

Clause 11.— (Appeals)

Shri Dattatraya Kunte: I beg to move:

Page 7, lines 32 and 33,—

for "and within such period as may be prescribed,"

substitute "within thirty days from the receipt of the orders" (51)

Shri M. R. Masani: I beg to move:

Page 7, line 27,—

after "section 5" insert—

"or section 6" (39)

Page 7,—

omit lines 34 and 35. (34)

Page 8,—

omit lines 13 and 14.

Of these three amendments, one is a routine one. In fact, it is a mistake to which I want to draw the attention of the Minister. In the matter of appeals this clause refers to clauses 5 and 10. I may point out that clause 6 is also of a similar nature and if the Bill had been properly drafted it would have included clause 6 also as a section from which an appeal would lie. This is a constructive suggestion that I am offering to my hon. friend.

My two other amendments are on the fundamental question whether the denial of passport should or should not be made a justiciable matter. Since it is already 5.30 p.m. Sir, perhaps you would allow me to continue my observations tomorrow morning.

The Deputy Minister in the Department of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Mathyal Rao): Sir, the time has already been extended by one hour by the Deputy-Speaker. It would not be possible for the Government to accept extension of time still further.

Shri M. R. Masani: I hope the Minister is not asking for its passage without a third reading. We want to

oppose the Bill during the third reading and we want to divide the House.

An hon. Member: We have to take up the China question now.

Shri M. R. Masani: This is a very important clause. Further, we want to oppose it during the third reading.

Mr. Speaker: Tomorrow would you be able to finish it in one hour's time?

Shri M. R. Masani: I think one hour would be adequate tomorrow.

17.28 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

SIEGE OF INDIAN EMBASSY IN PEKING AND SERIOUS DETERIORATION IN INDIA-CHINA RELATIONS

Mr. Speaker: We will now take up the Calling Attention Notice.

Shri Seshiyar (Kumbakonam): Is it a Calling Attention or a general discussion?

Mr. Speaker: Calling Attention Notice.

Shri Seshiyar: Sir, you said in the morning that the Minister will make a statement. So, all parties may be given opportunities.

Mr. Speaker: There are 50 names in the Calling Attention Notice.

How could I give opportunity to all of them?

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay Central South): You may ask the spokesman of each party to make a statement. That would be easier.

की वजह से (मुंबई) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अधिलम्बनीय लोक महत्व के निम्नलिखित विषय की और वैदेशिक कार्य

मंत्री का ध्यान दिलाता हूँ और प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह इस बारे में एक वक्तव्य दें :—

Shri M. B. Masani (Rajkot): Who were the friendly missions?

पेकिंग स्थित भारतीय दूतावास को चीनियों द्वारा घेरा जाना, चीनी चाजें द अफेयर्स द्वारा वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्रालय के विरोध पत्र लेने से बार-बार मना करना, घायल चीनियों के ठहरने की प्रवृत्ति बढ़ाया जाना, चीन द्वारा निकाले गए भारतीय राज-नयकों द्वारा हांगकांग में बुलाये गए सवाद-दाता सम्मेलन को रद्द किया जाना, नेपाल में हवाई झूठे पर चीनियों द्वारा भारत विरोधी नारे लगाये जाना और हाल ही की घटनाओं के बाद भारत-चीन सम्बन्धों का गभीर रूप से बिगड़ना ।

Shri Swaran Singh: The total number of individuals in the Embassy today is 66 including 15 women and 23 children. One family left for India a day before the siege began. Mr. Rao who accompanied Sri Raghunath and Vijay to Hong Kong and the weekly courier who was in Hong Kong have been asked to stay back in Hong Kong, until the position becomes clear. Hon'ble Members will recall that even before the confinement of the whole Embassy personnel in the building, demonstrations by Red Guards in front of the Embassy had already gone on for several days. Since the actual siege began day before yesterday, Red Guards have prevented any access of vehicles to the Embassy by blocking up the whole street. The so-called "masses" have smashed every window and door of the Embassy building facing the street, and the reception rooms which are adjacent to the street have been completely wrecked. So far there has been no attempt at forcing entrance into the Embassy premises, Although a small back gate has been damaged. Our Embassy reports that hundreds of demonstrators stood on two sides of the Embassy compound and hurled stones and broken glasses into the Embassy compound making it impossible for movements within the Embassy between the two wings. No injury has been caused to anybody yet but since windows in the reception and dining rooms of the residence and other sections of the Chancery face the road, there is at every moment the likelihood of stones falling into the building itself with a possibility of hurt being caused to women and children. Precautions are being taken against this eventuality. While all this was going on repeated attempts made by the CDA to contact the Foreign Ministry were frustrated either by lines being cut off or by false excuses. Hon. Members should realise that the total area of the

The Minister of Defence (Shri Swaran Singh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, hon. Members would be interested in the latest developments about the situation of our Embassy in Peking. We have now, after considerable delay received a full report from our Charge d' Affaires. Members will recall that at 11.00 a.m. on 17th June, the Chinese Foreign Minister suddenly demanded the evacuation of all members and their families residing in different parts of Peking in the Embassy compound. A period of two hours was given for this operation but, by the time the Charge d' Affaires returned to the Embassy half hour had already passed. No cars which were already in the Embassy were permitted by the Chinese to be taken out of the Embassy compound to bring in the families. It was therefore necessary to bring in families living in about 15 to 20 flats about 3 miles away from the residence in one or two vehicles belonging to the Embassy and a number of cars and vans lent to us by some friendly Missions. By the concerted efforts of the Embassy personnel and these friendly Missions our staff managed to evacuate every single family before the expiry of the time limit that is within 60 minutes.

[Shri Swaran Singh]

Embassy compound is not more than 1½ acres, divided into two buildings and a few out houses. Friendly Missions were prevented from bringing provisions until this morning, when some provisions were finally permitted by two members of the Chinese staff of the Embassy. Ever since the siege began there has been a sustained campaign to terrorise the Embassy personnel. There have been continuous demonstrations, burning of effigies and deafening noises caused by at least 30 loud speakers blaring away slogans day and night into this small Embassy area. Apart from the elementary physical problems this makes normal lives impossible for Embassy personnel. Hon. members can visualise the psychological torture to which our offices and staff in the Embassy of India, Peking and their families are being subjected to.

