

12.02 hrs.

MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT

SITUATION IN PONDICHERRY

Mr. Speaker: I have received notices of several adjournment motions. I am coming to them one after the other.

The first is regarding dissolution of the Pondicherry Elected Assembly, following the refusal of the Chief Commissioner to form the Council of Ministers and the subsequent uncertain conditions in Pondicherry by Shri Tangamani.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): Even during the last Session I wanted to raise certain points. During the last Session when the question was referred to, the hon. Prime Minister was pleased to state that the Opposition along with the dissident Congressmen could not form into a group because people were moving from one party to another. Subsequently what has happened is that on the 27th October, 1958, Shri L. R. S. Singh, Chief Commissioner, dissolved the Assembly and the reason he has stated is that the validity or otherwise of the election of the President on the 25th August, 1958, is doubtful.

I would like to mention that on the 31st October the Budget Session had to commence and the Chief Commissioner had sent summons to all the members. In the meantime, negotiations were going on among members of the Congress Party and the President of the Dissidents was present there. When the A.I.C.C. meeting was there, the dissidents formed into another group. On the 28th of the same month, a telegram was received by the members of the Assembly from the Chief Commissioner saying that no meeting was going to take place on the 31st October and that the Assembly was going to be dissolved. So, I would like to know the circumstances that led to this and when the next general

election is going to take place in Pondicherry.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri. Jawaharlal Nehru): I do not see how the condition in Pondicherry can be the subject matter of an adjournment motion. It certainly cannot be, whatever other means there may be of dealing with it. Nor do I know how the hon. Member has brought in the meeting of the AICC into it. It has nothing to do with it at all.

Before the meeting of the AICC, these difficulties came to our notice. A meeting was being held. The President of the meeting adjourned it. The President and with him a number of members went away, but the others, who were remaining behind, said that they would continue to meet. They elected another Chairman and continued the meeting. That matter came before us and we had it examined by the Law officers. They said that after the Chairman had adjourned the meeting by the normal law of meetings, that meeting could not continue and the subsequent activities were, therefore, illegal. Therefore confusion arose about that matter. That is number one.

Secondly, this Assembly—it is called as the Council was advisory. The Chief Commissioner has the real authority. Of course, we have tried to develop a custom, i.e., to accept the advice. But because of the fact that there was no stability at that time about the continuation of this Council, it was decided that the best course would be to have fresh elections. That is why it has been dissolved and fresh elections are going to take place. It seems to me far better to proceed in this way than to allow groups to pull against each other, sometimes to come together and then to break out. That is not considered satisfactory.

So, I do not see how this question becomes a subject for an adjournment motion.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the statement of the hon. Prime Minister I do not consider that it is a matter to which I should give my consent to move it as an adjournment motion.

RELATIONS WITH PAKISTAN

Mr. Speaker: I have received several notices of adjournment motions relating to "the grave menace to India's peace and security as evidenced by the warlike utterances of the Pakistan President, the hectic movements of Pakistan troops on India's borders and the incessant incursions into Indian territory by Pakistan Armymen and other nationals"; "the situation arising out of the reported mal-treatment and physical violence meted out to Shri K. C. Iyer, Accountant in the Office of the Assistant Indian High Commission, Dacca"; "the continued and increased Arms supply by the USA to Pakistan which in the context of the recent declarations of General Ayub Khan concerning Kashmir and the canal water dispute adds to the threat to the security of India" (Shri Dange). Shri Goray has given notice about "the hostile activities of Pakistani officials and Pakistani Army on our Eastern front." Similarly, there is one by Raja Mahendra Pratap saying that "the President Dictator of Pakistan said that he could go to war against India on Kashmir question." Then there is one by Shri Khadilkar regarding "aggression by Pakistani forces by entering forcibly into Indian territory."

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): My motion is about a definite matter.

Mr. Speaker: An instance has been given in his motion whereas the others relate to general matters. I have read it out. I would like to know what exactly the situation is.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City-Central): Sir, by raising the demand or requesting for this discussion, I do not wish to raise a hate campaign against Pakistan nor do I wish to raise

the question as to what form of Government they want to have for themselves. That is their affair. But, as the Prime Minister himself has already stated, the situation there is causing anxiety to us, first, because of the pronouncements of the Martial Law Administrator, though he has not stated that perhaps explicitly, and secondly, the greater supply of arms. It is very well known and already published in the press that the U.S. Secretary of Defence when we visited Karachi went to discuss the question of arms supply and a new pact of defence with Pakistan. Now, that arms supply may be directed against anybody else. But, surely, the immediate pronouncements have been against India. Therefore, such a build-up is bound to hit us first and anybody else. Therefore, my submission is that, if an adjournment motion is not so much to the taste of the Prime Minister, I should like to have a day set apart for discussion of this matter.

Mr. Speaker: And other relevant matters.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): I may submit there will be danger...

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): I would like to know before the Prime Minister replies.....

Mr. Speaker: I have also read his motion to the House.

Shri Khadilkar:....on what grounds recognition was given to the new Pakistan Government after the two shifts in the Government, unless the Government has a firm assurance from the present Government that all the commitments and previous agreements will be honoured in the day to day administration.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no question before us of recognition or non-recognition. We merely continue our dealings with those who are in charge of the destiny of Pakistan today. I have given much thought to it and I do not pretend to be able to