोपरि बोर्ड है, वे लोग पार्लियामेंट या पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों को कुछ नहीं समझते हैं, अगर पब्लिक इन्टरेस्ट में उनको कोई सुझाव दिया जाता है, तो वे उसका उल्टा ही सोचना शुरू कर देते हैं, क्योंकि अंग्रेजों के जमाने के पुराने नीकर अभी वहाँ पर मौजूद हैं। मैं सबसे पहले तो यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि 25 वर्ष के बाद रिटायर होने वाली जो बात है, वह सबसे पहले रेलवे बोर्ड से शुरू होनी चाहिये। जैसा शर्माजी कहा करते थे कि जब वह इरिगेशन मिनिस्टर थे, उन्होंने घर के नजदीक रेलवे स्टेशन बनाने का काम प्रारम्भ किया, लेकिन जैसे ही वे गये, उस स्टेशन को बनाने का काम बन्द कर दिया गया। रेलवे बोर्ड में जो प्रक्रम है वे बिल्कुल निकम्मे और बेकार होते हैं, उनकी तरफको योग्यता के आधार पर नहीं, बल्कि सिफारिश के आधार पर होती है। मैं आपको एक और घटना सुनाता हूँ। मैंने एक खन रेलवे मिनिस्टर साहब को लिखा था और उसमें दुमरिया हाल्ट बनाने के लिये निवेदन किया था। जिस समय तक हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब—डा० राम सुभाष सिंह वहाँ पर मौजूद थे, उस समय तक वह हाल्ट बनाने का काम करीब-करीब फाइनलाइज हो गया था और मैंने सुना था कि इसी बजट में उसके खर्च को शामिल कर के उसको बना दिया जायगा। लेकिन जब पुनाचा साहब धीरे, मैंने उनको खत लिखा कि अब डा० राम सुभाष सिंह मंत्री नहीं हैं, मुझे अब है कि रेलवे बोर्ड वाले आपको दूसरे तरीके से समझा कर यह जो हाल्ट बनने वाला है, जो कि करीब-करीब फाइनलाइज्ड है, जिसका नाम छपरा-सोनीपुर लाइन पर दुमरिया हाल्ट है, बनने दें। उनका खत जाया है कि चूँकि खर्च की कमी है, इसलिए

हाल्ट नहीं खोला जायगा। यान भी हाल्ट वहाँ पर मौजूद है, मैं तो रेलवे को मदद करना चाहता था, लोग सिकड़ी खींच कर गाड़ी को रोक लेते हैं और उतर जाते हैं, बिना पैसे के उतरते हैं, हाल्ट बन जाने से लोग टिकट कटवाते, लेकिन उस बात को नहीं माना गया। आप तो धिरे की बात को ज्यादा मानते हैं, प्रसली बात को नहीं मानते हैं, रेलवे बोर्ड के जो लोग हैं, वे इसको ज्यादा बसन्द करते हैं। मैं इसलिये आपसे निवेदन करूँगा कि इस दुमरिया हाल्ट के बारे में आप पुनः सोचें और इस को बनावें।

17.36 hrs.

NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY*

Mr. Speaker: Since we are starting at 5.35, if all of you agree, we shall finish at 6.05 P.M. Mr. P. Ramamurti.

Shri P. Ramamurti (Madurai): I had given this notice for a half-an-hour discussion on this question of the attitude of the Government of India on the question of the proposed non-proliferation treaty on nuclear weapons for the simple reason that the Government of India's position seems to be very ambiguous. Apprehensions are there among the people of this country as to what exactly is the attitude of the Government of India on this question. From the statements made by our Minister for External Affairs in the press some time back—since I have not got much time, I am not going for quotations—and also from the fact that an official of the Government of India, Mr. L. K. Jha, had been sent to Washington and Moscow and other places, and from the reports of his doings there in the press, it appears that the only objection that the Government of India has got to this treaty is that this treaty does not give them any

guarantee against a possible nuclear attack from some other country. (Interruptions)

An hon. Member: No.

Shri P. Ramamurti: That is what it appears. I would request the Minister to clarify this. That is why I am giving him an opportunity.

It appears that this is the only objection that the Government of India seems to have. Therefore, I would like to draw the attention of this House to certain basic facts regarding this non-proliferation treaty.