To put it briefly, our Embassy is besieged and the personnel of the Embassy are virtually held as prisoners. There have been similar sieges in Peking in the last one year in some other Embassies but what our people are now enduring is much worse mainly because our Embassy compound is comparatively small. Also, the only communications we are having with the outside world is the telephone and even in this case we are told that for full 8 hours on the day the siege began the Foreign Office refused to answer our telephone calls.

In spite of the almost unendurable strain that they are being subjected to, I am happy to announce that, in all his messages, our CDA has conveyed to us the determination of our Embassy personnel to go through this ordeal without financing.

The Chinese CDA was summoned to the Ministry of External Affairs yesterday. A most emphatic protest was lodged regarding the totally unjustified and unwarranted siege of the Embassy premises.

The Embassy was informed that unless the restrictions on the movement of our officers and personnel were removed and provisions allowed to go through, within 24 hours, the Government of India would be obliged to take appropriate counter measures, for which the Chinese Government will be obliged to bear sole responsibility. The Embassy was also informed that, as regards Mr. Chen Lu Chih and Mr. Hsien Cheng Hao the notes already communicated stand. However, on humanitarian grounds since it is alleged that they have received injuries, it is not being enforced immediately.

Hon. Members must have seen the reports in the Press about the unseemly behaviour of the Chinese personnel at the Willingdon Hospital where the seven injured Chinese have been receiving treatment. Expert attention has been given to these injured personnel, indeed Chinese Embassy Officials expressed gratification to our officers at the medical facilities and attention given to them. The Chinese CDA during his conversation was also informed that if, as is alleged Mr. Chen Lu Chih has suffered injury he could also be sent to the Willingdon Hospital where he would receive the best treatment possible. Notwithstanding all the arrangements made yesterday the Chinese Embassy personnel tried to interfere in the administration of the hospital. A Doctor of the Pakistan High Commission was also brought by the CDA as "a friend" to see the Chinese patients. The hospital authorities informed the Chinese CDA that he was welcome to see his colleagues, but the hospital could not permit foreign doctors to treat patients inside the Government hospitals. In the conversation with the Chinese CDA, it was also mentioned that in Peking also, Embassy doctors are not allowed to treat patients inside Chinese government hospitals.

Subsequently, the Chinese Embassy personnel insisted on shouting slogans

[Mr. Speaker]

siege had been lifted and if not, what was the position about it. If the hon. Minister has some information about it he can give.

I do not know whether all of you can put questions. (Interruptions) I have already told the Minister that whatever information he has, from 3 to 6 P. M., he can give.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay Central South): Before the Minister proceeds to answer Mr. Limaye's question....

श्री मधु लिमये : उनको कहने दीजिये न, येरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

Shri S. A. Dange:.... would he also give us information as to whether a counter-request was sent by the Government of India that they would like to send an aircraft to evacuate their women and children who are besieged there and whether the Chinese Government would accept this request and whether the Government of India has such an intention. Why can't we lock up the embassy there and evacuate our personnel instead of allowing them to be tortured like this? That is the point. Let the Embassy here also be looked up and let them also go.

Mr. Speaker: This will come in 'questions'. That is, of course, a pertinent point. We read in the Press today that they had asked for permission to send a plane to take the Embassy staff. Whether such a request has been made by us is the question. Of course, the main thing is whether, after 3 P. M., any other event has happened.

Shri S. A. Dange: Do they wish to send a ship?

Shri Swaran Singh: I would appeal to the hon. members that we should not treat it as a political issue; it is a national issue and we should all approach this problem not with a view to criticising the Government, but we should view it as a problem that we

have to tackle and tackle it consistent with our national honour and dignity. dignity. (Interruptions).

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: (Delhi Sadar): Let him tell us what he has done.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (South Delhi): When we had fixed that this would be taken up at 5:30 p.m. we did so in the morning on the understanding that he would have some information.

Mr. Speaker: I have myself said that.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, ये विदेश मंत्री भी नहीं हैं, विदेश मंत्री के लिये काम कर रहे हैं। प्रधान मंत्री यहाँ बैठी हैं, वह बोलें, वह चुप क्यों हैं। इन को बकरा बनाया जा रहा है ?

Mr. Speaker: Let us hear the hon. Minister now.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: (बलरामपुर) : यह राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न है, हम यह जानना चाहते हैं कि क्या सरकार राष्ट्रीय नीति तय करने के लिये तैयार है ?

Mr. Speaker: I shall allow the hon. Member to put questions later.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : प्रश्न तो एक ही है जो आपने पूछ दिया है। तीन बज गये, सरकार के अस्टीमेटम का समय निकल गया है

Mr. Speaker: On behalf of all the Members, I have done that myself. But hon. Members are not allowing the hon. Minister to answer. Let us allow him to say.

Shri M. L. Senani (New Delhi): We want action.

Shri Swaran Singh: We have not received information that the siege has been lifted, and we are proceeding on this basis; for further steps that we should take we are proceeding on this basis that the siege of our Embassy in Peking continues, and it is our intention to take a decision on our side, and we intend to deliver....

An hon. Member: When?

Shri Swaran Singh: . . . a note to the Chinese representative here some time this evening.

Mr. Speaker: Now, we shall have to think about how we shall proceed with this. Many hon. Members want to ask some questions and elicit information, or ask for clarifications. Or they may also like to make some suggestions. There are 50 names on the list before me, and I cannot possibly call all of them.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): We on this side of the House are also equally concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Apart from these 50 Members, there are others also. The House consists of five hundred odd Members. I know that. There are 50 Members who have given notice of this. But I shall not be in a position to call all of them. May I, therefore, call one from each party, and two or three from the Congress side also?

Shri Nath Pai: Why there or four from that side? None from that party should be called.

Mr. Speaker: It has been agreed to by all of us that 50:50 would be the sharing between the two sides . . .

Shri Nath Pai: All these difficulties have arisen because of their bungling.

Mr. Speaker: This is a matter about which we are all agreed. Naturally, we are all worried about it. Therefore, may I request hon. Members to keep a little calm and speak one by one? After all, Government also are equally anxious to do something. But perhaps they would need time. (*Interruptions*).

