

request them to go there. It is a good point. I am happy. What is happening in Calcutta? The police is not doing anything unwaranted. The parties are fighting among themselves and killing each other. This is something quite different (*Inter option*.) The question is quite different. Therefore, a great change is taking place in this country. If we read the history of the judiciary, you will find that it sometimes happens that when democratic institutions are brought to disrepute and contempt, that paves the way for the inroad of monopolists and dictatorships.

I may just bring this one thing to the kind notice of the House. What is happening all round India? The democratic institutions, one by one, Parliament, judicature, and all those institutions, came to disrepute. And ultimately what happen? Military dictatorships came into those countries. I hope this Parliament in time has passed this legislation, and I hope that it is in the interests of the people, it is the duty and responsibility of the people's representatives that they should defend what they have done. I am simply ashamed that the Members of Parliament, who are elected to this House by the mandate of the people, for the interests of the people for the service of the people, should decide to go to courts and challenge their acts elsewhere. They should reset fight and argue here and should abide by the overwhelming decision of this House. I think in this way, if we go on, people will lose faith in the judiciary also and it would be a bad day for our country.

Lastly, I am happy at whatever little has been done by the Government. After the nationalisation of 14 major banks, the State sector today has achieved a controlling height, and as the Law Minister has just now stated, 83 per cent of the credit and finances is under State control, and only 17 per cent is under the private sector. It is a good achievement. But I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister, what happen after the nationalisation of banks.

I am receiving letters every day. I am informed that if they go to the nationalised bank, they are spending Rs. 700 to get a loan of Rs. 5,000. They have to take the man home to their fields give him a good feast—meat and the rest—so that he will be satisfied and will give a good report, recommendation. But even then, several months pass and the applicant does not get the loan.

I am receiving many such letters. I hope the Minister of State for Finance will look into the difficulties which the people are facing. About whatever little achievement has been made, I am happy. Within 6 months, direct financial help to farmers from nationalised banks has increased to Rs. 25 crores. Bank credit to small industries has increased to Rs. 21 crores. Bank credit to small businessmen has increased to Rs. 42 crores. In spite of the difficulties put in the way, these achievements are there.

Sir, you are a lawyer and I will ask your opinion. How can you ask a butcher to pass a judgment on a flock of sheep whether they will be slaughtered or not? If people have shares in the banks, can they go and question the validity of the amount of compensation? The entire argument of Mr. Masani was to increase the amount of compensation. He is not satisfied with Rs. 87 crores. Monopolists and capitalists can never be satisfied with any amount. The time has come when the Representation of the Peoples Act should be amended to the effect that those who are elected to Parliament shall be members of the Constituent Assembly. The term of Parliament and Constituent Assembly will be coterminous for five years. By that way, we can also amend the Constitution and do everything we want to do. The time has come when we will have to face the real struggle between the forces who represent the vested interests and the new generation that is coming up. Through the instrument of this Parliament, we shall overcome this difficulty.

18.32 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

Visit by Delegation of Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam to India

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House will now take up the half-hour discussion. Mr. Nayanar.

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR (Palghat) : Sir, After 14 years of freedom fight against U. S. imperialism and their puppets, South Vietnamese people liberated three-fourth of the South Vietnam and formed a Provi-

[Shri E. K. Nayanar]

sional Government in June 1969. On behalf of that Government a delegation headed by Comrade Ngu Yen Van Tein visited India from December 13, 1969 to January 9, 1970. The leader of the delegation met our Prime Minister and Foreign Minister. Warm and heroic receptions were given to the delegation in various parts of the country during their short visit here.

Let us take the question of Vietnam and Geneva Agreement.

Geneva Agreement was reached in 1954 and India became the Chairman of the International Control Commission.

It is worthwhile here to quote what late great Vietnam leader Ho Chi Minh expressed about this Geneva Agreement last year, just before his death :

"Fourteen years ago, after the great Diem Bien Phu victory, the Geneva agreements were signed recognising the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Vietnam. Had the general election been held in July 1956 for our people, then our country would have achieved full independence, freedom peace and unity and North and South would have been reassembled into one family."

Within twenty-four hours of the signing of this agreement, U. S. President Eisenhower stated as under :

"The United States has not itself been a party to, or bound by, the decision taken by the conference...The Agreement contains features which we do not like."

True to his word, by launching a massive armed aggression against Vietnamese people, the U. S. completely flouted the 1954 Geneva agreements. Since the signing of the 1954 Geneva agreements, the U. S. imperialists have been sabotaging these agreements in an attempt to turn South Vietnam into a U. S. neo-colony and military base and permanently divide Vietnam.