We know that the atom bomb was first used when it was the monopoly of the United States of America against the Asian people in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, when there was no need whatsoever to use that terrible bomb and kill lakhs of people. After that, when it was the complete monopoly of the United States of America, repeated proposals were made in the United Nations that America should destroy her stockpile of the atom bomb and that it should agree never to use this terrific weapon, but it was the United States that refused to do it all along. Subsequently, after the United States of America's monopoly of atom bomb was broken, again and again repeated attempts had been made through international organisations and through international forums to get this atom bomb and nuclear bombs completely banned. Unfortunately it is on record that it is the United States that stood in the way of a complete renunciation of this weapon. On the other hand, they went on making tests, after tests; from the atom bomb, they went to the hydrogen bomb and to so many sophisticated bombs; tests over the ground, in the sea, under the water, under the ground—all these things have been going on. Today, as far as these big nuclear powers are concerned, they have got the monopoly of this nuclear weapon.

Today under those conditions, as far as the US are concerned, they do not agree to give up these weapons altogether. On the other hand, they are not even prepared to declare to the world that they will not be the first to use these nuclear and thermo-nuclear bombs. It is not even a question of retaliation. Even that simple declaration they are not prepared to make.

Today when they are proposing this non-proliferation treaty, it is not only a question of our getting some kind of guarantee against a possible nuclear attack. That is not the only question involved in this. The question is also this that these powers which have already got the monopoly of these weapons and the monopoly of nuclear research, seek to continue the monopoly not only of the nuclear and thermo-nuclear bombs, but they also want to prevent other nations from conducting experiments even for peaceful uses of nuclear energy. After all, we know that in future nuclear research is going to play a dominant part in development. As our energy resources get exhausted, as the water energy resources, hydro-electric energy resources, coal resources, as all these energy resources are getting exhausted, nations will have to go in for atomic energy. Today those people who are proposing this non-proliferation treaty, seek, by virtue of the various clauses in it—I do not want to go into all the clauses for want of time—to prevent other nations from developing this potential source of energy for peaceful purposes. It is an accepted fact that the acceptance of this treaty would mean that we will ourselves be agreeing not to proceed with our own atomic research and to utilise atomic energy for our own purposes. They will have the power of veto.

This is the primary question. Today it is known that even powers like W.

Germany and Italy and others who have a military agreement with the USA are opposed to this treaty for the simple reason that by virtue of this treaty their industrial development and their future will be thwarted by these super powers. That is the prospect that is facing us in this issue.

When such is the situation, today, we seek to make it as if it is only a question of nuclear defence against China. I do not know why China should attack us with nuclear weapons (Interruption). When we are so touchy about it, may I point out that after all when we have a dispute with China over the borders and over that we are prepared to say that it is going to be a cause of permanent hostility towards us and this question is not going to be solved, consider the position of China itself. Ever since the birth of the People's Republic of China, since that very day, even before that, we know that the Americans interfered in their civil war and abetted Chiang Kai-shek and tried to thwart the emergence of the People's Republic. After that, they set up a regime in Taiwan as their stooge to carry out their designs...

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): What about the cultural revolution?

Shri P. Ramamurti: We will talk about it when the occasion arises.

Under these conditions, when America refuses even to give a simple guarantee that it will not be the first power to use nuclear weapons, if China thinks that it has to prepare for its own defence against American nuclear blackmail, why should we be very much touchy about it?

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Rai-ganj): A very good defence of China.

Shri P. Ramamurti: But that is not the problem before us today.

Apart from the question whether any such guarantee is going to be use-

ful to this country, how can we accept such a guarantee? We had previously had that 'umbrella' proposal. Once you agree to the 'umbrella' proposal, you must know that when you need it, it will not be opened by you but by the person who holds it. You must also know that the moment you agree to that kind of nuclear protection, it means that bases will have to be made available in our own country for their operation. Then what happens to our policy?

Therefore, it is a fundamental question. It is a question of revising our fundamental policy. Therefore, apart from these things, it is basically a question of our being able to renounce our right to carry on our experiments in nuclear energy so that we will be able to utilise it for our own industrial development. Are we going to mortgage our right because America brings pressure on us? It is openly being talked in many countries that India would ultimately be pressurised to accept this on some kind of guarantee against nuclear attack. That is the only thing that seems to be bothering the Government of India.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: (Secunderabad): No, that is not so.

Shri P. Ramamurti: I would like to get a clarification and firm declaration from the Government of India, not him. Therefore, I want a clear statement as to what is our stand. Is what I stated our stand? Otherwise, why should Shri L. K. Jha be sent to those capitals to plead with them that some kind of guarantee must be given, as if that is the only thing? (An hon. Member: He is all over the place.) Is that the only thing we are concerned about?