Whatever that may be, let us not start talking simultaneously. It is no use ten Members getting up and speaking simultaneously. I would call one Member from each party, either the leader or anybody that the leader may suggest. Let us have some order in this.

Shri S. Kandappan: He should give straight answers.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, पहले इन दो मुद्दों का जवाब दिलवाइये बाद में प्रापका सुझाव ठीक है। हम इसको मानेंगे।

Mr. Speaker: If Shri Madhu Limaye has not got an answer for any of his questions, he may say that.

श्री मधु लिमये . मेरे पहले मुद्दों का ही जवाब नहीं आया है, पहले उन का जवाब आ जाये।

Mr. Speaker: That is what I have said. If the hon. Minister can give any extra information, I shall be very happy. If not, the hon. Member can ask for it again. There is no difficulty about it.

श्री मधु लिमये . मेरे पहले मुद्दों का जवाब दिलवाइये, उस के बाद सबाल पूछने का मौका आयेगा।

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. Minister any other information to give?

Shri Swaran Singh: I have given whatever information was available.

श्री क० ना० तिवारी (बेलिया) : प्रश्नी मधु लिमये साहब ने जो काल-एटेंशन नोटिस पढा है, उसमें जितने प्वाइन्ट्स हैं, उन का जवाब मिनिस्टर साहब ने नहीं दिया है। उसी तरह से दूसरे मेम्बर साहब ने जो प्वाइन्ट उठाया है, टाइम के बारे में, एरोप्येन भेजने के बारे में, उन का भी जवाब नहीं दिया है। इस लिये फुलर स्टेटमेंट आ जाब, नब सबाल पूछे जाय।

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is perfectly right . . .

Shri D. C. Sharma: We do not stand when you are on your legs, . . .

Mr. Speaker: I do not expect him to.

Shri D. C. Sharma: But the fact of the matter is that the hon. Minister of External Affairs has said nothing more than what we have already read in the papers this morning. What purpose is then served by this calling-attention notice? What is the use of raising this matter when we are going to get a rehash of the newspaper reports that we read this morning in *The Hindustan Times*, *The Statesman*, *The Indian Express*, *The Times of India* and all kinds of other papers?

Mr. Speaker: I entirely agree with the hon. Members. But if the hon. Minister says that that he has no additional information to give, I wonder what the Chair can do . . .

Shri Randhir Singh (Rohtak): Let him make the statement tomorrow.

श्री हुकम चन्द रघुबाय (उज्जैन)
प्रधान मंत्री मंत्री से जवाब दिलावाइये ।

Mr. Speaker: No please. After all, both the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister are here. Whatever information is available, they will give. If they are not able to give more information, the Chair cannot help.

श्री बच्चू सिन्घे : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इन के दूत ये हांगकांग में, और वहाँ पर प्रेस सम्मेलन होने वाला था । वह इन के आदेश पर रह किया गया है । क्या इस के बारे में मंत्री महोदय जानकारी नहीं देंगे ?

इसी तरह नेपाल में चीनी दूतों के स्वागत के लिये वहाँ के चीनी दूत आये थे और उन्होंने भारत विरोधी नारे लगाये, क्या इस के बारे में भी जानकारी नहीं देंगे ? जो इस ध्यान आकर्षण का विषय है वह तो कम

से कम उत्तर में आना चाहिये । उस के बाद आप का सुझाव हम ने मान लिया है कि हर एक दल में से एक सदस्य सवाल पूछेगा ।

Shri Swaran Singh: I have got this information about the press conference in Hongkong. It was cancelled because Mr. Raghunath was to report to our Government first. The press conference was held on Mr. Raghunath's arrival here yesterday.

Shri M. L. Sondhi: Was it on Chinese advice because it took away all the significance from it?

Shri Swaran Singh: I have said that I have no further information.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्ता : मैन क्वेश्चन का जवाब तो आना चाहिये । वह तो दिलावाइये कि 3 बजे के बाद सरकार क्या करने वाली है । यह नहीं बतलाया जाता तब साम ही क्या है ?

Shri S. S. Kothari (Mandsaur): The only way-out is to sever diplomatic relations and close the chapter.

Shri N. Dandekar (Jamnagar): Mr. Speaker, I really wish on a matter like this it was the Prime Minister who had dealt with this and who should have replied because this Minister, who has in fact only just seen this statement which he has read out, has a habit of provoking the House into a situation to which he himself then refers as undignified. I really think this is a very difficult question and it is a matter which we ought to approach quite dispassionately.

To begin with, I think I am right in saying that our Embassy Staff in Peking, both those who have come back as well as those who have remained there, have suffered great humiliation. We have followed these terrible happenings not only with great anxiety and sympathy but also with a great sense of humiliation in this country. It everybody here feels strongly about this, it is because of

the humiliating and servile position we have been accepting *vis-a-vis* China in the last five years. Everybody without exception was of the opinion that after the Colombo discussions failed, at least then we should have severed diplomatic connections, or we should have done so anyway when in Peking and all over China there began this stupendous, organised mob terrorism, or at least lately when other foreign missions have been so terribly badly treated—even our friends the Russians' and various other missions. But we just seem to go on taking this lying down, even when kicked about, humiliated and so on.

This is really the crux of the whole thing, that the Government do not seem capable of taking any dignified attitude, any dignified action. The minimum action which seems to have been called for at the present juncture should have been the severance of diplomatic relations.

Today, the governments ultimatum, if I might so call it, expired at 3 P.M. They are now going to sit and think of what they are going to do. Good heavens! Sir, I thought even when they issued this ultimatum, their mind would have been clear as to what they were going to do when it expired.

Sir, if I am guilty of taking this to the level of passion, I am sorry; but these things provoke one. And when one adds the pontification by the Minister, it really makes matters worse because, right throughout the country, there is a sense of humiliation and indignation. There has been a sense of humiliation right since the India-China war; there has been humiliation at the way they have been treating our notes and protests and the massive correspondence that has been going on to no purpose.

The Minister says other missions have also been treated badly. So, everybody ought to have known what we were in for. Therefore, the first question that really does arise is; is the Government ever going to assume a dignified stance, a posture of dignity

in this country and tell the Chinese, "we will not have anything more to do with you"? and will they stop all this business of keeping windows open with China so that they can throw no more dirt at us?