Why is the Government of India not accusing the U. S. A. and South Vietnam puppet Government against the violation of Geneva agreement? India is the chairman of the Geneva Control Commission. As such, India has a duty to accuse those forces which violate the agreements.

India never accused against the American

bombing in North Vietnam. Our government only requested them to stop the bombing. At the same time India also told the South Vietnam liberation movement to stop liberation struggle (a cause for which India stands) against the American aggressors, instead of a accusing and protesting against the American bombing and aggression, India Government stopped trade relations with North Vietnam in 1965. In fact, it is a prize to the American imperialists for their aggression! Why did India stop trade relations with North Vietnam?

The answer is that India bowed to U. S. pressures. In 1965 America passed an amendment to P. L. 80 Funds according to which a country who had trade relations with North Vietnam has no right to receive the benefit of P. L. 480 fund. Our Government is always uttering that Government will not accept any loan which will hinder our sovereignty. We have no courage to tell the U. S. A. that we will not accept such loans like this which will forbid them to trade with another friendly country with which they choose to trade. In fact, they were allowed to be dictated by the U. S. imperialism.

Further, India never demanded the withdrawal of the American troops from Vietnam. For a political settlement in Vietnam it is essential that U. S. and its allies like Australia, New Zealand, Philippines and South Korea should unconditionally withdraw their troops and military equipment completely from South Vietnam and Vietnam should be free from military bases. Instead of doing this, America sharply stepped up their military operations in South Vietnam. They raided South Vietnam villages with powerful B-52 bombers and toxic chemicals and mercilessly killed lakhs of people. Their policy in Vietnam is 'kill all, burn all, destroy all.'

As is known, 5,40,000 well-trained armed American men and officers are still operating in South Vietnam. Over, 5,000 planes and helicopters are being used against the Vietnamese people. Dozens of war-ships of the U. S. Seventh Fleet have been moved to the shores of Vietnam. America is trying to keep in power the Saigon puppet regime with arms and armaments.

The massacre in My Lai village in South Vietnam on 16.5.68 by the U. S. imperialist

aggressors shocked the entire world. The villagers were pulled out from their huts and divided into groups of 200, 100 and 70. Shooting was ordered with machine guns and automatic rifles against these helpless villagers. Hundreds of children and women became victims of this cold-blooded massacre.

From January 13 to February 19, 1919 more than 8,000 American and South Korean troops swept Ba Land region belonging to Anang Nagi Province, killed on the spot over 300 people, drowned 1,200 people in the high seas and herded 11,000 others in Fascist like concentration camps.

Mr. J. B. Neilands, Professor of Biochemistry of California University, analysed the action of toxic chemicals and stated as follows :

"By maiming and killing the civilians, most of whom are children under five, pregnant and lactating women, the aged and infirm, with application of anti-personal gases in confined spaces the U. S. is guilty of crimes against humanity."

I am sorry to say again that uptill now India has not raised its voice of protest against these U.S. soldiers and their inhuman crimes in South Vietnam.

In Calcutta, the leader of the Liberation Government Movement, Mr. Ngu Yen Van Tien, in his reply to the heroic reception given to them, stated as follows :

"We are all more happy because we are today celebrating the 9th anniversary of the founding of the National Front for liberation...Eighty per cent of the territory and three-fourths of the population of South Vietnam are now under the effective control of the Provisional Revolutionary Government... Basing on the success we have achieved, we can assure you, dear friends, that the South Vietnamese people will certainly win and the U. S. Imperialists will be vanquished."

Now the question before us is whether we should actively support the South Vietnam freedom fighters against U. S. imperialist forces.

Finally, I would request that the Indian Government must immediately recognise the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam and upgrade our diplomatic

relationship with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to full Ambassador level and also demand immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all troops, military personnel and armaments of U. S. government and its allies from South Vietnam.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour) : The hon. Minister had earlier promised that they are going to establish an Embassy at Hanoi. Why this cold feet now ? Why this nervousness ?

श्री शिवचन्द्र झा (मधुबनी) : हिन्दुस्तान ने गांधी जी की रहनुमाई में पहले क्विट इंडिया का नारा दिया। उसके बाद क्विट एशिया का नारा लगाया। यह नारा लगाया कि जितने भी साम्राज्यवादी एशिया की घरती पर हैं वे निकल जाएं। अब अमरीका ने साम्राज्यवादी के रूप में एशिया में और वियतनाम में अपना बहुत बड़ा अड्डा बना रखा है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि भारत ने अमरीका को कितनी बार कहा है कि वह अपनी फौजें वहाँ से वापिस बुला ले ?