Therefore, I want a firm declaration by the Government of India which seems to be resiling from its earlier position. Earlier it had taken up the position that any kind of treaty must

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

lead to the complete banning of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. Today no such condition is linked up with this thing. As far as the non-proliferation treaty proposals are concerned, there is no question of linking it up with the objective of complete destruction of nuclear weapons and the total ban of those weapons. These things are separate. Therefore, when this is not going to lead to the complete destruction of the atomic pile, when it is not going to result in the complete banning of atomic weapons so that people who have them may not brandish them and frighten other countries, I do not see why the Government of India should accept that treaty. Earlier it had taken a proper position. I have seen the speeches of our representatives in the debates in the 18 nation disarmament conference. Earlier they had taken up the stand that unless this whole question is linked up with the complete destruction of the atomic pile and total ban of nuclear weapons, India would not be a party to it. Unfortunately, the image now being focussed of this country in America is different. American newspapers are writing again and again that India will be able to accept it and it will not raise all those objections. This is being talked about there; newspapers are writing about it day in and day out.

Therefore, it is essential, in order to clear all these misconceptions that are there that the Government of India should make a forthright, straightforward statement that its fundamental objections to that treaty stand, fundamental objection on the basis of it putting an embargo on nuclear development by our country, fundamental objection on the basis of it not leading to a total destruction of nuclear weapons. On these two fundamental bases, our basic objection to it stands. Therefore, we cannot be a party to giving any encouragement or impression to anybody to imagine that India will be able to realise from the position that

she had taken up. I want such a forthright declaration.

श्री कंचरजान मुक्त (बिन्नी सहर) :
प्रधन महोदय, न्यूक्लियर ट्रीटी के बारे में हमारी सरकार की कोई साफ़ नीति नहीं है। हमारे अधिकारी बांतिगटन, भास्को तीर्थ यात्रा के लिए अलग-अलग गहरों में जाते रहते हैं और उन्हें मान्य नहीं कि उन्हें क्या करना है? खास तौर से एक बात जो कही जाती है कि न्यूक्लियर गारन्टी जो न्यूक्लियर पावर्स से ली जाय तो किस टाइप की गारन्टी सरकार चाहती है चाहे उसका इन्स्टालेशन हमारे देश के अन्दर होगा या बाहर से उन को गारन्टी मिलेगी यह अभी तक साफ़ नहीं है। इसलिए सरकार को यह बताना चाहिए कि आप जब गारन्टी की बात करते हैं तो किस टाइप की गारन्टी आप इन न्यूक्लियर पावर्स से चाहते हैं?

दूसरी चीज जो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि यह जो न्यूक्लियर पावर्स हैं यह दूसरों को तो कहती हैं कि आप यह अणु बम मत बनाइये आप ऐसी शक्ति पैदा न करिये, दुनिया में खतरा हो जायेगा, लड़ाई हो जायेगी तो क्या वह स्वयं इस चीज के लिए तैयार हैं कि वह भागे टेस्ट नहीं करेंगे। अगर वह इस चीज के लिये तैयार हैं तब तो उनके लिये इन्स्टिफिकेशन हो सकता है कि दूसरे देशों को भी कहें कि वह न्यूक्लियर टेस्ट न करें। लेकिन जो बड़ी बड़ी फोर्सेज हैं, चाहे उन में रशिया हो, चाहे यू० एस० ए० हो चाहे चाइना हो या कोई और हो, अगर वह खुद टेस्ट करती जायेंगी, वह ताकत ज्यादा बढ़ाती जायेंगी और किसी किस्म की कफायत अपने अन्दर नहीं करेंगी, केवल दूसरे देशों को बड़े बड़े समंन्स और दोषा देंगे—और इसका सबसे ज्यादा असर भारत पर पड़ता है—तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आप के जो उनसे कहा कि वह अपने न्यूक्लियर टेस्ट न करें, इस के बारे में उनकी क्या संभावना

किया है? तीसरी चीज यह कि हमारा देश शान्ति में विकास करता है।

Mr. Speaker: Only a question.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: I am asking question.

मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आज जब चाइना या उन की तरह के जो हमारे दुश्मन हैं, जिन के बारे में कोई प्रेडिकशन नहीं किया जा सकता और जिन्होंने भारत की पीठ में छुरा घोंपा है और उन के एजेंट हमारे देश में भी हैं, हम से आप इन्कार नहीं कर सकते, उन का कोलंबोरेशन बन जाता है तब क्या हमारे निचे जकरी नहीं है कि हम ऐटम बम बनायें? क्या हम केवल कन्वेंशनल आर्म्स के ऊपर भरोसा रखेंगे और ऐटम बम नहीं बनायेंगे? आप को इस बात को साफ बतलाना चाहिये।

Mr. Speaker: What is the question? You are making a speech. The first speaker has taken ten minutes. You are also taking ten minutes. I do not know what to do.

श्री कान्वरलाल गुप्ता : आप क्यों नहीं ऐटम बम बनाने की बात करते, क्योंकि अगर आप ऐटम बम बनायेंगे सभी देश की सुरक्षा हो सकती है। देश की सुरक्षा के बारे में आप इन्फ या दूसरी तरह की बातें नहीं कर सकते।

यह तीन सवाल मैं करना चाहता हूँ।

Shri D. C. Sharma: Taking for granted that we are not going to sign this treaty, taking also for granted that we are not going to have a nuclear umbrella from any nation, taking also for granted that if we sign this treaty our right of technological development, industrial development, would be curtailed, taking all these things into consideration, I want to ask the hon. Minister whether there are any other countries with which he has been in touch, and if so, what are those countries which have told the Government of India that they

are also not going to sign this treaty in its present form, on its present terms and under the present conditions?

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): In view of the continued nuclear blackmail by belligerent Red China which has occupied 20,000 square miles of Indian soil and which has been exploding bomb after bomb at Lopnor in Sinkiang on our border threatening India's security, and in view of the fact that there has been a virtual deadlock in the talks of the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee because of the obvious difference between the haves and have-nots of the nuclear power on the question of mutual responsibilities and obligations, and in view of our confirmed stand that we will not develop our nuclear energy for defence purposes, that it will be restricted only for peaceful purposes, may I know if the Government is in a position to assure the nation that they would be able to shield the country against any possible nuclear attack out of their own resources, if not in collaboration with any friendly country? Secondly, I want an assurance in this House from the Government that they will not sign such a non-proliferation treaty which will impede the development of nuclear science and technology in this country or elsewhere?

Shri S. Kandappa (Mettur): We have been talking of this umbrella. It is a commonsense point that no country would risk the safety of its territory for the sake of protecting others. If we had been assured by America or Russia that they would shield us in the event of any attack, I do not think that it would be sufficient enough for us to keep quiet. In the face of the Chinese threat—Mr. Ramamurti seems to feel assured and complacent on this point but I have my own fears—and the nuclear development and proliferation of the atomic weapons in their hands, in the face of the lurking fear and

[Shri S. Kandappan]

genuine anxiety in the minds of our people, will they get a total guarantee from the 'haves' that they are not going to use the atomic weapons against the 'have-nots'?

Shri Hem Barua (Mangaldai): China is a full-fledged nuclear power today and I do not agree with Members who say that China is not going to use her atomic power against us. China is not manufacturing atom bombs to preserve in the 'wardrobes'. It transpires that Pakistan also is going to produce nuclear bombs by 1968. Everybody knows that there is an *entente cordiale* between China and Pakistan antagonistic to India. Mr. Lai Bahadur Shastri desired, when he was our Prime Minister a nuclear umbrella jointly guaranteed by the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. That umbrella has not come and that umbrella is not possible because they are not ready to give a joint guarantee.

Mr. Speaker: My difficulty is this. The hon. Member is going into the whole background—Lal Bahadur Shastri and Jawaharlal Nehru and all that. I have to give ten minutes to the Minister. What is the question?

Shri Hem Barua: On the other hand, both the USA and the USSR have proposed the non-proliferation treaty. Now, from American sources, it has transpired that the treaty is going to be between these two monopolists of nuclear power and we do not come into the picture at all. In the face of this, because of the threat posed against us by our neighbours and because we are not counted by the big monopolists may I know whether our Government are in a position to give us an assurance that we reserve the right to produce the atom bomb when necessary and that we have not abdicated that right?

The Minister of Foreign Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with my friend Ramamurti that there is any ambiguity whatsoever in the policy of Government

with regard to non-proliferation treaty. I made a statement on the 27th of March 1967 which clearly sets out the Government policy. And in the press conference to which my 'hon. friend was kind enough to refer, I reiterated what I had stated in this House. May I now sum up what our policy is? It is perfectly true that this committee of 18 was primarily appointed for the purpose of advancing the cause of disarmament.