One other question is this. The Minister mentioned that in our plight other missions were helpful, friendly. Is there any reason why he does not mention their names? Could we have the names of such people on the spot who helped us, to whom we should at least acknowledge thanks for the assistance they have given? It seems to be a particular puerile kind of attitude to take, to be kicked around ourselves and not have the decency to mention the names of people who have helped us, as to which, if the Minister will not do it, at least some of us here would like publicly to thank them for the assistance they have rendered.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Madhok.

Shri Nath Pai: This will not do please. I submit if we want to get a worthwhile reply. This blanket reply does not help, we have never benefited. Let every question be separately replied to.

Mr. Speaker: After all, it was only an opinion expressed.

Shri M. Dandekar: There were two questions.

Mr. Speaker: The question is whether we are going to break our relations with them. The same or similar questions may be asked by other members also. It is already five minutes to six. If ten or twelve people are to ask similar questions, I do not mind, let us see if repetition will not be there.

Shri Swaran Singh: I do share the indignation of our people at the attitude and behaviour, uncivilised behaviour, of the Chinese towards the members of our mission, and, as I have already indicated, at 6 p. m., within a few minutes from now, it is

[Shri Swaran Singh]

our intention, taking everything into consideration, to impose restrictions on the members of the Chinese staff in Delhi, and they will be on a reciprocal basis. The type of restrictions that are imposed on the members of our staff there in China, similar restrictions are intended to be imposed on their staff in this country.

The severance of diplomatic relations is a bigger issue, upon which we should take a decision not when we are faced, with, this immediate problem. We should try to settle this first, and we should not link the question of severance of diplomatic relations with this. That is a bigger issue, about which the Government position has been clarified before, and there is no alteration in Government's policy in regard to the continuance of diplomatic relations.

Shri N. Dandekar: I wanted the names of the missions. I would like to thank those friendly countries. Which are those countries? Why is he suppressing the information?

Shri Swaran Singh: I am not suppressing anything. At the present moment I have not got the names of those countries. I will communicate them as soon as I get the names.

Shri Dandekar: Do I understand that the Minister does not know who were friendly to us?

Mr. Speaker: All countries are friendly. He should get information.

Shri S. Kandappan: On a point of order. We are discussing such an important issue.

Shri N. Dandekar: It is extraordinary that the Minister should not know the names of the friendly missions who helped us. I would like to say from here, many members would like to express our thanks to these missions.

Mr. Speaker: We have so many friendly nations. It is a question of the friendly nations, who helped us there.

18 hrs.

Shri S. Kandappan: On a point of order. We are discussing such a vital issue and the Minister says that he has no information. In an yesterday's English daily from Madras, I have seen the names of those countries' embassies that had helped us. Why could not the Government get that information?

Mr. Speaker: It is a question. What is the point order.

श्री मधु लिवये : यह सब क्या चल रहा है ? पहले से इन्फोर्मेशन हासिल करके क्यों नहीं आते हैं ?

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : कल प्रचारार्थों में पढ़ कर नाम बतायेंगे ?

Shri Swaran Singh: I would appeal to the hon. Members that they should be a little more indulgent to me because I depend upon the information that I received from the E. A. Ministry. After all, it is my intention to give all the information that I have. I have just received information that the embassies of Britain, France, Yugoslavia, Socialist countries . . . (Interruptions) Indonesia and the Scandinavian countries, helped our mission. (Interruptions.) I would like to assure the hon. Members that it is not my intention to suppress anything; after all I do not get anything by suppressing any information. I will pass on all the information that I get from the Ministry. If on any specific issue, they want information, I will try my best to collect it.

Shri Hem Barua (Mangaldai): This morning, you directed the hon. Minister to make a comprehensive statement. The names of these friendly nations are already in the Press; we have read about them. When this question was put specifically so many Ministers run to the official gallery, and the official gallery have given him a list and that list also is not complete. That is the trouble.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: The hon. Minister has just now said that they

are going to take reciprocal action against the Chinese in the Chinese Embassy here. This has been the practice; we have been behaving as reactionaries. The Chinese take some action and we react to that. What the country needs today is a positive approach....

Shri Hem Barua: Is it not a new meaning, Sir?

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: The hon. Minister says that we should be indulgent to him and that it is a national question. I agree with him that it is so and we should have a national policy towards China. The people of India want a positive policy of which there should be at least four planks: first, break of diplomatic relations with China; second, raise the issue of Tibet and repudiate the treaty of 1954; third, withdraw support to Chinese entry into the UN, and fourth, establish friendly relations with those countries which are interested in containing China and which are threatened by China. These are the four planks of worthwhile, national, positive policy towards China. The Government talked of national danger and I agree with it. Is the Government prepared for sitting down with the other national parties of the country and evolve a national policy on these lines of which the first plank is the immediate break-off of diplomatic relations with China? That is my specific question.

Shri Swaran Singh: The specific reply is that at this stage, this question of severance of diplomatic relations is not being considered.

Shri Baskiyar (Kumbakonam): By all canons of civilised behaviour and international diplomacy, the recent occurrence and the obnoxious behaviour of the Chinese should have made our Government long ago chalk out some plans. Just now the Minister says that some other embassies in Peking have been subjected to the same kind of treatment of demonstration in front, etc. I want to know in

such background what did the Government do all along to prepare our own embassy staff and to bring all the families of our embassy together? Why have the Government failed in this primary duty of giving protection to them and maintain the dignity of our embassy in Peking?

Shri Swaran Singh: Sir, let us not forget that the primary duty of affording protection to the members of any foreign mission is that of the host government. It is our responsibility here in Delhi to provide protection to members of the diplomatic corps of other countries. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Please hear him.

Shri M. L. Sondhi: It is an irrelevant reply.

Shri Swaran Singh: I wish relevance were the virtue that should be followed by the other side! It is extremely relevant. This is the responsibility that is accepted in international practice, that the host country is to provide protection to the members of a foreign mission. (Interruption). It is true that when a special situation arises or there is a special danger, then we have specifically to take up with the government of the country to which our diplomats are accredited, to take special measures. In this particular case, our members of the mission were staying in different flats, and there was no lack of security as such. When they were living in those various flats, on this occasion, as I have said, the Chinese authorities asked the members to move into the embassy building, and in accordance with that, we moved them quickly into this building, because this was what was required by—(Interruption)—Now, this was an unjust and uncalled for requirement by them; they should have afforded protection to our members of the staff even in the flats they were residing. They failed in their duty and they illegally asked our people in an unjustified manner, the members of our staff and others—to move into the embassy building.