माई लाई में जो मैसेकर हुआ है उसका परेलेल अगर दूँटना हो तो वह मलेशिया में ब्रिटेन द्वारा किया गया मैसेकर है। इस मैसेकर के बाद भी क्या आप यह समझते हैं कि इंटरनेशनल कंट्रोल कमिशन के जो आप अभी हैड हैं उसमें बने रहना आप अच्छा समझते हैं ? यदि अमरीका हटता नहीं है तो इससे इस्तीफा देना क्या आप अच्छा नहीं समझेंगे ?

जी डी आर के साथ आपके ट्रेड रिलेशंस हैं। नाथं वियतनाम के साथ भी क्या आप ट्रेड रिलेशंस जारी करेंगे ?

क्या आप नैशनल लिबरेशन फ्रंट की सरकार को रिकगनाइज करने के लिए तैयार हैं ? उसके लिए और वहाँ के देशभक्तों के लिए आप कोई फार्मल कमेटी बनायेंगे यहाँ पर जो कि वियतनाम की मदद के लिए फाइनेंसिंग रोज करे ? एड हू वियतनाम के नाम से ऐसा किया जा

[श्री शिवचन्द्र झा]

मकता हैं। उसके जरिये हिन्दुस्तान के लोग वहां के फ्रीडम फाइटरों की मदद कर सकेंगे। क्या आप इसके बारे में भी कुछ करेंगे?

SHRI D. N. DEB (Angul) : The Provisional Revolutionary Government delegation that came to Delhi recently had collected more than Rs. 1 lakh, which was presented to them in the shape of purses by various organisations. We have been told by the Minister that this money has not been allowed to be repatriated out of the country under normal foreign exchange rules. I would like the Minister to clarify in his reply as to what has happened to this money, in whose name this money has been kept in India and how it is allowed to be utilised since the Provisional Revolutionary Government do not maintain any office in India and therefore the money cannot be kept in their names.

Secondly, there is a great deal of controversy in South Vietnam over the invitation extended to Madam Binh who is the Provisional Revolutionary Government's representative at Paris Peace Talks. The Minister says that he has extended an invitation to her to visit India; that is, she has been officially invited unlike what he had said about the Provisional Revolutionary Government delegation which visited India. The Foreign Minister of South Vietnam has said that this will be considered as an unfriendly act. Similar feelings were expressed in unequivocal terms by their Minister Dr. Danh in Saigon recently which was prominently publicised in the *Times of India*. I would like the Minister to clarify the implications of the invitation extended to Madam Binh and whether the Government of India has taken into account the reactions of the South Vietnamese Government and whether it would not interfere in our position as Chairman of the International Control Commission and come in the way of our policy of non-alignment.

श्री कंभर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : साउथ वियतनाम की गवर्नमेंट लाफुली एस्टेब्लिश्ड गवर्नमेंट है। जेनेवा एग्रिमेंट के बाद यह सरकार बनी है। जिस प्रकार यहां प्रधान मंत्री या विदेश मंत्री उनसे मिले या यहां पर

उनका स्वागत हुआ, व्यक्तिगत रूप से भी चाहे आपने उनको बुलाया हो, यह बहुत बुरा प्रेसीडेंट इस सरकार ने स्थापित किया है। इसी प्रेसीडेंट के आधार पर कल को कोई काश्मीर में से या नागालैंड में से इनसर्जेंट्स दूसरे देशों में जाते हैं और उनका वहां स्वागत होता है, वहां के सरकारी अधिकारी उनसे मिलते हैं तो कैसी हमारी फीलिंगज होगी? क्या हम उसको बुरा मानेंगे? या नहीं मानेंगे?