18 hrs.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): General disarmament.

Shri M. C. Chagla: General disarmament and universal disarmament. The non-proliferation treaty was to be a step towards disarmament; we find in this treaty that it is not a step towards disarmament. This treaty merely aims at preventing the horizontal proliferation without preventing the vertical proliferation. In other words, it prevents the have-nots from acquiring nuclear power without any obligation being cast upon the haves either to freeze then stockpile or to reduce it. That is the first objection to this treaty.

The second objection which is equally serious is that it seriously impedes the peaceful research or research for peaceful purposes. Now we are told that the non-nuclear countries should not have peaceful explosions; it is suggested that it is very difficult to make out a distinction between peaceful explosions and military explosions. With great respect, to my mind, this is an absurd argument. In one sense, all nuclear technology can lead to military purposes, just as science can be used or abused. Any technological development can be used for good purposes or for bad purposes. Therefore, this argument does not convince the non-nuclear countries.

Thirdly, this treaty on the face of it is discriminatory. Whereas the non-nuclear powers are expected to subject themselves to inspection and supervision, the nuclear powers will not be subject to supervision.

Shri Nath Pai: Why don't you put the draft treaty on the Table of the House?

Shri M. C. Chagla: There is no draft.

Shri Nath Pai: I will produce it and place it here. We know all this.

Shri M. C. Chagla: The draft treaty has not been placed before the committee of 18.

Shri Nath Pai: You received simultaneously from USSR and the USA.

Shri M. C. Chagla: They are being changed, and USA and USSR have not agreed on clause 3, as Shri Nath Pai knows. Now, this House should bear in mind that India occupies a unique position.

Shri Ranga (Srikakulam): Very unique.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I do not know whether he says it sarcastically or he agrees with me.

Shri Nath Pai: He is realistic.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Our position is unique in three respects. First of all, we are a non-aligned country; we are under nobody's nuclear umbrella. We have no military alliance with anybody. Germany, Italy and other countries are protected by the nuclear might of the United States. There is nobody to protect us; we stand alone; we stand on our own legs.

An hon. Member: Alone and aloof.

Shri M. C. Chagla: The second respect in which our country occupies a unique position is that we are under an imminent threat of Chinese nuclear attack. I agree with Shri Hem Barua that China is not making nuclear

bombs to put them on a shelf or, as he put it, to put them in the wardrobe, and there, I disagree with Mr. P. Ramamurti. We cannot ignore or minimise the risk we run from Chinese nuclear advance.

An hon. Member: Why don't you make it? (Interruption).

An hon. Member: Not from America?

Shri M. C. Chagla: At present the threat is from China,—I do not know what the future holds for us, if you look at the world landscape—and Pakistan also, but Pakistan is not a nuclear country. These are the two countries from whom we might expect an attack and who are openly hostile to us. The third respect in which India's position is unique is that we are nuclearly a potential country. We are an advanced nuclear country and we are in a position to manufacture the bomb.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli): Do manufacture it.

Shri M. C. Chagla: In that respect, our position is similar to that of Sweden. Therefore, if we sign this treaty, we have got to consider whether it satisfies our national interests, our national security and is in conformity with the UN resolution, which has set up this Committee of 18.

There is another serious defect to which I would draw attention. In the partial atom banning treaty, there is a simple clause that any country may withdraw at any time. If you look at the draft provisions here, this is a treaty of indefinite duration and under the withdrawal clause, you can only withdraw after three months' notice to the Security Council and satisfying the Security Council that there are special reasons why we want to withdraw from this treaty.

These are some of the defects which this treaty has and I want to assure the House that we will not sign the

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

treaty in its present form. We will wait and see what shape and form this treaty will have at the end of the discussions in the Committee of 18. Our representative has been instructed to put forward all the objections we have to the treaty and we hope the treaty will be modified and amended so as to satisfy our national interests and national security.

Shri P. Ramamurti: Unless all the four criteria that you have laid down are satisfied, you will not sign the treaty?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I have pointed out what the defects are and what our position is. I agree with hon. members that no Government has a right to foreclose the destiny of future generations. Our policy has been clearly stated that at present we have no intention of manufacturing the atom bomb. I do not know what the conditions will be in future.

Shri Hem Barua: Is it in reply to my suggestion that we reserve the right to produce the atom bomb whenever we think it necessary and we do not abdicate our right to produce it?