Shri S. A. Dange: I am not raising questions of long-term policy just now. What is at stake is the safety of the women and children besieged in the Indian embassy, and the safety of the staff there. The Chinese have asked that they want to send an aeroplane to evacuate their personnel. Is the Government prepared to send an aircraft on our part to evacuate our personnel which is already besieged? The Minister speaks of reciprocal behaviour. The Chinese leaders, whatever their diplomatic notions may be, in the present circumstances they are shown to be highly cultured gangsters and it is such a relationship that is established by those gentlemen with our people in Peking. I hope the Minister is not calling for reciprocal barbarism on our part. Please do not do that. But then I would request that we do send our aircraft and do not go in search of a ship to go to Hong Kong and evacuate them, evacuate our women and children. I want to know whether the Government is prepared to do that.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): We do intend to send a plane, and we do not intend to allow their plane to come till they have given permission for our plane to come and for our people to be brought in safety along with their luggage.

Shri D. C. Sharma: The hon. Minister said very wisely that we should not make it a party issue,—I agree with him,—and that we should discuss it on the international plane. I want to ask him, how are you going to discuss it on the international plane, when China is not a member of the UNO, when China is not friendly to most of the nations of this world, when China is living an isolated, alienated existence, and when China has been known throughout history as a great inventor of torture? I think anybody who has read the history of China will agree with me that China has been known as the great inventor of torture. When China has inflicted upon our diplomatic corps, not only

physical torture, not only nervous torture, not only mental torture, but also spiritual and psychological torture, when China has done all that, I want to ask the hon. Minister—

Shri Hoen Barua: What is spiritual torture?

Shri D. C. Sharma: You cannot understand it. (Interruptions). Sir, may I know in what way he is going to solve this problem of evacuation of those persons from there on an international plane?

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister has answered just now that an aeroplane will be sent.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Did he not know that the Chinese diplomats here evacuated their families long ago? Did he not see the writing on the wall, when they had evacuated their families, that something was brewing there and something was going to happen? Why is it that he was in the dark about all these things?

Shri Swaran Singh: I have nothing to add to what the Prime Minister has said about the evacuation plan.

Shri D. C. Sharma: How is he going to make this issue an international issue?

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Lohia.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (कर्मज).
अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज मैं कुछ चिन्ता से बोल रहा हूँ, क्योंकि चीन ने अपना उद्वेग बम फोड़ लिया है और अगर वह चाहे तो वह एक बम से ही हमारी राजधानी और उस के सभी निवासियों को विस्तृत क्षति कर सकता है।

श्री डी० सी० शर्मा : कर दे हम को।
इस से बचना है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अगर उधर, इधर और अपने देश में इतनी हिम्मत होती, तो किसी भी बात की चिन्ता नहीं होती और कभी का चीन से सम्बन्ध तोड़ना तो दूर रहा, अब तक हम लोग न जाने कितने धागे बड़ गए होते ।

मुझे हैरत होती है जब मैं अपने देश के किसी मंत्री को यह कहते हुए सुनता हूँ कि न सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान के कूटनीतियों के साथ बल्कि इंग्लिस्तान और रूस के कूटनीतियों के साथ भी वही बर्ताव, या उस के जैसा बर्ताव हुआ है । अगर इंग्लिस्तान के डोवर की पहाड़ियों का एक छोटा सा हिस्सा भी चीन ने ले लिया होता तो अब तक क्या हो गया होता ? अगर रूस के साइबेरिया के मैदान का एक छोटा सा भी हिस्सा चीन ने ले लिया होता तो क्या हो गया होता ? लेकिन फिर भी जब इस देश का एक मंत्री चाहे वह विदेश मंत्री हो या प्रधान मंत्री ऐसी बातें बोलता है — आप यह न समझें कि मैं बिना सोचे बोल रहा हूँ—तो मुझे यह कहना पड़ता है कि इस देश की सरकार को अपनी जमीन के बारे में किसी तरह की लज्जा नहीं रह गई है । न जाने हम किस भविष्य में जा रहे हैं ?

Mr. Speaker: That is not the question. We are not discussing that now.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आज वह समय आ गया है, जब कि इन सब बातों पर गम्भीरता के साथ विचार किया जाये, वरना नतीजा क्या होगा ? अभी इस सदन को यह नहीं बताया गया है कि चीन ने खुद एक नोट सरकार को भेजा है कि चीन के दूतावास के ऊपर जो हमला हुआ था, जल्दी से जल्दी उस का संतोषजनक उत्तर दिया जाये, वरना चीन कार्यवाही करेगा । इस संसद को अभी यह खबर नहीं दी गई है । मैं यह खबर दे रहा हूँ कि चीन उसी सरकार को एक नोट भेज चुका है । इस प्रकार के नोट परस्पर आते जाते रहेंगे । नतीजा यह होगा कि चीन कोई

कार्यवाही करेगा, तब यह सरकार उसी कार्यवाही करेगी । जब चीन इस देश से अपने राजनयिक सम्बन्ध तोड़ेगा, तभी यह सरकार भी चीन से अपने राजनयिक सम्बन्ध तोड़ेगी । आखिर ये सब बातें एक दूसरे के साथ जुड़ी हुई हैं ।

आप जानते हैं कि जब इस सरकार ने संयुक्त राष्ट्र में चीन के प्रवेश के सम्बन्ध में कार्यवाही की—1962 के बाद कार्यवाही की । अपनी जमीन छिनने के बाद कार्यवाही की ! तब मैंने इसी लोक सभा में इनकी उपमा उत लडके से दी थी जो अपनी मां की शादी उसके बलात्कारी के साथ करा देना चाहता है । इस तरह की सरकार को लेकर आप कहां तक जा सकेंगे ? अब समय आ गया है जब इन सब बातों पर गम्भीरता के साथ विचार कर के एक नगाठार क़ैसला किया जाये ।