सरकार को ऐसे काम नहीं करने चाहिए, जिनसे नेशनल इंट्रेस्ट सफर करता हो। मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार ने इस बारे में डबल स्टैंडर्डज से काम लिया है। यह बिल्कुल अनफेहे की तरह का केम है। सरकार इस तरह की बातें करके कनफ्यूजन पैदा करती है और फ्रेंडली कन्ट्रीज को अनेसेसेरिली एनाय करती है। विदेश मंत्री ने चाहे उनको व्यक्तिगत रूप से ही बुलाया हो, लेकिन वह भी एक मिसअंडरस्टैंडिंग क्रीएट करेगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसे इनसर्जेंट्स को रेस्पेक्ट देना बेसिकली गलत है, जब कि साउथ वियतनाम में एक लाफुली एस्टाब्लिश्ड गवर्नमेंट हो।

क्या सरकार साउथ वियतनाम गवर्नमेंट को जेनेवा एग्रिमेंट के तहत लाफुली एस्टाब्लिश्ड गवर्नमेंट समझती है या नहीं; अगर हां, तो क्या वह यह एशोरेंस देगी कि ये जो इनसर्जेंट्स यहां पर आयेंगे, भारत सरकार का उनसे कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है और वह उनको बिल्कुल कोई मदद नहीं देना चाहती है?

पेरिस में विदेश मंत्री ने उनके रिप्रेजेन्टेटिव्स को जो यह कहा कि आई शील बैलकम यू इन इंडिया, चाहे वह बात विदेश मंत्री के नाते कही गई हो या व्यक्तिगत रूप से, क्या उससे मिसअंडरस्टैंडिंग होने की सम्भावना नहीं है?

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Minister.

SHRI M. L. SONDHY (New Delhi) : My name is also there; kindly see the list,

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have seen the list. Your name is not there.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Four speakers are allowed. My name appears next below.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have got the list. Your name is not there. But let the hon. Minister reply first and, if there is time, I will permit one or two questions. The hon. Minister.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI DINESH SINGH) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Vietnam struggle for independence is really a symbol of struggle for independence not only of the Vietnamese people but of all people of Asia and, in fact, of all people who have waged a war of independence or are waging a war of liberation. It has been a historic struggle of a people, of a small country, which has challenged the world's largest military power and it has been able to put up a struggle to preserve its independence.

I think, when we discuss the question of Vietnam, we must pay the highest tribute to the people of Vietnam for the struggle they have waged now over two decades for their independence. We had ourselves waged a struggle for independence. Perhaps the methods we followed were different and the conditions were different. But the struggle for over two decades now against the colonial power first and one of the world's largest military powers later is really an example which is unparallel in history.

I am not now going into the details of of the Geneva Agreement or what we have been trying to do to find the solution to the Vietnamese problem. But we have said repeatedly that the solution to the Vietnamese problem can be found only by peaceful methods and that the people of Vietnam must be left to themselves without interference from any foreign power to determine their future. There can be no other solution. The struggle of the Vietnamese people has established that force is not going to be the determining factor in settling international issues. It is a fact. It is a major fact. It brings untold misery on the people. Yet, the determination of the people is now the primary factor which will determine the international situation. Here is an example of a people, unarmed,

considered weak, a small country, which has demonstrated that colonialism has come to an end in Asia and that foreign imperial powers and others, despite their arms superiority and technological superiority, will not be able to crush down the Asian people. Therefore, it is a matter for us of very great importance that we see that peace returns to Vietnam and the people of Vietnam are allowed to determine their future according to their own will without any interference from outside.

The hon. Member who raised this discussion said that we have not made our position clear on this issue. I would like to remind him of the number of occasions when we had discussed this question here in this House, the statements that we have made in the international gatherings and at the United Nations. I myself had the privilege to address the United Nations in the autumn of last year and we had said so very clearly as to what we felt could be the possible solution in Vietnam and we had said that such a solution has to be a peaceful solution, that there has to be a cease-fire and an end of hostilities, that a government has to be established in Vietnam in which the people of Vietnam have the confidence and it is this Government that would be in a position to supervise the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Vietnam and to determine the wishes of the people of Vietnam. This is very clearly stated in the speech I made in the United Nations which is available in the Library of Parliament.

The hon. Member also said that we did not raise the question of bombing of D. R. V. N. by the United States. The House is a witness to the number of occasions this matter had been discussed here and the categorical statement made by the Government of India that the bombing of North Vietnam was totally unjustifiable and must be stopped immediately and we are glad that the United States thought it fit to stop the bombing even though, unfortunately, it carried on for a long time.

The hon. Member also accused us of not demanding the withdrawal of the United States troops and the troops of other countries which are there in support. We have on a number of occasions made the request for withdrawal of all troops from Vietnam.

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

He also accused the Government of not raising the voice against U. S. atrocities. Again in this very House I myself raised our voice very strongly against the atrocities in South Vietnam and said that they must be brought to an end. We are glad that this matter is being investigated by the U. S. authorities and that we shall be able to have the truth from the results of these investigations.