Mr. M. C. Chagla: That is exactly what I have been saying. I think this has been said by the prime Minister also. When she was asked, she said that at present we have no intention to manufacture the nuclear bomb. But the most important thing which goes against this treaty is nuclear technology. The big powers have the monopoly of nuclear weapons. Under this treaty, they want to acquire the monopoly of nuclear technology and we seriously object to it. As I said, we are an advanced country in nuclear technology. We do not want anything in this treaty which will impede the progress of our nuclear advance. We strongly resist any attempt at preventing this country from making progress towards betterment and improvement of nuclear technology.

I want to disabuse this House of one thing. There is no connection whatever between this treaty and the question of security. Mr. L. K. Jha's name was mentioned. He visited certain countries in order to explore the opinion there, what their view was with regard to our security and defence if we sign the treaty. Therefore, this House will not mix up these two questions. Apart from security and guarantee, we have got to look at the treaty on its own merits. As the treaty stands, it does not satisfy some of the most important criteria which the UN has laid down and which we ourselves have applied to the provisions of this treaty.

Mr. Sharma asked whether any countries have supported this. I was in Geneva and I had talks with important representatives of other countries. I cannot disclose the conversation . . .

Shri Nath Pal: Was there any counterpart of yours? There were only Secretaries; not a single Foreign Minister was there.

Shri M. C. Chagla: That is not true.

Shri Nath Pal: Who was there?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Mr. Foster was there.

Shri Nath Pal: What is his status? Is he the Secretary of State?

Shri M. C. Chagla: He is the representative of United States.

श्री नाथ पाल: मंत्री महोदय क्या कह रहे हैं! दूसरे देशों के अधिकारी जाते हैं और हमारे मंत्री चले जाते हैं। इसी तरह हम बदनाम हो जाते हैं।

Shri M. C. Chagla: He is the representative of United States.

Shri Nath Pal: I know it. I know who were present there. You should have sent your subordinate. India's Foreign Minister goes. There were no counterparts, no men of his status there. We are humiliated by every

State. You should meet only your equals and not anybody lower than you.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I entirely agree with Shri Nath Pai. When you go out, Shri L. K. Jha goes out, Shri C. S. Jha goes out. You should only go to meet your counterparts and not these men.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Mr. Foster is the representative of the United States on this Committee.

Mr. Speaker: What they mean is that the Foreign Minister of no other country was present there. Every country has got its representative. They say that there was no Foreign Minister equal in status to you. But that is a different question. You need not answer that now.

Shri M. L. Sondhi (New Delhi): Shri Jha goes and meets President De Gaulle, but the Minister of External Affairs has only met Mr. Foster.

Mr. Speaker: The Discussion is over. Let us go to the next item.

18.12 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE SECOND REPORT

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): Sir, I beg to present the Second Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Sir, let not the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs so rudely interrupt the proceedings. Shri Chagla is in possession of the House.

Mr. Speaker: He has concluded. Now, I would like to give some information:

Shri Nath Pai: What about Shri Chagla's reply?

Mr. Speaker: The Half-an-hour Discussion is over and the second Report 478(AI)LED-10.

of the Business Advisory Committee has also been placed before the House.

18.13 hrs.

RE: FOOD SITUATION IN KERALA

Mr. Speaker: Now, before we adjourn, there is one other point which I would like to tell the House. I would like to make an appeal to Shri Gopalan and other friends. I have written to them just now. They knew pretty well that the Speaker cannot give them food, he can only make appeals to them.

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Jagjiwan Ram): Sir, with your permission, I would like to say something. I wanted to intervene at that time when Shri Ranga spoke. During this period I have tried to ascertain the correct position from Andhra so that I may make some firm commitment. I had been trying to get in touch with the Chief Minister of Madras, Shri Annadurai, but I have not been able to contact him because he is outside attending some functions. In the night I shall try to get in touch with him.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): And you should inform them here.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Apart from that, I would like to give one or two pieces of information. The stock of rice in Kerala is 1187 tons. 3800 tons are on the move and may arrive in Kerala in the next two or three days. We have submitted indents for 800 wagons. That means 12,000 tons of rice from Andhra are to be moved to Kerala. We are making arrangements to run two specials every day carrying 2000 tons from Andhra to Kerala. These are 12,000 tons in our hands, rice that is procured in Andhra, for movement to Kerala. But procurement is proceeding. This is the firm thing that I have. More than that I am not in a position to say. I wish to make an appeal to the hon. Members. Today you can say that we may not be able to fulfil our assurances and