सवाल करना फ़िज़ूल है लेकिन मेरा पहला सवाल तो यह है कि क्या कहीं इंग्लिस्तान की डोवर की पहाड़ियों को या रूस के साइबेरिया के मैदान को चीन ने हमला कर के अपने कब्जे में लिया है कि जिसके कारण वे मंत्री हमारी प्रवस्था की उन की प्रवस्था से तुलना कर दिया करते हैं ।

दूसरा सवाल यह है कि क्या सरकार की कार्यवाहियां हमेशा जबाबी रहेंगी : जब हमारे दूतावास के लोग निकाले जायेंगे, जब चीन राजनयिक सम्बन्ध तोड़ेगा तब यह सरकार तोड़ेगी । जब चीन फिर से इस देश पर हमला कर देगा और एक-तिहाई हिन्दुस्तान खत्म हो जायेगा क्या तब यह सरकार चेतनेगी ? अब वह समय आ गया है जब अमरीका या रूस या कोई भी देश हमारी मदद करने के लिए आने वाला नहीं है जब तक कि एक-तिहाई हिन्दुस्तान चीन के कब्जे में नहीं बना जाता है । यह बात अचक-

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

इसराईल युद्ध ने बिल्कुल साबित कर दी है। तो क्या वह सरकार इन छोटी-मोटी बातों के झगड़े में फंसी रहेगी कि जो चीन करेगा, उसी का जवाब दे देंगे, वह बप्पड़ मारेगा, तो ये भी बप्पड़ मार देंगे, वह गाली देगा, तो ये भी गाली देंगे अगर वह किसी तरह से प्रेम करेगा, तो ये भी कर देंगे? क्या यह सरकार उसके प्रस्ताव का भी कुछ करेगी? अब गम्भीरता के साथ हमें कुछ करना चाहिए। हमें बप्पड़ नहीं मारना है, गाली नहीं देनी है, हमें शान्ति के साथ रहना है। हमने उनके साथ सम्बन्ध तोड़ डालना है, लेकिन अगर युद्ध करना पड़ता है, तो फिर ऐसा संकल्प बना कर युद्ध करना है कि चाहे हम क्षत्र हो जायें, लेकिन अपनी जमीन के एक एक इंच को बचा कर रखेंगे।

आज कोई ऐसा-बैसा मौका नहीं है। लेकिन जिस तरह आप इस सवाल को छेड़ रहे हैं और जिस तरह मंत्री महोदय ने जवाब देना शुरू किया है, उस से ऐसा मालूम होता है, जैसे बच्चों की कोई गोली या गुल्लो-डब्बे की लड़ाई हो रही हो। वह यह लड़ाई नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि चीनी राजनयिकों के खिलाफ जरा भी कोई कार्यवाही न हो। इस बात की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। हमें शान्ति और गम्भीरता के साथ अपने कदम तय कर लेने चाहिए कि अब चीन से हमारा कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। उसके बाद हम शान्ति से रहें। अगर हम आज वाले रिस्के को ही लगातार और पांच इस बरस चलाते रहें, तो अच्छा है। यदि युद्ध होता है, तो उसका सामना भी संकल्प के साथ करें, चाहे उसमें हमें कितनी भी तकलीफें उठानी पड़ें।

Mr. Speaker: After all, hon. Members can only ask questions. Dr. Lohia has raised a big policy matter. I do not know if the hon. Minister is prepared to answer it now. If he is pre-

pared to answer it I will be very happy.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैंने एक सवाल तो डोवर और साइबेरिया के बारे में किया है।

Mr. Speaker: If he is prepared to answer I have no objection. After all, even while putting a question, as somebody said, there is no use using a language which will be rather wounding the feelings of the other side. If the Minister can answer some of the points raised by the hon. Member, he may do so.

Shri Swaran Singh: Sir, you rightly pointed out that it is a bigger question of policy. According to Dr. Lohia a certain policy should be adopted by the Government. He has given reasons, which according to him are weighty reasons, why that particular policy should be adopted. I think that in a Calling Attention Notice, at this stage, when perhaps we elicit information or give information, these questions as to what should be our policy or whether any alteration in our policy is required, these are bigger considerations which can be discussed in the course of the debate when the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs are taken up. Perhaps on a Calling Attention Notice I cannot do justice to the bigger issues really in short replies. No question of fact has been elicited. He has put forward only certain views that should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker: I thought some discussion would have been necessary.

श्री राम सेवक दासव: अध्यक्ष महोदय, व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। प्रश्न पूछने का धर्म होता है कि उत्तर मिले और अगर प्रश्न का उत्तर न आये सीधा तो फिर उस समय आपकी सहायता की आवश्यकता मालूम पड़ती है। प्रश्न तो सीधा सा था कि क्या चीन की जब किया होगी तब हमारी कोई उस के ऊपर (बकवास)

Mr. Speaker: He is repeating the question in the form of a point of order.

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :
दूसरा प्रश्न था कि क्या ऐसी कोई
मिसाल बतावेंगे कि डाबर और साइबेरिया
का कोई हिस्सा चीनियों के पास गया
हो और उसके बाद भी उन्होंने सम्बन्ध
बनाये रखा हो ?

Mr. Speaker: Will you kindly sit down?

श्री मधु सिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय,
एक ही मेरा निवेदन है। पिछले बार मैंने
यह सवाल उठाया था। यह बार बार प्रश्न
देशों से तुलना करके इसकी गम्भीरता को
कम कर रहे हैं। इसलिए यह मंत्री महोदय
इस प्रश्न का उत्तर दें कि कोई भी दूतावास
या देश है कि जिसकी जमीन छीन ली गई हो
या जिसके ऊपर आक्रमण हुआ हो ? इसका
तो जवाब नहीं दे रहे हैं तो फिर ऐसी बाह्यगत
तुलना करने से क्या फायदा है ?

Mr. Speaker: He has said that.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): Sir,
I express our grave concern at the
siege of our Embassy premises, of our
diplomatic personnel, of our women
and children in Peking. I submit that
this siege is unjustifiable and un-
warranted.

**Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated
Anglo-Indians):** Very mild language.

Shri Umanath: If the Chinese Gov-
ernment had thought that there was
anything wrong on our part, it was
up to the Chinese Government to have
taken up the issue at the diplomatic
level. Further, what wrong has been
committed by our innocent women and
children and our diplomatic personnel
there? These are all matters to be
taken up at the diplomatic level
instead of resorting to siege and
similar things.