He raised the question of recognition of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam. I would like to say very clearly that whatever policy we adopt for the recognition of the P. R. G. is by no means any reflection on the history of the heroic struggle of the people of Vietnam. But we are bound by the circumstances in which we have to function. We have a special responsibility in South Vietnam. A Conflict is going on. A war has gone on there for many years. We have assumed certain responsibilities on behalf of the international community as Chairman of the Control Commission and this would not be the time for us to accept any new situations in juridical terms in South Vietnam. We have been functioning there as a result of the Geneva Agreements. We have established a Consulate General to keep in touch with the Government that is in Saigon and this could not be the time for us to think in terms of changing these arrangements. We hope that there will be an end to hostilities in Vietnam shortly and that will really be the time for us to assess as to what is then the lawfully constituted Government to which we must accord our recognition.

The hon Member also raised the question of our recognition of D. R. V. N. and the House is aware that we have a Consulate-General in Hanoi. When I went to Hanoi during the funeral of the late President, Dr. Ho-Chi Minh, the D.R.V.N. Government expressed to me their desire to strengthen relations with India and I reciprocated and said that we would be glad to strengthen our relations with D. R. V. N. We have to think of the form and the manner in which these relations could be further strengthened. And, this is under the active consideration of the Government of India.

Similarly, a question has been raised about trade with D. R. V. N. It is true that

there has been certain difficulty in our trading with D. R. V. N. They have also had difficulties, their own hostilities and around them; but it is a matter which is in our mind and we have to see how we can trade with D.R.V.N. Certainly, D.R.V.N. is an important area and we should try to see how we can deal with them.

The hon. Member who raised another point has gone, I think: I need not therefore reply to the question that he raised. He has raised the question of our resignation from the Control Commission. And, may I say, Mr. Chairman, that it would be giving up an international responsibility that we have accepted, for us to resign from the Chairmanship of the Commission. The Commission was really constituted to supervise the peace that was envisaged under the Geneva Agreement. Unfortunately, the conditions have deteriorated, and are not favourable for the effective functioning of the Control Commission; yet there is in Vietnam, the presence of the international community, and it would be quite wrong of us—though the Commission may not be terribly effective—to think in terms of winding it up. We must think in terms of strengthening the functioning of the Commission to bring about a situation in which it will be possible for the Commission to implement the task that was assigned to it under the Geneva Agreement. And, therefore, there could be no question of our withdrawing or winding up the Commission. It is still the hope of the international community to finding a peaceful solution to a very explosive situation in an area of vital interest to us.

Then, I think, the hon. Member, Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta raised the question of the invitation to Madam Binh that I conveyed during my visit to Hanoi. It is true that when I met her in Hanoi I said that she would be most welcome to come to India—and this way in my capacity as the Minister of External Affairs—and that she will certainly be received here when she comes, on behalf of the Government of India. The point here is, Sir, that there is no comparison between the situation in Kashmir or in Nagaland with the situation in Vietnam. Whatever we may think of the struggle—there may be different views in this House—the question remains that people are anxious to find a

peaceful solution, that there have been talks going on in Paris in which these people were represented. It is not that we are inviting some kind of a rebel from somewhere. These are responsible people with whom serious discussions have been held in Paris and it would be in our interest, in the interest of peace in Asia, that we not only keep in touch with them, but keep in close touch with them, to find out what their thinking is, how we can try to help them in finding a peaceful solution.

Therefore, there can be no comparison in this situation and the situation in Nagaland or in Kashmir. Nagaland and Kashmir are parts of India. There is no question of there being discussed as some separate arrangement outside the Indian Union.

They are part of the Indian Union. We have our Constitution that applies and there is no doubt in our mind about the situation there. Here an armed struggle is on, a complicated struggle in which the international community has taken great interest. In a situation of this kind, there have been talks going on with responsible sections in Vietnam and, therefore, it would be totally unrealistic for us to shut our eyes and say that we have nothing to do with the NLF or the agencies they may set up. In fact, we have to have close collaboration with them.

19.00 hrs.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : But he got cold feet under American pressure !

SHRI RANJEET SINGH (Khalilabad) : And he got hot head under Chinese pressure !