In this connection, I would like to
submit that what happened two or
three days ago in the Chinese Embassy
premises in India, the assault of the
Chinese and the pulling down of the
Chinese flag in our capital here made
our position morally weefl... (Inter-
ruptions).

Shri Randhir Singh: They slapped
our police and you are justifying it.

Shri Umanath: The other day, when
Shri Chagla referred to the question
of their entering the premises, he
said—these are his words—fortunately
they did not enter the premises. This
should not be tolerated at all. It is
unfortunate that such a thing should
have happened here. Anyway, I am
glad that the Prime Minister has
announced that the Government pro-
poses to send an aeroplane to Peking
on a reciprocal basis to evacuate our
families. Apart from this thing, apart
from the measures and counter-
measures, in view of the anti-climax,
I would like to know from the Gov-
ernment whether any efforts are con-
templated through such embassies
which are friendly with both countries
to bring pressure on the Chinese Gov-
ernment to resolve this particular
incident that has just now arisen?

Shri Swaran Singh: It is not neces-
sary to invoke the help of any other
Mission for resolving this issue. We
are directly talking to the Chinese
through their Mission here and
through our charge d'affaires in Pek-
ing.

Shri R. K. Sinha (Faizabad): The
question of China, as it has arisen in
view of the provocations, is a political
question, and it is time that we assess
our position politically because in
international politics we should not
permit China to be the first to initiate
certain measures and we are to reply
to it. China is trying to test our
policy of non-alignment, our policy of
progressive independence, our capa-
city to decide issues on merits. Sir,
I wish to tell Dr. Lohia and some
friends on the other side... (Inter-
ruptions).

Mr. Speaker: I thought he was asking a question... (Interruptions).

Shri M. L. Sondhi: Do not moralise... (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Ask the Minister whatever you want... (Interruption).

Shri E. K. Sinha: I wanted to join with Dr. Lohia in saying that every son and daughter of India will defend the sovereignty of the country. People on this side of the House are not in disagreement with the sentiment but before I say something people on the other side start howling. They are not prepared to hear one Member of the Congress Party... (Interruption).

I want to say that the Chinese Government is behaving so dictatorially because it has been provoked by the fact that we successfully defended the Arab cause in West Asia. They need this opportunity because they wanted to prove to the people in Asia and Africa that they can challenge the Government of India any time they choose. That is why I want to point out to the Minister that a policy of national defence, of national sovereignty and of standing up to all the threats of China is the only way to deter the Chinese. I want to ask the Minister whether China today is not isolated from the other socialist countries, whether the Chinese who give serious warnings every time to America and Taiwan are not tin soldiers and whether the Chinese who are not able to defend their allies in North Vietnam—whether these very Chinese can hope to challenge our policy of non-alignment and test it. I want to tell the Minister that if he wants to contain China, with proper pursuit of our policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence we should try to show the Chinese that we are prepared to pay tit for tat. We should also tell the Chinese that we shall cut down our staff in Peking and, if necessary, break diplomatic relations.

Shri Swaran Singh: I am in agreement with most of what the hon. Member has said. About the opera-

tive part, we are already conscious of the fact that India faces a constant threat from China. It is for this reason that we are always conscious of strengthening our defences to meet any challenge to our sovereignty and our integrity. In that I am glad that there is unanimity amongst our people and determination to defend our country, our honour and our dignity.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : क्या बाहियत बानें करते रहते हो ? इन बातों को सुन कर के तबियत झट्ला उठवी है । कहाँ एका हँ ? क्या एका हँ ?

Shri Swaran Singh: I was in fact re-echoing the sentiments some of which were expressed by Dr. Lohia and I do not know why he should feel angry over this. We have got the national policy of defence and we are pursuing that policy.

Shri Nath Pal: Mr. Speaker, I would beg that we keep a sense of proportion. There is a danger that we shall lose a long perspective by allowing ourselves to be swept off our feet by the temporary posture of heroics. What the Government is now trying to do is to try a posture of heroics.

I fully endorse what Shri Dange said and I was glad that even the Swatantra did that. We cannot meet the Chinese challenge by this kind of an improvised, ad hoc policy, hand-to-mouth and day-to-day policy. All the difficulties are arising because of the failure of this Government to evolve a long-term strategy and then fitting daily tactics into that. The Chinese have a long-term strategy towards this country. They know that this democratic country constitutes the biggest challenge and danger to China. Therefore they want to go systematically exploiting every opportunity to diminish the influence of India, to make India the laughing stock of Asia, to make India a non-entity and to make India a laughing stock of the world. Systematically they are proceeding towards achieving this objective. But

this Government has no policy towards China. It never had it. It never understood modern China.

I will like to point out to you here what *Izvestia* is talking about China. In the latest article, the *Izvestia*—they are Communist allies and brothers belonging to the same family—reports that the Peking cowards dare not help the people who are trying to raise their banner for freedom in Hong Kong. I would like to ask the Minister why these Chinese who never miss an opportunity to whip an insult, a humiliation, on India, who will talk in the loudest terms so far as India is concerned, will be extremely cautious; whenever it comes to confronting a major power, be it the Soviet Union or be it the U.S.A. Take the question of Qumoy, Matsu or Hong Kong; take the question of Formosa or Taiwan. The Chinese claim it, but they will never dare to raise their little finger to exercise their authority. Then, take the case of supporting the people of Vietnam. They accuse others of betraying but they themselves will never do anything. But why they do it in case of India is because they have found a measure of this weak-kneed leadership.

Today we are going to satisfy ourselves by doing this and that and by giving an ultimatum. I am not going to be satisfied with this. This country is not going to be satisfied with this. We want to know this from Mr. Swaran Singh and, if possible, from the Prime Minister; are we going to go on living with China on a day-to-day basis or are we going to evolve a national policy? He began by asking for the support of the national policy. If the policy is to be what has always been, that is, the total absence of policy, always reacting to the Chinese initiative, if the policy is to be of appeasement and of kowtowing the Chinese, we are not going to support him. Do we understand this perverse, sadistic, behaviour of the Chinese in isolation or is it part of a bigger scheme? This is immediately

followed by the explosion of a hydrogen bomb. I must say, I would not like that we pay in small matters tit for tat but I would like that on major issues we confront China. It is no use burning Chinese effigies in Connaught Place.

May I ask him: Is he even now prepared to sit down with others and try to evolve a national policy, a policy of firmness, a policy of self-respect, a policy of self-interest, a policy of liberating the territory that the Chinese have occupied? If you have such a policy, the nation is with you. The nation is not with you in the policy of kowtowing Chinese. He said that we have only 1½ acres in Peking. Does he know that we have given them 15 acres here? This illustrates how we are surrendering everything even in the matter of establishing an Embassy. The Chinese gave us 1½ acres and we are giving them 15 acres in the Diplomatic Enclave. Are we today at least aware of the danger of China, of the possibility that this may be a prelude to something bigger, of exploding the hydrogen bomb, of the mischief of Peking and of the statement from Pindi? Are we aware of all this? Are we trying to meet them in a grand manner as they are trying to evolve it?

Shri Swaran Singh: On this bigger issue, we have been following carefully the postures of China in the international sphere and the way they have functioned in Asia and Africa. I think, it will not be fair on the part of the critics of the Government's policy to say that we have ignored China's postures. In fact, there has been confrontation with China on the diplomatic front in Jakarta, in Algiers, in the Afro-Asian world, and we are fully aware of the Chinese designs in the Afro-Asian world and what their postures are.

On this question of Sino-Pakistan collusion also, it will not be fair for the critics to say that we are not conscious of this danger. In fact, both the External Affairs Minister and me-

[Shri Swaran Singh]

self and my predecessor, Mr. Chavan, have been aware of this danger. We are not unaware of this danger. We have always informed this House and we have been informing the country of this danger and what steps we have been taking to counter that. As to what is the best way of countering the Chinese menace, one view is the pursuit of vigorous, progressive, policies and strengthening of the non-aligned world and always championing the causes which are not liked by the Chinese—that is an important measure and an instrument to counter China. It is a fact that China is in a state of isolation and, therefore, several aggressive postures. . .

Some hon. Members: No, no.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : क्या बात कह रहे हैं अध्यक्ष महोदय बाकिर कोई झूठ की भी हद होती है ।

Shri Swaran Singh: . . . that they are adopting are not wholly unrelated to that sense of isolation and that sense of failure in the various diplomatic moves in which they indulge.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: Is he speaking to the House?

Shri Swaran Singh: I know that my hon. friends belonging to Jan Sangh and Swatantra Parties and others are not in agreement with the Government's policy on that issue. Whereas the objective is clear, we feel that the method that they are suggesting is not an effective method. It might be talking tall, but that is not an effective method. I would like to assure this hon. House in all sincerity and humility. . . .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वे क्या कह रहे हैं अध्यक्ष महोदय । पाकिस्तान उसका दोस्त है, नेपाल उसका दोस्त है, बर्मा उसका दोस्त है, अल्बानिया उसका दोस्त है, अरब

Shri Swaran Singh: To that we are the last to indulge in heroics. It is not our intention to indulge in heroics. We view this problem with all seriousness; we view it as a grave problem and a serious problem, and the steps that we take are taken after careful calculation and there is no element of either bravado or heroics in our attitude.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वह कभी नहीं हो सकता । हमेशा नाक रगड़ते रहोगे मिट्टी में, हिरोइक, हिरोइक सुन लिया हूँ अंग्रेजी में ।

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Guna): I would only remind the acting Minister of External Affairs about what our late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, said once in this House, that whenever in history China has been united and strong, it has been aggressive; we have to live with this aggressive neighbour. I am sorry, but I agree with Mr. Nath Pai that all these years we have not evolved any China policy; we have never enunciated a China policy. It is no use saying that China is isolated. If China is isolated, it is not on account of ourselves, because we have always advocated its entry into the UNO. There are other territories which are their own and in which the Chinese have been living for centuries. Why do they not go in that direction and why do they come in our direction? Why do they not heap indignities on other nations rather than heaping indignities on this nation, when we have advocated their entry into the UNO? I must say that anybody looking at your policy would think that we are a cowardly nation, we do not stand on our own legs and we yield to bullies. A nation that yields to bullies is bound to come down.

Another thing which I want to say is this. Suppose, a sadistic rascal is pulling out the eyes of my neighbours. When he comes to pull at my eyes, I have nothing to do but say that he

not to save my eyes because he has pulled out the eyes of my neighbours? This is a very strange attitude that is taken by the Foreign Minister. Because some others are insulted, we have nothing to do; whether they are insulted rightly or wrongly, more than ourselves or less than ourselves, the question is why are we being insulted? We must stand up. What is the good of saying that the other nations are also treated like this. Why don't you take council with those other nations?

Shri Swaran Singh: I have never said in justification of the Chinese behaviour that they have insulted other countries. That was farthest from my mind. In fact, in the statement today, I have said that although the indignities had been heaped on members of other missions, what they have done to us really surpasses all the brutalities and barbarities which are known to have been inflicted on others. That was not in any way a mitigation of what they were doing, but only to highlight their consistent behaviour which has been there throughout. I am sorry, a very senior hon. Member of this House, Mr Kripalani, and also some other hon. Members should have interpreted it in this form. It was farthest from my mind to mention those instances to show in any way that they are to be equated with ours. That is not the point. That was only to show that they are consistently adopting these tactics in a consistently barbarous manner. In this particular case,

namely the siege of our Embassy in Peking, they have surpassed even their own record. So, that is mentioned as a bad record and not in any way as an extenuating circumstance or even the remotest justification of what is being done.

I agree that we must act in a brave manner. I agree with Shri J. B. Kripalani that there cannot be any respect for a cowardly people, and I hope that our people are brave and that we should face this bravely, calmly and with all the strength that we can bring about and should not be lost in these polemics.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वुम
बल्कल निकम्मे हो, डरपोक हो ।

Mr. Speaker: It is nearing 6.45 p.m. We have spent over an hour on this. A calling-attention notice cannot be a debate. If I want to call all the Members who want to ask questions, then we may probably have to sit for another two hours, and I do not think that is possible. There cannot be a regular debate now on this calling-attention notice.

So, I shall now adjourn the House and it will meet again at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

18.42 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, June 20, 1967/Jyaishta 30, 1889 (Saka).