SHRI DINESH SINGH : He should have known me by now and Government by now that we are not pressurised by any other Government or by anybody having different opinions in our country, that we are responsible to the people of this country and while we have their support, we continue to exercise the functions of administration on their behalf.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : He has not replied to my question asking whether they recognise the South Vietnam Government or not.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I have said in the House on a number of occasions that we are not considering recognition of the PRG just now. In my reply also I repeated that in view of the situation there, without a reflection on the struggle of the people there, this is not the time for us to consider a change in the situation.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : While I welcome the emphasis the Minister has placed on the international responsibility of India, I would seek a clarification. If the objective is to seek a broad-based political system, why should India hesitate to affirm that she will maintain the existing links? She may forge other links also. In fact, the Minister referred to the Paris Peace Conference. Why not suggest the holding of a conference in India in an Asian context where you try and develop a broad based political system, called the Buddhist-oriented political group? Why not offer India as the venue for it? Ultimately we have to recognise that 95 per cent of the people of South Vietnam are Buddhist. You cannot deny it. Whether it is the massacre of My Lai or Hua, they should all be condemned. I would like the Minister to give us his concrete ideas on a standstill on violence because he himself has recognised the international responsibility of India. What are his ideas on a standstill on violence? Is he prepared to offer Delhi as the venue for an Asian conference?

SHRI RANJEET SINGH : Or Calcutta, with a peaceful atmosphere !

श्री रामाबतार शास्त्री (पटना) : श्री-मन्, जब दक्षिणी वियतनाम की क्रान्तिकारी सरकार के लोग यहाँ हिन्दुस्तान में आए थे जैसा उनका द्वादिक स्वागत देश के कोने-कोने में हुआ, केवल कुछ हमारे जनसंघी भाइयों को और स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के भाइयों को छोड़कर बाकी सारे देश ने उनका स्वागत किया, तो इस बात को देखते हुए, जनता के अन्दर इस उत्साह को देखते हुए क्या सरकार अपनी पुरानी नीति पर पुनर्विचार करके दक्षिणी वियतनाम की क्रान्तिकारी सरकार को मान्यता देना चाहती है या नहीं ?

दूसरी बात यह है कि जब थाप वहाँ के

[श्री रामावतार शास्त्री]

संघर्ष को वीरता-पूर्ण संघर्ष बतला रहे हैं तो क्या आप वहाँ के स्वतन्त्रता-संग्राम में डटे हुए लोगों को तरह-तरह से मदद करने के किसी प्रस्ताव पर विचार करेंगे या नहीं ?

SHRI P. GOPALAN (Tellicherry) : In the 1954 Geneva Agreement it was envisaged that the unification of the two Vietnams, South and North, must take place within two years, that is before 1956, but was it the North Vietnam Government or the Puppet Government of South Vietnam which did not agree to carry out this Agreement ?

May I know whether India, as the Chairman of this International Control Commission, has not failed to discharge its duty and do justice to the people of Vietnam by failing to achieve the unification of the two Vietnams, and if so, why India is still continuing as the Chairman of this Commission ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : We are in touch with different thinkings in Vietnam including the representatives of the leaders of the Buddhist community. It is not that we are not in touch with them. Regarding the holding of any meeting or conference in Delhi offering Delhi as a venue, we have not received any official request that the parties concerned in Vietnam would wish to meet in Delhi. Should we received such request, we shall certainly consider it.

Regarding the question whether we are going to review the policy, I have just stated hardly five minutes ago the position that we are not thinking of recognising just now. So, I cannot within five minutes again start re-thinking, but it is a situation which is under our constant consideration, and if and when the time comes to make any change, we shall do so.

The question has been raised that we have failed in our responsibility and that we should resigned and wind up the International Control Commission. I do not think the hon. Member paid attention to what I was saying regarding the Commission.

May I say that the International Control Commission has discharged a valuable service to the world community in the work that it has done in Vietnam ? It is not always possible for the Commission to achieve success. It can be done only with willing co-operation, that is the only way in which the international community functions. There have been complications in Vietnam, and to withdraw from it will not solve the problem. I cannot understand why the hon. Member should even think in terms of our withdrawing. Can he say that that will solve the problem and bring peace in Vietnam ? What is the point in making such suggestions which have no basis ? The whole point is that we want, on behalf of the international community, to try to implement the Agreement to find a peaceful solution. We should never withdraw from our responsibility to try to find a peaceful solution to any dispute in the world, and if we fail to find a solution for a period of time, that is not failure. The world is not built in months or years, it takes time to create conditions in which peaceful solutions can be found. We must have patience to work for it. I hope the House will appreciate the good work that has been done by our delegation and allow it to continue.

19.08 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, March 20 1970 (Pauṣa 29, 1891 (Saka).